

THE MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS: A PANACEA OR YET ANOTHER AGENDA

Qazi Kholiquzzaman Ahmad



Campaign for Popular Education (CAMPE)

THE MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS: A PANACEA OR YET ANOTHER AGENDA

[Revised version of the Keynote Address presented at the Meeting of Civil Society Leaders with Their Excellencies The Ambassadors of the G-8 and other Countries and Heads of Multilateral Agencies in Bangladesh, organized by the Campaign for Popular Education (CAMPE) in cooperation with the People's Forum on MDGs (PFM), Dhaka, 3 July 2005]

Qazi Kholiquzzaman Ahmad

President, Bangladesh Economic Association (BEA)
Chairman, Bangladesh Unnayan Parishad (BUP)
E-mail: bup@citech-bd.com

July 2005

Corrigenda

P6. line 11 from top please read PPPUS\$1 for US\$1

P6. line 13 from top: please read PPPUS\$1 for US\$1

Note: PPP= Purchasing Power Parity



Campaign for Popular Education (CAMPE)

Preface

On the eve of the G-8 Summit in Scotland, People's Forum on MDGs (PFM), Bangladesh organized a meeting of the civil society leaders with the Hon'ble Ambassadors of G-8 countries, heads of aid of the G-8 and other countries and heads of multilateral agencies working in Bangladesh. In the meeting, Dr. Qazi Kholiquzzaman Ahmad, President, Bangladesh Economic Association and Chairman, Bangladesh Unnayan Parishad, presented a Keynote Address which we thought would interest many, should it be published in a little booklet. Dr. Ahmad provided an overview of the MDGs and focused on the Bangladesh perspective. He has maintained that if the MDGs are to be pursued, there are many other issues which need to be sorted out in general and in country specific terms concerning trade, aid and debt relief, social development, gender justice, environmental sustainability and global partnership.

On behalf of the Civil Society, the following demands were placed to the G-8 leaders through the Hon'ble Ambassadors:

- Cancellation of all outstanding debts of poor countries
- Trade justice and more and better aid to encourage good governance in LDCs
- More social investments (health, education, social welfare, etc.)
- Reversal of environmental degradation which emanates mainly from developed countries for which LDCs suffer and are impoverished
- Restrictions of sales of military weapons to LDCs which are at the cost of developmental resources to LDCs and impede the fight against poverty and only help in the creation of more deprivation and disability in the world.

The G-8 Summit is however over and the outcome is far less than satisfactory.

We consider it prudent to mention here that the pre-summit 3 July 2005 meeting in Dhaka identified corruption, lack of good governance and accountability and misuse of resources as the major

For further information please contact:



Campaign for Popular Education (CAMPE)

5/14, Humayun Road, Mohammadpur, Dhaka-1207, Bangladesh

Phone: (88-02) 9130427, 8115769, 8155031-2

Fax: (88-02) 8118342

E-mail: info@campebd.org

Website: www.campebd.org

impediments to achieve sustainable development. Millennium Development Goals (MDG) are, as we see it, not a 'panacea', but a minimal target which can be achieved within the given time through sincere stepping forward by the government ensuring enabling environment, adherence of the G-8 countries to their promises and integrated steps taken by civil societies and multilateral agencies.

We are pleased to publish the keynote address of Dr. Q. K. Ahmad with a view to disseminating it among boarder clientele. His generous cooperation in this regard has inspired us. Our heartfelt thanks to the Hon'ble ambassadors and heads of aid of the G-8 and other countries and heads of multilateral agencies who, with their gracious presence and active participation, made the meeting a success. We also take this opportunity to thank all the designated speakers, representatives of CAMPE's partner organizations, other NGOs and CSOs who graced the occasion with their presence and participation.

Our thanks to colleagues at Bangladesh Unnayan Parishad (BUP) who have kindly agreed to oversee the matters related to the publication of this booklet.

We hope that this publication will serve as a useful material for people interested in and involved with MDG programming and implementation.

Rasheda K. Choudhury
Director, CAMPE
&

Convener, People's Forum on MDGs (PFM), Bangladesh

Table of Contents

Background	1
Some Points to Ponder	5
Concluding Remarks	17
Tables	
Table 1: UN Millennium Development Goals (MDG) and Targets	19
Table 2: ODA and Debt Servicing by Region, 2002	21
Table 3: ODA and Debt Servicing: South Asia, 2002	22
References	23

THE MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS: A PANACEA OR YET ANOTHER AGENDA

Background

By way of introduction, it may be useful to review briefly the major internationally formulated and promoted development approaches since the 1970s. Since the Second World War and until the 1970s, planned development, with the state playing a major role even in the non-centrally planned countries around the world, was a key strategy within a mixed economy framework. As opposed to this, Washington Consensus (WC) was formulated in the mid-1970s by the World Bank and the IMF working with the USA, which called for neo-liberal economic reforms, i.e. for free markets and globalization. Developing countries were enjoined upon to adopt the paradigm and aid-conditionality was used as the lever. Indeed, there has been unprecedented growth in wealth and international trade during the past decade and a half or so, supported by highly advanced and further advancing technologies, particularly information technology, and the financial and technological power of the multinational and transnational companies (MNCs and TNCs). But, by adopting the neo-liberal paradigm, many developing countries around the world did not benefit much and a significant number in fact faced adversity. According to the UNDP *Human Development Report 2003*, 54 countries were poorer in 2000 compared to 1990 and in 21 countries more people were hungry in 2000 compared to 1990. Also, the socio-

economic disparity between the richest and the poorest countries and between the rich and the poor within nations has been alarmingly increasing. The WC has in fact been extended and modified on the basis of the experiences gathered from its implementation around the world, but the basic framework of free markets and globalization has been kept firmly in place.

But poverty and deprivation persisted at high levels in the developing world. In this backdrop, the aid-seeking developing countries were asked in 1999 by the World Bank and the IMF to prepare the so called Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP). Once again, aid-conditionality has been used to cajole the countries into compliance. However, the basic policy framework of free markets and globalization has not only to remain in force but, in fact, to be strengthened. The WC, therefore, continues to flourish. But, clearly, it has been globally and nationally divisive. The disparity issue is recognized but never faced squarely.

Concerned with low levels of development and high levels of poverty persisting, Robert McNamara, the then President of the World Bank, started talking about the bottom 40 per cent people in 1973; and the concept of growth with social justice was born. But, that idea did not gather momentum. In 1995, an initiative called 20:20 Compact was launched at the Copenhagen Social Summit, focusing on poverty alleviation through universal access to basic social services. This initiative called for each developing country to allocate 20 per cent of its budgetary expenditure and 20 per cent of the aid flows into the

country to basic social services. This initiative generated a lot of enthusiasm, but only for a brief period. It is not in currency any more. In 2000, the Millennium Declaration was adopted by the 156 Heads of State or Government attending the Millennium Summit. The Declaration was formulated taking into account the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the UN Charter, and the outcomes of several key conferences on development held in the 1990s. Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) arose from that Declaration. Millions of words are now being spoken and written on the MDGs. These are now the high-profile rallying issues, particularly within the UN system but are being promoted in the countries around the world for adoption and pursuit. The civil society involvement in the MDG-process is being enlisted through the UN Millennium Campaign. At the same time, the overall postulates and ways and means for the package to be properly implemented around the world are being formulated and recommended by what is known as the UN Millennium Project.

There has been another major process promoted by the United Nations. This started with the World Conference on Human Environment held in Stockholm in 1972, which highlighted development concerns including those relating to the environment. As the attention to environmental concerns gathered momentum, the UN Commission on Environment and Development was appointed under the leadership of Gro Harlem Brundtland, which submitted its report *Our Common Future* in 1986. This report has suggested that there is no contradiction between developmental and environmental goals. Both can be promoted simultaneously. It called for

environmentally sustainable development so that while the present generation can meet their needs, the process does not compromise the ability of the future generations to meet theirs. A flurry of activities (e.g. dialogues, conferences, research, negotiations) around the report ensued, leading to the Rio Earth Summit in 1992 in which the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and Biodiversity Convention were signed and Agenda 21 was adopted. Sustainable development has been clearly defined in Agenda 21, as being economically vibrant, socially equitable, and environmentally sustainable with the human being placed at the centre of the stage. Indeed, development is for human beings and has to be for all of them. This Summit was followed by innumerable international, regional, and national conferences, workshops, and expert meetings leading to the Rio+5 review of the progress of the process by the UN General Assembly in 1997 and, then, to the Rio+10 World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) in Johannesburg in 2002. This process is still alive but not kicking; it has never received enough financial and technological support, although promised again and again, from the developed world. An element of it has been incorporated as Goal No. 7 in the list of the MDGs (Table 1), which is to ensure environmental sustainability. But, a framework for promoting equity along with growth and environmental sustainability is not part of the MDG process.

It emerges from the above discussion that:

- a) sustainable development, as defined in Rio, is already out of favour, certainly so in practice, as has been the case with several

- other internationally formulated initiatives since the 1970s; and
- b) the MDGs, which are now only five years old, are receiving a lot of attention right at the present time but yet to be, if ever, part of national and international agendas in practice; but
- c) the Washington Consensus rules the world.

Some Points to Ponder

1. The eight MDGs and the 18 targets set under them (Table 1) indeed reflect key concerns of the poor people around the world, wherever they may be. Obviously, these are not new goals. These have been routinely stated in one form or another as national and international goals in national and international policy pronouncements. Many developing countries have achieved significant progress in respect of various goals included in the package. What is new is that most of the 10 targets under the first seven MDGs are set in globally aggregated quantitative terms to be achieved by 2015. Naturally, individual countries are expected to work towards those targets. Hence, the progress or otherwise regarding these targets can be measured and monitored, both nationally and globally. This aspect of the MDGs makes the process attractive from a practical point of view.
2. The targets set under MDG 8 (building of global partnership for development) are qualitative and, therefore, pose problems relating to measurement and monitoring. But, in certain respects, global level quantification is already available (e.g. 0.7 per cent of the GDP

agreed to be provided by the developed countries to the developing countries) or possible (e.g. setting of debt relief targets). With necessary background work, country level targets in these respects can be determined. It should also be possible to set governance improvement targets by individual developing countries. Regarding other targets, useful indicators can also be formulated at global and country levels as appropriate, which can then be worked towards and the progress achieved measured and monitored. In this context dedicated work is necessary.

3. The MDG target of reducing poverty has been set with respect to people who live on less than US\$1 a day. But, what does US\$1 tell us about poverty. Will people whose disposable income per day rises above US\$1 become non-poor? Poverty has many dimensions. From human rights perspective, human dignity has to be invoked to determine the poverty line. For a poor person to achieve human dignity means that not only her/his basic needs will have to be fulfilled but also a dignified position in terms of participation in social-economic-political processes of transformation of society needs to be ensured for her/him. Poverty has, therefore, been extremely narrowly defined for the MDG target to be set and is meaningless from the human rights and human dignity points of view. One may apologetically say that this poverty measurement defines a starting point only.

4. Most of the targets under the first seven MDGs have been specified in terms of halving, or reducing by two-thirds or by three-quarters, or alleviating (by increasing or decreasing as the case may be) fully with reference to 1990. But, target-setting in terms of alleviation of

specified proportions gives rise to the ethical question: which half, which two-thirds, or which three-quarters? Even procedurally, there is this ethical-moral quagmire, given that the Millennium Declaration is and the MDGs are to be based on the UN-declared Universal Human Rights. To be sure, Universal Human Rights are not reflected in the way the MDGs have been formulated. As a result, these goals and targets may lack universal ownership among the peoples of the concerned countries so that there is a serious question mark concerning sustainable progress on the MDGs.

5. This ethical-moral and ownership problem could have been avoided by using a construct anchored on the principles of empowerment of people and establishment of participatory democracy, and focusing on the creation of opportunities and processes for all concerned to break out of poverty, deprivation, and powerlessness syndrome. Milestones could be set along the way to the destination when all the concerned people will have achieved that goal. In this approach, action will be mounted, not with respect to specific target groups, but with respect to the conditions from which all the poor and disadvantaged people suffer from. Although the MDGs as globally formulated do not, the country programmes developed around the MDGs can and should focus on people's empowerment and participation perspectives. That will ensure that the processes put in place are underpinned by ethics and morality on one hand and universal ownership on the other and should, therefore, lead to sustainable poverty reduction and improvement in the conditions of living of the downtrodden.

6. The MDGs, abstracted, as they are now, from the process of establishing an inclusive society, faces acceptability deficit in so far as people's perspectives are concerned. This is perhaps in the order of things as the MDGs have been formulated through a top-down non-participatory process.

7. There are poor people in the developed world as well. But, the number is small and the developed countries have the resources and the means to alleviate their (the poor people's) conditions. On the other hand, the developing countries contain most of the poor of the world and are critically short of resources and ability to address the problems and needs of the poor and disadvantaged. Hence, the developing countries are dependent on the developed world for support to improve their ability to pursue the MDGs. Of course, the developing countries must try to mobilize the maximum possible resources from their own sources but financial and technological assistance from the developed world would still remain critical for them to be able to pursue the MDGs properly.

8. A promise was made in 1969 by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and reaffirmed in 1995 Copenhagen Social Summit that 0.7 per cent of their respective GDPs would be provided in official development assistance (ODA) to the developing countries and territories included in Part I of the DAC list of aid recipients. ODA consists of concessional loans, net of repayments, and grants provided to developing countries by DAC members, by multilateral

agencies, and by non-DAC countries to promote development and welfare in the recipient countries. (World Bank 2005, p. 269 and UNDP 2004, p. 273). But, the actual performance has remained very much lower than the target of 0.7 per cent of the GDP, overall and for most of the DAC members individually. Only the Netherlands, Luxembourg, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark have exceeded that target. In fact, the total ODA provided by the developed countries in 2002 was US\$58.3 billion, which was only 0.2 per cent of their combined GDP of US\$26,299 billion in that year. The amount available would have been US\$184 billion if 0.7 per cent was provided and that would have been over three times the amount actually provided in that year. On the other hand, the developing countries transferred US\$297 billion to the developed countries and the multilateral financing institutions by way of debt servicing in 2002, which accounted for 4.8 per cent of their combined GDP. Instead of having to find new moneys, the ODA could have been enhanced a great deal by using some of the moneys received in repayments. (Table 2; UNDP 2004: Indicator Table 13).

9. There has been slight increase in ODA since 2002, but country/region-wise breakdown of the increased ODA is not available to me at this time. Use is, therefore, made of 2002 data (Tables 2 and 3) to take the analysis a little further. In 2002, Sub-Saharan Africa received in ODA US\$17.9 billion and paid in debt servicing US\$12.4 billion. In the same year, South Asia, with the highest concentration of world's poor, received in ODA an amount of US\$6.9 billion and paid in debt servicing US\$18.9 billion; and if India is excluded, the ODA receipts

amount US\$5.5 billion and the debt servicing to US\$5.6 billion for the other South Asian countries. In that year, all the least developed countries together received in ODA US\$17.3 billion and paid in debt servicing US\$4.7 billion. In the same year, Bangladesh received an ODA of US\$0.91 and paid in debt servicing US\$0.7 billion. In relation to the needs for effectively pursuing the MDGs and other socio-economic goals, the net ODA being now received by the low-income, resource-constrained countries is way short, as will be shown in point no.10 below. At the same time, debt repayments further reduce their limited foreign exchange availabilities.

10. According to preliminary estimates of the UN Millennium Project, total ODA flows are required to rise to US\$140 billion in 2005, made up of US\$74 billion as budget support to the low-income, resource-constrained countries to finance the MDGs, US\$18 billion for non-MDG investments in the low-income countries, US\$30 billion for the middle-income countries, and the balance to meet global investment needs such as regional infrastructure and cooperation, operation of the international system, global public goods like scientific research, and administering and monitoring ODA. It has been indicated that the MDG-related ODA will be required rise to US\$108 billion by 2015, causing the total ODA in that year to amount to US\$177 billion, assuming that ODA for other purposes would remain more or less constant through 2015. These ODA numbers for 2005 and 2015 respectively represent 0.51 per cent and 0.56 per cent of the rich countries' estimated GNI for the respective years, significantly below the target of 0.7 per cent. (Millennium Project 2004).

Accordingly, in 2005, the additional amount over the ODA of about US\$60 billion as of 2004 would be US\$80 billion. This amount could even have come from the debt servicing repayments received. Also, in future, even if the debts of most of the low-income countries are cancelled (debt repayment in 2002 by low-income countries amounted to US\$43 billion and US\$30 billion if India is excluded), all or most of the required increase in ODA could be met out of the debt repayments received from the developing countries. Moreover, in 2004, a staggering US\$900 billion was spent by the world on arms (Shetty 2005). If a fraction of that were diverted to global poverty alleviation and environmental protection and enhancement, that would have significantly contributed to making poverty history. In fact, there is likely to be only a small increase in ODA in 2005 compared to 2004; and the future prospects don't seem greatly encouraging.

11. If, indeed, the MDGs are agreed all round to be pursued in earnest, cancellation of all outstanding debts of heavily indebted and other low-income, resource-constrained developing countries would clear the deck for ODA to add to the resources available to these countries on a net basis. The World Bank and the IMF launched an initiative eight years ago aiming to eliminate US\$100 billion of debt, but it appears that only about a third of that has so far materialized (Paluzzi and Farmer 2005). There is a recent initiative by G-8 countries to cancel debts of some heavily indebted African countries.

This is not enough. There are many other countries in Africa as well as in Asia whose development efforts can be tremendously facilitated

by debt cancellation. If debt is cancelled and the ODA is raised closer to 0.7 per cent of the GDP, the financial constraints in respect of pursuing the MDGs will be eliminated. The Millennium Development Campaign, therefore, may particularly focus, in the international context, on total debt cancellation for the heavily indebted and other low-income, resource-constrained developing countries and the raising of ODA to 0.7 per cent of GDP and making adequate ODA available to these countries, without further delay.

12. But, agreement to cancel debts and raise ODA is not enough. There are a whole lot of conditionalities in terms of reforms relating to governance, economic and monetary policies, trade liberalization, industrial policy, social and utility sectors, etc. that the developing countries are required to fulfill in order that they can receive foreign assistance or become eligible for their debt to be cancelled. Some of the conditionalities imposed embody essential reforms and can also be quickly implemented with beneficial results. There are others which can be construed as worthwhile goals, but the manner in which these conditionalities are imposed cannot be fulfilled within the stipulated time periods and in the way they are specified. There are still others which can be and, not infrequently, have turned out to be detrimental to national interests or the interests of the downtrodden. If foreign assistance is to be sought and received on conditionalities to be fulfilled, careful negotiations are, therefore, necessary to determine the set of conditionalities jointly by the particular recipients and the concerned donors, keeping an eye on what the realities on the ground justify and what can be achieved within the relevant time periods. Critical but difficult ones may be agreed as goals to be

achieved overtime, with milestones specified to be fulfilled along the way. Care must be taken to ensure that the interests of the poor and disadvantaged are not hurt in the process of adjustments; rather their interests should be protected and enhanced. Failing to implement harsh or unrealistic conditionalities, as are there among those imposed now, many poor countries face problems relating to access to assistance and debt relief.

13. But, if additional financial resources are not available to take necessary corrective and developmental steps, as appropriate, the problems relating to which such conditionalities are imposed may accentuate. Hence, while there is no doubt that governance has to be improved in most aid-dependent countries around the world, regardless of whether there are aid-conditionalities to that effect or not, but they need resources (finances, technologies) to move forward in economic, social including poverty reduction, governance, and environmental terms. So, the situation is rather tricky in relation to governance-related reforms and resource availability. These issues must be openly debated and arrangements formulated in line with comments made in point no.12 above.

14. Important elements in governance reform include the establishment of transparency and accountability; control of corruption; control of wastage; setting of priorities on the basis of the realities on the ground; and raising of policy-making, programme development, and implementation capabilities and their proper deployment and application. The developing countries must address these issues,

as respectively relevant, with determination. Otherwise, increased resources will not go far. On the other hand, if governance is sufficiently improved, a lot more can be achieved with a given amount of resources.

One of the best guarantees of improved governance is empowerment of people and participatory democracy as suggested earlier, which the MDG Campaigns may demand that the developing countries pursue and the developed countries facilitate. Necessarily, in this process the major emphases on health, education, gender equity, environmental protection, and such other goals will fall into place. In this case, the process of building an inclusive socio-economic order and sustainable development (as defined by Agenda 21 in terms of economic vibrancy, social equity, and environmental protection, with the human being at the centre of the stage) should ensue and move forward.

15. For the exports of the developing countries, market access in developed countries remains constrained due to para-tariff, non-tariff, and other barriers. The heavy agricultural subsidies in the developed countries hurt the interests of many developing countries and their hard-pressed farmers. Subsidies to the tune of about US\$1 billion a day is provided to agriculture in the developed countries and of about US\$2 per day per cattle in Europe. Also, unrealistic labour or eco-standards are applied at times.

On the other hand, the precipitous trade liberalization, which essentially means import liberalization, implemented by the

developing countries in fulfillment of aid-conditionalities, have often been hurting them, particularly their poor farmers and workers, constraining both employment and production as a result of unfavourable competition both at home and abroad. To succeed in a fiercely competitive market, the efficiency of their economic sectors needed to be increased first. That could not result and, in fact, has not resulted from immediately subjecting these countries to competition against very strong opposition. For improvement in that direction, reasonable time and facilities needed, first, to be allowed to the concerned sectors to improve their competitive strength to be followed by opening up to competition. But, most aid-dependent developing countries had to open up with no preparation and taking no time and steps to determine the pace, pattern, and sequencing of the reforms that would have suited the prevailing conditions in the particular countries.

16. A fairer international trade regime is called for, which will allow the weaker countries time and facilities to adjust at home and market access for their exports in the developed world. In this context, south-south and regional cooperation for enhanced trade among the members of the respective groups as well as for common position, wherever possible, taken by particular groups of developing countries to try and secure better deals for their member countries from the highly iniquitous international trading system can serve useful purposes.

17. If the MDGs are to be taken by all concerned as a serious agenda, this approach has to be rescued from the widely held view, based on

the pronounced intentions and the reading of the lips of the developed world leaderships and officialdom, that nowhere near the kind of aid resources needed will be coming forth and that it is yet another agenda and may suffer the same fate as several other now-abandoned or out-of-favour major UN global initiatives launched since the 1970s.

This view seems to be bestowed with much credence, given that the globally ruling current paradigm is neo-liberalism driven free markets and globalization, covering not only economic sectors but also social and utility sectors (such as education, health, water, electricity, communications). This paradigm is inherently disparity promoting. It favours the rich countries and rich people within individual countries (who have the financial resources and ability to succeed in competition) and further disadvantages the poor countries and the poor people. Both global and national disparities are now glaring and accentuating further.

18. It is possible, though, that encouraging progress on the MDGs will be achieved in terms of global aggregates due to good performance by China and India (which together account for almost 40 per cent of the total world population and almost half the total population of the developing world) and by some better-off, fast-growing developing countries. But these countries would make progress anyway, regardless of the MDG agenda being there or not. The key to the agenda's success or failure relates to what happens in the low-income, resource constrained countries; and in so far as these countries are concerned, given that there seems virtually no prospect for increased

ODA and debt cancellation as required and because of the persisting governance problems in these countries, the MDGs seem destined to turn out to be another UN-sponsored failed agenda.

19. Access to education, training, health and various utility services raises the capability of the poor people. But the profit-making private sector's inroad into these services, not infrequently, constrains their (poor people's) prospects as they are squeezed beyond their ability or are at times forced to remain deprived of the services. Such outcomes are often facilitated by the absence or inadequacy, or poor implementation, of regulatory mechanisms. This is a failure of the state. But, the state's ability to perform in this regard may have been curtailed due to its roll back in the context of free market reforms, or the state may be unable to act as appropriate because of poor governance, or both of these conditions may be prevalent, each to a certain extent. Either way effectiveness of the state is compromised. Clearly, therefore, an effective state is essential so that it can ensure the availability of the above mentioned services to the people at large at affordable prices, either by working with the private sector within the framework of an appropriate public-private partnership, or through state-managed operations, if and as appropriate, given the particular situational contexts.

Concluding Remarks

In this paper, I have not discussed the Bangladesh perspectives. Rather I have reviewed the MDGs per se from certain conceptual

and practical perspectives. I have not also gone into specifics relating to various MDGs. However, I recognize that, if the MDGs were to be pursued, there are many other issues to be sorted out in general and in country-specific terms concerning, for example, trade, aid, and debt relief; social development; women's concerns; prospects of environmental sustainability; and global partnership. I hope that, from the on-going dialogues, research, and re-thinking, inputs will emerge for appropriately modifying the agenda and devising the ways and means of keeping the modified agenda not only alive but also kicking. This paper has raised key questions and issues, which should be addressed in this process of research reflections, and dialogues.

Tables

Table 1

UN Millennium Development Goals (MDG) and Targets

The goals	Targets
Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce by half the proportion of people living on less than a dollar a day • Reduce by half the proportion of people who suffer from hunger
Achieve universal primary education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that all boys and girls complete a full course of primary schooling
Promote gender equality and empower woman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education preferably by 2005, and at all levels by 2015
Reduce child mortality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce by two-thirds the mortality rate among children under five
Improve maternal health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce by three-quarters the maternal mortality ratio
Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Halt and begin to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS • Halt and begin to reverse the incident of malaria and other diseases
Ensure environmental sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmers, reverse loss of environmental resources • Reduce by half the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water • Achieve significant improvement in lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers, by 2020

(continued)

(Table 1 continued)

Develop a global partnership for development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop further an open trading and financial system that is rule-based, predictable and non-discriminatory, includes a commitment to good governance, development and poverty reduction—nationally and internationally • Address the least developed countries' special needs. This includes tariff- and quota-free access for their exports; enhanced debt relief for heavily indebted poor countries; cancellation of official bilateral debt; and more generous official development assistance for countries committed to poverty reduction • Address the special needs of landlocked and small island developing states • Deal comprehensively with developing countries debt problems through national and international measures to make debt sustainable in the long term • In cooperation with the developing countries, develop decent and productive work for youth • In cooperation with pharmaceutical companies, provide access to affordable essential drugs in developing countries • In cooperation with the private sector, make available the benefits of new technologies—especially information and communications technologies
--	---

Source: MDGs: Website.

Table 2
ODA and Debt Servicing by Region, 2002

	GDP in US\$ (billion)	Official development assistance(ODA) in US\$ (billion) received	Total debt servicing as %of GDP of:	Total debt servicing in US\$ (billion)
Developing countries	6189.3	55.150	4.8	297.1
Arab States	712.3	7.015	2.3	16.4
East Asia and the Pacific	2562.6	7.724	3.4	87.1
Latin America and the Caribbean	1,676.1	5.063	8.2	137.4
South Asia	757.1	6.851	2.5	18.9.
Sub-Saharan Africa	303.5	17.854	4.1	12.4
Least developed countries	204.7	17.282	2.3	4.7
Low income countries	1123.9	29.622	3.9	43.8

Source: UNDP, 2004 (Indicator Tables 13 and 18).

Table 3
ODA and Debt Servicing: South Asia, 2002

	GDP in US\$ (billion)	Official development assistance(ODA) in US\$ (billion) received	Total debt servicing as % of GDP	Total debt servicing in US\$ (billion)
Bangladesh	47.6	0.912	1.5	0.714
Nepal	5.5	0.365	1.8	0.099
Pakistan	59.1	2.144	4.8	2.842
Bhutan	0.6	0.074	1.1	0.006
India	510.2	1.463	2.6	13.265
Sri Lanka	16.6	0.344	4.3	0.714
Maldives	0.6	0.027	3.5	0.021

Source: UNDP, 2004 (Indicator Tables 13 and 18).

References

- MDGs Website. UN Millennium Development Goals—<http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/>
- Millennium Project 2004. "A Global Plan to Achieve the Millennium Development Goals", Draft Report of the UN Millennium Project, 17 September 2004.
- Paluzzi, J. E. and Farmer, E. A. 2005. "The Wrong Question" in *Development*, Vol. 48, No. 1, Society for International Development (SID), Rome, March 2005.
- Shetty 2005. "The Millennium Campaign: Getting Governments to Keep their Promises" in *Development*, Vol. 48, No. 1, Society for International Development (SID), Rome, March 2005.
- UNDP 2004. *Human Development Report 2004*, UNDP, New York, 2004.
- World Bank 2005. *World Development Report 2005*, The World Bank, New York, 2005.



Published by

Campaign for Popular Education (CAMPE)

5/14, Humayun Road, Mohammadpur, Dhaka-1207, Bangladesh

Phone: (88-02) 9130427, 8115769, 8155031-2 Fax: (88-02) 8118342

E-mail: info@campebd.org Website: www.campebd.org