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1. INTRODUCTION

The paper contains the Unnayan Onneshan contribution to the ongoing discussion of a global development framework as a replacement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) in the backdrop of the recommendations made by United Nations Secretary-General appointed high-level panel on post-2015 development agenda. In September 2000, 147 heads of State and Government and 189 countries from across the world signed the Millennium Declaration and identified six fundamental values as essential to international relations at the turn of the century. In the desire of translating those values into actions, the world leader agreed on eight goals (initially consisting of 18 targets and 48 indicators) to be achieved by 2015, which have become known as the MDGs.

Since the adoption in 2000, the MDGs have become a universal official framework for national and international development efforts and cooperation, policymaking and resource mobilisation. As the expiry date of the MDGs is drawing nearer, different quarters (e.g., governments, UN agencies, inter-governmental bodies, research institutes, think-tanks, NGOs, international organisations) are discussing the post 2015 development agenda and framework.

In addition, during the elapsed twelve years since the world leaders set the MDG targets, the world has witnessed major changes in the pattern of international cooperation and national policies owing to contexts and events such as recession, debt crisis, natural calamities, conflicts, uprising etc. There is also a growing understanding that the concept of sustainable development has to be brought at the core of any future agenda, especially after the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (UNCSD) in Rio de Janeiro from 20 to 22 June, 2012. The UN General Assembly in September 2012 endorsed the outcome document of the UNCSD, entitled "The future we want."

The United Nations Secretary-General appointed a high-level panel of eminent persons in July, 2012 with the task of making
Progress has, however, been slow for some MDG indicators, such as indicators regarding employment, proportion of skilled health personnel attending deliveries in developing areas, net aid disbursements, under-five mortality rate, maternal mortality ratio, loss of biodiversity and forests, and gender equality and women’s empowerment.

2. THE MDG FRAMEWORK: A BRIEF REVIEW

It is assumed that any framework for the post-2015 period is to be built on the strengths of the MDGs and drawing lessons from limitations. This section considers the progress of different goals of the MDG framework, and discusses weaknesses. It is, however, to be noted that in evaluating the MDG framework, one particular difficulty arises from the fact that some perceived strengths of the MDG framework could also be observed as weaknesses.

2.1 MDG Progress and Successes

The “Millennium Development Goals Report 2012” of the United Nations (2012a) states that the world has already met two important MDG targets well ahead of the deadline related to extreme poverty and slum dwellers. The targets for two other MDG indicators have also been achieved: gender parity in education and access to safe water. Progress has, however, been slow for some MDG indicators, such as indicators regarding employment, proportion of skilled health personnel attending deliveries in developing areas, net aid disbursements, under-five mortality rate, maternal mortality ratio, loss of biodiversity and forests, and gender equality and women’s empowerment. The challenge of global hunger has also remained the same.
This is the first time the world has seen so many countries working together to achieve a better future for the mankind. International development agencies and developed countries have come forward to work collectively. In addition to poverty, the MDGs have also targeted a number of economic, social and environmental problems at the same time with varying degree of success.

The MDG framework has acted as an inspiration for the world to consider a new development agenda for the post-2015 period. It has strengthened world cooperation in other areas (e.g. the development of a new framework for ending armed violence under the United Nations’ umbrella with 2015 as the deadline). In addition, the MDG framework has offered valuable experience and standards for enriched planning, implementation and monitoring of development programmes. It has, however also improved collection of data and increased the accessibility of data for general people (Le Blanc, Liu, O’Connor and Zubcevic 2012).

2.2 MDG Weaknesses

The MDG framework suffers from a number of weaknesses, which can be classified into four broad categories. First, the MDG framework has a number of embedded weaknesses in its instruments. Second, the MDGs seem to be promoting the dominant neoliberal policies, which have questionable effects on people’s lives and development. Third, the MDG framework has failed to raise voice against the power imbalances that exist between different states of the world and between different classes within a country. Finally, the MDGs appear to have shown no interest in addressing long-term structural bottlenecks.

2.2.1 Instrumental Limitations

This paper has identified seven problems related to instruments of the existing MDG framework. Of these seven, the first two are related to goals and targets, the third and fourth are about indicators, whereas the fifth and sixth are about dimensions. The final one deals with adoption, implementation, monitoring and accountability of the MDGs.
First, the MDG framework transformed global targets as national targets, creating misunderstanding, confusion, and sometimes frustration. According to the criticism of International Development Committee (2013), for example, the MDGs have left a huge share of every target aside. Why half the rate of poverty and hunger, rather than eradicating them from the world? Or, why target an improvement in the lives of only 100 million slum dwellers, but not all? On the other spectrum, some people interpreted the goals as over ambitious, unrealistic and arbitrary (e.g., Easterly 2009). They have pointed out that a country with 50 per cent poverty rate would have to face more difficulty in halving poverty than a country with 30 per cent poverty rate.

The critics, however, have failed to understand the feasibility of the MDG targets which was decided on the basis of global trends observed for different variables in the 1970s and the 1980s. Consequently, targets vary from each other, e.g., under-five mortality rate has been targeted a reduction by two-thirds while maternal mortality ratio by three-fourths (Vandemoortele, 2012). Moreover, those targets were set at the global level, and therefore, were not easy to transform and apply at the national level. Nonetheless, when the targets were used at the country level in that way, problems like above emerged (Loewe, 2012). Even then, there is little opportunity to deny that the MDGs have been misinterpreted even by leading international organisations (e.g., World Bank, 2005).

Second, the MDGs have been missing two key goals: inequality and violence. Inequality could have been a key component of the MDGs framework. Inequality, both social and economic, reduces people’s dignity and excludes them from exploring their possibilities. It also makes more difficult for the poor to invest in human capitals like health and education and may lead to political instability in the society (Berg and Ostry, 2011). Most importantly, the same growth rate would put a larger number of people out of poverty in a country with more equal distribution of income than would in a country with a less equal distribution of income. It is true that “share of the poorest quintile in national consumption” is included as an indicator under the poverty goal. Even then, the issue of
consumption inequality has hardly achieved any attention. Moreover, inequality has multiple facets and, to capture all of them, a separate goal on inequality is what required.

Violence against women and girls is one of the most regular patterns of rights violations in the world. Not only that violence keeps women and girls away from exploring their potentials, rather it also severely affects the achievement of the other MDGs (International Development Committee, 2013). Moreover, no single country afflicted with fragility, violence or conflict has succeeded in achieving one single MDG (World Bank, 2011).

Third, the MDG framework has only selected quantitative indicators to monitor the progress towards various goals and targets neglecting qualitative ones. Although the MDG framework is often lauded because of this characteristic; lack of qualitative indicators, however, has its downside as well. For example, two important areas—education and health could have been benefited from qualitative indicators. A learning assessment in Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda finds that although these countries have improved their primary enrollment rate to 90 per cent in 2011, the pupils’ acquisition of basic language and mathematics skills are disappointingly slow, reflecting poor quality of learning at the primary level (Uwezo, 2012). A qualitative assessment in such cases could have been provided as a better idea regarding the students’ actual level of learning.

Similarly, maintaining the standard is vital for the success of any health related intervention. For example, suppose a number of people have been provided with immunisation vaccines, but the vaccines have lost their effectiveness due to poor storage. In such cases, counting only the coverage would mislead the authority about the effectiveness of health interventions (Brown, Franco, Rafah and Hatzell, n.d.).

Fourth, the MDG related to international development has not set any measurable indicators. Therefore, the progress or failure is difficult to assess in those occasion. For example, the last three targets reads that “Develop and implement strategies for decent and productive work”, “Provide access to affordable essential drugs in developing countries” and “Make available
The MDG framework so far has not introduced any mechanism to tackle unsustainable production and consumption.

The developing world is not responsible for global warming and climate related disasters, but are the worst victims.

Moreover, there are expressions of intent, but no concrete mechanisms have been suggested. For example, there is no discussion as to how national and international community would act to spread the benefits of technology or to ensure people’s access to essential drugs. Fundamentally, it is difficult to discern the outcome as the result of MDG framework in the absence of evidence of such causalities.

Fifth, sustainable development has been given insufficient treatment in the MDG framework. The MDG framework so far has not introduced any mechanism to tackle unsustainable production and consumption. Especially, the consumption of resources in the developed world is unsustainable. For example, the world would need four Earths if every person in the world lived like an average US resident, but only two-thirds of the Earth if lived like an average Indonesian (World Wide Fund for Nature, 2012).

In addition, the developing world is not responsible for global warming and climate related disasters, but are the worst victims. For example, a rise in the temperature by 2°C could lead to a permanent loss of per capita income in Africa and South Asia by 4 to 5 per cent. The same increase, on the other hand, would result in a minimal loss for high-income countries, and for the world, by only around one per cent of average income. The estimated cost for developing countries equals 75 per cent to 80 per cent as the costs of the damages (World Bank, 2010). Even then, the question of responsibility and accountably in case of the climate and environment has not been properly defined or differentiated in the MDG framework.

Sixth, the rights based approach has been a missing dimension from the framework. The United Nations Millennium Declaration reiterated the commitment of the world leaders to stick to the principles of human rights, and it frequently contains terms like right to equality, right to development, etc.
The process of formulation and adaptation of the MDGs was weak, thereby lacking important tools of implementation, monitoring and accountability.

The MDGs have seemingly masked the neoliberal ideology in the disguise of humanitarian intentions. A closer look at the different targets of the goal eight would further illustrate this issue. The first target under the global partnership states as

The MDGs, however, have not incorporated human rights into the framework. Therefore, it has failed to equally promote and benefit from the legally binding human rights norms.

Rights based approach is related to the MDGs in two important ways. First, while poverty could lead to violation of rights, lack of rights could also lead to the creation and worsening of poverty. Second, introduction of rights into the policy framework could solve accountability issue of the MDGs by ensuring the role of the duty-bearer. The MDGs are not legally binding. But for almost all the MDGs, there are related human rights norms. Many countries have incorporated human rights norms into laws. Therefore, if the MDGs were transformed into the rights language, they would have become enforceable by law.

Seventh, the process of formulation and adaptation of the MDGs was weak, thereby lacking important tools of implementation, monitoring and accountability. First, the MDG framework followed a donor-led top down approach rather than a recipient-led one, although the goals are directed to developing countries. This has resulted in a lack of country ownership. Second, the MDGs have been set at the global level but resource mobilisation has been planned at the state level. However, no discussion is there regarding how those resources will be used to achieve the targets at the global level. Third, the MDG targets have been transformed later to fit into country context, which has complicated and distorted the whole process not only at the goal-setting level, but also at the implementation and monitoring stages as well. Fourth, the MDG framework has been suffering from lack of assigning accountability mechanism. For example, when it is mentioned that "develop and implement strategies for decent and productive work for youth," it is not clear who will do the job and who will monitor.

2.2.2 Ideological Bias

The MDGs have seemingly masked the neoliberal ideology in the disguise of humanitarian intentions. A closer look at the different targets of the goal eight would further illustrate this issue. The first target under the global partnership states as
Most importantly, the Goal-8, the only goal applicable to the developed countries, was designed without benchmarking, let alone monitorable, verifiable and reportable accountability mechanisms as opposed to other seven goals applicable for the developing countries.

The MDGs have failed to introduce actions to correct the existing power imbalance between different countries.

"Develop further an open, rule-based, predictable, non-discriminatory trading and financial system". Thus, it prima facie rejects any alternative options to prevail trading and financial system. Second, when it is said that the international community would develop trading and financial system for all, it gives a false impression that as if there is a consensus among different countries about what rules should be followed in case of trade and finance. In reality, the world is divided into many blocs and each opposes other regarding the rules of trade as ventilated by no outcome of Doha Round, despite it being enthusiastically dubbed as "development" round. Third, a non-discriminatory trading system does not mean that it is equitable.

Under the same goal, the second and the third target of taking care of the least developed, landlocked and small island countries remain rhetoric, with hardly any LDC graduating while the number has increased to 49 countries. Finally, the fourth target under the Goal-8 relating to debt has not seen any walk the talk action. Arguably, if developing countries are effectively supported, there should not be any reason for new debt problem. Most importantly, the Goal-8, the only goal applicable to the developed countries, was designed without benchmarking, let alone monitorable, verifiable and reportable accountability mechanisms as opposed to other seven goals applicable for the developing countries. These essentially accentuate maintenance of hegemony through neo-liberal political project.

### 2.2.3. Power Imbalance

The MDGs have failed to introduce actions to correct the existing power imbalance between different countries. In the present global system, the high-income countries enjoy more control over various resources and possess considerable power over the others. Using this power, they often determine the latter's economic fate and reap unjust benefits by rigging rules in so-called free-market environment.

Intellectual property rights provide an example of powerlessness of the poor countries. In the 1960s and the 1970s, the developing countries started to debate about the
suitability of the international copyright standards set mainly by colonial powers in the earlier decades. The US became concerned about protecting the ownership of its own technology. It could not however, make any advance through international forums like the UNCTAD or the UNESCO and so brought in a new agreement called Trade-related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) under the newly established World Trade Organisation (WTO). On the contrary, the developed countries are not letting any inch forward respecting the issues of developing countries such as market access in the Doha Round. While these countries have caused multilateralism to dysfunction, these countries or blocs forced and have been forcing many developing countries to sign bilateral trade deals, sometimes using GSP privileges as carrot or as tool of coercion. For example, the USA and the EU secured many bilateral trade pacts. Not only do they employ veiled threats or geo-strategic compulsions, sometimes developed countries resort to direct aggressions as well. It is argued that the birth of neoliberalism in the international arena occurred through a US military threat to Arab States in 1973, which forced those states to recycle all of their petrodollars through Wall Street (Hickel, 2012).

Power imbalance also exists between different classes within a country, wherein ultimately a small fraction of population enjoys control over the majority of wealth through corroboration and/or capture of the state power. Such division creates an exploitative economic and political system, which deters the poor to find any escape. The MDGs, influenced by neoliberal policies, has remained silent regarding this issue. The result is not only the continuation of power imbalance between societies, but also the unevenness of opportunities between members of societies and nations.

2.2.4. Structural Imbalance

The MDGs have failed to address major structural imbalances prevailing in the global economic and political system. Global economic system is presently suffering from two major structural imbalances. The first one is about unequal distribution of income between the rich and the poor. Neoliberalism has encouraged easy availability of debt-based
Injustice has risen in society as a product of neoliberal policies. Neoliberalism promotes the idea of individualism, resulting in disintegration of society and of societal relations.

In addition, injustice has risen in society as a product of neoliberal policies. Neoliberalism promotes the idea of individualism, resulting in disintegration of society and of societal relations. It places much greater importance on individual's success and efficiency than on equity. The values of collective action and support for fellow human beings are being destroyed. The result is the rise of selfishness and various injustices associated with it (Scholte, 2005).

3. THE PROPOSED FRAMEWORK OF THE UN HIGH-LEVEL PANEL: A RAPID ASSESSMENT

Compared to the MDG framework, the proposed framework of the UN high-level panel possesses some additional features. First, the new framework expresses a firm commitment that it has to deliver results to every human being, irrespective of race, gender, ethnicity, colour, religion etc. Second, it puts sustainable development at the core of the new agenda. Third, it identifies the importance of incorporating fear, conflict and violence related indicators into the framework. Fourth, it makes proposals, such as building a single supreme body and convening global meetings to strengthen the implementation and monitoring of the framework.

Nonetheless, the proposed recommendations of the panel fall short in several important areas. First, the neoliberal ideology is retained in the new framework. For instance, the first target under the goal "Create a Global Enabling Environment and Catalyse Long-Term Finance" takes a pro-market approach and reads "support an open, fair and development-friendly trading instruments, financial deregulation and speculation to ensure higher consumption expenditure by the masses in order to reap a higher profit from the economy (Quintos, 2010). The result has been observed as negative outcomes, such as in the accumulation of debts and in the increase of unsustainable consumption. Second, participation in the global economic governance is not equal for all countries. The rich countries and transnational corporations heavily influence multilateral agencies. Such practices have created a long-term difference between the product bundles and product prices amid the high-income and low-income countries.
In the general discussion, the idea of inequality takes such a meaning that it forgets to mention the most important one: the income inequality.

The power imbalance has not only remained a neglected issue in the new framework, but it takes a pervasive turn.

Second, it adds greater emphasis to another neoliberal idea of market-enhancing ‘good’ governance. Challenging the conventional good governance paradigm favoured by the donor community, the United Nations’ Department of Economic and Social Affairs (2012b) argues that it is not a prerequisite for economic growth or development, though it might be a worthy goal by itself. Aggregate good governance indicators are less helpful for identifying governance failure in specific areas necessitating policy interventions. Finally and most importantly, it fails to take account of the fact that historically good governance in the now high-income countries actually followed rapid economic progress, and not the other way around.

Third, the new framework continues to overlook the inequality. It is true that the concept of inequality is being discussed in it. However, other than gender equality, the framework has failed to include inequality in the final list of goals, targets and indicators. Moreover, in the general discussion, the idea of inequality takes such a meaning that it forgets to mention the most important one: the income inequality.

Fourth, the power imbalance has not only remained a neglected issue in the new framework, but it takes a pervasive turn. The new framework does accept the central role of a representative organisation like the United Nations, but it has also praised gatherings like g7+, G-20, the BRICS, saying that these organisations are playing positive roles in some areas of system, substantially reducing trade-distorting measures, including agricultural subsidies, while improving market access of developing country products”. Thus, the adherence is to a trading mechanism that wants removal of pro-active role of the state, but does not address elimination of structural barriers such as supply side constraints, and representation as well as effective participation.
The general description of the framework is often confusing as it does not seek for the best solutions for the present, rather depends on future optimism.

Fifth, the framework still ignores the rights based approach. The essential human necessities like free basic health services, free primary education therefore still remain an option in the new framework, but not an obligation. As a consequence, the framework has also failed to strengthen the implementation side by not adopting the rights based approach.

Sixth, the general description of the framework is often confusing as it does not seek for the best solutions for the present, rather depends on future optimism. For example, the report states that

"It is sometimes argued that global limits on carbon emissions will force developing countries to sacrifice growth to accommodate the lifestyles of the rich, or that developed countries will have to stop growing so that developing countries can develop – substituting one source of pollution for another. We do not believe that such trade-offs are necessary. Mankind’s capacity for innovation, and the many alternatives that already exist, mean that sustainable development can, and must, allow people in all countries to achieve their aspirations." (United Nations 2013: p. 5)

Agreed that technology may create an environment where everyone may grow without reducing carbon emissions, but the present situation asks for stringent measures by developed countries regard this due to their historic responsibility, which the report has failed to mention.

Seventh, the proposed framework has failed to include anything about international cooperation on important issues like debt and medicine. The MDG target of debt has already been limiting in that as it only focused on debt relief, but overlooked the process of accumulation of debt. Similarly, the role of pharmaceutical companies is crucial in making basic
The rate of decline in poverty is accelerated or decelerated, depending upon the social property relations, rather than the neo-liberal articulation that an increase in the size of the "things-basket" reduces poverty. The neo-liberal paradigm reduces the capacity of state through liberalisation, deregulation and privatisation, assuming that market will deliver the results. It further assumes that a part of the population will plunge into the poverty and they will be addressed through social safety nets.

In institutional sense, the major reasons for persistence of poverty in Bangladesh are: absence of adequate intervention for the expansion of production, deficiency of equalizing income augmenting employment schemes, shortfalls in public expenditure for enhancements of capabilities, inadequacies in regulatory regimes, lack of complementary policy structure and non-existence of enforceability of constitutional rights. The failing of the paradigm is to take cognisance of the endemic market failures and the need for the state to intervene with strategies, policies and incentives to enhance the productive capacity to ensure full employment, particularly addressing the disguised unemployment. When people do not
Another manifestation of poverty is accumulation by disposition. The country’s economy has been expanding and so is the dispossession in many forms.

Poverty may also increase due to the lack of maintaining coherence and/or complementarity in policies and implementation. For example, tax system of the country is regressive and bias in favour of rich as the government continues to broaden the purview of equal incidence bearing tax across the income quintiles, like value added tax (VAT) while there are hardly any concerted efforts in increasing income tax net and reduction in tax evasion as well as avoidance by corporate houses.

The constitution of the country, on the other hand, pledges to ensure basic necessities to its citizens by the state. Since these rights are not legally enforceable, the state as a duty bearer to the rights holders could not be operationalized. It, therefore, remains difficult for the poor to enjoy the basic necessities and graduate out of poverty.

Another manifestation of poverty is accumulation by disposition. The country's economy has been expanding and so is the dispossession in many forms. Reduction in income poverty has a limit, and the boundary of poverty is volatile. For example one may generate income at an increased rate but ought to remain at the same level inside the society due to the social stratification. People belonging to the lower class of the society are not allowed to enjoy other elements of life likes of expression, association etc. Hence, even if income poverty scenario may have changed, social poverty remains unchanged due to class differentiation.

4. THE CHANGING LANDSCAPE

A post-2015 global development framework must not only learn from the MDGs, but also take account of the changing global context and challenges. This paper identifies four major emerging trends that become crucial for the success of any development framework beyond 2015.
Today the problem of poverty cannot be attributed only to low-income countries due to the changing dynamics that have taken place in the last two decades.

4.1 Poverty and Inequality

Although the MDG of halving the proportion of people living on less than USD 1.25 a day was achieved three years ahead of the 2015 deadline, yet an estimate covering years between 2002 and 2011 found that about 1.56 billion people of 104 countries or more than 30 per cent of their population still live in multidimensional poverty (World Bank, 2013).

Moreover, today the problem of poverty cannot be attributed only to low-income countries due to the changing dynamics that have taken place in the last two decades. According to an estimate, 93 per cent of the world’s poor lived in what is called low-income countries in 1990. In 2007-08, this number decreased to 28 per cent and poverty became mostly concentrated in middle income-countries (Sumner, 2010). Likewise, poverty still remains a major issue in the richest countries of the world as well. For example, in the United States, one in every five children (22 per cent) lived below poverty line in 2012 (Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2012). The definition of poverty varies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box 1: Inequality around the World</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>➢ The richest 10 per cent people in 2012 accounted for 86 per cent of the world’s wealth. The amount was 46 per cent for the top one percent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Income share of the richest 20 per cent people in 44 developing countries is almost 50 per cent, whereas for the poorest 20 per cent, it is only five per cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ The wage share in Asia, Africa and Latin America has declined by roughly 20 percentage points, 15 percentage points and 10 percentage points since 1994, 1990 and 1993, respectively. On the other hand, the wage share among advanced economies has only fallen by roughly 9 percentage points since 1990.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Although women were involved in 66 per cent of the world’s work in 2007, they accounted for 60 to 70 per cent of the world’s poor and managed only 15 per cent of the world’s property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ The gap between the richest 10 per cent and the poorest 10 per cent children in terms of effective available income in 32 low- and middle-income countries has grown by 35 times since the 1990s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While countries have become successful in reducing inequality between them, inequality within a country has remained essentially the same over the last three decades (Olinto and Saavedra, 2012). Some selected statistics on world inequality situation are showed here (Box 1).

4.2 Economic Crisis and Job loss

The MDGs were set at a time when the world economy was prospering. Unfortunately, the economic situation changed markedly after the US was hit by a recession that began in 2007. The recession quickly crossed national boundaries and affected a number of countries all over the world to become the most damaging since the 1930s.

Following the recession, the global employment rate stood at 55.7 per cent in the fourth quarter of 2012, which is 0.9 percentage points lower than the corresponding pre-crisis period of 2007. Unemployment rate, on the other hand, stood at 5.9 per cent in 2012, which is 0.5 percentage points above the rate of 5.4 per cent of the pre-crisis period. The unemployment rate is projected to increase to 6 per cent in 2013 (ILO, 2013a).

The economic crisis has also worsened the employment opportunity for particular groups like women and youth. For instance, the gender gap in unemployment was constant on average at 0.5 percentage points between 2002 and 2007. By 2011, this gap increased to 0.7 percentage points, with ILO’s projections showing no significant reduction in it by 2013, or even by 2017 (ILO 2012). The global youth unemployment rate, on the other hand, increased from 12.3 per cent in 2011 to 12.4 per cent in 2012, and then to 12.6 per cent in 2013, which was 11.5 per cent in the pre-crisis year of 2007 (ILO, 2013b). At the same time, the number of workers in developing countries involved in vulnerable employment increased by more than 9 million within a year to reach at 1.49 billion or 56 per cent of all workers in the developing region in 2012 (ILO 2013c). The effect of worsening employment condition has been observed in the share of discouraged workers in the total inactive
population, which increased by 0.7 percentage points on average between 2008 and 2011 (ILO 2013a).

### 4.3. Trade, Finance and Aid

The economic crisis is having a negative impact on international trade. In the aftermath of the crisis, world trade growth declined from 5.2 per cent in 2011 to 2.0 per cent in 2012 and is expected to remain at around 3.3 per cent in 2013 (WTO 2013).

Since the beginning of the recession, trade related negotiations have become much more confrontational and are likely to remain so in the near future. A number of developed and developing countries have resorted to protectionist measures like tariffs, import licensing, compulsory standards and certification, buy-local clauses, and anti-dumping and countervailing duties. Many struggling industries have been provided with the opportunity of bailing out in the European Union countries and the United States. Some countries have even been considering imposition of discriminatory consumption subsidy (UNCTAD-JETRO 2010).

Moreover, as mentioned before, the crisis is having a negative impact on assistance provided by the developed countries. For example, the net official development assistance (ODA) to poor countries from members of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the OECD fell in real terms by 2 per cent in 2011 and then again by 4 per cent in 2012. In sum, ODA has fallen by 6 per cent in real terms since 2010, when it reached its peak (OECD 2013).

### 4.4. Rights Violation and Violence

Human rights violation has become endemic across the world in the recent years. Both rich and poor countries have been found guilty in this regard (Box 2). Due to the connection between rights and poverty, the issue of rights violation has become a major concern for development.
The extent and cost of the new kind of violence is not trifling and both rich and poor countries are being affected, even though the level of suffering is higher for the poor ones.

The changing pattern of violence has been causing a different challenge for development initiatives as well. Although interstate and civil wars have declined compared to the 1980s, other forms of violence have increased. Not only organized criminal gangs, terrorist organizations, and pirates are major drivers of violence in today’s world, local and international ideological movements and political conflicts are also creating threats, meaning that the world has to cope with multiple forms of violence.

The extent and cost of the new kind of violence is not trifling and both rich and poor countries are being affected, even though the level of suffering is higher for the poor ones. For example, one transnational terrorist incidence reduced per capita GDP growth of 18 Western European countries and 42 Asian countries by 0.4 percentage points and 1.5 percent, respectively (Gaibulloev and Sandler 2008, Sandler and

---

**Box 2: Rights Violation around the World**

- The number of stateless people at the beginning of 2012 stood at 12 million.
- The rights of a huge portion of the world’s 214 million migrants remained unprotected in 2012, both at home and in the host state.
- Among the 72 countries surveyed by the ILO, 40 per cent did not secure any weekly rest day for domestic workers or set any limit for hours of work.
- Rights violations in the United States in 2012:
  - Although drug offenses are roughly equal among Whites and African Americans, African Americans constituted about 33 per cent arrests in drug related offenses, even though their share in the US total population is only about 13 per cent.
  - Trade unions are severely restricted in the US and several states passed tougher laws which have significantly reduced the collective bargaining power of the workers.
  - A huge number of children work on US farms and often for 10 or more hours a day in extremely risky environment.
  - Large-scale gender discrimination suits were ruled out by the US Supreme Court in 2011 in a case which involved 1.5 million women employees of Walmart.
- Women on average earn 77 cents in the US for an income of one dollar by men.
- Rights violations in the European Union in 2012:
  - The EU forced to return more than 1500 refugees and migrants, of whom many were pregnant women and children and let some of them to die.
  - Mob violence against African migrants and Roma in Italy, against Roma in Eastern Europe, against migrants in Greece has given rights violation in the European Union countries a new dimension, where individual attacks are already common.

Source: Amnesty International (2013a and b), Human Rights Watch, 2012
On average, 400,000 people died per year from climate change related hunger and communicable diseases. Another 4.5 million deaths were caused from the carbon-intensive energy system related hazards.

Gaibulloev 2008). In some cases, the whole world suffers even if the disturbance is limited to a single country or region. For example, after the Libyan uprising, oil prices rose by 15 per cent in the first four weeks (World Bank, 2011a). Moreover, due to growing security risk, many countries are spending heavily on armed forces, which are also having negative impacts on their poverty reduction and other social sectors.

4.5. Climate Change

The IPCC in 2007 has clearly affirmed that climate change is happening and the concentration of carbon dioxide and global mean temperature has continued to increase compared to pre-industrial levels at a rate that are leaving profound consequences for human being and other species. About the effects of climate change, DARA and the Climate Vulnerable Forum (2012) have clearly stated that:

- On average, 400,000 people died per year from climate change related hunger and communicable diseases. Another 4.5 million deaths were caused from the carbon-intensive energy system related hazards.
- Over 98 per cent of all climate change mortality and over 90 per cent of all carbon economy related mortality occurred in developing countries:
- Economic losses from climate change and the carbon-intensive economy was estimated to be close to 1.7 per cent of global GDP in 2010.
- Least Developed Countries (LDCs) on average suffered a loss of over 7 per cent of GDP in 2010.
- Over three million people are expected to die in the United States, China and India in 2030, equal to half of the total mortality of the world. The economic loss of these three countries is estimated to reach a total of 2.5 trillion dollars in the same year.
- When expressed in terms of economic costs, a study by UNEP (2010, cited in DARA and the Climate Vulnerable Forum 2012) has found that biodiversity loss equals almost seven trillion dollars or about 10 per cent of global GDP.

Regional cost benefit analysis from 2010 to 2100 shows that climate change actions would produce net benefits for society
The MDGs have identified six values that are widely acclaimed and accepted. They are freedom, equality, solidarity, tolerance, respect for nature and shared responsibility.

The MDGs have identified six values that are widely acclaimed and accepted. They are freedom, equality, solidarity, tolerance, respect for nature and shared responsibility. Those values provide the basic building block for the post 2015 framework. Nonetheless, due to the inadequacies of the previous ones, the new framework aiming to achieve a zero-poverty world requires a fundamental shift in values and principles to include rights, equality, justice, sustainability and partnership for development through historic responsibility as new ones. These five principles would work better in ensuring a poverty-free world because of many reasons.

First, the new framework would provide a better link between the poor as rights-holders and the state as duty-bearers. Poverty reduction requires not only a proactive stance from the part of the poor, but also a positive approach from the individuals, entities and states, whose actions have intentionally or unintentionally responsible for creating such outcome. Translating the development goals into the rights...
The proposed zero-poverty framework would be better able to promote development goals as it places the right level of emphasis on equality.

Second, the proposed zero-poverty framework would be better able to promote development goals as it places the right level of emphasis on equality. The framework recognizes that poverty is often the result of unequal treatment and opportunities in economic, political and social arena. Moreover, inequality not only compromises a society’s ability to sustain growth and transfer the growth into poverty reduction, it also exacerbates environmental problems, which in turn aggravates poverty situation.

Third, the proposed framework identifies exclusion, discrimination and exploitation as the root causes of poverty and attempts to measure the effectiveness of interventions against such actions. Without access to justice, the marginalized would continue to feel helpless and social harmony would break down. Developing a proper justice system, therefore, is not only important for tackling inequality, but also to resolve social tension and social unrest, and to maintain a fair resource distribution and incentive system. An unequal and unjust society is neither economically efficient, nor socially, nor it deserves to be sustainable.

Fourth, the proposed zero-poverty framework builds on the principles of sustainable development in a way that acknowledges a broader level of necessities. For example, there has been a growing realization in high-consumption countries like the UK that if everyone on Earth starts consuming as much as the average UK resident consumes, two more additional planets would require to match the demand (WWF-UK, 2006). Moreover, it has been also felt that the high rate of consumption has not brought any noticeable change in the level of life satisfaction (SDC, 2003). On the other side, this
level of consumption is rapidly depleting the world resources, causing problems like climate change, and is compromising the living standards of future generations. Since the ultimate objective of any development agenda is people’s well-being, in addition to setting the macro-targets of saving the world from the adverse effects of climate change, developed countries should take the responsibility of shaping the lifestyles of their residents in favour of sustainable production and consumption through prudent use of public policies (Sustainable Development Solutions Network, 2012).

Fifth, the zero-poverty framework urges for a new partnership between developed and developing countries that is built on historic responsibility and, therefore, are better suited for development initiatives for three reasons. First, the colonial powers have led to the subjugation and destruction of colonized economies and societies and such acts are still seen in various forms in today’s global economy. Second, in the backdrop of constant threat from climate change induced disasters and the role the high-income countries historically played in creating such an environment, the principle of partnership for development through historic responsibility becomes even more prominent. The industrialization that took place in the Northern hemisphere after the industrial revolution had begun is mainly to blame for the greenhouse effect, which has been primarily affecting the poor countries. As negative economic externalities are subjected to regulation and punishment within a country, so why they be unaddressed at the global level? Third, poor countries often face the scarcity of fund that is required to tackle their economic problems. Therefore, a framework that takes historical responsibility of the advanced economies into consideration and decides their responsibility (e.g., how much aid they should provide) on such basis is more likely to perform better.

This section provides a set of indicators based on new fundamental principles. It discusses how the new principles of rights, equality, justice, sustainability and partnership for development through historic responsibility could be utilized to strengthen the measurement and implementation of the zero-poverty framework.
5.1 Rights

The concept of rights is based on the normative idea that being born as a human being, every person is entitled to enjoy certain entitlements that are the bare minimum to lead a life with dignity and respect. In addition, rights are universal, inalienable, and indivisible. As it is a normative concept, people vary in their opinion from each other about whether there should be such entitlements, and if yes, what those entitlements should contain. Fortunately, some broad consensus has emerged over the years, and rights indicators are increasingly used to measure people's living standards as well as to study the level of commitment of duty-bearers.

The rights indicators proposed in this paper mainly connect targets and indicators with the corresponding human rights standards, such as right to life, right to food, etc. (Table 1). The Table altogether recognizes seven types of rights, although such division is not conclusive and rather presented for illustrative purposes. One additional benefit is that such a division provides an opportunity to continue the targets set in the MDG framework. Each type of right is further divided into outcome indicators and process indicators. The process indicators measure whether the outcome indicators are actually realized in the field and the duty-bearers are fulfilling their duties.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Outcome Indicators (Examples)</th>
<th>Process Indicators (Examples)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right to life</td>
<td>a) Infant mortality rate</td>
<td>a) Proportion of 1 year-old children immunized against measles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Under-five mortality rate</td>
<td>b) The proportion of the health budget allocated to maternal health care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Proportion of births attended by skilled health personnel</td>
<td>c) Violence prevention integrated into school curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Maternal mortality ratio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) Number of violence incident in the area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to food</td>
<td>a) Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age</td>
<td>a) Percentage of population covered by public food/nutrition programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Proportion of population below minimum level of dietary energy consumption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to education</td>
<td>a) Net enrolment ratio in primary education</td>
<td>a) Percentage of government budget allocated to education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Proportion of pupils starting grade 1 who reach grade 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to health</td>
<td>a) Prevalence and death rates associated with preventable communicable diseases</td>
<td>a) Percentage of government budget allocated to health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to adequate housing</td>
<td>a) Proportion of population with sustainable access to an improved water source, urban and rural</td>
<td>a) Coverage of national electricity supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Proportion of population with access to improved sanitation, urban and rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Proportion of households with access to secure tenure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to work</td>
<td>a) Employment-to-population ratio</td>
<td>a) Percentage of government budget spent on training workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) The incidence of deaths/diseases caused by unsafe occupational environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Proportion of employed people living below $1.25 per day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to adequate standard of living</td>
<td>a) Proportion of population below $1.25 per day</td>
<td>a) Size of social protection programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Poverty headcount ratio (percentage of population below the national poverty line)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Poverty gap ratio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Share of poorest quintile in national consumption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 Equality

Equality normally represents that everyone gets the same. It however, disregards the fact that every human being has different needs. For example, the calorie requirement of a child is different from that of an adult. Serving both the same amount of food would mean that the adult would get less and the child would get more than what both of them requires. Therefore, equality should be used to mean the same level of opportunity. To draw the benefit of the later approach from our earlier example, an adult would get more food compared to the child as the adult needs higher amount of calories to maintain the same level of bodily functions if it is defined in terms of opportunity.

Equality can be categorized in many ways. The division of equality into the following four types – between countries, within countries, within household and between generations – however is essential for poverty reduction and human development (Table 2). Such division can ensure that no country, community or locality, household, member within the household and generation lives on less opportunity than the others. Each of these four dimensions can be further divided between equality of outcome (i.e. whether the benefits are shared equally) and equality of process (i.e., whether the treatment is equal).
## Table 2: Indicators of Equality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Outcome Indicators (Examples)</th>
<th>Process Indicators (Examples)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equality between countries</td>
<td>a) Per capita national income</td>
<td>a) Special and differential treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Per capita food, education, health, housing, clothing</td>
<td>b) 0.7 of GNI - MRV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) Import and export restrictions, by country groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality within nation</td>
<td>a) Proportion of income received by poorest quintile</td>
<td>a) Progressivity of tax structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Share of women in wage employment in the non-agricultural sector</td>
<td>b) Percentage of land re-distributed through land-reform programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Share of minority, IPs in decision-making</td>
<td>c) Per capita government expenditure in private/public, urban/rural educational institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Proportion of seats held by women in national parliament</td>
<td>d) Per capita government expenditure in private/public, urban/rural health institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e) Facilities provided to persons with disability under state regulations, including access to public and private buildings, education and health, and employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality within household</td>
<td>a) Prevalence of underweight children, by gender</td>
<td>a) Per capita household expenditure on children's health, education, etc, by gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Ratio of girls to boys in primary, secondary and tertiary education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Ratio of crime against women and children to total crime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergenerational equality</td>
<td>a) Per capita national debt</td>
<td>a) Percentage of national expenditure used to produce renewable resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Per capita natural resource extraction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The function of justice is to differentiate the right from the wrong and establish the right in every possible way.

5.3 Justice

The meaning and measurement of justice varies across disciplines and contexts. At the core, the function of justice is to differentiate the right from the wrong and establish the right in every possible way. In the development arena, it is important that justice supports a proper incentive system and solves conflicts in the best way.

### Table 3: Indicators of Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Outcome Indicator (Examples)</th>
<th>Process Indicator (Examples)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distributive or economic justice</td>
<td>a) Money required to access government services, e.g., subsidy</td>
<td>a) Percentage of public expenditure going for distributive justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Rate of tax evasion by different income groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Per hour wages of labours versus profits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Number of complaints about forced relocation of citizens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) Number of people not permitted to own or buy land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural justice or fair play</td>
<td>a) Percentage of cases won by the poorest quintile as compared to total cases</td>
<td>a) Number of persons and bodies appointed to solve complaints related to procedural justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Percentage of cases won by minority groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Average time between filing a case and receive a verdict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Proportion of woman and child victims who have received government services to total woman and child victims, divided by income and region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) Proportion of minority groups receiving legal services from the government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f) Number of complaints against judicial misconduct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restorative and retributive justice</td>
<td>a) Amount of compensation received by the poorest quintile</td>
<td>a) Number of persons and bodies involved in monitoring restorative and retributive justice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three types of justice indicators, therefore, are required for the post-MDG framework (Table 3). First, the distributive or economic justice is needed for measuring the fairness in distribution, both in access to resources and distribution of benefits. Procedural justice is required to ensure everybody's
The concept of sustainability often includes a combined approach consisting of three different views: economic, social and environmental. Natural resources provide materials for production and consumption. Environment also affects the survival of communities in a particular region. Conversely, economic activities and social practices also determine the rate and pace of environmental degradation. By the end of day, however, the environment is frequently found to take a secondary importance. To keep it at a central position, therefore, the focus should strictly be on environmental variables and on those human activities (whether economic and social) that have direct influence on environment. Exploitation of natural resources, climate and atmosphere, and sustainable production and consumption thus become important elements of sustainability.

The proposed post-2015 framework suggests indicators for all three of these: safe climate and atmosphere, protection of natural resources, and sustainable production and consumption (Table 4). In addition, the indicators of biodiversity are included as biodiversity is a powerful indicator that expresses a special kind of commitment of a society to nature. Among the four types of indicators, indicators related to safe climate and atmosphere present global picture, while the indicators of protection of natural resources and biodiversity conservation present performance at the state level. Finally, the promotion of sustainable production and consumption as an indicator is required to measure the responsible use of resources at the individual level.

5.4 Sustainability

The concept of sustainability often includes a combined approach consisting of three different views: economic, social and environmental. Natural resources provide materials for production and consumption. Environment also affects the survival of communities in a particular region. Conversely, economic activities and social practices also determine the rate and pace of environmental degradation. By the end of day, however, the environment is frequently found to take a secondary importance. To keep it at a central position, therefore, the focus should strictly be on environmental variables and on those human activities (whether economic and social) that have direct influence on environment. Exploitation of natural resources, climate and atmosphere, and sustainable production and consumption thus become important elements of sustainability.

The proposed post-2015 framework suggests indicators for all three of these: safe climate and atmosphere, protection of natural resources, and sustainable production and consumption (Table 4). In addition, the indicators of biodiversity are included as biodiversity is a powerful indicator that expresses a special kind of commitment of a society to nature. Among the four types of indicators, indicators related to safe climate and atmosphere present global picture, while the indicators of protection of natural resources and biodiversity conservation present performance at the state level. Finally, the promotion of sustainable production and consumption as an indicator is required to measure the responsible use of resources at the individual level.
Table 4: Indicators of Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safe climate and atmosphere</th>
<th>Outcome Indicators (Examples)</th>
<th>Process Indicators (Examples)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Per capita carbon dioxide emissions</td>
<td>a) Number of inspections made by government officials to identify violation of environmental laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Presence of pollutant in the air</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protection of natural resources</th>
<th>Outcome Indicators (Examples)</th>
<th>Process Indicators (Examples)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Proportion of land area covered by forest</td>
<td>a) Percentage of public expenditure for critical natural resources protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Percentage of land preserved as open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biodiversity conservation</th>
<th>Outcome Indicators (Examples)</th>
<th>Process Indicators (Examples)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Percent of native plant and animal species endangered vs. secure</td>
<td>a) Ratio of area protected to maintain biological diversity to surface area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainable production and consumption</th>
<th>Outcome Indicators (Examples)</th>
<th>Process Indicators (Examples)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Annual energy consumption per capita</td>
<td>a) Expenditure on public campaign about changing production and consumption patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Share of renewable energy in total energy consumption</td>
<td>b) Expenditure for agricultural research and food security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Water use per household</td>
<td>c) Expenditure for renewable energy, clean energy, energy efficiency and energy security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Tons of solid waste generated and solid waste recycled per capita</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.5 Partnership for Development through Historic Responsibility

In today's globalized world, each state's action often produces a positive or negative result for the others. So, the concept of global partnership has received prominence in international development agenda. Moreover, the high-income countries are to take active role in the financing of development programmes in poor countries. However, as the debate is frequently on how much they should do, what requires is that these countries respond from their historic responsibilities.
Financing is an important area of international cooperation for poverty reduction. Moreover, financing is an important area of international cooperation for poverty reduction, but unless improvements are done in other areas, such as market access, trade, and technology transfer, the effectiveness of financing would remain questionable. Likewise, any international cooperation between developed and developing countries would not be able to create much impact if measures are not introduced to ensure collaboration between private sector of the high-income countries with poor countries and their private sectors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Outcome Indicator (Examples)</th>
<th>Process Indicator (Examples)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Equitable market and trading mechanism    | a) Proportion of total developed country imports from developing countries and least developed countries, admitted free of duty  
   b) Movement of terms of trade          | a) Effective rate of tariff                                                                  |
|                                           |                                                                                              | b) Index of technical barrier                                                               |
|                                           |                                                                                              | c) Agricultural subsidy as a percentage of GDP in high-income versus low-income countries  |
| Special financing options                 | a) Debt service as a percentage of exports of goods and services                             | a) Net ODA to the least developed countries, as percentage of donors' gross national income |
| Effective development cooperation         | a) Proportion of population with access to affordable essential drugs on a sustainable basis  
   b) Fixed telephone lines per 100 inhabitants  
   c) Mobile cellular subscriptions per 100 inhabitants  
   d) Internet users per 100 inhabitants        | a) Number of agreements regarding technology transfer                                       |

To build up an effective international partnership for development through historic responsibility, the paper for illustrative purposes, suggests three broad areas. First, different nations and international organizations have to follow a procedure (reflected through process indicators) that would
The present paper has depicted that a new post-2015 development framework based upon fundamental principles of rights, equality, justice, sustainability and partnership for development through historic responsibility may lead to achievement of a zero-poverty world in the post-2015 period.

give rise to an equitable market and trading mechanism (reflected through outcome indicators). Similarly, the financial and other resources, especially technology and knowledge, have to be shared effectively across the world through effective programmes and would have to be monitored through appropriate indicators.

6. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In the 21st century, the importance of countries working together has increased manifold. The traditional model of a single country trying to solve its own problems has long been given way to multilateral efforts. Moreover, with the rapid development in information technology and transportation, exchange of information and movements of people and goods across borders have increased, the world has essentially become a globalized. Here, many of the problems faced by countries are common, e.g., the problem of global warming. This requires that states work together.

The present paper has depicted that a new post-2015 development framework based upon fundamental principles of rights, equality, justice, sustainability and partnership for development through historic responsibility may lead to achievement of a zero-poverty world in the post-2015 period. The poverty-free world, however, is only possible if all stakeholders are willing to work together and making necessary changes.

The MDGs has clearly shown that international cooperation can make an impact on the living and life standards of the poor. In addition, the MDGs have provided the world with valuable experience. So, it is time for walking the talk of a zero poverty world.
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