

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

FROM SUMMITS TO SOLUTIONS:
INNOVATIONS IN IMPLEMENTING THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS

Washington, D.C.

Wednesday, July 18, 2018

Introduction and Moderator:

HOMI KHARAS
Interim Vice President, Global Economy and Development
The Brookings Institution

Panel:

HIROSHI KATO
Senior Vice President
Japan International Cooperation Agency

JENI KLUGMAN
Managing Director
Georgetown Institute for Women, Peace and Security

JANE NELSON
Director, Corporate Responsibility Initiative,
Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University
Nonresident Senior Fellow, Global Economy and Development,
The Brookings Institution

JOHN McARTHUR
Senior Fellow, Global Economy and Development, The Brookings Institution
Senior Advisor, United Nations Foundation

* * * * *

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. KHARAS: Good morning, everyone. And thank you all for joining us in this morning's discussion of "From Summits to Solutions: Innovations In Implementing The Sustainable Development Goals." So, these are the UN's very ambitious agenda agreed to by a-hundred-and-ninety-three countries in 2015. Small kind of ambition, peace, prosperity, inclusion for the planet, people across the world. So, that's the small issue and problem that we are trying to work, think about, and to solve.

My name is Homi Kharas. I'm the interim vice president of the Global Economy and Development program here at the Brookings Institution and perhaps more importantly, I am a co-editor of this book and I'll be moderating today's discussion.

But before starting, I want to say a couple of words about the book. First, this is a -- the product of a partnership between Brookings and the Japan International Cooperation Agency's Research Institute, and I would really like to thank them for their intellectual and their financial support. And one of my co-editors, Hiroshi Kato, from JICA has made the trip over to join us in today's launch. So, Hiroshi, thank you so much for all of that.

I'd also, you know, like to thank all of the contributors to the volume and what you will see if you take a look at the book is that we have 31 different contributors. And I think that that's a little indicative of the issue that we're trying to tackle. The SDGs require many people, different perspectives, different disciplines. Everybody has their own lens and angle and one of the things we tried to do in the book is reach out to some of these different communities and try to get their perspectives. So, this goes well beyond just a development kind of project and to at least start this process of bringing in some of these other voices.

Now, with 31, we couldn't get all of the authors up on the stage here, so

you'll have to do your own homework a little bit for that. But I do see another of our co-editors, Raj Desai is here in the audience. Raj, thank you for that. I see Ann Florini, who wrote a great chapter on teaching people how to partner. We all talk about partnerships; we don't realize it's something that's actually quite difficult to do and requires some special skills. Thank you, Ann, for that. So, there are a number of different disciplines and different voices and I think that's really what's important.

We did do a launch, actually, in New York with the Deputy Secretary General of the United Nations, Amina Mohammed, on Monday up in New York. Amina had agreed to do a chapter for us before she took on this position at the UN. And I have to say we're very grateful to her for following through on that commitment despite her new responsibilities. So, I think that that was really interesting to see the reactions of the policy people, the -- there was a couple of Ministers, there were Permanent Representatives to the United Nations who attended that launch, everybody trying to see what is it that we can take out of work like this for our countries as we submit voluntary national reviews on these various plans that individual countries are trying to submit.

So, one of the things that is a little unusual, I think, about the book compared to other Brookings publications is that it doesn't try to actually offer comprehensive solutions. It's, you know, it's not definitive. And I would say instead, as we came into this, what we saw were a whole range of different obstacles in almost every area that we tackled. And what we tried to do was to say, "What is it that would allow us to overcome these obstacles? What's stopping us from actually getting something done?" And we tried to focus on those obstacles and issues where in our view, not enough attention is being paid.

So, there are some areas where actually there is extensive research by others. You won't see that covered in this book. So, if you wonder, "Well, why isn't

education, which is so fundamental to the SDGs, why isn't that fully covered in this volume?" The answer is because there are, you know, a ton of people doing research on education. We actually have a -- an entire center for universal education in our program at Brookings who, you know, provide a lot of material on that. There are far fewer people who are writing on things like oceans or geospatial data or women's empowerment or things like that. So, we try to select some topics where we haven't yet had, in our view, enough attention to the issue at hand.

And the second obstacle, I think, that we had is that this was supposed to be a book about implementation. And yet the SDGs by their nature are actually about a -- an intertwined system. We often say with the SDGs that all of the goals are connected to all of the others. So, you know, I was writing down a little kind of chain. You can't solve hunger without solving poverty; you can't solve poverty without addressing climate change; you can't address climate change if you don't deal with the oceans; and so on and so forth. So, it's easy to draw these links between all of the SDGs.

But if we then step back and say, "Okay, so we have to solve everything," you end up with paralysis. So, the way in which people and institutions actually work and operate does tend to be siloed. And so we somehow have to bridge this problem that on the one hand, everything is connected to everything else and we've got to move forward on a very broad front. But on the other hand, in order to move forward, we actually need to think more specifically.

Now, in engineering, you do this by approaching the problem with something called systems thinking or systems approaches. It turns out not to be that easy to take that concept into the social sciences where you've got behavior and, you know, people don't follow laws in the same way that physics actually helps you to, you

know, understand exactly what's going to happen. If you tweak one piece of the system, what's going to happen somewhere else in the system? These systems are not that, you know, defined. But there is actually a chapter in the book that explicitly tries to take a systems approach to this kind of thinking and that's something, I think, that we are trying to do and encourage in this volume.

So, where are we? Just as background to this morning's discussion, a few days ago a few of us put out a blog on, where do we actually stand? Here we are, three years into the SDGs; where do we stand? We looked at 25 indicators, quantitative indicators where we've got data on trajectories for over a hundred countries. In only five of those are we likely to get more than 50 percent of the way forward that would be required if we actually were to meet the goals. So, there's a real sense of urgency, I think, that we should take on. And for us, what that means is that actually we've got a great opportunity coming up.

Next year, 2019, is going to be the first year where leaders across the world are going to come together again and take stock off the -- off where we are with the SDGs. If we can't get this message of urgency and that we have to do something different and it's got to be at scale up to those leaders by next year, then I think the chances of us being able to actually meet the goals and targets will really recede. So, this is a particular point in time that I think we really have to try to seize and take advantage of.

So, what do we do? In the book, we've tried to break it down into a few areas and we call one capturing value. It's a simple concept, which is that if we believe that by and large the world is governed by market economies, if market economies aren't sending the right signals, you're not going to get things done. And there are lots of areas where we know that market economies aren't sending the right signals. We'll hear about

some of them. We'll hear about some of them. We'll hear about unpaid care work.

It's something that is inherent to the SDG concept of inclusion, but it's something where the market really is not actually rewarding the kinds of activities that many volunteers and others within households, care for children, care for the aged actually require. Obviously, the market is not rewarding climate externalities. And many of the other social externalities and other things and we'll hear about ways in which corporations can try to internalize some of these. So, capturing value basically is the idea that says, "We need to actually embed the SDGs in market economics and try to change incentives so that markets help us deliver on some of these goals."

The second big area for action that we identified is to target places. The SDGs are all discussed in terms of national commitments. They look at countries. That's no longer really going to be enough. Most of the action that will take place will actually happen not in countries as a whole, but in specific places. It'll happen in cities and small towns, it'll happen in rural areas, it'll happen in growth corridors that connect rural areas to small towns, and it'll happen in places like the oceans, which I've said before. We need to think about, where is it that these actions are going to have an impact?

And then the third area that we talk about is governance or accountability. And the question, as one of our chapter authors wrote, is, "So, who do we fire if we don't meet these SDGs?" I mean, we all know if you want to set in, you know, from a management point of view, if you want to set goals and targets, and if you really want people to take them seriously, there has to be some accountability. So, where is that accountability? Where is it in institutions, which countries, which governments?

And we've got a series of chapters that deal with that and you'll hear about one aspect of accountability in this morning's discussion. And that is the accountabilities and the responsibilities of rich countries, because that's really going to be

quite different from the old grand bargain of, "We'll give a little bit more aid in return for a little bit more action by the low-income countries in the, you know, basic needs of health and education," that was essentially the contract of the Millennium Development Goals period. So, today we've got a completely different kind of contract.

So, with that, let me turn to our panel and invite them to come and join me on the stage. Let's start with -- well, I'm at the end, so (laughter) that's not terribly useful.

Jeni Klugman -- Jeni is Managing Director at the Georgetown Institute for Women, Peace and Security. She's a Fellow at the Kennedy School of Government. She was previously at the World Bank as the Director of Gender and Development and has been the lead author of three of the UNDP's Human Development Reports that come out every year. Jeni -- and Jeni is the author of a chapter on gender and women's empowerment. Thank you, Jeni.

Hiroshi Kato -- Hiroshi Kato is a Senior Vice President of JICA. He has served in many positions formally. He was the Director of the JICA Research Institute. And indeed, we had a previous partnership with them at that time, so Hiroshi, thank you so much for coming here. And he has actually just also published a new book last year on the occasion of JICA's 50th Anniversary of Development Support.

We have Jane Nelson. Jane Nelson is the Director of the Corporate Responsibility Initiative at the Kennedy School at Harvard. She -- (coughs) excuse me -- also a Non-Resident Senior Fellow at Brookings. She is more widely traveled than almost anybody else I know in a range of forums, including the World Economic Forum. She's worked with the UN Global Compact, she's on the Board of Directors of many companies, and she is really one of the champions of the idea that it is corporations and companies that need to now actually change what they do and how they do it in order to

bring sustainability into the center of their operations and to move away from just thinking of it as corporate social responsibility.

And last and certainly not least, John McArthur. John is a -- my colleague in the Global Economy and Development Program. He's a Senior Fellow here. He's also a Senior Advisor to the UN Foundation, he's on the Board of the International Development Research Center in Canada, and he was previously the CEO of the Millennium Promise Alliance, which brought together people who were working on implementing the MDGs. So, thank you -- thanks to all of you for being here.

So, Jeni, we're going to start with you. And I think I'll let you just stand here rather than, you know, going down there. So, you know, we've talked for such a long time now about women's empowerment, how important this is in the world. It's been a, you know, you've been writing about this for -- probably for decades, I would think. So, what -- where are we on this now and are you optimistic or not about where we are, the direction where we're headed, and whether we can actually use the framing of the SDGs to make a breakthrough here.

MS. KLUGMAN: Well, thanks, Homi. And it's great to be here. And I think that the answer to your question is kind of broadly speaking that there is, I think, significant cause for optimism and I think possibly one indication of that is actually this volume. When Homi approached Laura Tyson and I more than a year ago and asked us to contribute to this volume, obviously we're very happy that gender was on the agenda. And then we were even more happy to see that we got pole position. Normally, we -- gender would be around Chapter 16 or so of a -- (laughter) and then there's a volume like this. But being in Chapter 2, I think, is somewhat symbolic, I think, of the recognition.

MR. KHARAS: It was not an accident.

MS. KLUGMAN: (Laughs) Of the -- no, and that's my point, I think, that

the -- you're going beyond the rhetoric and thinking about the central importance of addressing gender in this interconnected world to which Homi has already alluded to. And what we were able to do in preparing this chapter was draw on another piece in which had been involved and that was the high-level panel report on women's economic empowerment. And there we had looked at the breadth of the agenda, looked at where we stand, and in many ways, it is a picture which shows that gaps are not only pervasive but they're also persistent.

And in some areas, actually, there's counterintuitive trends. So, for example, globally, women's labor force participation has not been rising, it's slightly declined. Men's has also declined, but it's not necessarily what one would imagine would be the case with the increasing emphasis on women's opportunities over time. Homi asked us -- and Raj and John and Hiroshi asked us to be kind of selective, as well, in what we were going to address.

In the high-level panel report, we came up with seven drivers which we felt were kind of critical both barriers, but also on the flip side opportunities to accelerate progress. We were challenged to focus on just two. And in doing that, unpaid care really moved to the fore. We saw this as being important not only in terms of kind of constraining participation decision, so kind of whether or not women do choose to engage in paid work, but also kind of their aspirations in that context, the extent to which they're able to have, for example, an uninterrupted career, the ways in which they're able to balance other responsibilities. And we identified from the legislative policy, but also private sector actions that can be taken to accelerate progress.

Obviously, there's enormous diversity across countries. So, in countries where there's very limited infrastructures, invests in water and sanitation and energy are going to make an enormous difference. In Japan and elsewhere, it's marginal tax rates

on secondary earners which will make a significant difference on whether or not women are engaged in paid work.

But more generally -- and this is actually a theme in the chapter -- opening up and engaging in dialogue around gender roles is very important. In here, for example, we drew on evidence from Promundo, a global organization working with men and boys with quite encouraging evidence that many men would actually like to be much more engaged in unpaid care and they would be prepared to trade off paid and unpaid work to spend more time with their kids. We also know from fairly rigorous evaluations that early engagement with infants and young children affect, you know, allocations over time and can be quite informative there. So, we looked at kind of policy solutions around that.

The other key area -- and I know that I've only got a little bit of time, but just to give you a bit of a picture of kind of what we landed on in terms of key priorities -- was financial inclusion. And here again, it's something which is centrally recognized in the sustainable development agenda. Despite rising rates of inclusion globally, there has again been a persistent gap. So, the gap globally between women and men is around 7 percentage points; in developing countries, it's around 9 percent points. But actually, you're -- among the poor, between poor men and poor women, the gap is closer to 28 percent.

And here we looked at some of the promising reforms around kind of legal property and recognition of citizenship and so on, changes around ID, which is also central to the UN's agenda more broadly. And then we had a particular focus on digital finance and the ways in which that potentially allows some leapfrogging, kind of looking at the ways in which access to finance is being facilitated through mobile phones in particular.

And we know now that that can bring very significant results within relatively short periods of time. They're encouraging evaluations from Kenya and elsewhere to that effect. And now, for example, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation is picking that up, for example, in the context of social protection and the ways in which digitizing cash transfers has the potential to accelerate progress there.

And then just finally, once we were asked to focus on two aspects, we cheated a little bit and we snuck in a couple more. (Laughter) And so one was around what businesses can do and I think that has a nice connection to several other of the chapters in the book, what can be done to move the needle in terms of their own kind of organization and management supply chains and so on, as well as what can be done in terms of public sector employment and procurement.

So, I hope that you find it useful. It's very much drawing on kind of what we know, but kind of trying -- taking up the challenge to be selective and strategic to really identify ways in which we can accelerate the agenda. Thanks.

MR. KHARAS: Jeni, just to push you a little bit, would you say that this is an area where actually we have a pretty good idea about what needs to be done and we've got the technologies and all of that? So, we know what to do, but what's lacking in some sense is just the political will to actually go off and do it and scale up things that are already encouraging innovations?

MS. KLUGMAN: Well, I think it varies across the areas. So, the central challenge is clearly adverse norms, so the ways that women and men, boys and girls think about their roles in society, in the economy. And there are ways to affect those norms, but we really don't know that much about scaling up on that front. We have quite a lot of, I think, encouraging rigorous evidence from the household level, from the community level, from in some cases media campaigns, from in Bangladesh where call

centers and in India in call centers and Bangladesh with respect to garment sector opportunities actually change norms around girls' education and women's work. So, we do have examples like that, but I don't think we really have a -- so, I think we have a better sense on the barriers rather than on solutions.

In other areas, we have a much better sense. So, more than a hundred countries still have quite significant legal constraints on women's work, women's property, women's inheritance. And that for me, frankly, is a bit of a no-brainer. I think the World Bank has done a fabulous job in terms of documenting the (inaudible) extent of those barriers. The IMyth is doing a good job now in trying to trace what the impacts are -- real impacts are in terms of women's opportunities.

So, that's something which is more, you know, it's much more obvious, I think, in terms of what can be done. But I think that the recognition of the centrality of norms shouldn't lead us to kind of throw up our hands and say, "Well, nothing can be done." It's the question of, you know, what are leaders doing to change norms? What -- what's business doing to change norms? What's happening at the community level? How can we kind of promote change at that level?

MR. KHARAS: So, it's a combination of kind of stroke of the pen policy and --

MS. KLUGMAN: Mm-hmm.

MR. KHARAS: -- regulatory changes along with the much longer-term issue of actually changing norms and behaviors and peoples' perceptions.

MS. KLUGMAN: Mm-hmm.

MR. KHARAS: And now, Jane, let me come to you now because that probably is fairly similar to the issues that we face with corporations in thinking about how corporations actually can contribute and why they should care about the SDGs rather

than just about their own profits. And when we were up in New York, we heard people saying, "Well, corporations have now really bought into the climate agenda." I mean, they see it affecting their bottom line. But the rest of the stuff, "Ah, that's just stuff," you know, (inaudible) kinds of things. Is that where you see where we are, where we should be, and where we're going?

MS. NELSON: Okay. Good morning, everyone. Good to be here. I think where we are is a, you know, a partly good news story, (inaudible) challenging story in terms of the corporate sector and that I think one of the things that's different about the SDGs and the Paris Agreement compared to most other previous agreements is that there is pretty widespread consensus now that we simply will not achieve the sustainable development goals and fill the estimated get three to four-and-a-half trillion dollar financing gap every year without dramatically increasing private sector investment, private sector implementation capability, private sector innovation -- not just in sort of products and services and technologies, but business models -- private sector advocacy, you know, using the sort of consumer voice at the private sector.

And so the challenge is, you know, how do we get there? And the good news story is that there is a vanguard and, you know, probably we have several-hundred maybe, we have several-thousand companies that have become very sophisticated about understanding both the material risks and the material business opportunities, yeah, as well as just the (inaudible) leadership imperative to get engaged on sustainable development and being more public about aligning that to the sustainable development goals. But there's, you know, there's 45,000 companies listed on the major public stock exchanges. There's, you know, the International Chamber of Commerce has 45 million members, so we're such a long way (laughs) from getting, you know, the mainstream business community engaged.

And given, you know, the lack of -- whether it's political world, I mean, you know, enabling regulatory and fiscal incentives and sort of market failures and externalities, there's no way we're going to get there by relying on company by company doing it individually. So, I think the most interesting innovation -- and that's what my chapter looks at, sort of what I'm calling collective action (laughs) and sort of coalitions of large numbers of companies coming together either around a specific issue, such as climate change, such as gender, and such as education, or within an industry sector or in a sort of place-based way.

And I think there are some, you know, very interesting examples, yeah, literally in the last sort of, yeah, two to three years since the SDGs were announced where we're seeing that beginning to happen. And so just to give you some very practical examples: if we look at industry sectors, GSMA, which is the -- sort of the coalition of all the mobile operators, so 800 companies that do all the mobile sort of connections in the world, yeah, they came up with a -- an industry roadmap for the sustainable development goals and said, "You know, we're going to, you know, sort of hold our member companies accountable for what they're doing and, you know, they need to say, 'These are the goals that are important to us,' and then demonstrate to us, you know, how they're delivering on them."

A group of agribusiness companies, including Allam and a number from developing countries, so not just the western multinationals, came together to form the Global Agribusiness Alliance. And, again, with a very specific focus on, how does agribusiness identify the -- sort of the SDGs that are most material to them and work together and set common goals and then hold each other accountable for doing that. The consumer goods force, all the retail companies, the International Tourism Partnership, which has, you know, something like 30,000 hotels around the world have

made commitments around some of the key SDGs.

So, we're seeing sort of industry sector movements and I think, you know, I sort of -- I hope that your governments and civil society actors will encourage, yeah, more industry sectors to take that broad sector level approach.

I think we're also seeing some interesting sort of evolution of collection action at the country level and I'd like to sort of do a call-out of -- coincidentally given Japan's leadership role in this book and support for this book. Just yesterday at the UN, the Kadanrahn (phonetic), which is the national coalition for the top companies in Japan, launched a new charter around the sustainable development goals and it's a set of, you know, it's seven very specific commitments that the Kadanrahn as a group is making. And then again, it's going to monitor and hold its, you know, sort of member companies accountable in terms of how they, yeah, how they achieve that.

In the Netherlands, there's something on -- the Dutch government is working with business on covenants and they've got the banking sector, the agribusiness sector to come together around covenants parties supporting sustainable development goals. We're seeing, you know, more alliances at the city level. You know, there's an oceans, yeah, companies that are involved and fisheries and oceans coming together.

So, I see this as a, you know, it doesn't take away from individual companies getting it right and I think, you know, we're seeing some movement, not enough yet, on investors making greater demands of individual companies, on gender equality. Blumberg launched a gender equality index. It's an interesting market mechanism that's now over a hundred companies of being ranked, yeah, by a major financial information services institution.

So, we're seeing more of that. We're obviously seeing we have some, you know, government frameworks emerging, but an, you know, without -- from a

voluntary perspective without sort of business taking collective action. I don't think we're going to get there. And so these collective mechanisms, I think, are one of our best hopes for scaling up the business engagement in addition to enabling frameworks and market incentives.

MR. KHARAS: Jane, I -- a couple of times in your comments, you said that in these platforms, corporations will hold themselves accountable --

MS. NELSON: Yeah.

MR. KHARAS: -- for the commitments that they're making. In practice, what does that actually mean? Is it the boards that are holding managers and CEOs accountable, is it financial markets that are holding companies accountable by, you know --

MS. NELSON: Yeah.

MR. KHARAS: -- potentially affecting institutional investors, affecting their stock market evaluations? What's the nature of that accountability?

MS. NELSON: And I would argue that what we're seeing involved is basically three, maybe four levels of accountability that are beginning to emerge and they will need to work together. So, I think at the individual company level for the leaders, whether or not enough of them, is the boards increasingly holding their management to account. So, and you can tell if you look at a company's -- their public statements, their public reports, there are companies who say, "This is our carbon target. This is our water target. This is our gender target," and then, you know, they're bold to say, "What are we delivering? Because if we're going to make promises, we've got to deliver." (Laughs)

So, you're seeing that at the individual company level. You are then -- these voluntary coalitions are interesting because they're holding each other to account so that, you know, if you are part of one of these voluntary coalitions, you know, it's a little

bit more (inaudible) you can hold each other to account.

MR. KHARAS: Mm-hmm.

MS. NELSON: I think the very interesting third level is the, you know, financial services (inaudible) investor accountability mechanisms. So, you know, more and more investors are asking questions and the principles for responsive investment, which is one-and-a-half-thousand companies now investors with (inaudible) \$50 trillion on assets on the management, yeah, they're beginning to ask companies these questions.

Stock exchange listing requirements, there's something called Sustainable Stock Exchanges Initiative. And again, it started with, I think, four stock exchanges and it's now most of the world's major stock exchanges. And again, just yesterday at the UN were talking about having listing requirements. Many of them already have it, but if you're a company you want to list in a stock exchange, you've got to meet certain SDG requirements. So, you've got that level.

And then ultimately, it's your sort of government disclosure requirements and that's, you know, where we're seeing the least progress, but we are seeing some in the, you know, a number of particularly European government are now requiring -- and the European Union has, you know, launched a requirement for companies over a certain size to report annually on what they consider to be their material, social, and environmental, you know, performances. So, you're seeing, you know, the individual company, these sort of, you know, industry collective action, the financial services sector, (inaudible) investors holding companies to account, and then your government disclosure requirements.

MR. KHARAS: Great. John, let me now turn to you and maybe we can stay a little bit with this theme of accountability. You know, you have a chapter with Margaret Biggs on the implications for an advanced economy like Canada for -- of the

SDGs for how Canada should behave, both towards their own citizens domestically, but also internationally, and how they in turn can make commitments to their citizens through -- I think Canada just has posted a voluntary national review with the High-Level Political Forum at the UN to essentially, you know, lay out in public what their commitments are on these various things.

And your chapter describes, you know, not just how Canada has done it, but also how they should do it and how advanced economies might actually take on the idea that they're responsible not for everything, but just for selected things that also dovetail with their own domestic politics.

MR. McARTHUR: Thank you, Homi, and thanks to our co-editors and co-authors; it's terrific. And I have to say, I like this format. It's like we have our own new Jimmy Fallon here and we're all -- (laughter) we need a couch and we can just rotate through as you talk to us.

I think it might useful just to give a quick history as to our little journey on this. Because we -- when we -- Hiroshi and Raj and Homi and I first started talking about this book a couple years ago, the question of, "What does this mean for an advanced economy, this whole SDG thing," was still pretty new. And as much as all of us had been pretty involved in various parts of these conversations, it was quite interesting.

I'm Canadian, so I have a lot of Canadian reference points in my head every day. But the notion of how to connect the dots between these international conversations and the local ones was an open one. And there were three basic steps, as I reflect on it. (Laughs) And I just thought it might be useful to talk that through.

The first is, you know, this basic question, "Well, why is this even important?" Or I should say, that's even before you get into the steps, just understanding, why are you doing this? Why does this matter? And if I were to boil it

down, I would say if there is one thing we've learned in the world of politics and policy in the past few years, it's that if our communities don't work, the world doesn't work. And if the world doesn't work, our communities don't work. And these goals are a tool to connect the dots between those core dynamics. So, that's the why.

But then this question of, "Well, what is the problem we're trying to solve," and that's the first step. I would say the three steps were measure, interpret, and then think through the "so what?" And the measurement actually turned out to be a major exercise just to start, to use these goals, to take them by the book. And Krista Rasmussen and I, you know, we thought we'd do a quick snapshot to inform ourselves -- and this took us probably six or nine months just to really think through how to interpret these data for an advanced economy. And not just how to take the indicators, but then how to interpret them.

And the upshot -- some of you might have seen this, but even Canada is not wholly on track yet for any of the 17 goals. Now, there are two ways to interpret that. One is, "Oh my gosh. If Canada can't do this, why should anyone bother?" That's the wrong way to interpret it, just to be clear. (Laughter) The right way to interpret the -- in my view is, "Oh, look. Even Canada has some group getting left behind on each issue. And even Canada is not paying enough attention to all the issues. So, even Canada isn't on track by our estimate for any of the gender equality targets."

Canada, of course, for those who know the context well -- I see at least one fellow Canadian (laughs) in the audience -- issues of indigenous people are front and center of the political -- it's an existential challenge for the society, reconciliation. But also, you have by our estimate roughly 10 percent of the population living in pretty persistent poverty and deprivation, again, "Even in Canada." That's about three-and-a-half million people. That's a lot of people getting left behind on issues of hunger, of

poverty, of exclusion. It might be 15 to 20 percent that aren't getting basic skills of literacy and numeracy. Imagine what life's going to be like them in the context of the future of work.

So, these are all very foundational questions. And interestingly, many of them -- with the exception of poverty, where I think we've been having a lot of arguments on the middle class in advanced economies -- we're not maybe having enough argument on who's getting left behind. Those issues, I think, are exactly the issues that interestingly are exactly what politicians are debating already. But they're not used to debating them in the context of the sustainable development goals and they're not used to debating them in terms of an agreement on where we're trying to go.

The agreement is usually, "How are we going to make," or the debate is usually, "How are we going to make progress?" The question, I think, should be, "How are we going to make progress towards an agreed outcome framework? So, let's have your vision on how to cut poverty by half." That's the domestic target for every country. "What's your vision of how to get there versus my version of how to get there?" You can have a left-wing approach, you can have a right-wing approach, but we're all going to measure the same outcome. And that's the debate I think we need to have.

So, when we thought through this, we thought, "Wow, there's a -- there's clearly a domestic piece of this puzzle for advanced economies, for all economies. There's clearly an external piece of the puzzle, which we're -- and in the Canadian context haven't been discussing well enough but are used to discussing. But there's also a collective piece of this puzzle where each country, sometimes what they do at home will make outside contributions to what happens in the world."

So, for example, on oceans Canada has a pretty extensive coastline and what Canada does for its domestic decision-making on oceans has outsized impacts on

what happens to the world's oceans. And so we really separated out conceptually the domestic, the collective, and the external challenge. So, then there's the "so what?" piece.

The "so what," I think the single biggest piece that I took away from this is, there has been a huge conversation the past couple years thinking about, "Well, which -- you have to pick which goal's most important. Which goal are you going to start with?" And I have come firmly to the conclusion that's the wrong question. That's like saying, "Is one person's domestic violence more or less important than another person's food insecurity?" It's a preposterous question. And in Canada, the federal government has 30 members of the federal cabinet. So, can each of them take on at least half a goal? The reality is, each of them already has multiple goals, but what these SDGs are is a chance to put them all literally and figuratively on the same page.

But the real question is not which issue's most important because someone's already in charge on some piece of this puzzle everywhere. The real question is, "Which trajectories need to change?" And there are some issues where the trajectories are pretty good. So, Canada actually turns out every province is doing well on cardiovascular disease and on track to meet the SDG target. But there are some where it's actually moving backwards: child obesity. There are many that -- they're just not getting the last mile.

And so our policy therefore is the ability to distinguish between things where you need to keep going as you're doing, the things where you might need a nudge to make it a little bit better, move a little bit faster, move from walking to running, and there are some things where everyone's driving down the highway, but they're -- they took a wrong turn and in they're moving in the wrong direction. And we got to get them back on the right road. And these are the areas that need a turnaround and therefore we

need a new societal approach.

And the goals can help us have an honest conversation on the need for a new direction and then we can -- all the pieces that we've talked about -- the business, the science, the local government, the community, the federal government, in Canada the provincial, the state equivalent -- all are very important. But if you had this as a neutral outcome framework, then we can all be clear on, "Huh, this one's going pretty well, this one needs to do a little bit better, and this one over here needs a whole new approach." And so let's have that debate on how, where, and we don't even need to wonder why.

I'll stop there. Thanks.

MR. KHARAS: John, one of the things that Canada has just done, which I think is a real innovation, is to appoint a Minister who is in charge of the sustainable development goals.

MR. McARTHUR: Yeah.

MR. KHARAS: I don't know if that's a first for advanced economy, but it is certainly a distinct change. What -- how does the Minister we -- and we had the opportunity to have the (inaudible) Minister come to the New York event that I referred to before. Tell us a little bit about how the Minister views his role and ability to sort of, you know, change these conversations? Or how -- what you would hope --

MR. McARTHUR: Right.

MR. KHARAS: -- the Minister would do. That's perhaps easier.

MR. McARTHUR: (Inaudible) so I --

MR. KHARAS: Yeah.

MR. McARTHUR: -- won't speak on their behalf, (laughter) but I think the -- I would just say one thing to clarify. Canada has not figured all this stuff out. Canada is figuring this out. And there are many pieces of the puzzle. So, the -- just to

explain what Homi mentions and Minister Jean-Yves Duclos, who's basically a Minister for Families and Domestic Policy. And every -- it's kind of like a Department of Labor and Social Protection all in the same go. And in Canada, there's a very particular division of labor between the federal government and the provincial governments. There's no Federal Ministry of Education, for example, for all sort of historical reasons.

So, that ministry is now where the Prime Minister very recently decided to put the hub for the government's effort. There are about eight Ministers, I believe, who are on the Cabinet Committee that includes everyone from Environment and Climate Change to International Development to Indigenous Services to a Minister for Status of Women. There's a couple other I should be remembering, but, you know, it's a broad range of Ministers. And that, in my view, is exactly right.

One of the most interesting aspects of the SDG conversation in Canada, back to the indigenous bit, is that going to this challenge of reconciliation -- and the Trudeau government has really tried to do better on this and has even set targets. There -- there's not even hundred percent access to clean drinking water in Canada and this is largely because of lack of safe drinking water on -- in indigenous communities. And they've set a target to solve that problem by 2022, very consistent with the SDGs. It's the last mile. But the SDGs have become literally proposed as a neutral framework for the Assembly of First Nations to have a new mutual accountability fiscal framework with the federal government to have a new way forward.

Now, the -- this Minister, one of the things that I think so excited Minister Duclos is that he's a domestic Minister who has to in his day job, because of the education, Division of Labor and everything, coordinate with all these members of their -- the complexities of domestic politics. He has to coordinate with them and he has to coordinate with all these other ministries working across the country on so many issues

and he has to have then coordinate with the ministries working on global conversations.

And one of the very interesting things he said was that these goal -- on Monday was that these goals are a helpful tool for taking on these challenges that are happening around the world, like technological change, future of work, people being excluded. At the same time is confronting Canada's own very real challenges and connecting those. And I thought that was a very nice summary. But interestingly, they're also looking to learn from other countries that are confronting many of the same challenges.

So, I was in Ottawa recently and people are saying, "Which country's doing the best on this? Which one -- country should we be learning from?" You know, it's a very common question. I said, "Well, they're doing this bit in the Netherlands, they're doing that bit in Norway, they're doing this bit in Germany." But I said, "Imagine if there was a community of practice between, say, South Africa, Canada or Northern Manitoba," Saskatchewan and Flint, Michigan on how to make sure we have safe drinking water for the long-term because each community -- this is not an us versus them, this is all of us together. And how can we have community accountability at the local level for that. And people are very interested in that, so I'm kind of giving the long answer of there's no -- Canada's not a magic solution to any of these things. They're making tremendous progress in their national review this week. I think really has come a long ways in showing how far they've come in thinking about it. Again, even in Canada, everyone's looking for how to collaborate with others to do the stuff better.

MR. KHARAS: Thank you. Hiroshi, I want to come to you now because the things that we have heard to some extent are so different from what a normal aid agency would often think about. And yet, here you are, JICA, trying to think about these much broader issues. So, what prompted you and JICA to think that? Well, we need to

think a little bit more broadly than just about the aid agenda if we're really going to make a contribution to the SDGs.

MR. KATO: Thank you, Homi and the co-editors and contributors and friends. Thank you for having me. It's a great pleasure to be here. I'd like to get back to your question later, but I didn't contribute an individual specific chapter to the volume. I participated in the exercise as one of the co-editors. So, what I'll try to do is to talk about the book as a whole and what I learned through the exercise and convince you that you need to buy a book.

MR. KHARAS: Yeah.

MR. KATO: Buy the book. There are several copies available, so you are hesitant over whether you're going to buy it or not, please buy it because I'm going to convince you why you need to buy it and read it.

Now, my keyword is change. And I have several lessons that I learned from participating in this exercise. The fundamental difference between the MDGs and SDGs, well, there are many differences, number of goals and et cetera, et cetera, but I think the fundamental and most important difference between that wo is that SDGs call for fundamental changes. Changes in our mindset; changes in our behavior; and, changes in values, et cetera, et cetera. So, changes is the keyword in my view. And when we started the idea of creating a book about SDGs, my thought was maybe people will act as the business as usual way. Not really thinking about the changes seriously.

But as I see it and if you have a look at the chapters in the book, you'll recognize that there are certainly many changes already taking place. And so, I have to come to realize that the potential of the SDGs as a game changer is not something we imagine or something we desire and calling for, but it is coming to be proven real. Potential of SDGs as a rule changer or game changer is becoming real. And talking

about those changes that are already taking place, I have observed there are three characteristics. Changes are pervasive in various sectors and actors as my previous speakers talked about already. Changes are pervasive and maybe number two, the changes are irreversible, so we have changed. There are fundamental changes, we're moving in a certain direction and it is not likely that we're going to go back to the original positions. And thirdly, and which is I think is very important is that many of the changes are norm creating. They work in such a way they create new norms and standards and many of them have been referred to by my previous speakers. So, Homi said in his introductory remarks in the indigenous era, nobody lost his or her job by not attending the MDGs, but maybe we're living in an era where you may not get fired by not attending the SDGs, but it is possible that your companies will lose market if you fail to comply with the values embedded in SDGs or if your local government will be challenged by the citizens who are awakened to the values of SDGs or the eight agencies like, JICA or whatever, J-FIT (phonetic), and the USAID, et cetera, et cetera, might be challenged for their inefficiency if we fail to reinvent ourselves in such a way that we can contribute to development of SDGs.

So, I think these changes are pervasive, irreversible and norm creating and we are living in a whole new era. And I think this book vividly illustrates that we are entering in that era. I think that's the important message that we can get from this book. And secondly -- unfortunately, although changes are taking place, maybe the changes are not happening rapidly enough -- not fast enough and that means that we have to have a sense of urgency and the book tells us that we have to have a central agency. Not because we may get losed (sic) if we fail to meet the SDGs, but -- not because our lead prodigal leaders will lose face in the year 2030 in New York, but because our failure in changing ourselves fast enough will result in a situation where the lives of the eight

billion people will be in danger. So, the sense of urgency is another message we can get from this book. And thirdly, luckily, I think the third message we can get from the book is that the experts in various fields have provided specific and maybe a logical and understandable solutions that they propose forced to make changes fast enough and in the right direction.

This applies to say, government sectors or citizen -- civil society organizations, aid agencies or even researchers and scientists. And they also point to the possibility of the availability of newly -- a new technology and skills which have been hitherto underutilized, like satellite image data or -- and some other things. So, it provides specific suggestions as to how we can change -- make change in the desired direction.

So, talking about those changes that are happening in the SDG era and - - but we need to have a sense of urgency and we have some specific hints as to how we are going to change ourselves. Maybe this book is worth reading. I hope I've done a good job in convincing you to buy the book. And with that, I'd like to conclude my remarks. Thank you.

MR. KHARAS: Thank you, Hiroshi. And I would buy a used car from you any day (laughter). Let me -- let me open it up to the --

MR. KATO: I forgot to address the question (laughter) yeah, how JICA is going to reinvent itself? Well, in relation to the subjects that I refer to, maybe my unique organization is trying to reinvent itself in the following ways. Maybe there are two key words as I said earlier. Maybe the impact or the scaling up, we need to change -- massive changes, and urgency. So, urgency and scale are two important themes that we have to pursue in the decades to come. In order to do so, we are going to reinvent ourselves.

In the 20th century, most of the bilateral agencies used to engage in the G to G projects, government to government projects. And, we still continue to do so -- government to government projects, but we are increasingly trying to mobilize our resources in such a way that public resources like JICA can act as a catalyst. So, the key words are partnership with a private sector, and partnership with likeminded organizations including MBBs, bilateral organizations, and philanthropic agencies, et cetera, et cetera. And thirdly, utilization of technology, and ICT technologies. So, these three key words -- with three directions, we're going to -- we're trying to reinvent ourselves. Thank you.

MR. KATO: Wonderful. So, we've got a few minutes left. Let's see if people from the audience would like to ask our panelists any questions or make any comments. The lady here. I'll take a few questions, and then turn back to the panel.

MS. CHEROW: Thank you. Evelyn Cherow, Global Partners United. Last month, I was at the UN for the convention on Persons with Disabilities Treaty, and progress after 11 years. We know with the MDGs that the one billion people with disabilities were ignored, and the issue of poverty eradication as the umbrella is critical considering that population is the poorest of the poor. I'm wondering if the book addresses that. I bought the book, I haven't read it yet. It's a critical piece. There was much frustration expressed at the 11th anniversary meeting of that treaty.

And, my other question is, we've been talking about public/private partnerships for some time, but the business models still elude us. And, I'm wondering, with all that's written about impact, and angel investment, still not taking the risks, and looking more like venture capital, is there any hope for those of us trying to convince impact investors to come along on this ride? Thank you.

MR. KHARAS: Thank you. There's a gentleman just there.

MR. HOPWOOD: Thank you for the presentation. I'm living in Senegal, in Dakar. So, I'm going to bring the voice of Africa. We said this was the neglected dimension. I'd like to say two things. Firstly, I think it's interesting the volume that --

MR. KHARAS: Can you introduce yourself please?

MR. HOPWOOD: Ian Hopwood (phonetic). I teach, and I write, and I think. I notice there were no authors from Africa. Interesting. Of the 23 or the 17, there was the -- and, I think that we have a very great challenge for the continent to the extent that we are dealing with governments with budgets of \$300, or \$400, or \$500 per head, per year, for everything. In Benin, or (inaudible), or Senegal. And, we have a very ambitious (inaudible) agenda. And, there's a real danger in all of this -- that countries say, this is our agenda. And, at the end of the day, there's going to be a lot of frustration, a lot of failure, a lot of shortfalls.

How do governments prioritize? How do they prioritize to retain the credibility with their citizens? They endorse the generous resolution, they go home, and the sorts of miraculous changes, the paradise on earth promised by the STGs is not going to emerge, I don't think. So, I think we have that big issue of what to do in low income countries where the conditions for private investment are not very favorable, where there is great capacity and financial constraints.

The second point -- I'm also the honorary chair of the Senegalese Evaluation Association. Evaluation has been something which is quite weak. The MBGs, the STGs, its indicators, it's counting the progress toward measurable, quantifiable goals. But, the role of evaluation hasn't been pointed out by a number of people so far. It's really not sufficiently developed, neither in the resolution, nor in practice. So, how can we use evaluation to really drill down? To look at the success, the determinants, and so on.

And just finally, the goals are fine, but what does it take to get governments to move? There are rarely comments on gender. We have set out since 1979, which has been pushing on some of the same questions, which are now reintegrated into the STGs. So, what is it that really is possible? What does it take to make governments, set up, and move, and bring about change in the sense of urgency that we require? Thank you.

MR. KHARAS: Thank you. I'll take one more in this round. There's a lady here on this side. And, just as a small correction, we do of course, have a chapter from Amina Mohammed. It's on Nigeria, by a Nigerian, perhaps the most prominent Nigerian right now. So, she was a minister at the time, and now of course is the Secretary General of the United Nations.

MS. BELENOVICH: Hi, my name is Audrey Belenovich. I'm with Key Lime International, an independent consulting firm on international development. And, Mr. Kharas, you had mentioned in the beginning that the world is governed by market economies, and we need to embed the STGs in the market economy, which implies private sector inclusion. So, my question from the international aid community is, right now, most international development consulting firms and aid agencies, compete for U.S. AID grants. Should we expect a shift away from U.S. government funded grants, and on the more international -- and towards a more international competition on aid development, and stuff like that? And if so, do the agencies within Washington D.C., should they start gearing towards a more international competition for aid donors? Thank you.

MR. KHARAS: Thank you. Okay, let's turn to some of these. Anyone like to tackle disabilities? John?

MR. KATO: I don't want to.

MR. MCARTHUR: I'll jump on that one.

MR. KHARAS: Why don't you tackle disabilities and evaluation please?

MR. MCARTHUR: On the disabilities side, I would just agree. I don't think it's quite right to say the MBGs excluded that because the MDGs were exclusively -- having worked on the MDGs -- weren't about the poorest of the poor. They're about giving voice to the most voiceless in the world. That was the spirit of it. I don't think the disability issues got enough attention in that realm, in my experience. So, I'm agree with that, but slightly -- I had a different view of the history of it. But, I think the STGs -- I was actually at the UN that day, or a couple weeks ago -- or during that week. And, it was quite moving. And, one of the things Krista and I actually looked into in the Canadian context is the data that are available on -- in our benchmarking report for people with disabilities. And, a lot of the indicators and targets in here, actually call for that. And so, one of the big -- so it is in the STGs very much. And then also, you can only talk about it in a measured sense where there are data to talk about it. And so, one of the things that the STGs call for -- and I would say this is one of many means of disaggregation that need much stronger data. And so, part of what we're talking about, and this gets to the evaluation point. Because, even in Canada, we could only do this for a handful of indicators, and it felt very limited, and limiting. Part of what we're talking about here is this neutral outcome focused approach. So, I think -- the way I think about it is, the STGs are a tool. They're not a complete answer. They're far from it. There's not a single person in the world I know who would have written them all as they are, because they're a negotiated outcome of 193 countries. So, there are lots of groups, and lots of communities that feel it could have been better for the issues they care about. And, that's true. However, what they are is, the first time the world has ever had this type of negotiated outcome focused agreement.

So, the fact that even Homi, and Krista, and I could just put out a blog last week where we've looked at all of the people centered indicators with data, to say let's look at where -- these aren't general issues, these are specific issues, for specific peoples, with specific needs, in specific places. We did that, exactly, to try and give this life. But, this isn't about general issues, this is about people. And so, I think on the evaluation point, again, I think we've looked at a lot of this in different sectors.

I would argue that in some epistemic professional communities, evaluation is actually extremely strong. The global health community has a lot of evaluation. Global Fund has independent technical review hardwired into all its systems. A lot of the evaluation takes place in the world's top journals, like The Lancet, the BMJ, and others. And, we've looked -- actually we published a paper, Christine Jang (phonetic), and I recently, looking at which academic communities are evaluating progress on these goals. And, it turns out health stands out up here, economics is down here. And so, the economists, in my view, of which I'm a member of that community, arguably, need to be spending more time on the evaluation for say, the extreme poverty questions. And thinking about the scaled outcomes. You know, I'll let others speak on their areas of expertise, but I think that part of -- to draw this all together -- part of what we're talking about is looking at this outcome focused approach in a dispassionate way to start. What do the data tell us? Where do we need better data? Using that to inform the institutional questions of accountability. And then, pushing that so that the argument again, is over how to -- competing visions of how to succeed, as opposed to pretending there's a single answer on any of these questions because there very rarely is.

MR. KHARAS: Thank you. Jane, could you take on both the public/private partnerships business model, as well as the question on the relationship

between aid agencies and --

MS. NELSON: Absolutely. And, then very quickly, the impact of investing. On the public/private partnerships model, what I'd strongly recommend is that you do read (inaudible) chapter, and maybe you can connect. But, I think that you're right, and there hasn't been enough work and analysis done on what are the actual -- your mindsets, skill sets that are needed. And, we don't -- most universities don't teach, most schools don't teach on how do you build coalitions, and public/private partnerships? And, you (inaudible) is arguing in her chapter that that is something that needs to become something that is much more mainstream.

In terms of the -- your question on the impact of investing, yeah, I think we need to look at it as a spectrum. And, there is a danger, where you're moving more and more towards just commercial investment, traditional venture capital, et cetera. And, I think there's a role for that, and you have to be able to demonstrate that funding some of the SDGs can be commercially viable. But then, being very, very clear that the need for -- whether it's donor grants, or philanthropic grants is going to remain. I think the World Bank's new cascade approach for looking at World Bank funding could actually be applied in an interesting way to the private funding, as well. There's going to be certain eras where that grant funding is crucial.

I'd also -- I'd love to connect later, there's a very interesting business coalition as you probably know in the UK, on business advocates are on disability which have done an important advocacy job, and probably could be replicated in other countries. So, I'll come back on that. In terms of the links with the donor agencies, our colleague George Ingram (phonetic), might be able to answer more on the U.S. side here. I do think one of the shifts we're seeing, and I think JICA is a good example of that, is that we are growing focus. If you're going to work with consultants in private sector,

locally based, locally owned companies. And, your building that capability, and not -- you're partnering with the western consultants unless they -- they can demonstrate that they're either working with or building the capability of that sort of local enterprise, local advisory capabilities in the country of focus.

MR. KHARAS: Thank you. Jeni, maybe a couple of words on how does one get governments to move?

MS. KLUGMAN: Sure. Well, I think -- I was going to make a couple of points. One is, the agenda that we're talking about would obviously benefit from increased public investment that it's not conditional on very substantially increased resources. And, we try and make the point in the chapter that the vast majority of the women that we're talking about are working in the informal sector, for example. So, we're not talking about extending -- maternity and paternity protections are important, but they're not really central to the game that we're thinking about. For example, addressing unpaid care. So, it's very important to be very context specific.

On the other, major public investments in water and energy, are potentially expensive. The role of the private sector is very important there. But, I think in thinking about what's different since 1979 to which you alluded, some of you may not know that that was the year for the Convention for the (inaudible) of all forms of discrimination against women, which has been the most extensively ratified UN convention, the U.S. being one glaring exception, I think along with Palau, and I think somewhere else. But, it's also the convention that I think has the most extensive reservation. So, on the one hand, countries signed up, or governments signed up, but on the other hand, they had very extensive exceptions.

So, I think it's possible to say -- or true to say that while there were ostensibly these agreements, the governments were not really fully committed. And, we

see for example, from the work of women business and the law, the fact that there's such extensive legal discrimination on the books means that governments had not really bought into this. I think a couple of things have changed. Or at least a couple have changed. One is, I think that recognition of the economic dividends associated with gender equality. In conversation with feminists, if you say it's the smart thing to do, often the eyebrows will raise, people will start getting kind of itchy, and prickly, and so on. But, I think it's possible to make the case that there are important economic dividends alongside an important rights based case. And, they're not mutually exclusive. And, I think that we're coming around to that point of view. I think that the divergence between those communities is being brought together. I think the collective action and collective voice is an important aspect -- we allude to it a bit in the chapter, but for example, say where in we go in groups working with informal sector workers.

And, I think the final piece of the puzzle where I -- and connecting to what John mentioned earlier in evaluations, certainly there's a lot more that we need to learn. But, the evidence is really quite rapidly accumulating. A lot of it, obviously, is that the micro and community level, very specific in terms of the conditions under which a particular intervention worked. Some of these interventions are expensive, some of them less so. But, I think, the accumulation now of what evidence works, helps us when we engage in conversations with governments who ostensibly want to do something. But, now you can say, actually this has been tried here, you might want to attempt a version of that. So, I think building and sharing knowledge is a very important part of the agenda.

MR. KHARAS: Thank you. Thank you. Hiroshi, there was a question about how do governments prioritize with this very broad agenda. And, oftentimes, they come to you, and say these are where we want some assistance. Any observations on how they prioritize? How you try to bring this broader agenda to their attention?

MR. KATO: Okay, let me come back to the question later.

MR. KHARAS: No. No. No. (laughs)

MR. KATO: May I address some of the questions raised by the audience?

MR. KHARAS: Sure.

MR. KATO: One question is about Africa. I happen to be in charge of African countries within my organization, and I'm very glad that you raised the issues related to Africa. And, you're quite right. The reality in Africa quite -- much remains to be desired -- improved. And, seeing the reality in many of the poorer African countries, maybe what we're discussing might sound like an empty rhetoric. But, I still believe having an STG will help us in supporting the African governments, and the people to improve their lives. One is, maybe in light of the leaders, in some of the -- many of the -- a considerable number of African countries are aware of the fact that they need to aspire for the achievement of STGs, and they're leading their countries in that direction. And, like I said, many of the international external partners recognize that -- and to recognize that, they need to change their behaviors and mindsets. So, this new set of mindsets can help both the African countries, and the external partners to do a better job.

And secondly, I think we learned a lot from the experiences of MDGs. For examples, in case of education, maybe the MDG emphasized too much on the improvement of the enrollment rate of children in schools, and rather ignoring the actual outcome of pupils and students. Now, reflecting on that experience, rather learned the hard way, we are now focusing our attention to the actual learning outcome of children. And, that's one small, but important improvement. And so, I think we have learned a lot from our experiences in the MDGs, and trying to do better. That's about Africa.

And, about the business model, and the private and public partnership, I

think that this PPP used to be often used in terms of the framework of infrastructure development, the power development, et cetera, et cetera. But, not very much used in other sectors such as manufacturing, or agriculture, or education, for example. But, many of the external partners -- or international partners are trying to partner with the private sector in agriculture. Like empowering small scale farmers, or in education doing the -- ICT aided education materials. Or, maybe even manufacturing. So, this kind of private partner, and public partnership in other sectors than infrastructure and power is an area where various actors can put together the resources, and explore the better models. And, the prioritization, well, I think it's -- there's no general answer that I can give to the question. Again, it's the selection of the government. And, among the 16 goals out of 17, maybe individual countries should come up with the priorities in which area of their countries should be paid the bigger attention than others. This kind of political decision should come first when they make a decision about the priority of resource mobilization. Thank you.

MR. KHARAS: Thank you. And, I would just say on prioritization that I think now there is more and more evidence about the importance of having an inclusive process where governments, civil society, businesses, start to discuss what are the priorities. And, one of the risks that we face is that in some cases that space for civil society is actually being closed down which generates some real difficulties in having a truly inclusive prioritization. There's one -- there was one person who I had ignored in that first round. We've only got time for one more question. If you can identify yourself again, I will take that question. No, it wasn't Ann (phonetic), I know Ann. It was --

MS. WILLIG: Thank you everyone. Debora Willig, InterAction. Jeni, Jane, you both spoke about collective action. One of the conundrums that we run into leading a coalition of INGOs is, how do you in a useful way, help collective action break

down the silos between the sectors in moving STGs forward? It's lovely to sit in a room and talk, but as InterAction looks at how to actionably do that, I'm wondering what thoughts you all might have on how to incorporate INGOs with other sectors. How important it is. Or, wish your magic wand could create.

MS. NELSON: Well, I can think of a couple of examples on the gender side. I mean, clearly, they're very important links between goal five, and many other goals, but particularly goal eight around productive work. And, I think that we go, which I mentioned earlier, which is the informal sector workers organizing globally have done a great job, I think engaging, not only with the ILO, but more broadly across goals. So that, I think would be one interesting example. And one other one, is actually around goal 16 and 16 plus, which is quite an amorphous agenda in itself -- Homi is nodding his head

MR. KHARAS: That's institutions, governance, justices.

MS. NELSON: But, that for example, has a lot around violence. And so, violence against women is very important there. So, I think that actually is quite a promising platform. There's a group there, and a partnership there which seems to be working quite effectively to move that agenda forward. And so, I think that through various entry points particularly with the -- if you like the more ambitious goals around gender, around work, around peace, and good governance. I think there are excellent opportunities to make the work much more concrete by having the voice of folks who have been involved, more directly engaged.

MR. KHARAS: Thank you. So, Jane, I'm going to sort of draw this to a close, because I see that we're a few minutes actually beyond 12. I hope in this discussion, you've at least seen that the challenges are enormous, but in every area, at least I am filled with a little bit of optimism, that actually things are moving. Things are moving in quarters that we didn't really anticipate in the business community, in the

academic community, in local governments, as well as in the more traditional governments. Lots of innovations. This is a space where things are being tried, rather than solutions already having been developed. And, so I encourage all of you to join with us in this endeavor of trying to put on the table new solutions, and think about how they can be scaled up and speeded up so that they can actually be implemented in the kind of time frame that we have in front of us. And, if you that in thinking through those ideas, this book would be of some assistance, please do buy a copy and make Hiroshi, and us, very happy. Thank you all very much. Join me in thanking our panel. (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, 2020