

The Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation and the Evolving Post MDG Agenda: Asia-Pacific Perspectives¹

Qazi Kholiquzzaman Ahmad²

THE EVOLUTION OF GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP FOR DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION FOR DEVELOPMENT EFFECTIVENESS

The first High Level Forum (HLF) on aid effectiveness was held in Rome, Italy in February 2003, followed by HLF-2 in Paris, France in March 2005, HLF-3 in Accra, Ghana in September 2008, and HLF-4 in Busan, South Korea in November-December 2011. Along the way, ideas, understanding, and agreements expanded in relation to two broad aspects: contents and stakeholders.

Contents

In the Rome Declaration (RD), the main agreement was on harmonization of aid activities by the traditional aid providers. In the Paris Declaration (PD), it was agreed that the aid-receiving countries would be in the driving seat in terms of ownership of their development policies, strategies, and action programmes. A set of five principles were agreed for both aid providers (development partners) and aid receivers (partner countries) to adhere to, as follows:

Ownership: Partner countries are in charge of their development policies, strategies, and coordination of development actions, while the development partners will respect these arrangements and help strengthen the partner countries' capacity to perform the role effectively. Alignment: the development partners align with and support partner countries' strategies, institutional arrangements, and procedures. Harmonization: This is essentially a follow-up of the Rome agreement that the development partners harmonize their actions and be transparent and effective in collectively providing their support within the framework of common and simplified procedures. Managing for Results: This means that aid is managed by both development partners and partner countries, in terms of their respective responsibilities, in a manner that improves decision-making and aid implementation for the desired results to be achieved. Mutual Accountability: development partners and partner countries are to enhance mutual accountability and transparency in the provision and the use of resources for achieving the desired results. It was also agreed that the performance of both will be appropriately monitored.

¹ Keynote presentation at the "Asia Workshop on the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation: Links to the Post-2015 Development Agenda—*Reinforcing Effective Development Partnerships for Better Development Results*", organized by Economic Relations Division (ERD), Ministry of Finance, Government of Bangladesh, Dhaka, 25-27 August 2013.

² Dr Ahmad is Chairman of Palli Karma-Sahayak Foundation (PKSF) and Chairman of Dhaka School of Economics (DScE), Dhaka, Bangladesh. Email: <qk_ahmad@yahoo.com>

In the Accra meeting, the Accra Agenda for Action (AAA) was adopted that contains a series of commitments seeking to strengthen and accelerate the implementation of the PD. It has also sharpened and further clarified the Paris principles and monitoring arrangements.

Busan (HLF-4) built on the outcomes of the previous HLFs and proposed the creation of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC) to replace the Working Party (WP) established by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)/the Development Assistance Committee (DAC)—the OECD/DAC WP—in May 2003 in pursuance of the international consensus on financing for development (the Monterrey Consensus) reached in Monterrey conference in March 2002. The GPEDC was formally established in June 2012. Effective aid and good development are two key goals to be pursued by GPEDC, to which all concerned development actors should adhere. The principles, however, remain basically those provided in the PD and reiterated in the AAA, but with further elaboration, sharpening, and widening of the net of actors.

Importantly, Busan has moved the agenda from aid effectiveness to development effectiveness and has also introduced the concept of differing country contexts, on the basis of which ways forward and solutions need to be differentiated. Appropriate engagement in the case of fragile states to promote peace-building and state-building goals has also been agreed, not only in the context of violence and conflict but also with reference to health pandemics, climate change and natural disasters, economic crisis, food insecurity, fuel crisis and so on.

Stakeholders

While Rome focuses mainly on traditional development partners' actions in relation to the harmonization of aid provided by them, it is agreed, in Paris, that the partners own their development policies, strategies, and actions, not the development partners. At the Accra Forum, recognition has been accorded to Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) as stakeholders in development. Busan recognizes the important roles in development cooperation of emerging economy aid providers, private business sectors, and parliamentarians. However, these stakeholders are not yet formally inducted into the process. They can participate in debates and generation of ideas and undertake appropriate actions falling within their respective ambit, but remain outside the international accountability structures, which still involve only the traditional development partners and the partner countries.

At Busan, the DAC countries agreed that a different governance structure was needed to support the broader development partnerships being crafted. This led to the involvement of UNDP as a full partner, which provides secretariat support to the GPEDC that has replaced OECD/DAC WP. As a result, the new partnership framework becomes broader-based, enabling countries other than DAC countries to participate more effectively and on a more equal footing.

The Key Challenges for GPEDC

The challenge now is to resolve the emerging issues so that the GPEDC is enabled to fulfill its promises and deliver the desired results. In this context, work is in progress relating to: designing of a governance structure involving the expanded array of actors in development

cooperation; curving out of a proper role for emerging economy aid providers and integration of emerging South-South cooperation within a global framework; appropriate mainstreaming of the private business sector into the development cooperation framework; and development of a set of indicators to monitor global progress in development cooperation, taking into account differing country contexts.

DEVELOPMENT AND DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION

The Asia-Pacific stakeholders are already active within the framework of the GPEDC, as they have been previously in the context of functioning and evolution of OECD/DAC WP-facilitated aid effectiveness framework and activities. In fact, the Asia-Pacific region contains four OECD/DAC countries or traditional development partners (Australia, Japan, Korea, New Zealand) and many partner countries. The Capacity Development for Development Effectiveness (CDDE) Facility for Asia and the Pacific was established in March 2009 to help partner countries to work together for exchange of experiences and mutual capacity enhancement towards improving development effectiveness in each participating country. Its membership includes country governments, parliamentarians, CSOs, and supporters (both countries and international and regional institutions). The initiatives for action are developed primarily at the behest of the CDDE members. It is important to note that CDDE Facility has been created on the basis of the realization of the partner countries of the region that they can learn a lot from one another in the context of localizing and implementing PD and AAA principles and action programmes. With the strengthening of principles and the expansion of action programmes and the net of stakeholders in Busan, the CDDE Facility is sure to have a more engaging role to play in future.

The Facility works by assisting partner country representatives to come together along with representatives from other CDDE member categories to exchange views and experiences, derived from their differing or converging experiences and approaches for mutual benefit to be employed towards strengthening development effectiveness in their respective countries. Secondly, there are in the region emerging South-South cooperation networks, involving emerging Southern aid providers in the region. These south-south cooperation activities are also supported by the CDDE by disseminating relevant information and facilitating meetings of the representatives of the concerned participating countries towards more effective South-South cooperation in the region, leading to real improvements in the assistance provided and development results achieved. Based on these experiences, the region has, in fact, begun to contribute to the designing and strengthening of international financing and development policies and structures (e.g. GPEDC, G20, Green Climate Fund—GCF, Post-2015), involving Southern perspectives, particularly of least developed countries (LDCs) and other low-income countries, not just those of OECD/DAC.

The Asia-Pacific is a region of countries exhibiting widely diverse contexts and perspectives. It is home to: countries of widely varying geographical size and characteristics, population dynamics, and population density; four DAC countries; major aid recipient countries; emerging economic powerhouses and emerging Southern aid providers; LDCs and low-income countries; land-locked countries; island countries including small island developing states (SIDS); high carbon emitters in terms of total annual quantity or per capita/annum; very low carbon emitters both in terms of per capita/annum and total annual emission; highly vulnerable countries to climate change impacts; highly globally integrated countries and

countries not so integrated; mountainous countries; countries which are mostly just a few metres above sea level; countries, parts of which are desert or desert-like; countries where human capability (in terms of education, health, skills), social capital, and physical and social infrastructure are highly or fairly well developed and countries struggling in these regards; countries featuring transnational companies (TNCs) and multinational companies (MNCs) and countries at low levels of industrialization and without large business houses; resource constrained developing countries needing external assistance; developing countries which have become or are emerging as aid providers; developing countries where levels of poverty are low and countries where unacceptably high levels of poverty still persist; countries exhibiting respectable or high economic growth rates and countries where economic growth rates tend to languish; countries facing worker shortages; countries possessing abundant supplies of workers, significant proportions of whom are available for migration to other countries; countries endowed with large supplies of primary energy resources; and countries possessing very limited supplies of primary energy resources.

Such diversities may in fact act as bottlenecks in relation to cooperation building in the region, one way or another. Narrow national politics and bureaucratic procrastination or negative stances, particularly in large and richer countries, may be one major bottleneck. But, it may be argued that the diversities engender many complementarities that make for a fertile ground for cooperation building within sub-regions, between certain countries, and among many countries across the region for mutual benefit of the participating countries in each case. Careful exploration of ground realities is surely necessary for assessing scope, the potential areas of cooperation, and the feasibility of cooperation building in each case.

Indeed, each country has its own experiences arising from addressing the multifarious challenges faced by them. There is the traditional knowledge and distinctive cultural features that each country is characterized by. Regardless of which category, out of those outlined above, a country belongs to, it would surely have something to offer for others to learn and benefit from. And, of course, diversities offer opportunities for mutual learning and partnership and solidarity building.

Economically and technologically relatively advanced and fast growing developing countries of the region can certainly assist those countries which are struggling in these regards, that may also be in the interest of the assistance providing countries in terms of, for example, benefits from trade and future joint investments. In fact, some of these relatively better off countries are already emerging as aid providers and promoters of joint activities under South-South cooperation frameworks. South-South cooperation is not a very new idea; it dates back to the 1950s/1960s. In those days, the main focus was to enhance the bargaining capacity of the South *vis-à-vis* the North. Since then, it has passed through a checkered history until its emergence as a vehicle for development cooperation among developing countries, over the past few decades.

Indeed, cooperation need not only be in terms of provision of aid and exchange of experiences. Trade has already emerged as a major area of cooperation, particularly so sub-regionally, e.g. in ASEAN (established in the late 1960s), SAARC (1985), Pacific Island Forum (early 1970s). But, for years after establishment, progress was slow or stalled in all cases before things began to happen, although impacts on the ground still remain limited in certain cases, e.g. in South Asia, i.e. in the SAARC region. In addition to trade and experience sharing, other areas of emerging cooperation in the sub-regions and certain countries across the Asia-Pacific, which can enhance partnership and solidarity building

ambitions, include education and training, public health, empowering women, energy, ICT, finance, agriculture, climate change management and disaster risk reduction, poverty reduction, food security, and promoting unity in cultural diversity. However, levels of cooperation achieved so far in trade and other areas differ widely sub-regionally and between cooperating partners, depending on the economic and political diversity, historical burden giving rise to mistrusts, and lack of clarity and understanding relating to sharing of costs and benefits of cooperation. However, if these hurdles were overcome, all participating countries can expect to benefit more than under a non-cooperation regime, although some countries may benefit more than others at particular stages of cooperation building.

Among many cooperative arrangements in place in the Asia-Pacific, there are Free Trade Agreements (FTAs) or Trade Agreements (TAs) sub-region-wise involving countries belonging to ASEAN, SAARC, and Pacific Island Forum; and there are also many bilateral FTAs or TAs in all the regions. In addition, there are many other agreements or intents to work together expressed in Joint Declarations in all the sub-regions of the Asia-Pacific as well as among countries cutting across the region. More recently, it is seen that many countries of the region are intensifying efforts to widen and deepen cooperation for promoting partnerships, solidarity, and effective development in the participating countries. Indeed, a lot more needs to be achieved to reach satisfactory levels in many cases.

Should the Asia-Pacific region be inward looking in relation to cooperation building? Should the South-South cooperation building process neglect South-North and, indeed, global cooperation? My emphatic answer to both the questions is 'no'.

The Asia-Pacific region-wide and sub-regional, bilateral or multi-country cooperation across the region should exploit the opportunities available or can be created among the cooperating countries, while best utilizing the available options and opportunities of cooperation with OECD/DAC countries and other regions of the world and, at the same time, working to enhance such options and opportunities. But, a key focus should be strengthening economic, socio-cultural, connectivity enhancing, disaster risk reduction, and other types of cooperation within the region.

Triangular development cooperation, implying that OECD countries and multilateral agencies support programmes of development cooperation among developing countries, can reinforce the South-South development cooperation building in the Asia-Pacific region, as indeed in other regions of the world. It is a relatively new phenomenon and gaining in importance in the Asia-Pacific.

Triangular development cooperation is considered to be of much potential in the region. Based on the wide range of existing and increasing complementarities among the regional countries and the attention given by the governments, development cooperation activities are increasing and deepening among certain countries across the region, sub-regionally and bilaterally. This process can benefit from technical and financial assistance under triangular cooperation arrangements.

At the same time, as the Asia-Pacific region is already a big player in the global economy, its further strengthening through widening and deepening of development cooperation in the region and with other regions as well as with OECD countries can play a stronger role in the recovery from the current slow down, particularly in the developed world, and rejuvenation of the world economy.

Within the framework of triangular cooperation, the GPEDC and EDDE, which are supported by OECD/DAC and UNDP, are already facilitating both the mutual learning and experience exchange processes and promotion of South-South cooperation for aid expansion and effectiveness, trade expansion, and development effectiveness. A number of South-South cooperation arrangements in the Asia-Pacific benefit from triangular cooperation implemented through EDDE and GPEDC (OECD/DAC WP) or particular multilateral agencies.

There are many cooperation initiatives in the Asia-Pacific, supported by EDDE and GPEDC (OECD/DAC WP), and multilateral agencies. However, let me just mention three: The EDDE and UNDP supported an important effort ‘Development Cooperation in Asia-Pacific Perspectives: Regional Technical Working Meeting’ in March 2003 at Bali, Indonesia designed to generate outcomes to share with the closely following (also held at Bali) GPEDC Steering Committee meeting, UN Secretary General’s High Level Panel on Post-2015 Development Agenda meeting, and the Asia-Pacific Civil Society and Parliamentarians Forum (itself so supported). The meeting brought together officials and experts from Asia-Pacific region as well as from the UN system. It was a successful event where a number of key messages were formulated and forwarded to the above-mentioned events. The messages formulated relate to MDG achievements and acceleration of the implementation of the MDGs in the remaining days to 31 December 2015 and post-2015 development agenda. In fact, its recommendations have focused on what should be done nationally, regionally, and globally to strengthen effective development cooperation in the region.

This particular workshop in Dhaka (25-27 August 2013) entitled ‘Asia Workshop on the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation: Links to the Post-2015 Development Agenda’, organized to develop a Common Plan of Action for Asia (CPAA) towards implementing the GPEDC that captures the key priorities for countries of the region, particularly low-income countries, which include LDCs and SIDS. It is also designed that the CPAA is so formulated as will support the work of the GPEDC and contribute to strengthening the linkages between the GPEDC and the post-2015 development agenda, particularly via making direct contributions to the forthcoming ministerial meeting. Importantly, the workshop is also intended to provide an opportunity for the participants to explore the possibility of establishing a Regional Peer Support Facility to help link the national initiatives where necessary to the global agenda.

The third example that I would like to mention is the Greater Mekong Sub-regional Programme, formally established in 1992, that is supported by Asian Development Bank (ADB) and Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP). It facilitates trade, investment and development cooperation, and resolution of transboundary issues such as environmental degradation and diseases through cooperative action by the participating countries. The programme is known to have helped bring about significant progress in relation to its objectives.

Clearly, both policy and strategy development and action on the ground are supported under triangular development cooperation arrangements.

**DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION, FURTHER ACCELERATION OF THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MDGs, AND POST-2015 DEVELOPMENT AGENDA:
ASIA-PACIFIC PERSPECTIVES**

The Asia-Pacific region has already achieved targets or registered significant improvements on a good number of key indicators under different targets. But, in respect of other targets the progress has been sluggish or there is, in fact, some backsliding (see Table 1).

Generally, the achievements are uneven among countries of the region. It is important to note that region-wise, the key failure relates to health targets (under Goals 4 and 5), hunger (under Goal 1), completion of primary education (under Goal 2), and basic sanitation (under Goal 7).

Acceleration of efforts are, therefore, needed in the case of all countries performing poorly in the above mentioned and other regards and also with regard to indicators in respect of which achievements are significant but targets remain to be achieved.

Table 1: Country Groups on and off Track for the MDGs as of 2011

Goal	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	\$1.25 per day poverty Underweight children	Primary enrolment Reaching last grade Primary completion	Gender primary Gender secondary Gender tertiary	Under-5 mortality Infant mortality	Maternal mortality Skilled birth attendance Antenatal care (≥ 1 visit)	HIV prevalence TB incidence TB prevalence	Forest cover Protected area CO ₂ emissions ODP substance consumption Safe drinking water Basic sanitation
Asia-Pacific	● ■	▶ ■ ■	● ● ●	■ ■ ■	■ ■ ■	● ● ●	● ● ▲ ● ● ■
Excluding China and India	● ▶	■ ■ ■	● ● ●	■ ■ ■	■ ■ ■	● ● ●	▶ ● ▲ ● ● ▶ ■
South-East Asia	● ▶	▶ ■ ●	● ● ●	■ ■ ■	■ ■ ■	● ● ●	▶ ● ▲ ● ● ▶ ▶
South Asia	■ ■	▶ ■ ■	● ▶ ■	■ ■ ■	■ ■ ■	● ▲ ●	● ● ▲ ● ● ■ ■
Excluding India	▶ ■	■ ■ ■	▶ ■ ■	■ ■ ■	■ ■ ■	● ● ●	▶ ● ▲ ● ● ■ ■
Pacific Islands		■	▶ ■ ▶	■ ■ ■	■ ▲ ■	● ● ▶	▶ ● ● ● ▲ ▶
Excluding Papua New Guinea		■	▶ ● ●	■ ■ ■	■ ▲ ■	● ● ●	● ● ▲ ● ● ■ ■
North and Central Asia	■	▶ ● ●	● ● ●	■ ■ ■	■ ●	● ● ●	● ● ▲ ▲ ■ ■
Excluding Russian Federation	■ ●	▶ ● ●	● ● ●	■ ■ ■	■ ● ●	● ● ●	● ● ▲ ▲ ■ ■
Asia-Pacific LDCs	■ ■	■ ■ ■	● ● ▶	■ ■ ■	■ ■ ■	● ● ●	▶ ● ▲ ● ■ ■
Asia-Pacific Low Income	■ ▶	■ ■ ■	● ● ■	■ ■ ■	■ ■ ■	● ● ●	▶ ● ▲ ● ■ ■
Asia-Pacific Middle Income	● ■	▶ ■ ▶	● ● ●	■ ■ ■	■ ■ ■	● ● ●	● ● ▲ ● ● ■

● Early achiever
▶ On track
■ Slow
▶ Regressing/No progress

Source: *Accelerating Equitable Achievements of the MDGs: Closing Gaps in Health and Nutrition Outcomes*, Asia-Pacific Regional MDG Report 2011-12, ESCAP, ADB, UNDP, Bangkok, February 2012.

The notable achievements of the Asia-Pacific countries in various respects under MDGs have materialized mostly based on their own resources and capacities. Not much assistance for the implementation of the MDGs came forth, although it was postulated that adequate resources

would be forthcoming for the implementation of the MDGs formulated essentially by the traditional development partners. In fact, the ODA declined or did not go up during 2000-2010 in many Asia-Pacific regional developing countries including LDCs. Bangladesh is a case in point. Yet, Bangladesh may be considered a star performer in respect of achievements relating to the MDGs.

Bangladesh has in fact met some of the key targets well ahead of 2015, which include: poverty ratio, poverty gap ratio, gender parity at primary and secondary levels of education, under five mortality rate reduction, containing HIV infection, children under five sleeping under insecticide treated bed nets, and detection and cure of TB and DOTS. Also, the country is on track for achieving a number of other key targets, including: net primary level enrollment ratio, infant mortality rate, prevalence of underweight children under five, maternal mortality rate, contraceptive prevalence rate, proportion of one year-old children immunized, and proportion of people using an improved source of drinking water. There are certain other targets, which can be met with accelerated efforts; in some cases, though, targets will very likely remain unmet. Overall, the balance sheet is laudable.

While the regional countries are expected to intensify their efforts to further improve upon the indicators already fulfilled and where the achievements have fallen short or are poor, it is important for them also to participate actively in the process of post-2015 development agenda formulation. In this context, lessons learnt from the implementation of the MDGs and non-participatory manner of the formulation of the MDGs, ignoring the perspectives put forward in the Millennium Declaration, and the key issues not included in the set of MDGs chosen should be taken on board, along with other key issues and perspectives, particularly of the LDCs, SIDS, and other low-income countries in the process of analyses, debates, formulation of proposals, and finalization of the Post-2015 Development Agenda.

It may be recalled that the MDGs were picked, ignoring the basic framework provided in the Millennium Declaration, that invokes the following core principles: freedom, equality, solidarity, tolerance, respect for nature, and shared responsibility of managing the world economic and social development and threat to world peace and security. Disarmament is also included in the work programme proposed. Moreover, such key issues as energy, climate change, population dynamics, and production and consumption patterns have also been left out.

Work is now in progress for shaping the world development beyond 2015. The UN process initiated by the UN Secretary-General talks of Post-2015 Development Agenda, while Rio+20 conference has called for the formulation of Post-2015 Sustainable Development Goals. Work is going on within the UN system, beyond the Report of the UN Task Team; in countries around the world both at government and civil society levels; among UN major groups, research communities, and networks of social activists; and, of course, in the UN Open Working Group (OWG) of UN members states as Rio+20 follow-up.

Work on the review and consolidation of the suggestions, ideas, and proposals pouring in from around the world is going on under the auspices of the UN Secretary-General's office of Special Advisor and other mechanisms set up by him. It is expected that eventually both the UN and the Rio+20 processes will converge and a Post-2015 Sustainable Development Agenda (Goals)—henceforth Post-2015 Agenda—will be adopted at the UN General Assembly after thorough consideration of all the relevant aspects, which will be acceptable and applicable to all countries.

The UN Task Team's Report and the Report of UN Secretary-General's High Level Panel on Post-2015 Development Agenda (HLP) have provided a basic initial structure of the framework for debating the pros and cons relating to the formulation of an implementable Post-2015 Agenda.

The UN Task Team has recommended that the new agenda be based on the core values of human rights, equality, and sustainability and the key programme contents of inclusive social and economic development, environmental sustainability, and peace and security. The HLP Report has proposed five shifts: leave no one behind; put sustainable development at the core; transform economies for jobs and inclusive growth; build peace and effective, open and accountable institutions for all; and forge a new global partnership. Both Reports have emphasized that the Post-2015 Agenda construct a transformative process for the core values (including inclusiveness, people-centric stance, equity, and sustainability) to be established.

Of course, the two Reports have shortcomings and omissions from the perspective of an equitable global order and certain key concerns of different groups of countries, particularly the LDCs, SIDS, other low-income countries, and climate vulnerable countries. Also, while both the Reports have called for new global partnerships for development, how exactly might that be shaped remains to be worked out.

The ideas and proposals emanating from the regions and the counties concerned should be taken on board to move the process of formulating the framework and the set of goals with appropriate targets and indicators forward in an inclusive manner. The UN OWG, which has been debating various key issues and perspectives, can play an influential role in shaping the final outcome.

In my view, based on the experiences arising from the manner of formulation and the implementation of the MDGs and the current realities in the perspective of shaping the future world development, the following items should be included in the Asia-Pacific region's proposals for the Post-2015 Agenda as goals or targets and pursued through all the channels available and as forcefully as possible for their inclusion in the Agenda.

The Framework

The Post-2015 Agenda should be anchored on a framework based on the following principles: freedom from all kinds of 'unfreedoms', equality, solidarity, human rights and human dignity, inclusiveness (no one to be left behind), respect for nature, and shared responsibility of managing world social and economic development and threat to international peace and security based on common but differentiated responsibility and respective capabilities (CBDR&RC).

Specific Issues

- Eradicate Poverty, which is already a widely accepted goal to be retained from the MDG agenda. But its measurement in terms of income (based on PPP \$1.25 or \$2.00 per person/day) is grossly inadequate from human dignity point of view. Multidimensional poverty measurement should, therefore, be adopted.

- Hunger is now globally higher (about 925 million) than in the mid-1990s (about 780 million), although somewhat lower than a few years ago when hunger went up sharply in the aftermath of the global financial meltdown starting in 2008 and the following global recession. Also, nutritional deficits remain widespread, particularly among children and infants, even in countries that have achieved notable reduction in the poverty ratio. Hence, it is important that the Post-2015 Agenda include hunger and nutrition issues in terms of goals or targets, as may be agreed.
- Promote inclusive, Equitable and Participatory Social and Economic Development. This requires reorientation of economic and social policies and financial services. Particular emphasis needs to be given to the disadvantaged groups such as hardcore poor, ethnic minorities, disabled persons, people living in backward areas of a country, homeless children and adults, and women-headed poor households.
- Population Dynamics: the population size and its growth rate, unplanned urbanization, internal and external migration, ageing, and reproductive health are the key issues to be addressed here, which are important enough for inclusion as goals or targets in the Post-2015 Agenda.
 - ✓ In the context of intensifying climate change, which is already displacing significant numbers of people in climate vulnerable countries and the numbers will increase a great deal in future, migration has assumed a crucial dimension for many countries, including, for example, Bangladesh. External migration must, therefore, find a proper place in the Post-2015 Agenda.
 - ✓ Migration of workers is already an issue. They are often exploited by unscrupulous manpower agencies and agents; and in many cases, the migrant workers do not have access to ILO-sanctioned labour rights and fair remunerations. These issues clearly deserve serious attention in the Post-2015 Agenda.
- Climate Change Management is assuming increasing importance as climate change intensifies. Both mitigation and adaptation need to be emphasized. The vision of global warming of less than 2°C by end of the current century compared to the pre-industrial level must be respected and timely drastic cuts in the GHG emissions must be implemented, led by the developed countries.
 - ✓ The ongoing negotiations under UNFCCC for formulating a comprehensive legally binding agreement or agreement with legal force must be supported. It is imperative that decisions be taken by all the countries of the world on their mitigation ambitions without further dithering, on the basis of CBDR&RC, respecting the less than 2°C global warming vision. Unless the worsening of climate change is arrested and reversed while time remains, no affected country can go on adapting indefinitely as things keep worsening; moreover, the whole climate change process may become irreversible.
 - ✓ Adaptation is important for the countries already affected and likely to be affected more in future. This requires their adaptive capacity enhancement in terms of training, technology and financing. Developing countries, particularly LDCs, SIDS, and low-income countries need adequate international support in these regards. These issues are being addressed in the UNFCCC negotiations, but they merit recognition in the Post-2015 Agenda.
 - ✓ Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) is an important element in climate change management that helps reduce adverse impacts of natural disasters, which are increasing in frequency

and becoming more and more devastating as climate change intensifies. Hence, DRR needs be given due emphasis in the Post-2015 Agenda.

- Rules-based and Fair International Trade Regime is essential in order for the developing countries, particularly LDCs, SIDS and other low-income countries, to improve their self-reliance. As for the LDCs, all duty and quota free access of all their exportable products to the markets of developed countries strongly merit inclusion in the Post-2015 Agenda.
- ✓ Waiver has been awarded to LDCs in relation to Intellectual Property Rights (IPRs) obligations for another eight years, as agreed at WTO in June 2013. Further extension till 2030, the concluding year of the Post-2015 Agenda, should be flagged in the Agenda.
- ✓ Flexibilities in the Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPs) for other developing countries to allow them greater access to technology, knowledge, food security, access to health services, etc. deserve due attention.

- Inequality Reduction. This issue must be addressed at both national and international levels. Inclusive and equitable development is essential, but it does not touch the existing inequalities. In fact, its implementation will face difficulties unless steps are taken to reduce the current glaring inequalities (such as women, the hardcore poor, ethnic minorities, disabled groups, people living in backward and environmentally marginalized areas of particular countries).
- ✓ Nationally, each country must identify the specially disadvantaged groups, which are at the wrong end of the inequality metrics; and economic and social measures must be designed and implemented to address the disadvantages suffered by them so that social inequalities are reduced.
- ✓ At the international level, inequalities among nations can be addressed employing various means, including through redesigning and revamping of assistance flows, investment flows, technology transfer flows, and international decision-making processes in such a manner as to enable the poorer countries to improve their socio-economic conditions and international political clout. This is necessary for an equitable, inclusive, peaceful and sustainable world order.

- Job Creation deserves serious attention. In the present day world, this is a very important issue not only in the developing world and poorer countries; but also in developed countries, many of which are suffering from persistent high unemployment rates. Under the ongoing neo-liberal paradigm, market promotes the interests of the empowered and further weakens the prospects of the disadvantaged segments of the population. It is, therefore, very important that market reforms are implemented focusing on creating conditions for resource flows to those sectors of the economy in which people at large can engage themselves either by way of self employment or in wage employment. Such market reforms should find place in the Post-2015 Agenda.
- ✓ At the same time, measures need to be introduced facilitating (through training, institutional support, access to start-up capital, assisting migration internally and externally) youth employment for both girls and boys.

- Reforms of International Governance and Financial Architecture. The international decision-making and management of international institutions including Bretton Woods Institutions and Regional Development Banks are highly iniquitous as a result of direct voting rights of larger contributors or through political and other types of influence peddling by the international power structure.

Hence, for more equitable and sustainable world order, which is recognized to be beneficial to the humanity as a whole, it is essential that both international governance and financial architecture are reformed and remodeled to give proper voices to the voiceless nations. This issue is so important from the point of view of sustainable progress of the global society and international peace and security that it must find a proper place in the Post-2015 Agenda.

- **Means of Implementation of the Post-2015 Agenda.** The experience regarding means of implementation arising from the implementation of the traditional development partners-driven agenda of the MDGs is rather unsavoury. The MDG 8 was formulated in a rather wishy-washy manner; and very limited assistance, in fact, has been provided by the OECD countries for implementing the MDGs. Let alone funding of the implementation of the MDGs, even total official development assistance (ODA) has been stagnant or declined in certain years during 2000-2010; moreover, it has declined over the following two years consecutively. At the country level, the lukewarm or no support has obviously hampered progress in the implementation of the MDGs. Yet, notable progress has been achieved in respect of many key indicators by many countries in the Asia-Pacific and in other parts of the world, often mostly through national financing and efforts.

It is important to clearly define how the means of implementation will be mobilized for the Post-2015 Agenda. Although the Post-2015 Agenda is not going to be traditional development partners-driven, it needs to be supported by both the traditional and the emerging Southern aid providers, perhaps more in a strategic manner. But, an important role has to be played by the nationally mobilized financial and other resources.

More work is necessary to concretize the responsibilities of the above-mentioned three groups of stakeholders. Also, effective partnerships and coordination mechanisms for best possible utilization of the available resources for the most desirable purposes and well articulated mechanisms to measure, review and verify (MRV) the performance of each stakeholder need to be developed. In the past, commitments made have often not been kept—one usual example is the promise of ODA of 0.7% of the total GNI of the OECD countries, which, after 43 years since it was first agreed in 1970, has reached only 0.32%, although a few smaller countries have reached or exceeded the target.

In the adopted Post-2015 Agenda, concrete proposals in respect of the above mentioned and other related issues concerning means of implementation need to be offered with a view to improving the prospect of the best possible implementation of the Agenda.

Linking GPEDC to Post-2015 Agenda

The post-2015 Agenda is expected to be adopted by the UN General Assembly in its session towards the end of 2015. There is still some time to seek to influence the outcome through concerted efforts. The Asia-Pacific region can utilize the available time to try and influence the final outcome such that it includes key concerns of the region, particularly of the LDCs, SIDS, other low-income countries, and climate vulnerable countries. It is very likely that there are concerns in this region regarding which there will be convergence with other regions and members of certain groups, such as the LDC group, from other regions. It is important to seek those concerns out and work together with all the co-travellers in these

regards in pushing the inclusion of the issues in question in the Post-2015 Agenda so that their inclusion becomes that much more certain.

The GPEDC can make two kinds of contributions. Working with the regional countries, as it is doing in this conference, it can facilitate wider participation in the process of identifying the issues to be put forward by the region as a whole or by groups of countries of the region and help sharpen the background analyses and the formulation of the proposals to be taken forward. Secondly, the GPEDC should have an important role to play in the context of the implementation of the Post-2015 Agenda through supporting capacity building and resource mobilization activities in a format of collective efforts by groups of countries sub-regionally or across the region for mutual benefit. It can be an effective vehicle of promoting triangular cooperation in the region to help implement the Post-2015 Agenda for best possible results.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

This paper has briefly traced the evolution of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC). The concept used to be one of ‘aid effectiveness’ starting in Rome (HLF-1) in 2003, but in Busan (HLF-4) in December 2011 it was rightly replaced by ‘development effectiveness’ in keeping with the spirit of the expected development results to be obtained through partnerships. In this process, as was agreed in Paris (HLF-2) in 2005, the developing countries are in the driving seat in respect of their policies, strategies and development coordination and monitoring, while the OECD countries and multilateral agencies respect that position and provide aid and support, as per agreements between them and the partners (receivers of support).

A region of widely divergent contexts and perspectives, the Asia-Pacific is endowed with a wide range of complementarities for development cooperation to flourish among the developing countries of the region. There are also a number of countries in the region, which are emerging as Southern assistance and support providers, but mainly as partners in cooperation arrangements.

Developing countries of the Asia-Pacific region have, in fact, realized that they can mutually benefit by working together under cooperative arrangements. The traditional development partners can and are already facilitating and assisting in this cooperation building among interested developing countries of the region for effective development in the participating countries. This process has come to be known as triangular cooperation. The CDDE and the newly established GPEDC are emerging as important vehicles for promoting triangular cooperation for development effectiveness in the region. However, the process needs to be strengthened into a robust and equitable mechanism from the point of view of all parties, but with particular emphasis on the needs and perspectives of the disadvantaged countries and population groups.

The Asia-Pacific region has achieved notable results in respect of several targets under the MDGs. The progress has, however, been uneven across countries. Some countries such as Bangladesh have done particularly well.

Analyses of and experiences from the manner of the formulation of the MDGs and their implementation and the limitations of the MDG agenda in terms of not being based on a human being-centric framework and non-inclusion of certain key issues can usefully inform the process of the formulation of the Post-2015 Agenda. The UN Task Team and the HLP

have provided an initial structure to be built on. Ideas and proposals are pouring in from numerous stakeholders around the world. The expectation is that these and those generated within the UN will be properly coordinated and marshalled into an Agenda anchored on core values including human rights, human dignity, sustainability, inclusiveness, and equity and that the Agenda adopted will also address the key concerns of all groups of countries and all segments of the populations and will be acceptable and applicable to all countries.

This paper has highlighted some key issues from the perspective of the Asia-Pacific region for inclusion in Post-2015 Agenda. An agreed set of issues may emerge from discussions on these and other issues that may be proposed by the participants. Further work may be needed to generate more solid analytical backgrounds for the proposals to be taken forward. Here, the GPEDC can play a crucial role; and it will certainly have an important role to play in the region in the context of the implementation of the Post-2015 Agenda through effective triangular cooperation arrangements. In this context, the GPEDC will perhaps need to strengthen itself in terms of more effective governance, ways of working with emerging Southern assistance and support providing countries and other stakeholders, work programmes, and reach.

DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

Concept Note: “Asia Workshop on the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation: Links to the Post-2015 Development Agenda”, Economic Relations Division (ERD), Ministry of Finance, Government of Bangladesh, Dhaka, 25-27 August 2013.

Q K Ahmad, “A Review of the Report of the High Level Panel of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda, Appointed by the UN Secretary General (HLP)—*A New Global Partnership: Eradicate Poverty and Transform Economies through Sustainable Development*”, Palli Karma-Sahayak Foundation (PKSF), Dhaka, 20 July 2013 (unpublished).

Millennium Development Goals: Bangladesh Progress Report 2012, GED, Bangladesh Planning Commission, Government of Bangladesh, Dhaka, June 2013.

A New Global Partnership: Eradicate Poverty and Transform Economies through Sustainable Development, The Report of the High Level Eminent Persons on Post-2015 Development Agenda, United Nations, 30 May 2013.

“Regional Technical Meeting Summary of Development Cooperation: Asia-Pacific Perspectives—Regional Technical Meeting”, organized by CDDE, UNDP and Government of Indonesia, Bali, Indonesia, 22 March 2013.

Realizing the Future We Want for All: Report to the Secretary-General, UN Task Team on the Post-2015 UN Development Agenda, United Nations, New York, June 2012.

Accelerating Equitable Achievements of the MDGs: Closing Gaps in Health and Nutrition Outcomes, Asia-Pacific Regional MDG Report 2011-12, ESCAP, ADB, UNDP, Bangkok, February 2012.

Busan Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation, (HLF-4), Busan, South Korea, 1 December 2011.

Q K Ahmad, “Integration in South Asia: Moving Towards a South Asia Economic Union”, presented at a seminar organized by the South Asia Forum, New Delhi, 8-9 September 2011 (unpublished).

Accra Agenda for Action, (HLF-3), Accra, Ghana, 4 September 2008.

Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, (HLF-2), Paris, 2 March 2005.

Rome Declaration on Harmonization, (HLF-1), Rome, 24-25 February 2003.