1
End Poverty in All Its Forms Everywhere

Introduction

United Nations adopted the Millennium Declaration comprising the Millenium Development Goals (MDGs) as an outcome of deliberations in the United Nations Millennium Summit on 8 September 2000. It gave a new vision to the global efforts on development over the next 15 years. The Report of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development held in Rio-de-Janeiro, Brazil in June 2012 (also known as Rio+20) called "The Future We Want" paved the way for formal consultations on post-2015 development agenda in the form of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) based on three dimensions of development, namely, economic, social and environmental. SDGs are viewed as extensions of MDGs with sustainability parameter added to each MDG to be implemented in the post-2015 era along with a set of all new goals which were ignored in the MDGs.

The SDGs are a set of 17 specific goals offering special focus on important areas related to sustainable development that require urgent and extensive attention at present and in the near future. The SDG framework undertakes to provide systematic solutions to the obstacles identified in case of the MDGs like inequality, sustainability, institutional resourcefulness, implementation efficacy, environmental deterioration, etc., (UN 2014a). In this context, this paper attempts to explore the strengths and weaknesses of one specific MDG, namely, MDG 1 related to poverty eradication in context of India. Further the paper endeavours to identify the remaining gaps in fulfilling targets under MDG 1 with implications for the corresponding SDG 1, i.e., "End poverty in all its forms everywhere". This paper also supplements the evaluation of MDG 1 against the implementation framework of SDG 1 to be adopted by India in fulfilling this goal.

In order to set the background for SDG 1 for the next 15 years, we must evaluate the impact of MDG 1 in India. Second section presents a brief overview of targets of MDG 1 in the context of poverty. Third section provides evidence of achievements of MDG 1 targets and highlights the best practices and areas where the development programmes went beyond specified targets under the MDG 1. Fourth section briefly summarises the remaining gaps in fulfilling targets under the MDG 1. This section also highlights the estimated resource needs, scope of enhanced technology intervention, and impact evaluation with special attention to gender and youth issues. Fifth section describes the philosophy and concept of SDG 1 and its targets in detail, highlighting the scope and prospects with reference to achievements and failures of specific targets of MDG 1. Section six discusses in detail the implementation framework to be adopted by India in fulfilling the SDG 1 focussing on various parameters of implementation including its financing, technical architecture for its monitoring and evidences and lessons learnt from best-practices in the rest of the world.

Outline of MDG 1

Out of the eight MDGs adopted by the United Nations in 2000 to be achieved globally by the end of year 2015, the first Goal was to "Eradicate Extreme Hunger and Poverty". This goal was considered the most significant out of all and a precondition to achieve the rest of the seven MDGs. The overview of MDG 1 is given below.

MDG 1 was based on three specific targets:

Target 1.A: ***Reduce by half the proportion of people living on less than $1 a day.***

The above target was captured by the following three indicators:

- Poverty Head Count Ratio (PHCR): Extreme Poverty Rate.[1]
- Poverty Gap Ratio.[2]
- Share of poorest quintile in national consumption.[3]

Target 1.B and 1.C are associated with abating unemployment and combating extreme hunger levels globally.

Target 1.B: ***Achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all, including women and young people.***

This target had been captured by following four indicators:

- Growth rate of GDP per person employed.
- Employment to population ratio.
- Proportion of employed people living below $1 per day.
- Proportion of own-account and contributing family workers in total employment.

Target 1.C: ***Reduce by half the proportion of people who suffer from hunger.***

This target was based on two indicators, namely:

- Prevalence of underweight children under five years of age.
- Proportion of population below minimum level of dietary energy consumption.

As indicated, MDG 1 consisted of three different but interconnected targets of abating poverty, reducing mounting levels of unemployment and combating hunger. However, scope of this paper is mainly restricted to the first target of MDG 1, i.e., Target 1.A related to poverty alleviation in India.

Achievements under MDG 1 targets in India

This section briefly discusses the achievements of MDG 1 in context of Poverty Eradication in India on the basis of various indicators during the 25 year period ranging from year 1990 to 2015. Laid on the objectives of MDG 1, the SDG 1 intends to end poverty and deprivation in all its forms from everywhere by implementing development policies based on the three dimensions of development.

While discussing India's achievements in MDGs, it can be said that India has made significant advances in securing the MDGs. India achieved the targets of MDG 1 way before 2015, but the outcome is unevenly distributed.

To assess Target 1 of MDG 1, the first indicator is Poverty Head Count Ratio (PHCR) which refers to proportion of population below the national poverty line. In the year 1990, the total number of people below poverty line in India was 403.1 million which reduced to 269.3 million in 2011-12 which indicates that about 134 million people in India were elevated above the poverty line during this period. If we look at the figures for urban areas, the drop in number of people below poverty line has been from 74.5 million to 52.8 million which indicates that nearly 22 million people in urban areas were pushed above poverty line during this period. However, the data for rural areas of India show even far reaching outcomes according to which number of people went down from 328.6 million in 1990s to 216.5 in 2011-12.

Target 1 of MDG 1 expected to reduce the proportion of population below poverty line to half of its 1990 level. According to the figures in 1990, the estimated PHCR for India was 47.8 per cent which was supposed to be reduced to at least 23.9 per cent by 2015. However, it declined to 21.9 per cent in 2011-12, which illustrates that India already attained first indicator of Target 1.A – three years ahead of its stipulated time-period. In 1990, the PHCR estimates for Urban and Rural areas were 30.47 per cent and 52.6 per cent, respectively, which were to be reduced at least to 15.2 per cent and 26.3 per cent by the end of year 2015. The data depicts that during the year 2011-12, the PHCR for urban area was estimated to be 13.7 per cent and for rural area it was 25.7 per cent, which again shows that both urban and rural areas achieved this target way before the stipulated time.

Second indicator for achieving Target 1.A of MDG 1 was the Poverty Gap Ratio (PGR) which exhibits the depth of poverty by measuring the gap between mean consumption of poor below poverty line and that corresponding to the poverty line. The data demonstrates significant achievements by India on this indicator. The PGR for all India has been reduced substantially, estimated from monthly per capita consumption expenditure data based on Mixed Reference period (MRP).[4] The subsequent decline in urban PGR was from 9.62 in 2004-05 to 5.05 in 2011-12 while rural PGR declined from 6.08 in 2004-05 to 2.7 in 2011-12. This reflects that the poverty gap has been narrowed in both urban and rural areas during this period.

Government of India has implemented many programmes to bring overall improvement in the quality of life in rural areas through employment generation, development of rural infrastructure and provision of other basic amenities. At present, the Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India, is implementing Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA), National Rural Livelihoods Mission (NRLM), Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana (PMGSY), Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY) and National Social Assistance Programme (NSAP) in rural areas of the country, through State Governments.

Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) which came into effect on 2 February 2006 could be considered as one of the best practices of the Government of India to reduce poverty. MGNREGA is a centrally sponsored scheme which legally assures minimum 100 days of employment to any adult in rural area, who is seeking unskilled employment. According to the Ministry of Rural Development, MGNREGA can be described as unique in its scale and delivery architecture, and has become an effective instrument of inclusive growth, women empowerment, livelihood security and regeneration of natural resource base over the years. From 2008, every year around 5 crore households and 9 crore rural poor have been participating in the programme. Till August 2015, total number of job card holders were 12.35 crore with total number of workers as 27.28 crore.

Besides all the improvements that MGNREGA has made in national poverty figures, its performance in recent years points towards some alarming facts. The data depicts that disposal of funds available for MGNREGA decreased after the year 2011-12 despite better utiilisation of available funds for MGNREGA. According to official data produced by the Ministry of Rural Development, the participation rate of MGNREGA declined during the recent years from 30 per cent in 2011-12 to 27.8 per cent in 2013-14. The number of households gaining employment through MGNREGA fell from 5.26 crore in 2009-10 to 4.79 crore in the year 2013-14. The guidelines of MGNREGA instruct States to take special care of vulnerable groups like scheduled castes (SC), scheduled tribes (ST), women, disable, single women and other minority groups, but the data suggests that the benefits accruing to these vulnerable groups reduced significantly during the last few years. The employment days provided to SCs and STs together fell from 149.19 crore in 2009-10 to 88.02 crore man-days in 2013-14, suggesting a sharp decline of 64 per cent. Despite all these indications of varying performance of MGNREGA in recent years, MGNREGA has played a vital role in reducing poverty in India by 32 per cent and prevented 14 million people from falling into the poverty trap during 2004-05 to 2011-12 (Desai, *et al.,* 2015).

It is also important to assess the success of implementation mechanisms of government schemes. An example of best practices on MDG 1 may be found in the state of Orissa, where there is a mobile based monitoring system named Tracking Entitlements for Rural Communities (TERComs) to track the efficiency of social protection mechanism and delivery of entitlements to poor people in the rural areas. Under this scheme, village beneficiaries send their acknowledgements of receipts of entitlements under three main social protection schemes to the central server with the help of mobile phone application. This has led to real time monitoring of government funds utilised for social security of the poor. The same monitoring system is used at the district level in the state for monitoring the closing stock of Targeted Public Distribution System so as to estimate the stock entitlements not claimed by any of the beneficiaries every day. This model of monitoring could also be used in other states as well (UN 2010a,b).

Remaining Gaps in Fulfilling MDG 1 targets in India

This section elucidates the remaining gaps or hidden failures of MDG 1 Targets in India. Of all the failures of MDG 1, the third indicator of Target 1.A depicting the share of poorest quintile (20 per cent population) in total national monthly consumption portrays very disappointing outcome. The data pertaining to this indicator shows that the overall share of poorest 20 per cent of population in total national monthly consumption was never above 10 per cent during the entire period ranging from 1993-2012 and instead of increasing, this share has declined over the years for both rural and urban areas despite some fluctuations during this period. The share of poorest quintile in national consumption is lower in urban areas as compared to rural areas. The figures demonstrate that according to URP (Uniform Reference Period)[5] method, the share of urban poorest quintile in national monthly consumption declined from 8 per cent in 1993-94 to 7 per cent in 2011-12, whereas the share of rural poorest quintile decreased from 9.6 per cent in 1993-94 to 9.1 per cent in 2011-12.

Despite phenomenal progress in terms of PHCR for all India level as well as for both rural and urban areas, the rural-urban gap still persists in PHCR. Though, rural-urban gap in PHCR at national level has declined significantly from 18 per cent in 1993-94 to 12 per cent in 2011-12, at state level it is still very high. The state-wise gap in PHCR of rural and urban areas is not only high but also depicts uneven picture across states. States like Mizoram exhibited a gap of 29 per cent while many other states such as Odisha, Arunachal Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Assam, Jharkhand and Chhattisgarh had gaps of more than the national average of 12 per cent in the year 2011-12.

The overall performance in India in PHCR is quite satisfactory but the state-wise figures of PHCR for India in the year 2011-12 are much skewed and not satisfactory. For instance, states like Goa and Kerala significantly reduced their PHCR levels in the year 2011-12 to 5.09 per cent and 7.05 per cent, respectively, which is nearly one-fourth and one fifth of the PHCR of 1990 for Goa and Kerala, respectively. Whereas other states like Chhattisgarh had very high PHCR in 2011-12 at 39.93 per cent followed by Jharkhand and Manipur at 36.96 per cent and 36.89 per cent, respectively, despite enormous reduction owing to very high PHCR in the base year, i.e. 1990. India as a whole may have achieved the target of MDG 1 related to halving the PHCR by the end of year 2015, but many Indian states like Assam, Bihar, Jharkhand, Chhattisgarh, Nagaland, Mizoram, Odisha, Madhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh missed their MDG targets partly because of high base year values of PHCR in these states (Refer Annex 1).

The achievement of both urban and rural areas was notable in case of PGR (Poverty Gap Ratio), but the corresponding figures of various states of India are not as impressive. On one hand, some states like Goa, Sikkim, Himachal Pradesh, Punjab and Uttarakhand performed better than the national average while on the other hand, a few states like UP, MP, Chhattisgarh, Bihar, Odisha, Jharkhand, Manipur, Arunachal Pradesh and Assam reported considerably higher PGR even in 2011-12. Some states even registered rise in incidence of poverty as per PGR in both rural and urban areas, like Manipur, Mizoram, Nagaland, Meghalaya and Arunachal Pradesh.

Surprisingly, the states which depicted poor performance in both PHCR and PGR have illustrated better performance in third indicator of Target 1A, i.e., share of poorest quintile in total consumption as compared to other states. These states are Sikkim, Manipur, Meghalaya and Mizoram for both rural and urban areas. The union territories of Chandigarh and Daman & Diu also performed well. Further, the state level disaggregation of poverty data in India reveals that the most populous states of India like Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Odisha and Maharashtra were likely to miss their targets of MDG 1.

Philosophy and Concept of Sustainable Development Goals and Targets

SDGs are expected to supplement the positive outcomes of the MDGs. The idea behind up-gradation of MDG 1 to SDG 1 lies in the evolution of various approaches to measure poverty. The most ancient approach to poverty was the "Subsistence Approach" and the new concept of "Basic-needs Approach" came later, which along with food requirement also included aspects of non-monetary elements required for human subsistence. The concept of poverty was further broadened when Amartya Sen gave the concept of "Entitlements or Capabilities Approach" which proposed that "the income-centred view of poverty, based on specifying an interpersonally invariant 'poverty line' income, may be very misleading in the identification and evaluation of poverty. Since income is not desired for its own sake, any income-based notion of poverty must refer – directly or indirectly – to those basic ends which are promoted by income as means" (Sen, 1993). There are also discussions on the concepts of "Human Poverty" and on more specific versions like "Gender-based Poverty" in academic and policy discourses.

The philosophy behind the inception of SDG 1 is to extend the MDG 1 targets based on Minimum Needs Approach and Basic Needs Approach of poverty to Capabilities Approach or Entitlements Approach and Gender-based Poverty Approach. The basic objective is to inculcate inter-generational entitlements and reduce intra-household disparities. On methodological aspect, SDGs are much wider in concept than MDGs as SDGs are based on holistic approach of poverty.

Unlike MDG 1, SDG 1 aims to end poverty from everywhere in all its forms which includes economic, social, gender-based and all other forms of deprivation in income, education, nutrition, health, access to water and sanitation, and vulnerability to economic shocks. This is known as Multi-dimensional Approach of poverty which guided the Targets of SDG 1.

Implementation Framework to be adopted by India for SDG 1

The remaining gaps in fulfilling the targets of MDG 1 illustrate that positive outcomes of MDG 1 could have been better in India if implementation framework adopted by India had been more comprehensive. This section elaborates the normative framework of implementation of SDGs to be adopted by India in order to assure targeted outcomes. The implementation framework focuses on two major dimensions as discussed below.

Financing of SDG 1 in India

To attain the proposed targets of SDG 1, it is necessary to optimally utilise each rupee of development expenditure. The largest proportion of development expenditure incurred at the national level comes from public resources (UN, 2014). However, being part of a welfare state, corporate sector must share responsibility of development along with the public sector. In fact, a healthy partnership between public and private resources may prove fruitful in ensuring positive development pay-offs (UNDESA, 2013). It requires worldwide change of perspectives, techniques and liabilities to reflect and reconstruct the new picture of a developing nation. However, the State has to be highly vigilant for corporate sector investments in development schemes. With the twin agenda of overcoming poverty and ensuring sustainable development on the basis of economic, social and environmental dimensions, the requirement of financial resources to achieve SDG 1 will definitely exceed the present development budget (World Bank and IMF, 2015).

Besides mandating private sector to invest in development financing through the Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Act[6], public investment should be planned in such a way so as to catalyse and leverage the funds flow from private sector and other domestic sources. Private investments are always driven by risk-reward considerations. Government should make special efforts by incentivising development expenditure of corporate houses through efficient policies based on market solutions. Capital market investments that are targeted towards fostering activities under CSR are often known as 'socially responsible investments' (Sjöström and Welford, 2009). As compared to the developed economies of the world like Japan, UK and Australia, the volume of Socially Responsible Investment (SRI) is much less in Asia (ASrIA, 2008). Australian ethical funds have proved to be quite effective in generating SRI (Bauer *et al.*, 2006) and Asia can also learn from the experiences of U.K. in context of SRI (Solomon *et al.*, 2004). A few measures for facilitating or incentivising SRI in India can be implemented following these experiences of other economies. Firstly, the role of non-governmental organisations (NGOs) working for environmental, standards could be quite significant in forming coalitions with the shareholders in annual general meetings to influence corporate behaviour in favour of SRI (Waygood and Wehrmeyer, 2003). Also, these NGO's can have a dialogue with the management of corporate units to encourage them to invest in development financing. Secondly, corporate governance can also spur growth in SRI which elucidates the duties and responsibilities of corporate units, management as well as shareholders (Eurosif, 2004). Thirdly, pension-funds could be stimulated to invest with a perspective of SRI owing to their long-run nature and concern regarding the welfare of the nation (Clark and Hebb, 2004). In countries like USA and UK, huge investment in pension-funds are incurred.

Improved coordination between public sector, private sector, community organisations and civil society organisations in catering to financial and non-financial needs at the regional and sub-national levels builds effective ways to generate and utilise development finance for better opportunities.

The government agencies like NITI Aayog should provide technical assistance to states on mobilising financial resources on their own from domestic and international sources by innovations and capacity building. It is expected that the synthesis of financial support and technical assistance can lead to tremendous strengthening of development policies. In India the strategic use of development finance at the national level should be targeted towards low-income, highly vulnerable states with limited fiscal capacities like Bihar, Jharkhand, Chhattisgarh, Madhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh. State GDP could play a vital role in better implementation of SDG 1 across various regions as the states are equipped with better knowledge about opportunities and challenges at the local level. Greater fiscal autonomy should be provided to states. Development expenditure should be targeted more towards social security of young and the elderly and also of women as they comprise the most vulnerable class at the intra-household level which constitutes the depth of poverty.

Technical Architecture for Monitoring SDGs

Monitoring of SDGs is a very vital issue for their implementation. However, there could be no single approach which can monitor the development programmes in an optimum way. The implementation of SDG 1 requires amalgamation of a number of measures to be taken which could improve the technical architecture of SDGs and make them more target-oriented.

The biggest issue with the monitoring of development programmes is the performance measurement. First of all, objective parameters should be set for the evaluation of performance under SDG 1 (UNDP, 2015). Since, SDG 1 talks about removing poverty in all its forms from everywhere, it requires introspection of all forms of poverty prevalent in various countries. Human Poverty Index developed by the United Nations to complement Human Development Index could be referred for this purpose or country specific indices could be developed keeping in mind the country specific forms of poverty. This must include poverty in the form of deprivation in income or opportunities, education, access to natural resources, or inequality on the basis of gender, age, caste, creed, and other dimensions. Also, specific indices should be developed focussing on vulnerable sections of society like disabled population or transgenders to bring them to the mainstream and measure their level of poverty and its improvement over the years. Bhutan's Gross National Happiness Index (GNHI), Gender-related Development Index (GDI), Gender Empowerment Measure (GEM), Global Peace Index (GPI), OECD's Better Life Index, Genuine Progress Indicator, Index of Sustainable Economic Welfare (ISEW) are few such indices that capture poverty in its different forms. Secondly, the measurement of performance should be regular and at fixed intervals. Thirdly, evaluation agencies should be independent and autonomous of the implementing agencies in order to maintain the integrity of the measures. Fourthly, above mentioned objective approaches should be designed for measurement and only one specific approach should be used for measurement of one parameter. Lastly, regular publication of these measures should be brought out for various interest groups and the public.

The second issue with the implementation of such development programmes is decentralisation of planning, and design of mechanisms to be used for implementation of schemes. There should be greater decentralisation of planning and authority for developmental policy making. The success of decentralisation depends upon transparency and recognition of people's rights.[7] The role of local people and communities should be well-recognised and their support in implementing these policies should be encouraged (UNDG, 2014). Community based participation is necessary to ensure development at regional levels, with due recognition of challenges and

Lessons from Best Practices and South-South Cooperation

South-South Cooperation (SSC) has become the expression of collaboration and partnership among countries from the South, interested in sharing, learning, and exploring their complementary strengths to go beyond their traditional role as aid recipients. SSC is allowing the emergence of a paradigm where "Horizontal Partnerships", based on equity, trust, mutual benefit and long-term relations, become an alternative way to do development cooperation.

The Philippines has initiated citizen's participatory monitoring of local development projects for increasing transparency and accountability of implementing agencies. Specific lessons from Bangladesh regarding microfinance and employment generation from South-East Asian countries could be of vital use for India to solve its own problem of poverty.

The strategy adopted by Bangladesh in capacity building of poor and women, especially those belonging to the lagging regions of the country through a well planned education and training programme. The idea is to narrow down the skill gaps in labor force with special focus on target groups. Bangladesh has also successfully implemented a National Disability Action Plan involving all related ministries in collaboration with various NGOs to provide skill training, stipends, interest-free micro-credit and education facilities to the disabled population.

Nepal is a very unique country which redesigned its own constitution based on the needs and priorities of the society to remove inequality and disparity of socio-economic nature. The Micro-Initiative Fund (MIF) in Bhutan was formulated to solve the problem of rural credit in agriculture sector and small-business by formal financial sector through Bhutan Development Bank, through Tarayana Foundation which is a microfinance institution and has various donor-assisted projects.

Source: Author's compilation from various sources including OCED Report "Unlocking the Potential of South-South Cooperation Policy Recommendations from the Task Team on South South Cooperation", Report of UN High level Plenary Meeting on MDGs (September 2010) and Best Practices in Poverty Alleviation and SDGs in South Asia: A Compendium, 2014.

obstacles in implementing pro-equity policies, many of which themselves stem from inequities.[8] The vast differences in the infrastructure, resources and scale of development across various states and regions require state-specific or rather region-specific plans and policies which again demand greater autonomy at lower level or decentralisation of planning.

In order to evaluate the working of SDGs in India, emphasis should be laid on evaluation of various schemes and the role played by the government as well as private sector in development partnerships. Regular audits and verification of claims by private business groups, which receive various grants and rebates of different kinds from the government, should be conducted. An evaluation agency should comprise members from NITI Aayog representing government, civil society members, and members from local communities.

Since SDG 1 has laid down greater emphasis on removing poverty of all kinds from everywhere, it becomes essential to remove intra-household disparities among male and female, and young and old family members regarding poverty. For this, it is essential that gender-specific and age-specific intra-household poverty data should be collected and such database should be used efficiently for policy making. In India, presently there is no such measure of poverty or any such database, but in order to end poverty in all its forms it is necessary to make such database by inventing relevant methodology.

In employment, there is very narrow diversity based on gender, age, religion, caste, creed and culture which leads to exclusion of a large group of people from all the opportunities available. Such excluded groups of people always remain trapped in vicious circle of poverty. A solution to this problem could be obtained by developing a diversity index of employment. The government should support public and private sector units based on such indices.

India is a welfare state and it is the primary responsibility of the state to provide basic amenities to all its citizens of all ages, gender, caste, creed and cultural background. To do this, poverty should be removed from its breadth and depth for which affirmative budgetary action is required.

Endnotes

1. Poverty Head Count Ratio means proportion of population below the national poverty line.
2. Poverty Gap Ratio at national poverty lines is the mean shortfall from the poverty lines (counting the non-poor as having zero shortfalls) as a percentage of the poverty lines. This measure reflects the depth of poverty as well as its incidence.
3. Share of poorest quintile means share of poorest 20 per cent population in total national monthly consumption
4. Mixed Reference Period for calculating Poverty in India was introduced by Suresh Tendulkar according to which "Reference Period" for five non-food items viz., clothing, footwear, education, durable goods and institutional medical expenses is one year and for other items is 30 days just before the survey.
5. Uniform Reference Period for calculating Poverty takes 30 days Reference Period for all food and non-food items.
6. In case of CSR, policy makers must be alert as this mandate could be of limited use in a scenario where the amounts spent under corporate social responsibility are much less than the tax concessions given to corporate. So, the government may opt for giving tax benefits to these corporate units proportional to the CSR investments they make so that the social expenditures of the state are not hampered by this.
7. For instance, right to information (RTI) is harnessed as a tool for promoting participatory development, strengthening democratic governance and facilitating effective delivery of socio-economic services. In the knowledge society, in which we live today, acquisition of information and new knowledge and its application have intense and pervasive impact on processes of taking informed decisions, resulting in overall productivity gains (Ansari, 2008).
8. Power relations can cause and sustain inequity. Tackling harmful power relations takes time, and the empowerment of disadvantaged people must be combined with improving accountability mechanisms and reforming democratic institutions. It is important to build a vibrant civil society and an independent media. Addressing unhelpful attitudes and beliefs can also help foster social cohesion and build a pro-equity social contract (Jones, 2009).

References

Ansari, M. M. 2008. "Right to Information and its Relationship to Good Governance and Development." Central Information Commission, New Delhi. Available at: http://cic.gov.in/CIC-Events/IC-MA-LectureAtUNESCO-04122008.pdf

ASrIA. 2008. "SRI in Asia". http://www.asria.org/sri/asia/sriasia [19 December 2008].

Bauer, R., R. Otten and A. Tourani Rad. 2006. "Ethical Investing in Australia: Is there a Financial Penalty?" *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal,* 14(1): 33–48.

SAARC Secretariat. 2014. *Best Practices in Poverty Alleviation and SDGs in South Asia: A Compendium.* SAARC Secretariat, Kathmandu**.**

Clark, G. and T. Hebb. 2004. "Pension Fund Corporate Engagement: The Fifth Stage of Capitalism." *Relations Industrielles/Industrial Relations,* **59**(1): 142–171.

Desai, S., Prem Vashishtha and Omkar Joshi. 2015. *Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act: A Catalyst for Rural Transformation.* National Council of Applied Economic Research, New Delhi.

Eurosif. 2004. *Pension Programme SRI Toolkit*. Eurosif, Paris.

UNDESA. 2003. *Monterrey Consensus on Financing for Development.* Final text of agreements and commitments adopted at the International Conference on Financing for Development, Monterrey, Mexico, 18-22 March 2002, paragraph 1, Avialable at: http://www.un.org/esa/ffd/monterrey/MonterreyConsensus.pdf

Jones, Harry. 2009. "Equity in Development: Why It is Important and How to Achieve It." *Working Paper 311*, Overseas Development Institute, London, UK.

Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation. 2015. *Millennium Development Goals- India Country Report*. Available at: http://mospi.nic.in/Mospi_New/upload/mdg_26feb15.pdf

OECD. 2011. *Unlocking the Potential of South-South Cooperation Policy Recommendations from the Task Team on South-South Cooperation.* Available at: http://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/TT-SSC%20Policy%20Recommendations.pdf

Sen, A. 1993. "Capability and Well-being" in M. Nussbaum and A. Sen (eds.) *The Quality of Life,* (pp. 30-53). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Solomon, A., J.F. Solomon and M. Suto. 2004. "Can the UK Experience Provide Lessons for the Evolution of SRI in Japan?" *Corporate Governance,* 12(4): 552–566.

Sjöström, E., and R. Welford. 2009. "Facilitators and Impediments for Socially Responsible Investment: A Study of Hong Kong." *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management,* 16(5): pp 278-288.

UN. 2010a. *Report of High-Level Plenary Meeting on the Millenium Development Goals.*

UN. 2010b. MDGs Success stories of Asia and the Pacific: Accelerating Achievements of the MDGs, http://endpoverty2015.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/MDG-Success-Stories-AP_web.pdf

UN. 2014a. *Report of the Open Working Group of the General Assembly on Sustainable Development Goals*, UN document A/68/970. Available at: http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=a/68/970&referer=/english/&Lang=E.

UN. 2014b. *Report of the Intergovernmental Committee of Experts on Sustainable Development Financing, UN document A/69/315.* Available at: http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/69/315&Lang=E.

UNDG. 2014. *Delivering the Post-2015 Development Agenda: Opportunities at the Local and National Level.* United Nations Development Group (UNDG).

UNDP. 2015. *Report of Millennium Development Goals.*

Waygood, S., and W. Wehrmeyer. 2003. “A Critical Assessment of how Non-governmental Organizations Use the Capital Markets to Achieve their Aims: A UK Study.” *Business Strategy and the Environment,* 12(6): 372–385.

World Bank and IMF. 2015. *From Billions to Trillions: Transforming Development Finance*. World Bank and IMF Joint Development Committee Report.

World Bank Development Committee, Joint Ministerial Committee of the Boards of Governors of the Bank and the Fund on the Transfer of Real Resources to Developing Countries, Fiscal Policy for Growth and Development, Washington, DC: World Bank, 6 April 2006, http://siteresources.worldbank.org/DEVCOMMINT/Communiques/23555489/Communique(E)V2_Final.pdf

Annex 1

Sl. No	State/UTs	1990 est	1993-94	2004-05	2011-12	Likely Achievement in 2015	Target 2015
1	Andhra Pradesh	49.74	44.60	29.90	9.20	8.27	24.87
2	Arunachal Pradesh	63.51	54.50	31.10	34.67	27.72	31.76
3	Assam	57.92	51.80	34.40	31.98	27.34	28.96
4	Bihar	62.28	60.50	54.40	33.74	33.03	31.14
5	Chhattisgarh	51.32	50.90	49.40	39.93	39.82	25.66
6	Delhi	16.49	15.70	13.10	9.91	9.34	8.25
7	Goa	19.78	20.80	25.00	5.09	5.09	9.89
8	Gujarat	39.62	37.80	31.80	16.63	15.98	19.81
9	Haryana	40.02	35.90	24.10	11.16	9.87	20.01
10	Himachal Pradesh	38.72	34.60	22.90	8.06	7.17	19.36
11	Jammu & Kashmir	31.74	26.30	13.20	10.35	7.99	15.87
12	Jharkhand	65.74	60.70	45.30	36.96	33.25	32.87
13	Karnataka	55.11	49.50	33.40	20.91	18.29	27.55
14	Kerala	35.51	31.30	19.70	7.05	6.15	17.76
15	Madhya Pradesh	43.57	44.60	48.60	31.65	31.65	21.78
16	Maharashtra	50.85	47.80	38.10	17.35	16.42	25.43
17	Manipur	75.40	65.10	38.00	36.89	29.93	37.70
18	Meghalaya	43.57	35.20	16.10	11.87	8.86	21.79
19	Mizoram	10.99	11.80	15.30	20.40	20.40	5.50
20	Nagaland	25.50	20.40	9.00	18.88	13.29	12.75
21	Orissa	59.63	59.10	57.20	32.59	32.96	29.81
22	Pondicherry	38.27	30.90	14.10	9.69	7.25	19.14
23	Punjab	22.83	22.40	20.90	8.26	8.36	11.41
24	Rajasthan	39.44	38.30	34.40	14.71	14.62	19.72
25	Sikkim	31.99	31.80	31.10	8.19	8.59	16.00
26	Tamil Nadu	50.20	44.60	28.90	11.28	9.91	25.10
27	Tripura	31.07	32.90	40.60	14.05	15.96	15.53
28	Uttar Pradesh	50.67	48.40	40.90	11.26	27.94	25.34
29	Uttarakhand	31.81	32.00	32.70	29.43	11.88	15.91
30	West Bengal	40.92	39.40	34.30	19.98	19.37	20.46
	India	**47.80**	**45.30**	**37.20**	**21.90**	**20.74**	**23.90**

Source: Planning Commission (Now renamed as NITI Aayog)

Goal 1: End poverty in all its forms everywhere: Targets and Indicators	
1.1 By 2030, eradicate extreme poverty for all people everywhere, currently measured as people living on less than $1.25 a day	1.1.1 Proportion of the population below the international poverty line, by sex, age, employment status and geographical location (urban/rural)
1.2 By 2030, reduce at least by half the proportion of men, women and children of all ages living in poverty in all its dimensions according to national definitions	1.2.1 Proportion of population living below the national poverty line, by sex and age
	1.2.2 Proportion of men, women and children of all ages living in poverty in all its dimensions according to national definitions
1.3 Implement nationally appropriate social protection systems and measures for all, including floors, and by 2030 achieve substantial coverage of the poor and the vulnerable	1.3.1 Proportion of population covered by social protection floors/systems, by sex, distinguishing children, unemployed persons, older persons, persons with disabilities, pregnant women, newborns, work-injury victims and the poor and the vulnerable
1.4 By 2030, ensure that all men and women, in particular the poor and the vulnerable, have equal rights to economic resources, as well as access to basic services, ownership and control over land and other forms of property, inheritance, natural resources, appropriate new technology and financial services, including microfinance	1.4.1 Proportion of population living in households with access to basic services
	1.4.2 Proportion of total adult population with secure tenure rights to land, with legally recognized documentation and who perceive their rights to land as secure, by sex and by type of tenure
1.5 By 2030, build the resilience of the poor and those in vulnerable situations and reduce their exposure and vulnerability to climate-related extreme events and other economic, social and environmental shocks and disasters	1.5.1 Number of deaths, missing persons and persons affected by disaster per 100,000 people[a]
	1.5.2 Direct disaster economic loss in relation to global gross domestic product (GDP)[a]
	1.5.3 Number of countries with national and local disaster risk reduction strategies[a]
1.a Ensure significant mobilization of resources from a variety of sources, including through enhanced development cooperation, in order to provide adequate and predictable means for developing countries, in particular least developed countries, to implement programmes and policies to end poverty in all its dimensions	1.a.1 Proportion of resources allocated by the government directly to poverty reduction programmes
	1.a.2 Proportion of total government spending on essential services (education, health and social protection)
1.b Create sound policy frameworks at the national, regional and international levels, based on pro-poor and gender-sensitive development strategies, to support accelerated investment in poverty eradication actions	1.b.1 Proportion of government recurrent and capital spending to sectors that disproportionately benefit women, the poor and vulnerable groups

Note: [a] An open-ended intergovernmental expert working group on indicators and terminology relating to disaster risk reduction established by the General Assembly (resolution 69/284) is developing a set of indicators to measure global progress in the implementation of the Sendai Framework. These indicators will eventually reflect the agreements on the Sendai Framework indicators.