



institut du développement durable et des relations internationales – 6, rue du Général Clergerie – 75116 Paris – France – Tél. : 01 53 70 22 35 – iddri@iddri.org – www.iddri.org

analyses N° 02/2006 | GOUVERNANCE MONDIALE

(ex-Les notes de l'Iddri n°10)

Equity and human development

Emmanuelle Bouquet (Iddri)

Equity and Human Development

Emmanuelle Bouquet
Iddri

A Summary of the 3rd Forum on Human Development
organized by the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs and
the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP),
in collaboration with Sciences Po, IDDRI and *Les Echos*,
Paris, 17–19 January 2005.

Les notes de l'Iddri, n° 10

Equity and Human Development

Emmanuelle Bouquet

Iddri

A Summary of the 3rd Forum on Human Development
organized by the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs and
the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP),
in collaboration with Sciences Po, IDDRI
(Institute for Sustainable Development
and International Relations) and *Les Echos*,
Paris, 17–19 January 2005.

*The Human Development Report Office
and the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs would like
to thank the Sciences Po students
for their writing of summaries for all the plenary
and parallel sessions of this Forum.
Their work was very useful for the writing of this synthesis.*

Translation: Marie-Eve Tilman (Euroscript, Luxembourg)
Layout: Alain Chevallier, Montpellier (34), France
Distribution: IDDRI – 6, rue du Général Clergerie – 75116 Paris
iddri@iddri.org, www.iddri.org

© IDDRI, 2006

Synopsis

Foreword	5
Executive Summary	7
Summary of the Forum	11
Equity: a unifying development concept	12
A concept which can be expressed in many ways	12
A concept at the crossroads of several views on development	13
Equity and development: Towards new policies and practices	17
General implications	17
Equity and development at national level	19
Equity and development on an international level	22
Conclusion	28
Internet Sites	30
Communications	31
Speeches	32
Bibliography	33
Programme	37

Foreword

Five years after the adoption of the Millennium Declaration by the General Assembly of the United Nations, and the definition of the eight Millennium Development Goals (MDG) which followed on from it, the outcome as far as achieving these goals is concerned, seems very limited. In the light of this observation, it is essential that the international community joins forces and gives a new impetus to the fight against poverty. The search for the financial resources needed to change the current direction has become the main preoccupation of the national governments (United Kingdom, the Nordic countries, France, Brazil, Chile, etc.) and non-governmental organizations involved. However, financial means alone will not be enough. It is becoming essential to identify and implement new strategies for co-operation and development.

The approach in terms of human development set out in the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) since 1990 constitutes one of the major advances in the new concept of development. The Global Human Development Reports (GHDR) which have appeared since then insist on the need to increase income and put the idea of ‘opportunity’, which should be open to each member of society, at the forefront. In order to stimulate thought on these topics, since 1999 the Human Development Report Office has been holding fora which bring together researchers and political and civil society representatives to discuss the latest studies on human development.

From 17 to 19 January 2005, Paris hosted the 3rd World Forum on Human Development, jointly organized by France and the UNDP, under the patronage of Mr Jacques Chirac, President of the Republic. This Forum was the first major event in a decisive year for development, which has been marked in partic-

ular by the G8 Summit in July, the 60th General Assembly of the United Nations and the Summit to implement the Millennium Declaration in September and the end of the Doha Round trade negotiations in December.

Built around two main themes, 'Cultural diversity and democracy' and 'Justice and human development', this Forum was based on the conclusions of the GHDR 2004 entitled 'Cultural liberty in today's diverse world' and on the GHDR research taking place in 2005 on 'International co-operation at a crossroads: aid, trade and security in an unequal world'. These two reports stress the growth of inequalities at both national and international level, and the major challenge this represents for the survival of the poorest populations and the security of the richest populations. According to the human development report, introducing the concept of 'equity' in development policies at local, national or international level would guarantee balance and stability.

This summary of the 3rd Forum on Human Development contains all the contributions to the Forum, sets out the place which equity should occupy in development policies and raises a number of questions. What place should governments have in formulating development policies? What policies should there be for integrating minorities? What redistribution policies should there be for guaranteeing the universal provision of certain essential services? What forms of governance should there be and how can we ensure the participation and co-ordination of all stakeholders in development? What official development assistance policies should there be? How should the system of international governance be reformed? These questions still remain unanswered, but stimulating trains of thought have been put forward throughout the Forum and are included in this summary.

Reducing inequalities requires strong commitment by all development stakeholders, as well as far-reaching reforms. Taking the concept of equity into account is a reminder that the coordination of stakeholders and the fair distribution of obligations and responsibilities must be at the heart of development strategies.

Philippe Etienne

General Director for International
Cooperation and Development,
French Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Kevin Watkins

Director of the
Human Development Office
UNDP, United Nations
Development Programme

Executive Summary

Equity: a unifying concept

Because it can be linked to the many facets of development

A notion which applies to a wide variety of indicators

- ▶ Economic (e.g. income)
- ▶ Social (e.g. healthcare, education)
- ▶ Political (e.g. human rights, citizens' rights, participation in democratic life)

A notion which lends itself to various types of evaluation and analysis

- ▶ Depending on the type of indicator:
 - Quantitative indicators: distribution around the average, levels of concentration
 - Qualitative indicators: process of inclusion or exclusion, of discrimination (whether of an economic, social, religious or political nature); conditions of access to services and basic public goods
- ▶ Depending on the scale: national, regional, global
- ▶ Depending on the unit of analysis: people, households or countries, considered individually or grouped by categories

Because reducing inequality is an objective which brings different visions of development together

- ▶ The vision of equity as an end in itself, an integral part of human development
- ▶ The vision of equity as a driving force for economic growth and for alleviating poverty (conclusion of recent economic studies)
- ▶ The vision of inequalities as the source of geopolitical, regional and international instability (conflicts, terrorism, migration)
- ▶ The vision of equity as a concept for mobilizing the international community and public opinion in favour of development aid

Implications for action

At national level

Social inclusion policies (involving all countries, both developed and developing)

- ▶ Target groups:
 - Ethnic, religious or national groups
 - Indigenous populations
 - Migrants
- ▶ Means:
 - Democracy, participation
 - Proactive multicultural policies intended to defuse the risks of developing community-based identities

Policies for redistribution (mainly involving developing countries)

- ▶ Reallocation of public budgets (national budgets or official development assistance)
 - Millennium Development Goals (MDG)
 - Financing infrastructure and operating costs for essential services (ensuring large-scale provision, and even considering ending user fees)
 - Priority targets: ethnic minorities, pockets of poverty, slums
 - Direct money transfer programmes to poor households
- ▶ Pro-poor growth policies: differential in the rate of growth between poor and non-poor which leads to a more equitable distribution of the benefits of growth (a still largely theoretical construct which needs to be supplied with more specific provisions)

On the international community level

Equity and official development assistance

- ▶ Reallocation to Least Developed Countries (LDC) and fragile States
- ▶ Thinking in terms of transfers (global social contract) rather than in terms of investment or debt.
 - Objectives:
 - Mass provision of essential services (MDG)
 - Institution building and capacity building (reappraisal of the principle of aid conditionality), on a national scale; on a regional scale (regional public goods)
 - Procedures:
 - Increased amounts
 - Long term view
 - Risk taking
- ▶ Donor reform
 - On an individual basis: transparency, honouring commitments, evaluation
 - On a collective basis: harmonisation and coordination
 - Alignment with the MDG
 - Implementation of the Paris Declaration
 - Potential role of international financial instruments: International Finance Facility, international taxation

To build a more equitable global governance

- ▶ Adopting rules which take more account of the needs and particularities of Developing Countries
- ▶ Involving Developing Countries in defining the rules:
 - Redefining decision-making mechanisms
 - Strengthening Developing Countries' capabilities in proposals and negotiations
- ▶ Applicable fields: trade, environment, ODA, etc.

The challenges

Measuring equity

- ▶ Evaluating and monitoring the levels of inequalities involves adapting and harmonizing national and international statistical systems, which causes technical problems and creates costs

Financing the reduction of inequality

- ▶ Limited resources: ODA, national resources (taxation systems, ability to mobilize savings)
- ▶ Proposals for international financial instruments which should be made operational

Reviewing the institutions and the policy

- ▶ This review adds complexity in comparison with development solutions considered from a strictly technical point of view.

Agreeing on the means

- ▶ Even if agreement exists in principle on the objectives, there are major differences concerning the means (for example the link between the public and private sector) and procedures for multilateral co-ordination in the context of a global partnership.

Summary of the Forum

Since the start of the 1990s, the work of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) on human development has been based on a conceptual framework seeking to overcome the limits to the approaches reducing development to economic growth. The Millennium Development Goals (MDG), whose objectives are social rather than economic, are part of this approach which aims to put people at the centre of development problems. In this context, the notion of equity naturally has a place and seems to be emerging as a new keyword in the development community. For this reason, equity will be the theme of the Human Development Report (HRD) 2005, and that of the World Bank's World Development Report 2006.

As a value, equity presents a major advantage: its universal scope gives it the potential to bring together and mobilize so as to consolidate the upsurge in efforts made by the international community in support of developing countries after the 1990s, which were in turn characterized by doubt and disengagement. However, as a development concept, equity covers a very wide field, which immediately raises the question of which methods should be used for characterization and instrumentalization. Specifically, how can consideration of equity contribute to a renewal of the analyses, policies and practices tied to development?

Equity: a unifying development concept

A concept which can be expressed in many ways

Insofar as the use of equity as a development concept will be dictated by the definition given to the concept, it is useful to re-examine the different approaches presented on the occasion of the Forum and to suggest a classification of them. The notion of equity can be applied to a whole range of variables, which can be broken down into two categories.

The first category refers to quantitative, static variables which provide information relative to outcome. The level of equity linked to these variables is estimated based on an analysis of their distribution around the mean. The classic approach consists of regarding economic indicators such as income, consumption or the level of assets (Dikhanov, Fuentes, Gray Molina)¹ But other types of indicators, in particular those defined in line with the MDG (infant and maternal mortality rates, school attendance rates of children in general and girls in particular, etc.) lend themselves to an analysis of their distribution (Watkins, Cornia).

The second category of variables is more complex and its shape is often less well defined. They are constructed with reference to the conditions of access to services or fundamental public goods, and refer to the approach to human development based on concepts of equal opportunities and widening the range of choices offered to individuals (Sen, Malloch Brown, Fukuda-Parr). This is a set of qualitative, dynamic variables referring to processes. They are divided into two sub-categories according to whether the terms of access apply to individuals or to countries.

In the context of the Forum, the access variables applicable to individuals were defined with reference to the MDG (access to health and education services, for example), but also with reference to the *Human Development Report 2004* on cultural freedom (conditions for exercising human rights and citizens' rights in a democratic framework, especially with regard to minorities). Indeed, the HDR 2004 estimates the number of people around the world who are subject to exclusion for one reason or another to be 900 million. The variables applicable to countries refer to

1. The rest of this text, undated references refer to contributions of participants in the Forum, which are summarised on page 30 and most of which can be downloaded from the website (<http://hdr.undp.org/events/forum2005/>). The dated references can be found in the bibliography at the end of the document.

the conditions for access to markets, to official development assistance and to international sources of finance, as well as to the decision-making authorities of multilateral organizations (in particular the World Trade Organization, WTO).

The assessment of the level of equity linked to this second type of variables is based on an analysis of the processes of inclusion or exclusion, whatever its nature may be (economic, social or political). These processes may be considered as such, e.g. restrictions relating to teaching in a minority language or certain religious practices (Ivanov, Pate), or because of the consequences they have on the distribution of first category variables, e.g. income or life expectancy (Fukuda-Parr).

Depending on the variable we elect to use, inequalities may be measured in various ways, according to the scale (national, regional or global) and the unit of analysis (persons, families or countries, considered individually or grouped by category).

A concept at the crossroads of several views on development

The emergence of equity as a key concept may be connected more or less directly to the trends and issues forming the current development agenda.

The need to mobilize the international community

The Forum has been the occasion for a series of calls to rally the international community around the cause of development, launched by eminent personalities from the UNDP (Mark Malloch Brown, Kevin Watkins), the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Michel Barnier, Xavier Darcos, Philippe Etienne) and from civil society (Mary Robinson of the Ethical Globalization Initiative, Bernard Kouchner of Médecins sans frontières, Adrian Lovett of Oxfam). These personalities have reminded us of the commitments made by the developed countries on the occasion of the MDG in 2000 and at the Monterrey conference in 2002, in particular increasing the financing of official development assistance (an objective set at 0.7% of GDP). These commitments are still far from being achieved, as the Sachs Report on MDG, whose publication coincided with the first day of the Forum, also underlines (Sachs, 2005). Calls for mobilization have, moreover, been given momentum by the demonstrations of unprecedented solidarity which followed the tsunami. How can we capitalize on what seems to be an international awakening to our shared condition as 'citizens of the world' (Sen, Robinson) and support it in the longer term, in order to

alleviate not only the temporary effects of the tsunami of December 2004 but also the recurring effects of all the 'silent tsunamis' which daily ravage the least developed countries (LDC), especially in sub-Saharan Africa?

To be effective, the mobilization of the international community must be based on universal values reminding us of our humanity. This is the message in the title of the opening speech of the winner of the Nobel Prize for Economics, Amartya Sen, 'What is it like to be a human being?', and this idea resonates in the reference by Mary Robinson to the first article of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights: 'All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights.' In this context, equity as a value can act as a lever, because its field application covers variables of economic, social and political order at one and at the same time.

Evolution of notions of development

The growing awareness of equity is part of a continuous repositioning of development priorities. In brief, the 1960s were focused on physical capital, the 1970s on human capital, the 1980s on structural adjustment and the 1990s on poverty reduction (Birdsall). The change of direction which began in the 1990s was the result of awareness that liberalization and economic growth alone could not be equated with development, because of the processes of adjustment which are associated with them. On the one hand, although liberalization seems to result in global growth, national dynamics tend to vary, and processes of regression have even been observed. On the other hand, the relationship between growth and poverty reduction is also hard to define with certainty (Defraigne, Fontagné). This twofold conclusion calls for a specific approach to alleviate poverty.

What are the links between an approach based on reducing poverty and an approach in terms of reducing inequalities? For those supporting human development, equitable growth is set out as a principle. The question is not only to determine if globalization benefits the poor, but whether the gains resulting from globalization are distributed equitably (Sen).

From a pragmatic point of view, the growing focus on equity derives from the recognition that, in spite of the programmes to alleviate poverty, intra and inter-country inequalities may continue to exist or even get worse. The choice of equity as the theme of the Human Development Report 2005 stems from the conclusions taken from the follow-up studies of the MDG, amongst others. The results show two types of inequality. On the one hand, there are divergences between the paths and the

successes achieved by the various countries or groups of countries in pursuing these objectives. Sub-Saharan Africa in particular is lagging behind to a very worrying extent. On the other hand, progress towards the MDG measured on a national level can hide the continued existence or aggravation of ethnic or regional disparities, which run contrary to the very spirit of the MDG. Arguably, a third form of inequality can be cited: the major differences noted within a given country in the progress (or lack of progress or even deterioration) made in meeting the various targets (Watkins).

Recent studies by economists from the World Bank also focus on the question of inequalities (of income) both within and between countries. An inventory of global inequalities and their evolution in the last few decades has thus been drawn up. The results show a tendency for inequalities to become entrenched within countries from the 1980s, a period which coincides with widespread adoption of policies of liberalization (Fontagné, Dikhanov)². Inter-country data is more difficult to interpret because the conclusions reached depend, to a large extent, on the methodology used. In addition, the failure of previous studies to establish a systematic relationship between growth and poverty reduction has led to the launch of a new series of studies. These are based on presenting inequality as a third variable and seek to explore the interactions within the 'growth-poverty-inequalities triangle' (Fuentes, Bourguignon, 2004). The innovative nature of this approach stems from the fact that lower inequalities are no longer regarded purely as a result but also as a variable which may explain poverty reduction, economic growth and even democratization. In other words, even if reducing inequalities is not regarded as a principle or an end in itself, it can be considered as a way of promoting development.

Development and geopolitics: interdependence, migrations and conflicts

That development aid policies are guided by geopolitical considerations, (old colonial influences, management of the Cold War, etc.), amongst others, is nothing new. A much less conventional suggestion, however, is that underdevelopment is a potential source of international instability and consequently a key geopolitical issue per se. For Mark Malloch Brown of the UNDP, 'Human development is a necessity meeting both the survival imperative of the South and the security imperative of

2. A university study based on health indicators produced similar conclusions (Cornia).

the North.’ Many contributions have analysed the implications and the challenges of increased interdependence. They were based on two themes: international migration (Wihtol de Wenden, von Busekist) and violent conflicts (Mamdani, Fukuda-Parr, Collier). In both cases, processes, which above all affect developing countries and which initially fall within a geographical framework circumscribed to the local or national level, are expressed by repercussions on a regional scale or even more widely, involving both developing and developed countries. The tensions and the costs incurred by international terrorism are one example which springs immediately to mind. A study presented to the Forum showed and tried to quantify the costs incurred by an international conflict between neighbouring countries and the negative consequences in terms of development prospects for the entire region (Chauvet and Collier, 2004). Likewise, migratory flows can create negative externalities for transit and host countries. Generally, the ‘Fragile States’, which are characterized by an inability or lack of willingness to carry out their basic functions, now constitute a central category when thinking about the relationship between underdevelopment and global risks (DFID, 2005).

How does the question of inequality fit into this broad landscape? In the series of works of the HDR 2004, a constant in the contributions has been to reject interpretations based on a ‘clash of cultures’ (which would determine many violent conflicts and would undermine the ability of diasporas to integrate into their host countries). The proposed explanatory model was based rather on case-by-case analyses covering a long period of time as well as on considerations of equity (Akindes, Abdullah, Guichaoua, Gray Molina, Pournik). In developing countries, significant situations of serious inequality (regarding distribution of national wealth, and also political and social exclusion) could thus unleash the dynamics of conflict. Conversely, talk of a link between reducing inequalities, the democratization process and national and international stability is now commonplace (Kimlicka, Bangura).

In conclusion, the concept of equity which emerges from the studies of the Forum is a broad concept which covers economic, social, cultural and political dimensions. It allows the relationship between equity and development to be considered in a number of ways, particularly by bringing up the question of democracy and human rights, in line with the human development approach, or poverty reduction and access to essential health and education services in line with the MDG. It can also apply on different scales; take for example the case of citizens within a country or of countries within the international system.

Regardless of the definition of it we choose, equity seems to be emerging as a key development concept, whether as an end in itself, or as a means of promoting development, or even as a way of managing stability and security on a regional and global scale. However, although recognition of the importance of an approach based on reducing inequality is gaining ground, it is not clear how a concept of equity covering such a large and composite field will be expressed in practice. The following section is devoted to the implications of considering equity in the policies and practices connected with development.

Equity and development: Towards new policies and practices

General implications

The return of public policy and the State

It is a generally accepted interpretation that equity cannot only be a product of the interplay of market forces, because equity and the market are not part of the same register. To suggest that equity is the objective and driving force behind development logically requires stepping out of the liberal logic which had governed the structural adjustment programmes and re-establishing the role of governments (and government expenditure). Politics, policy and government intervention have been very visible in Forum communications, which links in with the MDG and HDR 2004. Two main themes have been developed: redistribution and inclusion. These themes, which in many cases are accompanied by a resetting of priorities, objectives and resources, have their field of application on a national and international scale, as the examples in the following sections illustrate.

An equity-based approach goes beyond redefining policy instruments. For the sake of consistency, it must combine a full rethink of the relational and decision-making processes which link on the one hand States to their citizens and on the other hand States to the international community. It therefore requires a rethink of the system of governance, participation and coordination at every level.

Finally, legitimization of governments must be accompanied by thinking about the connection with the other types of stakeholders involved in both the national and transnational sphere, i.e. civil society and the private sector. It is vital that these stakeholders are taken into account and that new types of partnerships are established (Sachs 2005).

Civil society may sometimes be questioned on its transparency and representativeness. However, experience teaches us that it carries out the essential functions of monitoring and questioning governments, and that increasingly in the developing countries it is a substitute for the State in key sectors such as healthcare or education (Birdsall, Kouchner, Robinson, Lovett, Simbulan, Menon).

Implementation of the MDG in developing countries is only conceivable if investments and mass transfers on a large scale in the sectors defined as priorities, particularly health and education, go ahead. There is currently a consensus on the need, at least initially, for a large part of these costs to be paid from public funds, via national budgets and official development assistance (Malloch Brown, Birdsall, Severino). This consensus is underpinned by the observation that, in many cases, the present local context does not provide the conditions necessary for the private sector to supply investment, production and services required under the MDG, due either to a lack of capacity or a problem of incentive and risk management. Ultimately, will the solution be found through increasing the intervention scope of the public sector or on the other hand by improving the capabilities and operating conditions of the private sector, particularly on a local and national scale? The question continues to be debated (Collier, Nuamah). In any event, from now on thought should be given to the feasibility and modalities of a handover with regard to ODA (Severino, Pouligny).

Measuring equity: the question of indicators

To be interested in equity presupposes that the appropriate means of measurement and evaluation are available. Whatever field may be considered, producing relevant indicators, collecting reliable data and using a systematic approach in a national or supranational framework, as well as analysing results from an operational point of view (formulating or evaluating policies or programmes), always raise numerous problems: either practical problems or problems of methodology. These issues fall outside the scope of this summary, but it may be useful to specify certain specific implications of an approach in terms of equity.

The first point relates to the new requirements for information created by the two elements of public policy identified in the previous section. Redistribution policies are generally based on existing indicators, referring us back to the first category of variables mentioned above, such as levels of income or consumption, school attendance levels or infant mortality rates. Nevertheless, these indicators are generally used as averages (particularly in the case of the Human Development Index (HDI), or the MDG targets), whilst an

approach in terms of equity involves consideration of distribution in order to be able to evaluate the absolute level of inequalities, to identify the most critical sectors for intervention and to target priority groups or areas. Consequently, a breakdown effort is needed. The HDR 2004 provides some results broken down by region or ethnic group, but these are still the exception rather than the rule. A more systematic attempt is the one conducted by the team of the National Human Development Report in Mexico, starting from the observation of large inequalities between the regions which would lose all their meaning in national averages (López-Calva).

Social inclusion policies necessitate, for their part, an attempt to produce new indicators which can take account of the processes of inclusion or exclusion and of their development over time. The qualitative, complex nature of these processes makes the exercise more complicated and the specificities of national contexts make attempts at comparisons between countries particularly hazardous (Nahem). The University of Maryland 'Minorities at Risk' project, which provided a large amount of data for the HDR 2004, is nevertheless an interesting example of a formalization and systematization of the subject (Pate).

The second point concerns the constraints and costs which these new needs for information put on national and international statistical systems which are often already short of resources. Certain problems, particularly those of a technical nature, can be resolved upstream and integrated in technology transfer programmes (Nahem, Fontaine). But to be effective, the introduction of new indicators or new methods of analysis must be approved by the countries concerned, which presupposes at least a convergence with national priorities as well as a favourable cost-benefit analysis. In this respect, the Mexican initiative has several advantages. It comes from a developing country in response to an internally formulated problem. It is based on an already existing statistical corpus (HDI) and only makes improvements at the margin, which reduces its cost. Lastly, it can be applied to other national contexts. Indeed, several developing countries have expressed an interest in collaborating with the Mexican team to benefit from their technical assistance (Lopez-Calva).

Equity and development at national level

Social inclusion policies

Social inclusion policies are applied in a large number of situations; they affect most countries, regardless of their level of development. Their scope of application covers principally the

following categories: ethnic, religious or national groups living in the same State, indigenous populations and migrants.

It has been observed, firstly, that social inclusion policies fit most easily into a democratic framework based on non-discrimination (Kimlicka, Dieckhoff, Bangura). Having said this, introducing social inclusion policies (possibly under the pressure of the international community or even of the diasporas) may also constitute the starting point of the democratization process. In addition, a functioning democracy is not sufficient to guarantee equity in the sense of inclusion of minorities. On the one hand, democratic institutions can be 'taken hostage' by essentially totalitarian and intolerant pressure groups (Abdullah, Mamdani, Menon). On the other hand, the HDR 2004 notes the limits of an approach based only on the absence of discrimination in ensuring equal opportunities. It advocates a more voluntary approach, based on three models defined in relation to the nature of the minorities concerned: multinational and multilingual federalism for ethno-national groups; internal decolonization for indigenous populations; multiculturalism for communities stemming from migrations (Kimlicka, Fukuda-Parr).

An analysis of social inclusion policies, especially when they form part of a broader process of building or rebuilding the State, must distinguish between form (the founding principles and constitutional or legal frameworks) and substance (the terms of negotiation and enforcement). In practice, as shown in particular by the South African examples in recognizing certain types of customary law, or by the Indian example of the coexistence of a number of religions in a secular framework, a great deal of arbitration on a case-by-case basis is necessary (Kollapen, Ntsebeza, Menon). To legitimize this process and defuse possible tensions is a delicate political exercise. Every context is unique; nevertheless, two main forms of situations have been identified as determining factors: the conditions of participation in the democratic debate at all levels, particularly at the lowest level (Paley, Ntsebeza, Kollapen, Menon, Mamdani) and the conditions of identity building for all citizens. This identity building should be anchored in a feeling of confidence in national institutions (Stepan), and cross the ethnic or religious divides that risk creating tension within the community (Sen, Bangura, Akindes).

Redistribution policies

The redistribution policies referred to can be placed in two categories. The first relates to direct transfer policies, targeted according to priority sectors and groups. In developed coun-

tries, the formula is generalized, even if the modalities and relative importance of the transfers may vary. The aim is to extend the establishment of a minimal universal social security system to the developing countries, to which productive dynamics could be added later – possibly supported by Microcredit-style economic development programmes (Severino; German; Sachs, 2005). The redistributive aspect lies in reallocating essentially public budgets (national budgets or ODA).

The approach advocated by the MDG fits into this first category. It aims to guarantee the conditions for fair access to essential services, particularly health, education and drinking water, for all populations, as a result of taking care of infrastructure investments and financing recurrent operating costs. The objective is not only to guarantee supply, but also, perhaps, to provide these services at no cost. The overall priority targets are ethnic minorities, regional pockets of poverty and slums (Sachs, 2005).

Another example is direct money transfers to the poorest or most vulnerable households. Evaluation of a pilot project conducted in Zambia among families affected by AIDS underlines the significance of this approach in terms of institution building and impact. Identifying beneficiaries, a critical step, is handled in a participatory way, after which all aspects of coordination are managed through market mechanisms. A system of this type has the advantage of reduced logistical costs and offers a great deal of flexibility for the beneficiaries (Goldberg, Walumba). The project is based on a partnership between the Zambian government and the German agency for cooperation GTZ. It is still limited to small-scale operations, but the case of the Oportunidades programme, which has more than 4 million beneficiaries in Mexico, shows the large-scale feasibility of this type of system when the operating rules are well thought out.

The second category of redistribution policy is more innovative. Described as ‘pro-poor growth policies’, they combine economic growth and reducing inequalities. The objective is to generate a growth rate in the poorest categories greater than that of the rest of the population. This differential in rates leads to a more equitable allocation of the fruits of growth. Simulations tend to show the potential for these policies to reduce poverty at a much faster rate (Fuentes; Bourguignon, 2004). This category offers a twofold advantage: from a conceptual point of view, it confirms the importance of an approach based on reducing inequalities; from a political point of view, the redistribution of future wealth by means of differentiated growth rates clearly seems to be less difficult to implement than redistribution of existing wealth via tax reform or even a redistribution of

economic assets. Nevertheless, it is still an intellectual construct which must be supplied with more specific provisions.

Key institutional and budgetary issues

The objective of social inclusion and redistribution policies is to reduce inequalities and to promote virtuous circles of human development. Having said this, they do not solve every problem, far from it, in fact. On the one hand, they are broadly based on a rehabilitation of the State, while a number of developing countries are characterized precisely by a State crisis. Complex processes of institution building or institutional consolidation must often be conducted in parallel, which may involve a radical restructuring of the economic or political balance of power. On the other hand, introducing these policies involves considerable budgetary costs, which raises the questions as to their short-term feasibility and long-term durability. These depend on the conditions of access to ODA and international financing, on growth perspectives, and on the ability of financial systems and national taxes to mobilize internal resources (Sagasti).

In every case, external determinants must be added to purely internal factors, referring us back to the conditions of countries' insertion into the international system. Cooperation between developing countries, by setting up regional blocks or by grouping around common interests and demands, can contribute to generating regional public goods which can increase capacities and reduce both internal and external vulnerability (Birdsall, Kaul). The African peer review mechanism is thus an interesting example of a regional initiative relating to governance (Savané). Whatever the case may be, the growing interdependence of development dynamics means that the relationship between equity and development at the international community level must be considered.

Equity and development on an international level

The eighth goal of the MDG is our main reference to make the link between equity and development at the international community level. This goal establishes the need to set up a global partnership for development and describes its nature, in broad terms. By doing this, it obliges the rich countries to face up to their responsibilities with regard to developing countries (Birdsall, Tübiana). These responsibilities, which may once again be seen in terms of redistribution and inclusion, are expressed by official development assistance on the one hand and by the conditions for building global governance on the other.

Official development assistance

Official development assistance is currently subject to major restructuring. One of the main reasons for this is due to the MDG, which constitute a paradigm shift (Severino). However, the consensus with respect to the MDG deals with the objectives to be achieved rather than on the paths to take to get there. It does not, therefore, allow less thought to be given to the manner in which aid is, or should be, managed (Tubiana). A second factor results from recent developments in econometric studies on the effectiveness of aid. These studies enable more in-depth analysis, by including new indicators and distinguishing different kinds of aid and different timescales with which to evaluate the impact (Chauvet and Collier, 2004; Amprou and Chauvet, 2004; Cogneau and Naudet, 2004; Clemens *et al.*, 2004). Taken together, these two factors contribute to re-establishing the ODA as an instrument for development after a decade of doubt and donor withdrawal, and they provide guidelines as to allocation mechanisms and the preferred action to be taken.

With regard to the distribution of aid, recommendations follow a trend towards reallocation to benefit two categories of countries which partly overlap: the least advanced countries (particularly in order to make up for their disadvantages in terms of structural growth) and the fragile States. Such a reallocation would mean combining the principles of equity and efficiency, whilst meeting the concerns of geopolitical stability. It would involve equity since these countries are generally those experiencing the greatest difficulties in progressing towards the MDG (Sachs, 2005; DFID, 2005) and often those left on the sidelines by aid systems. And it would consider efficiency with regard to two aims, firstly, to reduce global poverty (Collier and Dollar, 2001) and, secondly, to bring about institutional change (good policies, good governance).

As referred to earlier, the institutional dimension currently tends to be seen no longer as a prior requirement for but rather as an integral part of development (Birdsall). It has progressed from being prerequisite for access to aid to being the very purpose of aid. Furthermore, a recent econometric study confirms the existence of a link between aid and the prospects of institutional reform in the beneficiary country (Chauvet and Collier, 2004).

This change of viewpoint leads to a fundamental reappraisal of aid conditionality as it is still commonly practised. The Sachs report calls in particular for a distinction to be made in the case of institutionally deficient States between a lack of political will and a lack of capacity. In the second case, institutional weakness must be considered as a reason for support from the donor

community (Sachs, 2005). Indeed, methods of institutional engineering fail to guarantee the success of the undertaking, but the potential gains are very high and the costs of a lack of action may be even higher. In other words, the donors must reformulate their risk analysis in order to include more ‘uncertain interventions’ (Chevallier, Malloch Brown, Collier).

Restructuring of aid concerns also the procedures for dispensing it. To regard aid as an instrument in the service of a ‘universal social security’ aligned with the MDG leads to thinking in terms of transfers rather than in terms of investments dependent on the macroeconomic capacity of the receiving countries to absorb them (Malloch Brown, Severino). In addition, these transfers must serve to finance not only the national policies of countries, but also regional public goods (Birdsall; Kaul; Sachs, 2005). Generally, whether this is to ensure the mass provision of essential services highlighted by the MDG or is intended to develop institutions and strengthen capabilities, particularly in the fragile countries, these transfers must involve large amounts of money and be seen from a long term point of view through programmes lasting many years (Collier; Sachs, 2005). The details of these systems – choice of tools (monetary transfers as opposed to technical assistance, short-term programmes as opposed to those in the medium- and long-term, etc.); the selection of a combination of tools in terms of relative weight and sequencing – remain subject to decisions taken on a case-by-case basis. Such decisions generally need to be based on a keen understanding of local dynamics, but global econometric studies are also beginning to provide complementary perspectives (Chauvet and Collier, 2004; Clemens *et al.*, 2004).

Creating aid mechanisms based on the participation of and appropriation by beneficiary countries seems justified with regard to both efficiency and equity. Indeed, such an approach is in line with inclusion and allows the range of possibilities to be enlarged by national and local capacity building (Sagasti, Pouligny, Paley, Goldberg). This being the case, the conditions under which participation and appropriation are practised are not neutral. On the one hand, they must be clarified to guarantee the balance between processes and to avoid possible abuses of power (Birdsall). On the other hand, the initial training of the participants affects the learning curve, to the extent that one recommendation for setting out the mechanisms for appropriation and for capacity building on a national scale could be to invest more heavily in higher education (Collier).

Implementation of these new forms of aid is dependant on the likelihood of freeing up appropriate funding. First of all,

amounts must be revised upwards. The calculations made for the Sachs Report with the prospect of the MDG consider financing needs to be in the order of 135 billion dollars in 2006, i.e. approximately double the currently-available ODA funding. This financing must be in the form of donations and not loans. In addition, they must be predictable, stable and sustained over the long term (Severino; Timms; Badré; Sachs, 2005).

The amounts required are not very high in absolute terms, especially when compared to the 950 billion dollars devoted each year to global military expenditure, to take just one example (German, Badré, Lutz, Kaul). Furthermore, these costs could be covered if the developed countries allocated 0.7% of their GDP to ODA, as they committed themselves to do at the Monterrey conference. Although this indicator has been rising for several years, after declining for several decades and hitting a record low of 0.2% at the end of the 1990s, the objective of 0.7% will not be attained in the majority of the signatory states before 2010, or even later.

Faced with this assessment, several initiatives are seeking to reduce the gap between requirements which need to be covered quickly and insufficient resources in the short term.

As far as the LDC are concerned, debt reduction constitutes an indirect means of freeing up additional resources. The political feasibility of reducing bilateral debt is becoming more widely accepted (Lovett, Timms, Kaul, Badré), even if the wide range of creditors does not allow one single response. For multilateral debt on the other hand, opinions are more divided (Sagasti).

Two other possible additional proposals seek to raise funds allocated to development on an international scale. The French President Jacques Chirac has backed a report on the subject and supports the idea of an international tax (Badré), whilst the British government is seeking to promote an instrument linked to international finance markets (International Finance Facility, IFF). The IFF would allow immediate, predictable long-term resources to be obtained in exchange for a guarantee by the developed countries on future budgetary commitments to ODA (Timms, Ward). The IFF project is more advanced in its technical definition than the international taxation programme, but neither of these two mechanisms will be operational in the short term. In particular, the conditions for coordination between donors in order to manage funds earmarked for such projects have not yet been specified.

Lastly, the renewal of the approaches to aid is a good opportunity to put institutional reform of the donors themselves back on the agenda. Considerable thought has already been given to

this, at least inasmuch as identifying the shortcomings to be corrected (Birdsall). Above all else, the donors should comply with a core set of basic ethical principles: honouring financial commitments in terms of amounts and deadlines; setting up a culture of transparency and evaluation, which would mirror that which is already expected from the receiving countries. The question of operational skills and the level of programme preparation should be taken into account to a greater extent to ensure that there is a genuine capacity for action and reaction on the ground (Chevallier, Pouligny). Faced with the wide variety of motives, cultures and resources for action on the part of the donors, an effort to harmonize and provide consistency must also be made in order to improve the effectiveness of aid in developing countries (Birdsall, Sagasti, Severino, Tubiana, Kouchner). The elements of a collective solution are in place, as witnessed by the declaration of Paris of March 2005³ or the proposals for a multilateral financial instrument; and the consensus on the MDG could act as a catalyst to realignment of policies and practices. Nevertheless, we have scarcely begun to convert talk into action. In spite of agreement in principle, deep divisions persist regarding the means of and methods for multilateral coordination of aid.

Towards equitable global governance

Global governance refers to the institutions and mechanisms whose objective is to regulate phenomena that go beyond the national or regional framework. In an ever more globalized world, it plays an essential role in managing forms of interdependence. With reference to global public goods (GPG), global governance is seen not only as a means of producing and managing GPG, such as free trade or knowledge, but also as a global public good *per se* (Tubiana, Kaul, Andersson).

Aside from the question of equity in global governance, many difficulties of a conceptual or institutional nature remain unresolved. The link between the various levels (national, bi-national, regional, global) is an important example. In theory, it should be resolved by the principle of subsidiarity (Andersson). In practice, debate is ongoing regarding the relevance of operating on different levels. In the case of international trade for example, bilateral agreements enable greater flexibility and allow related themes such as the environment or the workers' rights to be taken into account (Fontagné, Defraigne), but at the cost of a

3. http://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/solidarite/forum_harmonisation/pdf/declaration_parisFR.pdf

lack of overall coherence (Tubiana). Even at the multilateral level, the proliferation of institutions and international legal frameworks, or conversely the excessive number of disparate functions assigned to single bodies, raise the question of whether this system can function (Tubiana, Ruiz, Young). A balance still has to be struck between harmonisation, pooling resources and maintaining a minimal diversity which will allow for a merging of ideas and healthy competition (Birdsall, Sagasti). Furthermore, the emergence of new issues, such as ownership rights over intangible goods (biological diversity, culture, knowledge) calls into question the suitability of traditional legal instruments (patents, protection of commercial property) and calls for a new approach (Yusuf, Young).

As a GPG, global governance falls under the issues raised by collective action (conditions for building, access and use) (Kaul, Collier). It is at this level that some thought could be given to equity in the relationship between the international community and the developing countries.

In the first place, more equitable global governance will come through the application of rules which take the needs and particularities of developing countries more explicitly into account. The commitments taken by developed countries to open up to nonreciprocal trade are one example of this (Defraigne). A principle of this type does not do away with the need for analysis and possibly for arbitration on an individual basis. For example, an intangible good such as knowledge may be considered to be simultaneously an asset and a GPG. This would have radically opposed implications: on the one hand, developing countries could gain from having increased protection for their local knowledge (Ruiz, Young); on the other hand they would also need more favourable access conditions to global knowledge in order to promote their development, which, on the contrary would require less protection (Kaul).

More generally, the process of building equitable global governance must involve developing countries by giving them the means to participate more effectively. For this it would be necessary, first of all, to redefine the decision-making mechanisms currently used by international organisms, which would necessitate changing the balance of power in favour of the countries of the South. This would also require building up their capacity to make proposals and conduct negotiations.

One major field in which this applies is international trade. As we have noted, equity and markets are not cut from the same cloth. On the one hand, *'free trade is not fair trade'* (Lovett); on the other hand, fair trade initiatives, however laudable they may

be, struggle to develop beyond certain niches and, whatever the case may be, do not constitute a short-term solution (Fontagné). However, thinking about equity may become more relevant if the problem is considered starting from coordination between stakeholders in international trade. The ideas pursued in the framework of the Doha Round about the terms for developing countries to participate in the MDG fit this theme exactly: they cover both decision-making mechanisms and capacity building (Kaukab). The scale of the needs identified for capacity building could justify rehabilitation of a body such as UNCTAD, which has the legitimacy and technical expertise required. This would allow the WTO to refocus on its original task, which is already very complex (Tubiana).

Implementation of the principles of equity in regulating international trade may find itself in the middle of conflicting points of view. For example, if there is consensus on the need for the European Union and the United States to put an end to protecting some of their agricultural produce, in particular sugar and cotton (Lovett, Kaul, Timms), would the developing countries have more to gain through complete liberalisation of trade or from keeping a system of preferential access (Fontagné)? As a second example, the project to integrate environmental or social considerations in trade negotiations (workers' rights, migration) is opposed by developing countries, who see it as a disguised form of protectionism (Fontagné, Defraigne)⁴.

Conclusion

Equity is emerging as a new keyword in the development community. Equity is a unifying concept, which gives it great potential. It combines different approaches to development (economic, social, cultural and political), various kinds of justification, (equity as an end in itself, equity as a way of fighting poverty, equity as a source of geopolitical stability), various levels of analysis (citizens as part of the State, States as part of the international community).

4. This example is useful because it illustrates how the two types of equity considered in this document can conflict with each other, at least in the short term. For a developing country, guaranteeing better social protection for its workers meets an equity objective with regard to its citizens, but may equally be seen as an attack against equity relative to the country's inserting conditions in the international trade system.

Equity fits in with recent changes in thinking about development and international governance and can be regarded as a key element in the renewal and alignment of development policies and practices. This key element can be broken down into two main categories: the principle of redistribution and the principle of inclusion. There are many fields in which it can be applied, in line with the diversity of the variables and processes which equity can encompass. Examples range from setting up a money transfer system for families in Africa stricken by AIDS to reform of the WTO and democratising state institutions.

Of course, taking equity into account does not provide all the keys. On the contrary, it reintroduces complexity by re-establishing the relevance of dimensions such as politics, policy and coordination between stakeholders. Currently, the challenges are no longer particularly technical in nature. They are rather conceptual and above all political. There is much ongoing debate on the means to be used. Above all, political willingness and co-operation within the framework of a global partnership are at the heart of the coming efforts to achieve success. There is no magic formula as far as this subject is concerned.

Internet Sites

Forum

<http://hdr.undp.org/events/forum2005>

Most of the contributions of those involved in the Forum are available online on the following pages:

<http://hdr.undp.org/events/forum2005/papers.cfm>

<http://hdr.undp.org/events/forum2005/speeches.cfm>

Human Development Report Office

<http://hdr.undp.org>

French Ministry of Foreign Affairs

<http://diplomatie.gouv.fr>

<http://diplomatie.gouv.fr/frmonde/pnud/index.html>

Institut du développement durable et des relations internationales

<http://www.iddri.org/iddri>

Sciences Po

<http://www.sciences-po.fr>

Page on report of the debate on the Millennium Project Report (18 Jan. 2005) http://www.sciences-po.fr/formation/master_scpo/mentions/carrieres_internationales/actualites/forum_rapport.htm

Millennium Development Goals Objectives

<http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/index.html>

Communications

Download from:

<http://hdr.undp.org/events/forum2005/papers.cfm>

Andersson Gun-Britt. *Underpinning Development through more efficient international cooperation.*

Bangura Yusuf. *Ethnicity, Inequality and the Public Sector: A Comparative Study.*

Birdsall Nancy. *Seven Deadly Sins: Reflections on Donor Failings* (diapositives).

Cornia Giovanni Andrea. *The pace and distribution of health improvements during the last 40 years: some preliminary results.*

Dieckhoff Alain (French). *Gérer la diversité dans les sociétés démocratiques modernes.*

Fontagné Lionel (French). *La mondialisation : croissance et inégalités* (diapositives).

Fontaine Laurent (French). *Le défi de la mesure des inégalités autres que celles de revenu.*

Fuentes Ricardo. *Poverty, Pro-Poor Growth and Simulated Inequality reduction.*

German Tony. *The growing gap between aid and wealth.*

Goldberg Jörg. *The Pilot Social Cash Transfer Scheme Kalomo District – Zambia.*

Gray Molina George. *Ethnic Politics in Bolivia: «Harmony of Inequalities», 1900-2000.*

Guichaoua Yvan. *Ethnic conflicts and their Economic Underpinnings: the case of Nigeria.*

Kaul Inge. *Global Public Goods: A Key To Achieving The Millennium Development Goals* (slides).

Kymlicka Will. *Culturally Responsive Policies.*

Kollapen Jody. *Identity and Democracy: Building Multicultural Democracies.*

Laaksonen Annamari. *Measuring Cultural Exclusion through Participation in Cultural Life.*

López-Calva Luis F. *Measuring the Distribution of Human Development: Methodology and an Application to Mexico.*

Lutz Catherine. *Democratic Social Movements against Militarization.*

Menon Nivedita. *Reflections on Secularism in India*.

Mercer Colin. *Cultural Capital and Capabilities: Defining and measuring the cultural field*.

Nahem Joachim. *Measuring Governance and Cultural Exclusion: The Need for New Governance Indicators* (slides)

Ntsebeza Lungisile. *Rural Governance and Citizenship in post-1994 South Africa: Democracy Compromised?* (Abstract).

Nuamah Kwaku. *US Technical Assistance and Private Enterprise Development in Africa: Trends, Lesson and Prospects* (Abstract).

Pate Amy. *Minorities at Risk: Monitoring the persecution and mobilization of ethnic groups worldwide* (slides).

Pournik Mohammad. *Exclusion and Conflict: The case of the Sudan*.

Sagasti Francisco. *The Future of Development Financing: Challenges, Scenarios and Strategic Choices* (slides).

Simbulan Roland G. *Human development in the context of emerging social movements: Power and struggles in the Asia-Pacific* (Annex).

Tadjbakhsh Shahrbanou. *National Human Development Report for Afghanistan, 2004*.

Timms Stephen. *International Finance Facility* (slides).

Wihtol de Wenden Catherine (French). *Le rôle des migrations dans le renforcement du multiculturalisme*.

Young Tomme Rosanne. *Historical development and recent events: Legal treatment of folklore and traditional knowledge* (slides).

Yusuf Abdulqawi. *Towards a Convention on Cultural Diversity: Background and Evolution*.

Speeches

Download from:

<http://hdr.undp.org/events/forum2005/speeches.cfm>

Amartya Sen (French), 17 January 2005.

Michel Barnier (French), 17 January 2005.

Sakiko Fukuda-Parr (French), 17 January 2005.

Jody Kollapen, 17 January 2005.

Abdulqawi Yusuf, 17 January 2005.

Pierre Defraigne (French), 18 January 2005.

Gun-Britt Andersson, 18 January 2005.

Stephen Timms, 18 January 2005.

Stephen Timms, 18 January 2005.

Adrian Lovett, 19 January 2005.

Mary Robinson, 19 January 2005.

Katérina Stenou (French), 19 January 2005.

Xavier Darcos (French), 19 January 2005.

Bibliography

Amprou J. & L. Chauvet, 2004. *Efficacité et allocation de l'aide, revue des débats*. Paris, Agence française de développement. <http://www.afd.fr/jahia/webdav/site/myjahiasite/users/administrateur/public/publications/notesetdocuments/ND-6-efficacite-allocation.pdf>

Anderson K., 2004. *Agricultural trade reform and poverty reduction in developing countries*. Washington DC, World Bank. http://www-wds.worldbank.org/servlet/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2004/09/16/000160016_20040916172547/Rendered/PDF/wps3396.pdf

World Bank, 2003. *Country Policy and Institutional Assessment 2003. Assessment questionnaire*. Washington DC, World Bank. <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/IDA/Resources/CPIA2003.pdf>

World Bank, 2005. *Studies in Fragility*. Washington DC, World Bank. 17 February 2005. <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTPOVERTY/0,,contentMDK:20313265~pagePK:148956~piPK:216618~theSitePK:336992,00.html>

Banque mondiale, 2005. *Rapport sur le développement dans le monde, 2006. Équité et développement*. http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTWDR2006/Resources/wdr2006_outline_fr.pdf

Bérard Laurence *et al.*, 2005. *Savoirs et savoir-faire naturalistes locaux : l'originalité française*. Paris, Iddri.

Birdsall N., 2003. *Why It Matters Who Runs the IMF and the World Bank*. Washington DC, Center for Global Development. http://www.cgdev.org/docs/cgd_wp022.pdf

Birdsall, N., 2004. *Underfunded Regionalism in the Developing World*. Washington DC, Center for Global Development. <http://www.cgdev.org/docs/WP%2049%20Regionalism1.pdf>

Bouët A., J.-C. Bureau, *et al.*, 2004. *La libéralisation agricole: des effets ambigus sur les pays en développement*. La lettre du Cepii, n° 236), p. 1-4. <http://www.cepii.fr/francgraph/publications/lettre/pdf/2004/let236.pdf>

Bourguignon F., 2004. *The Poverty-Growth-Inequality Triangle*. The World Bank. http://econ.worldbank.org/files/33634_PovertyInequalityGrowthTriangle-Feb24.pdf

Chauvet L. & P. Collier, 2004. *Development Effectiveness in Fragile States: Spillovers and Turnarounds*. Oxford, Centre for the Study of African Economies, Department of Economics, Oxford University. <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/32/59/34255628.pdf>

Clemens M., S. Radelet *et al.*, 2004. *Counting chickens when they hatch: The short term effect of aid on growth*. Washington DC, Center for Global Development. <http://www.cgdev.org/docs/CountingChickensFINAL3.pdf>

Cogneau D. & J.-D. Naudet, 2004. *Qui mérite l'aide? Egalité des chances versus sélectivité*. Paris, AFD. <http://www.afd.fr/jahia/webdav/site/myjahiasite/users/administrateur/public/publications/notesetdocuments/ND-7-Qui-merite.pdf>

Commission des Communautés européennes, 2004. *Pays en développement, commerce international et développement soutenable : le rôle du Système de préférences généralisées (SPG) de la Communauté pour la décennie 2006-2015*. Bruxelles. http://trade-info.cec.eu.int/doclib/docs/2004/july/tradoc_117930.pdf

Communauté des donateurs, 2003. *Rome Declaration on Harmonization*. Rome. <http://www1.worldbank.org/harmonization/romehlf/Documents/RomeDeclaration.pdf>

DAC, 2005. *Chair's summary. Communication: Senior Level Forum on Development Effectiveness in Fragile States*. Londres. <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/60/37/34401185.pdf>

DFID, 2005. *Why we need to work more effectively in fragile states*. Londres, DFID. <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/fragilestates-paper.pdf>

DIAL. Enquête 123. *Un dispositif pour le suivi de la pauvreté*. Paris. http://www.dial.prd.fr/dial_axes_de_recherche/PDF/plaqdial.pdf

HM Treasury, 2004. *International Finance Facility*. Londres, HM Treasury. http://www.hmtreasury.gov.uk/media/D64/78/IFF_proposal_doc_080404.pdf

Ingco M. & J. Nash, 2004. *What's at stake? Developing-country interests in the Doha Development Round*. In Agriculture and the WTO. *Creating a Trading System for Development*. M. Ingco & J. Nash. Washington DC, The World Bank, Oxford University Press: 1-22. <http://www1.worldbank.org/publications/pdfs/15485frontmat.pdf>

Jacquet P. & J.-M. Severino, 2004. *Prêter, donner : comment aider ?* Revue d'économie financière (juin 2004). <http://www.afd.fr/jahia/webdav/site/myjahiasite/users/administrateur/public/article/Pret-Don.pdf>

Kaul I., P. Conceição *et al.*, Eds., 2003. *Providing global public goods*. New-York, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Kymlicka W., 2004. *Culturally responsive policies*. New-York, UNDP-HDRO. http://hdr.undp.org/docs/events/global_forum/2005/papers/Will_Kymlicka.pdf

Landau J.-P. *et al.*, 2004. *Les nouvelles contributions financières internationales*. Paris, La Documentation française. <http://lesrapports.ladocumentationfrancaise.fr/BRP/044000440/0000.pdf>

Linz J., A. Stepan *et al.*, 2004. «Nation State» or «State Nation»? : *Conceptual Reflections and Some Spanish, Belgian and Indian Data*. New-York, UNDP-HDRO. http://hdr.undp.org/docs/publications/background_papers/2004/HDR2004_Alfred%20Stepan.pdf

Malhotra K. *et al.*, 2003. *Making Global Trade Work for People*. New-York, PNUD. <http://www.undp.org/mdg/globaltrade.pdf>

Manning R., 2005. *The DAC Journal. Development Co-operation Report 2004*. Paris, OCDE. <http://www.oecdbookshop.org/oecd/get-it.asp?REF=4305011E.PDF&TYPE=browse>

Milanovic B. *Worlds Apart: International and World Inequality 1950-2000*. Washington, World Bank. <http://www.worldbank.org/research/inequality/June18Papers/TransBrook3.doc>

OED, 2004. *2003 Annual Review of Development Effectiveness*. The Effectiveness of Bank Support for Policy Reform. Washington DC, World Bank. [http://Inweb18.worldbank.org/oed/oeddoclib.nsf/DocUNIDViewForJavaSearch/3D82DE51D6B462DA85256E69006BD181/\\$file/arde_2003.pdf](http://Inweb18.worldbank.org/oed/oeddoclib.nsf/DocUNIDViewForJavaSearch/3D82DE51D6B462DA85256E69006BD181/$file/arde_2003.pdf)

ONU, 2002. *Consensus de Monterrey. Projet de conclusions et décisions de la Conférence internationale sur le financement du développement*. <http://www.un.org/french/esa/ffd/docs/aconf1983f.pdf>

Oxfam. *An End to EU Sugar Dumping? Implications of the Interim WTO Panel Ruling in the dispute against EU sugar policies brought by Brazil, Thailand and Australia*. Londres, Oxfam. http://www.oxfam.org/eng/pdfs/bn_sugar_dumping.pdf

Oxfam, 2004. *Dumping: the Beginning of the End? Implications of the Ruling in the Brazil/US Cotton Dispute*. Londres, Oxfam. http://www.oxfam.org/eng/pdfs/bp64_cotton_dumping_060904.pdf

Oxfam, 2004. *A Sweeter Future? The potential for EU sugar reform to contribute to poverty reduction in southern Africa*. Londres, Oxfam. http://www.oxfam.org/eng/pdfs/pp041122_sweeter_future.pdf

Oxfam, 2005. *Paying the Price. Why rich countries must invest now in a war on poverty*. Londres, Oxfam. http://www.oxfam.org/eng/pdfs/pp041206_MDG_summary.pdf

Panyarachun A. & *et al.*, 2004. *Un monde plus sûr : notre affaire à tous. Rapport du Groupe de personnalités de haut niveau sur les menaces, les défis et le changement*. ONU. <http://daccess-ods.un.org/access.nsf/Get?Open&DS=A/59/565&Lang=F>

Pettifor A. and R. Greenhill, 2003. *Debt relief and the Millenium Development Goals*. New-York, PNUD-HDRO. http://hdr.undp.org/docs/publications/background_papers/2003/HDR2003_Pettifor_Greenhill.pdf

PNUD, 2003. *Résumé. Rapport mondial sur le développement humain 2003. Les Objectifs du Millénaire pour le développement : un pacte entre les pays pour vaincre la pauvreté humaine*. Paris, Economica.

PNUD, 2004. *Rapport mondial sur le développement humain 2004. La liberté culturelle dans un monde diversifiée*. Paris, Economica. http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/2004/francais/pdf/hdr04_fr_complete.pdf

Ravallion M., 2004. *Competing Concepts of Inequality in the Globalization Debate*. Washington DC, World Bank. http://econ.worldbank.org/files/34170_wps3243.pdf

Ravallion M., 2004. *Looking beyond Averages in the Trade and Poverty Debate*. Washington DC, World Bank. http://econ.worldbank.org/files/40221_wps3461.pdf

Ravallion M., 2004. *A Poverty-Inequality Trade Off?* Washington, World Bank. http://econ.worldbank.org/files/41122_PovertyInequality_trade_off.pdf

Ravallion M., 2004. *Pro-Poor Growth: a Primer*. Washington DC, World Bank. http://econ.worldbank.org/files/34168_wps3242.pdf

Roodman D., 2004. *An Index of Donor Performance*. Washington DC, Center for Global Development. http://www.cgdev.org/docs/cgd_wp042.pdf

Sachs J., 2005. *Investing in Development. A Practical Plan to Achieve the Millenium Development Goals*. Overview. New-York, Un Millenium Project. http://unmp.forumone.com/eng_low_res/TF1-overviewEngLowRes.pdf

Sen A., 2003. *Development as capability expansion*. In *Readings in Human Development*. S. Fukuda-Parr & A. K. S. Kumar. Oxford, New-York, Oxford University Press, p. 3-16.

Sen A., 2003. *Human capital and human capability*. in *Readings*. In *Human*

Development. S. Fukuda-Parr & A. K. S. Kumar. Oxford, New-York, Oxford University Press, p. 35-37.

Severino J.-M., 2004. *Le développement face aux conflits*. Le Monde Economie. Paris. <http://www.afd.fr/jahia/webdav/site/myjahiasite/users/administrateur/public/article/severino-conflit.pdf>

Severino J.-M. & O. Charnoz, 2004. *Financer le développement aujourd'hui*. InRapport moral sur l'argent dans le monde 2003-2004. A. d. E. Financière, p. 227-256. <http://www.afd.fr/jahia/webdav/site/myjahiasite/users/administrateur/public/notes-thematiques/Financer-le-developpement.pdf>

Sutherland P. et al., 2004. *L'avenir de l'OMC. Relever les défis institutionnels du nouveau millénaire. Rapport du Conseil consultatif à Mr Supachai Panitchpakdi, directeur général*. Genève, OMC. http://www.wto.org/french/thewto_f/10anniv_f/future_wto_f.pdf

UNDP and European Commission, 2004. *Governance Indicators: a User's Guide, UNDP, European Commission*. <http://www.undp.org/oslocentre/docs04/User-Guide.pdf>

Programme

Third Forum on Human Development **Cultural Identity, Democracy, and Global Equity**

Under the high patronage of Mr Jacques Chirac President of the French Republic

Organized by the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)/Human Development Report Office, in collaboration with Sciences Po Paris and IDDRI (Institut du développement durable et des relations internationales). In partnership with Les Echos.

Cooperating Organizations: Agence française de développement (AFD), France; Conseil d'analyse économique (CAE), France; Center for International Development and Conflict Management (CIDCM), Maryland University, United States; Centre for Research on Inequality, Human Security and Ethnicity (CRISE), Oxford University, United Kingdom; Development Initiatives, United Kingdom; Global Equity Initiative, Harvard University, United States; Global Public Goods Task Force; Haut Conseil de la coopération internationale (HCCI), France; Human Development and Capabilities Association (HDCA), United Kingdom; International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development (ICTSD), Switzerland; Institut du monde arabe (IMA), France; Maisha Foundation, Uganda; Watson Institute for International Studies, Brown University, United States.

The dynamics of globalization, the increasing flows of commodities, capital, services, information and cultural goods as well as the accelerated migration of people, are rapidly changing the make up of societies. Some will benefit hugely from these changes while others will be unable to or even fall further behind. Inequalities will continue to widen and identity-related demands will get stronger. International and national governance of economic, political and social systems must adapt to this new reality of the 21st century.

In this context, government action is necessary and urgent. New approaches to governance need to be invented if we are to achieve the Millennium Development Goals and make progress in realizing human development. Key questions include: What room for maneuver do governments have at their disposal for responding to the expectations of their citizens and to promote cultural diversity, respect for identities and equity? How can opportunities for equitable human development be promoted through international trade and foreign investment? What measures can improve the international financial and economic framework in order to reduce inequality? What resources can be mobilized to finance human development? On what basis can a new international solidarity be founded?

The Forum will be held over 2 and half days, alternating between plenary sessions and parallel sessions, to examine these key issues in light of the latest policy research and experiences of leaders from government, civil society, and academia, the world over. The aim is to promote viable responses to the challenges of human development today and offer governments strategies for meeting their commitments as signatories to the Millennium Declaration of 2000.

Monday 17 January, 2005

10:00 - 11:15 OPENING CEREMONY

Michel Barnier, French Minister of Foreign Affairs

Mark Malloch Brown, Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

FORUM PRESENTATION

Kevin Watkins, Director of the Human Development Report Office (HDRO), UNDP

INAUGURAL KEYNOTE SPEECH

Amartya Sen, Nobel Prize Laureate in Economics, 1998

Cultural Diversity and Democracy

Session I Identity and Cultural Liberty: Building Multicultural Democracies

Nation-building strategies of the last century had treated as sacrosanct the importance of asserting a single 'national' identity as central and indispensable to building stable democratic polities. Another unassailable conviction of this project was that the recognition of diversity and difference doomed a country to internal conflict and ultimately, territorial disintegration. However in the 21st century, with the bridging of cold war barriers, economic globalization, and struggles for democracy, diversity is increasingly a fact for almost all societies today. States cannot ignore the demands that arise due to diversity within their populace – and they are increasingly confronted with claims on the basis of language, religion, ethnicity, or heritage.

How can societies politically accommodate these different claims without compromising others? What kinds of multicultural policies can be employed to ensure equitable socio-economic opportunities and political representation of historically marginalized or minority groups? How can we deal with extreme political movements in democratic polities when they oppose the very principles of accommodation on which democracies are based? How can human rights be better protected universally regardless of cultural context? What differences are important and how can diversity be measured?

11:30 - 1:00 PLENARY SESSION

Chair: **Kevin Watkins**, Director, UNDP/HDRO

Speakers: **Sakiko Fukuda Parr**, Human Development Report (HDR) 2004 lead author; **Jody Kollapen**, Chairperson of the South African Human Rights Commission; **Will Kymlicka**, Queen's University; **Alfred Stepan**, Columbia University

2:30 - 4:00

PARALLEL WORKSHOPS

Exclusion and Minorities: Strategies for Economic, Social and Political Inclusion

Coordinator: UNDP/HDRO

Chair: **Haishan Fu**, Chief of Statistics, UNDP/HDRO

Speakers: **Yusuf Bangura**, United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD); **Andrey Ivanov**, Roma Regional HDR, UNDP/Bratislava Regional Center; **Mohammad Pournik**, Sudan National HDR; **Shahrbano Tadjbakhsh**, Centre d'études et de recherches internationales (CERI)-Sciences Po and Afghanistan National HDR

This panel will discuss challenges and innovative policies in the area of political representation, equitable distribution and cultural recognition, which can help secure human rights and expand human development in multi-ethnic and multi-cultural contexts.

Political Movements and Intolerance: Policy Options for Mitigating Conflict and Promoting Democratic Accommodation

Coordinator: Maisha Foundation

Chair: **Mahmood Mamdani**, Director, Institute of African Studies, Columbia University

Speakers: **Ibrahim Abdullah**, Fourah Bay University; **Nivedita Menon**, Delhi University; **Lungisile Ntsebeza**, University of Cape Town

In situations of long-standing conflicts, political actors have sometimes resorted to the use of violence and furthered intolerant ideas and conceptions about those they oppose. The institutional and constitutional frameworks within which such politics are pursued, however, can exert distinct influences through their formal structures of censure and incentives, and can encourage a policy of reconciliation and respect rather than one of confrontation and intolerance – which is essential for democratic processes of negotiation and accommodation. This panel will discuss some of the key debates around the issue of intolerance, and examine policy options for promoting democratic accommodation and mitigating conflict.

Cultural Diversity, Inequality and Conflict

Coordinator: CRISE, Oxford University

Chair: **Frances Stewart**, Director, CRISE, Oxford University

Speakers: **Francis Akindes**, University of Bouaké; **Yvan Guichaoua**, CRISE, Oxford University; **George Gray Molina**, UNDP, Bolivia

This panel will discuss how a combination of cultural identity and inequality may provoke conflict, focusing on policy suggestions to reduce the likelihood of conflict. The panel will consider how in Nigeria and Bolivia, in contrast to the Ivory Coast, measures were taken to reduce political exclusion which seem to have been successful in keeping the peace.

Defining and Measuring Cultural Exclusion

Coordinator: CIDCM, Maryland University

Chair: **Jonathan Wilkenfeld**, Director, CIDCM, Maryland University

Speakers: **Annamari Laaksonen**, Interarts Foundation; **Colin Mercer**, Cultural Capital Ltd; **Joachim Nahem**, UNDP/Governance Center; **Amy Pate**, CIDCM, Maryland University

This panel will focus on defining and measuring cultural exclusion and inclusion cross-nationally. Panelists will discuss conceptual issues in the development of cultural indicators and the practical issues of data collection. The panel will also address how such measures can be used to explore the development impacts of cultural exclusion.

Session II Cultural Diversity and Globalization

The increased flows of people and goods, ideas, resources, images – especially across national borders – mark much of the social transformations occurring in societies today. These pose new challenges for the protection of human rights and advancing human development and they raise questions about the ways in which we understand our common problems as well as our responses to pressing policy dilemmas.

How can we protect the rights of indigenous people who have historic claims to lands and who feel overrun by the settlement of people, enterprises, goods and ideas from outside their community? How can we respond to the rhetoric of cultural intolerance and xenophobia while protecting the freedom of expression and belief? How can we accept and accommodate immigrants in our societies and protect their human rights?

4:30 - 6:00 PARALLEL WORKSHOPS

Trade on Cultural Goods, Traditional Knowledge and Intellectual Property: Next Steps in TRIPS and CDB

Coordinator: ICTSD

Chair: **David Vivas**, ICTSD

Speakers: **Gonzalo Oviedo**, the World Conservation Union, (IUCN); **Manuel Ruiz**, Peruvian Society for Environmental Rights; **Abdulqawi Yusuf**, Director, Office of International Standards and Legal Affairs, United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)

This workshop will analyze the latest developments at the international level regarding trade in cultural goods and the protection of traditional knowledge (WIPO, WTO, UNESCO), and latest developments at the national level, and what option could be used to protect, preserve and commercialize cultural goods and traditional knowledge in a sustainable manner.

Challenges to Multicultural Societies for Peace

Coordinator: CERI-Sciences Po

Chair: **Aristide Zolberg**, Director, International Center for Migration, Ethnicity and Citizenship (ICMEC), New School University

Speakers: **Frédéric Charillon**, Sciences Po and French Defense Ministry; **Astrid von Busekist**, Sciences Po; **Alain Dieckhoff**, CERI-Sciences Po; **Catherine Wihl de Wenden**, CERI-Sciences Po

The panel will focus on three dimensions of multiculturalism: the role of migration in fuelling multicultural societies; the function of diasporas for political action and legitimacy; the transformation of foreign policies in the current era.

Social Movements and Transnational Democracy: Politics, Culture and Identity

Coordinator: Watson Institute, Brown University

Chair: **Kay Warren**, Watson Institute

Speakers: **Catherine Lutz**, Watson Institute; **Julia Paley**, University of Michigan; **Roland Simbulan**, Vice Chancellor for Planning and Development, University of Philippines

The panel will explore redefinitions of democracy by actions of social movements, in the relationship between ethnic groups and state sovereignty and policy, and through critiques of non-democratic state practices.

Tuesday 18 January, 2005

Global Equity and the Millennium Development Goals

Session III Reshaping Development Co-operation: Issues for Effective Financing and Implementation

Much work has to be done to cope with failings of the global trade and financial systems. Unfortunately, inequalities are exacerbated by the current structure of the international system. The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) for 2015 will not be met with “business as usual”, especially in sub-Saharan Africa. The current development cooperation system falls short on development financing, trade and debt relief as well as in terms of representation for developing countries.

What kinds of solidarity mechanisms might overcome these structural inequalities? Are international welfare transfers feasible? Based on what grounds? To cope with these structural inequalities, new forms of partnership are needed. What kinds of collective action could be defined? What would be the role, the responsibility, and the right of every actor in these collective processes?

9:30 - 11:00 PLENARY SESSION

Chair: **Laurence Tubiana**, Director, IDDRI

Speakers: **Nancy Birdsall**, President, Centre for Global Development; **Francisco Sagasti**, Coauthor of the Study on the Multilateral System of Development Financing and Director, Agenda Peru; **Marie-Angélique Savané**, Chair, African Peer Review Mechanism Panel, the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD); **Jean-Michel Severino**, General Director, AFD

11:30 - 1:00 PARALLEL WORKSHOPS

Fragile States: What Overseas Development Assistance (ODA) Can and Cannot Do

Coordinator: IDDRI

Chair: **Laurence Tubiana**, Director, IDDRI

Speakers: **Eric Chevallier**, Maître de Conférence, Ecole nationale d'administration (ENA) and Science Po Paris; **Paul Collier**, Oxford University; **Béatrice Pouligny**, CERI-Sciences Po

The international debate on ODA effectiveness leaves very little room for ODA to fragile states. The panel will focus on the rationality and legitimacy for ODA to fragile states and whether ODA might actually uphold human development and democracy in such situations.

New Challenges for ODA: From Discretionary Policies to Actual Commitments

Coordinator: Development Initiatives

Chair: **Judith Randel**, Development Initiatives

Speakers: **Tony German**, Development Initiatives; **Joerg Goldberg**, Gesellschaft Für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ), Zambia; **Stephen Timms**, Member of Parliament, Financial Secretary to the Treasury, United Kingdom; **Mwape Walumba**, Ministry of Social Welfare, Zambia

Aid is the only international resource earmarked to eradicate poverty. This panel will consider how reformed aid can advance global social justice and promote the worldwide provision of basic social security for all in an era of globalization.

Donor Perspectives and Foreign Aid: Modes of Delivery and Cultural Rationale

Coordinator: Watson Institute, Brown University

Chair: **Barbara Stallings**, Watson Institute

Speakers: **Kwaku Nuamah**, Watson Institute; **Francisco Sagasti**, Coauthor of the Study on the Multilateral System of Development Financing and Director, Agenda Peru; **Kay Warren**, Watson Institute

The panel will examine the foreign aid experience from several perspectives: through an examination of public-private partnerships; through a historical analysis of trends of ODA and through a trans-national ethnographic look at how the purpose of foreign aid is perceived and designed by different donor countries.

Challenges for Measuring Non-Income Inequality at Local and National Levels

Coordinator: HDCA and UNDP/HDRO

Chair: **Sabina Alkire**, HDCA and Global Equity Initiative, Harvard University

Speakers: **Luis Felipe Lopez-Calva**, Mexico National HDR; Laurent Fontaine, Chief, Human Development Unit, French Ministry of Foreign Affairs; **Kevin Watkins**, Director, UNDP/HDRO

Inequality of opportunity (access to health, knowledge, political and social inclusion and so on) is difficult to measure yet unequal opportunity generates poverty traps and increases vulnerability in a vicious cycle. Therefore, the panel will focus on the monitoring and measuring of these forms of inequalities which are critical to human development and require appropriate monitoring and measurement.

Session IV Social Justice and Inequality

Globalization is reshaping social, economic and political relations across the world. The potential human development benefits of global integration are large. However, globalization has been accompanied by deepening inequalities between countries and within countries. New approaches to the governance of globalization are needed to ensure that these inequalities are addressed. This implies rethinking the rules and reshaping the institutions that manage world trade, capital markets and foreign investment. Development assistance also has a critical role to play.

This session will explore some of the policy issues facing governments in developing countries, northern governments, the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the international financial institutions.

What can be done to revive the Doha Round for development? When and where can new and more equitable strategies for development be put into effect? How can the production of global public goods be increased? What changes are needed in the international system to lead to achievement of the MDGs?

2:30 - 4:00 PLENARY SESSION

Chair: **Christian de Boissieu**, Delegate President, CAE

Speakers: **Stephany Griffith-Jones**, Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex; **Pascal Lamy**, previous EU Trade Commissioner; **Jean-Pierre Landau**, Director for France, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development; **Stephen Timms**, Member of Parliament, Financial Secretary to the Treasury, United Kingdom

4:30 - 6:00 PARALLEL WORKSHOPS

Global Public Goods and Development

Coordinator: Global Public Goods Task Force

Chair: **François S  n  maud**, French Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Speakers: **Gun-Britt Andersson**, Ambassador for Sweden to the OECD, UNESCO and Global Public Goods Task Force; **Paul Collier**, Oxford University; **Inge Kaul**, director, UNDP/Office of Development Studies

This panel will identify and clarify the relationships between Global Public Goods (GPGs) and development by exploring the linkages between GPGs and the Millennium Development Goals and discussing the importance for development of regional public goods.

Making Global Trade and Finance Work for Human Development

Coordinator: IDDRI

Chair: **Pierre Defraigne**, Deputy General Director, EU Commission Trade

Speakers: **Lionel Fontagn  **, Director, Centre d'  tudes prospectives et d'informations internationales (CEPII); **Stephany Griffith-Jones**, Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex; **Rashid Kaukab**, Director, South Center

International trade and finance regulatory systems do not consider resulting inequalities. The objective of the panel is to consider how international financing and trade systems can work for human development.

Income Inequality: Measuring the Trends and Assessing the Consequences

Coordinator: UNDP/HDRO

Chair: **Kevin Watkins**, Director, UNDP/HDRO

Speakers: **Giovanni A. Cornia**, University of Florence; **Yuri Dikhanov**, The World Bank; **Ricardo Fuentes**, UNDP/HDRO

This panel will present recent national and global analyses to address some of the fundamental questions about trends in poverty and inequality and redirect the debate beyond selective interpretations of narrowly focused income data.

7.15 - 9.15

PANEL DISCUSSION AT SCIENCES PO

Can we reach the Millennium Goals? Debate on the Millennium Project Report
Coordinator: CERI-Sciences Po and IDDRI

Chair: **Laurence Tubiana**, IDDRI

Speakers: **Nancy Birdsall**, President, Centre for Global Development; **Pierre Jacquet**, Director of Strategy and Chief Economist, AFD; **Patrick Messerlin**, Sciences Po and member of the Millennium Project and of the Global Public Goods Task Force

Wednesday 19 January, 2005

Advancing the Human Development Agenda

Session V 2005-2015 – The Decisive Decade for the Millennium Development Goals

Human development is both process and outcome. Cooperation among governments, civil society, private enterprise, multilateral organizations and individuals is necessary to promote and sustain the process of human development beyond the basic struggle for mere survival. Eradication of poverty and deprivation is an urgent priority for human development and security. But the ultimate goal is freedom and dignity and a constant expansion of human capability.

How can we promote the agenda for human development as embodied in the Millennium Declaration including political and cultural freedom, human rights, and equitable economic and social development? How can we better use resources to this end? How can we increase cooperation and coherence among all development actors in the North and South, rich and poor? How can we effect positive change?

By ratifying the Millennium Declaration, all the countries in the world committed to a number of elements that are essential to human development: freedom, equity, tolerance, the rule of law, human security, peace and disarmament, democracy, and protection of the world environment. Eight clear and measurable benchmarks, the MDGs, were set to mark progress on these commitments.

The MDGs are attainable and not overly ambitious. However at the current pace, the promises made to the poor people of the world in 2000 will not be kept. 2005 is a year of opportunity and possibly the last chance to change course and move to attainment of the goals. The know-how and the resources exist to achieve them. It is a matter of political will as to whether the words of the Millennium Declaration will have meaning or not.

9:30 - 11:30

PLENARY SESSION

Chair: **Erik Izraelewicz**, editorial Assistant Director, Les Echos

Speakers: **Philippe Etienne**, General Director for International Cooperation and Development, French Ministry of Foreign Affairs; **Bernard Kouchner**, founding member of Médecins Sans Frontières, Nobel Peace Prize Laureate, 1999; **Adrian Lovett**, Director, Make Poverty History Campaign, OXFAM; **Mary Robinson**, Executive Director, Ethical Globalization Initiative

11:30- 12 : 00

CLOSING KEYNOTE SPEECH

Xavier Darcos, Delegate Minister for Cooperation, Development and Francophonie, French Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Equity and Human Development

Equity appears to be emerging as a new key word in the development community. What does this concept encompass and how can it contribute to renewing the research, policies and practices related to development? This document proposes several channels for debate, taking its point of reference as the content of exchanges during the third Forum on Human Development, entitled “Cultural Identity, Democracy and Global Equity”, which took place in Paris from 17 to 19 January 2005.

ISBN 2-915819-04

15 €

**institut du développement
durable et des relations
internationales**

6, rue du Général Clergerie
75116 Paris – France
www.iddri.org
iddri@iddri.org

Téléphone :
01 53 70 22 35
Télécopie :
01 53 70 21 45