

BMZ



Federal Ministry
for Economic Cooperation
and Development

d.i.e

Deutsches Institut für
Entwicklungspolitik



German Development
Institute

PEGNet

International Workshop

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

Workshop Report

21-23 November 2011
Bonn, Germany

Organized by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation
and Development (**BMZ**)

in cooperation with the German Development Institute/
Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (**DIE**)

and the
Poverty Reduction, Equity and Growth Network (**PEGNet**)

Introduction

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

The Millennium Declaration and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) have become a universal framework for development and international cooperation. They have inspired development efforts that have improved and still improve the lives of many people around the world. With this in mind, everything possible must be undertaken to achieve the MDGs by 2015.

But the deadline is fast approaching and with only four years to go until 2015, and despite considerable progress in some dimensions, the challenges ahead loom large. As the UN secretary-general acknowledged, the world needs to look beyond 2015. A core issue is how development policy in the future could best contribute towards addressing the pressing challenges posed by the continued existence of poverty and the threats to human well-being. Further, challenges such as climate change, fragile statehood and unstable economies will become increasingly relevant. Trying to find solutions to these complex problems entails equally complex decision-making processes. An effective development policy framework should accommodate the insights on how to reconcile our way of life with the need to ensure ecological, economic and social sustainability.

In the lead-up to 2015, the international development community is embarking on two processes: On the one hand, it is evaluating the success of the MDG agenda – were the goals met, and if not, why did they fail? – and on the other hand, it is discussing possible targets and instruments that might provide a framework for development policy after 2015. The international workshop “The Millennium Development Goals and Beyond: Reflections on an International Development Agenda after 2015”, organized by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development (BMZ), the German Development Institute/ Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE) and the Poverty Reduction, Equity and Growth Network (PEGNet) was meant to contribute to the discussion about a framework for development policy beyond 2015.

The aim of the workshop was to bring together different actors and experts to exchange on topics relevant to the post-MDG agenda at a very early stage. It brought together policy-makers and participants from civil society, academia and think tanks as well as from international organizations, both from developed and developing countries. In the future, an array of different actors will be called upon to actively join in the discussion, help create broad international support and pave the way for consensus on a post MDG framework.

This documentation is structured according to the workshop program^{*}. It gives an overview over the four sessions from the first two days, briefly summarizing the presentations and the subsequent discussions. Furthermore, the documentation reflects the group discussions and brainstorming for a post-MDG-framework on the third day.

The presentations of all sessions can be downloaded [here](#)

^{*} See page 12 below for the complete program

Monday, 21 November 2011

Session 1: The need for a global development agenda

The first session asked if an international goals system such as the MDGs is a desirable and adequate framework for planning, carrying out and achieving human development policies. What are the positive effects of having an internationally agreed framework, and what are the drawbacks? Can achievable development goals reflect universally shared values and global solidarity?

In his presentation, **Phil Vernon** (International Alert) argued that the current MDGs need to be fundamentally reformed. An alternative development framework has to move from an approach merely focusing on reaching ends of human development – as reflected in the MDG targets – to an approach that focuses on the means how these targets should actually be reached. He pleaded for a paradigm shift towards ensuring equal access to political voice, economic participation and justice as well as freedom from insecurity. Moreover, subjective aspects like well-being and aspiration must play a prominent role. Vernon stressed that only the broader frame for human development should be decided upon at the global level. Strategies on how to enhance progress towards human development should be conceived at the local level.

Malcolm Langford (Norwegian Centre for Human Rights) identified six ways to ‘fix’ the MDGs. First, the civil society has to be integrated more strongly into the process of formulating a possible new development agenda in order to enhance its effectiveness and legitimacy. Second, a new target system must reflect all thematic areas of the human rights agenda more holistically and include issues like equality. Third, a focus must lie on the inclusion of the poorest and marginalized groups which are currently excluded from many poverty reduction initiatives. Fourth, in order to avoid setting unfair targets for some countries and regions such as in the MDGs framework, future goals and targets need to better reflect local conditions and the limited means a country may have at hand to realize them. Fifth, a new development framework must mainstream human rights principles in all dimensions in order to avoid human rights violations committed in the name of reaching global development goals. Finally, a new goal system must be backed up by a functioning accountability mechanism.

In the session’s final presentation, **Lord Mawuko-Yevugah** (University of the Witwatersrand) presented a more critical vision of the current development paradigm. He argued that the current development architecture does not intend to promote the well-being and the interests of the poor population in the South and that, on the contrary, the various development plans serve the vested interests of businesses from the North as well as of southern elites. He called for a new global development paradigm that should aim at addressing democratic deficits in development policy making and identified a need for nationally conceived strategies and solutions with citizens as ‘means and ends of development’. In that regard, he considered a vibrant civil society for developing home-grown solutions as vital.

During the subsequent **discussion round**, the vast majority of participants agreed on the need for a global development agenda beyond 2015. Issues were raised on the assessment of progress towards reaching the MDGs: The MDGs have often been misinterpreted as planning goals although they were originally conceived as a loose and broad vision of a desirable overall future state of the world. Moreover, some participants called attention to the fact that the MDGs do not cover all relevant fields specified in the Millennium Declaration. The current MDG agenda fails to capture the broader dynamic of development, particularly growth and employment, but also human rights, empowerment and dignity. It essentially neglects sustainability issues and the role of the emerging economies in development. Moreover, some participants pointed out that the special role of fragile states as well as peace building strategies must be a central part of a new framework. The new framework should also call for significantly reducing impediments to developing countries' growth which originate from the international trade structure.

Despite these critical comments, the existing strengths of the present MDGs, such as their great mobilizing power, their results-based and time-bound orientation and the simple but comprehensive approach to development they reflect were underscored on multiple occasions. There was a call to keep in mind that the MDGs are the most visible expression the UN ever made in the fight against poverty. Most experts agreed on the fact that there is no need for a completely new agenda and that a post 2015 system of goals should continue to derive its legitimacy from the Millennium Declaration as a fundamental international consensus on development.

Session 2: The content of a new global development agenda

The second session dealt with the specific content of a new development agenda. Should a new goals system be limited to the level of final goals (as is the current one), or should it include instrumental goals e.g. the preservation of global public goods, redistribution or private sector development? Do the current MDGs cover all the important areas, or do they neglect key issues?

In his opening presentation, **Vinay Kumar Singh** (Indian National Academy of Direct Taxes) criticized the MDG agenda for simply describing to a set of objectives without clarifying how these could or should be reached. Therefore, he argued, a reformed framework must include process-related goals reflecting a strategy on how human development can most effectively be realized. He proposed including a clear global commitment to enhancing national capacity in local policy making in a reformed framework. Singh concluded that capacity building of local functionaries may be the key to improving actual ground level implementation of global commitments and national strategies.

Gabriele Köhler (Institute of Development Studies) held that a new global development framework must be devised by looking through a human security lense. This would en-

sure that it follows a rights-based and participatory approach, prioritizes economic and social equity and environmental sustainability, and includes employment and decent work.

Jan Rieländer (OECD Development Centre) argued that the MDGs' exclusive focus on poverty and basic services does not adequately address a range of challenges faced particularly by middle income countries, such as rising inequalities, unemployment and a general sense of frustration. Rieländer maintained that these phenomena are symptomatic for a lack of social cohesion. Thus, a new framework should fight marginalization, promote trust, offer its members the opportunity of upward social mobility and ultimately ensure the well-being of all members of a society. Rieländer concluded that for a new goal system to adequately reflect social cohesion, subjective indicators would have to be adopted.

During the **discussion**, many comments focused on income equality, inclusive growth and employment as major issues not adequately reflected in the current MDGs. These issues could be tackled by adopting new targets or by adjusting the monitoring of existing targets.

Some of the participants emphasized the need for a social protection floor to be included in the new goal system. This would ensure a lower bound of social rights and services and protect poor people from shocks. However, how such social protection floor could actually be implemented in a post-2015 framework remained an open question.

A broad consensus was reached on the important role of the emerging economies in the South and their key role in shaping a new development framework. Several commentators stressed the need to 'rethink the rules of the game' by recognizing that the lines between donor and recipient-countries are becoming increasingly blurred. One commentator argued that the MDGs' exclusive focus on poverty reduction and basic services does not adequately address many challenges faced by the emerging economies, as higher average income, better health and improved education do not automatically lead to higher life satisfaction, as exemplified by the recent uprisings in the Arab world.

In the discussion the need to look at differences between regions, groups and individuals was stressed in order to identify and support those excluded from the benefits of growth. Several commentators shared the opinion that instead of adopting only quantitative global goals, qualitative dimensions of poverty and well-being must also play a more important role after 2015.

Moreover, many participants stressed the need to make globally conceived goals more relevant for the national level. This could be done by adjusting the goal system to the specific context of each country, where some goal dimensions should only be applied to specific country groups (mainly fragile states).

Various statements called for global targets that are valid and binding for developing and developed countries alike and that address collective action problems with regard to the provision of global public goods. Some participants argued that the issues raised in the MDGs should not be confined to developing countries alone, as developed countries are by no means free from poverty, exclusion and inequity and both in fact face quite similar challenges.

Whether the sustainable development goals proposed in the lead up to the Rio+20 summit in June 2012 should be somehow integrated in the Millennium agenda was subject to a lively discussion. While there was consensus that the results of existing negotiation processes – in particular with regard to the Rio+20 summit – will have to be taken into account, there was no clear idea on how a post-2015 framework could be conciliated with other development agendas.

Tuesday, 22 November 2011

Session 3: Measuring progress towards goals

The third session concentrated on questions relevant with regard to indicators for adequate and efficient measurement of progress: What should be the level of analysis? How can qualitative aspects be included? How does indicator formulation affect the actual goal? How can the current development goals be reconciled with multidimensional notions of deprivation?

In his opening presentation, **Simon Lange** (University of Göttingen) argued that the most important numerical targets within the framework of the MDGs are unrealistic for very poor countries, as these are farthest away from achieving the MDGs and have to catch up more than others in order to do so. Thus, interpreting the MDGs as country-specific goals would increase the risk of undermining accountability and ownership. Lange underscored that for national policy-makers to take the goals seriously, they would have to be commonly agreed upon, country specific, relevant, measurable and realistic. Accordingly, he proposed an alternative approach to measuring progress towards global development goals: Comparing actual with projected trends of progress towards a respective goal for each country would give information on over- and underachievers based on realistic expectations. Following this approach, Lange presented a Performance Index which showed that progress is substantial even in countries which are judged “off-track” by the ordinary MDG monitoring approach when assessing actual progress against expected trends.

Looking at latest insights from research on multidimensional poverty measurement, **Nicole Rippin** (German Development Institute) stressed that the Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) developed by the Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative – OPHI in cooperation with UNDP has been a great leap forward as it gives information on the incidence and intensity of multidimensional poverty.

However, she pointed out that it neglects crucial information on inequalities among the poor themselves. Rippin presented a Correlation Sensitive Poverty Index (CSPI) based on a weighting scheme to differentiate between degrees of poverty severity. This index is intended to reflect the distribution of multidimensional deprivations within a society. Moreover, Rippin argued that to the CSPI permits circumventing one of the two cutoffs the MPI relies on and which have been criticized as being arbitrary.

In her presentation, **Sabina Alkire** (Director of the Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative - OPHI) underscored the various advantages of the MPI such as its decomposability by region and its comparability across time by region and indicator. She also referred to poverty dimensions currently excluded from global poverty measurement due to lack or incomparability of data. Among these 'missing dimensions' she included employment, security, freedom of choice, and empowerment. Alkire underscored the urgent need to gather more information on these deprivations until 2015 when a new goal system is to be defined. Finally, she suggested developing an internationally comparable measure integrating various post-2015 goals which would accompany a more detailed dashboard of single goals, targets and indicators.

In the **discussion**, a broad consensus appeared that the current system can undermine accountability and ownership. The most important numerical targets within the framework of the MDGs were considered unrealistic for the poorest countries when interpreted as country-specific goals.

One central issue was the problem of data availability. Moreover, the need for comparable data on a global level, the importance of national preferences, capacity building and ownership were repeatedly raised. As the five main areas of tension the following trade-offs were mentioned:

- between high aspirations on one hand and realism about what can be realized in a certain time span on the other;
- between coverage of what is important to the people vs. what can be measured,
- between how to go into household details and having single powerful national numbers,
- between the national level and a single global project and
- between complexity and appeal.

It was called for a global organization for statistics to handle the data challenges that the current MDG monitoring is confronted with. This organization should also try to include the 'missing dimensions' such as employment but also data on the private sector as well as on participation and transparency.

Regarding multidimensional poverty measurement, various participants welcomed the MPI as an innovative and comprehensive tool to inform policy-makers which could play a major role in a MDG follow-up framework. Notwithstanding there is the need to continue developing and improving the MPI as it currently does not adequately reflect other central dimensions of poverty.

The need to include subjective information on well-being in a new goal system was intensively discussed. Even though most participants concurred that the inclusion of subjective poverty measures would yield considerable insights on global well-being, many sceptical comments on the validity of such measures were raised. The availability of objective and sound data was identified as a key constraint to including subjective poverty measures in a post-2015 framework.

Session 4: The way towards a new consensus

In the fourth session, participants elaborated on the process of formulating and implementing a new goals system. Of particular interest was the role of different actors such as developing country governments, the (new) donor community, civil society and the business sector. Attention was also given to what should be done differently in the future as compared to the current implementation of the MDGs.

In the opening session, **Jan Vandemoortele** underscored that one has to move away from the traditional donor perspective on development when formulating a new goal system. The discussions in and perspectives from developing countries will have to play a major role on the way to a new consensus. Besides this danger of 'donorship' the current debate on post-2015 runs several risks: First, it will be impossible to formulate an all encompassing new development framework. Development and poverty are too complex to be covered by a global goal system. In that vein, for the goal system to remain comprehensible and concise, it should not be overloaded with too many development dimensions. Finally, the international community should refrain from prescribing development paths as this would run counter to the idea of ownership. Vandemoortele concluded that the post-MDG framework has to have the legitimacy of the United Nations. In fact, the UN Secretariat will have to perform three pragmatic tasks: being a convener of national debates, being an aggregator of ideas and proposals and being a gatekeeper for the new targets.

In the following presentation, **Adeyeye Adewole** (Ondo State University of Science and Technology) criticized that the poverty situation in Africa has not changed substantially since the formulation of the MDGs. In fact, national debts have increased, unemployment is soaring and corrupt practice is widely spread. He argued that from an African perspective, the MDGs were well intended but they lack an implementing institution. Accordingly, Adeyeye proposed a Global Development Regulatory Organization (GDRO) which would plan, organize, prosecute and regulate global development activities, ultimately putting into reality internationally agreed objectives. Such an approach would be a pre-emptive way of ensuring sustainable development and human well-being.

In the last presentation, **Claire Melamed** (Overseas Development Institute) identified two challenges that a new political framework will face. First, it must be clarified who benefits from progress and who does not. In the past, gains have not been equally distributed,

e.g. between urban and rural populations or between different ethnic or religious groups. Second, there must be an agreement on what progress actually is. Issues like the threat of violence, or the humiliation involved in being poor are not included in current poverty monitoring. In conclusion, Melamed presented three principles which could form the basis for a new agreement: universality and inclusiveness, building resilience and reducing vulnerability as well as building national economies.

During the **discussion**, broad consensus appeared on the importance of integrating equity into a new framework. One participant criticized limiting the focus on equity to access to services and underscored that inequality has multiple dimensions (e.g. ethnic background, gender). He therefore called for equity to be embedded in the core of the development narrative. One commentator argued that the G77 will not accept future goals if there are no clear goals for rich countries. Thus, a future framework would need to be more precise on global equity.

Another intensively debated issue was development funding. Most participants agreed that the concept of ODA is not far reaching enough and might be abandoned eventually. The following were considered to be important sources for development funding: progressive taxes within countries, international taxes, more funding from emerging economies, philanthropic foundations and the private sector. There was also a strong view on finding new ways for development cooperation between emerging donors, traditional donors and fragile states.

Finally, there was a strong consensus on the important role of the UN in the process of elaborating and negotiating a MDG follow-up framework. Many participants stressed that ideas and innovations on the future development framework have to be 'home-grown' and that partner countries, civil society and the private sector have to be involved in the formulation and implementation process of new goals. However, there was also a call not to expect results from the UN system in a very short time, as the necessary consultation process will be long and extensive in order to embrace as wide a range as possible of positions on a post 2015 framework.

Wednesday, 23 November 2011

A follow-up framework for the MDGs from the perspective of bilateral and multilateral organizations – An exchange of ideas

On the third day over 30 participants interactively discussed the practical implications and consequences of the issues raised during the previous two days. Some initial thoughts on challenges and opportunities relevant for a post MDG framework were developed.

Among the participants, there was a general consensus on the need for a **post 2015-agenda as an overarching development framework**. There was a doubt, however, whether all emerging economies and developing countries (and their respective political

leaders) would also agree and be willing to actively drive a new agenda forward. Many participants stressed that a new global framework will have to address a number of new global challenges, such as food security, climate change, environmental resilience, disaster reduction, and population growth. This perception of new challenges seems to be one main reason why simply extending the current MDGs beyond 2015 may not be sufficient. In addition, the growing influence of emerging economies will have to be taken into account when developing a new global agenda.

Accordingly, most actors seemed to favour the idea that the **MDGs should be reformed**, perhaps even to a considerable extent. However, concerns were expressed about overloading the MDG agenda and thus diluting it. Precisely because the MDGs have a strong focus on poverty, they are so effective in awareness-raising. Some experts held that rather than introducing additional goals and new targets for equality, sustainability and employment, existing indicators should be adapted so that they reflect these issues in more depth.

One extensively discussed topic was the **integration of equity** into a new development agenda. The participants focused on issues of equity (equality of access and chances) and on equality (equality of outcomes). Moreover, with regard to the danger of overloading the MDG agenda, it was proposed to integrate equity indicators into existing targets. For instance, this could be done by introducing specific targets reflecting improvements in the lot of the bottom quintile for existing goals.

New global challenges and global imbalances require an understanding of **transmission channels between the global and national level** as well as of global structures. Some participants alerted to the danger of imposing an international system that national governments do not agree with or which is not relevant for national or local contexts. This should be avoided by ensuring that countries can use their own nationally-adapted indicators to monitor progress and inform national or local debates.

These arguments directly fed into a discussion on goal measurement. It was stressed that internationally agreed goals will necessarily continue to form the basis for measurement and comparison at the international level. The need for nationally adapted indicators will require formulating these goals in a way that makes them meaningful and measurable at the national level. Introducing quality of life indicators – a suggestion supported by some – would introduce additional challenges into the measurement concept. Whilst qualitative data of all sorts would add a tremendous depth of understanding, it is much less objective than quantitative measurement.

In conclusion, a **few simple principles** upon which the post-2015 framework should be based were proposed. It should

- engage all actors,
- stay simple and concise,
- be relevant to new (geo-economics/political) contexts,
- contain measurable targets.

Input presentation and working groups

In her input presentation, **Meera Tiwari** (University of East London) sketched a first vision on how a new development framework – from her point of view – should look like. She argued that the design needs to embody a balance between globally formulated principles for development and locally determined goals specific enough to guide national or local development strategies. Such a ‘glocal’ framework would have to take account of new environmental, social and economic drivers and priorities for development not adequately reflected in the current framework. A broader range of actors will have to take part in the identification of such priorities.

Subsequently, the participants gathered in **four working groups**, each of which focused on one specific topic.

The **first group** discussed **equity** and whether it should become a separate target in a post-2015-agenda. It did not come to a final agreement on this complex issue. The group concluded that while the topic has to be part of a global framework, there should not be a separate equity target. Moreover, the inclusion of equity should have a global outreach and not only focus on developing countries. The group stressed the importance of choosing indicators on equity that would provide incentives for governments to actually do something about inequality.

The **second group** dealt with the issue of donor credibility in the debate on a new development agenda based on the assumption that, **to some extent they cause part of the problems** developing countries have to deal with. Should they change their behaviour first? The group stressed that one key problem is that many of the developed countries’ non development policies, regarding issues such as trade, immigration, taxes, GHG emissions, arms and land grabs, cause negative externalities for emerging and developing countries. It concluded that developed countries must promote policy coherence for development and engage in development cooperation at the same time. A range of issues were raised in the discussion: How can it be ensured that a new framework is genuinely universal, covering the North as well as the South? Is it our life style that needs to change the most? Would it be possible to better engage the emerging economies if developed nations tried to agree on improved policy coherence? Or would that just unnecessarily prolong the negotiations?

The **third group** discussed the challenge of **financing development in the future**. One of the key issues identified was the importance of national resource mobilization through taxation. Given that poverty is no longer a problem of poor countries only, this was seen to have implications for tax systems in rich and emerging economies as well. Using resources from international taxes such as a financial transaction levy or the carbon tax for development purposes was also considered. In addition, means for enhancing the private sector’s contribution to development (e.g. through Public Private Partnerships, taxes, decent wages, vocational training, social welfare) and for facilitating the transfer of remittances were discussed.

The need for a careful comparison of the Paris Agenda with the “Chinese approach” was put forward, as some actors seem to find the latter much more appealing.

“**Who should draft the new agenda** – the developing and emerging countries or the developed countries?” was the question the **fourth group** debated on. The group stressed that there must be a transparent bottom-up participatory process with “people’s assemblies”, civil society and the private sector involved. Modern technologies could be used to gather inputs and mobilize people. Moreover, all national and local levels of government should be involved in the consultation process. It was argued that it would be most effective to first seek regional consensus before negotiating global agreements. In conclusion, the group proposed the image of a “three headed dragon” (one person each from developed, emerging and developing countries) to drive and negotiate a new post-2015 framework.

Summary and open questions

During the **concluding round**, it was stressed that, in a future development agenda, the existing dimensions of the MDGs should be sharpened. Some issues need reconceptualization – for example in order to give a stronger focus on the quality of social infrastructure. Some future targets should be more ambitious, and others less so. Conceiving the new agenda in a way that its global goals can function as an umbrella for nationally adapted goals remains a major unresolved challenge. Moreover, new mechanisms for financing development require additional discussion. The participants mentioned various issues that should receive particular attention during future consultations:

- The institutional architecture the new framework will be based on;
- The means necessary to reach the goals (growth, jobs, ODA, infrastructure...);
- Approaches to reshaping the links between goals, targets and indicators;
- Adequate methods for measuring equity;
- The role of different cultural approaches;
- Considering the MDGs as global public goods;
- Including the needs of people with disabilities.

Workshop Program

Monday, 21 November 2011

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

Tuesday, 22 November 2011

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

Wednesday, 23 November 2011

08.30-09:00 *Welcome*

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

Introduction and wrap-up of day 1&2

Facilitator: Adrian Taylor

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

10.30-11.00 *Coffee break*

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

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

What should the post 2015 development framework look like

13.00-14.00 *Lunch*

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

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

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

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

How can the achievement of the goals be measured?

16.00-16.30 *Summary and farewell address*

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

List of participants:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Edited by the
BMZ Division on Millennium Development Goals; poverty reduction; social protection; sectoral and thematic policies

As at
February 2012

Addresses of the BMZ office

Bonn Office
Dahlmannstraße 4
53113 Bonn
Germany

Berlin Office
Stresemannstraße 94
10963 Berlin
Germany

Tel. + 49 (0) 228 99 535 - 0
Fax + 49 (0) 228 99 535 - 3500
poststelle@bmz.bund.de
www.bmz.de

Tel. +49 (0) 30 18 535 - 0
Fax +49 (0) 30 18 535 - 2501