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Abstract

This paper is an analysis of the post-2015 national consultation processes that took place in eighty-eight countries in the so-called 'global south', as part of a wider process of three different types of consultations. The main objective of these consultations was to discover and determine what the population believed should be the focus of the new development agenda, mainly the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), to come into picture once the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) expire in 2015.

The main approach this paper takes is aiming to understand the reasoning behind the determination of priorities for each country. For this, case studies were selected, based on the most common priorities and the socio-economic status on one hand for the first hypothesis and the processes on the other for the second hypothesis.
Resumen

La presente tesina es un análisis de los procesos de consultas nacionales post-2015 que se llevaron a cabo en ochenta y ocho países considerados como parte del ‘sur global’, como parte de un proceso más amplio que incluía tres diferentes tipos de consultas. El objetivo principal de estas consultas era descubrir y determinar qué es lo que la población consideraba que debía ser el enfoque de la nueva agenda de desarrollo, específicamente los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible (ODS), que entrarán a consideración una vez que los Objetivos de Desarrollo del Milenio (ODM) expiren en 2015.

El principal enfoque del trabajo es pretender entender el razonamiento detrás de la determinación de las prioridades de cada país. Para esto, casos de estudio fueron seleccionados, con base en las prioridades más comunes y el nivel socio-económico por un lado para la primera hipótesis y los procesos para la segunda.
Introduction

“Changing policies and policy making processes is a slow process and civil society’s impact on this process is often difficult to determine” (Curran 2005).

It is a well-known fact that modern day nation-states cannot function in isolation. Globalisation and cultural homogenisation have influenced and impacted all the areas of international cooperation, including development. The concept of ‘globalisation’ has been adopted by many governments to be added to their development discourse, as it is seen as an opportunity to promote growth and poverty alleviation or as an inevitable reality within which states have to act (Kelly 2000 in Willis 2005: 174).

But, as Cohen and Rai have recognised (200: 8), “[…] a global age needs global responses” (Willis 2005: 195), responses that need to be malleable and adaptable to local realities. The same sort of process can have different and varied impacts depending on the place it wants to be implemented and towards which groups of people (Willis 2005: 176). National-based development strategies in a globalising world are difficult to implement (Bjorn Hettne 1995 in Willis 2005: 183), and meaning that global development strategies need to be localised. The problem in classical development theory and strategies is that nation-states are not assigned enough importance (Schuurman 1993:10 in Willis 2005: 184).
In this context, the Millennium Declaration, adopted during the Millennium Summit of the United Nations (UN) in September 2000, stressed the need of a global agreement and cooperation towards developing countries (ESDN 2013). The basic commitment agreed upon was to achieve the reduction of extreme poverty and set out a deadline of 2015 (UN Millennium Development Goals). This document was the basis for a later one that became known as the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), consisting of 8 goals, 21 targets and 43 indicators. According to the MDGs Report 2014, several MDG targets have been met. Extreme poverty has been reduced by half, there have been results in the fight against malaria and tuberculosis, 2.3 billion people have now access to improved drinking water, all developing regions achieved or were close to achieving gender parity in primary education by 2012, women’s political participation has been constantly increasing and official development assistance (ODA) rebounded as well as developing countries’ debt burden remained low (MDGs Report 2014). Nevertheless, there are still targets and areas where more work needs to be done to be able to reach the goals, including environmental sustainability, world hunger, undernutrition, child and maternal mortality and sanitation.

But it is true that the goals that have been reached so far cannot be measured in a global and general way as they depend on local realities and regional environments. Additionally, the methodology for the adoption of the MDGs has been subject to criticism. Easterly (2009) considers that it was inconsistent and arbitrary, and Fukuda-Parr (2012) highlights the lack of broad consultation in their formulation.
Therefore, in order to widen the scope of action of the new development goals, to correct the MDGs’ deficiencies, and to include the civil society’s point of view, the UN came up with the idea of an inclusive process. It involved three different types of consultations. The first one was a national consultation process in 88 countries of the ‘global south’, with the goal of establishing what citizens wanted and what they considered were the most important topics to be included in the post-2015 development agenda. Additionally, multi-stake holder consultations in ‘developed’ countries took place, as well as 11 thematic consultations (World We Want, 2013). What will be discussed in this paper are the national consultation processes that took place in the ‘global south’. From the reports available it is clear that the priorities and interests the countries vary. The question arises as to why these differences in priorities and interests exist, which will be the focus of this dissertation.

**Literature review**

This literature review will cover a background on civil society involvement in the policy-making process, the forms of consultation processes with definitions, design, examples, advantages and disadvantages, and consultation processes in the international level.

**Background**
It is clear that in the policy-making process there are various actors involved. Amongst these actors civil society can be found, next to leaders, pressure groups, media and constituents, and the international community. Civil society has developed greatly in the past decade, expanding its size, scope and capacity, due to globalisation, telecommunications, economic integration and expansion of democracy (World Bank 2013). The World Bank (WB) has adopted a definition, based on what has been said by leading research centres, that considers civil society as “[…] the wide array of non-governmental and non-for-profit organizations that have a presence in public life, expressing the interests and values of their members or others, based on ethical, cultural, political, scientific, religious or philanthropic considerations” (2013). Therefore, the WB continues, this includes community groups, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), labour unions, indigenous groups, charitable organizations, faith-based organizations, professional associations and foundations (World Bank 2013).

It is also true that the term civil society has been used, abused and burdened with different meanings, which include political expectations, making it sometimes a shallow concept (Colás 2002: 176-177). Nevertheless, the influence that civil society has on the shaping of global and domestic public policy cannot and should not be diminished. A clear example is the World Social Forum (WSF) that is considered a global process of and by social movements, mass organisations, civil society, activists and advocated that happens every year in different continents with the goal of discussing global development issues (WFSM and World Bank). Meetings and reunions
of this sort usually end with conclusions and remarks that are taken to higher instances to have an influence on the policy-making processes.

**Consultation processes**

Deliberative civic engagement is one of the forms public participation can take. It involves citizens, policy makers and stakeholders devising solutions to public problems through inclusive discussions (Nabatchi 2012: 3), making it a participative process. It involves citizens, civil leaders and government officials coming together in public spaces to engage in constructive, informed and decisive dialogues about important public issues (Nabatchi 2012: 7). These deliberative processes can be designed in different ways, responding to its purpose, the convener, the deliberative methodology, the locus of action and/or the connection to the policy process (Nabatchi 2012: 4-5).

An example of deliberative civic engagement is the case of the City of Canada Bay Council in metropolitan Sydney in Australia. It was the first time in Australia that a local council used deliberative democracy to obtain citizen advice on key decisions regarding Council services, service levels and funding. They specifically used participatory budget, which typically gives citizens authority in relation to a component of the local government budget. But the Council included a mini-public using a deliberative approach, whose recommendations were developed through dialogue and deliberation (Thompson 2012).
Public participation is also found in consultation processes, which were designed to allow new ideas to be argued, tested, presented or dismissed to create new policies or to direct policy-makers. They are also used for promoting discussions around the topic on which the consultation is being done (Smith-Merry, Freeman and Sturdy 2009). It can be said that there are two types: community and national. The first ones, the community consultation processes, are usually conducted to improve the formulation and implementation of public policy, locally speaking, as they are usually of a small scale and target immediate issues. There are also the national consultation processes that have a wider scope and target to get a bigger picture of what the public wants.

The main aim and objective of consultation processes is to “[…] allow for the foregrounding of new policy ideas by both the government and the consultation ‘public’ in order to ‘answer’ a policy problem” (Smith-Merry, Freeman and Sturdy, 2009: 3). Therefore, with a basis on the results of the consultations processes, together with discourse policy documents, public responses and other events, policy should be efficiently, effectively and legitimately done.

In practice, for the implementation of participatory exercises, decision makers have a variety of motivations, but it is clear that if a variety of opinions are considered, better decisions will be taken, bringing citizens and institutions closer together (Monaghan 2007: 124 in Gudowsky and Bechtold
Additionally, by using community consultations, the process of policy formulation is democratized (Saward, 2001), making it more applicable as people become more related with it. Policy makers should adopt the usage of this consultation tool, as they cannot just ignore people’s interests and preferences. The consultations become forums in which superior policy outcomes can be generated (Crase, Dollery and Wallis 2005). Moreover, the use of public consultation processes raises legitimacy of policy decisions, improves its quality and produces greater efficacy (Holland, 2002). Ideally, as recognized by Munro-Clark, citizen participation generates improved social justice outcomes (1992).

The use of community consultations involves certain benefits. For Bellamy and Johnson (1997), the benefits are clearly five. First, active involvement of the people gives community ownership, which provides enhancement of the outcomes. Second, the results of the consultation end up being a coordinated decision of a community, at least at a first glance. Third, in the case of implicit economies of scale, a broad community approach is always preferred. Fourth, community consultations make people an integral part of any solution, enhancing its effectiveness for implementation. Finally, deciding to apply the national consultation processes fulfills citizens’ desire to be involved and gives the government a more legitimate policy.

In contrast, disadvantages of the use of citizen consultation have been identified. Irvin and Stansbury (2004) divided them into four categories. First, referring to the government and the process it can be time consuming, costly
and may backfire creating hostility. Second, talking about the outcome for the government, it can lose decision-making control. Third, on the citizens’ side, the process can be time consuming and pointless if the decision is ignored. Finally, the outcome for the citizens can lead to worse policy decisions if opposing interest groups heavily influence them.

Others have acknowledged the economic benefits of community consultations. Crase, Dollery and Wallis (2005) mention two main benefits. The first one is that it reduces the problem of information asymmetry as these consultations reveal information that would otherwise have been unavailable for the policy makers. Second, they recognize that a policy might have a better and wider acceptance if it is developed in a consultative way.

An equally important topic on consultation processes is the design. Usually governments use an initial production of policy documents followed by collection of responses from the general public. These aforementioned responses are collected at specific engagement events designed to promote discussions around the topic the consultation is being done on. This enables the governments to allow the emergence of new approaches to policy, including new voices and innovative ideas or approaches (Smith-Merry, Freeman and Sturdy, 2009).

Directly related to the design of the consultation process is the decision on who should be consulted. It might be argued that the consultations should target members of the general public of a specific community. But, due to the
need to represent minorities, it is clear that the consultations should have a special place for these groups (Catt and Murphy 2003: 408-409). Practically, due to resource limitations, time and money mainly, governments and organisations end up choosing whom to consult according to what they want or need to find, based on the requirements and context of each case.

**Consultations in the international level**

An interesting example on an international scope is the World Wide Views (WWV). This initiative was developed as an attempt to close the gap between citizens and policymakers, focusing on environmental issues. The Danish Board of Technology (DBT) in collaboration with the WWV Alliance, is a global network of partners that includes public councils, think tanks, parliamentary technology assessment institutions, non-governmental civil society organisations and universities. The first WWV and global citizen consultation took place in 2009, where 4000 citizens from 38 countries participated and gave their opinions on Global Warming. Its goal was to provide citizens with a voice for the 2009 UN Climate Summit in Copenhagen (COP15) “[…] by engaging them in a deliberative process about the global political positions on climate change” (Herriman, Atherton and Vecceilio, 2011). In this case, the process was started by Danish Government agencies, the DBT and the Danish Cultural Institute, which then instructed participating countries to use the same, standardized process (Herriman, Atherton and Vecceilio, 2011). The results of this consultation were summed up in a Policy Report including 9 recommendations, launched at the Danish Parliament on
November 17, 2009 (World Wide Views on Global Warming). The second consultation was done on Biodiversity with the participation of 3000 citizens in 25 countries in 2012. Similarly, a final report was done, “From the world’s citizens to the biodiversity policymakers”, published on October 2012 (World Wide Views on Biodiversity). They have two more consultations planned, one in 2015 on Climate and Energy and another in 2016 on Biodiversity again. At the moment, the coordinators are fundraising and mobilizing political support to be able to carry out the consultations they want to (World Wide Views).

There is a similar process that takes place in the international arena, specifically within the World Bank (WB) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF): the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs). These processes were introduced in 1999 as a framework to enhance domestic accountability for poverty reduction reform efforts, to enhance coordination of development assistance between governments and partners and as a precondition to access debt relief and concessional financing (World Bank). Every country that requires access to WB or IMF assistance has to prepare a PRSP every three to five years with a participatory process that involves different stakeholders and participants from society (World Bank). This dynamic made the PRSPs an innovative practice to tackle poverty as it meant new forms of participation and several consultation processes involving the civil society.

Since their introduction, PRSPs have been part of the agenda of around 70 low-income countries and various studies and papers have been published on the topic, mostly criticizing their ‘superficial nature’ (Curran,
McGee et al (2002) argue that the first round of PRSPs were poorly conceived, very narrow as only certain issues were discussed, exclusive because governments decided on who to consult and rushed as the processes were usually done without real planning. Despite the fact that the first round of PRSPs is seen as superficial ‘poverty diagnostic consultations’ that did not affect the policy choices, analyses have shown that the civil society mobilised actively around the PRSPs, in official or parallel processes (Curran, 2005). Specifically, Curran found that civil society organisations can influence policy in a variety of ways like raising public awareness or identifying problems and agenda setting necessities. Additionally, PRPSs are clearly a policy process of political nature, reflected in the fact that certain groups were excluded from the processes and powerful civil society organisations took control of the meetings (Curran, 2005). The result of the consultation process was also determined by the topics that were discussed. A final but not less relevant influence is the international-external agenda, as PRSPs are considered a donor driven initiative that advocates policy reforms (Curran, 2005). Therefore, despite small drawbacks, civil society was able to engage actively in the policy process during the first round of PRSPs (Curran, 2005).

Studies have focused on specific PRSPs from countries. In 2004, Hamilton focused on Georgia, describing the process of forming the Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Programme (EDPRP). The EDPRP went through three different phases: a unilaterally developed interim PRSP, the publication of discussion materials and a debate of these. She found that the government played a central role throughout, concentrating the decision-
making process in the EDPRP Secretariat, finding problematic cross-governmental cooperation and a marginal role of elected bodies such as Parliament and local councils (Hamilton, 2004). Additionally, civil society was actively involved and played a decisive role in the reformulation of the discussion materials or issues. Finally, Hamilton concludes that Georgia’s EDPRP was shaped by norms of governance, broadening participation, political capital of poverty and the role of the donors (2004).

Others have chosen comparative analysis as a tool to explain PRSPs. Piron and Evans argue that the formulation of PRSPs cannot be considered merely technical as they interact with institutional constraints, formal aspects of the political system the country has and historical background (Piron and Evans, 2004: 10). Moreover, they found that PRSPs would differ depending on the country and the historical moment they are being done in (Piron and Evans, 2004: 34). In a broader study of PRSPs it was found that policies and practices related to poverty are determined politically in poor, highly indebted and prosperous countries (ODI, 2001). Also, they argue that PRSPs are based on the idea that if governments are obliged to discuss poverty with their citizens then they will actually take the issue seriously (ODI, 2001).

The main difference between the process done by the WWV and the PRSPs is the reason for which they are developed. The WWV were and will be done to influence policy makers in the decisions they take regarding topics that affect global citizens. On the other hand, the PRSPs are a requirement to access financial assistance from the IMF and the WB, based on what the
citizens believe they need. Regardless of this basic difference, the process lead by WWV and the PRSPs are valid examples of public consultations that have an influence on the international arena.

A recent consultation process on the international level is the one designed to complement the initiatives already taken by Secretary General (SG) Ban-Ki Moon towards a post-2015 development agenda. Besides the UN System Task Team (Development Policy and Analysis Division), the High Level Panel of eminent persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda (HLP) and the appointment of Amina J. Mohammed as his Special Advisor on the topic (Department of Public Information 2012), something was missing. Therefore, the consultation processes for the post-2015 development agenda were created, making them of three types: eighty-eight national consultations in the South, multi-stake holder consultations in 'developed' countries and eleven thematic consultations (World We Want, 2013). The UN also put up a global survey (MY World Survey) on people’s priorities for the future, identifying sixteen development issues, where respondents selected their top six, anonymously (Bergh et al, 2014: 2).

It is clear that the idea behind the consultation processes is having a different background than the one the MDGs have. Before the Millennium Declaration several summits lead up the establishment of a set of goals, like the International World Summit for Children in New York in 1990, the International Conference on Population and Development in Cairo in 1994, the Fourth Conference on Women in Beijing in 1995 (Saith 2006: 1169).
Additionally, in 1996, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development came up with the International Development Goals (IDGs) through the report *Shaping the 21st Century: The Contribution of Development Co-operation*, citing, amongst others, the 1990 Jomtien conference on education, the 1992 in Rio on environment, the 1992 in Vienna on human rights and the 1995 in Copenhagen on social development (Saith, 2006: 1170). But what was the actual process that led to the publication of the eight MDGs by the UN Secretariat in August 2001. Ideally, goals should have been devised by governments, as part as an open debate to express the will of the citizens of developing countries. In reality, a working committee was put together from a range of UN bodies, including the WB, the IMF, UNICEF, the Population Fund, the WHO and the OECD (Peeters, 2010). As Manning (2009) points out in June and July 2001, under the chairmanship of Michael Doyle from the UN SG’s Office, a group of staff from the UN Agencies mentioned above agreed on a set of goals that highlighted the key commitments from the Millennium Declaration. This resulted in a framework of 8 Goals, 18 Targets and 48 Indicators, which became the authoritative statement of the MDGs, despite the fact that this list, per se, was never endorsed by the GA, as is well pointed out by Manning (2009).

Therefore, it can be argued that one of the main flaws and weaknesses that the MDGs have is the lack of participation in its determination process, which can be considered as a drawback and a source of resentment for many governments of developing countries (Melamed 2012: 7). That is one of the reasons the post-2015 consultation processes took place. The idea is that the
views of people and governments are considered and taken into account when determining the next steps for the global development agenda, when establishing what shall be done once the MDGs expire.

**Research Design**

**Background**

As mentioned before, the UN organised consultation processes to have as a basis for the determination of the post-2015 development agenda. I will be focusing on the eighty-eight national consultations that took place in the “global south”. Each country was required to present a final report to the UN, based on a specific format, not always used, detailing process, partners, stakeholders and results. These reports can be found in “The World We Want 2015” web page, specifically the “National Consultations” on [http://www.worldwewant2015.org/sitemap#national](http://www.worldwewant2015.org/sitemap#national). The consultations were organised by the UNCTs and the local governments, with assistance from civil society partners. Each country designed their consultations according to what they considered most appropriate, focusing on certain stakeholders and constituencies, aiming to engage commonly excluded groups (National Consultations).

The results of the consultations were compacted in one report *A Million Voices: The World We Want, A Sustainable Future with Dignity For All* presented to the UN GA in September 2013. This report summarized the
priorities and concerns of the population, of about a million people worldwide. The construction of a general report made sense for ease of understanding, but it left aside the differences countries had, in process and results.

**Research question**

The research question chosen is ‘why do countries that participated in the global south post-2015 national consultation processes have different number one priorities for the post-2015 development agenda?’ For a clear explanation and response, two different analyses will be done, based on two different proposed hypotheses, using the available reports presented by the participant countries as case studies.

**Hypotheses**

The first proposed hypothesis is that the socio-economic status of a specific country has an influence on their number one priority. This was tested by comparing the UNDP Human Development Index (HDI) and specific indexes depending on the priority, from the UNDP and the WB, once countries had been grouped according priority.

The second hypothesis is related to the process each country adopted for the consultations, that the process and methodologies used by participant countries influence the determination of their priorities. For testing this hypothesis, clear identification of the specific processes chosen was required.
Methodology

Qualitative positivist research methods were used as they are the most appropriate to identify and analyse intangible factors like social norms, socio-economic status, gender roles and others (Mack et al, 2005: 1). They also provide flexibility in the data to be collected and its use, therefore, as the reports were already done, qualitative methods were considered ideal. Additionally, qualitative methods are more targeted to explore the phenomena per se, like the processes used for the consultations, making them ideal for what this paper proposes.

Specifically, comparative case studies were used as an approach for this research, based on the fact that it would facilitate the understanding of the phenomena behind the priority setting of each of the participant countries. Additionally, case studies are used when there question to be answered is a how or why question about a contemporary set of events over which the investigator has little or no control (Yin,1994: 9). Moreover, case studies have the strength that they enable the researcher to study the phenomenon in its context, which is a valuable way of analysing the world and the post-2015 national consultations (Rowley, 2002: 18).

It is worth recognising that quantitative methods were also considered for the purposes of this paper, but were ruled out due to time and data limitations, as the available information was not enough to be able to conduct statistical tests such as regression models.
The process followed for getting the information required started with reading all the available reports, recognising priorities and processes chosen by each country. I grouped the countries according to the priorities they had, all those with education as a number one priority were one group. Those with health as a number one priority were placed in a different group so on. After this, using, the UNDP Human Development Report from 2013[1], I included the Human Development Index (HDI) level each country had and the ranking they were at, for an easier recognition of the socio-economic status each country had. All the aforementioned data was put together in an Excel table that was colour-coded depending on the priority (Annex 1).

For the first hypothesis, the three most common priorities between the countries, education, poverty and employment, were taken aside in individual tables, were the HDI levels and rank were included. Next to them, specific indexes, from the UNDP and the WB, were added for the comparison of socio-economic status and level of the chosen priority (Annex 2).

For the second hypothesis, once the types of processes were identified based on the reports available on the World We Want 2015 webpage, specific cases were chosen using purposive sampling, basing the decision on a typical or most common case, and two other different ones, to be able to compare and contrast the results and the way the actors involved play a role or not, specifically one that involved the local UNCT and one or several Ministries, one that commissioned the consultation to a different entity and one that commissioned the consultation to a different entity and one that

---

[1] The 2013 report was used because it was the current one when I started working on this dissertation, despite the fact that a new report was presented on July 24th, 2014.
formed a special committee or commission for the purpose of the consultations. Triangulation was used in this second hypothesis, as evidence from different sources was used (Rowley, 2002: 23), as emails were sent to the UN representatives of the countries whose reports were analysed to understand the reasoning behind the methodology chosen and additional official information was used to gain insight on the logic of the processes.

**Importance and contribution**

The need of a participative and inclusive process to reach a global agreement had never been really used before the post-2015 consultation processes. This fact makes it a phenomenon worthy of study. It is also important for the field to understand the reason behind the establishment of the different priorities found in the reports presented by the participant countries. This study can be considered as a first step towards a better understanding on how the decisions regarding the post-2015 development agenda were shaped.

Moreover, the current research has the prospect of becoming a basis for deeper and further studies regarding the same topic, especially once the post-2015 development agenda is settled.

Furthermore, it needs to be considered that there might be policy implications for when the actual agenda is determined, as my research can provide a better insight to how priorities vary and this might be useful for the
establishment of indicators and goals, when understanding how domestic policies and priorities turn global.

**Limitations**

It has to be taken into account the fact that there should be eighty-eight reports available on the World We Want 2015 webpage, but even if the link to the country exists, not all countries have a final report uploaded. There is only information on eighty-two countries: twenty-seven from Africa, seventeen from Asia-Pacific, sixteen from Latin America and the Caribbean, nine from Arab States and thirteen from Easter Europe and from the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). From these eighty-two reports, there are only seventy-three reports uploaded, from which five are draft or pre-final and are considered as final. Additionally, there are two unclear reports and one report that has the access link to it broken.

Furthermore, it needs to be taken into account the fact that the research is based on existent reports, done according to each country’s own methodology, which is not necessarily clearly explained in the available reports. This limits the research, as it is an external factor that cannot be controlled.

**Validity and reliability**
The validity and reliability of this paper should not be contested by the fact that it focuses on case studies, regardless of the way they were chosen. The goal of choosing case studies as an approach is not to show a generalizable view of the phenomenon, but to explain what happened in the specifically chosen cases, to attempt to answer a question or test a hypothesis. It could be considered as a limitation, but in reality generalization is not the goal of every study.

I believe that any other researcher would be able to replicate the research and reach similar or the same conclusions, due to the fact that the data is clearly explained and detailed, giving reliability to the paper.

**Case studies**

**Hypothesis 1: Relevance of socio-economic status**

Firstly, I will test the hypothesis that the socio-economic status of a country affects to the determination of their priorities chosen during their consultation processes. For this, I obtained each country’s priority by reading their reports, then compared it to their Human Development Index (HDI), their rank in the HDI and specific values related to the priority they have. Countries with the same priority were grouped and the chosen cases were the ones that with the highest repetition.
**Education: seventeen countries**

Education is the number one priority for Brazil, Cambodia, Colombia, Ecuador, El Salvador, Jordan, Liberia, Morocco, Peru, Saint Lucia, Solomon Islands, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Yemen and Zambia. From these, ten have medium HDI levels (Brazil, Cambodia, Colombia, Ecuador, El Salvador, Jordan, Peru, Saint Lucia, Thailand and Turkmenistan), three have low HDI levels (Morocco, Solomon Islands, Tajikistan) and the remaining four have very low HDI levels (Liberia, Uganda, Yemen and Zambia). Their ranks range from 77 (Peru) to 174 (Liberia), showing a wide scope of countries that consider education as their number one priority. To determine a relation between HDI and education I chose to use the percentage of population with at least secondary education from Table 8 of the UNDP HDI data and the mean years of schooling, which refers to the “[a]verage number of years of education received by people ages 25 and older, converted from education attainment levels using official durations of each level” (Dataset). From this data it can be concluded that in most of the countries that consider education as their priority for the post-2015 development agenda, less than 50% of their population have at least secondary education and the general mean of years of schooling between the seventeen is 6.7 years. There are exceptions, like Jordan with a 73.3% of population with at least secondary education and 8.6 as mean years of schooling or Tajikistan with 89.7% of their population with at least secondary education and 9.8 years of schooling as a mean. Nevertheless, the recurring characteristic shared by the countries that put education as their number one priority is that they are still in the process of achieving a higher percentage of
population with at least secondary education and reaching at least ten years of schooling, what is considered as basic education.

From the data collected it is clear that the countries that chose education as a priority have medium to low levels of education, which explains their priority determination. This fact could mean that because they have not reached high HDI levels, they consider education as an important milestone towards reaching higher levels of development, considering the percentage of their population that have at least secondary education and the mean years of schooling.

**Poverty: eleven countries**

Poverty was considered the number one priority in Angola, China, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Ghana, Grenada, India, Mozambique, Philippines Rwanda and Senegal. From this group, Grenada has high HDI levels, China and Philippines have medium HDI levels, Angola, Ghana, India and Senegal have low HDI levels, and Djibouti, Ethiopia, Mozambique and Rwanda have very low HDI levels. Additionally, they rank from sixty-three (Grenada) to one hundred and eighty five (Mozambique) in the HDI rank. On what it refers to specific poverty indicators, the Multidimensional poverty index (MPI) from the HDI of the UNDP was ideal as it measures “[...] multiple deprivations at the individual level in health, education and standard of living” (FAQs MPI), focusing on the percentage of a
country’s population in MPI, and the Poverty headcount ratio at $1.25 a day from the WB, the percentage of population living on less than $1.25 a day at 2005 international prices (WB Data), which refers to extreme poverty. Both the MPI and the $1.25 per day line are globally comparable measures of poverty, which makes them ideal for the purposes of the comparison required for the study. According to the research done, the percentage of population in MPI that the studied countries have show different realities. There is a wide difference between them: China has 12.5% of its population in MPI, whereas Ethiopia has 87.3% of its population in MPI, being those lowest and highest percentages. Similarly, the percentage of population that is living at $1.25 a day shows a smaller difference but nevertheless a considerable one as well, having China with a 11.8% and Rwanda with a 63.2%, lowest and highest values respectively.

Countries that chose poverty as a priority have different percentages of population in MPI poverty and living with less $1.25 a day, therefore a direct relation between the socio-economic status and the priority cannot be determined as there are no similarities in the socio-economic status of the countries referring to poverty.

**Employment: eight countries**

In the analysis of the reports, it was found that eight countries considered work or access to it as their priority. These countries are Algeria,
Armenia, Bolivia, Jamaica, Kyrgyzstan, Montenegro, Serbia and Tanzania. From this group of countries, two of them have high HDI levels, Montenegro and Serbia, four have medium levels, Algeria, Armenia, Bolivia and Jamaica and two have low levels, Kyrgyzstan and Tanzania. Their ranks go from fifty-two (Montenegro) to one hundred and fifty-two (Tanzania), showing a big difference between the countries. The data chosen to compare is from the UNDP and from the WB. The first is the employment to population ratio, from Table 9 Social Integration, which refers to the proportion of a country’s population that is employed. The second one, the data from the WB is the total unemployment percentage, which refers “to the share of the labour force that is without work but available for and seeking employment” (DataBank WB). These two rates were chosen because they complement each other appropriately and by mixing them a clearer picture of the country’s socio-economic status regarding work will be obtained. The reality of the eight countries that consider work as their number one priority varies. There is the case of Algeria that has a 43.9% of its population employed and registers a 10% of total unemployment, according to the latest data available. Another similar case is Armenia that registers 47.3% of its population as employed and has a 28.6% of total unemployment rates. On the other side of the employment rates, Tanzania has an 84.2% of their population employed and only a 4.3% of total unemployment. A similar situation is registered in Bolivia where data shows that 77.4% of the population is employed and they have 3.4% of total unemployment.
With this background, it can be said that levels of employment and unemployment do not have a relation with the fact that countries considered it a number one priority for the post-2015 development agenda, regardless of their HDI levels and rank, as it is clear that low levels of employment are not a common denominator in the cases of the countries studied.

**Hypothesis 2: Relevance of the process undertaken**

To test the hypothesis that the process has an influence of the priority, three different cases will be analysed. These cases were chosen because they represent the different types of processes that were used amongst the seventy countries whose reports were available on “The World We Want 2015” webpage.

The national consultation processes mainly involved the UNCT, under leadership of the UN Resident Coordination, the UN Agencies with presence in each country, governments, civil society, private sector, media, universities and think tanks. In each country specific case, the consultations were designed considering the necessity to involve generally excluded groups, mixing different methodologies and approaches. (National Consultations)

The reports examined are from countries that presented the most common process, the UNCT with local Ministries and NGOs, another from a country that commissioned the process to another entity and one that formed a special commission or committee for the purposes of the consultations.
**Ecuador**

*The process*

Besides the UN Country Team (UNCT), the Ministry of Coordination of Heritage (MCP) coordinated the Ecuadorian national consultation process on the Post-2015 Development Agenda, as it was deemed the most appropriate one given that the MCP led the country’s preparation for the Rio + 20 Conference. Additionally, the Vice-Presidency of the Republic and the Ministry of Justice, Human Rights and Cults cooperated and led the consultation process to include certain population groups that would have been hard to get to without their help, including people with disabilities and persons deprived of their liberty. Different UN Agencies were also part of the process, including Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), International Organization for Migration (IOM), International Labour Organization (ILO), Pan American Health Organization (PAHO), World Health Organization (WHO), United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women), Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), United Nations Volunteers (UNV) and the World Food Programme (WFP). The civil society was involved through the National Work Group of Volunteers (MNV), Foundation of Volunteers for Social Assistance in Ecuador (VASE), Foundation for Children and the Community
(FUNDIC), the National Federation of CSOs, Foundation for the Advancement of Reforms and Opportunities (Grupo FARO), Ecuadorian Centre for Environmental Law (CEDA) and the Foundation or the Future of Latin America (FFLA). Professors from Latin American Faculty of Social Sciences (FLACSO), Institute of National Advanced Studies (IAEN), Pontifical Catholic University of Ecuador (PUCE), Simon Bolivar Andean University (UASB), Equatorial Technological University (UTE), Universidad San Francisco de Quito (USFQ) and the Program on Population and Sustainable Local Development, (PYDLOS) from University of Cuenca represented Academia. Finally, the private sector was involved through the Ecuadorian Consortium for Social Responsibility (CERES) and the National Network of the Global Compact in Ecuador.

The consultation process targeted specific population groups such as childhood, youth, women, indigenous peoples, Afro-Ecuadorians, migrants, persons with disabilities, LGBTI community and multi-sectorial actors and persons deprived of their liberty. Additionally, the MCP and the UNCT also sought for opinions from additional groups, including trade unions, CSOs, academia, private sector, armed forces, public servants, local authorities, multi-sectorial groups and the general public. In most cases, the methodology known as Metaplan query, of distributing cards to the participants to respond guiding questions was used. Additional methodologies were used, like participatory workshops, surveys, working groups, focal groups, radio program broadcasts, video and audio recordings, individual interviews and public events.
The process in Ecuador took place between November 2012 and May 2013, period in which 3674 people participated in 75\(^2\) consultations in 15 of the 24 provinces. According to the results of these consultations, the number one priority is quality education for all, followed by quality, integral and intercultural health care, decent and dignified work, food security and nutrition and environment.

**Analysis**

The Ministry of Coordination of Heritage (MCP) was created by Executive Decree N° 117-A, article 1, of February 15\(^{th}\) 2007 published on the Official Registry N° 33 of March 5\(^{th}\), 2007. According to the Decree, the competences of the Ministry were to arrange and coordinate the policies and actions that the Ministries of Culture, Sports, Environment, Tourism, Education and Health adopt in the area of intangible capital. Additionally, the National Institute of Heritage, the Galapagos National Institute, the National Secretary of Water, the Secretary of the Peoples, Social Movements and Citizen participation were included into the list of entities the MCP had to coordinate. In the same line, the Organic Statute of Organizational Management Process of the MCP determined that the Ministry’s mission was to “propose, coordinate, arrange and monitor public policies and sectorial, inter-sectorial and institutional actions referring to natural and cultural

heritage, according to the guidelines of Good Living (Buen Vivir) and of a plurinational and intercultural State”.

Due to political and administrative decisions, the MCP was suppressed by Executive Decree N° 1507 of 23rd May 2013, published on the Supplement of the Official Registry N° 960, article 1. The Ministry of Coordination of Strategic Sectors, the Ministry of Coordination of Knowledge and Human Talent and by the Ministry of Coordination of Social Development acquired its competences, depending on the area, environment, culture and sports. It was a great challenge for the process, but as it was nearly completed, it did not affect it greatly.

The Vice-presidency, as one of the organs of the Executive Branch according to article 141 of the Ecuadorian Constitution of 2008, is the coordinating entity in charge of the change of the productive matrix and the Disabilities Technical Secretariat. Specifically, its mission is to “lead, coordinate, monitor, control and evaluate the formulation and execution of policies, plans, programmes, projects and inter-sectorial actions corresponding to the strategic sectors, to the basic industries and productive areas oriented to the change of the productive matrix; and, the coordination and control of the Disabilities Technical Secretariat” (La Vicepresidencia). Regardless of the change of Vice-president, the objectives and mission of the entity have remained the same.
The Ministry of Justice and Human Rights was created by Executive Decree No. 748 of November 14th 2007 and was published in the Official Registry Supplement No. 220 of November 27th 2007. Later, by Executive Decree No. 410 published in the Official Registry No. 235 of July 14th 2010 its name was changed to Ministry of Justice, Human Rights and Cults, which is the current one. According the Organic Statute of Organizational Management Process of the Ministry, its main mission is to “ensure access to timely, independent and quality justice, promote social peace, the full observance of human rights, the regulation and promotion of freedom of religion, belief and conscience, the improvement of the rehabilitation and social reintegration of persons deprived of their liberty, integral development of adolescent offenders or in conflict with criminal law, through norms, policies, programmes, projects and activities in coordination with the decentralized territorial unites and related institutions”.

These three institutions were part of the consultation process that took place in Ecuador. As mentioned earlier, the MCP coordinated the process and the Vice-presidency and the Ministry of Justice, Human Rights and Cults made reaching certain interest groups viable. The reason behind the determination of these entities for the consultations is not clear. As expressed above in the description of the process, the MCP was chosen because it had already coordinated Ecuador’s position for the Rio + 20 Conference. Not being able to find official documents nor journalistic reports on the reason why this relation was done, I contacted UNDP representatives in Ecuador. They mentioned that due to the direct link between the Rio + 20 topics and the
Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), it was deemed convenient that the same institutional actor took the lead in the process. Following the same idea, the Vice-presidency was in charge of the consultations with people with disabilities, due to the fact that they manage a specific programme targeted to that traditionally excluded group. Additionally, considering that the Ministry of Justice, Human Rights and Cults manages the prison system in Ecuador, they were put in charge of the consultations with people deprived of their liberty, due to their ease of access.

It is clear that the reason of the diversity of groups included in the consultations was to have a varied range of points of view. Considering the prioritized groups like children, youth, women, indigenous people, afro-Ecuadorians, migrants, persons with disabilities, LGBTI communities, multi-sectorial actors and persons deprived of their freedom; and additional groups such as unions, CSOs, academia, private sector, agricultural sector, armed forces, public servants, local and national authorities, joint consultative committees and general public, made the consultation more openly inclusive to avoid leaving important views aside.

Regarding the methodologies used, they were all deemed appropriate to achieve the final goal: getting the population’s thoughts and insights on what the post-2015 development agenda should include.

From the information provided, it is not possible to establish a direct link between the process, actors, and methodologies used in the consultation
processes and the priority determined, education. Despite the fact that the MCP was in charge of arranging and coordinating policies and actions of the Ministry of Education, it wasn’t the only one as other Ministries were included, therefore a direct influence from the Ministry in the framing of the questions or the way the consultations were conducted is not recognizable, when referring to the objectives of the MCP and the information available.

The determination of education as their number one priority can be more related to a general change in perceptions in the population and in the various policies the government has been adopting, as part the general change proposed in the Constitution of 2008 and the National Plan for Good Living.

**Tanzania**

**The process**

The Tanzanian process was co-led by the Government of Tanzania through the Ministry of Finance and the President’s Office Planning Commission (POPC) and the UNDP and the UNEP CTs (Brief Interim Report). In October 2012 the POPC commissioned the consultative processes for officials from the central government, the private sector and high learning and research institutions in Mainland Tanzania to the Department of Economics (DoE) of the University of Dar es Salaam. The POPC also commissioned the Economic and Social Research Foundation (ESRF) to coordinate and oversee the stakeholder’s process, covering five major
components: the local government authorities, CSOs, elders, youth, women and children. In turn, ESRF commissioned another firm, Children’s Dignity Forum (CDF) to oversee the workshops for elderly, youth, women and children (Brief Interim Report).

To ensure inclusion and parity, in the invitations sent to the ministries and higher and research institutions, they included a specification that they should send two officials, one male and one female. Furthermore, accountability was achieved by ensuring that the participants had access to the relevant information used in the consultations for feedback and influence analysis.

The consultations followed a structure in which they started with a presentation on the MDGs, afterwards shorter presentations were given in every workshop to force discussion. These presentations were then followed by plenary discussions and views were prepared to be tabled in the plenary the following day.

According ESRF’s report, the process they handled involved three layers of consultation. The first one “at the grassroots level in seven zones covering all regions in the Mainland, with vulnerable groups such as women, elderly and youth” (National Synthesis Report). The second layer were the consultations that were done with the private sector, higher learning and research institutions and public sector officials. It is worth mentioning that
parallel consultations were held by youth groups such as the United Nations Associate and the Youth United Nations Association.

With this background, the priorities determined by Tanzania were production and economic transformation with an emphasis on employment-generating growth, quality of social services, management of natural resources, social protection and social security, peace and security, human rights and governance, improving implementation effectiveness, institutional capacities and greater national ownership of the development agenda.

Analysis

The University of Dar es Salaam (UDSM) is considered the oldest and biggest public university in Tanzania. It was created in 1961 as an affiliate college of the University of London. In 1963, it became an affiliate of the University of East Africa (UEA). When the UEA split into three independent universities, it was officially created as University of Dar es Salaam on July 1st 1970 by Parliament Act No. 12 of 1970 (University of Dar es Salaam, 2014). According to the Ranking Web of Universities, it is ranked as 31st in Africa and 2319 in the World (Webometrics). Its Department of Economics (DoE) is one of the 10 departments of the College of Social Sciences. The DoE has two research centres, the Environment for Development and the Centre for Economic Policy and Research (Research). Additionally, the DoE has two collaborative projects, the African Economic Research Consortium and the Economic and Social Research Foundation (Collaborative Projects).
The Economic and Social Research Foundation (ESRF), as a collaborative project of the DoE, was also part of the process. It was created in 1994 as an independent and not-for-profit research and policy analysis institution (Introduction). It was created because a need and demand for a better understanding of policy options and development management was identified and ESRF was meant to fill that gap (Introduction).

A reason or explanation for the commissioning of the consultation process was found neither on the official documentation available, nor on the webpages belonging to the UDSM nor the ESRF. To be able to have a better explanation, I contacted the person that was in charge of the process, Mr. Amarakoon Bandara, via e-mail. He kindly responded that the logic behind involving both the UDSM and ESRF was that the government already that memorandums of understanding (MOUs) with them in undertaking similar work, therefore it decided to task the two institutions to undertake the consultations countrywide.

It is worth mentioning, though, that the Government of Tanzania, through the Ministry of Finance and the President’s Office Planning Commission and the UNCT did not leave the process aside, but they co-led it (National Consultation), leaving he logistics of the actual implementation to the University and the ESRF.
As what it refers to the consultation process and the methods used, the descriptions provided do not make it clear if there was any kind of influence from the DoE or the ESRF towards the format or framing of the questions presented to participants.

But it is impossible to miss the connection that the number one priority established “production and economic transformation” has with the nature of the entities involved. Both the Department of Economics of the University of Dar es Salaam and the Economic and Social Research Foundation have an economic purpose and background. Even if it is not possible to point out any influence, I consider it to be present.

Indonesia

The process

The Office of the United Nations Resident Coordinator (RC Office), on behalf of the UN Country Team (UNCT) in Indonesia, worked closely with the Government of Indonesia (GoI), who formed a National Commission on the Post-2015 Development Agenda under an agency called UKP4 (President’s Delivery Unit for Development Monitoring and Oversight). Additionally, UN agencies with representation in Indonesia and CSOs cooperated in the process. Vital partnerships for the process were done with the Badan Rehabilitasi dan Rekonstruksi Institute, the Friends of the Earth Indonesia, Leo Burnett, Partnership for Governance Reform, the Radio Republik
Indonesia, UNESCO Indonesia, Pulse Lab Jakarta, UNIC Indonesia, UNIDO, UNMC, UNFPA and UNV.

During all the consultations, the GoI was capable of engaging representatives of the Public and Private Sectors, Civil Society, Youth and Academia. Additionally, the UN Development Group (UNDG) requested complimentary consultations that were done by the Indonesia UNCT. These complimentary consultations focused on three main development themes, environmental sustainability, conflict and fragility, and inequalities, which were discussed in three one-day multi-stakeholder dialogues. Moreover, individual UN agencies organized several other meetings and consultations.

The participants that took part in the consultation process in the three dialogues were identified by asking UN agencies and CSO partners to provide a list of recommended participants taking into consideration gender, geographical area, community group and that they represented a group or organisation. The process took place between November 2012 and May 2013. The first consultation focused on Environmental Sustainability, the second on Inequalities, and the third on Conflict and Fragility. These consultations targeted environmental groups, women, farmers and fishermen, youth, labour, indigenous people, children, local and international NGOs, universities, private and public sectors. These were conducted through dialogues, workshops and through World Café Model. A separate Youth Consultation led by UNESCO was also done targeting mainly Youth Leaders, later complemented by the UNFPA Road to Bali Youth Roadshow.
Additionally, UNIDO conducted its own three-day post-2015 in-country consultation with the public sector, the private sector and academia. Finally, MY World Surveys took place in Indonesia from March to May 2013, for which Leo Burnett advertising agency created a “mobi-site” for easy access from basic smartphones.

It is worth mentioning that Indonesia considered relevant to include an analysis of twitter messages that were related to the post-2015 development topics, to complement the national consultations and thematic meetings.

With the previously described process, the UNCT found repeated requests for greater government economic protection for domestic goods and producers to protect small and/or traditional industries, reducing or renegotiating the Free Trade Agreements (FTAs). Other recurring themes found by the UNCT were greater government control of natural resources, access to affordable clean energy, inclusion of sexual and reproductive health education in the national education curriculum, disability support and prioritization of Good Governance.

Analysis

For the process to take place, the GoI decided to create a National Commission on the Post-2015 Development Agenda under the UKP4 (Unit Kerja Presiden Bidang Pengawasan dan Pengendalian Pembangunan), which is the President’s Delivery Unit for Development, Monitoring and Oversight. The UKP4, according to article 3 of Regulation 54/2009, has the task of
“assisting the President in the exercise of supervision and control of construction so as to achieve national development objectives with full settlement”³ (UKP-PPP Overview). In general, the work of the UKP4 is a cycle that starts with implementation, follows with reporting, then monitoring and verification and finally the Council Cabinet as a checkpoint⁴ (National Development).

Despite being able to find this information on the UKP4, there is no information available regarding the background for the conformation and/or creation neither of the Commission nor on its members. Due to this reason, I contacted Natasha Ardiani via e-mail to understand it. As President Yudhoyono was appointed as one of the Co-Chairs of the High-Level Panel of Eminent Persons on Post-2015 Development Agenda (HLPEP), he issued Presidential Decree No. 29/2012 in which he created the National Committee on Post-MDGs Post-2015 Development Agenda, to help him formulate the national positions he would take on to the HLPEP, based on experts’ and stakeholders’ inputs. After this, I understand that it made sense to continue with the same Committee to deal with the consultation processes, together with the UN-led one. Regarding the complimentary consultations done by the UNCT, there isn’t specific information either.

³ Unofficial translation of the information available in UKP-PPP’s official website
⁴ ibid.
It is clear that both the GoI and the UNCT aimed for inclusion when deciding whom to include in the consultation processes, as can be seen in the report and the above summary.

Similarly to the previously analysed cases, the information available is not enough to determine the existence of a clear influence of the specifically created National Commission in the result of a priority of greater government economic protection for domestic goods and producers to protect small and/or traditional industries, reducing or renegotiating the Free Trade Agreements (FTAs). There could be a case depending on what the specific policies Indonesia was dealing with at the time and what the position of the President and other government officials on the topic was, but that would be a topic for a completely independent and different study.

**Conclusions - Findings**

**Socio-economic status**

According to the previous data, it can be said that the socio-economic status of a determined country does not necessarily have an influence on what a country’s priorities for the post-2015 development agenda are. In the case of education there is a minor relation between the HDI levels and the levels of secondary education and mean years of schooling due to the fact that in the countries where education was a priority they mostly registered medium to low levels of education. But, in the other two cases, regarding
poverty and employment, it is not possible to determine a clear relation between the HDI levels and the acquired levels of employment and in the reduction of poverty. In the case of poverty because the percentages of population in MPI and living with less than $1.25 a day are not similar in any way to be able to establish a pattern and, therefore, a relation with socio-economic status. In the case of employment, the levels of employment are different, hence, no direct relation with the HDI levels and rank of the countries can be done.

**Process**

Based on the information available, it is not possible to establish if and how the processes adopted by the countries participant in the consultation influenced or determined in any way the outcomes, the determination of their priorities. The difference in process adopted by each country and the fact that they are external processes that cannot be completely analysed nor controlled make a deeper and more accurate analysis impossible. In the specific cases analysed, it is not possible to establish a real connection between the process and the actors involved in the process and the actual results, the determination of their priorities. In the Ecuadorian case, having the MCP, the Vice-presidency and the Ministry of Justice, Human Rights and Cults involved in the process did not really have an observable relation with education being their number one priority, regardless the fact that the MCP coordinated policies and actions of the Ministry of Education. For Tanzania, a certain level of relation between the priority of production and economic transformation and
the institutions involved, the DoE of the UDSM and the ESRF, due to the topics they deal with. Nevertheless, this relation cannot be proved from the information and data available at the moment, but the minimum relation is worth pointing out. Finally, in the Indonesian case, the creation of a National Commission tasked to deal specifically with the Post-2015 Development Agenda had no evident influence in the establishment of greater government economic protection for domestic goods and producers as their top priority, it cannot be determined with the information available.

**What next?**

From the research done and explained above, it is clear that there are many factors that determined each country’s priority. Therefore, a deeper study should be done to try to determine the clear reasons why the aforementioned countries chose the priorities they did, because from what has been done, the socio-economic status of a country based on their HDI levels is not directly linkable to the priorities chosen. Neither is the process, at least from what can be drawn from the reports available.

Other aspects, such as the actual parties that were involved, the political situation of the country and even policies that are being implemented or debated at the time the consultations took place should be considered to have a better picture of the reasons behind the priorities. This should be, obviously, done with more research, having special consideration on the aforementioned topics and also could focus on interviewing officials of local
governments and the UN that participated in the processes to get their insights and appreciations of the processes for a better understanding of them all. Doing so would be ideal to have a strong background for any policy changes that want to be implemented.

It is true that in the end these results on their own show little, but prove the importance that public participation has for the UN and it should have for local governments as well.
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### Annex 1

#### Country, HDI, priority and process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>HDI</th>
<th>HDI Ranking</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>no report on webpage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>no info at all in webpage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d'Ivoire</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>no report on webpage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>0.519</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>no report on webpage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao PDR</td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>no info at all in webpage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>0.702</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*unclear report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sao Tome and Principe</td>
<td>0.525</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*unclear report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>0.629</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>no report on webpage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>0.715</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>no report on webpage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suriname</td>
<td>0.684</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>no info at all in webpage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>no report on webpage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>link to report broken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>not clear in report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>0.632</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Citizenship and social cohesion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cuban non-governmental organisations with consultative status in the ECOSOC, individuals and groups associated with UNHCR (including academic and educational centres), organs of the Central Administration of the State, social organisations (like the Workers Central)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>0.581</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Development Model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>United Nations Country Team, Secretariat of Planning and Programming of the Guatemalan Presidency (Segeplan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The General Secretary of the Republic of Brazil and the national movement &quot;Nós Podemos&quot;, which comprises of representatives of the public and private sectors and the organized civil society for the implementation of the MDGs in Brazil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Involved work from the UN (UNFPA, UNDP, UNIDO, UNAIDS, UNV, UNHABITAT, UNICEF), CSOs (UN Youth Advisory Panel compromising representatives from: Khmer Youth Association; Youth Council of Cambodia, People Health Development Association, Culture and Environment Prevention Association, National MSM Network, Cambodia Indigenous Youth Association), Private Sector (Cambodian Chambers of Commerce) and the Government (National Committee for Sub-national Democratic Development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>From the National Government of Ecuador, the Ministry of Coordination of Heritage, coordinator of the process, with the cooperation of the Vice-Presidency of the Republic and the Ministry of Justice and Human Rights. Additionally, U.N. Agencies (FAO, OHCHR, IOM, ILO, PAHO/WHO, UN Women, UNAIDS, UNDP, UNESCO, UNICEF, VNU, WFP), CSOs (MNV, VASE Foundation, FUNDIC, National Federation of CSOs, Grupo FARO, CEDA and FFLA), Academia (FLACSO, UTE, ESPE and PYDLOS), and Private Sector (CERES and the National Network of the Global Compact in Ecuador).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>UN Country Team, with the aid of the Vice-ministry of Development Cooperation, the Technical Secretariat of the Presidency and other sectorial institutions and CSOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td><em>draft report</em> - consultations initiated by the UN Task Team and through the UNSG High Level Panel where the President of Liberia, Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf, co-chairs the HLP. It has also hosted CSO and Disability Rights African regional and Liberian national consultations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Ministry of General Affairs and Governance (MAGG), Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation (MAEC) + UN Agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>0.591</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>UN country team + Government Counterpart: Ministry of Development and Social Inclusion (MIDIS). The process also included an Advisory Committee: Peruvian Agency for International Cooperation (APCI), Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA), National Institute of Statistics and Informatics (INEI), National Center for Strategic Planning (CEPLAN) National Assembly of Regional Governments (ANGR), National Confederation of Private Business (CONFIEP), Roundtable for Poverty Reduction (MCLCP), National Agreement (NA). The Civil Society was involved through the National Association of Centers (ANC) leader of the global process &quot;Beyond 2015&quot; in Peru + local, regional and national organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td><em>draft report</em> - Community conversations, discussions on national Radio, and engagement on various social media platforms facilitated the dialogue. consultations were facilitated by the Department of Planning and National Development in the Ministry of Finance, Economic Affairs, National Planning and Social Security. Support to the process was provided by an Advisory Committee which comprised actors of diverse sectors and backgrounds from government, civil society, and regional development partners as a measure to build ownership and facilitate follow-up to the recommendations coming out of the.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Lucia</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Lead Consultant was engaged to undertake the consultations and was supported by the Advisory Committee, the local UNDP Programme Officer, and the UNDP/UNST in the Caribbean.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>0.622</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkmenistan</td>
<td>0.698</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>0.458</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Tajikistan national consultations were organized by the United Nations (UN) System and involved the bulk of the UN Agencies, Programmes and Funds in the country and establishment of a special ad hoc Task Force. UNICEF was assigned by the UN Resident Coordinator to lead the process in close collaboration with the Office of the UN Resident Coordinator. All consultations included the participation of one or more UN Agency Resident Representatives (Resident Coordinator’s Office, UNDP, UNICEF, WHO, ILO, WFP and UNHCR).

The UNCT developed a two-prong strategy aimed at ensuring an inclusive consultation process, through targeted consultation of identified marginalised groups, and promoting a wide response to the MYWorld survey. The UN contracted the Chulalongkorn University Social Research Institute (CUSRI). All this was done through group discussions, surveys, townhall meetings.

A high-level UN–Turkmenistan Joint Task Group was established to oversee and guide the country consultation process (members of the Joint Group included all heads of UN agencies resident in Turkmenistan, deputy ministers of relevant line ministries, chairs of state commissions and selected NGOs, chaired by Vepa Hajiev, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs).

The consultations in Uganda are informed by Vision 2040 which outlines where Uganda wants to be in the next 30 years, the Rio+20 process through which Uganda concretized her position on the global development framework, and the experience and knowledge acquired during implementation of the MDGs.

Ministry of Public Health and Population (MoPHP), Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation (MoPIC), Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs (MoLSA), Ministry of Technical Education & Vocational Training (MoTEVT), Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific research (MoHE) + The Federation of Yemen Chambers of Commerce and Industry (FYCCI) + Yemen Youth Observatory + The Children’s Parliament in Yemen + Democracy School + SOUL for Education + Yemeni Confederation of Labor Unions (YCLU) + Yemen National Dialogue Conference members + In cooperation with a third party company and Yemen 21st Century Forum of Yemen Times (Y21F), partnerships are being explored with four mobile operators and one landline operator for outreach to encourage participation in the My World Survey.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>GDPPPC</th>
<th>marker</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>Education (*quality with life skills)</td>
<td>Consultations were facilitated by the UN Country Team (UNCT) in Zambia, through the UN Communications Group and the Resident Coordinator’s Office. The UNCT worked in collaboration with two main CSO partners - the Civil Society MDG Campaign and the Zambia Climate Change Network, to organize the dialogues in districts and provinces. UN Agencies’ staff engaged in these local level and national dialogues. The UNCT also partnered with various print and electronic media to extend reach, and this was particularly so through the radio and TV coverage that continues. Popular Zambian artists, student leaders and Zambia’s First Lady, an advocate for MDG and Post-2015 dialogue campaign, came on board advocating for people’s participation in the dialogue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Education and employment</td>
<td>The process was a joint commitment between the Government of Solomon Islands, represented by the Ministry of Development, Planning and Aid Coordination (MDPAC), the Office of the Prime Minister and in country United Nations Agencies led by UNDP. A Taskforce (United National Local Task Force) was established to provide overall guidance and support for the post 2015 national consultations. This taskforce consisted of the Secretary to the Prime Minister and the Permanent Secretary of MDPAC, UN agency representatives (UNDP, UNICEF, UN Women, WHO) and an NGO representative. A Senior National Consultant was contracted to support the implementation of the consultations both at the national level and provinces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>0.719</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>The process of National Dialogues was led by the UN Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator, with support from UNHABITAT, UN Women, UN AIDS, UNDP, UNFPA and UNV. There was also special support from the Presidential Agency for Cooperation, the Directorate of Economic, Social and Environmental Affairs of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. An unique working group was set up between the National Government, the UN System in Colombia and CSOs. The government team, lead by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, had the participation and support of the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development, the Presidential Agency for Cooperation (APC) and the National Agency for the Erradication of Extreme Poverty (ANSPE).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>UNICEF, UNWOMEN, ILO and UNDP + UNCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>0.471</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>*draft report - A National Working Group, coordinated by the office of the UN Resident Coordinator, was formed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>0.722</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>The consultation meetings were led by the Office of the UN Resident Coordinator with the full-time engagement of a UNV National Coordinator recruited for this purpose. In addition to the resident agencies, a non-resident agency, UNWomen, also contributed to the process. A group of consultants were contracted to draft the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>0.617</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>The consultations in Viet Nam on the post-2015 agenda took place with women, men, young people and children from eight target groups. Each group was selected by the UN in Viet Nam on the basis that they do not usually have a voice in formal consultation processes. UN agencies were appointed for each target group and these agencies were responsible for organizing the consultations, selecting partners and participants and choosing the methods of consultation. Many partnered with civil society, academia and/or professional association networks to reach the target groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>0.538</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>equity and support for vulnerable people</td>
<td>The national consultations in Bhutan were conducted with technical and financial support of the UN System in Bhutan in partnership with the GNH Commission Secretariat and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Royal Government of Bhutan (RGoB), and in consultation with the Secretariat for the New Development Paradigm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>governance</td>
<td>The DRC Government through the Ministry of Planning and monitoring of implementation of the Revolution of Modernity four major phases containing several activities have been defined to drive the post in 2015 consultations in the DRC (pp. 3-6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>0.418</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>governance</td>
<td>The Government of Malawi and the United Nations, commissioned DEVCAS, a local consulting firm, to undertake national consultations with the objective of stimulating an inclusive, bottom-up and participatory debate on a post-2015 development agenda. The consultations took place both at the National and District levels, targeting central Government decision makers, Parliamentarians, Political Parties, CSOs, private sector representatives, local Government Authorities, traditional Leaders, CBOs, FBOs, women, youths, children, people with disabilities, people living with HIV and AIDS, the elderly, orphans, divorced and widowed women, and other vulnerable groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>governance</td>
<td>The consultation processes were done by the UN System in Mali, and help from Canada, Denmark, the EU, the French Agency for Development, the Netherlands, Swiss Cooperation, BAD, German Cooperation, Handicap International, Water Aid, Care Mali, Red Cross Mali, Islamic Relief, Civil society and private sector. The consulations were organised in six dialogue frameworks: civil society, private sector, government and local groups, disabled and vulnerable groups, women and youth and adolescents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>governance</td>
<td>Agencies of the UN Country Team, including UNDP, UNICEF, ILO, UN Women, IOM; Moldovan diaspora organizations; Independent think-tank EXPERT-GRUP – consultation process implementing team [use of SMS and social media as basis]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>0.466</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Partnership between the UN and the Institute of National Affairs, as endorsed by the Prime Minister’s Department and Department of National Planning. It focused on giving an opportunity to the vulnerable and marginalised groups in PNG to raise their concerns, aspirations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Page No</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>0.459</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>The consultation processes were a joint effort between the UN System in Togo and the local Government. In total, more than 70 groups took part in the debates (women, men, labor, youth, children, executives of departments government, policy makers, traditional leaders, NGOs, CSOs, people with disabilities, artisans, the media, political parties, employers, and elderly).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>UNDP, in partnership with the federal ministry of Planning and Kurdistan region ministry of Planning, conducted three participatory workshops. + 58 citizens from the Central region (Anbar, Babil, Baghdad, Diyala, Kerbala, najaf, qadissiya, salahhaddin and Wassit), represented civil society, academia, private sector, and the public sector + 64 citizens from the northern region (Duhok, erbil, sulaymaniyah, Kirkuk and ninewah), representing civil society, academia, private sector, and the public sector gathered for a one-day consultation in erbil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>0.436</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>The consultation process was conducted under the leadership of the Government of Benin with the support of the United Nations Development Programme. These national consultations were also held in many towns and departments at the level of central government and institutions, academics/researchers, among others. Two thematic consultations were also held on the topics of “Infrastructure” and “Youth and Employment”. The process involved mainly direct consultation through discussion forums, focus groups, and small workshops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>0.343</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>The process of national consultations to define the development agenda post-2015 was conducted under the supervision of a technical committee composed of officials from the Ministry of Economy and Finance (MEF) and the United Nations System ( SNU), with support from the Centre for the Study of Literature and Social and Economic Research (CEDAR). The technical committee has assured the programming stages of the national consultation, the mobilization of development at central and local level and supervision of field activities as well as ongoing consultations with the editorial team. CEDRES has been responsible for driving the process of national consultation with multidisciplinary teams of researchers. The various field activities were supported and / or supervised by senior United Nations System and the General Directorate of Economy and Planning (DGPE), + An ambassador was chosen to accompany the process of national consultations. This is the General Marc Tiémoko Garango, Former Minister of Economy and Finance and the Prime Ombudsman Faso. (pp. 7 y ss)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>0.773</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>National UN System, the Ministry of Planning of Costa Rica and multiple partners (UN Country Team and Technical Team). The National Post 2015 Consultation conducted in Costa Rica involved over 600 people, who participated in workshops, focus groups and interviews. It mainly targeted groups who live in the greatest conditions of exclusion and vulnerability in the country (indigenous people, migrants, refugees, GLTBI groups, persons with disabilities, people who live in poverty stricken communities, afro-descendents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>0.683</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>The process was led by the Ministry of Economy, Employment and Sustainable Development with the support of UND. They organised a meeting of national experts who raised the first reflection of the vision the country on the international development agenda post-2015. Additionally, an inclusive consultation with governments, civil society, trade unions, actors of Education and Higher Education, women’s movements, youth, people with disabilities and local development actors was done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td>0.439</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Government of The Gambia, UNCT, The Association of NGOs in The Gambia (TANGO), National Assembly members, the University of The Gambia, trade and student unions, professional associations and bodies, research bodies, federations and associations especially for the marginalized, the Private sector, Regional Governors; Community Leaders, Women and Youth Groups, and the media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td>0.576</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>inclusive dialogue</td>
<td>The consultation on post 2015-MDG in Timor-Leste was conducted in good collaboration between the Government of Timor-Leste through Ministry of Finance with the United Nations Agencies in Timor-Leste.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>0.734</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>inclusive growth</td>
<td>*pre-final report UNDP + ILO, Ministry of Labour, UN Global Compact Local Network, Confederation of Trade Unions, National Confederation of Employers/Entrepreneurs + Academy of Public Administration + The State Committee for Family, Women and Children’s Affairs (SCFWCA), IOM. UNHCR + State Committee for IDPs and Refugees, national and international NGOs. UNICEF + Ministry of Youth and Sports, local and International NGOs and Youth Centres. IOM + National counterparts, NGOs, journalists, UNDPI, RC’s office. WHO + UN agencies, WB, USAID, Public Health and Reform Centre + CCM, UNAIDS, National AIDS Centre, partners, UN Agencies, Centre for Hygiene and Epidemiology, Scientific research institute of Lung diseases, MoH. UNFPA + the Ombudsman’s office, IOM, diplomatic corps, development partners, civil society. FAO + Ministry of Agriculture, partners, Journalists Government. WB + Ganja State University, local authorities, think tanks, CSOs, business associations, and entrepreneurs. UN DPI + National NGO (Centre for Economic Sustainable Development), RC’s Office, national NGOs, researchers, bloggers + National NGO (Women’s Association for Rational Development), RC’s Office, social media, students studying journalism, national NGOs focusing on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>0.515</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Inclusive growth</td>
<td>no clearly defined process in the final report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>0.414</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>Inclusive growth</td>
<td>State level consultation workshops were attended by a total of 773 participants representing different stakeholders including government, UN agencies, academia, CSOs, NGOs, community leaders, media, IDPs, legislators and civic union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>The National Consultations on a Post-2015 UN Development Agenda was coordinated by the National Coordination Committee (NCC) on the Millennium Development Goals, under the chairmanship of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Regional Integration and International Trade and in collaboration with the Office of the United Nations Resident Coordinator. The NCC comprises representatives of the Public and Private Sectors and the Civil Society. In view of time constraints, the NCC opted for a methodology that focused on surveys, a youth dialogue and dedicated workshops. These processes were complementary. (pp. 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>The Government of Niger, through the Ministry of Planning, Spatial Planning and Community Development Agency and the UN Country Team, through its agencies, conducted the consultation process. Additionally, the Ministry of Youth, Sports and Culture, the Ministry of Population, Promotion of Women and Protection of children, the Ministry of Interior, Public Security and Religious Affairs and the National Youth Council participated in the process. Finally, CSOs and the private sector were also involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>opportunity</td>
<td>Mainly, Kosovo’s administration and the UN Country Team took part in the consultations. Specifically, the Office of the Prime Minister, the Heads of the Parliamentary Groups, Kosovo’s Parliamentary Women’s Caucus and participating Ministries, municipal authorities, education and health professionals of Dragash/Dragaš, Gjakovë/Djakovica, Gjilan/Gnilane, Rahovec/Orahovac, Peje/Peç and Mitrovicë/Mitrovica, the Network of RAE Women’s Organizations, Civikos, the Kosovo Chamber of Commerce, the University of Pristina, PEN, the Kosovo Women’s Network, shelters for survivors of gender-based violence (GBV), staff members from the UN Kosovo Team including UNDP, UNICEF and the Innovations Lab Kosovo, UNWOMEN, UNHCR,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

81
WHO, UNFPA and UNV were involved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Poverty</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>0.508</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>The National Consultation of Angola was prepared from the bottom up, starting from queries from sectorial groups that generated information and reports that were the basis for the National Consultation Workshop, by the UNCT and the present agencies. These consultations were held in various fora simultaneously. The workshops done involved the National Assembly, the Government, youth and children, civil society and private sector groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>0.699</td>
<td>101</td>
<td><em>draft report</em> - The consultation process was organised by forums. The first one was co-hosted by the United Nations Association of China (UNA-China) and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) China, and co-organized by the Foreign Affairs Office of the People's Government of Yunnan Province. This first forum included participants from the central government, local government and community groups. The second forum was co-hosted by the United Nations Association of China (UNA-China) and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) China, and undertaken by the China Wisdom Engineering Foundation. It involved participation from community groups, enterprises and research institutes, 10 central government ministries; and China offices of 14 international organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>0.445</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>The consultation process was led by the UNCT in Djibouti with support from Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation, international experts, Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries, prefects, regional council members, Ministry of Economics and Finances, National Commission on Human Rights, Ministry of Water and Energy and the Prime Minister office. It was done with members of municipal councils (local officials) of Djibouti city, members of Regional Councils (local officials) A, Youth Group of Djibouti -town, group Women of Djibouti city, representatives of the Private Sector, Researchers and University Professors, Students and Student of the University of Djibouti, associations and national and international NGOs, a sample of the vulnerable urban population living in outskirts of Djibouti (Balbala). Additionally there were interviews with government Officials and Journalists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>0.396</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>0.558</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>0.554</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First, a national taskforce, comprised of the Government, UN Country Team, the private sector and Civil Society Organizations was established to providing strategic guidance on the process of the consultations. The National Taskforce comprises the Ethiopian Government, represented by the Ministry of Finance and Economic Development (MoFED); UN Country Team (UNCT); the private sector, represented by the Ethiopian Chamber of Commerce and Sectoral Associations (ECCSA); civil society organizations, represented by the Consortium of Christian Relief and Development Association (CCRDA) and Poverty Action Network Ethiopia (PANE). The consultation process was led by the Ministry of Finance and Economic Development and the UN Country Team. 

Participants for all the consultations were mobilized by Federal and Regional governments, private sector represented by the Ethiopian Chamber of Commerce and Sectoral Associations (ECCSA), and CSOs represented by PANE and CCRDA.

The UN system in Ghana and the National Development Planning Commission (NDPC) are the collaborating agencies conducting the national consultations. The process included a two-day stakeholder consultation to solicit views of the poor and marginalized in the three Northern Regions of Ghana, Focus Group Discussions in 15 deprived and marginalized communities across the country, vigorous media and online activities such as Television and Radio programs, Facebook and renting of mobile text codes, and a one-day workshop was also held for different categories of professional groups.

The consultations were led by the United Nations Resident Coordinator and attended by the Ministry of External Affairs. It included constituency-based consultations with Government officials, civil society, industry, trade union, farmer’s union, women’s associations, research institute, youth.

The UN representation (UNCT) in Mozambique coordinated the process. Civil Society Organizations were inquired, including CSOs networks, platforms, forums, Media, Social and Vulnerable Groups representing Women, Youth, Children, elderly people, people with disabilities, organizations and Private Sector companies, members of Parliament, academic institutions and professional associations. Government Institutions were consulted through meetings and official documentation reviews. There were efforts of ensuring regional representation, having been selected one province in the south and another in north (south Maputo and Nampula in the north) and two provinces in the central region (Sofala and Tete).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>0.654</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>0.434</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>0.629</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>protectionism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The UN system in the Philippines and the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA) launched a series of consultations leading to a position on what constitutes a framework for the country’s post-2015 development agenda. The sectors consulted were National Government, Civil Society (i.e., NGO, Women, Home Owners’ Association, Cooperatives, CSO Network, Children, Farmers, Peasant, Overseas Migrants, Multisectoral, Population and development, Environment and Sustainable Development), Academia, Local Government, Private Sector, Youth and Donors.

The partners that were part of the process were MINECOFIN, MINALOC, RGB, MINEDUC, MYICT, MIGEPROF, NWC, NYC, IPAR, GIRL HUB, AVEGA, EDUCAT. The stakeholders were Government agencies, Social Groups and the General Population, Government agencies and Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), Youth and Women in selected districts, School going children and adolescents, and National level Government officials.

A partnership between the Ministry of Economy and Finance, representing the National Party and the United Nations representing the UN system took place for the purposes of the consultation. National and regional consultations were conducted through the organization of focus groups in five regions and at the national level, conduct a targeted investigation and organization of electronic voting.

There were plenary sessions, supplemented with group/breakout sessions. Within the breakout sessions, participants were afforded the opportunity to develop ideas and strategies that would assist Grenada in developing a national agenda for economic growth and overall sustainable development. Persons were allowed to select the thematic area they wanted to address, thus allowing greater participation based on a genuine interest and/or desire to contribute to the enrichment of that developmental area. After the breakout sessions, reports were delivered in plenary.

To administer and implement activities in Indonesia, they formed a National Commission on the Post-2015 Development Agenda under an agency called UKP4 (President’s Delivery Unit for Development Monitoring and Oversight). All 22 UN agencies that have representation in Indonesia cooperated in the process, as well as several CSOs. During the process, representatives of the Public and Private Sectors, Civil Society, Youth and Academia were engaged.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>0.702</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>The partners that were part of the process were, withing the SNU (United Nations Development Programme, (UNDP), Territorial Articulation Programme (TAP) of UNDP, United Nations Volunteers (UNV its acronyms in the English language), United Nations Women, United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), International Labor Organization (ILO), World Food Programme (WFP), United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (UNOHCHR), International Organization for Migrations (IOM), Pan-American Health Org. / World Health Org. (PAO/WHO), United Nations Educational/Scientific and Cultural Org. (UNESCO), Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS)) and the Government (Ministry of Economy, Planning and Development (MEPyD) of Dominican Republic, specifically the following Departments: General Department of Multilateral Cooperation (DIGECOOM), General Department of Economic and Social Development (DGEDES), General Department of Planning and Territorial Development (DGODT)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>0.662</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>The overall coordination of the process resided on the UN Resident Coordinator, these consultations were led by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Egypt Country Office in collaboration with the UN agencies working in Egypt, and in partnership with the Ministries of Planning and International Cooperation (MOPIC), and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>0.742</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>The Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) was the Lead Government focal point for UN in Iran. The Department of Environment (DOE) was designated by MFA as UNDP Counterpart for Country Consultations (CCs) Finally, within the DOE, the Centre for International Affairs &amp; Convention and the Directorate of Sustainable Development &amp; Environmental Economics took care of the process. The main stakeholders were Provincial Directorates, the Ministry of Interior (MoI), the Ministry of Sports and Youth (MSY), CSOs, Academia and Postgraduate students, private sector, public sector, youth and development experts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>0.745</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>The UN system worked closely with a broad range of partners, including the civil society, the academia, the private sector, the media, and the Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>0.713</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>The process was based on the recommendations of the UNDG, under the coordination of the Country Team, consisting of heads of UN agencies resident in Algeria. The local central government was part of the process through a stable contribution under the coordination of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) and from the sectoral ministries and national institutions. The main stakeholders involved were the civil society organisations, unions representatives, representatives of private sector, representatives of scientific and academic community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>0.729</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>The consultation process was facilitated by the International Center for Human Development (ICHD), jointly with the RA Ministry of Territorial Administration, with the support of the United Nations, under the general supervision of the United Nations Population Fund. The discussions were held in a unique Town Hall Meeting format which utilized scenario based discussions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>The process was done through a close coordination between the Ministry of Development Planning and the United Nations System in Bolivia. It was agreed to carry out a characterization of the inequality in the country, as well as making a query to a series of focus groups among the groups of greater social exclusion. Participants of the consultations highly vulnerable indigenous peoples, African descent, sexual and gender diversity, children and adolescents, homeless and teenage mothers, sex workers, domestic workers, women victims of violence, persons with special needs in health care, adolescents and older adults deprived of freedom, people living with HIV, adolescents and adult women in rural communities with high rates of emigration and population of the poorest areas of major capital cities and intermediate cities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>The UN System in Montenegro has, in cooperation with numerous national partners, created a wide communication platform with the aim of collecting citizens’ opinions and ideas on development priorities for the period beyond 2015. Among these are: Parliamentary Committee for Gender Equality, Chamber of Commerce of Montenegro, Red Cross Montenegro, Union of Employers of Montenegro, Institute of Public Health, Agency for Electronic Media, TV stations: Prva, TVCG, Vijesti, Atlas, Pink Montenegro, NTV Montena, MBC, University Donja Gorica, University Mediterranean, Civil society representatives: Digitalizuj.Me, Center for Children Rights, Ozon, Green Piva, SOS Niksic, Center for Democratic Transition – CDT, Center for development of NGOs - CRNVO, SOS Phone Niksic, Natura, Legal Center, Civic Alliance, German NGO HELP, Expeditio; Web-portals: cdm.me, portalanalitika.me, vijesti.me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>The Consultations were designed and implemented by the UN Country Team in Serbia with a prevailing One UN spirit throughout the process. External expert support was provided by the SeConS Development Initiative Group. An Inter- Agency Task Force, led by the Resident Coordinator Office (RCO), and UNDP, was established to facilitate this joint activity. It included the following resident UN agencies: ILO, IOM, OHCHR, UN Women, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNICEF, UNODC, UNOPS, WHO, WB), as well as the following non-resident ones: UNCTAD, UNEP, UNESCO, FAO, UN-Habitat, UNIDO, UNWTO. The Serbian Government took part in this process through the Post-2015 Advisory Board that was nominated to oversee and endorse overall activity. In reality, UNDAF National Steering Committee members (Serbian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Serbian European Union Integration Office) were given the additional task of overseeing the Post-2015 National Consultations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>0.476</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>The Department of Economics (DoE) of the University of Dar es Salaam was commissioned to coordinate the consultative processes for post 2015 development agenda for the following clusters of stakeholders: officials from the central government; the private sector; and higher learning and research institutions in Mainland Tanzania, of which this report is the outcome. Further to this, DoE has carried out a review of the national processes that can be related to the post 2015 development agenda.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>United Nations in Jamaica partnered with the Sir Arthur Lewis Institute of Social and Economic Studies (SALISES) at the University of the West Indies to engage Jamaican stakeholders in a consultation process between March and May 2013 on their priorities for the post 2015 agenda.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>0.622</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>UNCT set up a Thematic Working Group (TWG) composed by representative of UN agencies. The national government was part of the process in the very start and the National Institute for Strategic Studies (NISS) was part for data collection to facilitate process validation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 2

### Socio-economic status tables

#### Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>HDI</th>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>% POPULATION WITH AT LEAST SECONDARY EDUCATION (Table 8)</th>
<th>2012 MEAN YEARS OF SCHOOLING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>0.719</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>0.591</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Lucia</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>0.622</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkmenistan</td>
<td>0.698</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>0.458</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* means a lack of information due to data constraints faced by UNDP

Sources:

Table 8: Education (from the HDI)
https://data.undp.org/dataset/Table-8-Education/mvtz-nsye

Mean years of schooling (of adults) (in years)
https://data.undp.org/dataset/Mean-years-of-schooling-of-adults-years-/m67k-vi5c
## Poverty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>HDI</th>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>Population in MPI (%) 2012</th>
<th>Poverty headcount ratio at $1.25 a day (PPP) (% of population)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>0.508</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43.4 (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>0.699</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>11.8 (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>0.445</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>0.396</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>30.7 (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>0.558</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>28.6 (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>0.554</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>32.7 (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>59.6 (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>0.654</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>18.4 (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>0.434</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63.2 (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>29.6 (2011)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*- means a lack of information due to data constraints faced by UNDP and WB

Sources:

MPI: Multidimensional poverty index (%)
https://data.undp.org/dataset/MPI-Multidimensional-poverty-index-/746y-qwam

World Bank DataBank: Poverty headcount ratio at $1.25 a day (PPP) (% of population)
http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SI.POV.DDAY
**Work**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>HDI</th>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>2011 EMPLOYMENT TO POPULATION RATIO</th>
<th>TOTAL UNEMPLOYMENT %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>0.713</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>10.0 (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>0.729</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>28.6 (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>3.4 (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>12.7 (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>0.622</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>8.2 (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19.7 (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19.2 (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>0.476</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>4.3 (2006)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*- means a lack of information due to data constraints faced by UNDP

**Sources**

Total unemployment %

Table 9: Social Integration
Employment to population ratio
https://data.undp.org/dataset/Table-9-Social-integration/n9mf-gwye