THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

THE MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS AND HUMAN RIGHTS: BRIDGING THE DIVIDE

Washington, D.C.
Tuesday, September 14, 2010

PARTICIPANTS:

Introduction and Moderator:

TED PICCONE
Senior Fellow and Deputy Director, Foreign Policy
The Brookings Institution

Speakers:

SALIL SHETTY
Secretary General
Amnesty International

MICHAEL POSNER
Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights and Labor
U.S. Department of State

LAWRENCE GOSTIN
Linda D. and Timothy J. O'Neil Professor of
Global Health Law
Georgetown University

* * * * *

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. PICCONE: Good morning. Can everyone hear me? Okay, I'll take that as a yes. My name is Ted Piccone. I'm a senior fellow and deputy director for foreign policy here at Brookings. Welcome this morning to our discussion on the Millennium Development Goals and Human Rights: Bridging the Divide.

This event is particularly timely given the upcoming summit of heads of state at the UN General Assembly later this month where the governments will take a look at the progress being made on the Millennium Development Goals that were adopted 10 years ago and see what needs to be done in the next 5 years as we head toward the 2015 target.

And what we're going to do today is not just look at the Millennium Development Goals by themselves, but to look at them through the lens of human rights and we thought this was particularly important given the growing focus and the higher priority being placed on human rights in the Obama Administration and more generally on the international agenda. We have in the UN system three pillars that we talk about, right: peace and security, development, and human rights. And sometimes these things seem to be on separate tracks. What we want to think about today is where the development and human rights tracks, in particular, intersect and how they can reinforce each other more effectively.

We have, as speakers today, a number of distinguished panelists who are going to help us think through these issues from a human rights perspective. Our lead speaker is Salil Shetty. Salil Shetty is the new head, secretary-general, of Amnesty International and joined in just this past July. He is the organization's chief political advisor, strategist, and spokesperson. Salil comes to Amnesty after running many years

the United Nation's Millennium Campaign, so he's particularly well-suited to this topic and a key actor in both helping to create and launch and push governments toward higher and better targets for the Millennium Development Goals.

Prior to his time at the UN, Salil was the chief executive of Action Aid, an international development NGO, and we're very happy to have him here, and welcome to Washington in his new role as head of Amnesty International.

Our second speaker will be familiar to many of you, I hope. Mike Posner is the Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor. Mike came to office about -- almost exactly a year ago, so happy anniversary. Michael came to Washington after running Human Rights First as executive director and then president for many, many years, a lawyer with a deep background on a variety of issues including refugees, political asylum, international criminal law, et cetera. Michael will talk to us about how the State Department looks at some of these issues.

And then we will also hear from Professor Lawrence Gostin. Lawrence is the Linda D. and Timothy J. O'Neill Professor of Global Health Law at Georgetown University Law Center and he directs their Institute for National and Global Health Law. He serves as a professor of public health at Johns Hopkins and directs a joint center between Johns Hopkins and Georgetown, the Center for Law and Public Health, which collaborates with the World Health Organization and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

On that, let me turn the podium over to Salil. Thank you.

MR. SHETTY: Thank you, Ted, and thank you, Brookings for giving me this opportunity to speak here and for Amnesty International to put forward some of its views on this very important issue. The timing could not be better, just a few days before

our leaders meet at the UN to review progress on the goals and really chart an action plan for the next five years.

I must say that I have in front of me a 25 page speech which my colleagues are expecting me to read from, it's partly because they're not quite sure what I'm going to be saying, I think. I'm ten weeks on the job, I know quite a bit about the Millennium Development Goals and a little bit about human rights. There's many more people in this room here who know way more about human rights than I do. Thankfully I have some very capable colleagues of mine from Amnesty here. Whitney's in the front row. Kurt's gone to the back. I think he's going to be heckling from the back, but I'm going to be pointing at them if you ask me very difficult human rights questions.

But at the outset, I want to recall what we, Amnesty International, had actually said in our publication almost five years ago and I want to quote from that because that sets the context in which I'm going to say the rest of what I want to say. I quote, "In adopting the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948, the international community recognized that human beings can only achieve freedom from fear and want, as well as freedom of speech and belief, if conditions are created whereby all people can enjoy all human rights."

Now, despite this commitment to the indivisibility of human rights, international attention has largely been concentrated on certain violations of civil and political rights. For more than 40 years Amnesty International has played a leading role in putting these issues on the international agenda. In recent years, Amnesty International has broadened its mission in recognition that there are many more prisoners of poverty than prisoners of conscience, and that millions endure the torture of hunger and slow death from preventable disease.

As the international community has repeatedly recognized, all human rights are universal, indivisible, interdependent and interrelated. Human dignity requires respect for all human rights of all people. There can be no higher priority than the right to live with dignity, which is one of Amnesty's major campaigns right now, the Demand Dignity Campaign.

And I wanted to locate the discussion of MDGs within this broader context and the MDGs, as you know, in the last decade, have played a pivotal role in helping to concentrate international attention on issues of development and poverty reduction. They have provided a focal point for civil society which has mobilized millions of people nationally and internationally around MDGs to challenge poverty and exclusion.

Most international development agencies have supported and prioritized MDGs and while the target-driven approach has been questioned by some, it has been welcomed by others for creating a framework for measuring progress.

Now, despite these positive achievements, it's clear that progress in the MDGs has been insufficient and uneven so far and is excluding the most disadvantaged and poorest people in the world. It's now clear at the eve of the summit that unless urgent action is taken governments will fail the most marginalized communities. In many countries the data that's collected on progress is often not broken down by race, indigenous status, gender, location, and levels of progress for people in the poorest quintiles of income distribution within a country.

I always give the example of Brazil, which -- you know, with 150 million plus population, and Brazil's got pretty good data collection methods, and Brazil is right in claiming that apart from the sanitation goal, they're on track to achieving most of the other goals. But it's also true that in 2015, about 30 to 40 million Brazilians are not going

to have achieved the MDGs and my question to the Brazilian government always has been that for the 150 million people who are going to achieve the MDGs or the majority of people in Brazil who are going to achieve the MDGs, do they really need the MDGs, because they're probably going to achieve it anyway? It's the 30 or 40 million people who are at the bottom who needed the MDGs the most and they are the very people who are going to miss these goals in the year 2015.

However, studies of the desegregated data that does exist consistently reveal that even in countries where progress on the MDG is being achieved, there's considerable variation based on ethnic, geographical, and gender-based inequalities. Data from the Latin America region, for instance, indicates that extreme poverty remains higher among indigenous people and Afro-decedents than among the white population in many countries. An analysis of data from the Demographic and Health Service indicate that in 18 out of 26 developing countries with a decline in undefined mortality of 10 percent or more, the gap in undefined mortality between the richest and poorest households either widened or stayed the same, and in 10 of these countries inequality increased by 10 percent or more.

So I, therefore, want to focus what I'm going to say on why implementation of the MDGs, in a manner that is consistent with international human rights law, is crucial if we want the MDGs to reach those who need them the most and if we want to remain true to the spirit of the Millennium Declaration from which the MDGs were derived.

I'll also outline a few suggestions on the role that the U.S. and other governments can play in this regard. Amnesty International believes that when more leaders come together at the UN shortly, in order to achieve and sustain the MDGs for

all, they must commit to six steps in the last five remaining years, and I'll very quickly go through each of these six steps.

The first step, really, is to ensure that MDG efforts are consistent with international human rights standards and I think probably for this audience I don't need to dwell on this too much, but as you know, despite the clear linkages established in the declaration, the MDGs are silent on human rights and the global targets ignore key requirements under international human rights law. For example, Goal 2 on education aims to ensure universal primary education but neglects the obligation under the ICSCR to ensure that primary education is free, compulsory, and of sufficient quality. These requirements are key not just to comply with states legally binding obligations, but to ensure that all children are truly able to benefit from MDG efforts to increase access to education. They're also essential if states hope to address the barriers that many children face in accessing education.

Now, despite -- I'll give you one other example. Despite the fact that unsafe abortions lead to thousands of women and girls dying every year, many governments continue to criminalize abortion and to curtail women's' ability to decide freely the number, spacing, and timing of their children. Amnesty International has documented how, despite it's commitment to the MDGs, Nicaragua has criminalized abortion in all circumstances and put women's life at risk. This ban particularly affects pregnant women and girls who need treatment for life-threatening illnesses, who develop complications, who need medical treatment after a miscarriage or abortion, or who are survivors of rape or incest.

In Nicaragua, the overwhelming majority of girls who are pregnant as a result of rape or incest are aged between 10 and 14 and their health and life are put at

risk by unsafe abortions or by having to give birth at an early age.

So, governments in many countries violate the human rights of the people whose situation they've committed to improving under the MDGs. So we are constantly dealing with this funny, schizophrenic approach. From Cambodia to Italy to Kenya Amnesty International and other NGOs have documented mass forced evictions of people living in slums and in formal settlements. Governments come in and destroy homes, communities, and livelihoods, with little or no notice and due process and without offering alternatives, the effects on people, most of whom were already living in poverty, are catastrophic.

Now, in many cases, de facto, the MDG's framework completely ignore the international human rights obligations. When development frameworks fail to reflect legal commitments, they undercut these commitments, but more than that, they fail to benefit from the decades of expertise that underpin human rights law and the recognition in human rights law and standards that poverty is an experience in which discrimination and exclusion play a major part. This schizophrenic approach must end and governments must commit to reviewing all exiting and planned laws, policies, and programs aimed at meeting the MDGs to ensure consistency with human rights standards and this maybe should be undertaken in a participatory manner. So, that's the first call we are making to governments as we go into the summit.

The second is about fighting exclusion and discrimination and this is the second crucial step. International human rights law requires all states to guaranty quality and nondiscrimination. The MDGs, in contrast, contain no explicit requirement for states to comprehensively identify and redress exclusion and discrimination.

The example of roamer communities in Europe also starkly illustrate how

discrimination and inequalities faced by different groups of people also contributes to the exclusion from political processes and access to public institutions even in democracies. A focus on human rights and the obligations of governments to ensure nondiscrimination and equality is essential if you want to ensure that public policies and programs are aimed at addressing discrimination.

Amnesty's recent research in a Nairobi slum documents how violence against women is closely linked to issues such as lack of adequate sanitation. Women and girls living in informal settlements in Nairobi are particularly affected by lack of adequate access to sanitation facilities for toilets and bathing. Amnesty's research highlighted how three in every four households in the Kibera slum do not have a toilet in or near their homes. Most women use public latrines as toilets which are normally poorly maintained and the paper use charge is often beyond their means. To attempt to use a toilet at night is to risk assault and rape. Kenyon law, on the other hand, requires landlords to ensure access to a toilet to renters, but the government does not apply this law in the slums. This is also a reflection of how people living in informal settlements were historically left out from city planning and budgeting processes because of their irregular status and how this exclusion leads to further denial of human rights.

The importance of all of this is clear also from the recent research carried out by Amnesty International in the USA. Barriers to care reflect disparities among different population groups and affect maternal health in developed as well as developing countries. Our U.S. report showed how within the United States, gender, race, ethnicity, immigration status, indigenous status or income level can affect a woman's access to health care and the quality of health care she receives. African-American women are at especially high risk. They're nearly four times more likely to die of pregnancy-related

complications than white women. Even for white women in the USA, however, the maternal mortality ratios are higher than for women in 24 other industrialized countries. These rates and disparities have not improved in more than 20 years. The experience of women in the U.S. highlighted in this report show that even in wealthy countries women are put at risk by the failure of authorities to address the convergence of poverty and discrimination and to ensure the rights to live, to nondiscrimination, and to health. For women who are marginalized or living in poverty, the risks are particularly acute.

I want to quote briefly from a recent report by Institute of Development Studies Sussex with the United Nation's MDG Achievement Fund and the recent report by UNICEF on MDGs and equity. And it says, "If you want to accelerate progress towards MDGs, an equity-focused approach is what is needed." This is essentially also what the Right to Health framework requires governments to do, to prioritize most disadvantaged groups of people in all programs and by allocating resources to remove the barriers that certain groups of people face in accessing health care services and to ensure that health care services are available, accessible, acceptable, and of sufficient quality. And that's precisely why Amnesty International in the U.S. context is calling on the Congress to pass HR5807, the Moms for the 21st Century Act, which will help reduce maternal deaths by expanding federal maternal health care research and by requiring more effective and focused coordination on maternal care issues within the U.S. government.

And to help reduce maternal deaths globally, we're also calling on Congress to pass HR5268, the Global Moms Act, which will support activities that help expand access to better quality maternal health services, remove barriers to services and ensure that the meet international human rights standards.

States should, therefore, commit to ensuring that MDG efforts are inclusive, that they're aimed at ending discrimination and guarantying gender equality. So, that's the second point.

The third point is -- and this is a very important point and not talked about enough even in the MDG context, leaving alone the human rights context and that is setting national targets for real progress. For instance, if you talk about the 1 billion people who are estimated to be living in slums worldwide, states are required under international law to take immediate and progressive steps to realize the rights to adequate housing and other human rights of people living in slums and informal settlements. They're also under an immediate obligation to provide a minimum degree of legal security of (inaudible) which would be sufficient to provide people protection from forced evictions, harassment, and other threats. However, despite the staggering scale and severity of the problems, the MDG global target on slums is one of the least ambitious to improve the lives of 100 million slum dwellers by 2020, which left out 90 percent of the people living in slums.

The architects of the MDGs actually -- and I know this from inside, I'm happy that Will and colleagues from the UN are here as well -- the MDGs were always intended -- the intention was that governments would set national targets, adapt to their national context. But within the MDG framework in reality this was, unfortunately, left out and most states have been left to do this voluntarily. And they have very often chosen the lazy option and stuck simply with the global target of improving the lives of 100 million slum dwellers.

Reliance on the global MDG targets alone can also give a distorted picture of progress. For example, the targets do not take into consideration the

affordability and quality of services such as water. In part the problem is due to lack of data. For example, the Millennium Declaration specified a target of reducing by half the number of people unable to reach or afford safe drinking water. However, the MDGs limited this goal to access to water, as there is insufficient internationally comparable data on affordability.

The indicators considered water to be safe if it is provided from a source likely to be safe, such as pipe water or a protected well. Therefore, pipe water of poor quality that is provided from a polluted source can wrongly be counted as safe. Some countries have adopted national targets going far beyond the global MDG targets. For example, South Africa, which recognizes the right to water and sanitation in its national law, aims to move significantly beyond the MDG target, and achieve universal access to basic water supply and basic sanitation by 2014. And government figures indicate that they have made quite a lot of progress in this regard. Thus South Africa achieved the global sanitation target six years ahead of schedule and has already significantly surpassed the global water target.

Unfortunately, this example is more an exception. In order for governments to implement the MDGs in a manner which is consistent with the human rights obligations, governments should develop time bound and measurable national targets taking into account existing level of progress and resources available and very much in line with international human rights standards. These targets should be reflected in national plans of actions, laws and policies, budgets, and frameworks which identify appropriate monitoring mechanism, institutional responsibilities, timeframes, benchmarks, and indicators for progress. This is the third point about national targets.

The fourth point -- I'm going very quickly because I want to kind of cover

more ground and have more time for us to have discussion and of course we have two speakers after me as well. The fourth point is about having guaranteed full and informed participation. And informed participation and genuine consultation, in our view, are prerequisites for effective planning and delivery and must be guaranteed in all national and international efforts to meet the MDGs. The current framework of the MDGs does not explicitly recognize the right to participate actively and meaningfully. People in poverty are rarely involved in developing, implementing or monitoring efforts on the MDGs. Where decision-making processes involve civil society, community-based organizations, social movements, and individuals, this alters the way in which programs are run, designed, and managed. In some situations participation in reality tends to be very tokenistic right now.

The Secretariat of the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues reviewed national reports by 25 countries in Africa, Latin America, and Pacific in 2006 and '07, and found that with very few exceptions, indigenous peoples' inputs have not been included in national MDG monitoring and reporting. The reviewers also identify a lack of mechanisms through which they can ensure the input and participation of indigenous people.

Participation of people living in poverty in the planning, implementation and monitoring of MDG efforts is the best guaranty for ensuring that these efforts actually benefit people. Let me give an example from my own country. In 2005, the government of India introduced the Right to Information Act after a public campaign led by an NGO called MKSS. And this has transformed many of the ways in which development is formulated and implemented in India, and I don't have time to go into the details, but happy to do so in the Q&A.

But states, in our view, must ensure that people living in poverty should be able to participate in an equal way. And this is particularly true for -- in the case of women and providing an enabling environment for the work of human rights defenders including through guaranteeing peoples' rights to information, freedom of expression and association, in our view, is crucial.

Now, the fifth step, in our view, is the whole area of strengthening national and international accountability mechanisms for human rights. National and international accountability mechanisms applying human rights standards can strengthen MDG efforts by giving people living in poverty and peoples' organizations acting on their behalf, greater opportunities to hold governments to account. National accountability mechanisms which are closest to where people affected by the MDG process live are of paramount importance. The current reality is that there is hardly any parliamentary oversight and there are very few countries where responsibility is clearly assigned to a body that cuts across sectoral line ministries to monitor MDG delivery and ensure accountability.

There is very little information available in the public domain and very limited media debate. An ombudsman function to protect economic and social rights could go a long way in promoting accountability. When governments lack accountability, their stated aims regarding MDGs may fail. In Burkina Faso, for example, the government's policy to provide subsidized health care for pregnant women has been undermined by illegal charges imposed by hospitals. Such violations are closely related to a sense of impunity as women with such costs have limited options to lodge their complaints -- women faced with such costs have limited options to lodge their complaints. Accessible mechanisms to do so simply don't exist. This is not only a problem in

developing countries, because the U.S., for example, does not recognize the right to health in national law. Women have limited options to seek legal remedies where they are denied access to affordable health care as well.

In a recent landmark decision, the Constitutional Court of South Africa has noted that litigation and human rights fosters participative democracy requiring government to be accountable to its citizens between elections over specific aspects of policy. As part of this process, governments must disclose what they have done to formulate policies, what alternatives they have considered, and the reasons why the option underlying a policy was selected. People's action to hold governments to account can go a long way in this regard. In India, again, the social movements went to court to challenge the government's failure to address chronic malnutrition and the Supreme Court of India has given quite a lot of progressive judgments in this regard. Again, I'm skipping the details because we can do more during the discussion.

The international monitoring of states, I talked about the national -- I want to say something briefly about international. The international monitoring of states efforts to meet the MDGs is very limited and restricted to a voluntary public reporting system under which many countries have submitted reports mostly produced by UNDP arranged consultants. Many reports, however, lack an in depth assessment of progress and are also not updated regularly. The voluntary process of the (inaudible) under which states can choose to make presentations of their progress towards meeting the MDGs to the annual ministerial review is also very weak. Only seven countries chose to give presentations in 2009. However, there is no independent monitoring or evaluation of the reports and no forum for complaints.

The general assembly will consider ways to strengthening (inaudible) in

its upcoming session, but it is essential that any review process include a focus on whether MDG efforts are being implemented in a manner which is consistent with international human rights standards, an obvious step towards addressing the accountability gap is for states to integrate reporting on the implementation of MDGs in their reports to the UPR -- the Universal Periodic Review -- of the Human Rights Council and to international Human Rights Treaty monitoring bodies.

All states are required to report on the human rights performance to the Human Rights Council and undergo peer review in this process. Regional bodies like the Africa Union could also push hard for greater peer accountability. But justice at the end of the day is local and states should recognize the (inaudible) of economic, social and cultural rights and ensure that all people have access to courts in order to claim their rights or seek an effective remedy for violation of their rights.

So, the final point is about aligning international cooperation with the realization of human rights. The sixth crucial step is to ensure that international cooperation and assistance for the realization of human rights, in efforts to meet the MDGs, which is MDG Goal 8, intended to represent a global partnership between developed and developing countries, requires developed countries to support the achievement of the MDGs including through the global aid, trade, and debt policies.

However, it fails to specify that such policies should be consistent with international human rights standards. Development assistance, both technical and financial, has an important role to play in supporting countries to tackle poverty and achieve MDGs, but their role has been very limited in the human rights context. The 2008 ACCRA Agenda For Action has also affirmed that developing countries that donors would ensure that their respective development policies and programs are designed and

implemented in ways consistent with agreed international commitments on gender equality, human rights, disability, and environment sustainability. This commitment should be reflected in national and international efforts to meet the MDGs.

A final word on U.S. strategy and then I'll close. The U.S. strategy for meeting the MDGs acknowledges the importance of strengthening aid effectiveness, including through greater monitoring and transparency. But in order to do so, human rights standards must guide the formulation of international cooperation policies and programs. This will help to ensure that assistance promotes nondiscrimination, focuses on those who are most marginalized, supports partner countries to ensure that everyone has access to essential levels of health care, housing, water, et cetera. Integrating human rights into cooperation policies in the U.S. will also help to prevent harm.

For example, it's crucial that infrastructure projects carried out in the name of development, do not actually lead to a violation of human rights, such as forced evictions, or do not violate the rights of indigenous peoples. This is also very important in the context of international financial institutions including the World Bank Group where the U.S. plays a key role. These institutions must have adequate safeguards based on human rights standards to ensure that peoples' rights are not undermined.

Amnesty International has been working with other NGOs to press the International Finance Corporation, part of the World Bank Group that supports private sector investment in developing countries, to ensure that the current revision of their safeguard policies is in line with human rights law. So, where human rights standards are included in international corporation measures, this can really help to prevent harm.

So, in conclusion, I just want to say that while promoting economic growth, which is, again, something which is very strong in the U.S. strategy for the

MDGs, while promoting economic growth is important for addressing poverty in developing countries, the experience of the last ten years has clearly shown that economic growth does not translate to equitable progress in addressing poverty and certainly not to improve meeting international human rights standards. It cannot, by itself, address the barriers that many groups of people face in achieving the MDGs. So, we do call on the Obama Administration -- I'm very happy to hear from Mike as to how he sees this as we move into the summit next week -- to fully incorporate economic, social, cultural rights both in its foreign and domestic policy. We urge the administration to promote the recognition and implementation of the full spectrum of human rights as envisioned in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

I have focused on economic, social, and cultural rights in various examples for obvious reasons, but the example of violence against women and sanitation that I described also highlights the interdependence and the interlinked nature of the civil, cultural, economic, and social rights violations by people living in slums.

One may, of course, argue that all of this could be achieved through good public policy, even if these were not rights or legal obligations of governments under international human rights law. Governments could do so, but the reason why it's very important that these rights and governments' obligation and relation to these rights are recognized and implemented is to ensure that this is not left to the whim of governments alone and people can have opportunities to hold governments accountable when their rights are not realized. It also, of course, increases space for participation and organizing for people living in poverty.

And my final comment is that if governments do not take the crucial steps that are required now, we could find ourselves in 2015 facing the formidable

challenge of reaching the most disadvantaged and poorest people in the world with resources depleted, political will exhausted, and public attention that has moved on.

Thank you very much. (Applause)

MR. PICCONE: Thank you, Salil.

There are plenty of seats -- well, there are seven or eight at least up in the front couple rows here if people in the back want to move up and get more comfortable. Please feel free to do so just while we get our microphones on.

I wanted to thank Salil for those comments, very comprehensive look at the Millennium Development Goals, and we'll get into more discussion along the way, but first let me turn to Mike Posner for some comments.

MR. POSNER: Thank you, Ted. It's a pleasure to be here, and Salil, as you come to Amnesty, and we're thrilled to have you there 10 weeks into the job, from an extensive background on the development side. I come to this meeting equally unprepared having really focused so much on the human rights side in trying to -- in this context, try to think myself and in the government context of how human rights and development are integrated. So, this is, for me, a chance to learn and listen, but I want to offer a couple of thoughts, really just a few thoughts, by way of introduction.

I think it's important as we discuss these issues to begin by thinking about on the foreign policy side, how much there has been a disconnect, and how much in this Administration President Obama and Secretary Clinton have thought about and begun to articulate a coherent strategy for linking human development and democracy and human rights.

Last December, Secretary Clinton gave a speech at Georgetown where she explicitly discussed development, democracy, and human rights, and she said in

part, “Human development must be a part of our human rights agenda. Democratic governments are not likely to survive long if their citizens don’t have the basic necessities of life.” She went on to say, “The desperation caused by poverty and disease often leads to violence that further imperils the rights of people and threatens the stability of governments. Democracies that deliver on rights, opportunities, and development for their people are stable, strong, and most likely to enable people to live up to their potential. That’s our starting place. These are not three separate discussions; they’re three connected/interconnected discussions on human rights, democracy, and development.”

What does that mean? It means, in part, and this was also articulated in the Georgetown speech, that we take an approach to development that is rights-respecting or rights-oriented, and again it’s easy to say that it’s much more difficult to apply it in practice and I would be kidding myself and you to say that this is completely now integrated into everything the U.S. Government does. But a rights-respecting approach to development, we would say, has three components and they mirror some of Salil’s points. One is what he called informed participation. The notion ought to be that development projects are undertaken in the planning stage in consultation and engagement with local communities that are the recipients or the presumed recipients of those assistance programs.

Critically important, the Secretary spoke in Krakow at the Community of Democracy several months ago in July about the increasing constriction that governments, many governments around the world, are placing on civil society. We are deeply engaged now in an effort to work with local human rights and development, environmental, women’s organizations around the world, who are constrained, both in

their right to organize, their right to assemble, their right to speak freely, constrained in the assistance they can receive from outside of their countries, financial, technical, and otherwise. This is a key component in our minds to the development agenda. There need to be local actors empowered, free, able to participate actively, able to use the internet, able to communicate freely as an element of making development work and having a rights-oriented approach.

The second broad piece in our mind is that there needs to be in the application of development programs, a commitment to transparency and accountability. Again, Salil talked about accountability and it is critically important. There is no question that a significant portion of foreign aid from the U.S. and other governments as well as the multilateral development banks and so forth is threatened or undermined by the lack of open, accountable, transparent organizations and entities able to receive and deploy that aid in an effective, efficient way. We need to be attentive to that, we need to be more rigorous, we need to be tougher on ourselves in making sure that the aid actually gets to the places it's intended to go.

And the third aspect that Secretary Clinton outlined in terms of a rights-respecting or rights-oriented approach to development is to have human rights and democracy as an objective -- not the only objective, but as an explicit objective of some portion of that development assistance. What do we mean by that? When we talk about democracy and human rights, we take a broad view. We're not just talking about -- we're certainly not talking about regime change and we're not talking about simply, do they have an election. We're talking about societies that commit themselves to human rights and democracy 365 days a year, rule of law, openness and accountability, empowerment of women, the ability of trade unions to organize, a free press, a free open access to

internet, the existence and thriveability of civil society to operate, a broad -- and elections, and a political process that allows people to choose their own leaders, a broad, three-dimensional view of democracy and building those institutions ought to be a goal of development programs and projects.

Last comment from me, and part of our challenge, I think, in the U.S. Government, is trying to integrate what I just said with a kind of traditional development model, but there are four elements in the Obama approach to development, some of which are overlapping and I just want to lay those out to complete the picture.

The four elements that have been articulated are, one, leveraging innovation. This means using new technologies, new ways to deliver existing solutions to new people, more people, more effective ways.

Secondly, investing in sustainability. This means nurturing well-governed institutions. Again, this goes to accountability and transparency but also -- and this goes to Salil point on discrimination -- a particular emphasis on supporting women and girls.

A third element of the Obama development policies is tracking outcomes, again, transparency, greater and new methods of data collection to monitor and measure. We have a -- the President has declared a commitment, and we're trying to apply it at home and abroad, to greater openness in government, greater transparency in the way we operate and demanding the same from our partners.

And then fourth and finally, mutual accountability. That means that donors must deliver on what they promised, they must be transparent, including the United States, and we ought to be demanding of that of our partner countries. They must manage the funds transparently and responsibly.

So that's the framework in which we approach these issues. It is, to say the least, challenging on all levels to make those words into reality, but I think the approach we're taking is very much consistent with a lot of the points that Salil raised.

Thanks. (Applause)

MR. PICCONE: Thanks, Mike.

MR. GOSTIN: Thank you very much, Ted, for inviting me and Salil and Mike for two wonderful talks. I think there's going to be a lot of synergy in the way we're approaching this problem and what I want to do is focus on a post-MDG and human rights project that we're moving forward with. It's an international civil society academic venture and this is going to appear as an editorial in the World Health Organization Bulletin in October and then we'll be featured in the World Health Report of 2011.

So, clearly I'm going to focus mostly on health. There are, obviously, very vital health MDGs, but I believe very strongly that all of the MDGs have very important connections to human health and that human health, human development, and human rights really are the three pillars that I look to when I think about these problems.

I think we all know that preventable and treatable injuries and diseases overwhelm Sub-Saharan Africa, the Indian Subcontinent, and other improvised areas of the world. Every year 8 million children die before age 8, most of these preventable. Half a million women die in pregnancy or childbirth. More than 4 million people die of AIDS, malaria, tuberculosis. And by 2020, 70 percent of non-communicable diseases -- cancer, heart disease, diabetes -- will actually be in the developing world.

What's interesting, we're having the MDG summit quite shortly, in 2011 around this time, it'll only be the second time in the history of the United Nations that that body has had a high-level summit relating to a health issue. The first one was HIV/AIDS,

which really transformed the global landscape of that disease, and the next one is powerfully important and neglected in the human rights and development world, which is non-communicable diseases: cancer, diabetes, heart disease, respiratory disease, and the like.

As a result of all this, healthy life expectancy in Africa and Sub-Saharan Africa is 45 years old, which is a full quarter of a century less than high-income countries, leading to countless lives unfulfilled. And this does really reinforce Salil's point about socioeconomic disparities in health which are profound, and I think, unconscionable. And I could go on for quite a long time demonstrating those disparities which exist, as he said, both within countries and between the world's poor and richer populations.

So the question remains, we've got the Gates Foundation, the Global Fund, the GAVI Alliance, that when we track international development -- and PEPFAR, of course -- when we track international development assistance for health over the last two decades, it has quadrupled. And yet, despite this quadrupling, why are health outcomes among the world's poor still so dire? We believe that this requires a very systematic approach and this approach is one that builds on the MDGs and uses a human rights lens to look at global architecture to improve health as a matter of social justice and human rights and it entails four highly systematic question that the Joint Learning Initiative on National and Global Responsibilities for Health is going to undertake as a global consortium over the next several years.

The first question is what are the essential health services and goods guaranteed to every human being under the human right to health? This is really a foundational question for the Joint Learning Initiative because it is impossible to know what international and national obligations are unless we understand what the essential

package of health services and goods are that every person has the human right to expect. And without an answer to this question it leaves us without clear answers to a number of other health and human development questions.

The core content of the right to health, of course, starts both with the UN Rapporteur on the right to health and on Grover from Mumbai and the general comment on the right to health includes, I think, at least three minimal things. The first is the World Health Organization's Health Services Building Blocks, which involves basic primary care, workforce information, and financing. Second are essential vaccines, medicals and technologies. And here I would be remiss not to point out the major connections and sometimes dysfunctional connections between essential medicines and technologies and the world trade system and the world intellectual property system under TRIPS. And then finally what I've called in my writing basic survival needs, which are closely connected to the MDGs.

But one of the things I've really found, I've only been in global health for about five years and before that I've really come to understand population health very much, and I find when I go to meetings at the Council of Foreign Relations or other places with a lot of people who've been in global health and development, they really don't understand population health. They're very disease-specific. They're not very horizontal. But what I know and what everybody who's studied population health knows is that if you're really interested in the health of a population, you first focus on basic survival needs. These are: sanitation, hygiene, nutritional food, potable water, vector control or pest control -- mosquitoes and the like -- and tobacco control. And the right to health, I argue, requires that all of these three categories of services be universally available, acceptable, affordable, and of good quality as the general comment on the

right to health pointed out.

The second major issue is what do all states owe for the populations of -- for their own populations? Too often we begin -- and I have made the same mistake -- with the international assistance regime, and Mike made this point, I thought, really eloquently. If you focus on the human right to health, a country's own government must have primary responsibility for it, first and foremost. The WHO estimates the cost of basic health services at a minimum of $40 U.S. per person annually. This is a very, very low figure that every country ought to be able to do minimally and it doesn't even include the basic survival needs I mentioned.

In Nigeria in 2001, African heads of states pledged to devote at least 15 percent of national domestic budgets to the health sector and also meeting this $40 level. Yet many years later after this commitment, the mean in Africa is only $34 with a 9.6 budget allocation, and this is very, very low compared to developed countries and even as a percentage of GDP which should be somewhat equivalent. This includes 15 African countries investing as little as $2 to $10 per capita per year, which cannot begin to meet their population's health needs. Yet if one looks at health investments, they bear a very strong correlation with improved morbidity, mortality, and well-being in a population.

States also have a responsibility, and both Salil and Mike, I thought, pointed this out extremely well. They have an obligation to govern well themselves, what the World Bank calls good governance, which is honestly, transparently, accountably, and with the full participation of civil society.

Our third question is what do all countries owe to the world's least healthy people? I believe that framing global health funding as aid is fundamentally

flawed because it presupposes an inherently unequal benefactor-dependent relationship, but rather global collaboration requires a collective response to shared risks and fundamental rights where all states have mutual responsibilities. Charity means that financial contributions are at the donor's discretion -- how much to give, for what, and to whom. Consequently, aid is not predictable, scalable, and sustainable, which undermines host country ownership and responsibility for the health of their population. Yet high-income countries have also not come close to fulfilling their 1970 pledge of .7 percent of GNI per annum on official development assistance. Four decades later their contribution stands only at .31 percent.

And the fourth question is, what kind of global health governance system or a global health architecture is needed to make all states live up to their mutual responsibilities on the human right to health? Global health governance is essential because, as Mike has said, states will not accept international norms without genuine partnerships, equitable burden sharing, and efficient programs that improve health outcomes. Yet countries face serious problems of global governance -- fragmentation, duplication, and even confusion among the deluge of global health actors' initiatives.

We recently invited health ministers from Africa to Oxford where I hold an appointment and we didn't invite USAID or PEPFAR or DFID or the Global Fund and we allowed -- asked them to speak from their heart without their donors there, and you should have heard what they said. They really don't feel that they have a clear understanding of all the programs in their country, they don't have the ability to predict, plan, and invest for the long term.

The Joint Learning Initiative on National and Global Responsibilities for Health is going to launch a wide participatory process involving all major stakeholders

such as international governmental organizations like the WHO, states, foundations, industry, and civil society. We would love to work with Amnesty International on a bottom-up social movement because it is only bottom-up social movements such as the campaign to rid the world of landmines or to fight the scourge of HIV that makes civil change. And civil society now, I believe, is moving rapidly toward a broad human rights and health rights and social justice agenda where they're embracing the human right to health as a focal point for innovative global health governance.

Thank you very much. (Applause)

MR. PICCONE: Thank you, Larry. It was very interesting to hear, particularly the challenges on the health front and how they relate to the MDGs.

I'd like to take the prerogative of the chair and initiate the discussion. We have about half an hour for Q&A.

I mean, there was a lot of, as Larry put it, synergy among the comments and you hear a lot of common themes that are familiar to those of us in particular who have been working on both the development agenda and the democracy in human rights agenda for many years. There needs to be greater monitoring, greater accountability, better good governance, more transparency, need to mainstream human rights into the development agenda, need for voice and participation of those that are the recipients of assistance, et cetera. These are all, you know, important principles that need to be better implemented, but I think those general principles are understood and, I mean, they constantly need reinforcement, but they're there.

I want to ask a tougher question and maybe ask all three of you to think about this. I mean, right now the push -- and you'll hear a lot of in the next few weeks -- is, you know, let's meet the targets. We have the targets; we have five more years, a lot

of concern that they're not going to be met, what has to be done to meet them.

But at the same time you're drawing attention to all the inadequacies of those targets that they really are not going to meet the needs of the poorest of the poor because they don't incorporate the human rights framework. So, on the one hand, the voice -- the campaigning, the civil society movement in the media -- seems to be all about push toward achievement of the MDGs. UN Foundation is doing a big banner campaign in Times Square in the coming weeks. You'll hear a lot more about these things, but, at the same time, you're taking a pretty critical approach about, you know, are these the right goals and, you know, should we be thinking about targets for 2015, a new framework for 2015, so that we continue to build on the momentum? And what would those -- how would you go about, you know, strategizing between now and 2015 to go meet the goals that you've laid out?

MR. SHETTY: Do you want me to go first?

MR. PICCONE: Sure.

MR. SHETTY: Yeah. I'm quite clear about that question because as it happens we're in a very happy situation on responding to that because, in my view, if you take any given country or community, if you are able to actually make sure that these goals and targets, however inadequate they might be, if you're able to make sure that these goals and targets actually convert into real benefits for the poorest people in that community, you can be sure that the rest will benefit. So, actually focusing in the last five years on the poorest sections of society, whether it's Dalits and (inaudible) in my country or the minority groups elsewhere, women in most places, indigenous people in Latin American places -- if you can make sure that the health, water, education, challenges which these communities face, if we can make sure that you are able to tackle the

problem in those communities, the rest will be taken care of.

Now, should we also not focus on the issues beyond 2015? We should and we should start thinking about those issues, but we would be very reluctant to allow governments to get off the hook on their existing commitments between 2010 and 2015 by starting to talk, you know, prematurely about what happens after 2015. That's my take on it.

MR. GOSTIN: I agree with that. I think that the MDGs were such an unprecedented and powerful political force that we really can't ignore them and I think meeting targets is very important and I agree wholeheartedly that the way to meet the targets is to focus on the world's poorest people and you've mentioned -- and most vulnerable -- and you've mentioned them. At the same time I do think that there is a lot more that we could do building on the MDGs and there already are a number of campaigns, some of them are quite discreet, like the huge NCD Alliance that wants to move -- wants to get non-communicable diseases added to the Millennium Development Goals. But then I think there are much more broader issues like the ones I -- like we all mentioned in terms of human rights and accountability that I think would be useful. So, I would be moving on all those fronts.

MR. POSNER: I would just add, I agree with both comments. I would just add almost as a tactical matter, at this moment, given kind of a precarious international economy, I'd say to hold the line on the goals for 2015, make sure they're really respected, and make sure that the money that is available is spent the most wisely, would be the priorities I would play, and again, focusing on the poorest of the poor.

MR. SHETTY: But in addition, if I could just say, Ted, I think -- you know, and I mentioned this when I spoke, this part has been very much ignored by the

human rights movement that actually the targets are ultimately in practice defined at the national level, because you have these global things. That's people coming and making speeches here, but when you talk about what difference it makes to peoples' lives, it's national government policies and programs and delivery of that, and there's absolutely no reason why the human rights movement, and particularly as, I think, Lawrence said, you know, that's the bottom-up which can change the way in which national governments make their policies. We should push hard for national governments to have targets which are in line with international human rights standards, even for the next five years. There's nothing stopping us from doing that.

I think what Mike and I are talking about is to tinker with the global stuff you could actually go backwards. You know, I wouldn't want to take that chance at this point, but there's no reason why we can't push much harder. I mean, the countries like even Mongolia, for example, has added a ninth Millennium Development Goal on human rights specifically and there are many countries that have gone much further forward, including India. Of course, we are not likely to achieve these things but our national targets are more ambitious than the global ones.

MR. PICCONE: Well, this goes to the importance of domestic civil society and the role they play -- human rights groups, the development groups, together working toward these common goals. And I think in some countries the vocabulary around economic and social rights is very comfortable. In fact, it's really the priority driving incentive behind the human rights movement in some places. In other countries that's not the case. And certainly the United States has only now, in the last several years, beginning -- certainly we're beginning to see it at the kind of grassroots level, more of a discussion and a usage of that kind of terminology and even an effort to litigate some

of those rights in our courts. I think we're just beginning to see that take place in the United States. It will be interesting to see just even here if that takes off in the future.

Well, let's open the floor to some Q&A. We have some microphones going around. I have someone right here in the middle -- yes. Thank you.

Please identify yourself. Thanks.

MS. BADAWEE: Rose Badawee. I'm from York University in Canada, Toronto.

The Millennium Development Goals, as we know, these were basically framework, it's a framework, and as the speakers have mentioned that this is -- the onus is on the national government and to develop national goals which are implementable. The international goals were just basically framework, and I think there has been a lot of confusion on how to go about it. It is not for the UN General Assembly to take the countries to task, it is for the civil society to take their individual countries to task as to why certain things are not happening.

What I wanted to ask was -- two things -- one, of course, in any development arena we as researchers, thinkers, actors, and so on, think about certain approaches to development. There have been many mantras: poverty reduction approach and then consolidating this to human development approach to development, and now we have the human rights approach. And I think this is fantastic because it is basically mainstreaming or setting up some kind of focus where, you know, before it was gender, then you have human development, you have poverty reduction, and so on. Are we now going to be developing all of this or have we concluded that everything boils down to human rights, that everything is, essentially, human right? That's one for researchers and so on.

Two, the impact of the global recession on achieving Millennium Development Goals and also the international migration, because there have been lots of now constraints on international migration, legal or illegal, for that matter, and migrants who have been supporting their families back home. If they are not able to find work or are sent back, this will actually throw certain countries back into the poverty line. So, I'm wondering if in your approach, the International Amnesty, you have given any thoughts to these two issues.

MR. PICCONE: Thank you very much. Salil.

MR. SHETTY: Well, I think, you know, in my previous role when people have always asked me as to, you know, why is it that the Millennium Development Goals don't tell you how to achieve the goals, they only say, these are the goals? My push back on that was, actually, that's a good thing, because if you think of what happened with the Washington consensus, and, you know, it took a long time for us to recover from all of the ideas that were top-down, you know, one size fits all. And even if the Millennium Development Goals were much better than some of the Washington consensus ideas, in my view, even if sort of the D.C. consensus -- the Washington consensus -- will have problems, we don't want a New York consensus now which is going to be thrust down peoples' throats either, even if it's better than the previous one.

It's very important that the models are (inaudible), they're nationally adapted, and driven bottom-up rather than top-down, so I think that's a good thing.

So, I'm a little bit even reluctant to say, you know, we had this approach that approach, and now we have to have another approach, because I think approach is very context-specific. And that's why we have, you know, so many very interesting ways in which these goals have been approached in so many different contexts. I mean, some

of the stuff that has happened in the northeast of Brazil is amazing, you know, what they have been able to do. And it doesn't typically fall under any label, so I'm a bit reluctant to go down the labeling road. And Amnesty, anyway, doesn't generally proclaim the right sort of development philosophy, et cetera, but what we would certainly say is that whatever approach you take, people and their rights have to come first. That's the ultimate sort of acid, litmus test, in a sense, so if you want to call it a human rights approach to development, so be it.

MR. PICCONE: Any other thoughts?

MR. POSNER: I would just add, you know, I said earlier that there is, to me, three prongs to a rights oriented approach to development. One of them -- two of them are really process points. One is engagement of local communities. I think whether you call that a human rights approach or whatever, I think that's just smart development strategy. The second is accountability and transparency. Again, I think that ought to cut across whatever you're doing. If you want to be effective, you want to make sure things are getting where they're supposed to go.

And the third piece is what the objective is or what the target is of the assistance. In some cases it's to build democratic institutions. You want to build strong courts; you want to build institutions that promote democracy and human rights. But there are other objectives that you may or may not call human rights and that's equally valid.

MR. GOSTIN: Yeah, I agree with both of those comments because I think that there's too much categorical ways of thinking. I mean, one of the things that I've found out, I had had this proposal for a framework convention on global health which now we've pulled back to the Joint Learning Initiative, and even the good guys are split

over paradigms all the time. And so some people, if you -- some people in the human rights community, if everything is not human rights, they get upset, and I don't find that to be valid.

More importantly, some people are completely turned off by human rights and they say, no, you can't use -- literally, you know, countries have said this to me, you've got to use the human security approach rather than the human rights approach. And then others don't like the human security approach or the human rights approach, they prefer the global public goods approach. And I just find this counterproductive. I think it makes all of us who really are agreeing with one another hesitate and I just don't see the point of it. But I do believe that if you had to choose one it would be human rights and the reason why is because it's founded in international law which every state in the world, virtually, has agreed to in one form or another. And so it seems to me that that is -- that should be the primary approach.

MR. SHETTY: But I do want to sort of push back a little bit on the first point you made, which I forgot to mention, if you don't mind, that, you know, while I'm all for national citizens and civil society holding their governments to account, you know, these are agreements made at the international level including the Millennium Development Goals. Governments come to the UN, they make these promises and they go back, and there should be some accountability at the international level as well. And that's where the human rights angle actually is good because there are some ways in which you can hold governments to account. Again, they might have their weaknesses, but it's way better than anything else we have and therefore the human rights angle becomes definitely value adding.

MR. PICCONE: There was another part to the question on the impact of

the recession and migration. I would just reflect that it varied across the globe, the impact of the recession, and you are seeing, for example in Latin America, a fairly good turnaround rate and economies are growing and they're benefitting middle class, lower income people. There's this massive commodities boom that continues that has problems associated with it. But the demand for those resources continues to exist, so we're not seeing -- it's not as bad as we had thought it might be and there -- it's an interesting development to see how different zones of economic activity, different regional trading patterns, et cetera, may generate their own progress that's a little bit apart from what might be happening here in the United States.

A couple more questions. There's one right here in the front.

MS. JONG: Thank you. My name is Mi Jong. I am a reporter with *21st Century Business Herald*. This is a newspaper in China. Actually, as we're discussing all those challenges facing how -- whether and how we can accomplish the MDG, we do realize that an unconventional donor, that is China, these days are getting a lot of attention of their action in Africa and Latin America, for example.

So, this question I want to address to Michael Posner. Being as controversial as it is, the Chinese government's action and company's action in Africa and anywhere else, in terms of helping those countries, we do see that some of these investments prove to be effective, even according to some American professors. Like recently there's a book called *Dragon's Gift,* where this professor from American University went to Africa many times and did field research and found that many Chinese investments are effective. So, do you agree with her? And is there any lessons you think are worth to learn from the Chinese approach in terms of providing aid to other countries?

But, also, I want to hear your thoughts about how can the Chinese action

improve its transparency especially in the summit next week in UN? Do you have particular advice or suggestions to the Chinese on the transparency side?

Thank you.

MR. POSNER: That's a good and broad question and I can't say that I'm an expert in all of Chinese investment in Africa.

I would offer a couple of cautionary or words of concern. One is, while some of the projects, as you say, may, in fact, be very useful and good, there also are projects that I've seen and read and heard about and discussed with people in Africa where Chinese companies or the Chinese government have come in, rather than using local workers and building up local infrastructure and local economies, they've actually brought in Chinese workers and I think that's had a negative effect in terms of local attitudes toward that kind of investment.

Secondly, I have concerns in places like Sudan that Chinese investment, and the Chinese government and Chinese oil companies are very invested, has not been accompanied by a commitment to raise concerns about the way in which those oil revenues are being deployed and so you have in Darfur and Southern Sudan real human rights crises. And we haven't seen and we'd like to see a more affirmative response by the Chinese government and by Chinese companies reinforcing basic human rights principles. That hasn't happened as much as it should and I could give you a lot of examples, Sudan is one.

A third challenge -- again, I don't want to just be negative, but these are things that I see -- a third challenge is, and China is not unique in this, but in a place like Sudan, again, there is a very active arms trade and the small weapons manufactured by China have found their way into Sudan and have helped to fuel the conflict. Now, again,

China's not unique in that. There are plenty of other countries supplying arms. But I think those -- part of what I would see as a global responsibility on development is having a full throttle commitment to human rights so the development assistance and the investments, I think, need to be accompanied by a broader strategy that promotes human rights and I would say that would be my primary concern with respect to China.

MS. JONG: (inaudible)

MR. POSNER: On the transparency point, you know, again, I don't think any government is as transparent as I would like to see them, including my own, but there is certainly room for much greater transparency on the Chinese investment side. So I would say -- I would hope that as part of the discussions next week, I think the entire -- the whole global community needs to take a much closer look at issues of transparency and accountability and I think the two are linked and that would certainly be very true for the Chinese investments.

MR. PICCONE: Salil?

MR. SHETTY: I mean, you haven't asked me the question, but I'm volunteering a response. And really, for me, the very important question, you know, as China becomes a very key player in Africa, is to make sure that there is no doubt that many African governments are very pleased with Chinese investments. But you just need to make sure -- I think Chinese corporate investors and the Chinese government need to start talking to African people as well, a lot more than talking just to African governments, so you get a pretty direct sense of how they are responding to the work which China -- I mean -- and there's enough blame to go around. I mean, I wouldn't want to politicize this by pointing fingers only at Chinese companies. You know, we've had historically enough companies from the rest of the world who've been messing around in

Africa, so really I think it's to learn from the experience from everybody else and not repeat the same mistakes. It's going to be very, very important.

But even on the aid issue, and it's the same with India, you know, my country has aspirations to become an international aid donor, but there's a lot of best practice on how you do aid. There's the OACD process and, you know, to the extent that China doesn't want to become part of that, I think you will end up making the same mistakes and 25 years later we will be having the same conversation. So, I think there's real value as you start becoming more of a global player, you know, there will be more pressure on being more transparent.

MR. PICCONE: Why don't we take a couple more questions? Here and then in back. Yes, sir?

MR. JONES: I'm Tom Jones from Habitat for Humanity International, and would like, first of all, to thank you for the kind of ongoing stimulation we all need.

I'd like to go back to the third -- your third point, if I may, particularly as it pertains to shelter, the importance of shelter, the lack of pointed focus on that in the Millennial Development Goals, but yet the growing consensus that we find that with the legitimate issues there are to overcome poverty in the world -- health, education, economic development, sustainability -- at the end of the day, if persons don't have a decent place to live it undermines the other legitimate goals many believe. And I wonder what we can do in terms of focusing this and maybe another way in terms of the human rights issue. Is a decent place to live a basic human right?

MR. PICCONE: That's maybe more of a comment than a question, but please.

MR. SHETTY: As far as Amnesty is concerned, the right to housing is

one major campaign which we are running and it will remain a big part of our focus. You know, just like indivisibility and interdependence of human rights, the Millennium Development Goals are also a bunch of interrelated goals. It's really hard to separate and prioritize one or the other and as you know the people who are poor and discriminated against are the exact same ones who are hungry, who are, you know, having diseases, who are not having enough access to education, housing, so it all really converges when you think of which communities, which people we are talking about. So, you know, we wouldn't prioritize one other the other in that sense. I think this is a minimum package and every human being on the planet should have it.

MR. PICCONE: Well, I might ask the panel, since we're coming towards the end, for any final comments for wrapping up.

MR. POSNER: I would just add that, you know, the housing issue in particular is one that seems to -- just thinking of it from our own U.S. point of view -- lend itself very well to our legal framework because, you know, the property rights is the language that we're most familiar with and it's one that's very well-recognized. And security of tenure, land tenure, is a huge issue in other parts of the world and that is leading to really massive displacement and human rights violations and it's being driven in part by this drive for resources. And the scarcity of resources is only going to increase and I think we're going to see more and more of this problem. So that, of course, leads you to, you know, we need better judicial systems, and we need, you know, public defenders, and we need trained human rights advocates who can help people who are displaced from those areas. So I think it's an area in particular that I'm drawn to as a bridging topic that covers a lot of these areas.

MR. PICCONE: Well, I want to thank you all for coming and thank our

panelists and we look forward to future conversations. Thank you. (Applause)

* * * * *

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby certify that the forgoing electronic file when originally transmitted was reduced to text at my direction; that said transcript is a true record of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I am neither a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

/s/Carleton J. Anderson, III

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2012