

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

THE UN'S "ROAD TO DIGNITY" REPORT:
FULFILLING THE POST-2015 AGENDA AND
ENDING POVERTY BY 2030

Washington, D.C.

Tuesday, January 13, 2015

PARTICIPANTS:

Introduction:

JOHN McARTHUR
Senior Fellow
The Brookings Institution

Keynote Address:

AMINA J. MOHAMMED
Special Advisor of the Secretary-General on
Post-2015 Development Planning
United Nations

Discussants:

LINDSAY K. COATES
Acting President and Chief Executive Officer
InterAction

RACHEL KYTE
Vice President and Special Envoy, Climate Change Group
World Bank

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

* * * * *

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. MCARTHUR: Good morning, everyone; welcome to Brookings. My name is John McArthur; I'm a Senior Fellow here in the Global Economy Development Program, and delighted to welcome you all today to for us a very special event in which we can talk about a big global agenda and what might potentially be a famous or historic year for the world, at least in terms of sustainable development globally.

We have three major summits coming up this year. In December there is -- working backwards -- the major climate summit in Paris, that is the deadline for setting a new global climate accord, we have in September the summit Once Per Generation of world leaders to set sustainable development goals to follow on or succeed with a broader and more ambitious agenda the Millennium Development Goals, if those weren't ambitious enough, and before that we have in July a Financing for Development conference in Ethiopia where people will talk about how to pay for it. And crucially it's not just about public sector, but increasingly about the private sector and how these pieces can fit together. There's been an active collaboration led by the United Nations over the past few years now to make this what I would call the most inclusive global consultation in history for setting a global agenda. I should add that I wear a second hat in life as a Senior Fellow at the UN Foundation and we have the leadership here and we're delighted. And part of what I've been able to see in my own work, ranging from the academic to the policy outreach is an incredibly active, engaged, complex United Nations leadership trying to take the best ideas from around the world, from civil society, from business, from government at all levels, but also trying to distill it and to frame an agenda that is ambitious,

actionable, and real.

Now that has to be someone's job in the end and the person whose job it is our keynote speaker today, Ms. Amina Mohammed, who is the Secretary-General. Formerly her title is a Special Advisor Post-2015 Development Planning. Really what that means is she is the conductor of a very chaotic global trying-to-by symphony, trying to figure out to set the right notes for an integrated global agenda. I've had the pleasure to work with Amina for many years and she has an incredible personal story having worked in business, in the education sector in civil society, and in her home country of Nigeria in a pretty unprecedented manner as Ministerial rank as Special Assistant to the President responsible for the Millennium Development Goals, working for three consecutive presidents. And any of you who might know about Nigerian politics will appreciate just how tall an order that is in one of the most complicated political environments in the world, but also she became a global leader on the MDGs --I would say if I can share it -- after overcoming some skepticism on how might that work, what will that mean for us on the ground. And it was through her practical leadership, coordinating and bridging form the global discussions in UN Headquarters and capitals around the world, to truly the most remote and challenged villages around Nigeria that she came to be I would argue the world's thought leader in saying what does it mean to make global goals real in the places on the ground where people are trying to change their lives. And how do we take the public and private and community responsibilities seriously to bring this to a new agenda.

So with that I feel like the world is pretty lucky that we have someone of her caliber and compassion and commitment to help guide us on this

journey, but of course we have to figure out how we do our part too. So the Secretary General recently launched a major report on the Road to Dignity for All by 2030. As most of the world and this community know Amina was responsible for guiding the process on behalf of the Secretary General to generate that report. And so today we're very privileged hear that she's going to explain to us from her perspective what this all means and how we might think about a crucial year ahead.

We'll be followed by a terrific distinguished panel which I'll introduce in a moment, but this is a chance also for you to engage with her and with this panel, each of which is working on a very particular and ambitious piece of the agenda. We have Rachel Kyte from the World Bank, we have Lindsay Coates from InterAction, and our own Homi Kharas from Brookings who is also very involved with the High Level Panel on Post-2015 which many of you might know about.

So with that let me please welcome Amina Mohammed to share her views. Welcome, Amina. (Applause)

MS. MOHAMMED: Thank you, John, and thank you, Brookings and everyone for making it this morning that we could have some time to begin 2015 with a really robust discussion on what I call the last mile, the beginning of the end, but as we said, Homi, this morning that the end sort of gives us another beginning for 15 years. And happy New Year to everyone. For me I think it's still very much the orchestra thing that was supposed to be doing, it's still very much a cacophony at the moment, the tunes, the notes we're trying to tune them and we will get there in the end, but with 193 to business I say board members and to the rest of the world these are our member states that really have taken the lead

and started on this whole journey over two years ago in trying to define the next agenda and that's been really difficult. For the MDGs I have to say that for us it was really applying ourselves to a prescription that we had no idea who had made it up and it just landed at the country level. So in the beginning I was very much one of those who didn't like the MDGs, but at the end of the day they ended up for us being a baseline and something I believe when people say to us they failed so why embark upon another development agenda, they haven't failed. We may not have attained them and there is still unfinished business, but there were many successes and lessons learned that we've used in these last couple of years to try to reinforce some good foundation for the next agenda, but to lift the ceiling.

First, 2015, it's a great start to have it here. This is a wonderful audience. I've been looking through the names and thinking well this is where one needs to be to get the energy that we need to go forward and to really help member states reach what will be some very tense moments as they speak to the goal framework, as they speak to the financing, as we try to lift that momentum, that they land well in an agreement on climate change at the end of the year. But it's also an important moment for the UN because as it becomes 70 it's a reflection point, a reflection point in the world where things are very difficult. Two years ago -- we are in a worse place today in peace and security, with the human rights agenda, and I think that that's something we really need to take into hand as we discuss that the three pillars do mean something. And dumping everything on the sustainable development agenda isn't going to help us. We have right those three pillars and responsibilities from world leaders are never more urgent as it is now.

What drives me in this last mile, before I explain to you what's really taken us to this juncture, is one of two things. That the MDGs provided a frame and a tool for us to really engage with government to make the investments that we needed to and to really question what we were doing as a country for our people. And I think the sustainable development agenda gets much more into the bloodstream of countries, of partnerships, of a universal agenda that just doesn't look south and say we've got to do something down there because it's a bit of a nuisance, it's rather poor and there's a lot of conflict. Well, actually it's all over the place now. We can see that there are no borders and for that alone this universal agenda is incredibly important. Big reality check for me because every day since I've come here things in my country have not gotten better. We've had some successes and we can't deny those on the economic front, but by and large they've left people behind in a very insecure world. Forty years ago I was in a primary school where today the girls are kidnapped because that's a part of the country I come from. And more horrifically a couple of days ago the 10 year olds that we looked at taking off the streets that were selling ground nuts and being abused are the same girls that now somehow somebody is wrapping a bomb around and sending them into the public domain and all the atrocities that we see carried with that. So something is very wrong and I think that when we look at this agenda we need to see how is it really in terms of implementation beyond all the grammar, as we say in Nigeria, we put into this and the expertise and the knowledge and the evidence, how will it respond to what we need to look at which is the root cause of what is happening. It's the long way around, it's the hard road to getting a result in 2030, but if we don't do that it won't happen. So it's no more about tinkering with let's put a

Band-Aid on things; we really do have to dig deep and we really have to go beyond all the boundaries that we've seen before in trying to make this happen, and partnerships I think for us is going to be key to that.

And I thought coming to Washington I think it's pertinent to note that in last year's State of the Union President Obama focused on among other issues the country's environmental policies, creating jobs, and immigration reform. These issues as well as the ones that will figure in his new State of the Union address to be pronounced in a few days could figure in annual addresses of many other presidents because out in the world today we're facing universal challenges, inequalities, the financial crisis, unemployment, climate change, and they're not just specific to the United States or to developing countries, there are issues in all countries, developing, developed, north and south, and these are the things we're confronted with. And so when we look at finishing off the MDGs it really is worth reflecting on the MDGs as a universal agenda, the basic services that we speak to. I can take education for one because that's one that I've been passionate about since we first started and I know that education is taxed across the globe. Wherever we go have we got the right skill sets, is there the right quality, are we addressing the needs to put children, young people to work as we move forward, and maybe not. But it also means that we're reconciling a lot to do with the context in which we find ourselves. And it's no longer just a context of the south it's a global context. And so the universality of this agenda often one is asking what is it that we want to respond to from where and how do we -- is it just about tweaking the MDGs, are we really having a good reflection of it.

Since we embarked on this journey just over two years ago this has been the main discussion as to how do we move to the next agenda. If we

make it so big will it not be a sort of long list of let's just pick this and pick that and at the end of the day we do nothing? But I think that what we've got over two years is a very serious discussion that has shaped the outcomes of the open working group with the 17 goals, 169 targets, and we hope we will have the indicators. And I hope that we will not fixate anymore on the numbers. And I have to say that I was one of those that did so a few months ago when they came out because that's the old way of thinking of the challenge we have, whether in fact 17 goals is something that we can take to the country level and any one leadership would address in a serious way, or 169 targets that really don't do it for the goals. I think what we need to look at is the process that brought in all walks of life to shape this, and the substance of that agenda, what do the 17 goals contain and what are the targets saying. Can we actually deliver on those and find a financing framework to do that with, and the monitoring process that would hold us accountable for the promises that we're about to make in an agenda that isn't legally binding. And I think that's the challenge we have this year is that we do have to refine this. And the synthesis report was really the beginning of member states asking the Secretary-General to say well now we've come to a juncture where we have all these different strands, can you bring them together, knit them in a way that we can bridge into an intergovernmental negotiation. But only the United Nations understands by the way because the rest of the world is just wondering what on earth on they doing; this is so simple, why is it taking so long. And I think that in this case what we do have is not only that they have learned that this process has given them a qualitative output, that they've actually acknowledged that without this constituency and many others being involved all the way to the end we will not

maintain the ambition and the momentum that we need to respond to the agenda.

So the synthesis report in a sense is an ask by member states and so therefore the constituency that we wrote to in this synthesis report was basically member states, really trying to first of all I think appreciate the work that they have done. I started this job with no idea that it was going to be a member state process because I was brought on right at the beginning before Rio actually concluded. But through Rio, by the time we came out in June there was a member state process. So it was no longer something that I was going to sit down with a group of experts and prescribe with a little bit more interaction, it actually was a member state process. And I think to congratulate them that they managed to get where they got to and to take what was good out of that and really reflect on it through the report. We structured the report in a way in which we thought would help the negotiations, would help the interaction, the collaboration, and the negotiations with everyone, but in particular with member states. Member states not just in New York because this process so far has amongst member states by and large been in New York and we need to make that now bridge to the country level lest we have the same challenge of taking to countries something that they don't own even it was by their own persons. So the structure of the report started off by making a very strong statement as to why we're doing this and what we need to do to reflect on a response to what's happening in the world today. Really seeing that we need a universal agenda, it has to be an integrated approach, we do have to put up front and center that the eradication of poverty is still possible in our lifetime, but going about it in a very much different way and recognizing the context is no longer just one about where

we have deprivation, but inequalities have come on board, conflict is here, climate change is a reality. So many more things have come to visit us than we had in 2000, and certainly the scale at which we want to address this is so much bigger. And we've not done that before. More or less what we did in 2000 was address communities that really came out of laboratories and Petri dishes. I often describe Africa as a bunch of Petri dishes where everything is done as a pilot or best practice, but we've never managed to propagate it to scale where everyone is included. And so the big message of 2015 is we leave no one behind and mean that very sincerely. So the first part of it really we hope interprets itself into a declaration of what it is the United Nations intends to do, and remembering that the MDGs is unfinished business, and that the Millennium Declaration is still very valid today as it was then.

The second part of this has been about a framework in which we need to craft to respond to this. So you see the goals, you see the targets, and then what we do see in the synthesis report is trying to make sense out of this to communicate in essence what would move hearts and minds to make the investments that we need to generate the implementation on the ground to this huge agenda. And this is where the six elements for us made so much sense. And those who have experienced the MDGs will know that with the MDGs there was no one MDG you could face a president or a parliament with that they wouldn't say were important. None would say this doesn't matter, but if we look at some of the goals that we have and we see this as a pipeline of opportunity and investment there's still many that would argue over whether you need them in the package or not. So what could we bring that would help communicate this agenda at the country level and help the negotiations to get more clarity when

people say what do we use to advocate when we get down there, how do we hold government accountable, how do we make sure that business coming into partnership with government would not be an unholy alliance and that there are checks and balances to make sure that people and planet are at the center of the business model and not just corporate social responsibility to appease a few. How do we really do that? And I think that these six elements do speak to every leader, be it government, civil society, business, academia, when we talk about dignity and really facing the eradication of poverty, and looking at how we address the inequalities which in one form or another exist everywhere, how we really see the people agenda. And we really did put -- underscore people here -- why to finish off the MDGs, but more importantly there are millions of people who are not citizens, they're excluded because they are not citizens. And so we needed to talk about our humanity, we needed to talk about people's rights, and we needed to talk about people most of all.

We referred to the planet because there are so many ways of us looking at that and I think that climate change is one, our ecosystems are another. We can see it reflected in the goals, but if we don't pay attention to what we're doing in the environment in which we live in then there won't be very much left to do when we come to address the many challenges that we have. This is I think something that's not being spoken to in a way that is brought both the two together, two separate parallel processes if we address them in the United Nations, but a minister of finance, a minister of development handles these issues on a daily basis together and doesn't separate them in their mind. So the importance of bringing the planet into this discussion, our environment.

Looking at prosperity and a shared prosperity, one in which

societies and economies become much more inclusive and that your rights that we say we have we're actually thinking about them. So as our economies are growing we're not growing without people. We celebrate the growth of so many economies and we applaud Africa and we talk about the next frontiers for it, but it's leaving its people behind, especially its women, especially the young people. And so how do we have an economy that's inclusive that produces the jobs, the opportunities for innovation and entrepreneurship. How do we make sure that infrastructure is down so that we can actually go to scale, because we can't address delivery of health services or education if it is just that best practice or a few child friendly schools. We have to do it that this is what domestic resources does for everyone, the institutions actually deliver service and rights to everyone. So the prosperity side of it is important, but it has to be for everyone.

And that we address what is new; two new parts of this agenda in one way one was totally missed off, and the other one done in an ad hoc fashion. I think the fourth is about justice, and I think that that just is ingrained in everyone's want and life of dignity and is an incredibly important right when we look at how many injustices people face in a world full of conflict, where we have so many that are marginalized, rights are not adhered to. And institutions are so weak that even when we say this is a democratic dispensation it really isn't working. Those people in the parliaments are not representative of the people and they are not delivering on what we say is democracy. And by and large it's weak institutions for which there is not hook, there is no demand to actually put the money into those institutions to build them, but without them we will not have the scale that we need. And so to address peaceful societies, to address what we need to in terms of the rule of law and democracy. That's an important part of

the glue that allows all of this to hang together.

Last but not least are the partnerships. And without the partnerships it also doesn't hang together. This is a huge agenda and there will be different types of partnerships. There has to be the first partnership that the High Level Panel spoke to and Homi will know that he went through days and weeks and months of defining the partnership and the partnerships. I know that this was something that we discussed over and over again, but there has to be a global partnership with an intent and a will to get behind us and the universal agenda and to make this work. We have to put our money where our mouth is at the global level. But it is then also about the different types of partnerships that we will engage or that country level across countries, north-south, south-south, that we need to reinforce that we need to empower and engage with. And this is an important part of making this agenda work. It is not just the business it is about civil society, it is about parliamentarians, it is about the academic community. We won't get very far without that. And one of the things that we spoke to in terms of the partnerships is what was some of the tools that we needed for that. So the second part I've dwelled on because it's so important that it does help respond to this big agenda that we've asked for. We'll speak, and we've got Homi and many others here -- and I'm looking at the clock at the back, John.

The third part of this, the means of implementation. We don't just talk about the finance of this, but we do speak to technologies and again the capacity to carry this agenda. What do we need in our different environments to make sure that finance can work, that technology can be deployed and used. And I think on the finance agenda we've gone beyond the discussion of ODA, but

we have to remember that it is incredibly important, it is the first step to the conversation on the rest of the finance agenda. If we don't have that then we miss what is an incredibly important commitment to LDCs, to leveraging, to targeting better, to making better use of our resources. And again the whole issue of how you bring different sources of finance together to make a good whole, a robust whole. But it's insufficient and that then takes us to different types of financing that's available and we have had that discussion and will continue to have it, but domestic resource mobilization is a big part of this. That's really the sustainability, that pays salaries, that really makes sure that systems work, that when we say procurement for goods and services that that's something that has to happen on a weekly, monthly, annual basis. And without us really looking at how we can strengthen domestic resource mobilization through tax reforms, through better capacities to do this, to addressing governance and corruption, we won't make it. But it is a part of the agenda that is least attractive even though people acknowledge it's a big part of it, least attractive in an agenda that's moving from the old north-south to one that's universal and that we're thinking about all the resources we can mobilize. We have to think about innovative financing and what we can do with the private sector, how we can look at private equity that looks at longer term investments in very complicated environments. So how do we find the instruments to help people do that in business, scale up, invest more. I'm on that believes very strongly that the partnership really needs to be about global and locals as we talk to multinationals. Those local companies and young people in our countries who are managing in very difficult circumstances are not asking for enabling environment because they're in it trying to make everything work, would be the

best partners that we could bring that partnership together to really lean on government to do what's right and perhaps find a middle road for taking the risk because what we're talking about is people and it's the planet. So on the finance side I think those discussions are happening and July in Addis is going to be a big moment for us where those commitments need to fit this agenda and give those strong commitments that this can happen. It is a transition so no one expects there's a pot of money at the end of July; it is about us having the opportunities to access resources to do what we need to do.

The technology has been a very difficult discussion. You'd wonder why, but in the United Nations when you discuss technologies amongst countries and things like the facility and intellectual property rights all come up and it becomes a very tense political discussion. The good news is that when we discussed this in the open working group everyone spoke to some of the examples that you brought a success in health, in education, and the innovations that have really made us reach people faster than we possibly could have done in the past. And that's the discussion you want to take, that technology discussion and innovation for this. Talked about building the capacity.

Last but not least everyone is going to ask us how are we sure that you're going to deliver on this agenda. And there are no guarantees; this is not a legally binding agreement, but if it is compelling enough, if each one of the stitches that you've put in this tapestry that we want to deliver in September makes sense then countries themselves should see them in this and should hit the ground running. But we still need to know that are we doing the right thing, are we implementing, are we moving in the right direction. And to do that, we need a robust monitoring framework where we report from the country level, from

the regional level, and from the global level. It's only as good as it is that it comes back, that we can course correct, that we can in fact say yes, we're making the inroads that we need to. And if we're not how then can we do better. This is going to by and large rest on how qualitative, how deep and broad and real and credible our data is. And this is something that again we brought up in the High Level Panel the importance of having a data revolution and we worked on that, we've got a common consensus and understanding around what this means, how we bring traditional data and big data together to be useful to all constituencies, not just for monitoring but for placing those investments where they need to be. This is a big part of what we hope the United Nations can bring forth and that different actors will be involved in this, it won't just be government monitoring government, but how can we use civil society, how best can the research community help us to make this a reality and that we learn and that we actually embed and root these capacities in countries to that they can do this by themselves.

Those really are the four components of the synthesis report. And that's how member states would like to take it. And it's each of those components, not just as a whole report, but as a way to help them have these discussions. They've got two parallel processes now, one on financing lands in July and the other one in September. And in both cases there are opportunities for everyone to engage in some of those sessions that they have, particularly the side meetings. And they are now looking to frame these around the six elements that we've spoken about and I hope that that will deepen the conversation but will bring more clarity and help us now bridge the gap between global and local as we try to make this agenda a reality by September. I think what I would say is

what are we suppose to do? Well, continue to engage with this. I think to be much more specific about what the opportunity is and to target that. I mean I started at Brookings here this month, but I can say that we will all probably be in Davos in one way or another. How do we make the connections there that when we leave it's not about me trying to drag business to the table, but we make such impact that when we leave Davos they're dragging everybody else to the table because they're interested in this agenda.

It's a massive opportunity 2015. It's ours to lose and I think that we can in this generation really make it happen. So I look forward to having this conversation this morning and getting the energy that we need to start this last mile. Thank you. (Applause)

MR. MCARTHUR: Thank you so much, Amina. I'd like to invite the panelists to join up on the stage. And of the many leaders in the room -- and maybe we can get everyone mic'd -- I just want to point out a few people in our front row who are active on many pieces of this puzzle. We have Naoko Ishii who is the leader of the Global Environment Facility, we have Kathy Calvin and Susan Myers who lead the UN Foundation, and we have Michael Elliott who leads the ONE Panel, a lot of these public conversations. Right there a great cross-section of so many pieces that fit into this very, very big puzzle.

Maybe while people are getting mic'd just for sake of time I can float on question for you to consider, Amina.

MS. MOHAMMED: Okay.

MR. MCARTHUR: Amina, thank you for that incredible overview -- and I'm going to sit down in just one second. If you were a minister in say Nigeria or in a country today knowing what you know about that side of the

equation what would you see your job as being to help bring this to fruition over the coming year? What are the country level policy leaders, what's the expectation for them to make sure this kind of lands in September as you put it?

MS. MOHAMMED: Well, I think the first message would be that we're not dumping the MDGs. In fact one of the questions my president asked when I left Nigeria to come and to this job is oh, does that mean that we finished the MDGs? No, it isn't. I think it is really important that we know that that is unfinished business and in some places we really have reversed the gains. So I think it's an important time for us to reflect on how far we've come in this last mile of the MDGs and to really push to see how much further we can get. And then I think we have to manage the expectations that this is going to be such a change from the way in which we've done business, that it's about a transition, and what does that really mean step by step for a country, and try to evaluate where you are and what are the different issues that you need to take up to strengthen and prepare yourself for that. And it may be about data, it may be that we need to think much more concretely about a policy that we need because we need a counter terrorism policy in a part of the country. I have to say that in my country it's about the northeast, but it's affecting the whole country. A few years ago it was about a reintegration program because we had the Niger Delta being excluded from the oil and they weren't blowing up people they were blowing up the pipelines, but as good as because once you've dried up the economy people will die if you didn't have the resources then to do what we needed to do. So I think the one thing would be to explain first, you know, stake stock of what we're doing, explain what this agenda means going forward, and start to put in place what we need to do that, and articulate better the partnerships that they will need

to do this. I think, you know, not to talk about this about government alone. This is about all the partners and how to do that. Bring young people in too.

MR. MCARTHUR: Let me know properly introduce our full panel now that we have the pleasure of them being here. Just in order, next to me, Lindsay Coates is the Acting President and CEO of InterAction. She was previously COO of Population Action International. She began her career as a civil rights lawyer, so brings a lot of I think relevant perspectives to both the role of civil society in this and of course interaction a the umbrella, coordinating the U.S. NGO community, but also this element of justice and leaving no one behind. To her right is Rachel Kyte who is the World Bank Vice President and Special Envoy for Climate Change and has had many crucial roles on sustainable development, previously as World Bank VP for Sustainable Development and International Finance Corporation's Vice President for Business Advisory Services, and a member of the IFC Management Team, so brings both this fusion, which I'm going to ask you about in a moment, of the climate and development, but also the private and public sectors which is such a crucial thread of this whole conversation. And then last but certainly not least, Homi Kharas who is a Senior Fellow here and Deputy Director of the Global Economy and Development Program. And as was mentioned Homi was the Executive Secretary and lead author of this High Level Panel on Post-2105 which came out a couple of years ago already, but was really the first framing point co-chaired by Prime Minister Cameron, President **Yudhoyono**, and President Johnson Sirleaf, and had many leaders from around the world and really helped to frame these debates. And prior to that before his career at Brookings he was of course Chief Economist for East Asia and Pacific at the World Bank and a distinguished

career at the bank. So we really have an extraordinary cross-section of perspectives here today even before we get to the audience's comments and questions.

Maybe I can start with you, Rachel, because you have one of the most interesting challenges in this whole thing and Amina alluded to it, but this climate and development thread which politically have been two separate conversations in the intergovernmental process, but I think many of us who live in this see it as ultimately the same conversation and so I'm curious how do you see what needs to get solved this year? And is there one thing that you just wish people would understand to really kind of boil it down, but what are your views on this as you think about how we make both and all of these pieces work?

MS. KYTE: Well, that's a seminar in and of itself. But thank you very much; it's lovely to be here. Happy New Year.

I think if sort of 2030 is the point from which we walk back. Then if you're the proverbial prime minister or minister of finance, minister of planning that Amina was talking about, in 2030 you want to have an economy that is producing the jobs that if you're in that part of the world that you need because you've got a youth population, you've got a dynamic that needs them. You're going to want to have a competitive economy, you're going to want to have an economy that is not leaving people behind, that is more equal, is growing more equally than today, and you're going to want to have cities which are competitive, which means you're going to need to be able to breathe in them. And you're going to need to be able to access water for human consumption, but also for some forms of energy generation. You're going to want to be able to produce nutritious food and have that distributed around the country so the kids are

getting it. You're going to want to make sure that babies that have been born are going to go on and become productive citizens, which means that their nutrition in the first 24 months. That's what you're going to be working on and if you think about that then that is an integrated climate and development challenge. So all of the development that we will want to spur over the next 15 years, the lifetime of these goals, is going to take place in a world now impacted and shaped by climate. So the one thing that I really wish people would understand is that this isn't, you know, what's going to happen from 2030 to 2050, we're living it, experiencing it now. There are things that can be done now and must be done now because the pollution that we've put into the atmosphere which is causing those impacts now and for the lifetime of these goals was put into the atmosphere 20-30 years ago. And so everything that we do today that is inefficient, polluting, or harmful is just racking up the problems for that prime minister in 2030 as they think about what's going to happen from 2030 to 2050. So we're buying ourselves a complexity, we're buying ourselves a volatility that we've never had to manage before. And so we want to grow then -- those small businesses have got to have access to energy, and it's not any kind of energy. The cleaner the energy the better because we want to be able to breathe in the cities where people are going to be living. So these things are inextricably linked.

The politics at the international level is about how we pay for this I think in large part. But increasingly that development is going to have to be low carbon, it's going to have to be cleaner, and it's going to have to be resilient. We will have to make enormous investments from now every year on in the resilience of our development because of the impacts that we've already baked into the system as it were and that's going to cost money. And for vulnerable countries

that's going to cost a lot of money and that's going to have to come from public and private sources. So we need resilient and low carbon development if that prime minister stands a chance of being able to stand up in 2030 and say we got that.

MR. MCARTHUR: But what do you think that means for the Addis summit on the financing?

MS. KYTE: I think it means that public money, ODA, and other forms of public transfers have -- they've got to do more than they ever had to do in 1990. They have to work harder, they have to be leveraged more creatively, and they have to be regarded as, you know, the most special of special gold dust. And they have to be used in certain ways that will provoke more investment where we need it. I think if we can in Addis also understand that there is so much that public policy can do to drive things in the right direction. Amina talked about domestic resources. Mobilization of domestic resources can do a lot. The whole way in which we procure, et cetera. But there's also through public expenditures things that we can do which are more efficient than others. And then all of those fiscal policies, macroeconomic policies, and financial policies that you put in place will drive private investment of which there is more than people think into the things that we want. And so while we worry about where these transfers are going to come from, from north to south to the most vulnerable, both domestically and internationally, everybody has to put their sort of fiscal and macroeconomic policy house in order. If they do that they will get rewarded. And I think if you can in some way in Addis talk about the possibilities and the excitement of that, then I think you get over this problem of well, you know, if I go through sort of a difficult political reforms will I be rewarded for it.

But all prices where they are now, this is the golden opportunity for everybody to get their pricing of energy right and there will be a benefit from that to come. But that will require politicians to stand up and be counted and it will require leaders to lead.

MR. MCARTHUR: Lindsay, from the civil society perspective, and InterAction has of course coordinated a lot of inputs from the membership, I'm curious how do you see what has just happened and what needs to happen this year as we think through a bigger 2015 conversation?

MS. COATES: Thank you so much for having me. I think it's sort of preposterous for me to sit here as a white woman from the north talking about civil society, but I'll do my best. I think it's integral to remember that civil society plays multiple roles across multiple dimensions in multiple contexts. So you're talking about watchdogs, advocates, standards centers, implementers, and you're talking about people who are doing that in this country because they are universal goals, and people who are doing them in other countries. And as we move this dialogue forward I think one of the disappointments that I had around the synthesis report was you read the means of implementation and I see civil society in every paragraph. In every paragraph I see the interaction members who are collectively giving \$18 billion in funds, only \$4 billion of that is ODA, so its private funds raised from foundations and the public that's engaged in these issues and care about poverty. I see the local watchdogs who are pushing for transparency and accountability in their governments. And so the disappointment I have is I don't see clarity around the role of civil society and the space for civil society because what we're seeing right now in many contexts is a shutting down of civil society space. And so the thing that I would ask for and

hope for is the UN has done a tremendous job of sort of leading by example, and this whole process has been inclusive in a way that the MDG process was not, and I think continuing to push for civil society access and space is critical, and that's going to yield a mess. You know, it's going to yield a lot of disparate conversations and a lot of different ideas, but the energy and creativity comes from that. I think a great illustration of this is the Action 2015 Agenda which the ONE campaign has been very central to implementing both in this country and elsewhere because what they say is it's a flotilla, it's not a movement, you don't have to sign onto a bunch of positions. It's from where you sit, look at this rich dialogue and engage with it and be powerful around it. And so when you talk about long-term social change that's really what you're talking about is pulling people in. So the opportunity that this presents for all of us sitting in this room to go out both -- you know, where I live in my neighborhood in Washington to talk about this, and when I have opportunities with civil society partners around the globe to talk about dignity and justice is really powerful. And if we miss that opportunity it's wrong. And we need to hold institutions like the World Bank and the UN accountable around that space for civil society because it's a really exciting moment for all of us.

MR. MCARTHUR: I'll ask Amina to comment on that in a moment, speak to that I guess disappointment is the word you used. But I also just want to pick up on this notion of universal and this is a big question of what I mean, if it is truly for everyone and if it is for each country. How do you or maybe the membership, what's the range of views that you would think is most pertinent to what it means in the United States?

MS. COATES: What I have been struck by in my role within

InterAction is a real sea change in terms of how members think about and understand poverty. And I think this is consistent with the shift we've had from the MDGs to the SDGs. I've had more than one member CEO say to me I cannot be credible as an international development actor if I don't have programs and policies that are impacting poverty in my own country. So I think that universality and leave no one behind has really been internalized. Save the Children has been a great leader in this space in terms of leaving no one behind and getting to zero and all of that. So in this country I am so personally deeply troubled by the inequality and lack of access to justice and I feel that same energy and concern around our membership. And some impatience honestly with the administration around lack of clarity, around what the domestic agenda is. But that's like Rachel said, that's a whole other discussion that we could have.

MR. MCARTHUR: We have 15 years to work it out -- no we don't. (Laughter) Homi, you come at this from I think a pretty special perspective having been since raised in the World Bank and played such a crucial role there and then really bridged with the UN in previous years, and you have the academic freedom of being at Brookings, so you can constrain. I'm curious, how do you reflect on this in terms of what the priorities are and what the opportunities are, and speaking to those different constituencies, many of whom are in the room, and how to move forward in the best way.

MR. KHARAS: Well, I think first on the opportunities, there's sometimes a sense that when we talk about the sustainable development goals, sustainable development in general, that it's something expensive, it's going to cost us something. And the part about this that I get frustrated by is that all of the

academic studies where economists look at, you know, the benefits per dollar spent, they're coming up with numbers like \$20-100 of benefits for every dollar spent. So we have this sense that actually if you put money into sustainable development you get massive returns, massive returns. And we're living in a world where money today costs governments one percent, maybe three percent per year. I mean less than it's ever cost before. So to me we've got this kind of huge mismatch where we've got experience, we know sort of some programs that work, we've got very, very large returns out there, the cost of money is relatively low, and we can't put those two things together, we can't get the scale of that kind of flows to move into sustainable development investments. Everywhere, in developing countries, in developed countries, everywhere. And we talk a little bit about the aid flows. Aid is right now \$140 billion a year roughly, \$138 billion in 2013. If every country in the deck would get to their 0.7 percent so-called commitment, and there are some countries who still maintain they haven't made that commitment; let's say they did, we get up to \$310 billion a year. When we do broad back of the envelope calculations on sustainable development, just in developing countries you're talking about incremental of investments of \$1.5 trillion a year. It's a massive difference in the scale of flows that I think we should be talking about. When we look at organizations like the World Bank, if you take the entire multilateral development finance system, not including the aid, the grant money where they're acting as intermediaries for other governments, but what they borrow and then lend out to countries, \$22 billion per year. You have to ask yourself, is this really the kind of structure and system that will take advantage of these huge gains that we have. And the opportunity that I think that we have today is to sit back and say how can we re-

jig this system so that actually the financing channels, the directions in which this money goes, and whether it's through public intermediaries or whether it's through private businesses, it's really not all that important, what's really important is to make sure that these resources start to get spent on the things that we know will yield major returns in sustainable development. And some of them are in social sectors, but some of them are in infrastructure, some of them actually make money directly for equity investors, some of them make money for society as a whole and need other kinds of financial engineering to structure. But at the end of the day everybody is better off if this money flows there.

And then the last thing I want to emphasize is that we often say this is a unique opportunity and all the rest of it. There's one sense in which actually this time that's actually true. (Laughter) The reason why it's true is that we happen to have entered into the phase, the demographic phase which we will never, ever again in this world face. Sixty to seventy million people every year for the next thirty years are going to move into cities. Twenty to thirty years ago that number was thirty to forty million people per year. Moving forward after this peak has gone it's going to come back to thirty to forty million and then tail of to zero. If those investments that will be put in place as these people move into these cities, if those aren't done right, game over. You cannot retrofit this stuff. It is twice as expensive, three times as expensive to do that kind of retrofitting. So this is an opportunity that we've got to really seize now and it's not just the rhetoric of the moment and the fact that we've got these conferences and this, that, and the other, it's the hard reality of demographic trends. And so I think we've got a chance of getting this right, but this is the period where these very big investments in urban infrastructure which are going to dictate density, and so it's

going to dictate how much energy do we consume, how are we going to move people around, what are our agricultural productions systems going to really deal with. We don't get those things right, it's going to be really expensive to retrofit and then the next conversation that we have is not going to be about sustainable development as an opportunity, the next conversation we have is going to be about who wins and who loses, and there are going to be people who have to lose in the next round. I think that's what we really want to avoid. We have a chance now to be able to make this into a win-win in something that is more than just rhetoric.

MR. MCARTHUR: A really interesting point. And Homi and I of course upstairs talk about this regularly, but this notion of what do we build I think is part of the conversation that maybe could be added usefully of how do we build these new economies and societies rather than how do we adjust, because a lot of this is literally about building for these hundreds of millions of people moving into new physical places. And that's the real opportunity.

I want to open it up to the room in a moment, but before that just hear from Amina any reflections on the comments that have just been made, and there's this one particular issue on role of civil society or the space for civil society, but so many other comments on the environment, the financing.

MS. MOHAMMED: Yes, thank you very much. I welcome the comments on what is of concern in the synthesis report. Because this has been what is the bridge to the beginning of these negotiations and so leaves us opportunity to hear these things and reinforce them with member states. There's been a very big discussion about whether civil society should be in the room or not all the way until the end and we pushed very hard to make sure you don't get

sterile consultations through this for a couple of hours which is just not possible to bring in representation. And that's been opened up and there are days where that is visible. I think more importantly is in the document we talk about the role of reporting and what sort of reporting, what then will be the opportunity for civil society to be part of that. I think there are concerns that we have, a multitude of reports and then you very quickly find civil society drop to the bottom when it comes to which report do you take seriously. I actually believe that we need to see reports that take civil society as part of an integral whole, at the same maintain the independence you need to be constructive about what happens. So I think it's a big challenge.

I think the whole discussion of fit for purpose is another one. As you speak to me and we reflect about this, what is the role of civil society going for? How will you come out of your silos just as you see us in our silos at the country level and the UN, to make that a better advocacy opportunity in an integrated agenda that's leaving no one behind? I think that's going to be an important question that we haven't heard really dealt with where we speak about the children's constituency for civil society, yet it's so siloed around issues. And this will have a lot to do about how flows of money, funding will come to dictate. And I think we need to have a good conversation about not just what we require for the development agenda per se, but how then does that work with what you bring to the table of the 4 billion, the 8 billion. How does that work better for it? I do think that we need to find opportunities and platforms to push the agenda for civil society to be part of this going forth. We have a number of ideas that we hope we will share. The whole group that we use in the UN right now to try to coordinate, this includes big coalitions on civil society that we're taking (audio

interruption). I think it's a work in progress; it will never be enough. I've been in civil society to know that every time you say more I want more.

MS. COATES: Give me more, give me more.

MS. MOHAMMED: Give me more. And that's the right thing.

So I hope you keep pushing us there for it.

Reflections, again I mean we -- Rachel is my sister of another mother (laughter) so we speak the same thing. When I hear her speak to climate change and development it's pick up here and say right, Secretary-General, this is how we're going to say it. But it's so important to see how those investments and in fact the impact taking from one to the other are mutually reinforcing and have results in people's lives. And take the opportunity that Homi was speaking about which is there are so many green fields right now, so many opportunities to make this happen that it doesn't cost us what the retrofit would do which is impossible because that's not going to happen. I think, underscore, it's doable. We can actually do this, but we've got to make it attractive. What's the incentive? That's my greatest concern; if somebody said what worries you most of all, is that I see in a room of leaders that there's no incentive for them to find a way to make peace. The development agenda can't make peace, it can make investments so that we don't have those conflicts, we don't exclude people, we reduce inequality. We don't give reason for children and young people not to have any hope so they get involved in conflict and everything goes down. But we also have to think about coming out of conflict, how do we sustain that? It's a different environment totally. In the development area we have not been able to invest in that effectively to sustain the gains of peace. So I think we do have a leadership problem and that here we can all speak to climate change and development, but

that peace and security agenda, what is the incentive for the leaders in this world that make a difference, and there's five of them in our place, how do we make them do the right thing? Why should they do the right thing is the question that we need to ask them because it is affecting the way in which money will flow, it is affecting the cost that it's taking its toll, not just from funds but on people's lives. And I think that we generate more orphans, we generate a mental state in a society that will need different tools to address that if we could stop now would take us forth. So I think there's a much bigger conversation beyond just the climate and development to environment and the leadership that we're speaking about.

And just last but not least on the resources side, it's about unlocking resources I think. When you talked about the billions and we need trillions. And the trillions are there. How to unlock them for a good cause, for a right cause, for what we need to be doing. And it includes domestic resource mobilization. To see the little adjustments you make to procurement policy for instance, the savings that you can make on that that actually it brings a better understanding of the result that you need when you put that policy in place and (audio interruption).

MR. MCARTHUR: I'm going to open it up to the floor. And I just want to give our panelists a question to think about while we take others from the room. Just to hone in on it, each of you mentioned a gap I would say. And on the civil society there are lessons from the MDGs too. And on the environment it generally seemed to be one of the shortcomings of the MDGs. And on the financing Homi very clearly articulated some very clear doubts, quantitatively even. If you were to pick one or two recommendations to solve each of those

gaps, like what would be the proposal? What's the thing that would help bend the curve, switch the light, or whatever it is to -- if you had the moment with the President or the Secretary-General or the World Bank President, whatever it is, here's the one thing you need to do. Obviously that's an artificial question, but we'd love to know you think about the practicalities of solving these problems.

I think -- do we have some mics in the room? If we don't people can just -- oh, we do. So maybe stand up and we'll try and get a batch of a few and then we'll bring it back to the panel. So I see John. And please introduce yourselves. Ground rules, keep it brief and make sure it ends with a question mark. (Laughter) Thank you.

MR. COONROD: Great. Thanks, John. I'm John Coonrod with the Hunger Project. Amina, I really loved the synthesis report, particularly this figure with the single circle. It's not 17 goals, it's 1 little circle. And I also really loved three words in it, and those are the words that come after the word "government", "at all levels". The "at all levels" to me is a huge shift that creates space for the localization of the SDGs. And I think that is a huge gap and it's a special role I believe for civil society to build the capacity of local governance systems down at the community level. And that role -- the previous Secretary-General once said that the MDGs won't be achieved by countries, they will be achieved by communities. And I think all of us need to put a lot more emphasis on leveraging and mobilizing the kind of citizen activism that will produce these goals that will build resilient communities as we go into the means of implementation.

So I'm just wondering how the UN sees strengthening community level action within an intergovernmental framework?

MR. MCARTHUR: Some others? Oh, Naoko; yeah, please.

MS. ISHII: Thank you. Naoko Ishii from Global Environment Facility. Thank you so much for the wonderful panel discussion. My question on the gap is about global public goods. And, Amina, you yourself mentioned about the security and peace, you also mentioned the environment, and particularly from global public's point of view it's not national environment, it's more like global environment, and it's not only climate system, but also you mentioned ecosystem. And interestingly you also mentioned the finance minister does not necessarily separate the environmental development, but based on my own experience they only do care the environmental (inaudible) affects their own portfolio because of flood or drought and those kinds of things. So my question for maybe Amina and maybe also Homi, you mentioned that the return on those investments is extremely high, but how you can see that the full and the (inaudible) those global public goods can be identified and can be financed? So that would be my question.

MR. MCARTHUR: For those of you who don't know Naoko was a very senior official in the Japanese Ministry of Finance before taking on her current role.

In the back in the row here, yeah -- or -- yes, please.

SPEAKER: (Audio interruption) past 18 months or so we've had about 50 community convenings where we brought together local communities to discuss the Post-2015 goals. And my question is related to some other anniversaries this year. Fifteen year ago the UN Security Council resolved unanimously on 1325, on women, peace, and security. And there is alto of activity in the last few years since the U.S. through an executive order has issued

a national action plan. And also 40 years ago in Mexico City was the first UN convention on women. And 20 years ago was Beijing. And so my question is because it came up in all of our community convenings, and that is how will the issues of gender equality be addressed and is it a lens that all of the issues of development and climate and so forth will be considered?

MR. MCARTHUR: Was there one right in front of you? Maybe one more. This woman had her hand up. And then we'll come to the panel. We'll come back for another batch after.

MS. PALANIAPPAN: Thank you. Archana Palaniappan with Oxfam. So thank you to the panel and to Amina for being here. As important or more important than the SDGs themselves is how they will actually be achieved. As you know the dirty little secret is that the money is actually there, but because of tax avoidance countries are losing out. Oxfam estimates that at least \$18.5 trillion is buried away by wealthy individuals depriving more than \$156 billion in income and tax revenue for countries. And the IMF suggests that corporate tax dodging costs developing countries at least \$100 billion a year. That could cover basic education costs more than four times over. So if countries are going to be held accountable to the SDGs how are we going to support them to control these resources? How will the financing for development conversation grapple with this? And who are the southern champions that really drive this agenda forward to achieving the SDGs?

Thank you.

MR. MCARTHUR: Thank you. I think we've got something for everyone there on the panel so far between the community, local government, global public goods, gender equality, and tax evasion, and tax coordination is the

flipside of that.

Maybe Homi just to go in a different order. Would you like take a stab at any of those? The last one included?

MR. KHARAS: Thanks, John. So I think on taxes there's now a big discussion. It's gone into the OECD, the G7, and the G20. There's I think a considerable momentum around it and I'd be very surprised if there wasn't something reasonably strong about changing where we are today. Now there are a range of issues around secrecy and the sharing of tax information systems. So much of that still has to be worked out in bringing all developing countries into that net and system, but there's little doubt in my mind that we will have systems and structures that will try to close off some of these tax loopholes. And the good news of course is that in the interests now not just of developing countries but also of developed countries, so part of what makes a universal agenda so powerful is that that's exactly when some of these things tend to get real action. So I'm reasonable sure we'll get real action. Exactly what that will translate into in terms of dollars and cents is a little bit hard to predict.

If I could just touch on the issue of global public goods. It's a sad but I think probably true commentary that it is really difficult to get financing for global public goods. First it's a term where it's really difficult to get an understanding of what it is we're talking about.

MS. COATES: No sense.

MR. KHARAS: And if you don't have that basic understanding of what you're talking about it's really, really difficult to mobilize money for it. So in every area, whether it's ocean overfishing, whether it's climate change, whether it's mountains and ecosystems, we know that this is something which is really

underfunded. Are we going to change things dramatically? I'd be surprised, but I do think that what's now happening is that there's more and more understanding that many of these global public goods are actually national public goods. So the reason why in China there going to move away from coal-fired power plants is not because they want to save the planet. I mean maybe they do, but maybe they don't. But it is because there's massive amounts of pressure on clean air. So it's become a local public good. And the more these things translate into local public goods I think the more action that we will see. And there's more and more understanding now that many of these things are local public goods. If you destroy your local mangroves and you happen to live in a vulnerable area you will get large amounts of flooding. So I am quite optimistic that we can translate some of these things into things that country governments want to do. And then the question becomes an easier question to solve which is do they have the money to do it. And there we just need to think about what are the financing channels. Sometimes that money will take the form of grants, sometimes that money will take the form of loans. As I said before in today's environment of relatively cheap capital and relatively high liquidity we can do so much more with using lending instruments that don't put pressure on government budgets to the same extent and we haven't started to exploit that opportunity.

MR. MCARTHUR: Rachel?

MS. KYTE: Well, just following on from there I mean I agree very much with what Homi was saying. And going back to one of his earlier points which is there's a lot of data now about the investment here reaps a reward of X over here and there are a whole series of behavioral things and issues that we need to understand better about why we don't do that. So if we

know that a dollar invested in early warning will produce \$20-30 saving in the cost of reconstruction or relief then why aren't we as an international community helping every vulnerable country have an early warning system that's fit for purpose? I mean why would we throw this very, very precious 0.7 percent that people say that they're putting in, you know, into something that's just going to get washed away year after year after year? So the behavioral economics work has got to be pulled into these strategic decisions that are made not just at the national level but at the international level.

We also know that that proverbial mangrove is cheaper and more effective or as effective as a lot of very expensive concrete and sluice gates and dyke building, right. But we have very blunt instruments for putting those data and those numbers in front of decision makers. And so one of the responses to your gap question is something more sophisticated than GDP alongside GDP. I'm not saying we throw GDP out, but there's lots of work going on that needs to come to a head, it needs to be spurred on, it needs to have a deadline. We need to finish the natural capital accounts in work at the UN by a date certain. And then over the lifetime of these goals we'd be able to put different data sets in front of decision makers were those decisions will become easier.

The final thing I want to say is just on gender and climate. Karen, I think we last met in Beijing. (Laughter) It feels like that on my side. So gender and development have been a broader and much more nuanced story, but just on climate, you know, I think that -- and this goes to -- and I think I said this up in New York at the climate summit, this -- where women are going to be particularly important is on the consumption debate. If women are 80 percent of

consumers or make 80 percent of the consumption decisions whether it's at the house or the whatever, then -- but that's not just about whether you buy this light bulb or not. I mean there some dumbing of this gender debate down all the time. I'm kind of through with it. The pension decision, the savings decision, the house purchasing decision, the education decision, the big ticket items, these are where women really have an influence. And if you think about where we want to drive an express preference, then that's going to be a very big part of it. And there are some amazing civil society organizations around the world now that are really finding very interesting ways for women -- you know the ordinary women, the stay-at-home mom, the woman with three jobs, the aspiring middle class women of the developed world, right, who have not been mobilized for climate action, who are in solidarity with women in the rest of the world, who can express extraordinary power through preferences of consumption, but also the mobility patterns and how they get the kids to school and how they travel around. And that's an untapped juggernaut of political opinion that people are going to start listening to soon. Watch 1 Million Women in Australia, look at what they're doing and how their framing their debate. You know we need more of that in the developed world and then you'll get universal goals.

Sorry.

MR. MCARTHUR: Nice segue to Lindsay. No, thank you.

Lindsay?

MS. COATES: It's interesting because I see through all the questions an interesting thread, whether we're talking about localization, whether we're talking about global public goods, whether we're talking about gender, and I would like to underline everything Rachel has said. I totally, totally agree. And

we've got an interaction project where we're thinking about how to mobilize domestically around nutrition, early childhood nutrition interventions. And if we mobilize a domestic audience then we can mobilize an audience and awareness outside the U.S. When you think about transparency and accountability I think what we're seeing happening in the world right now is we're transitioning from power structures that are about hierarchy and control to a world where hopefully social change comes about because of networks and collaboration. And I think that Amina's work with this process has been a harbinger of engaging civil society and being networked and being collaborative, but that whole old hierarchal stuff is incredibly difficult to let go of. And so we're in this space as human beings where we've got something that's got to give and change and surrender power, and then networks and collaboration. Because it's that local voice that's going to get the tax reform, that's going drive the local resource mobilization. It's the local public good around my mangrove swamp and I care about that swamp. That's really kind of structurally what we're talking about. And I think we have to tolerate the cacophony but see that larger pattern.

MR. MCARTHUR: Great. "Tolerate the cacophony while seeing the larger pattern" is very, very (audio interruption). Thank you.

Amina?

MS. MOHAMMED: Wow. Okay. I mean I'm so glad that Homi said global public goods and defined because my one thing that came out of that was we need to educate ministers of finance and defense before you go anywhere on the issue of global public goods. To think that in many of our countries we all understand this at all. If I've learned one thing in the last two years it's that people think I'm smart because I use all these UN words and

statements and at the end of it I say I'm not really smart I've just gotten a handle around them and I deploy them when their necessary. But if you have to break it down to an action, an implementation, and communicate this with people who need to do the job, it's really difficult. And that's the first place we have to start, really relating it to what they do on a day-to-day basis. And I would start there. That question you had for me, it's the first thing. Education as to what we mean by this and the implications of the benefits in real terms because I think it's not always visible when we say that.

On the question of the MDGs at all levels, it's something I said in Nigeria with the MDGs right from the first day that I started working because the \$10 we were spending at the federal level and the federal system of three levels of government, we were getting less than \$2 at the local level. So the MDGs it was supposed to be about a baseline and additionally was just getting nowhere. And so the importance of actually underscoring that every level has a role to play in this and that you don't exclude that and work to it was one of those reasons. Member states' responses to this have been they really do work to the leave no one behind. And we've heard even from the most controversial of our member states the importance of the country level. And that's where the responsibility is and that's where we owe a delivery of service or a right space to gender. So I think there's much more about that now than there has ever been before; that this global level is not just about dictating, it's about what countries can do to respond to a framework that is global and universal. If there is anything I would say there is perhaps a trust deficit as to whether this agenda really is about a universal one when everyone is taking responsibility and it's not just talking about one side of the globe. I think that's still something we have to get through, this

old traditional way of the way in which we look at things.

On the number of anniversaries they have, of course very big on the agenda is women's agenda. I mean for us this has been an agenda that we say delivers on human rights and human rights are women's right. I think this is what we constantly have to underscore. But we've also seen very much coming back to use that we cannot hold up this agenda if half the capacity is not invested in and that's about women and about girls. And so I think that also, the inequality agenda, the access to education -- not even access to education, can we have a good education, a qualitative one? Going into school and coming out with an education is just what we have now, a generation to retool. So it's all about the access, but I think the important thing for the women's agenda is just as we have with UN Women, the HeForShe Campaign; about what men will do to ensure that women are partners in this is really important. It's about everyone, especially women where women are off the radar. But it is also about the boys and the men, where they're not on the radar, because if they're not the women are going to suffer. And I think that this is really where we come back to what's the bottom line, it's about everyone. And we know that people in different places have got different emphasis and gaps. We'll attend to that, but not to just sort of cookie cutter this that women across the board are in the position of -- in the backseat. They are in many cases, but I think we need to bring everyone through together.

I think last but not least the southern champions. Again for financing, for development, the stars are aligned for Africa. And we see this because first and foremost the President of the General Assembly for us this year is from Uganda. The person that heads up the G77, the largest group of developing countries in the United Nations is South Africa. The Financing for

Development meeting happens in Addis Ababa. I come from Nigeria. I mean we just cannot go wrong (laughter) yet of course we could. I think that that's where everyone feels that this is a time for us to say if Africa is really rising then we have to really get behind this and look to these champions. What is added to this is really the phenomenal feeling that the BRICS can do something about this in real terms beyond just talking about what the BRICS represent, what they could actually bring forth to this. And there have been a number of big discussions around the big ticket items for which we've seen this conversation begin. So I think we're beginning now to identify those champions. I think what we do need is more than the southern champions; it is about global champions. So even if you see a southern champion you need to be talking to a global and universal agenda or we've missed the (audio interruption). We cannot just be talking about where we are standing. Yes, we are as strong as where we're coming from and what we invest in it, but we have to speak to the global agenda and this is an incredibly important part of the message that we need to get across.

MR. MCARTHUR: Thank you. We only have about five minutes left and I'm committed to us ending on time. Maybe we can take just two very quick questions. Max, we have one over here and one over here and then I'm going to ask the panelists to be as judicious as possible in their final comments.

And please be very brief.

MS. REISER: Very brief. My name is Mindy Reiser, I'm Vice President of an NGO called Global Peace Services USA. Amina, I was very glad you mentioned the ministers of defense because we are speaking against the backdrop of the events in Paris which is only going to mean that there will be enormous pressure to increase the budgets of ministries of defense. So we

really to think of creative ways for people to understand that support for development in the end is support for a world that is more peaceful and more honest and more just, but the pressure is certainly going to be intense over the next year or two certainly and perhaps much longer.

MR. MCARTHUR: And there's one over here.

MR. BERG: Bob Berg, World Academy of Art and Science and former Senior Advisor to Four Parts at the UN. You've done gloriously to bring the UN to great prominence here.

I'm quite concerned about countries like the United States cherry picking among the 17 so that one hears at AID that 1, 16, and 17 are nice, and the rest is silence. So the question is indeed buying the package. And I'm wondering whether you have found champions in the north who will defend the whole package and whether you've engaged groups like the Club of Madrid for example to really work peer-to-peer at the political level? Tell us some of the strategies.

MR. MCARTHUR: We have three minutes left and I'm going to ask any final comments and I'll give the last word to Amina of course. Maybe starting with Lindsay and going -- just to mix up the order. And just any reflections you have on the questions that were just asked, but any kind of final words you'd love to leave with this audience and how to think about 2015 and what's coming up.

MS. COATES: I'm going to go back to the question you asked about sort of what's the gap. And for me the gap is around civil society. And so the thing I would say to the minister, the most important thing I would say to the minister is when we ask you to change something we may give you 10 things, at

least change 1 and then tell us about it. Show an interactive relational engagement. So to me that's the most important thing is to keep that dialogue going and to demonstrate meaningful change.

MR. MCARTHUR: Rachel.

MS. KYTE: So I think that this integration of a climate process and a development process needs to happen in 2015 for, you know action over the next decades. We're basically at the early stage in funding and economic transition to a world where we can meet our development goals in a low carbon resilient way. That's going to take profound sort of redirection of economic signals. That's something that is done by people who won't be in New York in September, and so we always have this institutional problem of, you know, who needs to be in the room and sort of understand what needs to be done. So that will remain, but all agencies therefore are needed, from the Fund to all the Gs to us, to others like us, to the UN, et cetera. So there's a big laying on of hands that is needed. But 2015 is an important year, it is an important year for the reasons Homi said so as well, but this is really about how we will grow over the next 10-15 years. And so we need to make sure that we don't get hung up with the perfect driving out the good this year. We need to get really good solid results so that people believe that systems can deliver, but this is about a profound economic challenge.

And then when we have those little litmus tests, those political litmus tests like \$100 billion a year every year from 2020 which is the political financial litmus test in climate, not to get tripped up by that too much. We will have to solve that politics, but this is about funding and economic transition.

MR. MCARTHUR: Homi.

MR. KHARAS: So I think that even though we talk about this whole agenda as an intergovernmental agenda and negotiation really what we have to think about is how will consumers and private businesses actually behave. These are going to be the people that drive all of the outcomes. They will generate the jobs; they'll make the consumption decisions as Rachel was saying. That's the real pressure about how to move things towards sustainability. And of course governments have a huge role to play in regulatory frameworks, the tax frameworks, and other things to sort of to steer that, but I think we have to understand this is about really bringing private business on board and to do that and to do that in a credible way, it seems to me we also have to think about well what are the accountabilities of the private business sector going to be. And up until now that's been short-term shareholder kind of, you know, financing reports. We've got to move to a world where actually more and more people start to think that this means long-term profit maximization which is going to come from integrating sustainability into management decisions. And I think they're already -- I don't know, a quarter to a third of Fortune 500 companies who actually do this. They don't necessary make all that data public, but they do it for their own internal purposes. And if we can really take that and systematize it and develop standards, et cetera, I think we'll go a really long way towards making this agenda a reality. So I hope we don't lose sight of the importance of the private business community, and I hope we don't just sort of leave them on the sidelines to come in and do some small side events somewhere while the real business gets done by governments because I think that would really be a disappointment. And just because the Club de Madrid was mentioned, we had an event with the Club de Madrid in this room about eight months ago. They are very seized

especially with the notion of inclusive growth and shared prosperity and I think that that discussion is a very valuable one that plays into this agenda.

MR. MCARTHUR: Thoughts?

MS. MOHAMMED: Yes, thank you very much. The question on the defense I actually didn't say defense, so sorry, I said development. But defense is really important because discussion is being --

MR. MCARTHUR: You did say defense and you were right.

MS. MOHAMMED: Did I say defense? I said development.

SPEAKER: No.

MS. COATES: No, you said defense.

MS. MOHAMMED: Okay. I said defense. (Laughter) I take it because I think, you know, we are constrained when we really think about what we discuss at the table. You bring the peace and conflict conversation and suddenly counter terrorism, security, all becomes about the bullet and not about the investment, and a woman or a young person, and a job, and I think that that message has to be pushed back around the cabinet table when those discussions happen that it's so much cheaper we get to everyone when we talk about people and not (audio interruption). Important to people's security, but that's not the priority.

What are we doing -- strategies in terms of bringing -- making sure that we don't cherry pick. That's a big discussion when you've got 17 on the list, but I think that if we look at them they almost cluster into investments. When we go through you won't be cherry picking. I think important is Homi's comment about bringing business in in a real way. There are many more partners to this agenda than just government and that way I think that we get the pressure to

take the whole because there are incentives for the whole and attracting everyone to take that work. It is about investing and making our economies work for people and planet. We are discussing Club de Madrid; they're in the office next week. So very much so. We started with them. And we need champions this year beyond just in one region of the map or another. So looking to leaders who've seen this, been there, done it, lessons learned, we want their voices around on this because they do have attraction and they can bring back pressures when the door shuts in New York to a negotiation the windows remain open, and capitals and leaders need to be making those voices really strong on that.

And I think in closing there is no free lunch in the world if we've learned anything. So we need to find the incentives for everyone to engage in this. And that really means speaking through to people what it is. And the clearest example I have is that speaking to the European Union the other day it was interesting, they had pressure to speak about .07. And it's more than that we know; however, they wanted to make sure that everyone was on board, that Canada and the United States and Japan were all on board meeting their commitments. And they talked about new donors. And when they spoke to new donors and they spoke to a particular region for this my question to them is what is the incentive for that donor to come in when in fact what they want is a peace dividend. Back to the question of who delivers the peace dividend so we can get more resources to actually invest in development for everyone, not leaving anyone behind. So there is something for everyone, but there is a lot of work for us to do to provide those incentives to encourage everyone to come into this agenda so it is a universal one and we're not leaving anyone off of it. And we

have another nine months to make that -- actually a year because of climate change agenda, at the end of the year is an incredibly important part of the whole. So we have a year, but we have milestones. July is our very first, September is the next, and December. What can we do in between that to make those milestones actually yield the dividends that we need to put into the next step so that at the end of the this year we can say yes, we did it, we provided an agenda that looking back from 2030 we're going to make all those commitments that we've put down.

MR. MCARTHUR: On that note let me thank everyone in the room and I think there were some people even watching on line at some point, so thanks to everyone for joining this conversation because it is a broad conversation that all of us need to help contribute to. And let me thank our panelists, Homi, Rachel, Lindsay, and Amina, for such an incredible set of thoughtful contributions. And, Amina, of course as our keynote is in the middle of a world tour right now (laughter) so if anyone asks it's Tuesday and you're in Washington. But very sincerely, a huge thanks to everyone and please join me in thanking our panel. (Applause)

* * * * *

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

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

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