

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION
FALK AUDITORIUM

PROMOTING SHARED SOCIETIES:

INCLUSION IN THE POST-2015 DEVELOPMENT AGENDA

Washington, D.C.
Friday, February 7, 2014

Moderator:

HOMI KHARAS
Senior Fellow and Deputy Director, Global Economy and Development
The Brookings Institution

Panel:

THE HONORABLE KIM CAMPBELL
Former Prime Minister
Canada

THE HONORABLE WIM KOK
Former Prime Minister
Kingdom of the Netherlands

THE HONORABLE CASSAM UTEEM
Former President
Republic of Mauritius

SANTIAGO LEVY
Vice President for Sectors and Knowledge
Inter-American Development Bank

JOHN PODESTA
Former Member
High-Level Panel on the Post-2015 Development Agenda

* * * * *

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. KHARAS: Well, good morning everybody. I'd like to get started. My name is Homi Kharas; I'm a Senior Fellow and the Deputy Director of the Global Economy and Development program here at Brookings and it's a wonderful honor and privilege for me to moderate this panel on I think a really important topic which is promoting shared societies and to take that vision and think about exactly what it means for a very broad discussion on the Post-2015 Agenda which is continuing to go on.

So let me first introduce our panel. It's a star studded panel. You will have the bios in the sheet that was distributed. I'll just go in order. The Honorable Wim Kok is a two term former Prime Minister of the Kingdom of the Netherlands but he has also been the Chairman of the European Trade Union Confederation, Deputy Chairman of the Socioeconomic Council, so somebody who I think has spent a large part of his life thinking and implementing hopefully these issues. The Honorable Kim Campbell is also a former President --

PRIME MINISTER CAMPBELL: Prime Minister.

MR. KHARAS: -- Prime Minister -- sorry, excuse me -- of Canada. She's served as President of the International Women's Forum so she's taken a very active role in promoting leadership of one group that's often described as being marginalized but is - - certainly perhaps faces a number a barriers but certainly are not marginal groups in our society. The Honorable Cassam Uteem is also a two term former President of the Republic of Mauritius. He has come up with -- as a local community worker, he's a former mayor of a large city and he's currently also a Board Member of the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance. Welcome. Santiago Levy. Santiago is a Vice President for Sectors and Knowledge at the Inter-American Development Bank. He's also served as Deputy Minister of the -- in the Ministry of Finance in Mexico but he's

probably better known at least to many of us here as a non resident Senior Fellow of Brookings who offered a tremendous book called Good Intentions, Bad Outcomes. He is the architect of perhaps the most famous safety net program in the world Progres-Oportunidades in Mexico and was both the intellectual and practical force behind its implementation. And at the far end is Mr. John Podesta. Mr. Podesta is here as a former member of the High Level Panel of the -- advising the U.N. Secretary General on the Post-2015 Agenda. He is also currently a counselor to President Obama dealing specifically with climate change and energy, a former Chair of the Center for American Progress and of course also a former Chief of Staff to President Bill Clinton. So welcome everybody. I think it's a -- it's just an extraordinary panel.

So the format for today is that we'll first have a panel discussion and for about 40 minutes or so, then I'll open it up to the floor for questions and answers. This event is being Webcast. If you would like to Tweet you should please use the hash tag Shared Societies. For those of who are not in the room but who might be hearing what I'm saying if you would like to ask questions on Twitter just use that hash tag, somebody will be monitoring it and we'll try to incorporate those questions into the Q & A session. So with that let's get started.

And, Mr. Kok, maybe I can just start with you. The -- really the core of the position paper that the Club de Madrid produced on the Post-2015 Agenda, the core I would say of that paper is that the marginalization of many groups has really ended the achievement of the millennium development goals and so if we're going to come out with a new set of sustainable development goals we had better put these groups really at the heart of the agenda and that's a very powerful argument but just to play the devil's advocate let me say that, you know, many politicians tend to think not of the marginalized groups but of the interests of the median voter or the median household who might be

more concerned about growth than about marginalization. So why do you think that it's so important to really address issues of marginalized groups?

PRIME MINISTER KOK: Yeah, thank you very much for that question. Perhaps first a few short words of introduction that the Club of Madrid is and the link between the Club of Madrid and the shared societies agenda and now the Post-2015 development goals. Club of Madrid is the largest global forum of former leaders, former heads of state and governments all over the world, almost hundreds democratically elected making their time and energy available to advise current leaders and to provide the kind of convenient platform for discussion on current global and regional challenges all related to democracy and democratic transition. We came to the conclusion already a number of years ago that the concept of shared societies is crucial for developed and developing countries for regions to make the best possible use of the potential of each and every individual regardless of religion, ethnic backgrounds, and etcetera. And we came to the conclusion that shared societies have also a place in economic dividends. So it's not just for intrinsic reasons but also for economic reasons that it's useful and essential for a country, for a society to be included.

Coming now to your question, your first question on the millennium development goals. I think it's clear that the marginalization or the underutilization of the input of individuals, marginalized groups in society has a negative effect on the realization of development goals. But the situation is even more serious because the way in which the millennium development goals have been used makes it possible that some people might say yes, okay; this country has a very good performance in terms of realizing the development goals. But then the underutilization of the input of individuals of marginalized groups, it doesn't come above the surface. So the general statistics may be all right but the precise effect, the precise outcome for groups of society may not be all

right. So what we are saying when we are now preparing for post development sustainable development goals Post-2015 try to avoid that you make that same type of mistake. So don't talk too much about averages, about general mathematic outcomes you want to realize without paying specific attention to the utilization of and the input of specific groups in society.

And this brings me down to your third and final somewhat provocative question, namely why paying attention to marginalized groups and not just paying attention to median voters and to the average citizen as if there would be a contradiction between the two. It's clear now to everyone in every society that inequality and the underutilization of certain groups in society are bad for economic growth as well. So there's no contradiction between approaching the median voters and using the potential of marginalized groups because if a society is unfair and of course a lot can be said about what's fair and what's not fair, but if there is a lot inequality in a society, if large groups in a society or in a region cannot participate on their own merits economic development pays a price for it. So there's a moral and intrinsic value in including everybody in society in economic and social developments but also in economic arguments. And I think it's important for each and every country to understand that this is not only of importance for developing countries but also the developed world and countries in the developed world will be well advised to pay more attention to that. And our proposal is to make this specifically visible in the way the Post-2015 development goals are going to be composed.

MR. KHARAS: Okay. Thank you. So, Miss Campbell, maybe I can turn to you. We've got a moral argument and an economic argument; do we also have a political argument here? I think one of the things that's really striking about Canada is that, you know, you've always been cited as this example of a country with tremendous

social mobility and where this notion of a shared society appears to be something that is common to, you know, all political parties maybe with differences of, you know, degree but is something that has been part of Canadian society for a long time. I mean how do you make sure that this agenda is actually an agenda that is shared by all political groups because, you know, we're talking about 2015 to 2030, there are going to be changes in political parties and then perhaps is -- you know what are the instruments that can be used? Some of the things you talk about in the paper, disaggregated data, communications, consultation with groups, etcetera, are those the things that in your mind have proven to be the most relevant tools for achieving this in Canada?

PRIME MINISTER CAMPBELL: Well, I think first of all that the commitment to shared societies is in many a mentality and I think of the title of Santiago's book, Good Intentions, Bad Outcomes is probably the most feared epitaph that any politician could have. And I think one of the things that we think about is how we can avoid doing the wrong things for the right reasons. And one of the ways of avoiding that is to try to; you know, get rid of the hubris that we know the answers to questions and understand that we don't know all the answers. And I'll give some examples. In Canada we have had for a very long time in the government of Canada an Office of the Status of Women whose job it is to do a kind of gender analysis of policy. And as a Cabinet Minister -- I remember when I was Minister of Justice talking to my colleague, the Minister responsible for the status of women, and we were talking about some area and I said I didn't really see a gender aspect to that area of policy and she said well actually you're quite mistaken. So here was I kind of, you know, frothing at the mouth -- well maybe not foaming at the mouth but certainly a very ardent feminist having to acknowledge that I had totally missed the gender implications of a certain area of policy making. And what is important to understand is that people -- to be -- when we talk about shared societies

we're not just talking about minorities or marginalized groups, a majority can be marginalized for certain policy purposes.

The Club of Madrid has done a lot of work with women for -- in peace and security and we have a particular project in Horn of Africa. And one of our participants -- I remember the first mission in 2009 a woman from Uganda said, you know, I'm talking to our foreign minister and he said but what do women have to do with peace and security? And she said and then I explained it him and he went, "Oh". And I think what we need are a lot of "oh" moments where we come to understand that what we think we're doing isn't having -- is having a differential effect on certain groups and how we can identify those groups, what are the tools we can use to make sure that we are not having bad outcomes because our policy is not well designed. And so the term shared societies has perhaps a kind of a new age sound to it in a way, you know, sharing and caring and it's a little bit Sesame Street, but it -- but the reason for it is because it's a two way street, it's this notion of giving people not just the opportunity to participate but a sense of dignity that we share a society, we share responsibilities, we share the need to try and understand how we're doing things. But the ultimate result is meant to be efficacy and effectiveness, it's meant to be policies that actually work, policies that don't waste money.

You know all of us, I mean the United States, Canada, countries that are very involved in international development, you know, our voters, and our citizens want to know that money is well spent. But even in our own societies we don't want to waste money. I think of the, you know, the challenges that, you know, American governments have faced in, you know, reforming of welfare law, etcetera. You know people want to hold governments to account. But one of the best ways of doing this is not too simply to identify the disproportional impact but also to engage in conversations with people to find

out how you can make things work. One of the things that were a light motif of my own operation in government was to get out and consult with people who were not the usual suspects, people who were affected by policy and to find out what might really work for them. You know there's nothing radical or subversive about the notion that the reality of the way people lives should be one of the premises on which you make public policy.

And so what we're really talking about is creating a mindset. And when we're looking at the millennium development goals they were really wonderful and I don't think anybody would say that they haven't had an impact but how could they have been better, how could we make them worse, what's the next step from 2015 on to try and create a reality, to try and have the desired outcomes not bad outcomes from the policy in which we're devoting a whole lot of time to development. So I think of shared societies as techniques, and disaggregating data is one of them. And sometimes we got -- we're surprised by the results. We go, oh, we didn't think that was happening. But it's a mindset, it's a way of saying if we really want things to work we have to understand that life in societies are very complex and that sometimes people are left out either politically or socially or economically. And that sometimes majorities can be marginalized for certain purposes, sometimes can people can be marginalized geographically, there are all sorts of different ways. But if we ask those questions and don't feel that we have to *a priori* know the answers, to actually see them as questions that need to be pursued we'll do a lot better job of all of our investment on economic development, of empowering people and getting the results. So it's a way of thinking not just a series of techniques.

MR. KHARAS: Thank you. So, you know, Mr. Uteem, I mean a way of thinking, sharing, it's all very well in very rich countries. They've got plenty of resources to share. Your country, Mauritius, is, you know, got some of the best social indicators, you know, across the world and I think it's been from a very sharp focus on just trying to,

you know, trying to make sure that you've got growth and development. So is there at all attention between growth and development and the poverty alleviation agenda versus the shared societies perspective or do you see these as being very much the same thing in practice in your country?

PRESIDENT UTEEM: Thank you very much for the nice words that you've been saying about my country, about Mauritius. But we shouldn't go with the delusion that everything is rosey in my country. Of course we've made a lot of progress and unfortunately I wouldn't in three or five minutes give you an exact indication of how we went about reaching or achieving what we've been able to achieve because it has to go back to history. Our country is a relatively new country but we had an advantage. Our country was a desert island 400 years ago. There were no inhabitants (inaudible). We are all migrants. All of our ancestors came either from Europe, from Africa or from Asia -- from Europe, France, England, from Africa, Mozambique, Guinea, Senegal, Madagascar, from Asia, India, all the different states of India and China. So you can have an idea of how not only heterogeneous is the emerging society but how complex such a society can be. And yet as you say we have achieved what we have achieved. There's a long way to go to reach the standards of people living in the West but we can -- we've -- a certain measure of satisfaction say that we've been able to reach where we have reached thanks in the particular to the vision of the our leaders who led the country to independence in 1968, thanks to the shared society vision as if we had the shared society vision before the shared society existed as a concept in our Club de Madrid.

We realized -- our leaders realized at the time of our independence in 1968 that we had a divided country. Half of the population voted in favor of and half of the population -- almost half voted against the independence of Mauritius. You wouldn't believe it that nearly 50 percent of the population of a country voting against the

independence of it against the independence of their own countries. Unbelievable but incredible. But this was a fact. So the leaders of the day in particular the Prime Minister of the day, the first Prime Minister of Mauritius, Sir Seewoosagur Ramgoolam, he had the wisdom of immediately after election asking the opposition to join government. Why don't you join in and we'll work together for the progress of Mauritius. There were a lot of problems in between of course. Partisans on one side who had just been fighting a hard and tough battle on the ground refused. Most of the grass root workers refused. But the wisdom of the leader prevailed and there was a coalition government formed. And this brought slowly unity among the people. Not hundred percent unity of course but unity in a large measure, consensus was reached and gradually it was this government, this first coalition government that set the scene for the development of Mauritius.

A second area in the political field itself which broadened this shared society in Mauritius was that the constitution made room for proper representation of all the different communities in parliament. A system was devised; an electoral system was devised whereby all the different communities at the end of an election would find themselves represented in parliament through what is known as The Best Loser System. It was not 100 percent representative I mean of all communities in Mauritius, not an exact quota system based on the strength of each community but it ensured an adequate representative of all -- an adequate representation of all the different communities on the island, so it brings in -- slowly brings in unity.

And a third area is the area of education. Education in Mauritius is free. From primary through university through secondary, education is free. But what do we teach in our schools? I take the example of the languages. I have told you how complex is our society. People come in from different regions of the world with their culture, with their religion, with their ethnic groups, with their language and each one wants his

language to prevail, each one wants his children to learn the language of -- their ancestral language. So our education system provides for not only the compulsory teaching and learning of English and French, these are the two compulsory basic languages, but also the teaching of 13 other languages starting from the primary schools. Not that all children of course would have to learn the 13 languages but a child of Chinese origin for example would be able to learn Mandarin if he wanted to, if his parents wanted to in the school. So teachers were provided to see that all the different provincial languages from India, all Europe, and all China would be taught to our children. In that way the languages of all the different communities are respected. This is another way of going about bringing unity and ensuring ultimately the progress of the country.

We are a secular state and we believe that secularism for a country like Mauritius would be the best answer to bring unity and also to bring about development. But we are a secular state with a difference. Religion plays a very important role in Mauritius. All the different communities are very religious. I'm not saying spiritually, very religious, a number of churches, a number of temples, a number of mosques. People go to churches and churches are not closed as they are in other places. Churches are very well attended not only on Sundays. So what type of secular state do we have? We have a secular state where the state provides subsidy to all religious groups. In the past, in the colonial days under British colonization the Church of England church was being -- the Church of England religion was being funded by the state. So we couldn't stop. The leaders of the day didn't feel that we should stop this subsidy, this funding of the Anglican Church. So the answer to that was let us given to all the different religions an annual subsidy based on the per capita. You have 300,000 Catholics; this is what the state will contribute at the end of the -- for a year. You have 700,000 people; this is how much you would. In so doing the state while remaining a secular state is helping the different

religions because we believe that moral values play an important part in our society. So this is how effective -- there's a long list that we can go through. This is how we have been able to put into practice the concept of shared society that has ensured we believe partly the progress that --

MR. KHARAS: So coalitions, subsidies and programs that really extend across everybody without discriminating --

PRESIDENT UTEEM: That's correct.

MR. KHARAS: -- across them. Mr. Levy, Latin America. Latin America probably is, you know, the region with the highest levels of inequality in the world, some of the biggest issues with, you know, different groups. They've done very well by some measures on reducing poverty, much less well in really achieving sustained growth or in dealing with these issues of shared societies or inclusive growth. And in many ways your book was really about highlighting some of those tensions. How do you resolve that?

MR. LEVY: So thank you, Homi. And, yes, sadly Latin America stands out as being the most unequal region in the world. Actually 14 of the most 15 unequal countries in the world are in Latin America so not something to be proud of. The region has made quite a bit of progress in reducing extreme poverty in terms of ensuring that the poorest 10 or 15 or 20 percent of the population in each of these countries now has much better indicators of consumption and access to help. But the region has a long way to go in terms of reducing inequality and an even much longer way to go in constructing shared societies.

There's a big difference between lowering your (inaudible) of extreme poverty and having shared societies in terms of real inclusion in terms of people. And what I've been trying to highlight in my book is that the structure in which social programs are currently carried out in Latin America is not conducive to a shared society if you think

about a shared society in terms of including everybody with the same of standards of rights and obligations particularly vis-à-vis the labor market. What is true about the region is that depending on which country you look at, 50 percent, 60 percent, 80 percent of the labor force finds itself in informal jobs. And only 30-40 percent of the population is the workers have access to health and pensions through a formal job. The structure of programs that is currently being put together to solve this problem is not conducive to inclusive growth and is actually having perverse incentives and perverse results because it is actually making the informal sector bigger and is giving prices for being an informal sector to the extent that formal people have to pay for a set of benefits and informal people are getting benefits for free. Very different from Canada where you have universal health insurance, very different from European countries. So the details of the program, the structure of taxation and the structure of program design are central to achieving shared prosperity. This is a very important point. People applaud after any social program and they think that any social program is to the good. The point that I'm trying to make is that not any program will be to the good and that you have to think carefully about the incentives and the message that you give in terms of rights and obligations. And the region, Latin America, although has made great progress in the last decade in reducing extreme poverty is not really having the architecture of social programs that will include -- that will lead to a more shared society and a more inclusive society.

And what's important is to raise consciousness that the potential of individuals is being wasted, their contribution to society is being wasted, what they could be as productive individuals is not being achieved, and that in fact everybody is losing in a context in which we're trying to reach more inclusion through the wrong sort of programs and institutions. So big challenge ahead even though some progress made so

far.

MR. KHARAS: Thank you. So, Mr. Podesta, let's bring this back to the Post-2015 Agenda. The panel report that you produced came up with this principle, "leave no one behind." Do you want to say a few words about first how did the panel come to that conclusion and what do you think will actually change on the ground if people decided to adopt that principle?

MR. PODESTA: Yeah. It -- I'll come at this and I'm coming at it from perhaps the -- I meet Mr. Levy in the center by coming at it from the other perspective. First of all, thank you, Homi. Homi was the Secretariat of the High Level Panel as I think all of you know and did a brilliant job of herding a lot of very diverse cats into a consensus position. And I think with our three co-chairs -- let me start there -- I think we began with trying to decide what the mission of this panel having been charged by the Secretary General to consider how we move forward in the Post-2015 environment. I remember in the first meeting the Secretary General said we have to keep our head in the clouds but our feet on the ground. And our Chairs pushed us to adopt a mission and I think at the -- from the very first meetings that we had we I think saw and came together as a group, again quite a diverse group, of -- that ending extreme poverty was both aspirational, that it could grab the mind space, the attention and the commitment globally but it was also operational that we -- excuse me, I'm Italian-American, I'm trying to use -- I can't speak even without my hands so I apologize for the bandage (Laughter) -- but it -- when I say it was operational I think we tried to take the lessons from the MDGs that Wim Kok discussed and we came up with -- and I'll just read two sentences from our mission that we adopted early which was, "Our vision and our responsibility is to end extreme poverty in all its forms in the context of sustainable development and to have in place the building blocks of sustained prosperity for all, the gains in poverty eradication should be

irreversible." So if you start from that perspective, that that was a challenge to the world that we could actually achieve and make operational, then I think you have to quickly move to the idea that you could leave no one behind, that you had to reach a perspective that was -- that reached into marginalized societies if your goal was to end extreme poverty. And we had to get that right this time around. We saw the gains that had occurred in -- as a result I think of the MDGs and the concentration and bringing together of governments, international institutions and global philanthropy around a simple set of goals and the fact that they could move both analysis, move money, move commitment towards achieving goals but that in order to get the whole way to really end extreme poverty we had to begin with that frame of leaving no one behind.

So what did that mean in practice? I think that when -- I think it guided our analysis and guided the, you know, particularly the illustrative goals and indicators that are included in the report. So in practice it means would a woman be able to inherit property or open a bank account. It meant that wherever you were born in the world that you had a right to legal identity, registration at birth. It means that the -- I think -- and Kim Campbell already mentioned this -- that you could not only track global growth trends and averages about lifting people out of poverty you really had to look at the lowest quintile population. And that's why I think the call in the report for a data revolution and specifically looking at indicators and trying to break them out and say which ones needed to be disaggregated, which were the most important to understand whether societies were reaching their most marginalized citizens was really quite central I think to the path forward for the Global Development agenda.

And I think more broadly and I speak for myself in this context, I think it meant that in order to reach people at the margins, particularly the most extreme poor it meant that you had to better connect the poor to the economic, the social and the political

lives of their countries and that you couldn't just rely on strong growth models, strong GDP growth --

MR. KHARAS: Right.

MR. PODESTA: -- in societies in order to achieve that measure. We've seen substantial poverty alleviation that has come from strong growth but in order to be sustainable and shared growth, inclusive growth you had to be conscious of the fact that had to reach the most marginalized people in society. So that this concept of inclusive growth has to be connected and people, the poorest people in the world have to be connected to ladders of opportunity. That means connection to the financial system, connection to the education system, connection to the healthcare systems of their countries. So I think in the end of the day whether we got it exactly right that will be left to the future. I'm sure we didn't and there's much to add to it but I think the analytic context was that strong sustainable growth could only come if you connected everyone to a shared prosperity model. And so let me close by saying that I think -- I very much welcome the report by the Club of Madrid. I think it adds texture and context to the work that we did on the Panel.

MR. KHARAS: Okay. Thanks. So I mean we've talked now very much about how this operates within a country but in the Club of Madrid report there's also a sense that this concept is actually more applicable globally as well and that we should think about it in terms of our international relations and things like that. And in that context -- and, Mr. Uteem, maybe I can call on you here, you know, the African Union was developing a Post-2015 position and that's very much about economic transformation. And so I wonder whether you can say something about to what extent is this agenda of economic transformation which seems to be at the heart of how the African countries see the Post-2015 Agenda really relates to a slightly different concept

which is shared societies.

PRESIDENT UTEEM: I'm going to start by saying that probably we shouldn't pose the problem in terms of dichotomy between, you know, economy transformation and inclusive growth. This is what Club de Madrid stand for, inclusive growth. And this is -- there is no dichotomy between this and the economy transformation that Africa -- African Union for instance -- the position of the African Union for instance is taking. The African common position on economic transformation and inclusive growth brings the two ideas together. If we approach them in the right way I think economic transformation is the means to inclusive growth and inclusive growth is the requirement for economic transformation. It is not that we do different things but we do things differently, bearing in mind how policy in one field has an impact on policy in another field. And so adjust policies to avoid those unintended consequences.

In the shared society's project and generally in the Club de Madrid we talk about a virtuous or benign circle which happens when we work in this holistic manner. In the shared societies project we will set down 10 areas of policy which states need to commit to. We call them the 10 commitments, not commandments (laughter), the 10 commitments. What are those 10 commitments? I have noted it down and I read them to you. First commitment, locate responsibility for social cohesion within government structures. Number two; create opportunities for minorities to be consulted. Number three, monitor structures and policies to ensure they are supportive of social cohesion. Number four; ensure the legal framework protects the rights of the individual. Five, deal with economic disadvantage and discrimination. Six, ensure the physical environment creates opportunities for social interaction. Seven, create an education system that demonstrates a commitment to a shared society. Eight, encourage the creation of a shared vision for society. Nine promote respect, understanding and

appreciation of diversity. Ten reduce tension and hostility between communities. If these commitments are taken by the states and respected we believe that we'll be able to create everywhere in the world shared societies. And shared societies we contend are the best way of going -- one of the best ways of going about to reduce the problem of extreme poverty in the world.

MR. KHARAS: But, Ms. Campbell, you know, here are 10 commitments, these are not the same as 10 or however many sustainable development goals that you expect the world to adopt, right? So how do you link these with the Post-2015 Agenda and what's been the response? You've been going around the world talking to world leaders about these commitments, how do you think its going?

PRIME MINISTER CAMPBELL: Well, if we think of the millennium development goals as the "what" the 10 commitments are almost the "how".

MR. KHARAS: Mm-hmm.

PRIME MINISTER CAMPBELL: Because it says it matters how you do things. And, you know, it's interesting, this is such a big subject but just a couple of things. I went -- I said before it was a mindset but, you know, John Podesta talked about being an Italian-American and why he needs to waive his hands around, if you go to the museum at Ellis Island there are wonderful posters, posters about American immigration in the late nineteenth century and posters talk about to beware the (inaudible) -- I forget -- it's a word that means inferior or whatever -- South European type. (Laughter) You know, this is -- the South European type is the pillar of American society but we can go back and we look at Canada and the United States which are very inclusive societies in many ways, they weren't always like that. And we had terrible prejudice and people came and they, you know, they didn't look and they didn't sound like the people who were already there. And how did they make their way up to become the Podestas and the

Panettas and all of the people from Southern Europe and Eastern Europe and all of the places that people thought of as being inferior? How did they make their way up? Well, they do this through commitments of government, structures of law. You create structures of law, you create protection and then people have to fight to use them. In Canada we just -- we actually were late to a constitutionally entrenched bill of rights which came in 1983. We had civil rights before that but that actually created a whole new flourishing of challenges to the legal frameworks that enabled people to participate fully and our aboriginal rights were constitutionalized. And what I'm saying is it's a way of thinking and a way of creating the basis on which commitments by governments that give people the tools to use. Because there was some very interesting research published recently in the United States -- and I can't remember the actual title -- but that showed that rich people actually think they're superior. Now that's very dangerous. It's this kind of rarifying way. I mean here we are, we're rich, and we're better than other people. And yet what we know is that throughout the world when people who have been marginalized, whether it's women not allowed to participate in the economy, whether it's certain ethnic groups, whether it's people of certain religions or people of certain disabilities, when they are given a chance, when they are given the opportunity to share in the opportunities of society it's a revelation to us, they turn out to be really smart and really productive and to really be very, very important. And when we look at the contributions -- I mean Canada and the United States are so lucky that we have had these waves of immigrants who come in and energize our society with their dedication and their skills and their different ways of looking. You know when you have a society like Mauritius which in many ways -- I mean it's a wonderful opportunity to be an entrepreneur because you've got this incredibly multilingual population. In Canada we have two official languages but we also encourage people to keep their heritage languages.

So you start out with these government commitments, the legislative frameworks, the policy. It doesn't happen overnight. Canadians are not different people from people anywhere else; we have all the same flaws. But you create the structures that enable people to use those levers to get a leg up and to have a part. And we are living examples of the fact that notwithstanding the prejudice, the, you know, the ability of people to -- the condescension that people have, that everybody -- that intelligence is no respecter of class or race or background. And what we see in many parts of the world is that we sort of think oh, these people, you know, they've never been democratic or they've always been poor or they'll never get there and yet really what they are is a great body of unrealized potential. And so for the millennium development goals we need to take the next step and say we've defined these wonderful goals, how do we help countries actually get there and have we been missing the point in terms of the how and I think that's what shared societies is all about.

MR. KHARAS: But migration as being one of the toughest issues to make any progress on globally and, you know, Mr. Levy, I mean migration is a huge issue in Latin America and do you see any prospect that in this Post-2015 Agenda we're really going to get, you know, a strong commitment to more open migration and not just of the, you know, of highly skilled workers but all the way for everybody?

MR. LEVY: I'd be rather agnostic about that. (Laughter) My sense is that an inheritance of the 2008-2009 crisis both in the United States and Europe are such weak labor markets that governments are going to be quite reticent for quite a few years to be much more generous in terms of migration. I don't think that we can big bets on that and I think for most of the inclusive agenda that Latin American has to be done you really realistically has to be thought of as by the governments of those countries and both the societies of those countries and no longer rely on help from abroad or trying to have

their problems solved by migration to other countries.

MR. KHARAS: So what about domestic migration, because that's another part of migration and, you know, there are also issues in Latin America about domestic migration how that's done and discrimination.

MR. LEVY: But those issues are more associated with specific ethnic groups or Afro American descendents or, you know American descendents that are still very much marginalized along the lines of what Prime Minister Kok was saying at the beginning. And even though there's been great progress in reducing extreme poverty if you disaggregate the data a little bit more and you look at sub-sect of people it's not been this homogeneous reduction and yes, there is some room for that. But that again would be an internal agenda to the countries as opposed to thinking of it as a global issue. Not that we wouldn't want to.

MR. KHARAS: Right.

MR. LEVY: But we're just think -- it's not in the cards for the next decade.

MR. KHARAS: So, Mr. Podesta, let me just come back to you and put this in the context of there are lots of countries around the world where groups are not particularly sharing and, you know, interacting harmoniously with each other. I mean we have conflict in so many different places. We've got this notion that somehow a peace dividend through some kind of a shared society vision would help with peace but do we have actually good examples of how that kind of, you know, sharing can actually help in situations of conflict or is this just a hope that we still have?

MR. PODESTA: Well, I -- you know, it seems to me that if you think about peace being -- you know, it's a difficult issue particularly in the U.N. context and Post-2015 context. We I think experience it on the panel. It's not a -- it is clear I guess

that conflict can drive poverty. If you look at the changing face of where --

MR. KHARAS: Mm-hmm.

MR. PODESTA: -- really poor people live it's quite different just in one generation.

MR. KHARAS: Mm-hmm.

MR. PODESTA: When a generation ago 80 percent of extremely poor people lived in low income stable countries, now 50 percent live in middle income countries but 40 percent live in conflict infected countries. So again if our aim is to kind of reach all and try to end extreme poverty I think tackling this question of conflict and post conflict is important. I don't know that the development agenda is likely to have a major impact on conflict mediation if you will. I mean I -- if you think of Syria or South Sudan or --

MR. KHARAS: Right.

MR. PODESTA: -- Central African Republic and you're -- it's unlikely that the application of development set of goals or strategies is going to effectuate much in the way of conflict resolution. On the other hand I think we have to pay much more attention to kind of post conflict situations and think about how we do a better job of creating the mechanisms of development and the mechanisms of social inclusion that will produce more stability going forward. And, you know, kind of in that context I think the work of the G7+ is important, trying to build -- our report focused on institution building.

MR. KHARAS: Mm-hmm.

MR. PODESTA: More transparency, building access to justice and I think that those are mechanisms that produce more inclusive societies and more shared prosperity but I think they also deal with direction in post conflict states. And I'll say one last thing which is I think one of the things that's been quite vexing in recent years and in

post conflict context is getting -- it goes back to the question you asked about is economic transformation and inclusive growth, are those two different kind of conceptualizations. But if you're thinking about the means of economic transformation including private sector investment and building the capacity of people to have livelihoods then I think we have to do a better job of thinking about how we're going to manage investment into -- particularly into post conflict states which has been I think a very difficult situation in context and how international financial institutions and private sector donors in particular think about how we get more private sector flows going into post conflict situations can I think be effective in making the turn so that those states don't end up in permanent cycles of violence.

MR. KHARAS: Mm-hmm.

MR. PODESTA: And, you know, I think there are some good examples of that. We've seen that perhaps in Liberia, in Timor, in East Timor, in Columbia for -- I would argue. I don't know if Mr. Levy agrees with me about that.

MR. KHARAS: So you brought up international financial institutions and there's, you know, we have this whole set of institutions in some sense that governs the world. Mr. Kok, I mean it seems as if multilateral governance isn't really going anywhere. I mean trade talks are stalled and climate talks are stalled and, you know, there's not all that much increases in aid any longer, they're flat, even maybe declining in some fragile states. I mean do you really have hope that actually we're moving to a world which adopts this idea of shared societies as a global concept as well as within each individual country?

PRIME MINISTER KOK: Yeah. That's a very broad question. I think at the moment we have the paradoxical situation that in a world that is more interdependent than ever before we turn various parts of the world into individual countries, even the

largest ones and the biggest ones turn into the direction of being more inward looking than we would like to see it. And while the current situation illustrates that we are all still far from an ideal type of multilateralism you are referring to but I think there are signs of hope. Listening to what you said in this report, leaving no one behind, you're saying -- can say -- you can be cynical and say well, these are just words. I'm not cynical, I'm not cynical, and I don't want to be cynical. So leave no one behind means that we have the challenge to translate that mission into instruments also being part of new development goals where you can measure and monitor how developments are. And if hope is -- well, listen to the state of the union. Inequality is a major concern for the United States. Inequality is a major concern also for other states in the world. And this is of course not very promising but the promise is they will find this (inaudible) we have to find way and means in order to tackle the problem. Look at China, the Chinese government, the Chinese authorities are deeply concerned about the lack of social cohesion, about the growing social problems. So there is a growing awareness all over the globe that growth of course is very important but growth is not the only thing that comes. Just GDP doesn't tell us that much. Quality of growth, here we come to the environmental challenge of course but also the way -- the question about who profits, who takes the advantage, who takes the benefits of economic growth, social mobility. So there are strong reasons for think tanks but also politicians and other organizations in various countries all over the world to think in depth about this challenge.

And I notice -- I may be too optimistic now, but I notice that the international financial institutions, International Monetary Fund, World Bank, there are also a growing awareness. So I think we are still living in a time where we sometimes say that we -- the crisis is over. Well, I hesitate if the crisis is really over because we are still in the aftermath and a lot of stuff can happen. So you see the immediate turmoil in

developing markets as soon as tapering (inaudible) starts. We in Europe are by far not yet out the woods. I mean the most serious situation around the Euro Zone is behind us but we are still not yet out of the woods. Reforms are absolutely necessary in a number of countries. So it's volatile and in this climate of volatility don't expect all of a sudden a new wave of enthusiasm. But I think there's a growing concern, a growing awareness that not only at the local, at the domestic, at the regional level but also at the global level some kind of a shared society thinking is needed before we start to understand better that in the end we will all benefit from positive developments in terms of shared societies also in developing countries elsewhere in the world.

MR. KHARAS: Okay. So, thank you very much. Let me start to open it up to the floor for questions. You'll see that this notion of shared societies it, you know, it touches on so many different issues and we've talked about global governance, about conflict, education, migration, mindsets and culture, just lots of things. So the floor is open. Please introduce yourself. A microphone will come round and if you have a question for a specific panel member please indicate who.

Yes. So we have a lady here, a gentleman and then the gentleman there.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Good morning. Thank you all for your comments. My name is Wendy and I'm with the American Red Cross. And we're one of 189 Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies throughout the world and we know that natural disasters, shocks, everyday stresses, something we share as a society is our vulnerability to those. And unfortunately the most poor and marginalized people get trapped in a cycle of poverty. Now we hear this word resilience a lot, is that same as a shared society to you? Thank you.

MR. KHARAS: Thank you.

MR. ATWOOD: Brian Atwood, Brookings Non Resident Fellow and University of Minnesota. I want to first thank the Club of Madrid for the statement. It's made -- this is not the first time the Club of Madrid has come forward on development issues. Your support for the effectiveness agenda that was taken up in Busan, Korea was very important as well. I want to ask perhaps John Podesta and only from the High Level Panel it seems to me that in the debate, especially in New York with respect to the G77 that the poorest countries of the world they're most concerned about MDG 8 not being implemented, basically policy coherence for development. This means -- and maybe the political leaders here could also get into this as well and it may relate to the answer that Mr. Levy gave on migration, especially when you're having economic problems making concessions on issues related to finance and trade are much more difficult but they may be the answers at least if you can end the contradictions between what you're trying to do with official development assistance and what you're trying to do with policy related to trade and the like. How did you address on the High Level Panel and how can we address those issues politically nowadays?

MR. KHARAS: Here. There's one --

MR. MELKERT: My name is Ad Melkert. I had the honor to serve under Prime Minister Kok as Minister of Social Affairs and Employment in the Netherlands. I want to talk about labor markets. Santiago Levy has referred to it. The single unique feature of the MDGs is really the monitoring, having indicators that show whether you're on the right track or not. In 2000 there's been a big fight about having employment as one of the key indicators and the fight was lost for all kind of reasons including coherence and the interaction with the international financial institutions. Now that fight is on the agenda again and following the ideas that are related to shared society and not only looking at the marginalized but also at the problems of the aspiring middle class that

came up but fell down in the years of crisis, on the labor market indicators shouldn't the labor market indicators not be the innovation really in the next stage of the MDGs for the employment, social security, pension, but then also the share of labors in the formal economy? Because that is of course the issue that is often hidden behind all the figures that people are simply not counted for. So my question would be whether that would be supported and whether the Club of Madrid would not take the lead in that. I'd be very happy to see that.

MR. KHARAS: Okay. Why don't we quickly deal with those? Santiago, do you want to take up this issue of labor markets?

MR. SANTIAGO. Well, perhaps I can take the third question. So that's music to my ears. I certainly think that again from Latin America's perspective, I can't speak for other regions of the world that I don't know well but I think about Latin America and I think about the development challenges ahead not the that issue of extreme poverty has been fully solved but we're way on our way to solving it and we sort of understand what needs to be done. The greatest challenge is access to a good job, access to a formal job, access to a job that has associated with it insurance in terms of health, pensions, disability that will protect you against shocks and the middle classes from going up and down and certainly having indicators of insertion in the labor market to share the population that is the formal labor market. Who has access to jobs, men, women, the young, the old, by race and all that? It would certainly be in my view key, probably the *sine qua none* of the indicators that we would like to follow to ensure that we can construct the shared prosperity on a productive basis. And so I couldn't agree more with your proposal.

MR. KHARAS: Thank you. Mr. Podesta, would you like to take up the issue of MDG 8?

MR. PODESTA: You know, I'd like to take the first and the second question and link them to some extent. The term climate change hasn't come up in our discussion all morning and I think that's probably a mistake. I think that -- and the approach of the panel actually I think aimed at trying to build sustainability and finance. I think with respect to -- we came up with a goal of creating a global enabling environment and catalyzing long term finance to Brian's point. But what we largely did I think -- it may be a disappointing part of the report as I reflect on it is we dragged in a lot of other conversations, dragged in the 2°C limit, we dragged in a development friendly trade regime which is sort of, you know, more or less doctored in the global trade dialogues. I think we were focused on finance in a context in which there is -- in coming back to the first question -- in a context in which there's a tremendous need for finance to build resilient societies that will keep people from the shocks that are certain to come I would say, not likely to come, are certain to come from a changing global environment. And in the context of the global climate negotiations the -- at -- in Copenhagen there was an agreement to try to mobilize 100 billion dollars of year of climate finance. Well, how is that going to be done at a time when there are so many needs on the development agenda and will there be an ability of the global system to kind of make those two streams come together. In my view that's a very tricky part of what's going to -- of the negotiations that will go forward in the Post-2015 context. How do you mesh the challenges and the needs to build sustainability and resilience of -- from the shocks of global climate change at a time when you're trying to lift people up? And I think in some ways those things have to come together, I mean conceptually. We have to be able to bring together economic strategies and development strategies that are going to take account of both lifting people out of poverty, connecting them to sustainable economies but we have to do it I think in the context of being cognizant of both sides of that.

That is largely I think going to come from mobilization and private capital as opposed to being stuck in the -- I think where development assistance is going to be most needed is creating the mechanisms to draw private capital into building the infrastructure of more resilient societies which tackles both I think the climate challenge and the ability to provide a kind of a social floor for people who will be most -- who if -- caused the least amount of the problem of climate change but will be affected the most by it.

MR. KHARAS: Thank you. Let me just read out a couple of questions that have come via Twitter and let me just remind people hash tag shared societies if you're using that. How are people with disabilities and young people included in the vision for shared societies? Another question, how do we build accountability for the shared society vision? Any of the panel members like to take up those?

PRIME MINISTER CAMPBELL: I think again it goes back to this point I made at the beginning that very often we don't see who the marginalized excluded people are and we need to be open to the notion that there are people who are being left out that could make a contribution. Certainly in my own country the laws protecting people with disabilities that are actually entrenched in our constitution have been the foundation on which policy has opened up doors for people to make the contribution. I mean the City of Vancouver where I'm from had a mayor who was in fact a quadriplegic, Sam Sullivan. Now most -- you know for much of my life you would have looked at Sam Sullivan and said very nice and let's hope we can find a job for somebody that has a disability, but the notion of a leading a major city and getting out and fighting -- duking it out in the political arena would not have struck you. So I think what we need to do is as I say open up our minds that -- the same thing with young people. I just saw a comment the other day -- I forget what country it was that experimented but giving the votes to

people at 16 didn't appear to dramatically change their society or you're taking it to hell in a hand basket. You know maybe there are ways in which we need to empower younger people because they're not -- 16 year olds they are not the 16 year olds, even when I was 16 -- hate to say it but certainly the 16 year olds of my parents' generation. So these are the kinds of thing that if you have the attitude and they got a mindset of a shared society that -- and I would just also go back to point out that first question about resilience because it really does -- you know, I -- you know if you look at the United States and the response to natural disasters, you know, in New York Hurricane Sandy and -- or in Canada the flooding in Calgary with that -- countries that have capacity in their government, that have the capacity both in terms of local and regional governments, that have, you know, first responders and people who know how take decisions, where people are literate, where they can follow instructions, they can read. I mean there's a whole -- it's a whole different order of magnitude of the ability to respond.

And when we talk about climate change there's a kind of a trifecta of disadvantaged countries, of the ones that are mostly vulnerable to climate change, are the poorest and the ones who are the weakest or failing states. What the Club of Madrid is about is really about democracy and because we see it as the way of building capacity but it has to be done by the way of bringing in all of these resources that countries often overlook. And so I think it's all kind of seamless, but again if we're looking at how we move in the next step of alleviating poverty, etcetera, and I, you know, I think this idea leave no one behind is really another way of talking about a shared society. Don't assume that certain groups of people can't make a contribution, can't be part of the solution to our problems. Because if we don't include them we will always be kind of just halfway there in finding the answers. So young people, disabled people, people who are -- as I say and often majority of people whether it might be an ethnic group or women or

whatever are often marginalized for certain purposes in societies. You know societies that are run by elites, you know, they just assume that whole groups of people don't really have anything to offer and it's a tragedy for all of us even if it's not happening in our own country.

MR. KHARAS: Okay. Thank you. So let me come back to the floor; I'd seen plenty of more hands. Let's start right here, right in front.

MR. MICHAEL: Yes, thank you. Jim Michael, I am a consultant and a student I guess. It seems to me that this is a wonderful opportunity because we have panelists who are not only thinkers about development and the future of our societies and the benefits of inclusion and inclusive societies and at the same time people who have great political insights and who have been in positions of great responsibility for managing the tension between things that seem like obvious good policy and political contests in which people oppose those views. As Santiago Levy's reference to migration I think is an excellent example where there's a lot of evidence on the benefits of more open migration and at the same time a lot of political resistance to it and I wonder if the panelists with their political insights might have some thoughts about the political challenges and dealing with those political challenges to more advancing, more inclusive societies as a part of the development agenda for Post-2015. Thank you.

MR. KHARAS: Thank you. Right in front. This silver-haired gentleman.

MR. BRADFORD: Thank you very much. Colin Bradford from Brookings as well.

MR. KHARAS: Stand please.

MR. BRADFORD: Okay. It is very inspiring. Thanks to each of you for this morning. This has been -- I hope this will be broadly disseminated. The most discouraging moment however was Santiago Levy saying that well intended programs

don't come -- produce results because of what I understood to be what I would call the structural context in which they're being carried out? So the question that I'd like to ask for all of you is, you know, how would you be more specific about what those structural elements are which keep good programs and good policies from having real effect? The two that occur to me which you -- none of you have mentioned so far is the tax system and the financial system. But I leave it to you to identify what you think they are. Thank you.

MR. KHARAS: Thank you. And there was a lady right behind.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Hi. My name is Jennie; I'm a sophomore at American University. And my question is it seems like in any level whether it's domestic or regional or international we can't address these issues of minorities or the marginalized effectively without the engagement of external groups that don't particularly believe that they're part of the issue. So it was mentioned that dialogue was key to encourage groups to embrace their role in effecting shared society, so whether it's groups of -- polarized groups or even in the development field between groups that are overlooked and those implementing these development efforts I was wondering in this agenda of shared society is there a commitment in different ways of facilitating these interchanges?

MR. KHARAS: Thank you. Let me come back to the panel. I think this is going to be the last word. So, Mr. Kok, any of those questions, political challenges, structural constraints, how you communicate with groups?

MR. KOK: Yeah, let me focus on two of the questions. One is on political tensions. I think one striking example nowadays is how we deal with migration in Europe. You see there on one hand that part of the population, at least considerable part of the population tend to be suspicious or hostile against a free flow of migration even

within the European Union. I'm not yet talking about migration from outside European Union but inside European Union. And there a number of reasons for this. Of course the labor market situation nowadays, the not always unjustified fear that parts of the incomers from other East European economies, for example, not always good for security and safety because sometimes gangs of people organize a lot of inconvenience including criminality. But that's of course not the whole story. And on the other hand you see that on the somewhat longer round there's a growing need for migrating workers because the labor markets scarcities 10 years or 15 years from now will be huge. So that's one very good example of the tension where politicians on one hand have to take the concerns and the suspicion of their population into account of course. If they wouldn't they would not be trusted any longer. On the other hand people have to be forward looking and say -- especially politicians have to be forward looking and say well, how we are going to solve our medium longer term scarcity on the labor market problem without migration.

Second phenomenon I want to mention is -- this was about the structures, the structures that are necessary for the future. Let's say the ongoing discussion in not only European but especially European countries on the future of the welfare state. Well, we have been compared with other parts of the world relatively generous in terms of organizing a social safety net and all -- with all various elements. You know that. But reforming the social safety net, reforming the welfare schemes is extremely important also in order to take into account the necessity to restore a balance between entitlements on one hand and long responsibility on the other hand. That's also about shared society. Shared society is not just sharing in the benefits in this case of welfare society, but also sharing in the responsibilities where everyone has to make a contribution. And it's very important I think to approach this modernization, this ongoing

process of modernizing and reviewing the welfare society system and also not only from the point of view of austerity programs and we need to save money but also in terms of responsibilities. And I think this is again an issue where politicians should not only listen to what their electorate is telling them but also showing the report in order to explain to people that it's sometimes necessary to change a bit from a protective society into a participation society where everyone has to make contribution. And then society also has the responsibility of course of not only to ask people to contribute but also to be active in organizing opportunities for people to be active in.

MR. KHARAS: Thank you. Ms. Campbell, participation societies?

PRIME MINISTER CAMPBELL: You know, it's interesting. I think one of the big challenges today, there seems to be a consensus that leadership ain't what it used to be, that there is somehow a deficit of leadership. And I'm not sure whether it is the leadership that has changed or the followership, or the context in which people are trying to lead. I think of my own time in government to the issue that brought me into national politics in Canada was the Canada/U.S. Free Trade Agreement which was the subject of an enormously contentious election in 1988 in Canada. And there's a lot of conventional wisdom that, you know, we -- (inaudible) Canada would get, you know, totally overwhelmed by the United States although there's much of evidence that shows that the smaller country in such an arrangement benefits more. But in fact our party actually won the election so we implemented the agreement and most people now would say that that was a very good thing. We also brought in goods and services tax, a multi stage value added tax to replace a federal sales tax that was killing our exports and Canada is very dependent on exports. That was probably one of the issues that helped you defeat us in '93 but the tax is there still there because it was good policy. (Laughter)

As Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada I implemented a very

comprehensive gun control legislation and although we don't have anything like the Second Amendment in Canada it's a very divisive issue, probably more divisive in the criminal law area than abortion.

Now we were able to move ahead with these and now I would say that I tried to maximize the constituency for the good policy and issues that I was responsible for but also even in the free trade and the taxing. But in a parliamentary system if you have a majority government once you've tried to maximize the constituency for the policy you can usually move ahead with it. And what that means is that even though you may make a lot of people mad in the short term the policy has a chance to play itself out and people may even defeat you in the next election. But interestingly enough all of the policies -- the parties that were strongly against us in these policies took them up on their own and they have now become kind of conventional wisdom in Canada. They're no longer even seen as all that controversial, aggravating but not controversial in terms of the goods and services tax.

So how do leaders take the responsibility to make decisions sometimes that are unpopular? Now sometimes there are structural things that make it possible, like a parliamentary system when you have a majority government and I think the American system may be more difficult that way. But I also think that there are things out there -- the internet, which can be a wonderful source of information, it's also a source of some much stupidity and misinformation, you know, where you can have an opinion whether you've bothered to read anything or you know anything about it or not. And so it can -- I think also the instantaneous nature of the responses to things I also think makes the contact just more difficult for politicians. But I think one of the great skills -- I do believe that public service is a calling and when we celebrate the 50th anniversary or mark the 50th anniversary of the assassination of President Kennedy as a child of that generation,

of the '60s, I said that President Kennedy made people feel that public service was a noble calling. And I still feel that way but I think it's hard. And I think one of the challenges of politicians is they have to work with civil society; they have to work with partners to try and create the constituency for good policy. It won't always happen overnight and you have to be prepared to lose an election on it too and a lot of people are not. But I think democratic politics is hard. Democracy is a blunt instrument; it's not a precision tool. But Churchill was right, it's the worst form of government except for all the others and that's why we in the Club of Madrid are so committed to it. And so I think this challenge -- we all have to ask ourselves as leaders, or former leaders, or citizens, or people in think tanks or academia, how do we help to create the constituency for good policy, how do we help to answer the kind of knee jerk reactions and how do we help to try and understand that sometimes there will be for the best of intentions bad outcomes, but that that's in some ways unavoidable because we can't know everything, but how do we learn from why we had those bad outcomes to try and prevent them. And that why in a sense when we talk about the shared societies we're talking -- the millennium development goals was an extraordinary step forward as a global consensus. How can we make them better, how can we add --

PRIME MINISTER KOK: Yeah.

PRIME MINISTER CAMPBELL: -- forms of accountability and monitoring to them and dimensions of thinking that will make them better? It won't be perfect but leadership is hard today and I think we have to understand that maybe there aren't going to be Lyndon Johnsons who can twist an arm or Franklin Roosevelts who can mobilize people, maybe there will be. But we have to learn to take some of that responsibility on ourselves to create the constituency that enables the people who have the ultimate responsibility to pass the laws and legislation and policy that are the

foundation for these --- the -- building these better thing to enable them to do that. And that's the challenge that modern democracies face.

MR. KHARAS: Thank you. Mr. Uteem, just one minute.

PRESIDENT UTEEM: One minute? Well, perhaps I'll express my surprise I'm the only voice from the South here and I find it extraordinary how leaders from the -- from certain Northern countries resolve their contradiction. I'm taking the example of migration for instance. Migrants are welcome, are most welcome. This is a free movement of goods, free movements of services, free movements of people. But reach a certain time one situation goes bad, no migration, migration is not good, migration of people should stop. Migration of goods should continue, migration of people should stop, right. This is not understandable. You have -- I mean this is not critics against anybody in this room; this is only an observation that the Western world has to realize that if they want to get rid of people from the South then the South must be given the opportunity of developing. Development should go to the South. In the 1950s and much before everything that could be taken away from Africa, from Asia has been taken away, right. And now is the time not only to give back but to help those people that has been colonized for so long to stand up on their own feet, to develop their country. This will prevent you -- if you had -- if the Western world had gone by with their promise, that is the .07 or .7 percent of their GDP, a contribution to the third -- so-called third world today there wouldn't be so many migrants trying to come to the West, right. In Mauritius in the 1950s and 1960s shiploads of people were going to Belgium, to France, to England trying to sneak in. But today no one wants to come to these because the country itself has developed. Why should they leave the sun, why should they land in the sea (laughter) and the good life in Mauritius? So my point of view is that if you want to solve the migration problem, right, you help the third world countries, the developing countries

into becoming sustainable -- into going into sustainable development, creating jobs for the young people. There is no better way of solving poverty than to give a job. By giving a job you're giving dignity at the same time to a young man. This young man in our part of the world will help the family. And like in other places in the South we still fortunately look after our parents so that if a young man is given a job he's able to earn a living. It's not a living for himself; it's a living for the whole family. So creation of a shared society, helping the people from countries from the South would be one of the best options for a resolution of this migration problem.

MR. KHARAS: Thank you. And I'm sure many of us look forward to migrating to Mauritius. (Laughter) Certainly in our old age. Mr. Levy, last word.

MR. LEVY: So quick comment on Colin's questions about architecture. In many Latin American countries the children of formal workers and the children of informal workers can go to the same public schools.

MR. KHARAS: Mm-hmm.

MR. LEVY: But they cannot go to the same public health clinics. The reason is that all schools are funded from general revenues and therefore your labor status doesn't matter to what school you go to. But health services are not funded from general revenues; they're funded for formal workers from wage taxes. And therefore the same children can go to the same schools but not to the same clinics. Contrast that architecture of social structure programs with say Canada or with England where the National Health Service will imply that regardless of your status you can go to the same health clinics when you're from the public sector. What's behind this at the end of the day is that taxation issue that you mentioned. And that's where the chickens come home to roost.

PRIME MINISTER CAMPBELL: Mm-hmm.

MR. LEVY: We talk a lot about sharing but we don't talk about the taxation side and unless we make the tax reforms that are required to have public health services you're going to have this dichotomy which really is -- breaks at the heart of a shared society concept.

MR. KHARAS: Thank you. Mr. Podesta, you have the last word?

MR. PODESTA: Well, I think if you think about what -- we celebrate the success of the MDGs. There were places where it failed but if you think about the success what were the structural differences and I would posit that the places where they were specific, where the indicators were concrete and where you could measure had the biggest impact, but only in places where there as good governance, or at least reasonable governance. And so I think those -- you're asking what the structural constraints are, one is not knowing exactly where you want to go and then having the government that can deliver those results. And that's why I think it's so important -- we had a pretty inclusive process leading up to the development of the Post-2015 Agenda. I think U.N. has done a good job with that, not just with our [anel but more broadly in trying to be inclusive in getting input. But I think when you get to the country owned development agenda that also has to be an inclusive process. So again the people we've been talking about, the people left out and left behind, the marginalized, young people, etcetera, have to be part of the development of the indicators and targets themselves. Then you can measure them, then you could hold governance -- government accountable and then I think you can achieve real success.

MR. KHARAS: Thank you. Well, ladies and gentlemen, you know, this is just the start of what I think will be a whole series of conversations. We've still got two more years until we get to Post-2015 so I hope you'll join us there and please join me in thanking our wonderful panel for a really inspiring conversation. (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.

Carleton J. Anderson, III

(Signature and Seal on File)

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2016