



United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs  
Division for Social Policy and Development



## **DRAFT**

### **Summary of the E- Dialogue**

**on**

**Rethinking and Strengthening Social Development in the Contemporary World**

**Organized by UNDESA/DSPD in collaboration with UNDP**

**6 - 24 April 2015**

#### **I. Introduction**

As part of the preparation for the 54th session of the Commission for Social Development, the Division for Social Policy and Development (DSPD) of the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA) organized an electronic dialogue (E-dialogue) in collaboration with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) from 6 – 24 April 2015. The purpose of the E-dialogue was to engage experts and policy-makers in the area of social policy and development from various regions in a consultation on the priority theme of the 54th session of the Commission (February 2016) to help the Commission arrive at action-oriented policy guidance for Member States and the international community.

#### **II. Background**

The year 2015 marks the 20th anniversary of the World Summit for Social Development, held in Copenhagen. During the 53rd session of the Commission for Social Development (February 2015), Member States acknowledged that the vision, principles and goals adopted at the Summit remain as relevant today as twenty years ago. Despite the enormous progress in having halved the proportion of people living in extreme poverty, more than 1 billion people remain below the poverty line. Rates of unemployment and underemployment, particularly among youth, are also unacceptably high, and many countries continue to grapple with the challenge of fostering social inclusion.

More recently, many countries have experienced widening inequality, persistent poverty and exclusion, volatile food and energy prices, food and water insecurity, environmental degradation and intensified negative effects of climate change. People across regions often feel they are getting more vulnerable to economic shocks as well as environmental and social risks. Building on the lessons learnt from the implementation of the Copenhagen Programme of Action, Member States during the 53rd Commission urged further integration of poverty eradication, productive employment and decent work for all, and social integration into the post-2015 development agenda.

The E-dialogue under the theme of “rethinking and strengthening social development” was conducted to provide a unique opportunity for experts and policy-makers to examine the critical role of social policy and social development in achieving people-centred, inclusive, just, and socially, economically and environmentally sustainable development for all. Key messages and recommendations arising from the E-dialogue was expected to be reflected in documents to be prepared for the 54th session of the Commission.

### **III. Objective**

The E-dialogue was convened as part of the preparation for the Commission's annual session. It aimed to reach a wider network of experts than a physical meeting would. Contributions to the E-dialogue aimed to form an important input to the report of the Secretary-General on the priority theme of "Re-thinking and strengthening social development in the contemporary world".

### **IV. Organization**

The E-dialogue took place during a period of three weeks, from 6 to 24 April 2015, and was organized by DESA/DSPD in collaboration with UNDP, using the "Teamworks" platform.

#### **The themes and guiding questions**

**Week 1** (6 – 10 April): Strengthening social development: What will it take?

This session focused on broad policy directions to strengthen social development in the context of the post-2015 development agenda to be adopted in September 2015. It built on the conclusions of the Report of the Secretary-General on the priority theme and discussion of the 53rd session of the Commission for Social Development (link to the Commission web site). "Social Development" in this online discussion was based on the concept adopted at the World Summit for Social Development and contained in the Copenhagen Declaration and Programme of Action.

#### **Guiding questions:**

- What are effective policy approaches (examples at the national level) that were proven to be effective in promoting social development (i.e., reduction of poverty, decent jobs, social inclusion, access to basic services, etc.)?
- How did/do they strengthen social development in relation to sustainable development?
- How to achieve policy coherence among different sectors (i.e, social, macroeconomic, trade, environment, etc.) to achieve socially-desirable goals?
- Is there a need for a new, broader social development framework? If so, please describe its key elements.

**Week 2** (13 – 17 April): Rethinking Social Development to address new trends and challenges

This session focused on challenges to, and opportunities for, social policy in the contemporary context. The discussion revisited recent trends in development thinking (i.e., conceptual framing of "development", such as revitalizing people-centred, inclusive development, equality and equity, and values and norms emphasizing social justice, etc.), and identified challenges that would need renewed attentions from social development perspectives. It also identified opportunities to strengthen social development and to address challenges, which would lead to a discussion on the broader social development framework.

#### **Guiding questions:**

- What are new trends in development thinking?
- In your view, what are the most pressing emerging challenges, and why?
- Can current social policy frameworks effectively address these challenges? If not, what needs to be done and how?

**Week 3** (20 -24 April): Social development and implementation of the post-2015 development agenda

This session focused on clarifying the role of social development in achieving sustainable development, paying particular attention to how social policies could drive economic and environmental sustainability. Within the existing SDG framework, it explored how the social development community could strengthen the social pillar and dimensions of sustainable

development: Goals 1 – 6 (poverty, hunger, health, education, (gender), water and sanitation) and social dimensions of goal 8 (employment and decent work), Goal 10 (inequality) and Goal 16 (peaceful and inclusive society). In addition, the discussion focused on how we can effectively address social dimensions of the economic and environmental pillars, as well as the interlinkages among the three dimensions of sustainable development.

Guiding questions:

- In which areas can positive synergies (win-win situation) between social and economic, and social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development be created? What are effective policy tools to enable this (i.e., decent work, social protection, green jobs, etc.)
- How to manage potential conflicts or perceived trade-offs between social and economic and social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development. What are effective approaches (what needs to be done) to manage them?
- What will be the most effective mechanism to strengthen the social pillars of sustainable development? What conceptual framework can be most useful to strengthen the social dimensions of sustainable development in a more coherent and integrated manner?

**V. Profile of Participants:**

There were a total of 153 registered participants, and a total of 2,799 users from 169 countries. The largest share of users are from the USA (343, 12.21%) followed by Brazil (187, 6.66%), India (134, 4.77%), Canada (83, 2.95%), UK (72, 2.56%), Kenya and Nigeria (71, 2.53% respectively), Egypt (60, 2.14%), Italy (52, 1.85%), Pakistan (51, 1.82%) and France (49, 1.74%).<sup>1</sup> In total, 320 comments were posted, of which 155 for the first week, 87 for the second week, and 78 for the third week discussion.

The profile of users ranged from policy-makers (directors, senior analysts, research coordinators, technical advisers, monitoring and evaluation officers), academia (college professors/lecturers, senior researchers, teachers, students), practitioners (programme/project managers, chief consultants), civil society organizations (CEO of think tank, president/director of NGOs, etc.). They exchanged their views, share knowledge, good practices and useful resources.

The spike of usage was recorded at the beginning of the first week when the technical team launched the iContact mail campaign to all Teamworks users. It was proposed to explore a possible use of the WorldWeWant Policy and Strategy Group (PSG)'s social media channel at the beginning of each week to reach similar audience.

**VI. Summary of the E-Dialogue:**

The E-dialogue illustrated the vast range of policies and interventions in the social development field and the fragmentation that exists among the various areas. Comments include those related to education, health, employment, poverty reduction, social protection, social transfer programmes, water, sanitation, youth, gender, older persons, persons with disabilities and indigenous people. Some of these policies were categorized as universal policies while others as targeted policies aiming to address specific needs of disadvantaged or vulnerable social groups, communities and individuals, who have not benefitted from public social services, or who may be left out from development processes. From the conversations, it was clear that most people engaged in certain social policy see the whole development process from their unique perspectives. In the dawn of the adoption of a new global sustainable development agenda, the E-dialogue highlighted existing gaps in addressing the inter-linkages within the variety of issues that are part of the “social dimension” of sustainable development.

---

<sup>1</sup> For further information, please see attached a list of users sorted by affiliated country.

If the main feature of the post-2015 development agenda is to take a holistic and integrated approach to address complex and inter-related global challenges that are no longer contained in the existing borders of a specific policy area, nor effectively tackled by one or two sectors alone, there is a need for a fundamental shift in policy approach, institutional mechanisms, and above all the mind sets of policy-makers. A holistic approach should allow breaking down silos and design policies and programmes in a way that “the whole is larger than the sums of the parts”. This will require a more coherent overarching social policy framework under which each policy is implemented to achieve common social development objectives, including - to make social progress and improve the quality of life for all people to live with dignity. Such an overarching social policy framework will strengthen social development under the new post-2015 sustainable development agenda. We need to put people at the centre of sustainable development. Without strengthening social policy and development, there will be no inclusive and sustained economic growth, nor environmental sustainability. The majority of the participants repeatedly emphasized the centrality of social policy and development during the E-dialogue.

#### A new framework to strengthening social development and policy

There was a general consensus on the need for a more coherent and broader social development framework that would enhance coherence among various social policies and programmes. Such a broader social development/policy framework would have key elements of inclusive development: new ways of forging consensus; creating shared values and ownership; embracing diversity; breaking down barriers to inclusion; and building trust. A civil society empowering framework should also be considered.

Such a framework allows a coherent and integrated approach to social policy making, taking into account the level of development of each country, political space, economic policies that enable progressive taxation and redistribution mechanism, as well as social inclusion policies. Effective targeting mechanisms must be developed to ensure leakages are being addressed to avoid unintended consequences. Such an approach should be applied to all key social policies to create effective synergy among them.

For example, well-designed social protection programmes based on social rights is considered as one of the most effective ways to promote social development, as it enables the most vulnerable families and individuals to ensured access to basic services (education, healthcare, nutrition, clean water and sanitation), guarantees minimum income to support their livelihoods, and prevents them from economic shocks and environmental risks. Better synergies should be created among education and health policies and social protection programmes, as well as vocational and skills training, labour policies and social protection programmes. Fiscal instruments for funding social protection programmes need to be carefully examined to sustain them over time, for example, through progressive tax reforms.

A social policy framework could also be framed in education, health, decent jobs, social protection and social dialogues. Public health and its innovative policies have proven to be catalyst for social progress over the past several decades. Health should be incorporated as an integral component for social development. Health is the product of a well-balanced interaction with one's physical and non-physical environment. It is the integration of productive and sustainable lifestyle habits over a prolonged period of time. As such, the right of every human being to be healthy should be an inalienable right. With increasing transnational interdependence, a coherent health policy needs to be part of, and also vitalize social policy, irrespective of whether at a community or international level.

In countries that have achieved nearly universal access to primary education and well developed institutions of higher education are nowadays confronted with the challenge of building better synergies across the whole spectrum of the educational system. Improving the quality of basic education received by all children and expanding access to quality secondary education is essential to improve the insertion of young people into the labour market. However, the curricula of secondary education must also be adapted to build the skills required by young workers in the new economic realities of a globalized world. Similarly in the case of tertiary education; it must be adapted to respond to the need of strengthening the capacity of countries to innovate through a Research

&Development agenda relevant to the needs of micro, small and medium enterprises, which are the largest source of employment in developing countries.

All components of society need a living wage. Productive employment and decent work are fundamental to sustain livelihoods, escape poverty and exclusion and social inclusion. The four pillars of the decent work agenda, that is - job creation, rights at work, social protection and social dialogue need to be taken into consideration. Social dialogue is an important component of the social policy framework, where people and social actors share representation in crafting social policies to enable more equitable development.

A social development framework must aim at strengthening all social institutions and interactions, and not just formal organizations. It is informal relationships, such as family, kinship and neighbourhood-based supports that generate social sustainability. To strengthen social development, it is important to cultivate the aggregated capacities of several billions individual that so far have been largely untapped. Any conceptual framework needs to meaningfully integrate the contributions of those individuals who have been traditionally seen as passive recipients into development processes.

The long-term sustainability of social policies and how funding is secured and allocated to social development were identified as major concerns. In some countries, public funding for social protection programmes, for example, were seen as short-term measures even where a law was enacted to guarantee it. Limited funds availability might lead to unmet demands during economic recession, which would push back those who are marginally above poverty line. Some suggested that a market mechanism might be considered for more sustainable social development, while other suggested options for progressive tax reforms and increasing taxes on companies in the extractive industries. In this context, new sources of funding need to be explored to finance a social development framework.

At the national and international level a new tax system could be built to bring social justice and ensure environmental protection. It is also necessary to better regulate global finance, and apply new taxes, such as taxes on financial transactions and financial activities. Domestic resource mobilisation for social development could be further enhanced through: (i) improved tax collection and broadening the tax base; (ii) progressive tax systems to increase revenue; and (iii) measures to address tax evasion and tax havens. At the international level, additional funding for setting up social development framework should be considered through adequate development cooperation programmes.

### New trends and challenges

Some of the trends identified during the discussion point to a paradigm shift in the way that policy strategists are beginning to approach social development. For example, the impact of environmental degradation on social well-being has been increasingly recognized. This has had a direct impact on the way social policy is conceptualized in relation to environmental policy, in particular with a more robust understanding of the impacts of climate change on groups and societies and with a greater acceptance of the need for a transition to green jobs and a green economy. However, despite the framework of the three pillars of sustainable development, the complex linkage between the social and economic pillars remains a challenge.

For example, capital and jobs move easily across borders, however, people who seek better opportunities face countless restrictions. Similarly, poverty and inequality were identified as great impediments for an integral sustainable development and a significant setback for securing human rights for all. While there is a growing recognition of the need to combat inequalities both between and within countries, there should be much better coherence between poverty-eradication and inequality reduction policies. Without explicit attention to a potential “middle-income-gap” between top and bottom earners, the World Bank’s initiative to promote income growth at the bottom 40 per cent may face difficulties in reducing widening inequalities, which could lead to economic and social instability.

Social justice is an important principle for people-centred inclusive development to take its root. The World Social Forum (WSF) has addressed the link between social development and social justice.

Its assessment of the impact – to date - of the international economic system on social development is that social justice is not being achieved, in part due to inadequate quality of political participation of ordinary citizens especially on economic policies that affect their lives. Coherence between social and economic policies remains elusive in part because of the growing influence of powerful, and often unaccountable, private interests in development. There is an ongoing need in most countries for a wide set of socio-economic policies: to alleviate inequality, reform public services and pensions, create good jobs and better labour conditions, address low-living standards, enact land reform, and secure affordable food, water, energy, transportation and housing, among others. Social justice should be at the core of every effort and a strong focus should be put into tackling the root causes of poverty and inequality.

Drawing on UNRISD project “New Directions in Social Policy: Alternatives from and for the Global South”, three major trends were observed.

First, there has been a notable expansion of social policies and programmes, often with significant innovations in terms of programme design, in so-called emerging and many developing economies. These include large-scale conditional cash transfer programmes; extensive employment or public works programmes; the expansion of health insurance coverage; large-scale social programmes associated with housing, literacy and food security as well as the expansion or reform of pension schemes. Beyond such identifiable “social” policies, many other policies are being experimented with that, while not necessarily categorized as social policies, have important social functions. These include minimum wage legislation, efforts to formalize labour, or policies relating to land distribution and natural resource management. For many countries in Africa and Latin America, two “lost” decades of increasing inequality and declining human development indicators from the 1980s are now showing signs of reversal. Inroads are being made into poverty and inequality at national levels, particularly in Latin America. These positive trends are often associated with new and more redistributive social policies, as well as with other elements of the economic environment, such as employment, and possibly with the pursuit of more heterodox economic policies.

A second phenomenon is the “social turn” that has occurred at the level of development ideas and discourse, beginning in the mid-1990s. There has been a marked shift in ideas away from the market fundamentalism of the height of the Washington Consensus version of neoliberalism, towards more serious recognition of the importance of institutions, politics and social equity. There has been a rediscovery of lessons from earlier development experiences: that shared development processes are crafted through deliberate policy processes, requiring capable states that can intervene to shape markets and society. The renewed priority given to poverty reduction and related social goals through the MDGs was one important illustration of this shifting consensus around the content of development. However, recent (and ongoing) crises have highlighted the urgency of identifying and testing alternative policies and approaches that simultaneously promote productivity and growth alongside greater equity, inclusiveness and sustainability. Central to such policies must be a focus on employment and on capability-enhancing social policies, which in turn requires a role for the state in using available resources for developmental purposes.

A third significant trend relates to the reshaping of the global development landscape – its actors, institutions and policies. Building on the lessons learned from the implementation of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), there has been a renewed call for the UN to play a stronger role in economic policy, a role that had largely been lost to the Bretton Woods institutions. IFIs and other groups such as the G20 also started paying more attention to social issues. Perhaps most significantly in this context, new actors have entered the development scene as donors including countries such as the Brazil, China, India and the Republic of Korea. These shifts have potentially profound implications for the ideas and relationships that have dominated the development project since the mid-20th century.

The contemporary challenge is to build on the expansion of social policies and programmes related to the MDGs and to generate a more transformative social policy approach that can address structural inequalities and their drivers, and respond to global challenges including, among others, demographic shifts, the rise of precarious employment and unemployment, particularly among youth;

gender division of labour and unequally shared burden of care; complex forms of displacement, social disintegration and conflict; increased migration flows; and unsustainable environmental practices.

Central values of social development are that every human being has an inherent right to a decent livelihood and that all people should be allowed to participate on equal terms in decisions that affect their lives. Social policy is a mechanism for promoting these fundamental values of social inclusion, solidarity, equity, respect for nature and human rights. Responding to the multifaceted risks and challenges of today requires expanding the conventional boundaries of thinking and practice. It also involves the reconceptualization of premises and assumptions upon which social policies are based, and calls for redesigning existing social policy instruments or developing new ones in order to adapt to the new conditions created by these changes. It also highlights the need for policy coherence and responsiveness, across the domains of economy, society and the environment, while recognizing that policy coherence is not simply about better coordination in the design and implementation of interventions across different fields. It means ensuring that progress in one domain is not undermined by consequences or reactions in another; that the sharing of costs and benefits is perceived as equitable – between groups, countries or regions; that pro-growth policies and technological or efficiency gains do not crowd out welfare and sustainability objectives; and that environmental protection goals are balanced with human welfare considerations.

New trends and challenges identified during the discussion are listed in the following section.

### Sustainable development

A global agenda for sustainable development brings to the fore the complex interactions of the various dimensions of the development process. It is difficult to pursue sustainable eradication of poverty without sustained and inclusive economic growth, or without strong communities that are resilient to economic shocks and environmental risks. Similarly, inclusive economic growth cannot be achieved, without well-functioning education and health systems for all or without well-functioning institutions. Above all, the achievement of sustainable progress in the economic, social and environmental fields also requires active participation of people in decision-making processes and strong institutions to guide transformative changes in the way economies and societies operate.

There was a wide recognition about the opportunity that the concept of sustainable development brings to tighten the policy inter-linkages among the various dimensions of development. In everyday life societies are not divided between economic, social and environment fields; they all interact simultaneously. When people go to work, they are contributing to economic growth, while bounded by a social contract that defines their pay, benefits and social interactions; and in the process of producing goods and services they use (or mal use) the natural environment. Thus, the only way public policy decisions contribute to keep a good balance among these different dimensions is to take explicit consideration of the multiple interactions that are taking place.

Policy choices will have to incorporate an explicit recognition of the impact of policy decisions on the economy, the society, and the environment. Leveraging synergies across policy areas and reducing negative impacts will be a must in the implementation of the post 2015 development agenda. Strengthening national policy dialogues through the use of tools that help assess the direct and indirect impact of policy decisions will be important to facilitate active participation of the multiple actors whose actions will determine the future of sustainable development in each country context. Governments, the private sector, social groups, communities, and individual citizens will all play a role in shaping the future their societies. Their individual actions will be consistent if there is a shared vision and clear recognition of the opportunities and costs of a country specific strategy for sustainable development.

The notion of inclusive and sustainable development is a powerful concept, and it is time to bring the concept to a reality, by transforming it into a new coherent, integrated universal policy framework that can be implemented at the international, regional, national and sub-national levels. This requires an approach going beyond “business as usual” and consolidates the efforts of multiple actors and all

forms of development cooperation (South-South, North-South, Triangular). Strengthened mechanisms for regional and global cooperation will be most critical to achieve sustainable development.

The challenge is that there are numerous interactions across economic, social and environmental fields. It is a complex web of interactions within the entire human and societal activities. Examination of each and every interaction to assess how certain policies will have positive or negative impact on all three dimensions is extremely challenging. Therefore, it is necessary to identify key social (economic or environmental) policies that would lead to positive social, economic and environmental outcomes, and how a more coherent social policy framework would create pathways towards socially, economically, and environmentally sustainable development.

In designing any policies, their potential short-, medium-, and long-term impacts in all three dimensions should be carefully analysed. Based on such analysis, policy options that would create positive synergies (win-win or triple-win situations) across the three dimensions of sustainable development should be identified to optimize overall outcomes. This will require a whole of government or rather whole of society approach, where all sectoral ministries and all societal actors (academia, the private sector, civil society organizations, social groups, and citizens) share common knowledge of potential consequences (positive or negative) of certain policy interventions and devise optimal policy mix to achieve sustainable development.

The policy analysis needs to be further extended to various inter-linkages such as: food security and agricultural development; the nexus across energy, land, water and sanitation; the links between social protection, health, education, and labour market insertion; or equitable economic growth, environment protection, and universal access to quality education and healthcare. The challenge is enormous: to re-examine all areas in the development process, all policies to be implemented in order to identify key inter-linkages, enhance positive synergies and reduce possible negative impacts.

For example, social protection policies contribute to achieving multiple objectives simultaneously. Conditional cash transfer programmes increase family income thus reducing poverty and economic vulnerability at the same time while helping to improve school attendance and health. Other programmes of social protection are linked to the creation of employment with multiple impacts on reducing poverty, improving the employability of workers, increasing food production and rural infrastructure. More recent programmes are linking poverty reduction with environmental sustainability, as in Bolsa Verde in Brazil. New concepts are emerging, such as “eco-social-policies” which according to one of the postings aims at providing incentives to make sustainable management of environmental resources at the same time as improving the resilience of individuals and communities.

Useful examples where positive synergies (win-win situations) have been/can be created are included in the annex of the report. In addition, there are existing tools to assess the policy options available to national government and their impact on the various dimensions of development. Building alternative policy scenarios, ex ante, and comparing them to analyse their impacts should be a new norm in policy-making. Building national capacity (government officials, members of parliaments, civil society, etc) in this area is critical, as we move toward a post-2015 development sustainable development framework.

#### Institutional mechanisms to enhance policy coherence

In order to achieve policy coherence among different sectors at the national level, governments could create a consultation process with different social actors, including those who are traditionally excluded, to comprehensively analyse issues affecting social development, so as to formulate strong and coherent policies that reflect the realities people face. Coherence could be created by focusing on people and politics that promote/support empowerment of local communities to lead a sustainable way of life. Effective approaches should involve broad cooperative stakeholder representation from all sectors. It is essential to have stakeholder groups which have holistic perspectives on social development that engages stakeholders together, not in their respective disciplines.



Another path to enhancing policy coherence among various policies would be to have a legal framework where the legislature itself is ethically bound to ensure coherence (among sectors such as economy, trade and investment, environment and the service sector). In addition, open access to public information and data could enhance transparency, strengthen accountability, and improve access to information, and build citizen's knowledge and capacity. Recent technological advance would enable E-governance, information sharing, comprehensive database in such areas as education, health, employment, and facilitating interaction between governments and citizens. Improved data, in turn, helps governments to more effectively target their interventions.

In addition, there is need to strengthen institutional coordination mechanisms. Setting up a body at the national level may assure better communication and coordination among various efforts within governments to create synergy and complement their work and avoid duplication. The vertical and horizontal coordination is required not only in one field, but also among various fields/sectors, for example, between education, health, water and sanitation, poverty reduction strategies, rural development, and social protection floors initiatives. This could be further linked to skills training, job creation, youth policy, cooperatives, etc.

### **New trends and challenges identified during the discussion**

#### **Systemic challenges:**

- **Income inequality:** unprecedented monetary enrichment and fast global control over natural resources, by a comparatively small number of people and their financial capacities. The **current metrics of world economy and human welfare are at odds** and can never be compatible with one another. The economic system currently employed uses a quantitative currency for trade and exchange and is zero-sum, whereas institutions of social justice and welfare are nonzero sum.
- **Climate change:** it is estimated that the world economy now needs to reduce its carbon intensity by 5.1% every year to 2050 in return for a fair chance of limiting warming to 2oC above pre-industrial levels.
- **Natural disasters.**
- **Water and food insecurity.**
- **Pollution,** including from technological waste
- Population growth and **demographic changes;** rapid urbanization; youth bulge; population ageing (implications for energy, food securities and subsidies, environmental degradation).
- New strains of deadly **diseases.**
- Fast pace of **technological change.** Digitalization has fundamentally changed society. Everything and everybody is to a certain degree connected. This has changed not only our behavior but also the fundamentals of virtually every organization from business, government, international organizations, products, services, NGO's and so forth.
- With **globalization** new trends are emerging where investments and employment is moving from developed to under developed countries and the trend is expected to actually increase exponentially causing social instability.
- Lack of **trust** in governments and investors.
- Ongoing **conflict.**

#### **Challenges and opportunities to social development:**

- **New actors** in the international system: non-state, transnational and multinational.
- **Migration;** changing patterns of migration: new opportunities (remittance); brain drain, **Bias and prejudice** towards migrants/refugees. Need for adequate policies to ensure their quality of life in host countries
- **Social movements** are becoming key players in the framing of issues and possible alternatives to solve them. The **high level of social networking in an interdependent world** presents challenges and opportunities to both governments and civil society. People are increasingly sharing their experiences and views on different matters, and together can create synergies and policy options.
- **Changing dynamics of jobs and education.** High incident of unemployment and underemployment, coupled with increasing debt burden on newly graduates.

- Inadequate attention to “social inclusion” in existing policies which primarily focus on providing short-term economic assistance and social services. Need for a long-term, multi-generational approach, including addressing biases and prejudices against minority groups, including refugees.
- The economization of all aspects and expressions of life, which undervalues anything that cannot be translated into immediate commercial gains.
- The trap of middle-income countries, which in good times invest heavily in social welfare policies which can hardly keep in times of crisis, is in creating a false middle class that comes and goes with poverty.

**Some examples of effective policy approaches provided through the discussion included the following:**

1. Uzbekistan has recently graduated the group of lower middle income countries and aims to enter the group of upper middle income economies by 2030. One option for an effective social contract in the future could be formulated as “loyalty in exchange for guaranteed opportunities”. Social policies within this model create opportunities: (i) broad opportunities to drive sharp growth of labour productivity and economic breakthrough essential for the middle income economies; and (ii) emergence of new opportunities expand social rights of people including the right for income, education, social security, pensions, etc. Within this model, inclusiveness is not a restriction on growth but rather a strategy that enhances growth and at the same time, ensures meeting people’s social rights. More information can be found in Policy Brief of the Center of Economic Research on “Social Policy for Economic Transformation and Social Sustainability: New Social Contract in the New Stage of Development” (<http://www.cer.uz/en/publications/2368>)
2. A comprehensive approach to social protection was developed in Uzbekistan, based on analysis of structural transformations of the economy, anticipated demographic patterns, social structure and transformation of life styles and values of people in the medium-and long-term. This includes providing social allowances coupled with re-training of individuals to alignment current skills to the labor market demand, which has multiple effects: ensuring guaranteed income in the short term, while developing skills necessary for gaining decent employment and sustainable source of income in the medium and long term. It creates broad opportunities for self-realization of individuals. It also contributes to economic growth and an increase in the government budget, thus expanding the fiscal space for effective social policies in the future as well. For further information, please see “Uzbekistan Towards 2030: A New Social Protection Model for a Changing Economy and Society” (<http://www.cer.uz/en/publications/2199>).
3. Engaging in multi-stakeholders platforms can further social development. Refer Dias, Sonia M. 2011. [The Municipal Waste and Citizenship Forum: A Platform for Social Inclusion and Participation](#). WIEGO Policy Brief (Urban Policies) No. 5. at [www.wiego.org](http://www.wiego.org)
4. Chile’s Transparency Law (20.285) promulgated in 2008 and enforced. This particular Law has led to a change in the way people can monitor the performance of the State in terms of expenditure and policies implementation, therefore censoring and limiting the possibility of corrupt activities in State divisions. Through this law people are able to access all information related to public expenditure and the affairs of the State, such as how the budget is distributed and spent in every institution of the State, how much is spent on salaries and on infrastructure of State offices. They can also inquire authorities about the results of social programs, how policies have been created, implemented and the overall effect in a community in particular, or society in general. Ministries now have to publish their expenses online and answer inquiries in a limited amount of time. If the information is not provided, bureaucrats could be held legally responsible. As a result, there has been considerable improvement in regulation of the state expenditures and performance. In addition, Chile has also passed a new law regulating lobbies that even goes beyond the transparency law. Authorities are required to publish meetings held, private gifts they receive, hearings granted, trips taken, everything in great detail etc.. And if they do not, they can be punished, or even imprisoned.
5. In South Korea, some of the wealthy chaebols have built education systems, such as schools, and transportation systems for students. Another example would be the Seoul Metropolitan government opening its first homeless café in 2013 to provide barista education program and jobs to the

homeless. Both of these examples allow social inclusion and access to the basic services that people need in order effectively develop the society.

6. Results-based financing (RBF) has shown promising results increasing healthcare coverage and quality for the poorest populations. Salud Mesoamerica 2015 (SM2015) is an example an encouraging new model to address inequalities in a more effective and efficient way. SM2015 aims to reduce maternal and child health inequalities through a result-based financing model. (SM2015) is a public-private partnership between the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, the Carlos Slim Foundation, the Government of Spain, the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) and the countries of Central American and the state of Chiapas in Mexico.

At the start of the program, the IDB and the country agree to set of process, coverage, quality and impact targets that are externally verified by a third partner. To design a program to meet the targets, each country receives a donation that is matched by country funds to implement evidence-based interventions in the poorest areas. If the country meets the previously agreed targets, it receives an incentive; half of the country funds initially invested for reimbursed for unrestricted use within the health sector. Even when donations are less than 1% of the health budget, systemic changes have already been achieved.

Unlike other RBF programs, results expected by SM2015 include changes to national policies, coverage of healthcare interventions and quality of care. With this purpose, independent household and health facility surveys are collected in every country. The IDB partnered with the Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME) at the University of Washington to conduct the surveys. In addition to assessing performance, surveys provide robust and comparable data about the maternal and child health of the poorest populations.

Baseline surveys revealed important health inequalities. Even when most countries have achieved high coverage at the national level of key interventions to reduce maternal and child mortality, important gaps remain for the poor. For instance, the contraceptive prevalence rate in the poorest areas in Mesoamerica is more than 20 percentage points under the national average. Institutional birth by qualified staff is particularly low in areas with high indigenous populations, such as the poorest areas of Chiapas and Guatemala, where around 1 in 4 women has access to institutional deliveries by qualified staff.

After 24 months of program implementation, all countries have achieved important results, increasing the availability of equipment and supplies in medical units and updating national norms. For instance, in Nicaragua, the percentage of Health Facilities with continuous availability of inputs for emergency obstetric and neonatal care increased from 60 to 90.9%. In El Salvador, the Community Health Teams with inputs and equipment for child care increased from 36.2 to 92.2%. In Chiapas, Mexico inputs and equipment for prenatal and postnatal care increased from 3.6 to 45.8%. Panama increased the number of basic attention units with availability of family planning methods from 7.1 to 78.9% and Belize from 73.7 to 89.5% El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Panama have updated national norms for micronutrient supplementation in children 6 to 23 months; an initial step towards decreasing anemia. In Panama and El Salvador zinc has been included in standards for management of diarrhea in children.

In Costa Rica, SM2015 has encouraged cross-sector collaboration addressing teenage pregnancy. The Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Education and the Department of Social Insurance are working together to develop integrated strategies to prevent teenage pregnancies and support young mothers.

SM2015 has helped Ministries of Health leverage funds for the poor and the health sector. In El Salvador, for example, a specific target was set to increase spending for the poor. In all countries, even when targets are in health, SM2015 given the argument for the Ministry of Finance to ensure the funds needed were available (including counterpart funding as well as resources to meet targets).

In the next two years, Ministries of Health throughout the region will have to achieve even more challenging and ambitious targets. Countries have committed to achieving healthcare coverage and quality targets.

The RBF model implemented by SM2015 could be expanded to a wider set of social development goals. Giving realistic, ambitious and measurable targets for outcome and impact level indicators to sectors that earlier worked independently could open paths for improved solutions. To learn more about SM2015, visit: [www.sm2015.com](http://www.sm2015.com)

7. In Latin America the nearest country to meet the MDGs is Cuba, which despite having a very underdeveloped market itself has made evident progress in literacy, health, universal education, combating HIV, etc. This shows that there are needs that the market cannot meet that must be guaranteed by the state: economic development, social and cultural rights as enforceable rights, including through international courts.
8. A notable expansion of social policies and programmes, often with significant innovations in terms of programme design, in so-called emerging and many developing economies. These include large-scale conditional cash transfer programmes (pioneered in Brazil and Mexico, but widely replicated); extensive employment or public works programmes (India, South Africa); the expansion of health insurance coverage (in parts of Latin America and East Asia, and increasingly in sub-Saharan Africa); large-scale social programmes associated with housing, literacy and food security in several countries within the Bolivarian Alliance for the Americas (ALBA), as well as the expansion or reform of pension schemes in all regions (including their re-nationalization, as in Argentina). Beyond such identifiable "social" policies, many other policies are being experimented with that, while not necessarily categorized as social policies, have important social functions. These include minimum wage legislation, efforts to formalize labour, or policies relating to land distribution and natural resource management.
9. In the case of Chile, a new immigration law that considers the new dynamics that involves the phenomenon of immigration. The landmark National Instructional Migration Policy sets a new legal body to serve as support for the implementation of migratory policies that ensures compliance with international conventions for the protection of the rights All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, adopted in 2005. The Chilean case serves to illustrate a historical element in many of our societies: social justice and inclusion should be central to the design of public policies.
10. Cases such as repeal of the so-called "Videla Act" of 1981 and the enactment of the Immigration Law No. 25871 of 2004 in Argentina show a dramatic change in the way that migration is addressed. This legislation has the merit of being the first legal body to recognize the human right to migrate, having as one of its key objectives migratory regularization, in order to move towards formal employment.
11. ASEAN Community 2015: Managing Integration for Better Jobs and Shared Prosperity  
<http://www.adb.org/publications/asean-community-2015-managing-integration-better-jobs-and-shared-prosperity>.

#### **Other useful resources mentioned by commenters:**

- 1) **UNRISD new research project:**  
 New Directions in Social Policy: Alternatives from and for the Global South  
<http://www.unrisd.org/80256B3C005BB128/%28httpProjects%29/2D903DC6376D3185C1257C16004B9CA8?OpenDocument>
- 2) **ECLAC/CEPAL, Ricardo Infante B. and Osvaldo Sunkel**  
 Chile: towards inclusive development  
<http://www.cepal.org/publicaciones/xml/0/36660/RVI97InfanteSunkel.pdf>  
<http://www.cepal.org/cgi-bin/getProd.asp?xml=/revista/noticias/articuloCEPAL/0/36660/P36660.xml&xsl=/revista/tpl-i/p39f.xsl&base=/revista/tpl-i/top-bottom.xsl>
- 3) **Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation:**  
<http://www.effectivecooperation.org/about.html>
- 4) **Busan Partnership** for effective development cooperation  
<http://www.oecd.org/development/effectiveness/49650173.pdf>
- 5) **Green Growth Knowledge Platform[GGKP]** <http://www.greengrowthknowledge.org/>

- 6) **UNRISD Policy Brief** on “Social Drivers of Sustainable Development “  
[http://www.unrisd.org/80256B42004CCC77/\(httpInfoFiles\)/8D3BD0D6511694EDC1257CD60035665E/\\$file/Social%20Drivers%20of%20Sustainable%20Development%20-%20Background%20Note.pdf](http://www.unrisd.org/80256B42004CCC77/(httpInfoFiles)/8D3BD0D6511694EDC1257CD60035665E/$file/Social%20Drivers%20of%20Sustainable%20Development%20-%20Background%20Note.pdf)
- 7) **The World Bank**, “Thinking Out Loud IV: Innovative case Studies on Participatory Instruments”
- 8) **Rio+20 global Synthesis Report prepared drawing on over 50 National Reports:**  
<http://www.uncsd2012.org/nationalpreparations.html>
- 9) **UNDP publication (2013)** “Social Protection, Growth and Employment: Evidence from India, Kenya, Malawi, Mexico, Peru and Tajikistan”, which aims to explore how social and economic policies can be better integrated to simultaneously advance social welfare, employment outcomes and inclusive growth.  
[http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/Poverty%20Reduction/Inclusive%20development/Social%20protection,%20growth%20and%20employment/Draft8\\_SPG&E\\_web.pdf](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/Poverty%20Reduction/Inclusive%20development/Social%20protection,%20growth%20and%20employment/Draft8_SPG&E_web.pdf)
- 10) **International Labour Organization (2012)**, “Working towards sustainable development: Opportunities for decent work and social inclusion in a green economy”
- 11) **UNDP (2013)**, “Green jobs for women and youth: What can local governments do?”
- 12) **UNDP (2009)**, “Green jobs for the poor: A public employment approach”  
<http://www.undp.ro/download/green%20jobs%20for%20the%20poor%202009.pdf>
- 13) Documents (not yet in English) on water and financing agent's responsibility focused on sustainability, with some proposals for Brazil <http://www.prr3.mpf.mp.br/meio-ambiente/1505-2015-04-24-16-55-32>

#### **Additional global reports of relevance:**

- 1) **UNDP–UNEP Poverty-Environmental Initiative (2012)**, “What drives institutions to adopt integrated development approaches? The poverty-environment nexus and analysis of country evidence from the Poverty-Environment Initiative  
<http://www.unpei.org/knowledge-resources/publications/what-drives-institutions-to-adopt-integrated-development-approaches-the-poverty-environment-nexus-and-analysis-of-country-evidence-from-the-poverty-environment-initiative>
- 2) **UNECA**, Measuring Human Exclusion for Structural Transformation: The African Social Development Index (ASDI): [http://www.uneca.org/sites/default/files/uploaded-documents/COM/com2015/se\\_asdi\\_com2015\\_1\\_pager\\_sdpg\\_en.pdf](http://www.uneca.org/sites/default/files/uploaded-documents/COM/com2015/se_asdi_com2015_1_pager_sdpg_en.pdf)
- 3) **Social Progress Index data for 2015**  
<http://www.socialprogressimperative.org/data/spi>



## Annex I

1. United States	343	(12.21%)
2. Brazil	187	(6.66%)
3. India	134	(4.77%)
4. Canada	83	(2.95%)
5. United Kingdom	72	(2.56%)
6. Kenya	71	(2.53%)
7. Nigeria	71	(2.53%)
8. Egypt	60	(2.14%)
9. Italy	52	(1.85%)
10. Pakistan	51	(1.82%)
11. France	49	(1.74%)
12. Philippines	47	(1.67%)
13. Chile	44	(1.57%)
14. Indonesia	44	(1.57%)
15. Switzerland	39	(1.39%)
16. Colombia	39	(1.39%)
17. Spain	38	(1.35%)
18. Cameroon	35	(1.25%)
19. Mexico	34	(1.21%)
20. South Africa	34	(1.21%)
21. Bangladesh	33	(1.17%)
22. Peru	33	(1.17%)
23. Turkey	33	(1.17%)
24. South Korea	32	(1.14%)
25. Nepal	31	(1.10%)
26. Senegal	31	(1.10%)
27. Argentina	30	(1.07%)
28. Australia	30	(1.07%)
29. Ethiopia	28	(1.00%)
30. Côte d'Ivoire	25	(0.89%)
31. Congo (DRC)	24	(0.85%)
32. Germany	24	(0.85%)
33. Netherlands	24	(0.85%)
34. Tunisia	23	(0.82%)
35. Thailand	22	(0.78%)
36. Sri Lanka	20	(0.71%)
37. Belgium	19	(0.68%)
38. Ecuador	19	(0.68%)
39. Ghana	19	(0.68%)
40. Jordan	18	(0.64%)
41. Japan	18	(0.64%)
42. Sudan	18	(0.64%)
43. Morocco	17	(0.61%)
44. Zambia	17	(0.61%)
45. Lebanon	16	(0.57%)
46. Uganda	16	(0.57%)
47. Bolivia	15	(0.53%)
48. Burkina Faso	14	(0.50%)
49. Iran	14	(0.50%)
50. Togo	14	(0.50%)
51. Zimbabwe	13	(0.46%)
52. Madagascar	12	(0.43%)
53. Malaysia	12	(0.43%)
54. Panama	12	(0.43%)
55. Russia	12	(0.43%)
56. Rwanda	12	(0.43%)
57. Sweden	12	(0.43%)
58. El Salvador	12	(0.43%)
58. El Salvador	12	(0.43%)
59. Austria	11	(0.39%)
60. Benin	11	(0.39%)
61. Costa Rica	11	(0.39%)
62. Norway	11	(0.39%)
63. Tanzania	11	(0.39%)
64. Guinea	10	(0.36%)
65. Singapore	10	(0.36%)
66. Bhutan	9	(0.32%)
67. China	9	(0.32%)
68. Guatemala	9	(0.32%)
69. Hong Kong	9	(0.32%)
70. Cambodia	9	(0.32%)
71. Niger	9	(0.32%)
72. New Zealand	9	(0.32%)
73. Portugal	9	(0.32%)
74. Bosnia & Herzegovina	8	(0.28%)
75. Jamaica	8	(0.28%)
76. Mauritania	8	(0.28%)
77. Trinidad & Tobago	8	(0.28%)
78. Ukraine	8	(0.28%)
79. Uzbekistan	8	(0.28%)
80. Vietnam	8	(0.28%)
81. Angola	7	(0.25%)
82. Fiji	7	(0.25%)
83. Iraq	7	(0.25%)
84. Kyrgyzstan	7	(0.25%)
85. Kazakhstan	7	(0.25%)
86. Mali	7	(0.25%)
87. Mozambique	7	(0.25%)
88. Romania	7	(0.25%)
89. Somalia	7	(0.25%)
90. Venezuela	7	(0.25%)
91. United Arab Emirates	6	(0.21%)
92. Albania	6	(0.21%)
93. Armenia	6	(0.21%)
94. Greece	6	(0.21%)
95. Chad	6	(0.21%)
96. Uruguay	6	(0.21%)
97. Afghanistan	5	(0.18%)
98. Burundi	5	(0.18%)
98. Burundi	5	(0.18%)
99. Denmark	5	(0.18%)
100. Algeria	5	(0.18%)
101. Liberia	5	(0.18%)
102. Myanmar (Burma)	5	(0.18%)
103. Malawi	5	(0.18%)
104. Namibia	5	(0.18%)
105. Nicaragua	5	(0.18%)
106. Poland	5	(0.18%)
107. Saudi Arabia	5	(0.18%)
108. Yemen	5	(0.18%)
109. Barbados	4	(0.14%)
110. Dominican Republic	4	(0.14%)
111. Gambia	4	(0.14%)
112. Haiti	4	(0.14%)
113. Hungary	4	(0.14%)
114. Ireland	4	(0.14%)
115. Kuwait	4	(0.14%)
116. Lesotho	4	(0.14%)
117. Mongolia	4	(0.14%)
118. Mauritius	4	(0.14%)
119. Papua New Guinea	4	(0.14%)
120. Palestine	4	(0.14%)
121. Paraguay	4	(0.14%)
122. Taiwan	4	(0.14%)
123. Belarus	3	(0.11%)
124. Congo (Republic)	3	(0.11%)
125. Finland	3	(0.11%)
126. Honduras	3	(0.11%)
127. Comoros	3	(0.11%)
128. Laos	3	(0.11%)
129. Latvia	3	(0.11%)
130. Moldova	3	(0.11%)
131. Puerto Rico	3	(0.11%)
132. Sierra Leone	3	(0.11%)
133. Swaziland	3	(0.11%)
134. Tajikistan	3	(0.11%)
135. (not set)	3	(0.11%)
136. Botswana	2	(0.07%)
137. Belize	2	(0.07%)
138. Georgia	2	
139. Israel	2	(0.07%)
140. Libya	2	(0.07%)
141. Malta	2	(0.07%)
142. Maldives	2	(0.07%)
143. Suriname	2	(0.07%)
144. São Tomé & Príncipe	2	(0.07%)
145. TimorLeste	2	(0.07%)
146. Antigua & Barbuda	1	(0.04%)
147. Bulgaria	1	(0.04%)
148. Bahrain	1	(0.04%)
149. Brunei	1	(0.04%)
150. Bahamas	1	(0.04%)
151. Cape Verde	1	(0.04%)
152. Cyprus	1	(0.04%)
153. Djibouti	1	(0.04%)
154. Estonia	1	(0.04%)
155. Gabon	1	(0.04%)
156. Grenada	1	(0.04%)
157. GuineaBissau	1	(0.04%)
158. Guyana	1	(0.04%)
159. St. Kitts & Nevis	1	(0.04%)
160. St. Lucia	1	(0.04%)
161. Lithuania	1	(0.04%)
162. Luxembourg	1	(0.04%)
163. Macedonia (FYROM)	1	(0.04%)
164. Martinique	1	(0.04%)
165. Qatar	1	(0.04%)
166. Serbia	1	(0.04%)
167. Slovenia	1	(0.04%)
168. South Sudan	1	(0.04%)
169. Sint Maarten	1	(0.04%)

© 2015 Google