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Chapter I

History, impact and outline of lessons of MDGs

Summary

• The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) were a consequence of several processes, including changes in development thinking, a series of thematic conferences held in the 1990s putting forward time-bound, quantitative goals, and the urge of the international community to make a big push towards development in the new millennium.

• The MDGs were successful in mobilizing a wide range of actors—extending much beyond national Governments—that, through many initiatives, took steps towards supporting developing countries to achieve the Goals.

• A multidimensional analytical framework is needed to draw MDG-related lessons with regard to economic, social and environmental policies, and alignment of global goals with national goals, and to determine the impact of the MDGs on development thinking and data development.

• Alignment of national goals with the MDGs was an interactive process involving decisions by political leadership, stakeholder consultation, legislative changes, and their incorporation in national plans and budgets, all of which required flexibility in order to reflect a country’s specific conditions.

• The MDGs further advanced the shift from a unidimensional focus on income growth to one centred on direct, multidimensional measures of human welfare. The MDGs also led to significant improvement in the capacity to gather, process and report data, thereby laying a good foundation for monitoring the implementation of the post-2015 development agenda.
Introduction

The launching of the MDGs at the dawn of the present century ushered in one of the most important initiatives undertaken by the United Nations. It strengthened the engagement of the United Nations with the actual development efforts by Member States, and enhanced the role of the United Nations in global development thinking and practice.

As the period of the MDGs expires in 2015, the world is ready to embrace a post-2015 development agenda which, along with a set of sustainable development goals, is expected to be launched at the seventieth session of the General Assembly in September 2015. It is therefore incumbent upon the United Nations to draw the policy lessons to be learned from the period of the MDGs in order to support the implementation of the sustainable development goals in the post-2015 period. This Survey aims at contributing to this endeavour.

There are numerous reports that document and provide information on progress towards the MDGs. For example, The Millennium Development MDGs Report 2015 (United Nations, 2015a) and the MDG Gap Task Force Report 2015 (United Nations, 2015b), issued by the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations Secretariat on an annual basis, monitor progress, identify implementation gaps and make recommendations with respect to achieving the MDGs.1 The Global Monitoring Report, a joint publication of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank since 2007, provides yearly in-depth analysis in a particular MDG-related area of importance, in addition to monitoring, within a framework of accountability in global development policy, the overall progress in achieving the MDGs. Further, a large number of country and regional reports, prepared with support from the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), focus on progress in achieving the MDGs in individual countries and regions. There are many other reports as well, prepared by international non-governmental organizations and think tanks, some of which appear among the references listed in this Survey.

The present World Economic and Social Survey does not aim at conducting an exhaustive assessment of the MDG experience. It focuses instead on drawing lessons from key policies and strategies adopted during the course of the implementation of the MDGs and discussing their policy implications for the post-2015 period. For this purpose, this Survey engages primarily in a meta-analysis, i.e., an analysis of other analyses and assessments already available within a comparative holistic framework. The conduct of the review and the lessons offered entail a consideration of six clusters: (a) development thinking, alignment of national goals with the MDGs and data development; (b) economic policies; (c) social policies; (d) environmental policies; (e) governance and institutions, and peace and stability; and (f) global partnerships for development. An entire chapter is devoted to each cluster.

1 The first MDG Report was issued in 2005, while the first MDG Gap Report was issued in 2008.
The present introductory chapter sets the stage by examining the analytical framework used and providing an overview of the subsequent chapters. It discusses the experience of alignment of national goals with the MDGs and the lessons that can be derived from that experience for application to the adoption of the sustainable development goals. This chapter also considers the impact of the MDGs on development-related thinking and data development and reporting.

The organization of the body of this chapter is as follows:

The second section provides background material demonstrating that the MDGs represented a consequence of several processes.

The third section reviews the discussion on the strengths and weaknesses of the MDGs as a set of goals.

The fourth section reviews major steps taken by the United Nations and other organizations at the international and regional levels to facilitate the implementation of the MDGs.

The fifth section discusses the MDG alignment experience where the implementation efforts took place, namely, at the national level, taking note of its interactive and multidimensional character, the modifications of the MDGs that were introduced in the process, and the variety of ways in which MDGs were incorporated in national plans, strategies and budgets.

The sixth section focuses on the defining characteristics of the analytical framework used in this Survey, while taking note of the drawbacks of some of the existing studies. A broader, multidimensional framework is offered which can capture the richness of the MDGs experience and exhibit the role of policies. This section also discusses how to characterize the different types of policies and factors that have promoted the achievement of the MDGs directly or indirectly.

The seventh and eighth sections focus on the impact that has been exerted by the MDGs on development thinking and data development, respectively. In particular, the sixth section explores the role played by the MDGs in cementing the shift from a unidimensional focus on income towards one centred on direct, multidimensional measures of welfare. It also discusses the possible impact of the MDGs on enhancing the “agency” dimension of development, facilitating the “rights-based” approach to development, and encouraging a revival of political economy.

The MDG background

The adoption of the MDGs by the United Nations was neither sudden nor serendipitous. Many historical factors and intellectual developments converged to produce this initiative,
which required the conscious effort and hard work of many. A clear understanding of the genesis of the MDGs is therefore necessary if an analysis of the MDG experience and the lessons to be drawn from that experience are to inform the adoption and implementation of a post-2015 development agenda. The present section provides a brief review of the processes leading to the formulation of the MDGs.

**United Nations engagement with development issues during the period 1950–1990**

“Development” is one of the three pillars of the work of the United Nations, along with “peace and security” and “human rights”. The very structure of the United Nations, specifically the importance of the Economic and Social Council and the Security Council, underlines the importance of the development pillar. The United Nations threw itself into a consideration of the global development agenda soon after its founding and issued three major reports (United Nations, Economic and Social Council, 1949; United Nations, 1951a, 1951b). These reports reflected the recognition that developing countries needed to raise savings, investment and the rate of economic growth (Jolly, 2005).

By the 1960s, United Nations thinking regarding development had already started to extend beyond the narrow confines of the subject of economic growth. Pursuant to the designation by the General Assembly, in its resolution 1710 (XVI) of 19 December 1961, of the 1960s as the First United Nations Development Decade, the United Nations published, in 1962, a report of the Secretary-General entitled “The United Nations development decade: proposals for action” (United Nations, 1962), which suggested directions for development efforts. In the foreword to this document, the Secretary-General, U Thant, declared that “(d)evelopment is not just economic growth, it is growth plus change”. The report also took of the advice of the Economic and Social Council, namely, against putting “over-riding and disproportionate emphasis” on “the more material aspects of growth”. The Council also cautioned that “(h)uman rights may be submerged and human beings seen only as instruments of production, rather than as free entities for whose welfare and cultural advance the increased production is intended”, and thus that “(t)he end may be forgotten in the preoccupation with the means” (ibid., 1962, pp. 10-11; Jolly, 2005, p. 53). The first session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), held in Geneva in 1964, played an important role in advancing the thinking of the United Nations on development.

In the 1970s, the International Labour Organization (ILO) pioneered the concept of meeting “basic needs” as the fundamental goal of development, to be achieved through a focus on “employment”. These ideas were put forward formally in the resolutions adopted
by the World Employment Conference in 1976. They were also picked up by the World Bank and led to the formulation of the “redistribution with growth” model.²

The 1970s also saw the first spate of international conferences focused on various particular development issues, including the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment (Stockholm, 1972), the World Food Conference (Rome, 1974), the World Population Conference (Bucharest, 1974), the United Nations Conference on Human Settlements (Vancouver, 1976) and United Nations Conference on Science and Technology for Development (Vienna, 1979). The World Conference of the International Women’s Year (Mexico City, 1975) led to the establishment of the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women (INSTR AW) and the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) and adoption by the General Assembly, its resolution 34/180 of 18 December 1979, of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.³

However, the basic needs approach to development did not last too long at the World Bank and the IMF. Following the debt crisis and the recession in the early 1980s, these institutions adopted a programme of “structural adjustment”, focused on curbing inflation, reducing deficits, and restoring balance. The countries of Latin America and Africa were, in particular, subjects of such structural adjustment programmes, which, while successful to some extent in containing inflation and cutting deficits, also resulted in a “lost decade of development” in large parts of these two continents.

Alarmed by the adverse consequences of structural adjustment policies for economic and social development, various United Nations organizations put forward ideas defending employment and social spending. The United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), for example, published a volume on the impact of structural adjustment programmes and argued for “adjustment with a human face”. Along similar lines, the Council of Ministers of the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) adopted on 10 April 1989 the African Alternative Framework to Structural Adjustment Programmes for Socio-Economic Recovery and Transformation (A AF-SAP), of which the General Assembly took note with interest in its resolution 44/24 of 17 November 1989.

Growing acceptance of the multidimensional view of well-being

Meanwhile, supported by the theoretical work of Amartya Sen (1983, 1985, 1988, 1989), there was a further shift during the 1970s and the 1980s in the thinking about development and its purpose. Sen showed that what is important for human well-being is not (monetary) income per se, but rather the various “functionings” that a person may wish to perform and engage in. This in turn depends on a person’s “capability”, which hinges not on monetary

² See Chenery, Robinson, and Sirquin (1986) for discussion.
income alone, but on a wider array of social arrangements and factors (see also Alkire 2002a, 2002b, 2005; Fukuda-Parr, 2003; Kuklys, 2005; and Nussbaum and Sen, 1993).

Sen’s theoretical framework led to two important changes in development thinking. First, it encouraged a move away from the narrow focus on income, which can be only an indirect enabler, to more direct measures of human welfare. Second, it also encouraged a multidimensional view of human welfare rather than a unidimensional one focused on income. These ideas coalesced in the concept of “human development”, disseminated by UNDP through its Human Development Reports, which were launched in 1990. The reports included Human Development Index rankings covering life expectancy, education and income. Although this represented an important step forward towards multidimensionality and direct measures of human welfare, the Index remained a partial measure. There was therefore an urge to move still further along in this direction.

United Nations-related conferences of the 1990s

Development-related thinking and practice experienced significant propulsion in the 1990s from the impact of several other momentous historical events. The first was the approaching new millennium. This historic moment induced the international community to take the long view and ponder long-term development goals. The second landmark event was the end of the cold war, resulting in a more cooperative international environment and the possibility of refocusing attention and shifting the enormous quantities of resources that had been channelled towards armaments in the direction of activities for peaceful development, so as to actualize the so-called peace dividend.

The enthusiasm generated by the above historical changes and occasions was reflected in the series of thematic United Nations-related conferences held in the 1990s. These included the World Conference on Education for All (Jomtien, Thailand, 1990); the World Summit for Children (New York, 1990); the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 1992), which adopted Agenda 21 (United Nations, 1993)\textsuperscript{4} and the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development (ibid.);\textsuperscript{5} the World Conference on Human Rights (Vienna, 1993); the International Conference on Population and Development (Cairo, 1994); the World Summit for Social Development (Copenhagen, 1995); and the Fourth World Conference on Women (Beijing, 1995). While many of the goals adopted at these conferences were aspirational and unquantified, some were quantitative and time-bound (see, for example, Development Assistance Committee, 1996 and Manning, 2009).


\textsuperscript{5} Ibid., annex I.
Formulation of the international development goals (IDGs)

Against this background, and in part to sustain official development assistance (ODA), some of which was then being diverted towards countries in transition, the members of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC)\(^6\) engaged in a “reflection exercise”, producing in May 1996, the document entitled “Shaping the twenty-first century: the contribution of development co-operation” (Development Assistance Committee, 1996), which assembled a short list of the targets and goals adopted in the above-mentioned conferences, particularly in the areas of poverty, education, health, gender, environment and governance. The document contained the following six quantitative goals: (a) poverty reduction by half by 2015; (b) universal primary education; (c) gender equality; (d) infant mortality reduction by two thirds and maternal mortality reduction by three fourths; (e) access to primary health care and reproductive health services; and (f) reversing loss of environmental resources. These came to be known as the international development goals (IDGs). The IDGs, as formulated, were expressed with brevity that was appreciated as an effective means of attracting attention and highlighting the concrete tasks that lay ahead with regard to development. This led to the perception that, sometimes, “less is more” (Manning, 2009, p. 86).

The IDGs gained support in the development community as well as among leading international organizations. OECD, the United Nations (including UNDP, other funds and programmes and some of the specialized agencies), the World Bank and IMF initiated a process of cooperation at the secretariat level with a view to agreeing on indicators for monitoring progress towards the IDGs. The Group of Eight (G8), at its twenty-fourth Summit in Birmingham, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, in 1998, supported the IDGs despite certain reservations on the part of some of its members (Manning, 2009).

The World Bank and IMF came to see the relevance of the IDGs for resolving the debt problems of the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC), as reflected in the World Bank-IMF paper entitled “Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Initiative: strengthening the link between debt relief and poverty reduction” (International Monetary Fund and International Development Association, 1999), which helped direct greater attention to the MDGs in the preparation of the first round of poverty reduction strategy papers (PRSPs) (Fukuda-Parr, 2010).

The cooperation among OECD, the United Nations Secretariat, and the World Bank and IMF led to the finalization of a set of seven IDGs with 21 indicators. The goals had already been included in box 6.2 of the UNDP Human Development Report 1997 (United Nations Development Programme, 1997a), as well as in the World Bank World Development

---

\(^6\) The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee became part of OECD by ministerial resolution on 23 July 1961. It is a unique international forum for many of the largest funders of aid, including the 29 Committee members. The World Bank, IMF and UNDP participate as observers.
Indicators (from 1998 onward). In 1999, United Nations organizations adopted a revised set of guidelines for the production of common country assessments and for the United Nations Development Assistance Framework, which included among their 40 indicators most of the 21 indicators that had emerged from the DAC-led process. The outcome of this cooperation was made public in the June 2000 report entitled “A better world for all: progress towards the international development goals” (International Monetary Fund, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, United Nations and World Bank Group, 2000), which was launched by the then Secretary-General, Kofi Annan, in Geneva at the twenty-fourth special session of the General Assembly, entitled “World Summit for Social Development and beyond: achieving social development for all in a globalizing world”, held from 26 June to 1 July 2000.

The United Nations Millennium Declaration and the formulation of the MDGs

Meanwhile, the United Nations was itself preparing for the Millennium Summit, to be held in September 2000. On 27 March 2000, the report of the Secretary-General entitled “We the peoples: the role of the United Nations in the twenty-first century” (United Nations, General Assembly, 2000) was issued. The report set out proposals related to the Millennium Declaration, to be adopted at the Summit. The report was expansive in laying out the challenges of the new century, focusing on globalization and governance, freedom from want, freedom from fear, sustaining our future and renewing the United Nations. The last section (VII) of the report presented, “for consideration by the Summit”, a compilation of “values” and “priorities” (including the Secretary-General’s own initiatives) with regard to poverty reduction, peace and security, environment, and strengthening the United Nations.

The United Nations Millennium Declaration (adopted by the General Assembly by its resolution 55/2 of 8 September 2000), which followed in the footsteps of the report entitled “We the peoples”, in terms of its expansiveness, included sections on values and principles, peace, security and disarmament, development and poverty eradication, protecting our common environment, human rights, democracy and good governance, protecting the vulnerable, meeting the special needs of Africa, and strengthening the United Nations. The section on development and poverty eradication contained the following list of time-bound targets:

• To halve, by the year 2015, the proportion of the world’s people whose income is less than a dollar a day and the proportion of people who suffer from hunger and, by the same date, to halve the proportion of people who are unable to reach or to afford safe drinking water.

• To ensure that, by the same date, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling and that girls and boys will have equal access to all levels of education.
• By the same date, to have reduced maternal mortality by three quarters, and under-five child mortality by two thirds, of their current rates.

• To have by then halted, and begun to reverse, the spread of HIV/AIDS, the scourge of malaria and other major diseases that afflict humanity.

• To provide special assistance to children orphaned by HIV/AIDS.

• By 2020, to have achieved a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers as proposed in the “Cities without Slums” initiative.

This list clearly reflects several of the IDGs set out in the report entitled “A better world for all”.

In paragraph 31 of the United Nations Millennium Declaration, the General Assembly was requested to review on a regular basis the progress made in implementing the provisions of the Declaration, and to ask the Secretary-General to issue periodic reports for consideration by the Assembly and as a basis for further action. The report of the Secretary-General on the road map towards the implementation of the United Nations Millennium Declaration (United Nations, General Assembly, 2001) was issued on 6 September 2001 pursuant to that request. The annex to the report contained MDGs, formulated based on the targets given directly above. The list comprised eight MDGs, 18 targets and 48 indicators.

Issues associated with the MDGs

Quite expectedly, the MDGs elicited a large amount of commentary, both appreciative and critical. Broadly, the MDGs were welcomed as a useful tool with which to focus on the achievement of specific development gains within a broader development vision, and as a framework for conducting the development activities of the United Nations, for setting national priorities, and for mobilizing stakeholders and resources towards the pursuit of common MDGs.

Issues of omission and commission

The critical comments can be divided into two broad groups: one focusing on omissions and the other on acts of commission.

With regard to omissions, some commentators noted that while the United Nations Millennium Declaration was wide-ranging, covering many different areas, the MDGs were
focused on only one section of the Declaration, namely, that entitled “Development and poverty eradication” (sect. III), thereby neglecting the issues of peace, security and disarmament; protecting our common environment; and human rights, democracy and good governance, among others. Many thought that, even within the area of development and poverty eradication, some important issues were omitted, such as reproductive health rights, employment and job opportunities, access to secondary and tertiary education, and equality of opportunities and outcome (Manning, 2009; Rippin, 2013; Fukuda-Parr, 2010; and Fehling, Nelson and Venkatapuram, 2013).7

Regarding flaws of commission, some observers were unhappy with the use of the $1/day measure of poverty, finding it to be too narrow and/or too low. Some were puzzled by the decision to specify some MDGs in the form of proportions while expressing others in terms of absolute numbers (Saith, 2006; 2007). Along similar lines, some commentators asked why the end point for some MDGs was 2020, while for most others it was 2015. Many questioned why some targets were left quantitatively unspecified (under, for example, MDGs 7 and 8), while the other MDGs and associated targets were quantitatively specified. Many thought that a focus on social sectors would divert resources away from more productive sectors (Manning, 2009; Rippin, 2013; Fehling, Nelson and Venkatapuram, 2013; and Nayyar, 2012).

There were procedural questions, too. Some noted that the MDGs were introduced in the annex to a report of the Secretary-General (on the road map towards the implementation of the United Nations Millennium Declaration) instead of being formally set out and discussed and adopted by the General Assembly (Rippin, 2013).

In response to the above criticisms, it has been pointed out that the MDGs were taken verbatim from the United Nations Millennium Declaration, which was discussed and adopted at the Millennium Summit, so that another round including discussions and adoption was not necessary. Further, since the General Assembly, in its resolution 56/95 of 14 December took note with appreciation of the report of the Secretary-General on the road map, including the annex thereto, and recommended that the road map be considered a useful guide in the implementation of the Millennium Declaration by the United Nations system, it was determined in consequence that the MDGs had been formally considered and approved by the Assembly.

With regard to omissions, it was noted that the intention in formulating the MDGs was to create a small set of precise and measurable goals on which the international community could focus. The aspirations expressed in sections of the Millennium Declaration other than that on development and poverty eradication were generally not measurable, at least not to everybody’s satisfaction. Also, only goals already included in the Millennium Declaration (and on which consensus among the States Members of the United Nations had been achieved) could be included in the MDGs.

7 Further, the criticism was levelled that targets were not always disaggregated so as to account for the differences across various social groups, such as those comprising persons with disabilities, indigenous peoples, youth and older persons.
It may be noted that the criticisms were sometimes contradictory. For example, while some critics found the MDGs overambitious, others found them not ambitious enough. Similarly, on the one hand, some critics did not like the perceived ODA-related underpinnings of the MDGs, while on the other, they complained that not enough ODA was promised in the MDGs.

Overall, the positive responses prevailed, and the MDGs became the centre of attention. One of the main objectives in formulating the MDGs was to inject life into the Millennium Declaration so that it did not moulder away unimplemented. This objective was clearly achieved. The concept of the MDGs became powerful enough to stimulate people’s minds. Further, critics generally pointed out that the criticisms they offered were meant to be “friendly”: they were aimed at fostering improvements in future formulations of goals, rather than suggesting that the world would be better off without the MDGs.

Moreover, there were some follow-up steps taken regarding the perceived omissions. Though the Goals did not change, some targets and indicators were added pursuant to the outcome of the World Summit held at United Nations Headquarters from 14 to 16 September 2005. Those additional targets encompassed reproductive health, access to HIV/AIDS treatment and loss of biodiversity. Also, the target for employment was revised and relocated. When the revisions were complete, the MDG framework (effective from January 2008) contained 8 MDGs, 21 targets and 60 indicators (see appendix I.1).

**Universality versus a focus only on developing countries**

Some observers noted that while the MDGs focused on developing countries, many of the problems they faced were also being confronted by developed countries. For example, there was a contention that the MDGs were “ghettoizing” poverty in developing countries, ignoring the fact that important problems of poverty and deprivation existed in developed countries (Saith, 2006). This contention was also related to the dissatisfaction with the use of the World Bank $1/day line for poverty measurement. It was argued that the use of such a low poverty line allowed developed countries to “hide” their own poverty problem, which would have surfaced if, for example, national poverty lines had been used instead.

The tension between universality and the focus of the MDGs on developing countries was not limited to the sphere of poverty reduction (broadly MDG 1). It surfaced more prominently in the case of MDG 7, which included environmental issues that were actually more relevant for developed countries than for developing ones (see chap. IV for details). The fact that most targets under this Goal were not specified quantitatively was another source of dissatisfaction among critics of the MDGs and provided a further basis for the argument that they imposed “tasks” on developing countries, while “absolving” developed countries of fulfilling their own responsibilities (see, for example, Fehling, Nelson and Venkatapuram, 2013; Nayyar, 2012; and Saith, 2006).
In the light of the dispute above, it is instructive to note that, from 2008 the Millennium Development Goals Report started to report MDG progress for both developed and developing countries, as well as globally, i.e., for the world as a whole.

Global or national MDGs

A more important question was whether the MDGs were global or national goals. This question was sometimes intertwined with another, namely, whether the MDGs were “hard” (planning) targets or merely “aspirational” (see Fukuda-Parr, 2014; and Fukuda-Parr, Yam-in and Greenstein, 2014).

It is clear from the earlier discussion that the MDGs were considered not merely aspirational targets but achievable ones. The report entitled “A better world for all” (International Monetary Fund, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, United Nations and World Bank Group, 2000) shows the data analysis that contributed to the formulation of some of the IDGs, later incorporated in the MDGs. Each of the goals was formulated based on trends of achievement in its respective area during the 1980s and 1990s, and it was through the extrapolation of those trends that the quantitative targets were derived. In other words, the MDGs were deemed as hard planning targets.

However, even if it is conceded that MDGs were hard planning targets at the global level, the question remains whether they should have been taken as such in the context of every region and country. Jan Vandemoortele (2008; 2009; 2011a; and 2011b), one of the Co-chairs of the Secretariat-level committee that drafted the MDGs on the basis of the Millennium Declaration, has been opposed to treating them as a one-size-fits-all set of goals for all developing countries. He has contended that the targets were meant to be global, and that national targets derived from those global targets were supposed to be hammered out on the basis of specific national conditions. In his view, it was a grave error to treat these targets as equally applicable to all countries. He pointed out that, since many of the MDGs were formulated in terms of proportions of initial levels, the one-size-fits-all interpretation of MDGs put the countries that were initially farthest from achieving the Goals at a great disadvantage. Scholars, such as Easterly (2009), Fukuda-Parr, Greenstein and Stewart (2013), and Manning (2009) have expressed similar views. Easterly, for example, provides a detailed analysis showing how the one-size-fits-all interpretation is particularly unfair for Africa, which is often presented as a case of failure with respect to achievement of the MDGs, when, in terms of both historical and contemporaneous comparisons, many African countries have in fact performed better than has been perceived. In reviewing and drawing lessons from the MDGs experience post-2015, it will be important to keep the above issue in mind.
MDGs versus strategies

Another issue associated with the MDGs is whether they pointed to the application of any particular development strategy. Some commentators noted that the MDGs were not accompanied by policy recommendations, and some pointed to this as a potential weakness (Rippin, 2013). However, one of the principles of the United Nations in the area of development is that each country has primary responsibility for its own economic and social development and can choose its own national policies and development strategies.8

Countries across the world have displayed a considerable range of variation with regard to the socioeconomic policies and strategies they adopted to achieve the MDGs (see chaps. II, III and IV for more details). The variety of policies and strategies produced a variety of outcomes. Some countries achieved commendable success, while others failed to do so, with international and regional organizations being able only to provide support to the national Governments in charge of implementing the MDGs. It is therefore important to take note of and draw lessons from the diverse experiences undergone in the implementation of the MDGs for the post-2015 agenda, as the implementation of the SDGs will continue to depend primarily on national policies and strategies.

Implementation efforts at the global and regional levels

The United Nations and the international community took major steps to facilitate the implementation of the MDGs, the following being particularly important. They are presented for the most part in chronological order.

Inter-agency and Expert Group on MDG indicators

The Inter-agency and Expert Group on MDG indicators (IAEG-MDGs) was established in 2002 with responsibility for monitoring progress towards the MDGs. Its primary task was to decide on the indicators to be used. The membership of IAEG-MDGs comprises representatives of the United Nations Secretariat, several United Nations organizations, OECD, the World Bank and IMF, as well as national experts from statistical offices and other national and international organizations dealing with data development for MDGs, including the Partnership in Statistics for Development in the 21st Century (PARIS21) and the Inter-American Development Bank. The annual reports of the Secretary-General to the General Assembly on progress in MDGs implementation has drawn upon the annual report of the Inter-agency and Expert Group. Official data presented in the statistical annex of the

---

8 See the outcome document of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, entitled “The future we want” (General Assembly resolution 66/288, annex).
IAEG-MDGs report on all MDG indicators by region and subregion have also been reflected in the Secretary-General’s report.

IAEG-MDGs has also worked on standardization of the statistical concepts and methods used by various national and international organizations in order to ensure comparability of MDG indicators; and has formed various subgroups mandated to work in specific areas, particularly those requiring more urgent attention. The Inter-agency and Expert Group, which has held two meetings every year to review methods, standards and availability of data on the MDG indicators, reviewed and analysed the trends of progress in achieving the MDGs and targets. It has also reviewed the national and international initiatives on technical cooperation for the generation, compilation and processing of data for MDG indicators.

As noted above, MDG indicators were proposed by IAEG. However, starting in 2003, the results of the work of the Inter-agency and Expert Group were also presented, on a yearly basis, to the Statistical Commission for review by Member States, including the examination of discrepancies between national and international figures and technical aspects of the indicators, even if the Commission had not been involved in the selection of the indicators. As also noted, the indicators were developed by experts from international agencies and representatives of national statistical systems. As contained in the annex to the aforementioned report of the Secretary-General on the road map towards the implementation of the United Nations Millennium Declaration, they were later taken note of with appreciation by the General Assembly in its resolution 56/95 of 14 December 2001. In that resolution, the Assembly requested the Secretary-General to prepare an annual report and a comprehensive report every five years on progress achieved by the United Nations system and Member States towards implementing the Millennium Declaration, drawing upon the road map.

**Financing for development: the Monterrey Consensus**

Even before the Millennium Summit, concerns over declining ODA led to the proposal of a special conference on financing for development, a reference to this conference also being made in the Millennium Declaration. Adoption of the MDGs imparted additional significance to what became known as the International Conference on Financing for Development, held in Monterrey, Mexico, from 18 to 22 March 2002. Despite the controversies regarding the relationship between MDGs and foreign aid, there was a clear perception that developing countries would need additional development assistance in order to achieve the MDGs and other development goals and targets which emanated from the important conferences held in the 1990s, as mentioned above.
The Monterrey Consensus of the International Conference on Financing for Development (United Nations, 2002)\(^9\) covered six main areas: domestic resource mobilization; mobilization of international resources for development, foreign direct investment (FDI) and other private flows; international trade as an engine for development; international financial and technical cooperation for development; external debt; and systemic issues, including issues of coherence and consistency of the international monetary, financial and trading systems. The Monterrey Consensus defined the global partnership for development among developed and developing countries. Among many other things, it reiterated the target of 0.7 per cent of gross national income (GNI) of developed countries to be disbursed as ODA to developing countries and from 0.15 to 0.20 per cent of GNI of developed countries to be disbursed as development aid to the least developed countries.

**World Summit on Sustainable Development**

The World Summit on Sustainable Development was held in Johannesburg, South Africa, from 26 August to 4 September 2002 to consider the progress that had been achieved since the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992. The Summit placed emphasis on Type II partnerships, which were supposed to play a key role in implementation of the MDGs.\(^{10}\) The World Summit also led to some improvement in the set of MDG targets and indicators. The main new target set at the World Summit related to halving the proportion of people without access to sanitation by 2015.

**The UN Millennium Project**

In 2002, the Secretary-General initiated the UN Millennium Project to enable the development of a plan for achieving the MDGs. The plan, entitled Investing in Development: A Practical Plan to Achieve the MDGs (United Nations Development Programme, 2005) and issued in January 2005, noted that rapid gains could be achieved, particularly in low-income countries that had good governance. The plan estimated that the total cost of meeting the MDGs in all countries would be $121 billion in 2006, increasing to about $189 billion in 2015 (in 2003 United States dollars). The plan showed that these additional amounts could be generated if the developed countries lived up to their commitment to providing 0.7 per cent of their GNI as ODA (Stokke, 2009).

---


\(^{10}\) Type II partnership refers to partnerships that go beyond national governments and included various non-government and civil society organizations (see for example, Baker, 2006).
In September 2005, a follow-up to the historic 2000 Millennium Summit (called the 2005 World Summit) was held to consider, inter alia, the progress in implementation of the MDGs. The decision taken at this Summit to set up a Peacebuilding Commission (2005 World Summit Outcome, para. 97) proved to be a significant, helpful step forward in the implementation of the MDGs, because (as will be shown in chap. V) peace and stability has turned out to be an important determinant of success in achieving the MDGs. The 2005 World Summit also helped to elicit pledges of significant funding aimed at achieving the MDGs (2005 World Summit Outcome).

The global financial crisis and the Doha Follow-up International Conference on Financing for Development

The global economic situation took a downward turn with the onset of the global financial crisis in 2007 and the resulting great recession in developed countries, affecting development efforts through multiple channels (see the discussion in chap. II). The Follow-up International Conference on Financing for Development to Review the Implementation of the Monterey Consensus, held in Doha from 29 November to 2 December 2008, and the Conference on the World Financial and Economic Crisis and Its Impact on Development, held in New York from 24 to 30 June 2009, considered the situation and put forward a number of proposals for dealing with the aftermath of the crisis and for sustaining the development efforts and progress towards the MDGs. These included coordinated fiscal stimulus, to be undertaken by the developed countries as well as large, fast-growing developing countries capable of doing so. These suggestions were partially implemented, helping the recovery in some countries. However, overall, the global economic situation continued to be less favourable for the MDGs than that in the pre-crisis years.

The 2010 high-level plenary meeting of the General Assembly on the MDGs: acceleration of MDG progress

The United Nations organized the high-level plenary meeting of the General Assembly on the Millennium Development Goals, held from 20 to 22 September 2010, to consider the progress in achieving MDGs and to undertake new initiatives to help the countries that were lagging behind. By that time, it became clear that many nations were finding it difficult to attain or maintain the pace required to achieve the MDGs by 2015. In the outcome document,
entitled “Keeping the promise: united to achieve the Millennium Development Goals”, 11 world leaders reconfirmed their commitment to the MDGs and took initiatives to “accelerate” MDG progress. Resulting from initiatives taken earlier, $20 billion was pledged to accelerate progress towards assuring women’s and children’s health. A broader range of MDG acceleration efforts, combined under the MDG Acceleration Framework, 12 commenced following the meeting. A number of initiatives taken at global levels to accelerate the MDGs were summarized in the report of the Secretary-General entitled “A life of dignity for all” (United Nations, General Assembly, 2013a).

**Initiatives of other international organizations**

Apart from the global efforts mentioned above, there were many other initiatives undertaken by various United Nations and other international organizations. For example, the World Bank and IMF urged developing countries that were seeking credit to incorporate the MDGs in their PRSPs. A review of 22 PRSPs—of which 15 were for 2005-2008 and 1 (that of Rwanda) was for 2008—shows that almost all of them expressed a commitment to the MDGs and almost all the key MDG priority areas were included as a priority, with few exceptions (Fukuda-Parr, 2010).

Many United Nations organizations undertook initiatives in their respective areas. For example: the World Health Organization (WHO) and UNICEF played an important role with regard to the health-related MDGs; the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) undertook initiatives with regard to MDG2, focused on education; ILO played an important role in supporting efforts related to employment and social protection; and UNDP played an important role in helping countries prepare their MDG reports and in formulating and implementing programmes under the MDG Acceleration Framework, as mentioned above.

---

11 General Assembly resolution 65/1.
12 The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) first developed the MDG Acceleration Framework (MAF), with the technical inputs and collaboration of other United Nations organizations, to help accelerate progress at the country level on those MDGs currently seen as unlikely to be reached by 2015. This framework was rolled out in 10 pilot countries across a range of MDGs over 2010, and proved to be a flexible and robust tool which can be applied in different contexts by various actors. More detailed information is available from http://www.cr.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/mdgoverview/mdg_MDGs/acceleration_framework.html.
Regional initiatives

Global efforts were complemented by efforts at the regional level, undertaken by the regional commissions, regional development banks and other regional organizations. The regional commissions exerted an important role in supporting countries achieve the MDGs. In playing this role, each commission had to face the specificities of its respective region.

Many African countries, several of which were ridden by internal and cross-border armed conflicts, were the farthest behind in terms of various human development indicators. The ECA was therefore faced with the daunting task of having to support these countries make progress with the MDGs, often under difficult circumstances.

In Latin America, the problem of poverty was less acute, because many countries of the region had already achieved the middle-income status. However, as there was considerable disparity both within and across countries, the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) had to focus its efforts on supporting countries in the region go beyond national averages and reach the disadvantaged sections of their population.

Many countries of Asia entered the MDG reference period having, during the 1980s and 1990s, already instituted reforms leading to poverty reduction. However, a significant number of them, particularly those in East and South-East Asia, suffered considerably owing to the Asian financial crisis beginning in July 1997. They witnessed significant setbacks in poverty reduction and required a considerable amount of time to overcome the effects of the crisis. Since the poverty reduction and human development performance of the Asian countries was not uniform, the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) had to explore ways of disseminating the best practices of poverty reduction and other human development achievements to the countries that were lagging behind.

Members of the Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (ESCWA) were for the most part middle-income countries with less acute problems of poverty and other forms of deprivation. However, many countries of the region became engulfed in domestic and external conflicts during the MDG reference period, making the task of attaining further progress in human development difficult.

The Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) faced a special situation because a large number of its members were developed countries, to which many of the MDGs did not really apply. However, for the new member States, countries of South-Eastern Europe and the countries of Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia, MDGs 1 to 7 were quite pertinent. Moreover, for the developed countries of ECE, both MDG 7 (targets A and B) and MDG 8 were of particular relevance. Thus, the ECE had to customize its efforts, the form of customization depending on the particular group of countries with which the Commission was dealing.

The World Economic and Social Survey 2014/2015 acknowledges with thanks the inputs provided by the regional commissions to the preparation of the present section and to various other chapters.
All the regional commissions published MDG progress reports for their respective regions. These reports played a crucial role not only in monitoring MDG progress but also in encouraging the countries of the regions to press ahead with their own MDG efforts. The regional commissions helped countries formulate the policies necessary for achieving MDG progress, disseminate best practices and implement peer reviews. The regional commissions also helped countries strengthen their statistical capacity.

Alongside efforts by the regional commissions, there were various initiatives undertaken by the regional development banks. In addition, various regional associations of countries played an important role. For example, in 2001, the Organization of African Unity (OAU) adopted the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD),¹⁴ which was ratified by the African Union in 2002. The aim of the New Partnership is to reduce poverty, put Africa on a sustainable development path, halt the marginalization of the continent and empower women. The commonality of these goals and the MDGs is quite obvious. In many cases, the initiatives of the regional associations were geared more towards trade and investment promotion.¹⁵ However, increased economic growth resulting from these initiatives provided enabling conditions for achieving progress towards achieving the MDGs.

**MDGs implementation as a multi-stakeholder effort**

The MDGs were able to energize not only national Governments and organizations associated with national Governments, but many non-State and non-governmental actors as well. Thus, many non-governmental organizations, civil society organizations, foundations and other philanthropic entities, and even individuals, played an important role in contributing to progress towards achieving the MDGs. Many business organizations, including multi-national corporations and other private companies, also joined the MDG efforts in various ways.¹⁶ The MDGs thus became a widely shared, multi-stakeholder effort. Indeed, one of the main successes of MDGs lay in its mobilization of forces for development across the board, at the global, regional, and national levels (see chap. VI for a more detailed discussion on multi-stakeholders).

---

¹⁵ See www.nepad.org and http://www.asean.org/ for more details about the thematic areas of NEPAD and ASEAN (Association of Southeast Asian Nations), respectively.
¹⁶ For example, the Advanced Marketing Commitment (AMC) program enlisted the participation of pharmaceutical companies in developing new drugs and vaccines necessary to achieve MDG health goals. More than 1600 companies in 160 countries joined the United Nations Global Compact to help achieve MDG related goals. See http://www.un.org/press/en/2015/sgsm16616.doc.htm for details.
Implementation efforts at the national level

While the international and regional efforts reviewed above have been important, it was the efforts at the national level that played the decisive role in effecting progress towards achieving the MDGs.

The MDGs had already found their roots in the world conferences of the 1990s and were launched as far back as 8 September 2000, through the adoption by the General Assembly in its resolution 55/2 of the United Nations Millennium Declaration, followed by the Assembly’s recommendation, in its resolution 56/95 of 14 December 2001, that the above-mentioned road map be considered a useful guide in the implementation of the Millennium Declaration. However, it took some time for national policies to be aligned with the MDGs. In some countries, MDG implementation started through projects promoted or implemented by various United Nations agencies, funds, and programmes, and other donor agencies. The launching of the United Nations MDG progress report process, which required data from individual countries on their MDG-related achievements also provided an impetus to devoting attention to the MDGs by the national governments.

Alignment with MDGs as an interactive process

The alignment of national policies with the MDGs at the national level was an interactive process involving (a) decisions and initiatives by political leadership; (b) consultation with stakeholders; (c) incorporation of MDGs in national development planning and financing; and (d) introduction of legislative changes (see figure I.1).

There was generally no clear time sequence governing these different lines of activity. Sometimes, consultation with stakeholders preceded and facilitated decisions and initiatives taken by the top political leadership. At other times and in other places, the latter influenced the former. Formal legislation sometimes facilitated the alignment and implementation of the MDGs (for example, in the case of establishing gender equality).

Political instruments and initiatives could take various forms, including decisions by the cabinet, resolutions adopted by the parliament and decrees issued by the executive.
Often, no clear-cut political step was taken: instead, general and sometimes tacit approval was conferred by the political leadership to proceed with the MDGs. One important political decision could have centred around whether to create an executive centre, to serve as the national focal point for the MDGs. In most cases, however, such a centre was not created; instead, the line ministries were entrusted with the task of pursuing the MDGs that fell within their purview, with coordination tasks left either to the finance or to the planning ministry (see chap. V for further details in this regard).

The consultative process encompassed many different venues, including workshops, meetings for discussion and conferences. One characteristic feature of the MDG consultative process was its multi-stakeholder approach, with participation of a wide range of national, regional and international actors. The consultative process was often followed or accompanied by advocacy and awareness campaigns, which took diverse forms, including the use of short films and radio programmes, the creation of logos (as in Afghanistan), the composition of special songs, and the hosting of cultural and sporting events (as in Bhutan). Both the consultative and the advocacy processes often extended to subnational levels and sometimes focused on particular MDGs and themes.

Legislative bodies played an important role in creating the necessary legal framework for MDG implementation. In some countries, the alignment with the MDGs was accompanied by the elimination of severely discriminatory laws against women (see chap. III for details). For example, Pakistan introduced a series of new laws in the course of the MDG reference period, pertaining to health care, employment, and harassment and domestic
violence. Uganda developed strong HIV/AIDS legislation which enabled the implementation of HIV/AIDS-related policies. Sometimes MDG advocacy groups were allowed to present their case in the parliament (as in Chile). Parliaments also assumed an important role in the alignment and implementation of the MDGs, particularly through their role in approving national plans and budgets that allocated funds for activities aimed at achieving the MDGs.

**Modifications of goals as part of the alignment process**

Several countries introduced some modifications in an effort to “nationalize”, “localize” or “contextualize” the MDGs. These modifications took different forms.

First, in many cases, countries decided to modify the MDGs through the addition of goals. For example, Afghanistan adopted the goal of enhancing security; Mongolia and Albania adopted goals regarding human rights and democratic governance; and Cambodia and the Lao People’s Democratic Republic adopted the goal of removing unexploded ordnance. Sometimes, only targets were added. For example, because of the challenges it was facing in reducing the mortality ratio, Afghanistan added targets for reducing the country’s high fertility rate. As part of its efforts to improve gender equality, particularly in education, Pakistan, adopted a target for gender parity in youth literacy.

A second type of modification was focused, particularly among “late entrants”, on the base year and/or the terminal year. For example, owing to prolonged conflict, Afghanistan signed the Millennium Declaration only in 2004 and after broad consultations and international endorsement, adopted its “Vision 2020” for meeting most MDGs, and thereby effectively extended the MDG terminal year to 2020. Similarly, Rwanda and the United Republic of Tanzania adopted Vision 2020 and Vision 2025, respectively, and regarded the MDGs as part of those Visions.

Third, modifications sometimes took the form of prioritization. While the presentation of the MDGs themselves did not suggest any form of hierarchization, some countries decided to assign priority to particular Goals, given the extent of the MDG targets as well as the efforts that would be required to meet them. For example, Zimbabwe’s official list of MDGs highlighted MDGs 1, 3 and 6 as the country’s main priorities.17

---

17 Some countries decided to prioritize the pursuit of specific MDGs during implementation rather than during adoption of the MDGs, in order to “unlock” progress in particular areas. For example, after national and subnational consultations, Pakistan chose to prioritize MDG 2 as part of its MDG Acceleration Framework, as a result of which the country achieved good results in terms of boosting enrolment and retention. However, such prioritization may also lead to the diversion of resources allocated to other Goals.
Incorporation of the MDGs in national plans, strategies, visions and budgets

One of the manifestations of the alignment of the MDGs with national goals has been their incorporation in national plans, strategies and visions.

In many countries, the MDGs were included as part of their national development strategies and “visions”. In Botswana, for example, the seven pillars of its Vision 2016 and the 2010-2016 national development plan corresponded to the MDGs (United Nations Development Programme, 2010a). Similarly, the seventh national socioeconomic development plan of the Lao People’s Democratic Republic, covering the period from 2010 through 2015, became the focal document in detailing how the country aimed at achieving the MDGs while preparing to graduate from least developed country status by 2020 (United Nations Development Group, 2010a).

The extent of the national development strategies of some countries went beyond the MDGs. India’s eleventh national plan (2008-2012) contained 27 monitorable targets, many of which were consistent with, or even more ambitious than, the MDGs, particularly in the case of employment, thereby making achievement of MDG 1 more likely (United Nations Development Programme, 2010a).

In some cases, the national development strategy included targets that, while not encompassed by the MDGs, were of direct help in achieving them. Bhutan’s ninth five-year plan (2003-2008), for example, emphasized the need for improvements in the overall nutritional status of the population. Fulfilment of this plan clearly helped achieve the MDGs related to child and maternal mortality.

For many developing countries, the beginning of the MDG implementation process coincided with their preparation of PRSPs as a precondition for securing loans from the World Bank and IMF, as indicated above. Another means of aligning their national development policies with the MDGs was through adding MDG targets to their existing programmes, as was the case for Zambia and Zimbabwe, for example, with regard to the MDG 6 targets related to HIV/AIDS, as noted in those countries’ MDG reports.

Some developing countries have adopted visions that are far in advance of that underpinning the MDGs. For example, since 1972, Bhutan has sought, under the concept of gross national happiness (GNH), to forge an alternative path which goes beyond the conventional income-based measures of development, so as to maximize the happiness of all Bhutanese by enabling them to realize their full innate potential as human beings. Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Ecuador and several other Latin American countries champion the concept of buen vivir —encompassing a new way of achieving “the good life” through the striking of a better balance between the needs of human societies and the capacity of nature and a lower impact on the environment. Ecuador, as the first country to have incorporated the “rights of nature”
in its Constitution, offers the example of a more advanced approach to sustainable development than has been possible in the context of the MDGs.\textsuperscript{18}

Another outcome of the alignment with the MDGs has been the allocation of necessary resources in the national budget. Since the 1990s, many countries had abandoned five-year planning and were thus left with only annual budgets for financial planning. The experience demonstrated that annual budgeting allows too short a time-horizon for the effective implementation of many policy initiatives. This experience gave rise to what are now referred to as medium-term expenditure frameworks whose duration is from three to four years. During 1990-2013, more than 130 countries adopted such frameworks to ensure greater alignment of the expenditure programmes with the MDG-based PRSPs (see chap. V).

**Analytical framework**

The above discussion reveals how the MDG process overlapped with many other development processes. This overlap suggests that the analytical approach to reviewing the MDG experience and drawing MDG lessons needs to be carefully chosen.

**Difficulties in assessing MDG achievement**

In recent years, there have been several studies that attempted to assess the MDG impact, defined as the impact of the MDG campaign on development outcomes covered by MDG targets.\textsuperscript{19} This entailed an exploration by those studies of such questions as (a) whether the MDG impact should be assessed through comparison of levels or trends; (b) whether (if assessment was to be through comparison of levels) the benchmark levels should be uniform or differentiated across countries; and (c) if assessment was to be through comparison of trends, which statistical methodologies were suitable for the comparison of those trends.

Since the counterfactuals necessary for assessing the MDG impact are generally not available, these studies employed the before-and-after approach, utilizing the year 2000 as the dividing line. Some of them implemented this approach through regression analyses (including time effects), which took the values of MDG indices as dependent variables (see, e.g., Friedman, 2013). Other studies limited themselves to simple differencing of the values of the indices and dividing the results by respective time lengths in order to compute and compare rates of change before and after the launching of the MDGs (see, e.g., Fukuda-Parr, Greenstein and Stewart, 2013).

One problem faced by these studies, however, is the presence of confounding factors. The MDG outcomes, which vary from country to country, are determined by a confluence of factors, such as alignment of national development strategies, international initiatives, and broad global and regional economic conditions.

\textsuperscript{18} In 2007–2008 Ecuador rewrote its Constitution, which was ratified by a referendum of the people of Ecuador in September 2008. The chapter addressing rights of nature acknowledges that nature in all its life forms has the right to exist, persist, maintain and regenerate its vital cycles.

\textsuperscript{19} See, for example, Fukuda-Parr, Greenstein and Stewart (2013); and Friedman (2013).
The multidimensional framework for analysing the lessons of the MDGs

The World Economic and Social Survey 2014/2015 has adopted a multidimensional, structural-form approach. It is multidimensional because it captures the different dimensions of the MDG experience and focuses on the entire MDG outcome, not just on the component that can be attributed to MDG-inspired policies. From the viewpoint of this Survey, all policies that have helped to achieve the MDGs are of interest, irrespective of whether they are MDG-inspired or not. The approach is structural, because it aims at examining causal connections and hence takes note of intermediate outcomes as well as the end outcome.

Among the different dimensions of the MDG experience, the most important are:

a. Development thinking, national alignment with the of MDGs, and data development;
b. Economic policies;
c. Social policies;
d. Environmental policies;
e. Governance, institutions, and peace and stability;
f. Global partnerships for development
The multidimensional analytical framework proposed by this Survey as a means of capturing the richness of the MDG experience is presented in figure I.2.

The framework accommodates both the multidimensional and the multi-stage characteristics of the various processes. For example, good governance can be an enabler of good economic, social, and environmental policies and their effective implementation. By the same token, positive outcomes associated with such policies can in turn help to improve good governance. The same feedback model applies to peace and stability, which are recognized as both enablers and outcomes of development. Given this dynamic, presenting the various dimensions schematically in parallel does not imply a negation of the temporal (multi-stage) relationships among them.

Also noteworthy is the lateral interaction among these different dimensions. For example, social policies can be part of economic (fiscal) ones. In addition, by promoting human capital and enhancing social stability and cohesion, social policies can also improve the investment climate and promote economic growth. Similar lateral interactions apply to the other dimensions as set out in the framework above. For example, while economic
policies can affect the environment, initiatives to protect the environment can impact the economy.

The broader framework presented in figure I.2 thus enables the analysis and capture of the interactive process through which the three sets of determinants listed above have influenced the MDG outcome. It also facilitates an examination of the direct impact of MDG-inspired policies as, and where, such impact becomes decipherable. Further, as mentioned above, the framework allows us to trace those policies and examine how they influence development outcomes, which is the focus of this Survey.

Correspondence between the analytical framework and the organization of the chapters of the Survey

The correspondence between the analytical framework in figure I.2 and the format of this Survey, in terms of the organization of its chapters, is quite straightforward, as illustrated by the figure.

The MDG experience with regard to development thinking and data development and the lessons it offers for the post-2015 period are discussed below.

The MDG experience regarding economic policies and the lessons it offers for the post-2015 period are discussed in chapter II, which focuses on sustained, inclusive and equitable growth as an effective path towards achieving the MDGs and examines the policies that proved helpful for fulfilling this condition. It also highlights one lesson learned, namely, that the pattern of growth needs to be altered to ensure that growth is sustainable during the implementation of the post-2015 development agenda, and discusses the policies that can help to achieve this purpose.

The MDG experience with regard to social policies and the lessons it offers for implementation of the post-2015 development agenda are discussed in chapter III, which reviews the experience with social policies adopted to enable achievement of poverty reduction and education, health-and gender-related MDGs and draws lessons specific to these particular areas, as well as those that are of a general nature. Chapter III highlights the significance of these lessons for completing the “unfinished MDG business” which forms an important part of the SDGs.

The MDG experience with regard to environmental policies and the lessons that it offers for implementation of the post-2015 development agenda are discussed in chapter IV, which takes note of the special treatment of environmental issues under the MDGs, whereby the task of setting time-bound quantitative targets was often left to other environmental processes, such as the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, and examines the pros and cons of this arrangement in the light of the MDG experience and the lessons offered for implementation of the post-2015 development agenda. Chapter IV also
reviews the experience with regard to MDG 7 targets related to drinking water, sanitation and slums, and draws lessons therefrom for implementation of the post-2015 development agenda.

The MDG experience with regard to governance, institutions, and peace and stability and the lessons it offers for implementation of the post-2015 development agenda are discussed in Chapter V. One important MDG lesson is that good governance, institutions, and peace and stability are both enablers and outcomes of development. An important query, however, is how a country can achieve good governance, institutions, and peace and stability. Chapter V presents a review of the MDG experience from this perspective and draws lessons therefrom for implementation of the post-2015 development agenda.

The MDG experience with regard to global partnerships for development and other forms of cooperation and the lessons they offer for implementation of the post-2015 development agenda are discussed in chapter VI. While the MDGs focused initially on intergovernmental cooperation for development, over time there was a proliferation of multiple development partnerships involving diverse non-State actors. There was also a shift from bilateral and multilateral frameworks to global cooperation, including the formation and use of global funds. Chapter VI notes that the experience with the global partnership for development as well as multi-stakeholder partnerships of global nature will be particularly relevant for implementation of the post-2015 development agenda, which is expected to be universal in character.

The MDG impact on development thinking

The MDGs were a product of, and in turn exerted considerable influence on, development thinking. Some aspects of their influence have been generally regarded as positive, although other aspects have generated debates.

Cementing the shift from a unidimensional to a multidimensional framework

One of the important ways in which the MDGs have influenced development thinking is through a cementing of the shift from a unidimensional focus on income to one centred on multidimensional, direct measures of human welfare. As noted earlier, this conceptual shift was one of the sources of inspiration for the formulation of the MDGs. While theorists on economic development have argued for this shift over several decades, the MDGs put it into actual practice in a major way. The formulation of the 17 proposed SDGs with their 169 targets, covering the entire range of economic, social and environmental issues, further expands the multidimensionality of the development goals.
Impact on “agency” and the “rights-based” approach to development

In his discussion of development, Amartya Sen distinguishes between the “evaluative” and the “agency” aspects of development (Sen, 1989; 1999; Fukuda-Parr, 2003), which refer, respectively, to the outcome of the development process and the process through which the outcome is achieved. The basic needs approach, for example, recognizes the necessity of paying attention to the multiple dimensions of human welfare. However, from Sen’s capability perspective, this represents a top-down/donor-recipient approach, whereby outside agencies (donors) provide basic needs-type goods and services to the people (recipients) who need them. The basic needs approach therefore does not enhance the agency aspect of development. The capability approach, on the other hand, argues for structural changes which enable people to achieve development outcomes by themselves, as a result of their own efforts, and for an avoidance of dependency on the benevolence or discretion of outside agencies to achieve those outcomes.

Viewed in this context, the MDGs obviously represented a significant step forward in terms of the evaluative aspect of development. Further, relative to the Human Development Index framework, the MDGs encompassed a much wider set of development outcomes. However, whether the MDGs could also have advanced the agency aspect of development remains a controversial issue. Some observers believe that, like the basic needs strategy, the MDGs have by and large constituted a top-down initiative, underpinned by ODA and other forms of external assistance. In their view, “country ownership” of MDGs was weak and, in many cases, superficial—a pretence serving merely to justify the receipt of aid (Saith, 2006; 2007; Fukuda-Parr, 2011; Fukuda-Parr and Hulme, 2011).

Similarly controversial is the impact of the MDGs on the promotion of the rights-based approach to development. Rights are multidimensional and generally exercised with regard to specific functionings, such as food, education, health care, housing, gender equality, voice and participation. It is therefore possible to argue that, by focusing attention on many of these direct measures of human welfare, the MDGs helped to strengthen the rights-based approach to development.

However, some observers contend that the MDGs have in fact impeded the progress of the rights-based approach to development, apparently for two reasons (Saith, 2006, 2007; Fukuda-Parr and Hulme, 2011; Fukuda-Parr, Yamin and Greenstein, 2014). The first reason hinges on what is perceived to have been the omission of many relevant issues from the MDGs. It is contended that by not including these issues, the MDGs may have weakened the progress towards rights-based development (Langford, 2010). For example, lack of prominence of employment-related targets in the MDGs can be perceived as weakening the demand for the “right to employment”. The issue of omission was discussed above, where it was noted that for various reasons, the MDGs could not be as comprehensive as many had wished. However, the omission of issues need not be interpreted as constituting the non-recognition of the rights associated with those issues.
The second reason given in support of the above contention centres on the formulation of many partial MDG targets. It has been maintained that the formulation of a partial target is tantamount to an undermining of the right associated with the issues concerned. In some cases, the partial target, as formulated, seemed to be particularly unsatisfactory. For example, if decent housing is a basic right of people, then a target whose aim is improvement of the living conditions of only 100 million slum dwellers by 2020 (MDG 7, target D) would appear to negate or weaken that right.

These criticisms have their merits. However, they do not seem to take into adequate consideration the distinction between the declaration of a right and its realization. Even if a certain right is recognized and declared, the process of its actual realization can only be an incremental one. This being the case, partial targets may not be interpreted as implying non-recognition or neglect of a given right.

The enhancement of both the agency aspect of and the rights-based approach to development depend ultimately on empowerment (Kabeer, 2001; Kabeer, ed., 2005). Conferring a right is equivalent to empowerment, although there is a distinction to be made between “formal” and “real” empowerment, corresponding to the declaration and the realization of that right, as noted above. However, enhancement of the agency aspect of development cannot proceed unless people feel empowered, either formally or in reality.

The above discussion suggests the possibility of a trade-off between declaring a wide range of rights without adequate follow-up and focusing on a narrower set of rights with robust follow-up. The MDGs are certainly narrower in scope than the goals adopted at many of the thematic conferences of the 1990s. Furthermore, unlike United Nations-related conventions, the MDGs are not legally binding. Hence, they have not resulted in empowerment in a legal sense. However, by offering relatively stronger follow-up and developing a robust monitoring, publicity and peer review mechanism, the MDG process led to considerable acceptance of its targets. This acceptance of the MDGs helped to create a sense of empowerment among people with respect to the functionings included under the MDGs. For example, the fact that a national Government was concerned about reducing the maternal mortality rate (because of the global spotlight focused on it by the MDG process) may have helped create among women in developing countries the conviction of a right to safe child birth. Once such a conviction of right has developed, agency-related processes can unfold.

It may be noted in this regard that enhancement of the agency aspect of development is not always a bottom-up process; instead, it may work through the interaction of both top-down and bottom-up processes. Thus, even if the MDGs are accepted as constituting a top-down initiative, this does not rule out the possibility of their conducing to agency-enhancing bottom-up processes as well.
A revival of political economy?

The MDG experience has reinforced the realization that good governance, high-quality institutions and peace and stability are both enablers and outcomes of development. In so doing, that experience has highlighted the close connection between economic and political factors of development. The shift of focus from income to a broad range of direct human development outcomes has also helped to illuminate the connections between politics and economics. It may be no mere coincidence that during the MDG reference period, a greater number of mainstream development economists have come to recognize institutions as the crucial determinant of development outcome.20

By offering concrete experiences supporting the links between development and institutions, and by revealing the importance of equitable distribution and peace and stability in achieving human development goals, the MDGs may have helped significantly in breaking down artificial barriers between the domains of economics and politics and facilitated a revival of the study of political economy, which had receded from view for much of the twentieth century.

Unintended and unwarranted impacts?

Some scholars have drawn attention to certain unintended—and unwarranted—impacts of the MDGs on the development discourse, because the focus of the MDGs has often been more on the choice of targets and indicators than on the broad goals themselves.

Fukuda-Parr (2014), for example, has pointed out that the consequences of the choice of targets and indicators are not necessarily innocuous. Improper choices in this regard can lead to significant distortions in several ways. One way is through exclusion. The choice of a particular indicator entails the rejection of many other possibilities. Through such exclusion, the MDGs exercised a reductionist function and in so doing sacrificed the enrichment of the MDG discourse.

While no particular indicator is perfect, some are more flawed than others. Distortions can also occur through amplification of those flaws, which may be intertwined with particular conceptions, assumptions, viewpoints and even ideologies. The choice of a particular indicator may lead to amplification of its flaws to the global scale when, under other circumstances, they would have remained confined to more limited scales. The choice of a particular set of indicators may inadvertently promote a specific mindset with respect to several development issues. It is on this basis that Saith (2006; 2007) considers that the MDGs exerted a harmful influence on the development research agenda.

Examples of the above-claimed distortions were noted earlier in connection with the poverty reduction goal. Some scholars have contended that by choosing the $1/day definition

---

20 See, for example, Acemoglu, Johnson, and Robinson (2001); Rodrik, Subramanian, and Trebbi (2004); and Acemoglu and Robinson (2012).
of poverty, the MDGs distorted the discourse on poverty and the means of overcoming it.21 Along similar lines, scholars have contended that the MDG focus on communicable diseases such as AIDS led to distortions of the health-care priorities of many developing countries.22

While the above-mentioned possibility of distortion is real, some sort of trade-off between generality and precision seems unavoidable, if global development goals are to be set at all. The MDG experience has been useful in bringing to the fore concrete evidence of this trade-off and the lessons that it offers in terms of deciding where to draw the line between generality and precision. These lessons have been reflected to a certain degree in the draft SDGs, which have been formulated at a fairly general level. However, as the targets are finalized and the indicators are chosen for consideration by the General Assembly, the world community will again face the issue of trade-offs, as noted above. The MDG experience will certainly prove useful in taking the relevant decisions in this regard.

**MDG lessons for data and statistics**

One of the areas in which the MDGs had considerable impact was data generation, processing and reporting. As is well known, the MDGs evolved to become a set of eight Goals, 21 targets and 60 indicators. Furthermore, it was suggested that the indicators should, where relevant, be disaggregated by sex and by the rural/urban divide. As mentioned above, in 2005, the United Nations began to issue The Millennium Development Goals Report, which heralded the beginning of consolidated reporting on MDG progress achieved.

**Data achievement during the MDG reference period**

Even a cursory look at the list of 60 indicators (see Appendix I.1) makes it clear that the task of furnishing data for all of them, let alone data disaggregated by sex and the rural/urban divide, is not an easy one. Since many developing countries had not been prepared for this task, significant efforts were necessary during the MDG reference period to enhance countries’ statistical capacity.

In response to the challenge, there was a focused effort across all United Nations and other international organizations to improve the quality of data necessary for measuring progress on the MDGs. As noted earlier, one of the two yearly meetings of the Inter-agency and Expert Group on MDG Indicators was dedicated to discussing priorities for capacity-building in countries and to coordinating the various initiatives related to MDG data and indicators across the United Nations system. Further, all organizations within the Inter-

---

21 See, for example, Vandemoortele (2008) and Saith (2006, 2007).
22 See, for example, United Nations (2012a) and Schwank (2012).
agency and Expert Group launched specific initiatives designed to strengthen data production for the MDGs. Notable in this regard has been the rapid expansion by UNICEF of the Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS) programme, which has provided data for a large number of MDG indicators. In preparing The Millennium Development Goals Report, the Statistics Division of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs relied on inputs from 28 major organizations and agencies involved in the MDG implementation process.

Over the years, United Nations agencies, funds, and programmes, the regional commissions and other development partners have engaged in a number of initiatives aimed at supporting developing countries strengthen their statistical capacity to produce, analyse and disseminate data for monitoring development. These activities, especially the increased level of dialogue between countries and international organizations within the Inter-agency and Expert Group, PARIS21 and various other forums, have yielded important results.


As a result of the multidimensional efforts listed above, the statistical capacity of most developing countries has increased. The methods and purposes of data collection for measuring human development progress are now much better understood; and the system of data reporting from the national to the regional and from the regional to the global level is now more streamlined. Hence, the world community is much better prepared to take on the data challenges posed by the post-2015 development agenda.

**Data challenges posed by the post-2015 development agenda**

The enormous data challenges posed by the post-2015 development agenda encompass several dimensions.

The first is the huge increase in dimensionality. As noted earlier, the proposed 17 SDGs comprise 169 targets. The process of indicator selection has yet to be completed. However, it is clear that their number will be large. Moreover, as data disaggregation along
various dimensions has been set as a priority, the data dimensionality of the SDGs will likely be several times greater than that of the MDGs.

The second challenge entails customization at the national level which will be required because many SDGs have been formulated in a general way. This will pose additional challenges. First, the national organizations concerned will require levels of technical expertise that are sufficient to enable the proper interpretation of the relevant SDG indicators and decision-making on how to implement them using the available data sources. Second, national customization will need to ensure a sufficient degree of cross-county comparability and allow for aggregation at the regional and global levels. It will not be easy to meet all of these demands.

Third, there will be a huge increase in the volume and dimensionality of data from the supply side, with which the data architecture for monitoring the post-2015 development agenda will be obliged to deal. While monitoring of the MDGs was conducted primarily through the use of data generated by government agencies (i.e., official statistics), there is currently a proliferation of supplementary sources which generate very large volumes of data, including real-time and big data. A data revolution is indeed in the offing, if not already in progress (United Nations, 2013a). Deciding on the extent to which data from unofficial sources can be used to supplement official data in monitoring the implementation of the post-2015 development agenda will constitute a big challenge.

Fourth, an important direction in which the data revolution has to progress is with regard to valuation of the natural capital, in terms of its contribution to economic development as well as its depletion and degradation as a result of human economic and other activities each year. The System of Environmental-Economic Accounting (SEEA) (United Nations, European Commission, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Inter- national Monetary Fund, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development and World Bank, 2014), adopted by the Statistical Commission in its decision 43/105 (United Nations, Economic and Social Council, 2012), needs to be mainstreamed. Achieving sustainable development post-2015 will require making rapid progress in adoption and implementation of this integrated system by all nations.

The mainstreaming of natural capital in national accounts will provide useful information for decision-making. Physical asset accounts provide valuable information on the state of the environment, as well as on the condition and capacity of ecosystems to continue to provide services. They can be complemented by monetary accounts, which may prove challenging, in particular if non-market assets are involved. Ascertaining the “prices” to be used for the valuation of the physical assets is heavily influenced by assumptions and other subjective considerations. If wrong (low) prices are used, natural capital may be undervalued and overutilized. The valuation of natural capital can therefore be a double-edged sword.

Meeting these and other data challenges to monitoring the post-2015 development agenda will require a huge collective effort, involving the participation of nations based on
their respective capabilities. Nevertheless, the MDGs have established a sound foundation, including useful lessons, for dealing with these challenges.

Conclusions

The MDGs are the most important development initiative undertaken by the United Nations so far. As the international community moves ahead with the post-2015 development agenda, focused on the sustainable development goals (SDGs), it is important—and will prove useful—both to examine the lessons derived from the MDGs and to determine how the acquired knowledge can help facilitate implementation of the new agenda.

The MDG outcomes were the result of an interactive process involving MDGs-inspired and other policies, and the changes in general conditions. Narrowly focused reduced-form statistical exercises cannot capture the richness of the MDG experience and reveal how policies affected the MDG outcomes. The Survey therefore uses a multidimensional analytical framework which enables a wide-ranging review of the MDG experience with regard to the alignment of national goals with the global goals; development thinking; data development; economic, social and environmental policies; and policies related to governance, institutions, and peace and stability, and to global cooperation for development.

The review of the process of alignment of national goals with the MDGs demonstrates that the process did not follow the same route in all countries. Despite the quantitatively specified targets of most of the MDGs, individual countries did in fact try to customize them through, inter alia, adding new goals and targets, changing the initial or the final year of the process, or opting for a certain prioritization of the goals. The MDG experience therefore points to the importance of allowing countries to customize the global goals creatively in accordance with their individual situations. However, customization has to be conducted within the context of a clearly formulated global framework which ensures inter-country comparison and aggregation at the global level.

The review reveals that, while the MDGs themselves were in part an outcome of changes in development thinking, they in turn influenced that thinking. Their influence can be perceived along four pathways. First, the MDGs indubitably helped to cement the shift from a unidimensional focus on income to one that is attentive to and encompasses multidimensional, direct measures of human welfare. Second, the MDGs may have helped to enhance the agency aspect of development, although there are differing views in this regard. Third, the MDGs may have facilitated the rights-based approach to development, although here, too, views tend to differ. Last, the MDGs have exhibited the close connection between economics and politics, thereby highlighting the need to revive political economy as a sub-discipline of economics.
The MDG reference period is ending with the achievements witnessed having been considerable in the areas of data development, reporting and monitoring. Those achievements were often the result of collaboration under national, regional and global initiatives and among the agencies and institutions involved. One important MDG lesson learned is that such collaboration needs to be strengthened in order that the huge data and monitoring requirements associated with the SDGs and the post-2015 development agenda may be met.
### Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)

#### Goals and targets (derived from the United Nations Millennium Declaration)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>1.1 Proportion of population below $1.25 (PPP) per day</th>
<th>1.2 Poverty gap ratio</th>
<th>1.3 Share of poorest quintile in national consumption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 1: Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger</strong></td>
<td>1.4 Growth rate of GDP per person employed</td>
<td>1.5 Employment-to-population ratio</td>
<td>1.6 Proportion of employed people living below $1.25 (PPP) per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target 1.A:</strong> Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people whose income is less than one dollar a day</td>
<td>1.7 Proportion of own-account and contributing family workers in total employment</td>
<td>1.8 Prevalence of underweight children under five years of age</td>
<td>1.9 Proportion of population below minimum level of dietary energy consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target 1.B:</strong> Achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all, including women and young people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target 1.C:</strong> Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people who suffer from hunger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 2: Achieve universal primary education</strong></td>
<td>2.1 Net enrolment ratio in primary education</td>
<td>2.2 Proportion of pupils starting grade 1 who reach last grade of primary</td>
<td>2.3 Literacy rate of 15-24 year-olds, women and men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target 2.A:</strong> Ensure that, by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 3: Promote gender equality and empower women</strong></td>
<td>3.1 Ratio of girls to boys in primary, secondary and tertiary education</td>
<td>3.2 Share of women in wage employment in the non-agricultural sector</td>
<td>3.3 Proportion of seats held by women in national parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target 3.A:</strong> Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education, preferably by 2005, and in all levels of education no later than 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 4: Reduce child mortality</strong></td>
<td>4.1 Under-five mortality rate</td>
<td>4.2 Infant mortality rate</td>
<td>4.3 Proportion of 1-year-old children immunized against measles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target 4.A:</strong> Reduce by two thirds, between 1990 and 2015, the under-five mortality rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 5: Improve maternal health</strong></td>
<td>5.1 Maternal mortality ratio</td>
<td>5.2 Proportion of births attended by skilled health personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target 5.A:</strong> Reduce by three quarters, between 1990 and 2015, the maternal mortality ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target 5.B:</strong> Achieve, by 2015, universal access to reproductive health</td>
<td>5.3 Contraceptive prevalence rate</td>
<td>5.4 Adolescent birth rate</td>
<td>5.5 Antenatal care coverage (at least one visit and at least four visits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.6 Unmet need for family planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
### Annex I.1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals and targets (derived from the United Nations Millennium Declaration)</th>
<th>Indicators for monitoring progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 6: Combat HIV/AIDS malaria and other diseases</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target 6.A: Have halted by 2015 and begun to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.1 HIV prevalence among population aged 15-24 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.2 Condom use at last high-risk sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.3 Proportion of population aged 15-24 years with comprehensive correct knowledge of HIV/AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.4 Ratio of school attendance of orphans to school attendance of non-orphans aged 10-14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target 6.B: Achieve, by 2010, universal access to treatment for HIV/AIDS for all those who need it</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.5 Proportion of population with advanced HIV infection with access to antiretroviral drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target 6.C: Have halted by 2015 and begun to reverse the incidence of malaria and other major diseases</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.6 Incidence and death rates associated with malaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.7 Proportion of children under 5 sleeping under insecticide-treated bed nets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.8 Proportion of children under 5 with fever who are treated with appropriate anti-malarial drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.9 Incidence, prevalence and death rates associated with tuberculosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.10 Proportion of tuberculosis cases detected and cured under directly observed treatment, short course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 7: Ensure environmental sustainability</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target 7.A: Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse the loss of environmental resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.1 Proportion of land area covered by forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.2 CO₂ emissions, total, per capita and per $1 GDP (PPP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.3 Consumption of ozone-depleting substances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.4 Proportion of fish stocks within safe biological limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.5 Proportion of total water resources used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.6 Proportion of terrestrial and marine areas protected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.7 Proportion of species threatened with extinction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target 7.B: Reduce biodiversity loss, achieving, by 2010, a significant reduction in the rate of loss</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.8 Proportion of population using an improved drinking-water source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.9 Proportion of population using an improved sanitation facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target 7.C: Halve, by 2015, the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.10 Proportion of urban population living in slums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 8: Develop a global partnership for development</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target 8.A: Develop further an open, rule-based, predictable, non-discriminatory trading and financial system</strong></td>
<td>Some of the indicators listed below are monitored separately for the least developed countries, Africa, landlocked developing countries and small island developing States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes: a commitment to good governance, development and poverty reduction – both nationally and internationally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target 8.B: Address the special needs of the least developed countries</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes: tariff- and quota-free access for the least developed countries' exports; enhanced programme of debt relief for heavily indebted poor countries (HIPC) and cancellation of official bilateral debt; and more generous ODA for countries committed to poverty reduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Official development assistance (ODA)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Net ODA, total and to the least developed countries, as percentage of OECD/DAC donors' gross national income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2 Proportion of total bilateral, sector allocable ODA of OECD/DAC donors to basic social services (basic education, primary health care, nutrition, safe water and sanitation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Goal 1 continued)
### Annex I.1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals and targets (derived from the United Nations Millennium Declaration)</th>
<th>Indicators for monitoring progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 8: Develop a global partnership for development</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Target 8.C: Address the special needs of landlocked developing countries and small island developing States (through the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States and the outcome of the twenty-second special session of the General Assembly)** | 8.2 Proportion of bilateral ODA of OECD/DAC donors that is untied  
8.4 ODA received in landlocked developing countries as a proportion of their gross national incomes  
8.5 ODA received in small island developing States as a proportion of their gross national incomes |
| **Target 8.D: Deal comprehensively with the debt problems of developing countries through national and international measures in order to make debt sustainable in the long term** | **Market access**  
8.6 Proportion of total developed-country imports (by value and excluding arms) from developing countries and least developed countries, admitted free of duty  
8.7 Average tariffs imposed by developed countries on agricultural products and textiles and clothing from developing countries  
8.8 Agricultural support estimate for OECD countries as a percentage of their gross domestic product  
8.9 Proportion of ODA provided to help build trade capacity |
| **Target 8.E: In cooperation with pharmaceutical companies, provide access to affordable essential drugs in developing countries** | 8.10 Total number of countries that have reached their HIPC decision points and number that have reached their HIPC completion points (cumulative)  
8.11 Debt relief committed under the HIPC and Multilateral Debt Relief Initiatives  
8.12 Debt service as a percentage of exports of goods and services  
8.13 Proportion of population with access to affordable essential drug on a sustainable basis |
| **Target 8.F: In cooperation with the private sector, make available the benefits of new technologies, especially information and communications** | 8.14 Fixed-telephone subscriptions per 100 inhabitants  
8.15 Mobile-cellular subscriptions per 100 inhabitants  
8.16 Internet users per 100 inhabitants |

---

2. For monitoring country poverty trends, indicators based on national poverty lines should be used, where available.
3. The actual proportion of people living in slums is measured by a proxy, represented by the urban population living in households with at least one of the four characteristics: (a) lack of access to improved water supply; (b) lack of access to improved sanitation; (c) overcrowding (3 or more persons per room); and (d) dwellings made of non-durable material.
4. Source: UN/DESA.