



House of Commons
International Development
Committee

**Post 2015
Development Goals:
Government Response
to the Committee's
Eighth Report of
Session 2012–13**

**Tenth Special Report of Session
2012–13**

*Ordered by the House of Commons
to be printed 19 March 2013*

HC 1065
Published on 20 March 2013
by authority of the House of Commons
London: The Stationery Office Limited
£0.00

The International Development Committee

The International Development Committee is appointed by the House of Commons to examine the expenditure, administration, and policy of the Office of the Secretary of State for International Development.

Current membership

Rt Hon Sir Malcolm Bruce MP (*Liberal Democrat, Gordon*) (Chairman)
Hugh Bayley MP (*Labour, York Central*)
Fiona Bruce MP (*Conservative, Congleton*)
Richard Burden MP (*Labour, Birmingham, Northfield*)
Fabian Hamilton MP (*Labour, Leeds North East*)
Pauline Latham OBE MP (*Conservative, Mid Derbyshire*)
Jeremy Lefroy MP (*Conservative, Stafford*)
Mr Michael McCann MP (*Labour, East Kilbride, Strathaven and Lesmahagow*)
Fiona O'Donnell MP (*Labour, East Lothian*)
Mark Pritchard MP (*Conservative, The Wrekin*)
Chris White MP (*Conservative, Warwick and Leamington*)

The following members were also members of the Committee during the parliament:

Mr Russell Brown MP (*Labour, Dumfries, Galloway*)
Mr James Clappison MP (*Conservative, Hertsmere*)
Mr Sam Gyimah MP (*Conservative, East Surrey*)
Richard Harrington MP (*Conservative, Watford*)
Alison McGovern MP (*Labour, Wirral South*)
Ann McKechin MP (*Labour, Glasgow North*)
Anas Sarwar MP (*Labour, Glasgow Central*)

Powers

The Committee is one of the departmental select committees, the powers of which are set out in House of Commons Standing Orders, principally in SO No 152. These are available on the internet via www.parliament.uk.

Publications

The Reports and evidence of the Committee are published by The Stationery Office by Order of the House. All publications of the Committee (including press notices) are on the internet at www.parliament.uk/parliament.uk/indcom. A list of Reports of the Committee in the present Parliament is at the back of this volume.

The Reports of the Committee, the formal minutes relating to that report, oral evidence taken and some or all written evidence are available in a printed volume.

Additional written evidence may be published on the internet only.

Committee staff

The current staff of the Committee are Dr David Harrison (Clerk), Chloe Challender (Senior Committee Specialist), Louise Whitley (Inquiry Manager), Rob Page (Committee Specialist), Anita Fuki (Senior Committee Assistant), Annabel Goddard (Committee Assistant), Paul Hampson (Committee Support Assistant) and Nicholas Davies (Media Officer).

Contacts

All correspondence should be addressed to the Clerk of the International Development Committee, House of Commons, 7 Millbank, London SW1P 3JA. The telephone number for general enquiries is 020 7219 1223; the Committee's email address is indcom@parliament.uk

Tenth Special Report

On 22 January 2013 the International Development Committee published its Eighth Report of Session 2012-13, Post-2015 Development Goals (HC 657). On 14 March 2013 we received the Government's Response to the Report. It is reproduced as an Appendix to this Special Report.

Appendix: Government response

The government welcomes the opportunity to respond to the report of the International Development Committee: Post-2015 Development Goals. The government agrees with the report's view that the post-2015 debate is of fundamental importance to the future of development. It welcomes the Committee's support for the work of the High Level Panel.

The report asserts that the post-2015 development framework must be ambitious and aim at eliminating extreme poverty. The Prime Minister set this out as his vision from the outset of the High Level Panel. For the first time in history, poverty eradication is within our grasp. The post-2015 framework must reflect the priorities of poor people themselves. It must respond to the changing global opportunities and challenges since the Millennium Development Goals were agreed. And it must be relevant not only to governments, but also to the private sector and civil society organisations.

The government believes that the new framework must address both the root causes and symptoms of poverty. The building blocks of sustained prosperity should be a central pillar of the new framework: the rule of law, the absence of conflict and corruption, the presence of property rights and strong institutions. The Prime Minister has called this the "golden thread" of conditions that enable open economies and open societies to thrive.

Sustainable development must be at the core of how we deliver poverty eradication. Resource scarcity and increasing numbers of people vulnerable to natural disaster threaten the progress already made on the Millennium Development Goals. Moreover, for the many rural poor, a healthy natural resource base is critical to their livelihoods. The High Level Panel agreed in Monrovia that the new framework must be "people-centred and planet-sensitive" and that unsustainable development is not worth having.

The final post-2015 development framework will be decided in the UN General Assembly. Working alongside other UN member states, the government will take an active role in securing international agreement on an ambitious, compelling post-2015 framework that is centred on eradicating extreme poverty, a framework that will make a transformational difference to the lives of poor people.

Response to Conclusions and Recommendations

1. Even if the High-level Panel's secretariat had been appointed on time it would have had much less time and far fewer staff than the Commission for Africa secretariat. The High-level Panel's conclusions and recommendations are therefore less likely to have secured international political 'buy-in' before they are published. It is imperative to win international commitments to implement post-2015 development goals and we recommend that the UK retain its cross-Whitehall Committee of officials which has supported the Prime Minister in his role as co-Chair as well as trying to seek international agreement with the other co-Chairs to keep a UN secretariat in place until the UN General Assembly agrees the post-2015 development agenda. (Paragraph 15)

Agree. The expertise of a wide range of government departments has been invaluable to the UK government's work on the post-2015 development agenda. The government will continue to coordinate across Whitehall after the High Level Panel has completed its work and ensure a coherent UK approach to the post-2015 development agenda. This will enable us to engage effectively with the Open Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals and other UN processes.

The government has encouraged other partners to take a similarly joined-up approach to the post-2015 development agenda and, for example, welcomes the approach taken by the European Commission by issuing a single communication on the post-2015 development agenda.

As well as having its own dedicated secretariat, the High Level Panel is also supported by an integrated UN secretariat established under the Secretary-General's Special Advisor on Post-2015 Development Planning. This secretariat supports the different UN processes informing the post-2015 framework, including those that will continue after the Panel, and will remain in place until the end of 2015. The UN Secretary General's Special Adviser on Post-2015 Development Planning serves as an ex officio member of the High Level Panel and will be well placed to take forward its recommendations following the conclusion of the Panel's work.

2. We accept that the High-level Panel wishes to hold some of its meetings in private. However, it is regrettable that no notes of such meetings are available to the public. In an age where transparency is increasingly important, publishing a note of meetings would have helped to achieve public 'buy-in'. (Paragraph 18)

Partially agree. The High Level Panel is composed of eminent persons working in their personal capacity. Its discussions must take place in an environment in which participants from all countries can feel free to express personal views that might differ from those of their national governments. A published note of the Panel's deliberations might risk compromising the ability of some panel members to fulfil their role effectively.

Nonetheless, the government welcomes public interest in the work of the High Level Panel and recognises the importance of openness and transparency both as a principle in itself and as a means to engender public support and engagement. The government welcomes the establishment of a High Level Panel website to communicate the Panel's work to a broad public. This includes information on panellists, the secretariat, outreach initiatives and papers from the three meetings to date. In addition, the three co-Chairs have made press statements after each Panel meeting and the Panel collectively published a communiqué immediately after the Monrovia meeting to communicate on its deliberations and progress.

The Secretariat and members of the Panel have travelled widely to participate in the UN's thematic, country and regional consultations and in other outreach events with business and civil society. The meetings of the High Level Panel in London and Monrovia involved outreach to civil society, business and youth organisations. Members of the Panel and co-chair envoys have briefed the UN General Assembly to keep it abreast of the Panel's deliberations and progress. The Department of International Development has also financially supported 'MyWorld' and 'Participate' public consultation initiatives to ensure public input to and engagement with the post-2015 development agenda.

3. We know that the High-level Panel's report will be followed by an intergovernmental process, but it is currently unclear what form this process will take or how the Panel and its secretariat will mobilise and lobby internationally to win political support for its proposals. To ensure that the current levels of momentum and public interest are not lost, we hope that this uncertainty can be resolved as soon as possible. We urge our Prime Minister, and the Panel, to set out clear proposals for an international campaign to secure support for the Panel's proposals during the intergovernmental process. (Paragraph 20)

Partially agree. The Panel will report to the UN Secretary General at the end of May. Its report will be one of several inputs to the UN Secretary-General's report to a UN General Assembly special event on the Millennium Development Goals in September 2013. Other inputs will include the product of the UN's national, regional and thematic consultations, the Sustainable Development Solutions Network and the work of the Open Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals.

The Panel's Terms of Reference mandate it to make recommendations on how to "build and retain broad political consensus on an ambitious yet achievable post-2015 development agenda". The Panel will be reflecting on this ahead of its final report. Without wishing to pre-empt those discussions, it will be important that Panel members continue to be involved in efforts to promote an ambitious post-2015 agenda following the release of the Panel's report. It will also be essential that other stakeholders – such as civil society, the private sector and policy experts – continue to be closely involved during the period of intergovernmental negotiation.

4. Following publication of the High-level Panel's report, the Prime Minister and his fellow panellists should focus on building international political support for its recommendations with a view to ensuring that they are incorporated in the post-2015 framework. To this end, it will be important to engage with heads of government from both donor countries and developing countries. (Paragraph 21)

Partially agree. A continued engagement with the international community, the public, and civil society will be key in securing an ambitious post-2015 framework. The UK government will play its part, working with partners to ensure that the Panel's recommendations are communicated clearly and contribute as fully as possible to the post-2015 process. It is critical that engagement continues at all levels to secure wide ownership of the eventual framework and that different voices, including those of vulnerable and poor people, are brought into the debate.

The Secretary of State for International Development, Justine Greening, will lead UK efforts to raise the profile of the Panel's recommendations and will work with international partners to secure an ambitious post-2015 framework that drives progress on eradicating extreme poverty.

5. The UK has assumed the Presidency of the G8 for 2013. This presents another parallel with the Commission for Africa: in 2005, when the Commission for Africa's first report was published, the UK also held the G8 presidency. On that occasion, the UK Government was able to use its G8 Presidency to win important commitments from a number of other G8 countries: deals were agreed for a \$50 billion increase in development assistance and for large-scale debt cancellation. However, some states failed to honour their commitments. Through its Presidency of the G8 in 2013, the present UK Government has an excellent opportunity to challenge its fellow G8 members to honour their existing commitments, and to push for further commitments. The UK Government, during its Presidency of the G8 in 2013, should encourage its fellow G8 members to make further, specific commitments to development. (Paragraph 22)

Agree. The UK has long been a leader on development. We are committed to spending 0.7% of GNI on Official Development Assistance (ODA) from 2013 onwards. We are continuing to push other donors to live up to their commitments too.

The Prime Minister has said that he wants to use the UK's G8 Presidency to move the international agenda forward, to focus not just on aid, but also on the underlying drivers of growth and jobs which will lift people out of poverty for good. This agenda is at least as ambitious as our 2005 G8 development agenda. It means looking beyond the G8's role as donors and examining how the actions we take to liberalise trade, set standards, and shape the global economy can affect the development of poorer countries. Our starting point for taking forward our Presidency priorities—supporting global trade, tackling unfair tax practices, and improving transparency—will be 'getting the G8's own

houses in order'. G8 commitments to take action on these issues will help to boost prosperity in developing countries in the long term.

Under our G8 Presidency, we will produce the G8's Second Comprehensive Accountability Report, which will report on past development commitments made by the G8. The report is a concrete example of transparency and accountability at work - a central theme of the UK's G8 Presidency - and is an opportunity to hold G8 leaders to account for the promises they have made to assist developing countries.

It is also important that developing countries drive the future development agenda, to ensure that it both meets their needs and receives wider legitimacy. The development agenda also needs to reflect the changed development landscape since the millennium, including the increasing significance of sources of development finance other than ODA. These sources include domestic revenues, foreign investment including by emerging powers, and remittances.

6. It is vital that the post-2015 development framework reflects the needs of the poorest. We welcome the many consultation processes which have been launched: such processes will help the world's poor to contribute to the debate. We commend DFID for providing funding for the 'Participate' and 'My World' initiatives. As the post-2015 process continues to develop, during and beyond the lifetime of the High-level Panel, the outcomes of these consultations should be taken fully into account. We urge the Prime Minister and the High-level Panel's other members to remain engaged with the process after their report is published and to continue to mobilise public opinion and to press Heads of Government to support their post-2015 agenda. (Paragraph 28)

Partially agree. The Prime Minister has been explicit about the need to listen to the voices of those living in poverty and to use these to inform panel recommendations. The work of the 'MY World' and 'Participate' initiatives was presented in London and discussed again in Monrovia. DFID will continue to support 'Participate' and 'MY World' after the HLP has concluded its work. It is important that the voices of the poor and of citizens more generally continue to inform the post-2015 development agenda.

Discussions in the international community will continue following the Panel's report, and a number of other processes will also inform the debate on the post-2015 development framework. These include the Open Working Group on Sustainable Development, national and thematic consultations lead by the United Nations Development Group, and the Sustainable Development Solutions Network. We will encourage Panel members to remain engaged. As mentioned earlier, the Secretary of State for International Development, Justine Greening, will lead UK efforts to raise the profile of the Panel's recommendations and will work with international partners to secure an ambitious post-2015 framework that drives progress on eradicating extreme poverty.

7. One of the key purposes of the post-2015 framework must be to build on the successes of the MDGs and where necessary to ‘finish the job’. The successes of the MDG framework derived primarily from the fact that the MDGs had great resonance around the world: with governments, with civil society organisations and with ordinary people. If the post-2015 framework is to achieve similar success, it must retain these qualities. (Paragraph 33)

Agree. The post-2015 framework should be focussed on eradicating extreme poverty. Achieving this will involve updating the goals and targets from the MDGs and addressing some elements that were not included in the MDGs. “Finishing the job” will also mean reaching the poorest and most vulnerable people, and the government is supportive of targets and indicators to incentivise and monitor this.

The simplicity and focus of the MDGs made them a powerful advocacy tool and created a common vision and strategic language through which the international community could rally. This is why the Government is arguing that the post-2015 agenda should retain these qualities in a simple, compelling and ambitious new framework.

8. We recommend that issues of sustainability be incorporated into the post-2015 framework. Poverty reduction and environmental sustainability are intimately connected: the task of the present generation is to meet development challenges without compromising the interests of future generations. As such, we believe that the arguments for merging the two agendas are stronger than the arguments for having two separate sets of goals. One option would be to include one specific goal on sustainability issues in the post-2015 framework. Ideally, however, sustainability should be included as a component part of a number of the post-2015 goals. (Paragraph 38)

Agree. The government is in favour of a single set of goals focussed on eradicating poverty and embedding the principles of sustainable development. The agendas of ending poverty and sustainable development overlap significantly, and two separate sets of goals could create confusion and competing demands.

Resource scarcity, increased numbers of people vulnerable to natural disasters, and the importance of natural resources to many rural poor mean that action on the environment will be essential for eliminating absolute poverty. Integrating the good stewardship of our natural environment across goals would be an efficient way to achieve this, and would recognise that many issues central to eradicating poverty—for example, food, water and energy— have social, economic and environmental aspects. There might also be value in a specific goal on the environment or natural resources. It should also be borne in mind that not all development challenges can be resolved through a goal framework. Some important environmental sustainability issues may be better resolved through other means.

9. We share the Prime Minister's belief that good governance is fundamental to development, and we believe that the issue must be included in the post-2015 framework. The Prime Minister has defined the 'Golden Thread' in a number of different ways. We recommend that the Prime Minister give a clear and consistent definition of what he means by the 'Golden Thread' in response to this report given its importance in his thinking on the post-2015 framework and goals. We also feel that the 'Golden Thread' would be strengthened by the inclusion of issues such as empowerment, fairness and collectivity. The Prime Minister should consider incorporating these issues. (Paragraph 44)

Partially agree. The Prime Minister set out his vision of the Golden Thread, and some of its policy implications, in his Wall Street Journal article of 1st November 2012. He described the Golden Thread as:

“[the] conditions that enable open economies and open societies to thrive: the rule of law, the absence of conflict and corruption, and the presence of property rights and strong institutions.”

He also said:

“Eradicating poverty requires the growth that is fueled by open economies, and open economies are themselves best ensured by open societies: rights for women and minorities, a free media, integrity in government, and the freedom to participate in society and have a say over how your country is run.”

This view builds on a respected body of academic literature emphasising the importance of inclusive and open political and economic institutions for development. For example, Daron Acemoglu and James Robinson's *Why nations fail* argues for the crucial link between accountable, inclusive institutions and prosperity. The mutually reinforcing links between economic, political and social freedoms have been highlighted by Amartya Sen, for example in his 1999 book *Development as freedom*.

Strong institutions are a central pillar of development. At Monrovia it was agreed that institutions should be included as goals and in the narrative of the post-2015 framework.

10. There is a strong argument that post-2015 framework should include one overarching goal on health based on Universal Health Coverage, rather than the three health-related goals which feature in the original MDGs. This should be done in such a way that the current vital emphasis on maternal and child mortality is not lost. (Paragraph 47)

Partially agree. The health of individuals and communities is vital for their own wellbeing and for eradicating poverty. The Prime Minister has been clear that the post-2015 development agenda should include a continuing focus on health. The government

strongly agrees that the importance placed on maternal and child mortality should not be lost.

There is a strong argument for continuing to focus health aspects of a new development framework on outcomes: reducing preventable death and illness in all socio-economic groups of society. Strong health systems are critical for this and universal health coverage could be an important means towards a health outcomes-focused goal in a post 2015 framework.

11. Job creation is one of the most crucial of all development challenges. Whilst the issue of employment was included in the original MDG framework, it was insufficiently prominent and failed to capture the public imagination. In the post-2015 framework, the task will be to design an employment 'goal' which captures the imagination of people around the world. (Paragraph 50)

Agree. Jobs are central to translating economic growth into poverty reduction. When asked, the poorest and most vulnerable communities regularly prioritise jobs over other issues. The Secretary of State has been clear that she wants to see an end to aid dependency through jobs. As such, jobs should be central to the new framework. This could be achieved through a specific goal on jobs, or through targets focused on the range of activities needed to create jobs, such as stimulating investment or access to financial services. It will be important to agree targets that are measurable and that encourage the kind of job creation that in itself stimulates growth.

12. Whilst primary education is important, this Committee has found in its work over several years in this Parliament and the last that secondary education is equally critical to development. Under the post-2015 framework education targets should cover primary enrolment, primary completion, secondary education and quality of education. (Paragraph 52)

Agree. Education is fundamental for development, and both access and quality are important. The post-2015 framework should continue the drive for access that was established in the MDGs, but with an equal focus on learning. In a number of developing countries where progress has been made on primary education, moving the focus to secondary education will be a valuable approach.

13. If poor countries are to build their capacity to grow their economies and provide public services, they will require more people with high quality technical and vocational qualifications and more graduates. Therefore, as the post-2015 framework is developed, the importance of tertiary education should be actively considered. (Paragraph 53)

Agree. Tertiary education is important for long term sustained growth and the diversification of economies. A holistic approach to education will consider all aspects of the educational system, from early years through to tertiary. Poverty eradication is the

focus of the post-2015 development agenda, and so primary and secondary education will remain the most pertinent areas on which to focus efforts.

14. We warmly welcome the Prime Minister's commitment to 'getting to zero' on extreme poverty. We firmly agree that this should be one of the new Goals. Whilst this is ambitious, for the first time in human history it is also achievable. (Paragraph 58)

Agree. From the outset of the High Level Panel, the Prime Minister has clearly expressed his commitment to eradicating extreme poverty. A world free of extreme poverty is within our reach and the post-2015 framework is an important opportunity to drive a global effort to improve the lives of the poorest and most vulnerable people. The new framework should take into account where poor people live now and where they will live in the future. Achieving the eradication of poverty will therefore require a framework that is relevant for low income, middle income, and fragile countries alike.

15. We believe that advancing the rights of women, especially with regards to education, health, land ownership, family planning and protection against early marriage, is central to development. These rights should be explicitly set out in quantitative detail in the post-2015 framework. (Paragraph 61)

Agree. Gender equality and the empowerment of all girls and women are fundamental to development. Not only is it an important human right in itself, it is widely accepted that where women and girls are "locked out", economies and societies are held back. The Secretary of State has been clear that she does not think sustainable development is possible when only half the population are involved. As she stated in her March 2013 speech at Amnesty UK, the post-2015 framework should address issues of "voice, choice and control" for women and girls.

There is a strong and compelling evidence base showing that improving gender equality can have a significant impact on economic growth and is a multiplier for other development goals. Addressing gender equality is thus central to eliminating poverty. The government is committed to finding powerful targets and indicators in a post-2015 framework to drive gender equality. The government is seeking a specific focus on women and girls, as well as mainstreaming gender considerations throughout the framework.

16. Given the incidence of disability, especially in poor developing countries, a high priority should be given both to the prevention of disabilities and to rights, including political empowerment, for people with disabilities. (Paragraph 62)

Agree. The Prime Minister has been clear that the new framework will need to reach the poorest and most marginalised people. Equality of opportunity for people with disabilities is a core part of this vision. Addressing this will be an important challenge for the new framework, including in the areas of health and political empowerment. The new framework could achieve significant progress for people with disabilities in a

number of ways. One approach would be to use disaggregated data in the monitoring of goals to identify any disparities in results. Another approach would be to set zero-targets, which necessarily capture people with disabilities.

17. There is room for improvement in the means by which progress is measured. Under the MDGs, the tendency to assess progress by means of national averages has allowed great disparities (such as those between women and men, or between particular regions of a country) to be hidden. Under the post-2015 framework, data should be broken down ('disaggregated') by gender and region, and by other variables as appropriate. (Paragraph 64)

Agree. The focus on average progress against the MDGs has in places masked uneven progress across different regions, countries and social groups, and failed to provide enough incentives to reach the most vulnerable.

The Prime Minister has been clear on his vision for the new framework, focused on eradicating extreme poverty and tackling the root causes of poverty not just the symptoms. This will require inclusive growth which delivers change for the poorest and hardest to reach. It will require action to tackle inequalities around gender, age, disability, geography, ethnic group, religion, and sexual orientation. And it will require better governance, including equality before the law, political rights and voice for all, open and inclusive government and the empowerment of excluded groups.

The government is supportive of disaggregating data by sex, geography, disability, age, and other variables where appropriate in the post-2015 framework. This is important for better tracking of progress across different regions and groups and to incentivise reaching marginalised or vulnerable groups. However we need to be conscious of the lack of data and capacity of some national statistical systems and the challenges of putting a general call for disaggregating data into practice. While it may be that a full disaggregation of data only becomes possible over the course of the period covered by the new framework, that should not hold back our ambition.

Further approaches to inequality for the new framework include "zero targets", other "social floors" or a specific focus on outcomes for the poorest 10 or 20%. We should avoid approaches which could create perverse incentives, promote a levelling-down rather than a shared prosperity approach, or distract attention from the overriding priority of improving absolute living standards and eliminating extreme poverty.

18. The development of robust targets and indicators will be a key determinant of the success of the new framework. We agree with the comments made by Michael Anderson, the Prime Minister's Special Envoy on the Development Goals: UK institutions such as the Overseas Development Institute and the Institute of Development Studies should seek to play an active part in developing these targets and indicators. (Paragraph 68)

Agree. The government welcomes the contributions of UK based institutions, including think tanks and NGOs, which have played a helpful and important role in discussions so far. We are proud that the UK has organisations with the expertise and capacity to inform international debates. This work will be particularly important for the technical debate on targets and indicators that will take place later in the post-2015 process.

It is also important for a broader set of actors to engage in the discussions. Southern institutions' understanding of domestic and regional processes in developing countries, and their access to evidence, are key to inform the post-2015 agenda. Their contributions are also central to ensuring broad ownership of the post-2015 process.

19. The post-2015 framework should make a very clear distinction between the ultimate 'ends' of development (which should be set out in the goals) and the means by which those ends might be achieved (which should be set out in the underlying targets and indicators). (Paragraph 71)

Disagree. The means and ends of development are not standalone categories, and thinking of the issues in these terms is not always helpful. A number of development issues can be thought of as both. For example, education is both an 'end' and a 'means' of development. Moreover, the government believes that, in order to eradicate poverty, the foundations that enable people to improve their lives need to be established – for example, good governance, transparency, and tackling corruption. Developing goals on these issues—for example goals on “ensuring effective and fair government for all”, or “ensuring access to justice and safety for all”—would usefully focus attention on these critical issues and ensure that there is global momentum behind them.

20. We agree that the new goals should be global in scope whilst the underlying targets and indicators should be specific to individual countries' circumstances. Individual countries may, however, lack the capacity or political will to develop their own targets and indicators. Therefore, we would propose that various sets of targets and indicators be developed, and individual countries choose the set most appropriate to their circumstances. (Paragraph 74)

Partially agree. The challenge for an effective framework will be to reconcile maintaining global momentum and a sense of global jeopardy on the one hand, with promoting national ownership and taking account of national circumstances on the other. The Panel is considering a number of options to facilitate this, and the idea of a 'menu' of indicators or targets from which countries could choose is a valuable contribution to this discussion. Such an approach would allow countries to determine their national priorities for themselves, and to select indicators and targets that are relevant for them. It would promote domestic accountability. It would make for a sound platform on which to base national dialogue with international partners. However national target-setting might need to be complemented by global targets, for example social floors – a minimum level that all countries should reach – “zero targets” such as universal primary education in the current goals, or areas where global norms could be

expected to apply. In all cases it will be important that indicators are based on globally comparable metrics to facilitate meaningful measurement of global progress and comparison.

21. The post-2015 agenda should set specific and measurable goals for all countries, including traditional donors and middle income countries, in key areas of international cooperation such as development aid, climate change, tax, trade, transparency, migration and intellectual property rights. (Paragraph 75)

Partially agree. The post-2015 framework should include responsibilities for all countries. The international development landscape has changed considerably since 2000: the donor-recipient categorisation is no longer as relevant and emerging powers are becoming significant actors in low income countries. At the same time, tackling extreme poverty is an important agenda for many developing countries that are no longer aid dependent, such as India. And developed countries need to get their own house in order. The post-2015 framework should reflect this.

The Panel is actively considering how best to foster key areas of international cooperation within the new framework. This is the main theme of the Panel's upcoming meeting in Bali in March. MDG 8, the 'Global Partnerships' goal in the current framework, has been widely criticised for having limited impact. A challenge for the post-2015 agenda will, therefore, be to foster improved international cooperation.

22. Due to inevitable time lags in data collection, it will not be possible to use 2015 as the baseline year for the post-2015 framework. Whilst it would be desirable for the baseline year to be as close to 2015 as possible, we recognize that—for reasons of practicality—it will have to be several years earlier. (Paragraph 77)

Agree. One of the strengths of the MDGs was having a robust baseline year (1990) to measure progress. This thereby enabled monitoring and accountability. This was particularly important because the MDGs were mostly relative goals (e.g. halving extreme poverty). A common baseline will be essential for tracking global progress on the next set of goals and this will need to be as close to 2015 as practicable.

23. Whatever the ultimate timescale for the post-2015 framework, it will be important to include some interim targets, perhaps every five years. This will help to ensure that policymakers' attention remains focused on the framework. (Paragraph 80)

Partially agree. There are a number of advantages to interim targets or review points. These can help build momentum; allow for benchmarking on an on-going basis; and allow for adjustments in targets. More developed milestones and interim targets could also fit in better with political cycles and drive action. However, questions remain regarding the capacity of some developing countries to gather and analyse data quickly. Overburdening national statistical offices could have a detrimental effect on the overall impact of the new framework. The inclusion of interim targets should be part of the

debate, alongside other ways to maintain focus on progress. For example, the MDGs did not have five-year interim targets; momentum was rather maintained through measures such as the 2008 Mid Term Review, and 2010 UN High Level Event on the MDGs.

24. The simplicity and measurability of the MDG framework have been crucial factors in its success. We believe that the post-2015 framework must retain these strengths, and we are pleased that the Prime Minister shares this view. The number of goals should be no higher than 10, and all should have quantifiable targets. If the new framework is to be as successful as the MDGs, this simplicity will be fundamental. (Paragraph 84)

Agree. The government strongly supports a framework with no more than ten goals, all with quantifiable targets. The MDGs have acted as a global and national-level mobilization tool because they are simple, easy to understand and compelling. This should be maintained.