

**Report of the Expert Group Meeting
Globalization and Poverty Reduction: Can the
Rural Poor Benefit from Globalization?
New York, 8-9 November 2001**

I. Introduction

The Expert Group Meeting was organized by the Division for Social Policy and Development, Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA), and held in New York from 8-9 November 2001. The purpose of the meeting was to bring together experts from different countries and the relevant United Nations agencies to discuss the impact of globalization on the rural poor. Issues and concerns examined included challenges and opportunities of globalization for rural areas; poverty reduction strategies and national and regional experiences; the policy framework and policy agenda for rural poverty reduction; the role of the United Nations and policy recommendations. The meeting was attended by ten experts representing universities, academic institutions and the United Nations agencies such as the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the World Bank, as well as staff from DESA.

The impact of globalization on poverty eradication has increasingly become the focus of attention of governments and international organizations. The economic arguments in favour of globalization stress the positive relationships between increasing international trade and investment flows and faster economic growth, higher living standards, accelerated innovation, diffusion of technological and management skills, and new economic opportunities.

Reality has proven not to be so rosy. First, the benefits of globalization are not equally distributed and tend to be concentrated among a relatively small number of countries, particularly the more advanced ones. The poorest countries such as the least developed countries in Africa have not been able to sufficiently harvest the benefits of globalization. Second, most efforts have been placed in facilitating free trade flows, particularly in products which are of importance to the developed countries, as part of the globalization process. Other dimensions of globalization like labour market standards, the environment, sustainable development and poverty alleviation has received much less attention. Third, globalization has also led to an

increased vulnerability among many countries to international economic conditions, as clearly demonstrated by the Asian financial crisis.

The ongoing focus of countries and international organizations on poverty alleviation has created a much clearer picture of the magnitude, nature, determinants and possible routes out of poverty. Recent estimates by the IFAD indicate that 75 percent of the poor work and live in rural areas. Rural poor have restricted access to and control over assets - land, water, credit, information, technology, health, education and skills - and to markets. As such their lives have limited links to the macro-economic environment in which globalization takes place.

Developing countries have been given the main responsibility to harness the potential benefits of globalization for the rural poor and to counter possible negative effects. They are urged to adopt appropriate structural and social measures that promote macro-economic stability essential for economic growth and poverty alleviation. High-income countries are urged to support these initiatives through increased aid, debt relief, experience exchanges e.g. on policy making and good governance, liberalized market access for products of importance to low-income countries, and increased resources for the fight against communicable diseases. However, many low-income countries already face tremendous and often contradicting challenges in achieving poverty alleviation goals; for example, implementing "Education for All" programmes with reduced government expenditure, or ensuring sufficient income-generating and employment prospects for the rural poor without intervention in agricultural output prices or in investment allocation policies.

Developing countries are in need of concrete guidelines on the appropriate social, market and political instruments and delivery mechanisms (macroeconomic measures) that can bridge the micro world of the poor and the macro world of national economies as well as guidance on the appropriate sequencing of instruments and mechanisms to ensure fast and optimal benefits for the rural poor.

Globalization and poverty alleviation are important themes in many recent resolutions and declarations adopted by the General Assembly including: section III of the United Nations Millennium Declaration adopted by the General Assembly under Resolution 55/2, and resolution S-24/2 on "Further initiatives for social development" adopted by the General Assembly at its twenty-fourth special session in July 2000.

II. Overview of poverty reduction strategies

Paul Shaffer, University of Toronto, Canada presented a paper on New thinking on poverty and implications for poverty reduction strategies. He proposed that there have been at least three major changes in thinking about poverty, which have been increasingly recognized over the past decade and have entailed policy implications. First, the concept of poverty has been broadened. This is reflected in the move from a physiological model of deprivation, focused on the non-fulfillment of basic material or biological needs to a social model of deprivation, focused on such elements as lack of autonomy, powerlessness, lack of self-respect/dignity. Subsequently, there has been renewed emphasis on the concept of vulnerability and its relationship to poverty. The concept of inequality and its link to poverty has re-emerged as a central concern. Also, the idea that poverty should be conceptualized as the violation of human rights has been powerfully argued within the UN system.

The second major change has been the broadening of the causal structure to include a range of causal variables, which previously received little attention. This change may be conceptualized in terms of broadening the “forms of capital” which have figured in poverty analysis and include political, social, cultural, coercive and environmental capital. Increasing importance is being afforded now to these changes. The operational consequence is to shift attention from interventions in human and economic capital to empowerment, social organization, legal reform, human rights, etc. Three dimensions of globalization serve to accentuate the importance of the expanded causal framework of poverty reduction: spread of democracy and human rights; the spread of “western” culture and the resultant “cultural” critique; globalization of conflict and implications for poverty. First, one aspect of globalization is the spread of democratic structures and the increasing attention given to political and civil rights. In this case, forces of globalization accentuate the importance of political and social capital to poverty eradication. They also bring out the intrinsic importance of certain aspects of social deprivation, such as disempowerment, lack of agency, etc. Second, the cultural critique of globalization rests on the view that it is being leading to global dominance of “western”, mainly American consumption patterns, tastes and culture. There is a fear that this process is coming at the expense of the global diversity of cultural norms and practice. In this case, cultural capital is being degraded with negative consequences for certain dimensions of social deprivation. Third,

renewed attention has been placed on the relationship between globalization, conflict and poverty. There are powerful forces of globalization which have served to fuel or aggravate conflicts including the global arms trade, trade in precious metals which finance conflict, etc. In this case, issues of globalization focus on the centrality of coercive and political capital to poverty as well as absence of peace and security as constituents of social deprivation.

The third major change in thinking about poverty has been deepening of the causal structure. This represents a shift in analytical focus from stocks of poverty to flows of individuals or households into and out of poverty. It has led to a focus on transitory rather than chronic poverty and on shocks, stresses and individual/community response. The operational consequence is to shift attention from long-term strategies to reduce chronic poverty to strategies of risk reduction/mitigation, which “smooth” income or consumption. Examples include insurance schemes, credit, seasonal public works, etc. There are at least four ways in which forces of globalization relate closely to the deepened causal framework of poverty. First, increasing flows of financial capital, and in particular portfolio investment increases the risk of financial instability occasioned by massive capital flight and currency crisis. At least part of the reason for the severity of the Asian financial crisis was the rapid flight of portfolio flows from this region. Second, the growing mobility of people in general and labour specifically, increases the risk of spread of infectious diseases such as HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis. Third, the increasing reliance on trade increases the vulnerability to terms of trade shocks. Rising global production and reduced consumption may severely squeeze world prices to the detriment of local producers. Fourth, transfers of technology increase risk both downside and upside if long-term effects technological are unknown.

Discussant Peter Townsend, London School of Economics, University of London, noted that anti-poverty strategies and policies have existed at different levels and to what extent Governments can make a difference needs to be sorted out. What need to be looked at are different poverty reduction strategies that are being implemented today in various countries and how to classify them. At what levels (international, national and local) are they influential or significant. He also noted that the United Nations is taking a lead in identifying strategies in terms of approaches. There are different strategies being adopted by international agencies. Strategies take institutional form and analysis and scientific form. Two ways can be used in looking at the strategies. First, historical analysis and approach. In this respect, treatment of the

welfare state can be a good example. There is a vast knowledge about the models of welfare state, which have been successful and unsuccessful. A recent well-known analysis identified three welfare state strategies and anti-poverty strategies. It is called social democratic model, cooperative model and residualist model. The Netherlands was chosen as representing the social democratic model. Germany was selected as the cooperatives model and US as the residual model. In terms of record in successfully coping with poverty and other social issues, these countries are in the order that have been mentioned. The social democratic example was better than the cooperative model and the cooperative was better than the residual in achieving low rates of poverty. This empirical evidence suggests that there is cross-national dimension for analysis.

III. Experience with rural poverty alleviation

Atiqur Rahman, Lead Strategist and Policy Coordinator, IFAD, spoke on the Experience with rural poverty alleviation: What has worked, what has not? He noted that growth is important for poverty reduction, but growth should be broad based and accommodate non-farm production and market based exchange. Efforts to reach the United Nations commitment to reduce the proportion of poor by half by 2015 must focus on agricultural and rural development. Achieving the poverty target requires empowerment of the poor through access and control of appropriate assets, technologies, markets and institutions. Allocation of resources, including ODA targeted to the poor is needed. Better partnership involving all stakeholders so that the poor are empowered is essential in poverty reduction. What has worked and what has not worked can be addressed by looking at these four aspects: access to assets, technology, markets and institutions.

For the majority of the world's poor, particularly women, access to land and water assets are of critical importance for rural poverty reduction. Without secure property rights, poor farmers lack the incentive to invest in land and water management. What has not worked in many developing countries in access to land are top-down, confiscatory land reforms; land reform without appropriate infrastructure and services; and gender mainstreaming. Top-down land reforms have often created social conflicts in societies. Without providing farmers who benefited from the land reforms with appropriate infrastructure and services has led to often losing their land. Beneficiaries and other partners, like NGOs, are often not part of the decision-making process. To escape poverty, post-reform farmers need appropriate infrastructure and

services for farm products requiring coordinated collection and processing, or connected to global market systems. Neither traditional nor reformed landholding systems have increased much women's share of farmland. What has worked in some developing countries with regard to access to land include support of post-reform farmers and decentralized or citizen-driven reform processes. Participation of all stakeholders in the reform process promises the best results. However, large resources are needed to have a major impact and to provide landless with access to their own farmland.

The rural poor have less access to water-yielding assets and water control. What has not worked in this area is that major dams increasingly face management problems and present environmental threat. Second, water subsidies encourage waste and are steered to the rich, who control water assets. Third, there are pressures to divert commercial water off take away from agriculture towards urban people who are willing to pay for the water. What has worked in access to water is farmer-controlled or improved traditional small-scale irrigation; training of women's groups to control water assets; formation of water user associations; user financing of costs; and hygiene education. The formation of associations, for example, has helped to keep water-yielding assets well-managed, responsive to users and sustainable. As for human assets (nutrition, health, education, skills), provision and quality continue to be urban-biased. The effects of user fees on basic services for the rural poor have been damaging. They have discouraged the poor to use the services. What has worked in these areas is the improvement of human asset outlays to the rural poor, especially women, which have raised cost-effectiveness. Also improvement of nutrition raises learning, productivity and wage rates and cult the risk of income loss due to illness. Pro-poor assets policy should include legal rights to own a land, control over water assets, and improvement of human assets.

Technology is central in reducing rural poverty. But technological progress has been directed towards large farms and high potential areas, bypassing the poor. Research has neglected the priorities of the poor. What has worked in this field is public sector research into food staples selected by labour-intensive smallholders; improved pest management; and land management technology. Pro-poor, sustainable technical progress should seek to enhance output and yield potential, labour-intensity, as well as collaboration between farmers and researcher groups. In this regard, new resources for the public sector and institutions, and priority setting by the rural poor are crucial.

Markets for the rural poor are being restructured by trade liberalization and globalization. Equal access to markets and asset control, as well as improved skills, generally help the poor to gain from liberalization. Liberalization without preparing the rural people for the economic and social consequences of open markets has not benefited the poor.

Typically, the rural poor face high physical and transactions costs in accessing markets. They are also constrained by lack of information about markets, lack of business skills and collective organization that can interact with large market intermediaries. The poor are more exposed to price fluctuations. Moreover, liberalization increases income fluctuations, through changes in export crop prices. What has worked include farmer groups or associations; provision of market information and rural roads.

The distribution of benefits between rich and poor, urban and rural depends on institutions. Decentralized institutions for natural resources management and financial services seldom outreach the poorest directly but often help the moderately poor through efficiency and sustainability because the local rich groups recognize their shared interests with the poor. Different forms of decentralized control has been tried with NGO and government support. Participatory decentralization has now become a growing approach. Local institutions tend to be more accountable to local people.

Financial services such as credit, insurance and savings benefit the rural poor to smooth consumption and acquire assets. But new ways to spread risks should be devised for the poor. Coherent anti-poverty strategies require stable partnerships involving donors, governments and NGOs. Putting the poor at the center of the process through empowerment and strengthening the coalitions of the poor will benefit them. Globalization and liberalization will work out for the rural poor only if partnerships are built to develop equitable market-mediated relations and accountable institutions.

IV. The links between globalization and rural poverty alleviation

Selim Jahan, Bureau for Development Policy, UNDP, stressed that globalization is not a new phenomenon, but it has new features. It is more about new markets, new actors and new rules as well as about the growing interdependence among people. Globalization presents opportunities but also introduces new vulnerabilities for people. Increased trade, new technologies and information are speeding up economic growth and human advances, offering

great potential to eradicate poverty in the next century. However to date, globalization bypassed poor countries and poor people. Rural poverty continues to persist partly because macroeconomic policy is biased towards certain groups in the economy. To make globalization work for people it is important to capture global opportunities in trade and capital flows, while protecting people from vulnerabilities and overcome the shrinking resource squeeze. Countries should invest in human development so that people are ready to face the challenge of globalization.

Pro-poor growth that reduces inequality and enhances human capabilities lead to poverty reduction if certain conditions, such as sound macroeconomic policies, partnership with all relevant actors and good governance, are met. National action should focus on expanding full employment, reducing inequality, removing anti-poor biases in the macroeconomic framework, ensuring access to productive resources, raising agricultural productivity and incomes, promoting microenterprises and the informal sector, and providing social services to poor people.

Migration is also marked by uneven opportunities and uneven impacts. While, high-skilled labour is more integrated, with high mobility and wages, market for unskilled labour is often restricted by national barriers. Although technological connectedness has affected the poor, they are increasingly marginalized in access to information and communication technology. Policies are needed to make technology accessible to poor countries and poor people. Resource squeezes on the state are constraining the provision of public services. In care economy the shrinkage has affected the most the rural poor. Globalization increases pressure on people's ability, especially women to provide care to their families and communities. Care services no longer come from families, instead they are provided by the market. New arrangements for care in a globalized economy should be designed.

Vigdis Broch-Due, Senior Researcher, Department of Social Anthropology, Cambridge University, spoke about the linkages between globalization, poverty and conflict. She stressed that conflict causes poverty through the destruction of natural and human resources, threatens the livelihood of communities and undermines strategies to alleviate poverty. These processes have been poorly understood and, therefore, the nature of these linkages should be addressed. International aid institutions and NGOs are currently experiencing serious difficulties, both in assisting communities in their attempts to manage conflict and rebuild their social institutions in post-conflict situations, and in designing strategies for poverty alleviation. It is therefore

important to examine the poverty-conflict nexus more closely. Inter-communal conflict is often exacerbated by competition over resources and resource allocation. Inequalities in the distribution of these resources have frequently been amplified by inequalities in the State's management of social and political benefits. This threatens the participation of communities in the life of society. The role of resource competition in exacerbating conflict, as well as the mechanisms local communities might have at their disposal to manage conflict in situations of marked inequality in the distribution of resources should be examined.

In times of conflict, vulnerable groups tend to suffer most. Conflict frequently threatens intra-household resource allocation as much as inter-communal allocations, and inequalities in nutrition, education and health care provision within the family-household group become evident.

Identifying the nature of poverty-producing processes and conditions when particular forms of inequality merge also need to be examined. It also will be useful to look at women's specific coping strategies and to examine the ways in which they seek to maintain the well being of their children.

Poverty in many African communities is not just a matter the scarcity of material resources, but is also the result of "poverty of choice", because of the lack of participation in the political decision-making and democratic processes. The strengthening of civil society and social institutions is impossible when communities are unable to generate sufficient economic productivity and growth to sustain themselves. Investing in women and children as an integral part of developing human capital endowments is an essential part of a poverty alleviation strategy. Identifying specific mechanisms to strengthen civil society would contribute to poverty alleviation at the local level.

V. Reaching the rural poor

Malcolm Bale, Sector Manager, Rural Development in East Asia Region, World Bank, presented a paper on Reaching the rural poor in a globalizing world. He emphasized that what is needed is a comprehensive and holistic view of rural development which takes into account interactive variables that can be marshalled to reduce poverty. A cooperative and coordinated approach driven by willing developing countries in partnership with the development community supported by wealthy countries, is an approach that will significantly reduce rural poverty. There

are three broad priority areas where governments and donor agencies can take action to assist the rural poor: policies and actions to foster broad-based rural growth; policies to improve the social well-being and reduce vulnerability of the rural poor; and policies and actions to enhance sustainable resource use.

Policies and activities that contribute to a vibrant rural economy are important levers in reducing rural poverty and in reducing income inequalities that may be exacerbated by globalization. Developing countries need to make sure that their policies work toward the improvement of agricultural productivity and competitiveness by investing in science and technology; promoting agricultural education/extension; assisting in crop and livestock diversification; improving markets and access to markets; providing rural infrastructure; providing an enabling environment for non-farm enterprise so that private business in rural areas is encouraged; providing a policy environment and institutional structures that place agriculture and rural activities on an equal footing with other industries; increasing the productivity of water use; and wisely meeting the challenge of biotechnology.

In order to improve the social well-being of the rural poor, Governments need to allocate a larger share of public expenditure to rural areas to: improve access to nutrition and health; increase access to, and quality of, rural education; and implement food security schemes that lower the risk and vulnerability of the rural poor. Social safety net schemes developed for urban areas should be extended to rural space. With regard to policies and actions that governments need to undertake to enhance sustainable resource use as first order priorities include: policies, regulations and oversight to limit land degradation; vigorous reforms leading to improved water utilization and management; sound policies and actions to ensure sustainable production of forest products; and policies that consider global warming as part of development planning.

Industrialized countries and the development community can support and encourage rural development, and can assist in cushioning the negative effects of globalization, in a number of ways. The size, composition and efficacy of foreign aid is important. Aid is often allocated to achieve political objectives or tied up in its use to the donor's nationals or producer's. The macro-economic policies of industrial countries can provide market and economic stability and enhance a more inclusive integration of developing countries into the global economy. Good macroeconomic policies in industrial countries are part of a complementary package of actions that can be undertaken by industrial countries. Market access, trade policy and domestic

subsidies are important issues for poverty reduction. Currently, the governments of industrial countries provide \$1 billion per day on support to their farmers. This is six times the amount they spend on development assistance. It has negative effects on farmers and rural people in poor countries. The subsidized food from industrial countries pushes down world prices and deprives poor farmers of markets in third countries. Trade policies and intellectual property protection are also seen as being biased against poor countries.

David Reed, Macroeconomics for Sustainable Development Officer, WWF, argued that efforts to reach the rural poor do not and cannot take place in an institutional void but are circumscribed by economic policies, institutional arrangements and relations of political power. These arrangements exist because they (regardless of how we view them) are working for specific groups and not others, and usually work against the rural poor. These interests will try to defend themselves and to reproduce or perpetuate relationships of power and privilege through government and/or through economic interaction. Many countries around the world are undergoing a process of reform which is driven either internally or externally; this structural change is not only necessary but urgent.

Most countries of the developing world have very significant natural resource sectors such as mineral wealth, timber and energy supplies, for e.g. or commodity production, agriculture. Historically, power and privilege in many developing countries are tied to the capture of these resources, and the organizing of the production of small rural producer to reproduce privilege and support for industrialization. The reform process is explicitly designed to change economic relations and redistribute political power; end monopolies and oligopolies; reduce public rent-seeking; shift/reduce pro-urban/anti-rural bias.

Selim Jahan, Bureau for Development Policy, UNDP, emphasized that the rural poor need access to productive and natural resources, which are unevenly distributed. Poor people have lost the ownership to these resources because of legal complexities and this had adverse effects on their capacity to overcome poverty. Markets are also not accessible to the rural poor. Policy reforms are needed to ensure access and secure rights of the poor to assets as a protection against vulnerability. The rural poor are especially vulnerable when crisis occurs. Distributive policies aimed at restructuring public expenditure and building social safety nets also should be in place. Focus should be given to providing the rural poor access to education, health and other social services.

There is also a need for different actors to fight rural poverty. Mobilization of broad participation and partnerships with NGOs, voluntary organizations, the private sector, and other stakeholders, strong role for community groups and NGOs in policy and decision-making is required. It is essential to mainstream poverty reduction within national economic policy.

The reasons behind globalization not reaching the rural poor are urban bias in macroeconomic and social policies, non-alignment between macroeconomic policies and national anti-poverty strategy, and non-participation of the poor people in decision-making and implementation processes.

VI. National/regional experiences

Makha Sarr, Consultant, Senegal, presented a paper on Globalization and rural poverty: Constraints and opportunities for Africa. He stressed that the income inequality between sub-Saharan Africa and the rest of the world has widened in the last decade, in spite of the benefits expected from globalization. The gap is even wider with respect to the external sector with exports of goods and services of sub-Saharan Africa growing slowly compared with the world as a whole. With respect to foreign investment, many developing countries exports, including several in Africa have put in place the required regulatory framework. However, only a small group of countries has attracted foreign investment. While rapid economic growth in recent years was accompanied by the reduction in income inequality in other regions of the world, the income gap between rich and poor widened in most African countries.

Trade liberalization is most relevant to the African context given the present structure of its economy, which is largely dependant on the export of primary commodities. It is even more relevant in rural areas of the majority of African countries, which are agricultural-based. Increased financial flows among countries and regions, particularly the growing importance of private capital and less emphasis given to development aid, is also another characteristic of globalization that has an impact on Africa, in view of the great reliance of the region on external financing. Trade liberalization has led to increasing competition for both Africa's traditional exports of primary commodities and its nascent manufacturing industries, mostly from Asia and Latin America where labor productivity was higher. At the same time, there were relatively more imports by African countries. Both trends have obviously negative impacts on rural income. Africa registered market losses for agriculture commodities as cocoa, coffee, cotton and oilseeds,

as well as food crops. The region has gained little in terms of market access while facing heavy multilateral obligations. The decline in agricultural commodity prices has resulted in the reduction of income and purchasing power in rural areas, a major determinant of rural poverty.

As to financial flows, the most noticeable efforts were made in the East and Southern parts of the continent in the framework of the Common Market of East and Southern Africa (COMESA) and the Southern Africa Development Community (SADC). Two other sub-regions are in the process of building economic groupings, namely the West African Economic and Monetary Union (UEMOA) and the Central Africa Economic and Monetary Community (CEMAC). These two communities have the specificity of being bound together by the CFA Franc, which is tied to the French Franc. The CFA zone countries receive only a negligible share of the already small amount of FDI in sub-Saharan Africa. In order to successfully meet the challenge of globalization, the CFA zone countries need to evolve domestic saving and investment policies, primarily for the benefit of the agriculture sector and the rural poor. Such policies would, in turn, make the economies concerned more attractive to foreign direct investment.

Foreign aid has been declining in recent years, but it is increasingly focused on social and administrative infrastructures. This trend together with the decline in official aid clearly shows a relative neglect of agriculture and rural development. Thus, unless there is a deliberate emphasis on the rural sector by the governments concerned, it would result in a continuous decline in agriculture and food production, decreasing rural income and increasing poverty. Aid should be increased and its present orientation needs to be reviewed so as to focus on the rural areas, and especially the agriculture sector.

Since poverty in Africa is mostly in rural areas, its reduction would depend, to a certain extent, on the full implementation of the Uruguay round Agreements. It is important that developed countries refrain from such practices as non-tariff barriers (trade-related intellectual property rights- TRIPS, trade-related investment measures-TRIMS, subsidies, etc.). It is also vital for developing countries in general, and African countries in particular to obtain from developed countries a significant improvement in market access. These efforts would contribute to promoting exports from agricultural-based African economies, and make their products more competitive in domestic markets, and reduce rural poverty. In this regard, the speedy implementation of Integrated Framework for LDCs and the initiative by the United States - the African growth and opportunity Act (AGOA) would contribute to these efforts.

Combating rural poverty requires encouraging capital formation in rural areas, ensuring the profitability of investment and providing a stable environment. In this regard, and particularly for African countries, public investment, adequate pricing policies and provision of essential services are of vital importance. These are necessary complements to the benefits that could be drawn from globalization. The ongoing exercise on formulating Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) in several African countries could offer such opportunity.

Linda Low, University of Singapore, presented a paper on Globalization and poverty reduction: An Asian perspective. She noted that the impact of globalization, information and communication technology (ICT) and the knowledge-based economy (KBE) on the economies of countries in Asia has been generally favourable, although there has been a tendency to over-concentrate on industrial policy with a corresponding neglect of agriculture. The economics of a dualistic balanced growth model are being revisited as fiscal expenditure focuses on the rural sector infrastructure and employment creation. Although remain as important targets human resources development (HRD), technology especially to reduce the digital divide, the Asian crisis showed the weaknesses in the provision of social security and social safety nets. Thus, beside the specific HRD and ICT emphasis, all fiscal stimuli can also be directed to social and rural sectors, which would benefit as well from an upgrading of skills to become globalization ready.

Although science and technology applied to raise agricultural productivity is longstanding and perversely, the Asian crisis may redirect some focus and incentives back to agriculture. The rural sector needs as much ICT and KBE for better production, marketing, distribution and research and development. Market incentives are, however, needed to reorient investment, human resources and interest to fuel these industries and feed the people. The same incentives employed in promoting industrialization can be used in agriculture and rural development, starting with the right infrastructure, human capital and training; the process can even be export-led and based on the promotion of FDI.

In view of a China-ASEAN free trade area proposal or even ASEAN-plus-three (APT) is moving toward more trade liberalization and free trade arrangement, it may also be timely to address strong agricultural protection in many Asian economies, including Japan. Employment creation and public sector spending in infrastructure and HRD in agriculture and rural development lend themselves to multiplier expansion as more domestic inputs than imported raw

materials, capital goods, equipment and technology are involved. Also, rural income expansion is more likely to further boost domestic demand as more local goods and services in the first instance are demanded as the rural poor turns richer. In short, the marginal propensity to consume is high and the marginal propensity to import low in many large agricultural rural populations in Asia as in China, India and Indonesia. High saving and prudent spending are also virtues worth some policy thinking in designing such policies- to stimulate the rural poor toward globalization.

The timing may not be bad to spread the benefits of globalization to the rural poor and reinforce the effort toward poverty reduction. The return of some urban new poor back to the rural community and sector may further create opportunities and interaction as in any capital and technology transfer with a reverse urban-rural migration. It is important for the government to create the right environment and incentives, and even FDI and TNCs can be persuaded that globalization can benefit the rural poor and raise standards of living and growth. The old Asian export, FDI, TNC-led growth model has to be expanded to take the agriculture sector into account for more diversified and sustainable growth.

The added opportunity for Asia policy and efforts from enhancing international competitiveness to social competitiveness should not be missed. The Asian growth with equity model was not sufficiently resilient and durable as classes of new poor emerge to wreck socio-political stability and harmony. ASEAN more than Northeast Asia is more prone to ethnic and socio-political volcanoes erupting. The European social model, which revolves around its Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) may be accused of being protectionist but it makes some sense in preserving certain cultural values in the rural community which coexist with the industrial. Asia should make some adaptations toward some social model which also takes into account social security, social welfare and safety nets as some Asian economies are also facing the challenges of demographic ageing and have to balance the aspirations of the youths with the needs of the old. Asia has its own brand of village politics and democratization which should be explored, modernized and reequipped for globalization.

Asia should rethink its growth model and focus in the light of its experiences with globalization, ICT, KBE and the Asian crisis. It would be able to differentiate between self-induced policy mistakes and unforeseen difficulties imposed exogenously. Preventive, mitigation and coping strategies should follow.

Olympios Katsiaouni, DSPD, UNDESA and *Jaroslav Gorniak*, Jagiellonian University, Krakow, Poland presented a paper on Globalization and rural poverty in transition countries. They discussed how globalization affects transition economies at the international level; how entry, or distance of entry, from the European Union, affects the candidate nations and processes to eradicate poverty; and the circumstances and response by particular countries, which can make the difference between success and failure.

In the case of East European economies and the Baltic countries, transition and globalization have merged, with the latter providing an extra urgency to the reforms already admitted. The reduction in the role of the state was an explicit purpose of the transition - the near economic anomie that followed was not programmed but neither was it the result of the process of globalization.

At the regional level, for East European and the Baltic countries in transition, their positioning vis-a-vis the European Union has been a major preoccupation. The EU promises to confer benefits to candidate countries both before and after admission. There are already accession grants in place to enable the countries that in principle have been accepted for membership to prepare for entry. Once entry is gained there are different type of grants and other inducements that aim at bringing up the living standards of the new entrants to the average of the existing members. Yet, which countries will benefit and how far, meaning whether rural poverty will perceptibly decline, is not easily gauged. There are good reasons to think that the capacity to respond to the EU challenge varies and not all potential entrants from transitional economies will benefit equally. In some cases, as with small farmers on land of low productivity, the assistance may be too late to make any radical difference. In these groups, small-scale farmers of advanced years and of low education, market incentives may not be strong signals for change with the sober implication that rural poverty among them will stay relatively high both before and after membership.

At the individual country level, there are number of areas that require attention for poverty reduction. They include severity of poverty, geographical distribution, land ownership, labour market, gender bias, empowerment of civil society and devolution, and macroeconomic environment. In some countries, including Lithuania and Poland, though rural poverty is higher than urban it is not very severe - in the case of Lithuania it was estimated that 1 per cent of GDP, would be sufficient to lift most households out of the officially prescribed poverty level. Hence,

political will is absolutely necessary if the required resources will be mobilized for the purpose of poverty eradication. As to geographical distribution, poverty is never equally, or randomly, dispersed in individual countries or throughout the economies in transition. For regions of higher incidence special measures can be designed to deal with their unique concerns and problems - backward regions do not break out of their predicament unaided. Broad policies must complement region-specific initiatives, and mobilizing community and civil society groups, to strengthen social inclusion and fight poverty.

China found land reform a strong ally in its fight against rural poverty and so has Poland. Security of tenure, access to credit, and elimination of the discriminations and constraints that afflict women in rural activities, have been canvassed as effective anti-poverty measures. Despite the available evidence on the poverty reducing impact of land reform, and on eliminating gender inequalities, IFAD has found that in most cases the rural poor have not benefited from land and tenurial reform. There are two attributes that tell against rural labour, first its demographic character, in particular its ageing population, and second its educational and training background which leads to low productivity. Despite efforts in different countries, it is still the case that farmers, especially on smaller holdings, tend to be on average older and less mobile than the rest of the population, and second that there is little incentive for younger professionals, especially in health and education, to settle in rural areas.

As to gender bias closer attention must be paid to policies and supports to enable women to operate in the market on equal footing with men, including access to loans. It is known that women in agriculture are more likely to use the products, or income derived, for their families, family health or on education of their children. Thus, there are positive externalities to the family and society, by policies that encourage remunerative activities for rural women. Social cohesion and participation is unthinkable without political and social structures that reflect and organize at grass-roots levels, and especially the rural population. Yet, Community Based Associations, CBOs and NGOs, are much more likely to be found in an urban than rural setting with media attention focusing accordingly. Further, in a number of economies in transition the legal status of CBOs and NGOs is not clear so that even when they are present and have the capacities they may not be able to undertake activities on behalf of public sector institutions.

VII. Role of the United Nations

Peter Townsend, London School of Economics, University of London, presented a paper on the Role of the United Nation: Global resources for the rural poor. He argued for the simultaneous pursuit of specific and general antipoverty policy objectives, and not only a better fusion of economic and social objectives. The necessary ingredients of the argument involve realistic financial resources for development, specification of benefits and beneficiaries, prioritization and measurement of human rights, and simultaneous concern with long-term structures and short-term remedies.

Public opinion has to be harnessed in favour of specific, and direct, identifiable remedies. Consideration could be given to introducing a universal international child benefit, incorporating a range of practicable and affordable measures according to the resources and poverty assessment of different countries, financed by a "children in need" tax on international financial transactions. Because of the greater needs among rural populations they would benefit disproportionately. Identification of the principal beneficiaries would greatly strengthen the arguments for a financial transactions tax. This would help not just with the problem of working out how the tax would work technically and to whom it would be applied. If resources were used for young children that would also improve dramatically the chances of, for example, reducing world poverty by half by the year 2015, and simultaneously ensure a reduction of the exposure of millions of young children to malnutrition and premature death. It would also contribute strongly to the fulfilment of Articles 22 and 25 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and of the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

Specific forms of possible international child benefit could vary depending on the circumstances of countries. The United Nations could give attention to the value to be recommended per child and according to age. There are possibilities of cash allowances under given age, free school meals or collection of free foodstuffs and milk. A start could be made in some countries with an allowance or benefit in cash for infants under age of two. A low birthweight baby allowance is an example of a measure that could be applied in both rich and poor countries.

Other measures may also need to be introduced, including Tobin tax and the alternative carbon tax which is aimed at "making polluters pay", discussed in the Zedillo Report. The Zedillo Report concluded that a global council should be set up to handle some of the problems

of international economic guidance. This global council would be more broadly based than the G7 or the Bretton Woods institutions. The Zedillo Report also continued proposals for domestic resource mobilization, private capital flows, trade and international development cooperation, including the necessary achievement of the 0.7 per cent of GNP aid target. A persuasive argument was put forward for an international tax organization to monitor developments in taxation in different countries and review "excessive" measures taken by multinationals.

It is recognized that the human rights approach may offer an additional and useful perspectives for the analysis of human development. Human development measures of economic growth and poverty do not take into account the ravages of war and the costs of deforestation, global warming and pollution. The causes of poverty are not sought in the collection of cumulative evidence of the initiation and sustainability of violence. Another issue that deserves attention is creation of a human rights index, whereby the performance of different countries might be measured. An initiative by UNICEF in this direction seeks to put this right. What has been found is that current statistical indicators can be put to this purpose, although the substitution of new indicators would be feasible as well as preferable.

In channeling the benefits of globalization to the rural poor much can be gained by the United Nations by comparing its work with that of other agencies in dealing with the same problems. The issue of playing complementary rather duplicative roles can be examined. Comparative analysis of the roles of different international organizations can be revealing, and also helpful in showing what more distinctive as well as larger role can be played by the United Nations. There is unique opportunity to take acknowledged global initiatives, investigate and apply human rights and, through advocacy of specific universal policies, like the one suggested of a financial transactions tax related to a child benefit, show how international social policies can suitably complement national policies.

The role of the UN in reducing poverty, including that in rural areas, can be strengthened by building more firmly on the 1995 Copenhagen agreement. This represented a breakthrough in securing agreement to draw up national anti-poverty plans, but also bridge the gap between rich and poor countries by devising a two-tier measure of "absolute" and "overall" poverty. European social scientists have welcomed this initiative and sought to extend and implement the proposals. One major possibility is to relate country-specific reports on the extent of absolute and overall

poverty to direct measures to reduce it, and so contribute to a key aim of the Millennium Declaration.

Selim Jahan, Bureau for Development Policy, UNDP, highlighted a number of areas where the UN and UNDP can play active role in poverty reduction. At the global level, the UN should provide a platform for negotiations and they can be conducted in such areas as opening markets to poor countries, debt-relief for sub-Saharan Africa, and fight against HIV/AIDS. It also has a role in protecting the interests of poor developing countries and strengthening their bargaining positions through providing legal aid and professional support for negotiations in WTO dispute settlement, helping establish an ombudsman mechanism dealing with justice, developing regional initiatives to strengthen common positions for negotiations on trade, environment and labour standards. As to the mobilization of financial resources, focus should be given to the proposal on currency taxation, better-allocated ODA, especially for sub-Saharan Africa, and implementation of 20/20 concept.

At the national level, there is a large presence of the UN agencies and the challenge is to bring together different actors into development process. National action is important to capture global opportunities in trade and capital flows and to protect people against vulnerabilities of globalization. These efforts are often divided between different ministries and departments and this fragmentation weakens the country's capacity to address these issues. For this reason, developing countries should consider setting up a coordinated mechanism for dealing with globalization. National human development reports can be used to promote social dialogue among the various parties, as well as to outline key national priorities for managing globalization to enhance human development. The United Nations should provide assistance to countries to develop pro-poor growth policies, reduce inequality and enhance human capabilities. In addition, national action should be directed at better access to productive resources and social services, and provision of income transfers, restructuring public expenditure and taxation. New dimension of the UN's role is help protecting the poor, including the rural poor during periods of crisis. Public provision of services is essential. Countries should be encouraged to set goals and dates for achieving access to education and health care.

Multinational corporations influence the lives and welfare of people, however it's not used to ensure that globalization works for human development. Their social responsibility should be subject to public accountability. A multilateral code of conduct.

To achieve all these actions, the UN should work closely with national Governments, build alliances with NGOs and other actors, and coordinate activities of different UN agencies.

Yvette Stevens, Special Coordinator for Africa and the Least Developed Countries, DESA, stressed the need for a holistic approach in poverty reduction, which would involve the different agencies of the UN system. The UN global conferences and summits addressed issues related to globalization and poverty reduction and the outcome documents reflect concrete initiatives in these areas. For example, the Plan of Action adopted at the tenth session of UNCTAD underscored the need for strengthening international cooperation to prevent crisis, mobilizing external resources for development, increasing for development. Copenhagen +5 called for the reduction of proportion of people living in extreme poverty by one half by the year 2015. It urged countries, in the context of comprehensive national strategies for poverty eradication, integrate policies at all levels, including economic and fiscal policies, capacity-building and institution building, as well as to give priority to investments in education, health, social protection and basic social services, in order to empower the poor people. Governments were also encouraged to develop and implement pro-poor growth strategies. The Third UN Conference on LDCs paid particular attention to the issues of trade and finance as critical for poverty alleviation in LDCs.

The role of the UN in poverty reduction at the national and regional level can include provision of technical assistance to formulate appropriate macroeconomic policies and reforms for poverty reduction; domestic policy responses to external shocks to reduce their negative impact on growth and development; policies for diversifying African economies and increasing their competitiveness in the global economy; industrialization and trade policies. Helping undertake analytical research relating to approaches and strategies for poverty reduction and advisory services and operational activities on poverty issues will be useful.

At the international level, the UN should undertake advocacy for international action in support of Africa's development and better integration into the world economy through improved access for African commodities to developed country markets, increased ODA, taking into account the goals and development strategies of African countries, and durable solution for external debt problem.

Other issues related to globalization and some non-economic causes of poverty such as continuing conflicts fueled by increased globalization, natural disasters and human rights abuses

need to be addressed. The UN system could go beyond the traditional approaches to poverty reduction which mainly concentrate on economic factors. For example, in the area of conflict prevention, the UN should promote international understanding and agreements to address illegal flows of arms in Africa. As to natural disasters, activities to predict, mitigate and reduce the negative effects of natural disasters need to be considered. The UN could be involved in early warning on flow of refugees, “brain drain” and promotion of human rights.

Peter Gudgeon, DSPD, UNDESA, presented a paper on Globalization and rural poverty reduction: the role of the United Nations system: contrasting styles and competing models. He noted that while there is a slowly emerging consensus on the nature of the globalization poverty relationship, the operational interpretation of the relationship (in terms of the UN system's global agenda and the country level activities and their conceptual underpinnings) is characterized by a plethora of contrasting styles and competing paradigms. However, the UN system is gradually developing a consensus on the way forward on how to position globalization as a force for the common good and as a powerful tool for rural poverty reduction. The major gap between rhetoric, commitment and implementation follow-up in all of these areas presents the biggest challenge to the UN system to reduce extreme poverty by half by 2015.

Action is urgently needed to retool globalization to ensure that globalization based goods and services - financial, economic, social (including global public goods) actually reach or benefit the poor directly or indirectly through improving the channels and mechanisms of delivery to the poor and through enhanced governance systems and capacity of the public and private sectors responsible for poverty reduction. Adoption of a new “inclusive” human centered globalization model - a more pro-active multi-layered strategic approach is required by the UN system if the Millennium Development Goals are to be met. Concerted action is needed at three levels, at the international level, through mobilization of concerned parties and through the intergovernmental processes; at the regional/national level, through the regional commissions and individual countries, and at the within country/local level, through the coordinated UN system programmes. At all levels the importance of establishing strategic partnerships is those akin to the UN-Private sector Global Compact model operating at the international and national levels.

These considerations could be reflected in a well-articulated strategic action framework for globalization and poverty reduction at the international level, on the preparation of strategic

globalization/poverty reduction programmes for management and application/implementation at the national level and linked to projects/programmes at the local level. At all levels, the UN system has a key role to play in the articulation of this process and would seek to align its programmes to reflect these priorities. It implies a new set of partnerships between the UN, the private and public sectors, with civil society and NGOs and the poverty groups.

Global strategic framework will seek new more favourable conditions for globalization, especially for LDCs in such areas as improved terms of international trade, access to global public goods, accelerated development of ICT, strengthened world financial architecture, measures to stimulate ODA. National strategic plans for accelerating globalization for poverty reduction would emphasize improved governance for globalization, institution of reform and liberalization programmes which are sensitive to the poor, national programmes for ICT with emphasis on bridging urban-rural digital divide, strengthened rural marketing.

The modalities of the UN system involvement are largely in place and could be readily mobilized in defining the strategic frame for the new globalization/poverty reduction model. The envisaged support models range from providing a forum for debate and discussion; research studies, statistics and seminars; definition of advocacy positions on globalization and poverty; field level operations of Funds and Programmes and specialized agencies; and special role of the regional commissions. The principal UN agencies with a stake in rural poverty reduction are under the ambit of UN Funds and Programmes, specialized agencies, the functional commissions of the ECOSOC and regional commissions, some of which have a major country level presence. For example, in the DESA, globalization/poverty reduction model development might be possible in the context of the technical cooperation activities. The functional commissions are key bodies in the development of a more coherent and consistent approach to developing the integrated model of a human centered globalization model which will embrace the critical issue of addressing rural poverty and positioning globalization as the key driving force in poverty reduction.

VII. Summary of policy recommendations

National level

- Macroeconomic policies that are pro-poor should be encouraged or supported in order to address poverty reduction and the marginalizing effects of globalization on the rural economy;

- Policies and actions to foster broad-based rural growth should be directed towards:
 - promoting agricultural and rural development, improving agricultural productivity and competitiveness by investing in science and technology; assisting in crop and livestock diversification;
 - improving market infrastructure and access to markets; providing rural economic infrastructure;
 - providing a policy environment and institutional structures that place agriculture and rural activities on an equal footing with other industries;
 - increasing the productivity of water use, and generally giving priority to the material facilities that ensure safe drinking water, sanitation and shelter;
 - meeting the challenge of biotechnology applications for poverty reduction;
- Policies to improve social well-being and reduce the vulnerability of rural people should be strengthened. A larger share of public expenditure should be allocated to rural areas to improve access to nutrition, health and education, implement food security schemes that lower the risk and vulnerability of the rural poor and develop safety nets programmes targeted at vulnerable groups, including the rural poor;
- Gender sensitive initiatives should be undertaken both by Government and civil society to enable a better mobilization of resources, thereby reducing discrimination and poverty among the vulnerable groups;
- Policies to enhance the sustainable resources base need to be undertaken and priorities should include:
 - policies and regulations on reducing land degradation and promoting sustainable production of forest products;
 - reforms to improve water utilization and management;
- Poverty Reductions Strategy Papers (PRSPs) should more fully integrate issues related to trade and foreign direct investment given their importance as determinants of employment, growth and incomes of the poor;
- Collaboration with civil society, local communities and other actors should be strengthened, including social dialogue on PRSPs;
- Countries should take steps to strengthen their positions in global negotiations in trade and others areas, through appropriate regional initiatives;
- Regional integration should be strengthened with greater attention to disadvantaged areas;
- Developed countries should encourage more open trade policies and market access for developing countries' products. In this regard, they should strive to provide greater incentives for foreign direct investment and the transfer of ICT for development for the poorest countries, and reduce domestic subsidies, especially on agricultural products and semi-manufactured which compete directly with exports from LDCs;

- Coordinated domestic strategies and mechanisms dealing with globalisation should be developed to improve the management of globalization in order to ensure the maximum beneficial effects while minimizing its adverse impacts;
- Development of direct measures in cash or kind to bring immediate relief to vulnerable groups in greatest poverty, including new-born children, disabled, and elderly people;
- Further research for poverty measurement could be considered and may include the development of multiple indicators and poverty lines implementing the 1995 Copenhagen goals; the study of the reliability and validity of these indicators and poverty lines; their correlation with other social indicators, non-monetary approaches and poverty profiles of particular poverty layers;

International level

- A strategic approach towards developing a “new”, more inclusive, model of globalization should be examined. Efforts by the United Nations system to reach the Millennium target of reducing the proportion of extreme poor by half by 2015 and the establishment of a more human-centred globalization model may necessitate the adoption of a more pro-active strategy
- Concerted actions are needed to retool globalization in order to ensure that globalization based goods and services – financial, economic and social, including global public goods – reach or benefit the rural poor through improving the channels and mechanisms of delivery and through enhanced governance systems and capacity of the major actors;
- Fairer trade, foreign investment flows and the transfer of ICT, especially for LDCs, should be promoted;
- The social responsibility of multinational corporations needs to be developed and information from MNCs sought about their social, including employment, policies for permanent and temporary staff, especially young people – so that MNC and national Government policies can be debated;
- The mobilization of new forms of financial resources for poverty eradication is important and, in this regard, further serious consideration needs to be given to:
 - introducing a Tobin tax on international financial transactions;
 - introducing a carbon tax “to encourage making polluters pay”;
 - creation of an international tax organization;
- Consideration could be given to introducing an international child benefit, financed by a “children in need tax” on international financial transactions;
- A more durable solution for the external debt problem through debt relief, especially for LDCs, should be considered, within the context of the Highly Indebted Poor Countries initiative;
- Official development assistance should be increased, in line with previous commitments, and its present orientation needs to be reviewed in order to focus more on the rural areas, particularly in the agriculture sector;

- The provision of legal aid and the creation of an ombudsman should be considered to provide support to poor countries in their bilateral and multilateral negotiations in trade and other areas;
- Partnership with civil society and the private sector should be strengthened to encourage productive activities and the development of rural areas;
- A human rights index, which measures progress of different countries, can be a useful indicator that can be constructed;
- The relevance of economic human rights, such as the rights to an adequate standard of living and to social security, including social insurance, to further international as well as national action to reduce poverty, should be considered as a matter of urgency;
- Further efforts should be taken with regard to the international comparability and shared methodology of poverty measurement, and to facilitate international discourse and exchange of solutions.

ANNEX I

**Expert Group Meeting
Globalization and Poverty Reduction:
Can the Rural Poor Benefit from Globalization?**

New York, 8-9 November 2001

PROGRAMME

Thursday, 8 November 2001

Session 1: Opening

930-1000 Opening address by *Mr John Langmore*
Director, Division for Social Policy and Development, DESA

Participants' self-introduction

1000-1130 **Session 2: Overview of poverty reduction strategies**
Chair: *Mr Atiqur Rahman, Lead Strategist and Policy Coordinator, IFAD*

Presentation by
Mr Paul Shaffer, University of Toronto, Canada

Discussant
Mr Peter Townsend, LSE, University of London

Open debate

1130-1145 Break

1145-1300 **Session 3: Experience with rural poverty alleviation**
Chair: *Mr Selim Jahan, Bureau for Development Policy, UNDP*

What has been the experience with rural poverty alleviation? What has worked, what has not?
What are the "proven" elements of successful rural poverty alleviation programmes?

Presentation by
Mr Atiqur Rahman, Lead Strategist and Policy Coordinator, IFAD

Open debate

1300-1400 Lunch break

1400-1530 **Session 4: The links between globalization and rural poverty alleviation.**

Chair: *Mr David Reed, Macroeconomics for Sustainable Development*

Programme Officer, WWF

Presentation by

Mr Selim Jahan, Bureau for Development Policy, UNDP

Ms Vigdis Broch-Due, The Research Council of Norway

Open debate

1530-1545 Break

1545-1745 **Session 5: Reaching the rural poor**

Chair: *Mr Paul Shaffer, University of Toronto, Canada*

What are the policies, instruments and mechanisms at the disposal of governments of developing countries to transmit the benefits of globalization to the rural poor or to protect vulnerable groups from (further) marginalization by the globalization process? How do these fit in, for instance, with the PRSPs?

Presentation by

Mr Malcolm Bale, Sector Manager, Rural Development in East Asia Region, World Bank

Mr Selim Jahan, Bureau for Development Policy, UNDP

Discussant

Mr Atiqur Rahman, Lead Strategist and Policy Coordinator, IFAD

Open Debate

Friday, 9 November 2001

0930-1100 **Session 6: National/regional experiences**

Chair: *Mr Peter Townsend, LSE, University of London*

How much has globalization really benefited the rural poor and what were the crucial determinants in this process?

Africa *Mr Makha Sarr, Consultant (West/Central Africa)*

Asia *Ms Linda Low, University of Singapore*

Economies in

Mr Olympios Katsiaouni, DSPD, UNDESA and Mr Jaroslaw Gorniak, Jagiellonian University, Krakow, Poland

1100-1115 Break

1115-1300 Open debate

1300-1400 Lunch break

1400-1615 **Session 7: Panel: Role of the United Nations**

Chair: *Mr John Langmore, Director, DSPD, UNDESA*

What is the role the United Nations can play in assisting developing countries in channeling the benefits of globalization to the rural poor? What is the United Nations' role vis-à-vis other international organizations and NGOs?

Presentation by

Mr Peter Townsend, LSE, University of London

Mr Selim Jahan, Bureau for Development Policy, UNDP

Ms Yvette Stevens, OSCAL, UNDESA

Mr Peter Gudgeon, DSPD, UNDESA

Mr David Reed, Macroeconomics for Sustainable Development Programme Officer, WWF

1615-1630 Break

1630-1745 Open Debate

Wrap up session - Closing remarks

ANNEX II

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Name	Contacts
1. MALCOLM BALE	Sector Manager, Strategy and Policy Rural Development and Natural Resources Unit East Asia and the Pacific Region World Bank, 1818H Street, NW Washington, DC 20433. Tel: 202-473-1913 Fax: 202-522-1675 Email: Mbale@worldbank.org
2. VIGDIS BROCH-DUE	Senior Researcher Department of Social Anthropology Cambridge University United Kingdom Tel: 202-722-4992 Fax: 202-722-4992 Email: vigdisbroch-due@starpower.net
3. JAROSLAW GORNIAK	Associate Professor Head of Department of Sociology of Economy & Education Institute of Sociology, Jagiellonian University Krakow, 31-466 Krakow, Akacjowa Poland. Tel: 48-12-4135193 (Home) Fax: 48-12-4302099 Email: usgornia@cyf-kr.edu.pl
4. SELIM JAHAN	Senior Adviser Employment for Employment Reduction Bureau for Development Policy United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Phone: 212-906-5010 Fax: 212-906-5857 Email: jahan@un.org

5. LINDA LOW	Associate Professor Department of Business Policy, NUS Business School National University of Singapore, Law Link Republic of Singapore 117591 Phone: 65-779-6279 Fax: 65-779-5059 Email: fbalowl@nus.edu.sg
6. ATIQUR RAHMAN	Lead Strategist and Policy Coordinator International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), Via del Serafico, 107-00142 Rome, Italy Tel: 39-0654592090 Fax: 39-065043463 Email: at.rahman@ifad.org
7. DAVID REED	Director Microeconomics for Sustainable Development Program Office, World Wildlife Fund, 1250 Twenty-Fourth St. NW, Washington, D.C. 20037-1175 Tel: 202-778-9602 Fax: 202-293-9211 Email: reedd@wwfus.org
8. MAKHA SARR	Consultant Office of the President of the Economic and Social Council of Senegal, Fenetre Mermoz, FM50, BP 16537, Dakar-Fann, Senegal Tel: 221-6375658 Fax: 221-825-6290 Email: mdsarr@sentoo.sn
9. PAUL SHAFFER	Consultant Centre for International Studies University of Toronto, 1 Devonshire Place Toronto, Ontario Canada M5S 3K7 Tel: 416-885-7721 Fax: 416-652-1678 Email: P.Shaffer@utoronto.ca

10. PETER TOWNSEND	Emeritus Professor and Senior Research Fellow of Social Policy, Department of Social Policy, London School of Economics University of London, Houghton Street, London WC2A 2AE Tel: 44-20-7955-6632 Fax: 44-20-7955-7415 Email: P.Townsend@lse.ac.uk
11. JOHN LANGMORE	Director Division for Social Policy and Development Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA), DC2-1370, United Nations Tel: 212-963-5855 Fax: 212-963-3062 Email: langmore@un.org
12..GLORIA KAN	Chief, Intergovernmental Policy Branch Division for Social Policy and Development, DESA, DC2-1362, United Nations Tel: 212-963-5873 Fax: 212-963-3062 Email: kan@un.org
13. ODILE FRANK	Chief, Social Integration Branch Division for Social Policy and Development, DESA, DC2-1320, United Nations Tel: 212-963-6901 Fax: 212-963-0111 Email: frank@un.org
14. DONALD LEE	Chief, Poverty Eradication and Employment Unit, Intergovernmental Policy Branch Division for Social Policy and Development, DESA, DC2-1358, United Nations Tel: 212-963-8762 Fax: 212-963-3062 Email: lee27@un.org

15. YVETTE STEVENS	Special Coordinator for Africa and the Least Developed Countries, OSCAL/DESA DC1-1236, United Nations Tel: 212-963-5084 Fax: 212-963-3892 Email: stevens@un.org
16. OLYMPIOS KATSIAOUNI	Interregional Adviser Socio-Economic Policy and Development Management Branch Division for Social Policy and Development, DESA, DC2-1464, United Nations Tel: 212-963-6417 Fax: 212-963-1265 Email: Katsiaouni@un.org
17. PETER GUDGEON	Interregional Adviser Socio-Economic Policy and Development Management Branch, Division for Social Policy and Development, DESA DC2-1462, United Nations Tel: 212-963-6217 Fax: 212-963-1265 Email: gudgeon@un.org
18. ALBERT VINOKOUROV	Social Affairs Officer Intergovernmental Policy Branch Division for Social Development, DESA DC2-1348, United Nations Tel: 212-963-1713 Fax: 212-963-3062 Email: vinokourov@un.org
19. SARANGEREL ERDEMBILEG	Social Affairs Officer Intergovernmental Policy Branch Division for Social Development, DESA DC2-1344, United Nations Tel: 212-963-4720 Fax: 212-963-3062 Email: erdembileg@un.org
20. SHEHNAZ DARUWALA	Social Affairs Officer, Intergovernmental Policy Branch, Division for Social

	Development, DESA DC2-1374, United Nations Tel: 212-963-1118 Fax: 212-963-3062 Email: daruwala@un.org
--	--