

Beyond 2015 Submission to the EC Public Consultation **“Towards a post-2015 development framework”**

07.09.12

[Beyond 2015](#) is a global civil society campaign, pushing for a strong and legitimate successor framework to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Ranging from small community-based organisations to international NGOs, academics and trade unions, Beyond 2015 currently brings together more than [400 civil society organisations](#) from 80 countries across the world. We are united behind the vision that:

- A global, overarching, cross-thematic framework succeeds the Millennium Development Goals, reflecting Beyond 2015’s policy positions.
- The process of developing this framework is participatory, inclusive and responsive to the voices of those directly affected by poverty and injustice.

In Europe, the Beyond 2015 European Task Force (ETF), which is the author of this submission, brings together all 200 European participating organisations in Beyond 2015. It also consults closely with the full membership of CONCORD - the European confederation of 1,400 development and humanitarian NGOs working together to influence the development policy of the European Union - since CONCORD is a participating organisation in the Beyond 2015 campaign. As such, the submission should be seen as the common voice of these European development NGOs on the post-2015 framework. This submission necessarily represents an amalgamation of very diverse organisations’ thinking and cannot possibly reflect the full range of opinions of the individual participating organisations of the ETF. It reflects the current state of thinking within the ETF as well as its key messages. In order to avoid repetition, we have cross-referenced questions and would therefore request that our submission is read in its entirety.

Towards a post-2015 development framework

Climate change, growing inequality, food insecurity, demographic change, resource constraints, an unsustainable growth, consumption and production model and the financial and economic crises pose complex and interrelated challenges that must be addressed in order to realise the human and environmental well-being and development goals that have been enshrined in the UN Charter, international law, norms and agreements.

The politics of development have changed significantly since the MDGs were designed in the late 1990s: the geo-political balance of power has shifted, inequality is deepening, poverty is taking on new dimensions and the actors tackling - and creating - development challenges have changed. Implementing the MDGs has taught us valuable lessons on what works and what does not. It is now time to move beyond the traditional development cooperation agenda and identify and address comprehensively the true root causes of the key challenges that the world is facing today. To do this will take courage, collaboration and conviction. It is not something that should be rushed. However, the design of the post-2015 development agenda presents a unique opportunity which must be seized in order to create a just and sustainable world in which every human being can realise their rights and live free from poverty.

A. The MDGs: benefits and limitations

It is very difficult to give a comprehensive answer to a question about the benefits and limitations of the MDGs. Beyond 2015 ETF will provide some general observations in answer to the following questions, which will be complemented by the individual answers of our members, and of course, other organisations.

The MDGs have been at the root of **considerable progress in the education and health sectors** particularly and our member organisations will expand on this and other sector-specific advances. The MDGs have also played a role in bringing development organisations together to work on the same issues, committing energy and resources towards the same ends. They have, furthermore, added considerable value in terms of **mobilisation** of public and political interest, commitment and investment. However, as evident from the overall progress made on the MDGs, advancing this framework has been uneven at the national level and it has been taken up differently by different stakeholders.

1. To what extent has the MDG framework influenced policies in the country/ies or sectors you work in/with?

The MDG framework has influenced policies in several ways. It has:

- Made the **fight against poverty one of the key elements of development policy** of a significant number of international institutions and governments (albeit with unequal involvement and commitment). In the case of the EU, the objective of poverty eradication in the context of sustainability has been enshrined in the Lisbon Treaty.
- Led, in some developing countries, to more systematic, planned approaches to the fight against poverty and, in some cases, also provided the opportunity for more socially excluded and marginalised groups to make their voices heard.
- Facilitated national policy-makers in defining priorities, identifying and planning interventions, particularly in the social sectors.
- Improved transparency to a certain degree in some countries through the production of regular reports on progress.
- Generated, as a result of rising inequalities (between population sectors, age groups, genders, geographic locations, income quintiles etc), some political debate on this issue in the context of meeting the MDGs, but insufficient policy efforts have yet been made to resolve inequalities.
- Led to the development of some new policy and programming instruments, such as the longer term EU 'MDG Contracts' which brought about more planning security for partners.
- Made budget cuts in development cooperation more shameful, but unfortunately not sufficiently so as to prevent them.

2. To what extent has the MDG framework been beneficial for the poor in the country/ies or sectors in/with which you work?

At a global level, there has been major progress in reducing poverty. Indeed, MDG 1's target on poverty is hailed as one of the few that have already been met. But since in fact **most of the progress has occurred in major emerging countries, and especially in China, it is hard to say to what extent the MDGs have had substantial added value in this regard elsewhere**. If one looks at poverty reduction having removed China from the equation, global poverty did not fall much.¹

Yet, the recent report of the UN System Task Team on the post-2015 UN development agenda stresses, "...the historic contribution of the MDG framework in providing a common worldwide cause to address poverty". It also states that, "(i)mportant progress has been made in most countries, particularly towards the goals of eradicating poverty and improving access to primary education. Yet trends have been uneven

¹ Where will the world's poor live?, Andy Sumner, Presentation to the OECD, June 2012

within and across countries and regions. The poorest and most discriminated against on the basis of gender, age, disability, ethnicity or otherwise have often been the most disadvantaged.”

We very much agree with the latter part of that analysis. The way the MDG framework was conceived led to **countries pursuing ‘low-hanging fruit’** – that is, achieving progress for those who were the easiest to reach. The benefits of MDG progress accrued least to those who are poorest and most marginalised and especially those who suffer multiple forms of discrimination. On the contrary, the most disadvantaged have seen few or no improvements and the disparities between them and others have only increased. The MDGs therefore **did little to tackle the root causes of poverty and marginalisation**, such as discrimination, which are embedded in social, political and economic processes and which impact on the achievement of all the Goals.

The MDG framework’s emphasis on poverty did help to increase somewhat the focus of development efforts on Lower Income Countries (LICs). However, it has more recently become clear that the majority of the world’s poor currently live in Middle Income Countries (MICs).² In the future, as LICs gradually pull their poorest out of poverty and some enter the MIC category, the poor are likely to reside about 50:50 in MICs and in LICs (including conflict affected and fragile states).³ All these trends regarding where poverty lies have considerable implications for donor policies towards MICs and conflict-affected fragile states (CAFS) particularly, in order for those policies to achieve pro-poor outcomes. We will address this in Section C.

3. What features and elements of the MDG framework have been particularly valuable in the fight against poverty?

The MDGs led to **more focus and priority-setting** in the debates and, to a lesser extent, in the actions of the international community, particularly as regards social development and social policy. In a number of countries, some of the goals were made explicit in national development policies and in bilateral development cooperation agreements. Furthermore, the weight given to social development in the MDG framework was appealing to citizens and easy for policy-makers to adopt, which helped to shift political attention somewhat away from the focus on macro-economic growth. It also helped to mobilise public opinion and raise media attention in some countries.

A key added value was the fact that the MDG framework was built on a set of **concrete goals** and predominantly **quantifiable targets** that were relatively **simple** and straightforward to understand, explain and monitor. Organisations in the South, for example, have been reported to appreciate the framework for improving awareness of development issues, spurring commitment from governments and turning the fight against poverty into a global movement.⁴ Progress could be measured, albeit in an overly narrow manner, on the basis of the agreed indicators. Furthermore, the statistical methodology and data needed as a basis for analysis and policy development were improved for those issues that feature prominently in the MDG framework (which does not gainsay the need for further disaggregated data, as mentioned later). Knowledge of the geography of the problems was consequently enhanced, even if their root causes were not fully identified or addressed by the MDGs framework.

Importantly, **resource flows increased** until recently. Official Development Assistance (ODA) for all sectors combined increased immediately following the introduction of the MDGs, and the health sector’s share of these resources more than doubled.⁵

² Global Poverty and the New Bottom Billion: What if Three-Quarters of the World’s Poor Live in Middle-Income Countries? Andy Sumner, Institute of Development Studies, September 2010

³ Sources: Aid workers are doing themselves out of a job, but..., Andrew Rogerson, ODI Blog Posts, 10 July 2012; Where do the world’s poor live? Where will they live in 2020 and 2030?, Andy Sumner, IDS, upcoming 2012

⁴ 100 Voices, CAFOD, 2010

⁵ OECD 2011; United Nations Statistics Division 2012; Post-2015 Health MDGs, Lu et al, 2010

The nature of the positive elements of the MDG framework is important to 'transfer' to or retain in any new framework that will be elaborated in the future.

4. What features and elements of the MDG framework have been problematic, in your view?

Some of the strengths of the MDG framework also proved to be risks and weaknesses. For example, the **narrow focus on a number of social issues** and the fact that progress in these field has been **measured by even narrower indicators** has led to only **late inclusion, undervaluation or even total omission of some important aspects of development** such as peace and conflict, freedom from violence, governance and anti-corruption, decent work and social protection, uneven population growth, climate change adaptation etc. There is therefore an inherent danger in the 'MDG approach', in that it reduces 'development' to progress on some of the basic needs and development policy to development assistance to the most poor and problematic countries. So one could argue, as has Jan Vandemoortele, that the MDGs "represent a reductionist view of development" or an oversimplification.⁶ They have contributed to a **narrowing of the focus of international efforts to providing development assistance** to poor and/or fragile countries.

Some flaws of the framework were known and criticised from the very beginning. For example, the **rights-based approach to development** of the Millennium Declaration was **to a large extent lost** in the formulation of the Goals. Instead, the MDG framework fostered an approach to development which focused on the volume of financial aid, while sidelining fundamental reforms needed to realise people's rights. Through setting targets on the basis of quantifiable indicators, rather than also including qualitative and outcome-based indicators, the framework promoted a narrow approach to **'solving' poverty through 'paying'** and **failed to address adequately the structural barriers that drive and perpetuate poverty and inequality**. Indeed, the formulation of the MDGs has contributed inadvertently to increasing inequality between people.

The lack of a rights-based approach led to a number of other limitations of the MDG framework. For example, while reducing extreme poverty (ie. incomes of less than \$1.25 per day) by half could be seen as a laudable aim, eradicating it, as a rights-based approach would imply, would be still better, as would raising that limit to, for example \$2 per day (the other international poverty line). However, should one be aiming to improve people's overall security and build their resilience as part of a future framework, these levels could be seen as quite inadequate. Clearly, this kind of reflection regarding 'limitations' of the Goals can be applied to all the Goals and reflects an inherent weakness of the need to set quantifiable 'minimum standards' to be attained. The definition of poverty cannot be reduced to a single matter of monetary threshold. The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights stated in 2001 that poverty is "a human condition characterized by the sustained or chronic deprivation of the resources, capabilities, choices, security and power necessary for the enjoyment of an adequate standard of living and other civil, cultural, economic, political and social rights."⁷

The **emphasis on aggregate measurements** has meant that a country might be 'on track' to meet a particular goal but that **huge disparities** may exist within a country (in part owing to the country having prioritised the 'low-hanging fruit') which are totally masked, for example between age groups, genders, geographic locations, population sectors or income quintiles. Furthermore, countries may have made enormous progress, such as a number of African countries, but may still be missing the targets and as a result be criticised. As Jan Vandemoortele has so rightly pointed out, "saying that Africa is missing the targets is missing the point."⁸ There was a lot of ambiguity about the level (global, national, regional, local?) at which results had to be measured. Some have even questioned the accuracy of measurements given the

⁶ If not the MDGs, then what?, Jan Vandemoortele, Third World Quarterly, Volume 32, Issue 1, 2011

⁷ Poverty and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, E/C.12/2001/10, 10/05/2001

⁸ Presentation to the Belgian Senate, June 2012

desire of countries to prove progress has been made. Certainly, one could argue that the emphasis on quantification was exaggerated, to the near-exclusion of all other forms of measurement.

The Goals themselves were not formulated in a participatory way. The process of their formulation was driven by donor governments, building on the OECD's 'Shaping the 21st Century: the contribution of development cooperation.' The design of the MDGs became a technocratic, top-down exercise. Not only were southern governments and national parliaments not closely involved, neither were concerned populations, let alone the poor and vulnerable, or small and remote communities. An approach was taken that **one size fits all**, whereas this is far from the truth. In some cases this approach contributed to a lack of ambition at national level where the goals seemed to be unreachable anyway. The lack of participation and consequently ownership may also have contributed to the failure of the MDGs "to engage with power and politics. The transformations needed to achieve the MDGs and further global development should have been driven by domestic politics and local actors".⁹ It is at least in part for this reason that full participation of *all* stakeholders in the process of drawing up the new framework will be so crucial - paying particular attention to the perspectives of those most affected by poverty and inequality and those systematically excluded from decision-making fora - and why the successor framework will need to be conceived differently.

Sustainability, although present in MDG 7, **was hardly visible in the framework** and ended up being regularly referred to as the water and sanitation goal. That led to all the other aspects such as environmental degradation and natural resource issues being overlooked – perhaps because the access to water and sanitation target is the most quantifiable and measurable. The critical role of environmental sustainability as a cross-cutting issue is not apparent but, as with other cross-cutting issues, it underpins the achievement of many other Goals. As the 2011 UN Human Development Report points out, environmental deterioration threatens to reverse progress in human development for the world's poorest, impacting on livelihoods, health, food security, nutrition, access to water and agricultural productivity.¹⁰ Looking forward, Beyond 2015 ETF would recommend using a broader definition of sustainability to include at a minimum economic and social sustainability in addition to environmental sustainability since this would better address people's well-being and resilience.

MDG 8, on the realisation of a global partnership, is a particularly problematic Goal in itself. Attempts were made to incorporate a large number of extremely important aspects crucial to the success of achieving development objectives. But the result was that it was vague, and **missed out critical issues that directly impact upon the achievement of all the MDGs and poverty eradication, such as the importance of applying policy coherence** in order to achieve development objectives or the **need for financial stability** and the **regulation of major actors in financial markets** (and the last decade has shown how financial crises and speculative behaviour of actors in financial markets can undermine development efforts). It has consequently failed to deliver. Moreover, it was not subject to clear quantitative targets, binding commitments or deadlines and there is insufficient clarity on the role of each of the governmental (including local and regional authorities) and non-governmental actors (including civil society and private sector).

Lastly, the **weakness of the monitoring and follow-up** mechanisms and instruments has been a major drawback in the MDG framework. This is closely linked to the **lack of mutual accountability** of national governments, international institutions and other actors that will be addressed in the next question.

⁹ After the Millennium Development Goals, Save the Children International, April 2012

¹⁰ http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/hdr/human_developmentreport2011.html

5. In your view, what are the main gaps, if any, in the MDG framework?

There are a large number of gaps in the MDG framework. Most importantly, it entirely omitted to incorporate a focus on policy coherence and accountability mechanisms, and, in focusing predominantly on the social sectors, overlooked the need to take a comprehensive approach to development, that is, to include other policy areas which impact significantly on the achievement of development objectives. Beyond 2015 ETF will address these issues further in the respective questions later in our submission. Suffice to say here that in our view **policy coherence for development** (that is, the need for all actors to ensure that their policies in any area do not negatively impact on people's perspectives for development in any country and preferably support the goals of development) is fundamental to the success of any development framework. There are few policy areas which have no impact on developing countries in one way or another, be that indirectly or directly. But policy coherence was entirely missing from the MDG framework. Similarly, **a recognition of how complex and interlinked issues are** – for example, food security and nutrition, health, education, water and sanitation and gender equality – was also missing.

Appropriate and rigorous accountability mechanisms pertaining to all actors are crucial for the success of achieving goals and turning aspirations or 'commitments' into obligations and this is developed in response to Question 7. Accountability is also central to democratic governance and the respect for human rights, both of which, as has been noted, were lacking from the MDG framework. The new post-2015 framework must express a genuine commitment to mutual accountability which encompasses the impact of richer and emerging countries' policies in areas such trade, tax and financial regulation etc and the role of all actors impacting on sustainable development objectives in any way. Mechanisms are also needed for citizens to hold governments accountable for progress towards development goals, accompanied by adequate civic education programmes to enable an informed, critical and meaningful engagement.

The **lack of comprehensiveness in thematic coverage** is well-known. It is commonly cited that issues such as climate change or addressing situations of insecurity, fragility or conflict are missing. Now that discussions are beginning on the design of a new framework for development, it will be crucial to ensure that it is fully thought-through in terms of the policy areas which are covered in and by it, and in so doing also capitalise on the links and synergies which exist between them.

The MDG framework **failed to measure progress in terms of equality and human rights realisation**. Due to the concentration of income, power and access to resources in the wealthiest quintile of the population in many countries, the national average on a range of development indicators can differ greatly from the average for the 80% of the population that excludes the upper quintile. **This kind of disparity also exists for many other non-income-related parameters, such as gender, age, geography (urban-rural) etc.**

Despite the considerable value of **disaggregated data** to policy design and equality outcomes, it has **not been sufficiently prioritised** in research or planning. The lack of even the most basic disaggregation in many of the poorest countries renders resource allocation less efficient and the realisation of everyone's human rights a distant dream.

Other significant gaps, which must be addressed in the post-2015 framework, include the lack of:

- A strong link with the principles and particularly with the rights-based approach of the Millennium Declaration.
- Focus on the rights of **marginalised groups** and those groups traditionally excluded from development processes.
- Adequate or fairly shared financing across the MDGs and between countries.
- Targets for so called 'developed' nations, other than very weakly in MDG 8.
- Binding agreements and commitments.

B. Feasibility of a future framework

6. In your view, in what way, if at all, could a future framework have an impact at global level in terms of global governance, consensus building, cooperation, etc.?

Global issues, such as global governance or climate change, need global solutions. Global solutions cannot be conceived or achieved if the framework is not global and if support for strong multilateral action is in any way undermined by focusing only on certain categories of countries.

An important task of the process to reach a post-2015 framework is to learn the lessons from the design and implementation of the MDG framework, as well as of other processes. It will be important to conduct **discussions which are inclusive and participatory**, leading to a **win-win** situation for as many stakeholders as possible and giving all parties a reason to commit to as ambitious a framework as possible, while recognising at the same time that there is a moral obligation to change the status quo in a large number of areas.

Developing countries were considered to be the key duty-bearers to deliver development outcomes in the MDG framework. Consequently MDG 8 - a global partnership for development - which potentially could have had an impact on global governance - was instead limited to assisting developing countries in achieving the seven other Goals through the classic channels of aid, trade and financial liberalisation, and assisting poor countries to achieve debt sustainability.

To have an impact on global governance, a future framework **must deliver, or commit to change which will deliver, legitimate and adequate systems of global responsibility, accountability and transparency which apply to all countries and all actors and which will support the realisation of human rights obligations.** This is essential to secure an international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in human rights treaties and conventions - arguably among the most fundamental manifestations of multilateralism to date - can be fully realised. Those systems of global responsibility, accountability and transparency must also embody and express a similar or stronger commitment to the one secured in the Busan Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation, which undertakes to “deepen, extend and operationalize the democratic ownership of development policies and processes.”¹¹

As put by the UN System Task Team in their report on post-2015, ‘Realizing the Future We Want for All’, “(t)he post-2015 UN development agenda should be conceived as a truly global agenda with shared responsibilities for all countries. Accordingly, the global partnership for development would also need to be redefined towards a more balanced approach among all development partners that will enable the transformative change needed for a rights-based, equitable and sustainable process of global development. This would also involve reforms of mechanisms of global governance.”

Poverty and inequality are not accidents of fate. They are the results of specific power relations and policy decisions which are discriminatory, exclusionary and unjust. Governance describes the institutional context within which human rights are achieved or denied. It is about how power and authority are exercised in the management of a national and global public affairs and resources. Crucially, it is about whether the most marginalised are empowered to participate meaningfully in decision-making. Governance, as it relates to discussions on a post-2015 framework, should be viewed from two different angles:

- **Global governance arrangements** and the potential impact upon a future development framework.
- **The relationship between governance, participation and democracy and poverty, and poverty eradication outcomes.**

¹¹ Busan Global Partnership Agreement: Busan Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation, Dec. 2011

7. To what extent is a global development framework approach necessary or useful to improve accountability with regard to poverty reduction policies in developing countries?

As a preface, it is essential to stress three points:

- i. The aim of the post-2015 framework, rather than limiting itself to poverty reduction, should be to create a just and sustainable world in which every human being can realise their rights and live free from poverty. Accountability mechanisms should therefore not only be geared to poverty eradication, but to addressing every actors' role (be they a country, a company or an international organisation) and their commitments within the post-2015 framework.
- ii. Poverty eradication should not be the sole prerogative of developing countries. Based on national poverty lines, 170m people live in poverty in high income countries.¹² Poverty is therefore found in all countries independent of their categorisation by income. All countries should therefore be held accountable to try to reduce poverty in their context and to close the gap between the richest and poorest.¹³ Higher income countries should simultaneously continue and increase efforts to assist lower income countries to eradicate poverty through international cooperation.
- iii. To enforce genuine mutual accountability, the post-2015 framework must encompass the impact of all actors' policies in areas such trade, agriculture, tax and financial regulation etc.

A framework that is global in scope and application is essential in these three regards.

Moreover, in times of globalisation and growing global interrelationships between economies and people, poverty eradication and, more holistically, the progressive and universal realisation of human rights, are a universal responsibility and would bring universal benefits. Climate change, income inequality, migration, gender justice, financial regulation, conflict and other issues all have fundamental human rights dimensions that present themselves across countries with very different levels of income. Insofar as these issues require international cooperation, cross-border action and policy coordination, a global framework will be essential to secure accountability across country boundaries.

The lack of accountability and transparency has been recognised as one of the deficiencies of the MDG framework.¹⁴ Broadly-speaking, accountability refers to policy-makers and power-holders being held to transparent performance standards against which they are answerable, through democratic institutions and processes, most particularly at national level (eg. through a democratically elected parliament, or an independent judiciary). It ensures that corruption and misconduct do not go unpunished and that good governance principles are upheld. Accountability is therefore central to democratic governance and respect for human rights, as it defines the relationship between state and citizen, and between the "rights-holder" and "duty-bearer" under international human rights law. Accountability improves policy-making and ensures that those whose rights are infringed upon in the development process are able to seek effective redress. **Mechanisms are therefore needed at different levels**, from the lowest level right up to the global level. **Locally-led monitoring of the key pillars of the governance system**,¹⁵ involving all population groups and sectors, is indispensable in reinforcing and complementing global systems.

Moreover, **a mix of accountability mechanisms** will be required. Where the future framework addresses issues with respect to which international standards or norms already exist, the focus should be on

¹² What Do National Poverty Lines Tell Us About Global Poverty?, Ugo Gentilini and Andy Sumner, IDS, June 2012

¹³ Please note that Beyond 2015 recommends moving away from GDP as the sole indicator of the well-being of a nation.

¹⁴ "The shortfalls have occurred not because the goals are unreachable, or because time is too short. We are off course because of unmet commitments, inadequate resources and a lack of focus and accountability." UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon, March 2010

¹⁵ For instance Transparency International identifies the following 'pillars' in a country's governance system: Legislative branches, executive branches, judiciary, public sector, law enforcement, electoral management body, ombudsman, audit institution, anti-corruption agencies, political parties, media, civil society and business.

strengthening existing accountability mechanisms (such as Human Rights Monitoring and Reporting, Peer Review Mechanism, reports on implementation of Multilateral Environmental Agreements) or following best-practice examples (e.g. national/regional human rights commissions/Court). Where the framework covers issues where there is a gap in effective mandatory accountability mechanisms, such as in the area of corporate transparency and accountability, new mechanisms will need to be put in place.

Grounding the post-2015 framework in human rights standards reinforces accountability by stressing that meeting development commitments is not a matter of charity but of legal obligation.

Lastly, the fact of the future framework being a global one will provide a number of supplementary and necessary elements for accountability to be meaningful. These include:

- Global commitment and obligations – if the framework focuses only on developing countries, the mistakes of the past, as outlined in response to Question 4, will be repeated, such as a lack of ownership by southern countries, a North-South dichotomy being created and donors not being held to account in any meaningful way, if at all. Joint responsibility (based on the principle of common-but-differentiated responsibility) for achieving the goals of the future framework, applied to all actors, is essential.
- Transparency and visibility – both in the sense of noting progress, but also in lack thereof. This would also offer the possibility of recourse to measures such as ‘naming and shaming’ if desired.
- Monitoring and reporting will be meaningful.

8. What could be the advantages and disadvantages of a global development framework for your organisation/sector, including how you work effectively with your partners?

Beyond 2015 ETF will provide a general response to this question, which individual organisations will complement in their submissions. While the participating organisations of the ETF focus on specific sectors such as trade, energy, agriculture or the environment, as well as general development policy, we are united by our ambition to promote the establishment of a strong and legitimate successor framework to the MDGs which aims to create a just and sustainable world in which every human being can realise their rights and live free from poverty.

By a “global” future framework, Beyond 2015 ETF means a framework in which all countries commit to contributing to the achievement of the goals which are agreed at global (UN) level, that the goals apply to all countries in line with the principle of common-but-differentiated responsibility (eg. governments contextualise the global goals at sub-levels, such as targets, to ensure ownership and relevance) and that all people across the world stand to benefit from the realisation of the goals.

Beyond 2015 ETF is basing itself on the assumption that the mistakes of the past (as outlined in answer to Question 4) will not be repeated and that the future global framework will take a human rights-based approach, underpinned by the fundamental principles, freedoms and standards needed for the progressive realisation of people’s rights. Such a framework would:

- **Reframe and redefine human progress** and set out the key areas which need to be addressed in order for people’s rights to be achieved, together with measures to do so. Our response to Question 15 sets out which key areas should be included.
- Recognise that we face **global challenges that can only be met by global responses** and detail the various **actors’ roles and responsibilities in achieving the goals**.
- Set out states’ obligations to fulfil the objectives of the framework at national level.
- Reaffirm the international community’s obligation to support states in their efforts to progressively realise people’s rights, if the state they live in is not in a position to finance the fulfilment of its obligations.

- Create an **enabling environment for a vibrant civil society** in line with international human rights obligations. This would be particularly important in countries where, for various reasons, the tradition of civil society involvement is weak or not well-established. An active and strong civil society is in turn crucial to the successful implementation of a global post-2015 framework since it is a key actor contributing to the realisation of set goals, monitoring the framework's implementation, and securing the accountability of actors at all levels from national to global.
- Guarantee that international partnership commitments be brought in line with clear targets, timelines, indicators and procedures at all levels.

There are inevitably a number of potential pitfalls in creating a global framework, as highlighted in answer to Question 4, which it will be important to avoid. While we recognise that the next global framework will not be easy to negotiate – especially if a comprehensive and rights-based approach is taken – Beyond 2015 firmly believes that the future framework must be global. In order for a meaningful future framework to be achievable, it will be crucial to create alliances early on, to engage in open dialogue with all stakeholders and to work towards a win-win situation.

C. The potential scope of a future framework

9. In your view, what should be the primary purpose of a future framework?

The primary purpose of a future framework should be to create a just and sustainable world in which every human being can realise their rights and live free from poverty.

Based on the Millennium Declaration and informed by the strengths and weaknesses of the MDGs, the framework needs – to achieve this purpose - to articulate a set of **clear, concrete, binding objectives** which have been **agreed upon through a participatory process**, which are **time-bound** and universal in nature, which have the capacity to capture and maintain appropriate and adequate support at public and political levels.

The objectives must embody a commitment to poverty eradication, equality, environmental, economic and social sustainability, peace and security, resilience, good governance and policy coherence for development.

The framework must have accountability at its core and the commitments must be measurable, with associated indicators which are both quantitative and qualitative. The framework must reflect a move towards the principle of 'universality' and must harness and build on commitments made at international fora by the international community which seek to address contemporary challenges faced – in particular - by the poorest and most vulnerable, notably climate change and malnutrition and food insecurity.

10. In your view, should its scope be global, relevant for all countries?

As already stated, especially in response to Question 8, the scope of the new framework **must be global**, in order to recognise the obligation of all countries to address the challenges faced by people in low, middle and high income countries. It should be guided by the principle of **common-but-differentiated responsibility** whereby every country has obligations but they may differ to reflect the country context. All countries should agree to make development progress, both individually and collectively. People around the world continue to suffer poverty, inequality and insecurity and measures to resolve these challenges need to be aligned and coordinated at a global level.

The fact of the future framework being global in nature will reinforce accountability. Countries must be accountable both to their citizens and to the international community. Quantitative and qualitative measures will need to be developed at a global level which can be applied nationally.

The framework should represent and reflect consensus across the international community that:

- Human Rights are universal. They must be realised both at national and international levels and they must be respected by all actors, including the private sector.
- Inequality within and between countries requires particular attention. Recognising its multi-dimensional nature, the post-2015 framework should provide a clear policy agenda to tackle inequality.
- Global public goods, such as biodiversity, need global protection. Climate change mitigation and adaptation is essential at a global level.
- All countries have to make their policies coherent for development globally. High and middle income countries have obligations towards lower income countries e.g. in trade relations.

A global framework will **enjoy greater legitimacy** and acceptance than one which is not. It would ensure global recognition of global responsibilities. And it would contribute to ending the outdated 'North-South dichotomy'.

11. To what extent should a future framework focus on the poorest and most fragile countries, or also address development objectives relevant in other countries?

A future framework should have a focus on the poorest and most fragile countries but it also needs to address appropriately and adequately development objectives in other countries.

However, two points should be made here. Firstly, Beyond 2015 ETF interprets the notion of 'development objectives' broadly. In addition to issues of policy coherence, human rights, gender equality etc. being mainstreamed, we recommend that the future framework **addresses the key global challenges** faced by the world today, ie. challenges that do not pertain to any particular category of country and that might not typically be considered as development objectives, such as global governance.

Secondly, while a focus on the poorest countries is necessary, since the demographics of global poverty have shifted such that a majority of poor people now live in middle income countries, and that in the future the poor are likely to reside about 50:50 in MICs and in LICs (including conflict affected and fragile states)¹⁶, it is **outdated to imagine that a post-2015 framework should only apply to low income countries.**

Furthermore, "extreme poverty is gradually changing from a question of poor people in absolute poor countries to questions about domestic inequality."¹⁷ This therefore begs the question as to the nature of the appropriate response, with **domestic policies becoming increasingly important in order to implement agreements** which may be made at global level. **Donor policies towards both MICs and LICs will need to be considerably adjusted**, including having recourse to other tools and instruments, in order to achieve pro-poor outcomes. This is especially the case given that in the former aid is being cut, while donors hesitate to plough too much money into the latter. These poverty trends therefore have implications for the issues to be included in the future framework – and *how* they may best be included. This is yet another reason why a more comprehensive focus in the future framework, including areas such as policy coherence for development, governance and so on is so important.

Nonetheless, **priority should be given to the poorest and most vulnerable people in a country**, independent of the development 'status' the country has been attributed. A specific focus should be given

¹⁶ Sources: Aid workers are doing themselves out of a job, but..., Andrew Rogerson, ODI Blog Posts, 10 July 2012; Where do the world's poor live? Where will they live in 2020 and 2030?, Andy Sumner, IDS, upcoming 2012

¹⁷ Where do the world's poor live? Where will they live in 2020 and 2030?, Andy Sumner, 2012

to the most marginalised, disadvantaged and excluded, ensuring the risks and inequalities they face are comprehensively addressed and that their resilience at individual, community, national and international levels is both strengthened and sustained.

It should also be acknowledged that the poverty *incidence* is generally higher in the poorest and most fragile countries. This results in shocking statistics, such as the fact that approximately half of the children who die before their fifth birthday lived in the poorest and most fragile countries.¹⁸ No low income fragile or conflict affected state has yet attained a single MDG. Yet fragile states are home to approximately 1.5 billion people. Therefore these countries do need specific attention.

A common feature of the poorest and most fragile countries is their higher levels of insecurity and violence, including gender-based violence. To be meaningful, a future framework **must address the interlinked challenges of conflict and insecurity, risk and vulnerability, and poverty** since progress is fundamentally held back in countries where insecurity is high. Since each society has unique dynamics that can lead to conflict, it is unlikely that a single goal can be formulated to uphold peace and tackle fragility. However, the new framework must address the common root causes of insecurity which have been identified in research, as well as those ingredients that help countries to transition out of fragility. We have raised a number of these throughout our submission – particularly in answer to subsequent questions – such as decent livelihoods, domestic revenue and tax-raising ability etc.

12. How could a new development agenda involve new actors, including the private sector and emerging donors?

All actors – organisations, companies, countries etc - should work together to apply the aid effectiveness principles, and in doing so deliver effective development co-operation.¹⁹ However, Beyond 2015 ETF will focus primarily on the private sector. At the outset, it is important to recognise that the private sector is *not* a monolithic bloc and ranges from micro, small and medium enterprises (MSMEs) – operating in the informal or formal sector- through to large multinational corporations (MNCs). Secondly, ‘involving’ the private sector could take many forms.

Small-scale producers and businesses, a hitherto neglected part of the private sector, play a particularly significant role in development.²⁰ The informal sector - which is largely made up of small businesses - accounts for 75% of total employment in developing countries.²¹ Poor women, men and children tend to predominate here. A private sector approach with a priority focus on small-scale producers and businesses would deliver outcomes more in line with human rights obligations, promoting dignity and decent and stable livelihoods for many, while also contributing to equitable and resilient societies. An important step is to develop tools for engaging actors in this sector: definitions, data and analysis of the sector are needed in order to design appropriate schemes and policies. Another crucial component is stimulating and safeguarding the ability of these groups to organise representation and take part effectively in policy formulation.

In line with a differentiated view of the various actors in the private sector, a post-2015 framework would need to adopt a different approach to bigger actors in the private sector- especially those whose roles have grown exponentially in importance over recent years, in their own right and through public procurement contracts and public-private partnerships. **Evidence is lacking on the real impact of their contribution to**

¹⁸ The Millennium Development Goals and Fragile States: Focusing on What Really Matters, David Carment and Yiagadeesen Same, January 2011

¹⁹ Busan Global Partnership Agreement: Busan Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation, Dec. 2011

²⁰ Thinking small: Why poor producers and small business owners may hold the key to a sustainable recovery, CAFOD, February 2011

²¹ Addressing informality, reducing poverty, Marty Chen, Poverty in Focus, No. 16, pp. 6-8, Dec. 2008

development. Much is based on case studies and proof can be found of both a positive impact (such as in research and development) and negative (environmental pollution, depletion of natural resources, buying up huge swathes of quality land in developing countries for biofuels or grain for animal feed, pharmaceuticals and extractive industries). It will therefore be critical that a future development agenda **addresses both the impacts and responsibilities of these actors** in the multitude of areas in which they are active or which suffer spill-over effects.

A commitment to respect and strengthen human rights obligations, financial transparency and social and environmental sustainability must underpin all operations of all actors in the private sector without exception. Despite the existence of a plethora of codes of conduct, standards and principles in a variety of different areas (such as fair labour standards, the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, the UN “Protect, Respect and Remedy” Framework and the Sustainability Reporting Guidelines), these are voluntary, difficult to monitor, relying as one does on companies’ own reporting structures, and therefore insufficient. So issues of tax avoidance and evasion (for example through mispricing) remain to be addressed, but could be, for example through mandatory country-by-country reporting requirements. **Binding regulation for minimum standards in key areas should be envisaged, thereby combining a corporate social responsibility approach with a corporate accountability approach.** Given the huge impact of the activities of large corporations (for instance in the financial sector, but also in food, energy, etc.) and their potential to cause or trigger major crises with global ripple effects which massively undermine progress in terms of poverty eradication, the realisation of human rights etc., such accountability must be incorporated into or be an outcome of the new development agenda. Similarly, while many companies are beginning to accept that **producing in a sustainable manner**, using local producers and relying on responsibly sourced raw materials is in their longer-term interest, this sustainability factor is yet to be embedded in all core business operations. Such an outcome would be highly valuable from the post-2015 development agenda.

In conclusion, there are many different ways in which the private sector could be included in the post-2015 development agenda, and the framework will need to adopt a differentiated approach towards the different actors in the private sector, focusing on both their roles and the responsibilities.

And last, but not least, a word on the involvement of other actors such as **emerging donors**. Since Beyond 2015 ETF stands firmly behind the future development framework being a global one, it goes without saying that for us emerging donors should be involved going forward. That involvement should take several forms:

- **Dialogue** on human development with emerging donors since they have important experience to share on what their development processes have been.
- **Commitments** to delivering on the goals set out in the framework, including in their roles as future donors to less well-off countries. **The buy-in of emerging donors will be one of the most important determinants of the strength and results of the post-2015 framework.**
- **Influencing** other governments with whom consensus will need to be forged.
- **Reinforcing** adherence to ethical principles, such as non-violation of people’s human rights.

13. How could a future framework support improved policy coherence for development (PCD), at global, EU and country levels?

The principle of Policy Coherence for Development (PCD) must be placed at very heart of the post-2015 development agenda. **PCD will be absolutely fundamental to the success of the future framework**, especially given the shifting nature of poverty, the links between and impact of all policy areas on the achievement of development objective and the decline in ODA. As recently stressed by the UN System Task

Force in their report on post-2015, “to realize the future we want for all, a high degree of policy coherence at the global, regional, national and sub-national levels will be required”.²²

Since the current MDG framework was adopted, globalisation has advanced to a stage where it is no longer sensible or possible for political leaders to ignore the global impact of domestic policy. Nowhere is this as evident as in the field of development cooperation. The ongoing economic, hunger and climate crises clearly demonstrate how devastating the consequences are of both regulatory policies and the production and consumption patterns of the world’s richest countries on the poorest. The negative effects of a policy generally hit the most marginalised people on the planet hardest despite their holding no responsibility for the decisions that led to the crises. PCD potentially addresses this critical global “accountability gap” more than any other policy instrument by stressing that all decision-making processes – both in the North and South - must be responsive to the needs and aspirations of the world’s poorest people and must ‘do no harm’ to their human rights and development perspectives. The EU’s legal obligation under the Lisbon Treaty to ensure that all policies take account of development objectives makes for an interesting model, even if further work is needed on implementation.

The ‘shared responsibility’ in the current MDG framework has in practice led to diffuse responsibility, allowing different actors to continuously avoid accountability, while targeting other actors for a lack of progress. The new post-2015 framework must ensure a relationship based on genuine mutual accountability which also encompasses the impact of rich countries’ policies in areas such trade, agriculture, energy, tax and financial regulation etc. In this sense, PCD reinforces the spirit of the Millennium Declaration which underlines political leaders’ “collective responsibility to uphold the principles of human dignity, equality and equity at the global level”.²³ In this context, it is important to stress that while the major barrier for PCD is the failure of developed countries to redress harmful policies, the concept requires developing countries also to be consistent domestically with development objectives - for instance, in ensuring that economic growth leads to poverty reduction and is environmentally sustainable.

The importance of policy coherence to human rights commitments and sustainability should not be underestimated. Just as human rights conventions confer legal obligations on states to implement their provisions, so international law requires international organisations to interpret their mandates, as far as possible, in harmony with the mandates of other international organisations, and in line with the ultimate goals they have in common.²⁴ They should all, irrespective of differences in economic power and influence, apply their mandates in practice in ways that do not place their members in contradiction with obligations which they have also undertaken in other international instruments and treaties.²⁵ Despite these legal requirements policy and practice more often than not fail to cohere with international law.

Furthermore, **there are still no robust institutional mechanisms that prevent richer or emerging countries’ policies, or those of the private sector, from having a negative impact on the world’s poorest people.** So, even though there is increasing awareness (and sometimes, full knowledge) of the consequences of policies and actions, there is still no obligation to intervene ahead of decision-making and anticipate and prevent incoherence. **Nor is there a complaints procedure** open to governments, civil society organisations or local communities negatively affected by others’ policies, which could trigger a revision of harmful policy provisions and lead to remedies for their negative effects on poor people in developing countries. The post-2015 development framework must address this, by requiring international and national level action.

²² Realizing the Future We Want for All, UN System Task Team on the Post-2015 UN Development Agenda Report to the Secretary-General, June 2012

²³ UN General Assembly (2000): UN Millennium Declaration, Art. 2

²⁴ Report of the World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalisation on policy coherence 2007, para 603.

²⁵ Ibid.

A set of general criteria which must be met by the new Framework can be deduced from the experiences with implementing PCD in practice so far²⁶:

- The framework's goals must be global in scope and tangible targets and indicators must be drawn up which allow for **effective assessment** of whether international, regional or domestic policies are coherent with the goals.²⁷
- **Guidelines** for proper institutional mechanisms such as PCD screening and monitoring of relevant policy-making process at international, regional and domestic levels must be attached to the new global goals. The guidelines must include specific indicators that allow for regular measurement of progress in implementation of such mechanisms in both donor and developing countries.²⁸
- The above points must be combined with **clear lines of responsibility** among the relevant institutions starting with the UN where the goals will be anchored but including other international bodies, regional organisations, national governments and civil society.
- A **redress mechanism** should be established that allows for affected people's voices to be heard and have their case raised when their rights are being undermined by incoherent policies.
- A **UN Special Rapporteur for PCD** should be appointed as part of the new post-2015 development framework.

In today's increasingly interdependent world these requirements are a matter of fundamental accountability and legitimacy for the post-2015 framework as a whole.

14. How could a new framework improve development financing?

In order to make progress in the financing for development agenda, the new framework will have to build upon the existing agenda: the Monterrey Consensus of Financing for Development, the subsequent Doha Declaration on Financing for Development, the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, the Accra Agenda for Action and the very recent Busan Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation. Development financing, currently highly fragmented, must be harmonised and made more coherent, including in terms of the standards applied when it comes to its accountability and transparency. Furthermore, it is crucial that donors live up to all their commitments on aid volumes and aid effectiveness.

In this context, the framework will need to prescribe a few key principles that should become the fundamentals of the financial system and the economy at all levels:

- **Fiscal policy: a rights-based approach**
Domestic fiscal policy is a key instrument of governments to mobilise domestic resources to fulfil their human rights obligations. Sound fiscal policy must have three purposes:
 - **Strengthen domestic revenues through effective taxation and ending illicit financial flows.**
Today revenue collection levels in developing countries are significantly below the global average. This is due both to poor national tax systems and administrations but also to the fact that illicit financial flows of approximately eight times the size of ODA are escaping developing countries each year through multinational companies' tax evasion and fraud. If these illicit financial flows were curtailed and taxed, estimates shows that approximately USD160 billion would be mobilised in domestic revenues each year.

²⁶ For a comprehensive overview, see Delivering Results – How Denmark can lead the way for PCD, Concord Denmark, 2012; see also Building Blocks for Policy Coherence for Development, OECD, 2009

²⁷ For example, the current international accounting standards facilitate massive outflows of illicit finance from developing countries. Globally binding targets to end these flows are needed, with which all international accounting standards must be brought in line.

²⁸ The measurement would thus be operating similarly as the previous Monitoring Framework and Evaluation of the Paris Declaration.

- **Re-pricing of goods and services** in order to internalise ecological and social costs and discourage undesirable behaviour (such as speculation, by using a Financial Transaction Tax, or carbon emissions through carbon taxes).
- **Redistribution of income and wealth** from the richer to the poorer sections of society (eg. through progressive taxation, the development of long-term, nationally-owned comprehensive social protection systems and the delivery of quality public services with particular efforts to ensure their accessibility for poor people).
- **Domestic private sectors must be supported** with a priority focus on small producers and businesses, and preferably through national and regional institutions rather than international ones. A number of factors should be weighed in any decision as to whether to use public money to fund private sector investments which involve rich country firms (such as in the case of public procurement contracts). These include the need to:
 - Verify that there is financial additionality because the company would not otherwise have had the necessary funds, ie. the investment would not have occurred without the support of public funds.
 - Ensure development additionality, ie. that the investment of public money contributes to meeting the development objectives, such as eradicating poverty and realising human rights and women's empowerment. Important in this, for example, is an analysis of the potential of the investment to provide goods and services that are accessible to the poorest and most vulnerable at a fair and reasonable cost, create jobs, increase productivity in the country concerned and deliver pro-poor outcomes.
 - Untie aid in order to bring magnified benefits to the domestic economy of the country in which the investment is being made.²⁹

The private sector's role with regard to development finance from donors has gained in significance as a result of current donor difficulties of maintaining ODA levels. Donors have sought to leverage the private sector's innovativeness to find new ways of raising development finance. However, as Eurodad points out, "investing in the private sector [must not be] a cheap excuse for declining budgets, but a truly developmental tool."³⁰ Development outcomes and impacts must rule, as should local solutions where possible.

- **Regulate to contain corporate excesses** - the financial crisis has amply demonstrated the costs of inadequate financial sector regulation and an opaque financial system. Regulating financial markets to end speculation, reorienting the financial sector to provide credit for activities that contribute to sustainability and a new framework for cooperation on international banking supervision and regulating commodity markets are some of the important issues to be addressed in this regard.
- **Adopt measures to strengthen a country's ability to counter crisis** - for many countries of the world the financial crisis has turned into an economic crisis, which in turn is having a ripple effect across the global economy. Unsustainable sovereign debt situations have invariably forced countries to adopt regressive and anti-social policies. Securing international monetary stability, fair, predictable and transparent treatment of sovereign debt crises, reforming the system of Special Drawing Rights and allowing countries to put in place measures to regulate capital flows are important measures to strengthen countries' ability to weather crises.

²⁹ Sources include: Common or Conflicting Interests? Reflections on the Private Sector (for) Development Agenda, Bruce Byiers & Anna Rosengren, ECDPM, July 2012; Private Profit for Public Good? Can investing in private companies deliver for the poor?, Jeroen Kwakkenbos, Eurodad, May 2012

³⁰ Private Profit for Public Good? Can investing in private companies deliver for the poor?, Jeroen Kwakkenbos, Eurodad, May 2012

D. The potential shape of a future framework

15. What do you consider to be the "top 3" most important features or elements which should be included in or ensured by any future development agenda?

Firstly, a number of *overarching principles* should guide the development of the future framework and which also informed the outcome document from RIO+20:

- **Applying a human rights-based approach** which puts human rights principles and standards at the heart of the framework at all levels.
- **Developing a global framework** with a one-world-approach including universal and common-but-differentiated responsibility. The framework must acknowledge the interconnections between extreme wealth and consumption, and poverty and the food, energy and climate crises.
- **Put the well-being of people** at the centre. This should include the participation and empowerment of citizens as measures of success.

Secondly, *three cross-cutting themes* that should be part of any future framework are **human rights, environmental sustainability (including climate change), and policy coherence for development**. Beyond 2015 ETF believes that by setting these cross-cutting issues at the heart of a new framework we can ensure that equality, non-discrimination and participation will be integrated in a meaningful way, that climate change will be addressed in a comprehensive manner and that all policies that impact on development will not undermine development objectives but instead contribute to their achievement and the realisation of human rights.

In addition to cross-cutting themes, there are *specific policy areas* that will, in our opinion, need to be included in the framework:

- **Human development based on the social sectors.**
- **Mobility and migration.**
- **Economy, consumption and production; trade and finance.**
- **Environmental sustainability.**
- **Governance.**

We would be delighted to meet with you to clarify what we include in each of these policy areas and the rationale for this choice. In the Beyond 2015 European Task Force's discussions on development in situations of conflict and fragility, it was agreed that the root causes of conflict and fragility could be addressed through these policy areas. This is rather different to the approach of the UN System Task Team, for example. No matter how the areas are eventually grouped or organised in a new framework, it is essential that they all be included, and that the complexities of the interlinkages also be addressed, rather than dealing with each issue in a silo.

Thirdly, **accountability and transparency** in decision-making, funding flows, budgetary and project expenditure, etc. will be crucial. The Millennium Declaration was an ambitious document with many far-reaching statements that defined the commitment of UN members to development. The Millennium Development Goals were conceived as simple, concrete targets that could contribute to the achievement of the commitments made in the Declaration, but they became the accountability mechanism by which progress toward the Declaration commitments would be measured. We have summarised the problems of the MDGs as an accountability mechanism in Section A.

The future framework must include accountability mechanisms which hold governments to account for the full range of commitments. Accountability should not just be upward, but also downward, to the people. A wider range of tools and communication channels for **informing people** about their rights and the

commitments made by their governments is therefore necessary, as well as systems to allow civil society, and individual citizens, particularly the most vulnerable, to participate in the elaboration of national development policy and plans and to hold their governments to account for decisions taken, progress or lack thereof and so on.

16. What do you consider to be the "top 3" features or elements which must be *avoided* in any future development agenda?

Firstly, any future development agenda must **avoid creating North-South divisions**. It is clear that goals which apply only to developing countries and for which only they are held accountable is not useful. The sustainable development agenda implies that North and South have to work together to tackle global challenges. However, whilst advocating for global goals, Beyond 2015 would like to emphasise that a one-size-fits-all approach should be avoided.

Secondly, the future agenda must **avoid increasing inequalities** between men and women, as well as between the poorest and most marginalised versus other groups. In order to achieve this, the most vulnerable sectors of a population must be represented in the discussions on a future framework. Wide national ownership and broad participation will be key when developing the new global framework. Low- and middle-income countries should be supported in playing an active part in the discussion.

Lastly, we need to **move away from quantitative measurements alone**, to an appropriate mix of quantitative and qualitative measurements, in order to focus more on equality and the well-being of citizens. In this, the work done by the Stiglitz Commission on the concept of well-being can provide some guidance: for example, moving away from GDP as the sole indicator of the well-being of a nation, toward a basket of indicators including the GINI Coefficient and Human Development Index. Similarly, human rights standards can be used to define goals and targets. Combining these two ideas would result, for example, in a goal on education being that all children should complete primary education and achieve qualitative measures relating to literacy, mathematics and life skills. Governance and corruption issues are often cited by poor citizens as one of the biggest barriers to their development. Targets on corruption could look, for example, at the rates of reported bribery in the education sector and changes – positive or negative – over time as a result of policy interventions. Participatory and inclusive approaches to monitoring could include getting feedback from people on their perceptions of progress.

17. Should it be based on goals, targets and indicators? If any, should goals have an outcome or sector focus? Please give reasons for your answer.

The specificity of the goals, targets and indicators of the MDG framework was at the same time a strength and a weakness. They at once drew global attention to development priorities, and focused policy action on specific areas that could be monitored and progress reported on. However, they also simplified very complex issues, often ignoring root causes of problems, and drawing attention away from governments' commitments in other key areas left out of the framework, such as social inclusion, labour, trade etc.

It is clear, therefore, that the positive aspects of the concrete, measurable and time-bound goals, targets and indicators of the current MDG framework (as elaborated in answer to Section A) need to be retained. However, the future framework must reflect our greater understanding of the complexities involved in achieving development objectives. As such, Beyond 2015 ETF supports a more comprehensive and accountable framework which will build on the key principles of human rights, an equitable approach to development, sustainability and policy coherence for development.

A global framework should incorporate globally defined and agreed goals reflecting the global challenges the world faces today, but should recognise the specific development challenges for particular regions and countries. In line with the principle of common-but-differentiated responsibility, we support the more

detailed layers of the framework – such as targets and indicators – being differentiated according to country context and needs (and further differentiation as appropriate). The inclusion of qualitative measures in this differentiated framework would also be appropriate. We recommend that **a broad approach to targets and indicators be considered to better reflect the needs. Other measures which could be considered include regulation, (binding) minimum standards, a new convention etc and the choice should be made depending on the issue at stake.**

Accountability mechanisms, or reference to them, must make up an integral part of the framework.

As to whether the goals should have an outcome or sector focus, the two are not mutually exclusive. The important thing is that indicators are meaningful and measure progress in a realistic manner. The indicators should not be burdensome but enable the global community to measure progress as a global, national and sub-national level with high quality data, disaggregated by at least age, gender, disability, social or minority status and wealth quintile.

18. How should implementation of the new framework be resourced?

There never has and never will be one single source of financing through which such a global framework can be resourced. Indeed, finance per se should be seen as only one solution within a package of measures. Going forward, resourcing the framework will need to be considered as a matter of right and responsibility to be shared between countries.

Important issues that need to be considered in resourcing the new framework are:

- **Burden-sharing:** the prevailing paternalistic and charitable approach to development finance needs to be replaced by the notion of burden-sharing between rich, middle income and poor countries. Such a model would be consistent with state obligations within the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights to ‘take steps, individually and through international assistance and co-operation, especially economic and technical, to the maximum of [their] available resources’ to achieve the rights set out in the Covenant (Art. 2). The principles of common-but-differentiated responsibility and predictability of resource flows must be respect this burden-sharing approach.

A fundamentally refashioned form of official development assistance (ODA) is important in this regard. While far from the only form of financing, donors must be required to make ODA commitments legally binding. Additionally, specific emphasis will need to be put on mechanisms to raise resources and to correct the extreme inequalities in the distribution of income and wealth through, eg. progressive taxes at the national and international level. The Financial Transactions Tax is an example of a tax which could be used for such redistributive purposes. Beyond these measures, other innovative mechanisms to raise resources could also be explored.

- **Costing of implementation:** For burden-sharing to be effective, a costing of the implementation of commitments would be required. An example of an important area in this regard would be the costing of social protection schemes, since social protection will be a key area to be addressed by the post-2015 framework owing to its importance as a policy instrument to uphold state obligations to fulfil economic and social rights.
- **Governance:** Decisions on resource allocation and transfer mechanisms, monitoring and accountability are crucial. Adequate and fair rules for procurement that are coherent with a poverty eradication focus, the untying of development assistance, transparency of decision-making, alignment with the recipient’s priorities, processes and timelines, effective parliamentary scrutiny, clear time-lines, targets and indicators for resource transfer etc. are indispensable policy interventions in this regard.

- **Policy Coherence for Development:** as previously stated, strong policy coherence for development, will be fundamental to the success of the post-2015 framework. Ensuring that policies in key areas support sustainable development goals will in fact avoid further costs being generated, or investments undone, through the negative effects of incompatible and harmful policies. Important policy areas to be made 'coherent' with development goals include: climate change; trade, investment and finance (including crisis prevention, ending tax evasion and eliminating speculation on essential goods and services); agriculture; energy; food security; migration; and conflict, fragility and security policies. Binding regulation should be envisaged for major actors in the global economy and international policy.

REFERENCES

Questions 1-5

- The Millennium Development Goals Report 2011, United Nations, June 2011
- The millennium Development Goals Report 2012, United Nations, June 2012
- Global Monitoring Report 2012, Food Prices, Nutrition and the Millennium Development Goals, The World Bank, 2012
- Report on progress in achieving the Millennium Development Goals in Africa, United Nations Economic and Social Council Economic Commission on Africa, March 2012
- Human Development Report 2011, UNDP, 2011
- Where will the world's poor live?, Andy Sumner, Presentation to the OECD, June 2012
- If not the MDGs, then what?, Jan Vandemoortele, Third World Quarterly, Volume 32, Issue 1, 2011
- Global Poverty and the New Bottom Billion: What if Three-Quarters of the World's Poor Live in Middle-Income Countries? Andy Sumner, Institute of Development Studies, September 2010
- Aid workers are doing themselves out of a job, but...., Andrew Rogerson, ODI Blog Posts, 10 July 2012
- No Future without Justice, Development Dialogue No. 59, June 2012
- Realizing the Future We Want for All, UN System Task Team on the Post-2015 UN Development Agenda Report to the Secretary-General, June 2012

Question 6

- Post MDGs: what next for a global development agenda that takes human rights seriously?- Alicia Ely Yamin
- Poverty, Human Rights and the Global Order: Framing the Post-2015 Agenda- Pogge

Question 7

- Accountability Workshop Report: European Beyond 2015 Conference, May 2012
- Locally-led monitoring as an engine for a more dynamic and accountable post 2015 development agenda- Richard Morgan and Shannon O'Shea, UNICEF

Question 8

- Making Aid Effective means Protecting Civil Society, Trocaire, August 2011;
- Sustainable Development Goals and the relationship to a post 2015 global development framework: a Beyond 2015 discussion paper, May 2012)

Questions 9-11:

- The Wheel of Development: the Millennium Development Goals as a communication and development tool, Dorine Van Noren, Third World Quarterly, 17 May 2012
- Inclusive growth and a post-2015 framework, Gina Bergh, Claire Melamed, ODI, May 2012
- Poverty, human rights and the global order: framing the post 2015 agenda, Thomas Pogge, Yale University, April 2012
- Human security and the next generation of comprehensive human development goals, Gabriele Koehler, Richard Jolly, Mara Simane, IDS, April 2012
- Realizing the Future We Want for All, UN System Task Team on the Post-2015 UN Development Agenda Report to the Secretary-General, June 2012
- A Post-2015 Framework for Development, Workshop Report, ODI/UNDP, October 2011
- The MDGs after 2015: no goals yet, please, Claire Melamed, ODI, September 2011
- Democratic Ownership Beyond Busan: Building Inclusive Partnerships for Development, Alliance2015, June 2011

- Post-2015 policymaking. What is being planned, what might actually happen, and CAFOD's current policy lines, Amy Pollard & Bernadette Fischler, March 2012
- After the MDGs - what then?, Janice Giffen with Brian Pratt, INTRAC November 2011
- Articulating a Post-2015 MDG Agenda, UNECA – African Union Commission, March 2012
- After 2015. Contexts, politics and processes for a post-2015 global agreement on development, Claire Melamed, ODI, January 2012
- Trocaire 'Beyond 2015: Where next for the Millennium Development Goals?' Event Report Feb 2012
- Climate change as part of the post-2015 development agenda, Lucy Scott, Andrew Shepherd, ODI, June 2012
- Human security and the next generation of comprehensive human development goals, Gabriele Koehler, Richard Jolly, Mara Simane, IDS, April 2012
- Development dialogue – no future without justice, Dag Hammarskjold Foundation, June 2012
- Trocaire 'Beyond 2015: Where next for the Millennium Development Goals?' Event Report Feb 2012
- 'Do we need new MDGs for OECD countries and the BRICS?' Partner Workshop Report, Welthungerhilfe, April 2012
- A global development framework after 2015, involve, September 2011
- Using human security principles to develop a post-2015 framework, IDS, April 2012
- Inclusive growth and a post-2015 framework, Gina Bergh, Claire Melamed, ODI, May 2012
- Development dialogue – no future without justice, Dag Hammarskjold Foundation, June 2012
- The Millennium Development Goals and Fragile States: Focusing on what really matters, David Carment and Yigadeesen Same, January 2011
- Putting inequality in the post-2015 picture, Claire Melamed, ODI, March 2012
- Inequality, a new frontier for post 2015 development policy, Claire Melamed, June 2012
- Towards a Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, UN ISDR, February 2012
- Post MDGs: What next for a global development agenda that takes human rights seriously?, Alicia Ely Yamin, June 2012

Question 12

- Realizing the Future We Want for All, UN System Task Team on the Post-2015 UN Development Agenda Report to the Secretary-General, June 2012
- Common or Conflicting Interests?, Bruce Byiers and Anna Rosengren, ECDPM, July 2012
- Post-2015 MDGs: what role for business?, Paula Lucci, ODI, June 2012
- Private profit for public good? Can investing in private companies deliver for the poor?, Jeroen Kwakkenbos, Eurodad, May 2012
- After the Millennium Development Goals: Setting out the options and must haves for a new development framework in 2015, Save the Children, April 2012
- CONCORD - various papers and non-papers
- Thinking small: Why poor producers and small business owners may hold the key to a sustainable recovery, CAFOD, February 2011
- Addressing informality, reducing poverty, Marty Chen, Poverty in Focus, No. 16, pp. 6-8, Dec. 2008

Question 13

- UN General Assembly (2000): UN Millennium Declaration, Art. 2
- Report of the World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalisation on policy coherence 2007, para 603.
- Delivering Results – How Denmark can lead the way for PCD, Concord Denmark, 2012.
- Building Blocks for Policy Coherence for Development, OECD, 2009

Question 14

- [CIDSE submission to the High Level Panel on Sustainable Development, March 2011](#)
- [No Future Without Justice. Global Civil Society Reflection Group. June 2012](#)
- Working group on Economy, Consumption and Production, European Beyond 2015 Conference, May 2012
- Increasing the impact of EU Development Policy: an Agenda for Change, EC Communication, 13.10.2011
- Common or Conflicting Interests?, Bruce Byiers and Anna Rosengren, ECDPM, July 2012
- Private profit for public good? Can investing in private companies deliver for the poor?, Jeroen Kwakkenbos, Eurodad, May 2012

Questions 15-17

- [Realizing the Future We Want for All](#), UN System Task Team on the Post-2015 UN Development Agenda Report to the Secretary-General, June 2012
- [After 2015: contexts, politics and processes for a post-2015 global agreement on development](#), Clare Melamed, ODI, January 2012
- [Disaster risk management in post-2015 policy frameworks: Forging a more resilient future](#), ODI Briefing Paper 75, June 2012
- [Post-2015 Goals, Targets, and Indicators](#), Barry Carin and Nicole Bates-Eamer, April 2012
- [Report of the Commission on Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress](#), Joseph E. Stiglitz, Amartya Sen and Jean-Paul Fitoussi, September 2009
- “The World We Want Beyond 2015” European Seminar, 24-25 May 2012, Background Paper on the Post-2015 Framework”
- [Putting climate finance on the Rio+20 agenda](#), Transparency International

Question 18

- Financial Crisis and Global Crisis, Yilmaz Akyüz, South Centre, 2012