



Transcript provided by the Kaiser Family Foundation¹
(Tip: Click on the binocular icon to search this document)

**WHAT DO THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS MEAN
FOR GLOBAL HEALTH?
Kaiser Family Foundation
September 9, 2015**

¹ The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

[START RECORDING 28795-090915_kff_webinar.mp3]

PENNY DUCKHAM: Hello, everybody. Welcome to today's web briefing.

As you know, this is an opportunity exclusively for journalists to focus today on what the Sustainable Development Goals mean for global health. As in previous web briefings on global health issues, we are joined today by a great panel, and the opportunity here is to get an advanced sense of what some of the issues will be when the U.N. General Assembly meets in New York in a couple of weeks' time, and in particular when they focus on the Sustainable Development Goals.

I am going to move very quickly to hand over to the panelists. I just want to remind you that if you could please send in any questions as we are talking, I will read out the questions and we will get to as many as we possibly can. The whole point of this is to cover as many questions as we can during the one-hour presentation. Please send those in. In the meantime, each of our presenters will talk for about five or so minutes. We have slides which you can access on our – they've already been posted. If you want to flip through them as we're discussing them, you can do that too.

With that, I am going to hand over, with many thanks, to Tony Pipa who is here with us in Washington, D.C. He is at the State Department and is the U.S. Special Coordinator for the Post-2015 Development Agenda. Everyone's bios are on our

¹ The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

website, so I'm not going to go through his incredibly impressive bio. Over to you, Tony.

TONY PIPA: Thanks, Penny. I'll just give an overview of where we've been going and how we've come to this agenda, talk a little bit about the Millennium Development Goals, and the differences between those and the new Sustainable Development Goals, and leave it at that.

For the last three years the global community, which is really the U.N. and the member states within the U.N. - but also this has been a very transparent and inclusive process, it's involved also multilaterals, advocacy organizations, technical experts, and private sector - has been engaged in a discussion about the set of goals to succeed the Millennium Development Goals. As Penny mentioned, this will culminate in a Sustainable Development Summit later this month preceding the U.N. General Assembly where world leaders will formally adopt what is being called the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The rumor is that this will be the largest gathering of heads of state ever. The U.S. was a real active participant throughout the negotiations on this agenda, which concluded in early August.

As we transition from the Millennium Development Goals to the Sustainable Development Goals, just a word about the MDGs. The Millennium Development Goals were started in 2000 with an end date of 2015, hence the need for a successor

¹ The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

framework. They were eight goals, 21 targets, and while there are a number of forces that have contributed to the development gains of the last 25 years, the MDGs really have been a benchmark during a period of extraordinary progress in the fight against global poverty, hunger, and disease.

The world met the first MDG five years ahead of schedule, which was to cut in half the world's extreme poverty rate. Across the board, per capita incomes in the developing world have more than doubled over this period. We have a child born today; he's twice as likely to survive into adolescence as in 1990. The MDGs really demonstrated the power of setting ambitious global goals. They helped drive common action. They helped get everyone on the same page. They were focused on a first order set of goals for the developing world. They also demonstrated the value of global measurement. They really forced the global community to track progress against measurable targets and helped highlight why we're falling short. For example, several years into the agenda it was clear that globally we were coming up short on MDG 4, which was about child survival. This realization prompted the 2012 Child Survival Call to Action where the world came together to make a new pledge to prevent child deaths under five, by 2035.

As part of that international commitment, for example, the U.S. government and USAID focused efforts in 24 countries saving 500,000 children's lives in just two years. We now know

¹ The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

that six of the priority countries out of that effort have achieved MDG 4. The MDGs were a benchmark in helping drive action and were really a symbol of what setting ambitious global goals could look like. Having said that, there were still gaps and we've fallen short on what the original MDGs have set out.

This is a very dense slide, but the major point here is that gaps really persist. As we went in to think about developing this set of Sustainable Development Goals, we've incorporated those areas where we still have what we call the unfinished business of the MDGs. As we talk about the differences between the MDGs and the SDGs, I'm going to hit on three major points. One is the difference of ambition; another is the difference that political inclusivity has brought through that very inclusive open and transparent process. The third is about integration.

When we look at the SDGs, we've gone from a set of eight very discrete goals from the Millennium Development Goals and 21 targets, to 17 goals for the Sustainable Development Goals, and 169 targets. That means they're more ambitious in size. Where the MDGs were focused primarily on social development and poverty, education, health, and hunger, the SDGs broaden out to both environmental considerations. It was environmental sustainability, being a big part of it, as well as economic growth and economic activity.

¹ The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

They also dove deeper. Whereas the MDGs, for example, on poverty were about a relative reduction, 50 percent, now on some of those original MDGs, we're seeking to end things: to go to zero. You see where in the goals we're trying to end extreme poverty, end preventable child, and maternal mortality, come to a HIV/AIDS free generation. They're also very comprehensive. I like to think of the MDGs as the cornerstones of what developing countries needed, whereas the SDGs really provide a full foundation for any country and what they would need to develop.

The unprecedented political inclusivity obviously was a part of the breadth of this agenda, but it also creates a lot of momentum and buy-in. Countries themselves feel a great sense of ownership over this agenda and the political commitment that it reflects to end poverty, while sustaining and maintaining the earth's resources, I think is quite powerful. It's also a universal agenda. Where the MDGs were focused primarily on developing countries, and became much about flows of resources to developing countries, the SDGs are about collective action and shared responsibilities.

Countries that are at the heart of this, and their political leadership really need to provide direction. It's also going beyond just government. It's really going to need a whole of society effort to achieve the aspirations that the goals set out. This is really development as a political

¹ The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

enterprise and it is going to require private investment. It's going to require countries growing their own domestic resources. It's going to require the participation of civil society as well as other types of investments, philanthropic investments. I think the last point I'll say is that these goals – the MDGs were very specific and isolated on eight particular indicators. These goals really highlight integration, and how they force countries to think about how you make progress, and advance progress on one area of the agenda: not at the expense of another area of the agenda.

When you think about extreme poverty and reducing extreme poverty over the last 20 years, many countries did that with carbon-based economic growth that helped drive that, which then had environmental considerations. The SDGs really force you to take an integrated approach and to make progress on sustainability considerations at the same time as you're making progress on health. It also highlights what we've learned about development. For example, we know now that girls' attendance in formal school during adolescence actually is correlated with lower rates of HIV/AIDS. Taking that into account, understanding that, and programming and thinking about strategically how we do that is extremely important in this agenda and a big difference from the Millennium Development Goals.

I think I'll leave it there.

¹ The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

PENNY DUCKHAM: Thank you so much, Tony. We are going to move straight to John McArthur now.

Thank you to those of you who are sending in questions via chat, but please continue to do that and we will address those towards the end of these presentations.

John McArthur is in New York today. Thank you John for joining us.

JOHN MCARTHUR: Thanks so much for having me, Penny. Always a pleasure to be with Tony, who has been such a committed leader on this. I don't have much to add. I think, Tony, you did such a great overview of everything. I do have some slides I'll show to tack on. They're a little bit maybe some of the same points. I would just say that I come at these issues from multiple angles. One is at a personal level; I was quite involved in an official capacity in the early years of the Millennium Development Goals effort and trying to figure out how this notion of taking goals seriously could come to life. In some ways, it's hard to imagine that was the nature of the conversation such a short time ago; but it was.

There's a second hat I wear, which is as a Senior Fellow at the U.N. Foundation, which, just to be explicit, is an independent non-governmental organization, but with a very special relationship working collaboratively with the U.N. to support connectivity to broader constituencies in the world.

¹ The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

There is a third, which is as an academic and a Senior Fellow in the Brookings Institution. I'm very keenly focused on what we can say empirically and quantitatively about these issues and how we can understand, with some rigor, what is happening, and how we can jump from real life to numbers, and then back to real life. It is in that spirit that I would just share a few basic thoughts.

The first is, if you could jump to the next slide please. These trends, as Tony said, in extreme poverty are by any stretch of historical time field, extraordinary. We've been seeing extreme poverty around the world drop by roughly one percentage point per year, for a generation. It's on route right now; based on the latest World Bank trajectories, to get down to about 5 percent of humanity by 2030, on what one might call a business-as-usual scenario.

Even this very first principle of ending extreme poverty has shifted from a seemingly insurmountable task, where, within the lifetime of most people on the phone, this was at least a third of the world that was living in extreme poverty down to a question of how would you actually take on the last 5 percent? That's a conceptual leap to think about not reducing, but actually eliminating. It's based in this notion that we are in, what I what I would argue, is the fastest rate of progress in history, in tackling these very basic human needs around the world.

¹ The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

The next slide, if you can shift please, shows, and this is a study that I did, a quantitative study last year, the accelerating rate of progress in child survival. The dark line here is the actual trend. The top dotted line is what the trend would have looked like if the trajectories of the 1990s had continued. The middle dotted line there is what the trajectory would have looked like if the trends of the turn of the century had continued.

What we see is that this curve actually has been bending downwards. Some of you might know UNICEF and World Health Organization put out new numbers today where they showed that hard line has actually gone below 6 million. It's down below to about 5.9 million. Actually, there's a footnote for us to update these acceleration numbers for next week. What we're seeing is that this is what I would call the ultimate bottom line measure of progress in developments, because it's not a relative measure. Is a dollar a day the right measure of poverty? Is two dollars a day the right measure?

This is a measure that every human being in the world can rally around, which is can your child survive to see their fifth birthday? We've seen that after decades of stagnation, especially in the poorest countries, the past 10 years in particular has been the first time that all countries at all levels of income are able to see the same rate of progress.

¹ The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

If we jump to the next slide, one of the great surprises to many people is that the greatest gains, the big bends in those curves, are actually in Africa. Roughly three-quarters of the global gains have been based on ground-level breakthroughs from entrepreneurial practitioners, governments, and clinicians all around the continent, with global partnership, have been saving many million lives.

The most conservative estimate as of the last year's data is that at least 7.5 million more children are alive today than even if that middle curve on the previous slide had continued. Again, as I was mentioning, I'm updating these numbers for next week, and using the latest data, the numbers are going to be even significantly bigger, it looks like. We've seen, and by rough estimate, I think at least 15 to 20 million more people are alive today than if the world hadn't been taking this on.

What you also see here is that a lot of people think all the progress is just due to China. Well, China's progress, notwithstanding the past few weeks, has been extraordinary, but even if we look at the income poverty target, the estimates, the best available data suggests that if you pull China out of the equation the rest of the world this year has also achieved the Millennium Goal of cutting extreme poverty by half. You see that every region in the world has at least turned the tide on a problem that, again, 15 years ago seemed, in many cases,

¹ The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

insurmountable. This nature of extreme and extraordinary, pardon me, I should say extraordinary progress on extreme problems is quite profound.

The fifth slide, if we could jump to the next slide, we see that exactly as Tony said that the problems are growing, in my view, just faster than the rate of progress. This is the graphic. Many of you probably know that CO2 emissions are now, for the first time in millions of years, about 400 parts-per-million on a regular basis. The flip side of the progress is it's just been the nature of the beast, such as it is, until today is that for all those economies that are growing, all these societies that are making tremendous economic progress, they're doing so with the corollary of pumping our carbon into the atmosphere. That's a problem that we have to take on next, and we have to not just to solve the problem, but change the way we do business in order to solve the problem and literally, change the way we do business.

This is part of, I think, the essence of the new Sustainable Development Goals, what is being called the Global Goals for simple form - if we then shift to this next slide again please - we can see that in my view, these goals are about the second half writ large, the second half of extreme poverty. They're about the second half of the issues that the world needs to take on. The Millennium Goals were not very successful in the environment. They did not include things

¹ The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

like oceans, which is so fundamental. They did not include climate. They did not include things like inequality, which to many of our surprise has become one of the single most salient, critical issues in all corners of the globe.

They also take on the second half of the world. These are about each country's issues on this agenda: not just some countries' issues. I would argue that they finally take on the second half of society. When you look at issues like responsible production, and consumption, or sustainable cities and communities, these are not just government questions: these are not NGO questions. These are equally private sector questions. These are equally scientific questions. We need, again, new forms of technology, new forms of doing business, and a new layer of aspiration to build on the success we have to make sure that the rate of progress wins out over the rate of extension of problems.

One thing I would just say as maybe an anecdote, but one that I've found really crystallized things for me is when these targets were confirmed by Tony and all the other negotiators from the other 193 countries around the world, my first reaction was wow. After the most inclusive global process in history to set a global agenda, this seems to me a slightly Churchillian outcome. Churchill's famous quote on democracy is: It's the worst form of government except for all the rest.

¹ The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

This was a messy but ultimately reasonable list of issues. I described it to, of all people, my mother that night. I said Mom - and my mom is a terrific person that doesn't really understand what I do of course day to day, but is very supportive - I said the goals that people have been working on, the end of extreme poverty and all that, they finished today. She said, that's great. I said there is only one problem. She said, what's that? I said, there's 17 of them, and I don't know how to explain it. She said, 17, that's a great number. I asked, well why do you say that? You're the first person to say that. She said, it sounds like they didn't fake it. They're really complicated. If they put it all down into some Letterman-style Top 10, I might not believe it so much; but the world's just complicated.

It's funny, and I tell that story, because in the past couple of weeks I told it to other people in both public audiences and privately, and I think that the point is resonant. When you are dealing with a set of complex challenges, and people have said back to me, the world is complicated, you can't pretend to oversimplify the nature of the challenges in front of us. We need to raise our game in order to tackle them with full sophistication, but also we need to respect the public's understanding of the nature of complexity.

¹ The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

These are big issues that require both complexity of organization, it requires sophistication and respect for the different nature of each problem in each part of the world, and also they need, I think, a broader sense of how everything is so interconnected, that these elements of progress do often come with the flip side of challenge, and vice versa.

I'll stop here. I would say that these goals are ultimately, the final point for now, about framing the challenge as it looks today. The challenge ultimately comes down to these very nice points in my view that, again, Tony and his fellow negotiators came up with in the preamble of the new document, which reference people, planet, and prosperity. I think that ultimately, this is an agenda that the world can rally around. The global community understands that you need all three things. You need to promote all three. That, I think, is what I think is exciting. It's also a conversation that the world would like to have in terms of, how do we actually organize to do that?

I'll stop there. Thank you.

PENNY DUCKHAM: Thank you, John. I'm going to turn to my colleague Jen Kates here in the Kaiser Washington office for a quick presentation, and then we'll move to the questions, which are coming in. Thank you very much. Keep them coming.

¹ The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

JEN KATES: This is great. Thank you, Penny. To Tony and John, thank you so much for your contributions and thoughts on this.

What I'll do is drill down a little deeper on the health components of the SDGs although, as both Tony and John said, it's really hard to separate or isolate out one concept within the SDGs from others. They're all very interconnected. I also want to reiterate some things that have been said that are really important to understand about the shift from the MDGs to the SDGs.

Seen in the first slide, really just represented by numbers. from a smaller number of goals to more goals, from a smaller number of targets to more targets, indicators, and down the line. One way to think about it is numbers, but the way I think about it, it represents a major transition in the view and approach to global health and development that's happened just in the past 15 years. From the time when MDGs were created, where there was very little global attention to the growing health problems of the day, to really a revolution in the approach that you could mark by - you've got not just MDGs, but the creation of PEPFAR, of the Global Fund, of Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance, and other things that are just quite remarkable in this trajectory of change.

They also were a real move from a very focused agenda - the MDG agenda was very focused - to a much more comprehensive

¹ The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

one. It moved from what I see as a view of the relationship between donor and recipients, or developed and developing, or an us-and-them model, to an all-of-us approach. This is really marked just in many ways both by who created these goals from an MDG very small more elite group, to a much more inclusive, and as John said, messy-sometimes process, but one that was much more democratic and involved civil society, certainly in the health sphere, but in all spheres at a level that we've not seen before. It's really been a move from a more narrow view of development to a much more universal one, which emphasizes addressing inequities and inequalities in this concept of leaving no one behind, which frankly was just not there before.

This move, I think from many analyses was definitely facilitated by the MDGs themselves as well as what came after them. It also, just to put some reality around this, this all has been occurring when there was a move initially from a time of rising budgets that more easily supported a growing emphasis on health and expanding agenda, to a time of austerity and financial constraints. That is just a real parameter that we all have to address. Also, the MDG agenda, while formally ending shortly, is not finished.

Turning to health, let's go to the next slide, which is just a visual comparison, just again focusing on health and isolating it to some extent, artificially. In the MDGs, there were three goals - the lighter blue - that were focused

¹ The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

directly on health, so that's about half, almost. In the SDGs, there is one health goal, but there are many others that obviously touch so much on health: zero hunger, gender equalities that are interconnected, but there is one dedicated health goal.

Going to the next one, looking at that health goal which is goal number three, the goal itself is to ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages. I'm sure Tony and others who are more involved in the back-story can say how to get that phrase and how it finally was agreed to is a long, long story, but that's what it is, and it's fairly inclusive. It includes nine targets that actually include all of the MDG elements that were health-specific.

It also includes, I do not know if this came up earlier, but for each of the areas of the SDG goals there are means of implementation, so it's not just here are our goals. There are other targets that really are about how we are going to make those goals happen. These are just the targets. Four of the nine of these actually have specific numbers associated with them. It's not just maternal mortality, but what you are going to do to reduce the global maternal mortality ratio, for example. Not all do. Some have a target year, again, not all do. This slide just presents all of that.

What's going to come next is indicators. All of these are good, but I think everyone knows that what you measure gets

¹ The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

done. The ongoing conversations are what are the specific indicators that are going to be agreed upon to measure each of these targets? Right now, there's over 200 that are being looked at. For the health area specifically, there are 16 that are highly recommended or suggested.

Going forward, a key question will be financing the SDG agenda and part of the reason this has become such a critical issue is that the traditional source of financing when the MDGs were first created, the international community was the traditional source, donor governance, development banks, to some extent the private sector and NGOs - it's flattening out. You can see this on the next slide. These are data from Chris Murray and his team at the Institute of Health Metrics and Evaluation, looking at development systems for health from all sources. You can see the MDG revolution starting in 2000 and on with a dramatic increase in funding for health from external sources that has begun to flatten out. Everyone has agreed that it's not going to be these sources that have the solution, but these are a key part of the story.

The last slide, just to bring it a little bit closer to the U.S., the U.S. represents about 30 percent of all international support for health. The U.S. too, has also been stagnating in the amount that is available. I think going forward, how this broader agenda gets financed is going to be a

¹ The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

key question and it's certainly not all about money, but that is going to be an issue.

Pulling this all together, I would just make a few closing comments. I think there's a lot of cautious optimism about health focus in the SDGs: that the idea that there's a recognition of leaving no one behind, and accomplishing not just the traditional health challenges, HIV, TB, and malaria, but new ones: non-communicable diseases, and pollution. Things that everyone is recognizing now are just as integral to the health of the world are on there. On the other hand, there's concern is the agenda so expansive that prioritization will be hard for countries? How are countries going to prioritize this health agenda? Who's going to monitor this? How are we going to hold countries and others accountable? I'll just mention that's where civil society becomes really important. Finally, what are the indicators that are going to be developed, agreed upon, and measured over time and the data for them?

These are just some of the questions that I think should be considered within a broader frame. I do believe there's a lot of cautious optimism that that there's about to be very soon, in a couple of weeks, a global consensus on a very comprehensive and forward looking health and poverty agenda for the next 15 years that I don't think many of us would have envisioned a decade ago. I will just end there, and look forward to everyone's questions.

¹ The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

PENNY DUCKHAM: Thank you and thank you to all the panelists for covering what is, I think we've all gathered, complex sets of issues in a relatively short period of time. Just to be clear, we will be posting a transcript and an audio version of this so you will have the chance to go back and check any bits that you have missed or need to be clarified. Please continue to submit questions and we're going to get to those now. I am just going to start with a fairly essential question given that this is the first of the goals.

From Jeanne Whalen at the Wall Street Journal, maybe Tony you could start with. How do you define extreme poverty?

TONY PIPA: Extreme poverty in the agenda itself is defined by income. In fact, I think it's target 1.1 which is eradicate extreme poverty currently measured as people living on less than \$1.25 a day. When we talk about extreme poverty, we're talking about consumption, those that are living on \$1.25 a day. I will say though that overall this agenda also broadens out into poverty in all its dimensions, and has an aspect. When you look at Goal 1 itself, the actual goal, before that target on extreme poverty is about ending poverty in all its forms, everywhere. Which is actually quite ambitious, because it starts to take into account different dimensions of poverty.

When we talked about extreme poverty and we talked about ending it in this generation by 2030, which I think it's

¹ The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

a moral center of this agenda, it is defined as people living on \$1.25 a day. John, you might want to, because there might be work that's going on to shift that.

PENNY DUCKHAM: John, do you want to add to that? Are you here John?

JOHN MCARTHUR: Yes, sorry. I was muted. I was responsibly muted for a moment. Excuse me. Just to say that exactly as Tony said. The \$1.25 a day that's the purchasing power parity measure. There's a whole technical history of that number, but it's based on the poverty line in the 15 poorest countries in the world which are in turn based on roughly actual what you need to eat to stay alive, roughly speaking. It is a very core measure of the worst forms of poverty in the world.

The actual number and the best way to put a current U.S. dollar equivalent parity number to that in purchasing power terms is a matter that is an ongoing technical review, so we presumed it from the latest purchasing power parity estimates that have come out in the past year. There's going to be a new assessment and a new number that's used to update that, but the core concept will be the same of really the most dramatic forms of extreme poverty. This goal, I would say, is really understood as the first among equals of the whole goal of the whole process of eliminating that.

¹ The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

The second target in the whole structure, and these 169 targets, the way I counted, there's really 107 outcome targets and then 62 procedural targets on how to get there. The second of these core outcome targets is, as Tony said, to cut at the national poverty line level in all countries, poverty by half by 2030. It's an absolute for the world to eliminate extreme poverty and then it is a proportionate for each country.

The other thing I would add here, just to make sure it's explicit, is that these are all aspirational targets. There's no binding element to this. These are things that countries have all agreed to aspire to. There's no punishment that a country gets other than the failure to achieve the goal, if it doesn't achieve the goal. I think the power of these voluntary commitments is that the idea is so compelling unto itself that one can't argue against it. Who can argue against eliminating extreme poverty by a reasonable metric by 2030? No one I know. The real question is how do you create space for people in communities, countries, providences, states, and towns around the world to figure out on their own terms how they are going to get there. The clarity of the target is what enables that to really happen in hopefully a powerful way.

PENNY DUCKHAM: I'm now going to move to a question from James Reinl from Al Jazeera in New York. In a sense, John, actually you addressed this when you gave us the anecdote about your mother. I am going to start with you, because I am

¹ The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

sure you have been faced with this challenge. Imagine that you are talking to an elderly relative or man on the street with no background knowledge of the SDGs, could you explain in the simplest jargon-free language possible what you would consider to be the most important issue to relay about these new U.N. targets?

TONY PIPA: I think, as John mentioned, it is a political commitment that world leaders are making to end poverty and its related indignity while at the same time sustaining and maintaining the earth's ecosystems and resources. I think that's at the core of it. You can think of it almost in terms of extreme poverty, extreme inequality, and extreme climate. The intersection of those particular issues and that gets to the core of it.

As John just mentioned, I think you really have at the moral center of this, the amazing opportunity that we have, that we are actually on the cusp of ending extreme poverty within a generation by 2030. It is something that the President has really committed to, from a U.S. perspective. He's mentioned it now three times running in the State of the Union Address. We, as the U.S., will partner with others to end extreme poverty in our lifetime. It's almost an under reported phenomenon. The amazing progress that we've made on this and that we are literally within reach. We are on the cusp.

¹ The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

As John even showed with some trends, even just doing business as we do it today we'll get down to 5 percent. Bending that curve with a greater political commitment and some greater focus, we are truly within reach of what would be an astounding human achievement. I think that is at the basis of these goals, and at the moral center.

At the same time, I think the point that I, and Jen picked up on this as well, the point about integration, where we have to do this at the same time as being sensitive to improvements that we want to make in the world and make progress on those at the same time as we're making progress around issues with poverty and things that are related to it, like the indicators on health, education, water, sanitation, and other things. I think it's extremely important.

I also think these take into account something that we really know now from a development perspective, that the best way out of extreme poverty is inclusive economic growth. It is about growth and it's about growth that reaches those that are the most vulnerable, are most marginalized, and doing it in a way that includes that economic activity for those that are at the lowest end of the scale.

Somebody mentioned that "leave no one behind" mantra. I also think that's a major difference between the MDGs and the SDGs whereas progress on the MDGs you could say because they were relative indicators, you could target those that were

¹ The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

closest to getting you over the line that we had set for ourselves on the MDGs. The SDGs force us to go deepest and to go to the farthest behind, because we really are going the last mile to be able to achieve the SDGs that we're putting out.

I hope that's helpful in shedding light in how to encapsulate the different mantras. As John put out there, it's people, planet, and prosperity. I would add peace and partnership into that. That you have all the dimensions as a shorthand. I really think it's about ending poverty and its indignities while sustaining and maintaining the planet's resources and its ecosystems.

PENNY DUCKHAM: Jen.

JEN KATES: I guess I would just add, because there's not much more to add. To be the person on the street who doesn't really know any of this and is probably hearing bits and pieces on the news of a lot of strife in the world, conflict, and questions about borders, this is a real good news story. Putting all that aside for a second, the world leaders in a consensus way are coming together have jointly agreed on this important agenda for the global community.

It's about ending extreme poverty and all its associated challenges, that there's agreement on this in a very big way, in a profound way, is a really important marker of what that power of coming together can do amidst all these other challenges. I just want to add that in, because I think

¹ The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

the average person in the street would want to know that since there are so much negative things happening around the world right now.

PENNY DUCKHAM: Of course, the interesting thing is that this discussion will immediately follow on from the address that the Pope will give to the Assembly which inevitably may touch on these questions too. I am going to now take a question from Claire Provost in London from the U.K. Center for Investigative Journalism. Tony, this is initially for you, but I think all three of you would address it. Why do you think the private sector, including some multinational corporations, have been interested in getting involved in the post-2015 agenda? To what extent did the U.S. consult with American companies when defining its positions on the SDGs?

TONY PIPA: Well, certainly, we engaged with private sector as well as we did with civil society and others, because I think it goes back to one of my earlier comments. The breadth and the ambition of this agenda really requires us, and this is the way in which this administration has also been approaching development, it really requires this to be a whole of society endeavor, so yes it's going to require government resources. Yes, it's going to require political leadership, and political will on behalf of leaders of governments. By the same time, the resources are going to have to go beyond what governments themselves can provide.

¹ The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

I think that's one of the reasons why the private sector is engaged. They see a role, actually. I think they also see that question of sustainability is something that I think they are struggling with themselves. From their own perspective as businesses, how are they going to maintain and continue to grow over time? What do they need to be challenging themselves in terms of sustainability? They see the convergence with the goals themselves.

Frankly, they also likely see opportunity in emerging markets and markets and areas of the world that are growing. Africa has a coterie of some of the fastest growing economies in the world, but is interested in economic transformation and economic growth that really reaches those who are most vulnerable within their countries. How can we find the intersection between private investment and private business to both stimulate and maintain development gains over time in a way that's sustainable? That's sustainable economically, that is also sustainable environmentally.

From our own perspective, so for example, when you look at some of the President's signature initiatives on development, look at something like Power Africa, which is about meeting energy poverty in Africa. We put through official development assistance and other public investments about \$7 billion on the table. We have leveraged up to almost \$32 billion additional dollars from that \$7 billion. Twenty

¹ The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

billion of it has been from the private sector. When you're looking at large term infrastructure like energy, and bringing energy access and sustainable energy to those that don't have it, you are going to need resources that go beyond what government can provide. You can unlock that through these multi-stakeholder partnerships. I think that's just one example of the type of things that Jen was even talking about: Gavi, the Global Fund, and what it's meant to global health. I think we continue to look at how you stimulate science, technology, and innovation around these particular issues. Again, I think that goes back to what can we do in partnership with the private sector and private investments.

PENNY DUCKHAM: John and Jen, do you want to touch on it too?

JEN KATES: Yes, I was thinking that when the question came up about that at least on the health side, and also more broadly in development, there really has been a concerted shift and change in the conversation around the private sector and the Global Fund and Gavi are perfect examples where you engage the private sector, not just after the fact, but in creating these institutions, financing these institutions, and leading these institutions, and the results you are seeing. I think a broader point that Tony made earlier is the realization that inclusive economic growth is all those rise up. I think the private sector sees that and whether it's self-interest or

¹ The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

economically driven as well as there being a sense of being part of a global community, it really has made the case to the private sector writ large of involvement in this in a way that wasn't there 20 years ago, 15 years ago.

PENNY DUCKHAM: John?

JOHN MCARTHUR: I would just add a couple of points on this. One is, like you see in the global health revolution of the past 15 years, there are many private sector leaders. Individuals and human beings simply want to be part of the solution. Whether that's organizing for new technologies, making products available in new ways, collaborating with governments for new financing mechanisms to make products available to people who wouldn't otherwise have access; just lots and lots of those things.

At the same time, I would say that there's the flip side, which is the basic need of this. If we think about, just think about the sense of orders of magnitude, the rough, rough, rough estimate to the incremental investments needed to bring all of these successes to life is on the order of \$1 to \$2 trillion a year. That sounds at first blush like a big scary number unless you think about it, just to put it into perspective, on what a roughly \$80 trillion global economy, it's actually a pretty small share. If you compare at the other end of the other end of the spectrum to say if every developed country in the world were to fulfill the targeted 0.7

¹ The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

percent of national income for official development assistance or foreign aid, that would only work out to about \$350 billion a year. These numbers and the nature of the investments are in some ways much bigger than anything an old school, if you will, aid budget would ever be able to take on.

They're also different in their nature, they're different in their composition, and they're about these issues, like how do you make the right investments that will garner and generate the right technologies and products to help support new ways of doing things? There's the role of basic science in that which typically tends to be publically funded, like the National Institutes of Health. There's a role for the venture capitalist community. There's a role for the institutional investors, and so forth.

One of the big issues here and it gets interwoven in that ending poverty and promoting prosperity side, the great example I would say, the biggest ticket numbers on this are around energy infrastructure for the world. Maybe \$600 billion to \$1 trillion a year of incremental investments is needed in energy infrastructure to build the smart cities, all the lack of urbanization around the world, to help create the environment for the jobs, and to get the power from the companies, all of these basic things. Much of that money, if not most of that money, is going to be private capital. It will depend on the country, the level of development, and all

¹ The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

those things. There are institutional investors, pension funds, and others that make these long-term investments in things like power plants. The question on one hand, it's how do we make sure that the power plants and the energy systems are getting built where the countries want them to get built, in order to boost their economies?

The other side of it though, and this is again this interwoven challenge at every step is how do we make sure those are low-carbon power plants? How do we make sure those are low-carbon energy systems? What are the incentives that the local government or the international institutions may be able to provide to crowd in that extra bit of financing that might help make sure that we bend the curves on the carbon trajectory. This is a classic example in a very profound issue where we need to align the incentives of the public investment and the private investments in order to solve the mix of problems in front of us.

The final thing I'd say on this is that in many parts of the world there's still concern that the business community is not yet very engaged in this. Also in other parts of the world, there's a concern that maybe the business community should not be overly engaged in this.

Just to be clear, I'm Canadian, so I come from that part of the world on a personal level. There are many issues of what are the fair standards for investment? What are the

¹ The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

Kaiser Family Foundation

9/9/15

fair standards for measuring our corporate performance whether that's on ecosystem footprint, labor standards, energy usage, all these things, but also what are the fair ways to recognize companies that make huge contributions through the normal course of business? This is part of the complexity, but also the power of this agenda, I think, to take on those questions with a much clearer head over the next 5 to 10 years.

PENNY DUCKHAM: I'm going to turn back to Tony for a moment, but before I do that I just wanted to add what is a related question really, from Vivienne Russell based in London at the Public Finance International. She's asking: Does the shift to a broader more inclusive development agenda need to be matched by a parallel shift in finance away from traditional aid flows, which is effectively what we've really been talking about now.

TONY PIPA: That's interesting, because that's a little bit of what I wanted to come back and comment on. I do think that the collective action and the shared responsibility elements of the SDGs really reflect the change even in the global economy. The message that I heard from countries over and over again, as we were engaging in dialogue and the discourse in putting the agenda together, is that they have ownership of their own development. They are leading that development, and so it wasn't a question, which I think the MDGs were a little bit predicated upon about aid and being an

¹ The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

aid recipient and how you could maximize and optimize the impact of aid. It was about we are interested in leading our own economic transformation and doing the things necessary both from a policy perspective as well as our own institutions, governance, and our infrastructure to be able to really stimulate the kind of economic growth that will do the things that the SDGs lay out, both in terms of poverty reduction, but also in terms of growth and in terms of meeting some of the multiple strands of the goals.

It also reflects, frankly, even the shift in financial flows worldwide. In the 1960s official development assistance going from developed to developing countries made up 71 percent of the external flows that developing countries receive in terms of financial flows. That number is now down to 9 percent, because you've had incredible growth of foreign direct investments. You've had the growth of philanthropic giving, and remittances. There's just a much greater mix of financial flows. During the time, like even over the last 10 to 15 years, the amount of domestic resources that developing countries have has almost tripled. They have more of their own resources and they're continuing to mobilize more resources domestically and are interested in doing that. It does speak to a more nuanced and varied approach to how we use our official development assistance.

¹ The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

For the poorest countries and those that have the least access to outside financing, ODA, which is the common acronym for our aid is extremely important, and is primarily grant-based from the U.S. perspective. It provides them a way to be able to finance some of the human and social development programs that we're talking about. We're also increasingly using our ODA as a way to leverage and catalyze other resources. I spoke a little bit about Power Africa and that's just one example of how we've been using our own aid, and even as we've been providing funding to the Global Fund, for example, we've been doing it sometimes on a matching basis. It crowds in other types of investment.

I really think there are increasing innovations in even the type of public investments that we're making available. Rather than just giving direct grant-based aid to developing countries, we are increasing the amount of ways in which we use our public investment to reduce risk through things like loan guarantees, so that private sector investment can happen more readily, for example, and looking for ways to create partnerships in which we do that.

I think you'll continue to see innovation in that regard. I think you'll continue to see ways in which we look for ways to maximize the return on investment that we're providing through our official development assistance. As John said, we're going to have to unlock the resources across many

¹ The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

different sectors and maximize the impact of those resources for the sustainable development gains that we're putting out. I think it's just increasingly reflective of how the world economy has changed and where developing countries and their progress, what it's brought us as well.

PENNY DUCKHAM: I hate to end on a rather more skeptical note, because this is in a way extremely encouraging and different story than some of the headlines that one sees. This is James Reinl again, that's Al Jazeera who's asking, the Middle East was fairing quite well on the MDGs, then the Arab Spring happened, followed by conflict in Libya, Yemen, Korea, and Iraq, that derailed the progress. What is the point of expecting this region to achieve the global SDG targets against such a worrying backdrop of war, instability, and refugees? Again, I'm sorry, because I feel what we focused on what could even seem rather utopian, but I think very realistic goals. We're dragging ourselves back to the headlines and reality.

TONY PIPA: I think it's a good entre, though, into the recognition of something we haven't talked about. That is the recognition in the SDGs of the importance of peace and peaceful and inclusive societies as well as the stability and strength of governance and how that governance needs to be responsive to its citizens. That was not something that was part of the original MDGs. Goal 16 in the SDGs captured many of those elements as well as there are other things in the goals

¹ The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

themselves that also focused attention on communities and populations that also need to have that attention to be able to be included in progress.

I do think that one of the powers that we've learned, and one of the lessons that we've learned of the MDGs is that one, it gave a real platform for discourse between citizens and countries about what progress meant. I think having those elements of peace and governance is really important, because it will provide a platform for conversation around that.

It will also provide a platform for driving some standard ways of measuring progress around that. The MDGs were very helpful within the health community, actually, on coming to some international standardization and agreement on what metrics ought to look like and how we gather and collect that data. I think it will do the same for some newer parts of the agenda. I think it's actually a really important point, because when you look at progress on the MDGs, those countries that fared worst and struggled to meet even one MDG were countries typically coming out of conflict or continuing to be in conflict, or which had still some instability or some weakness in the institutions that they have as a government to be able to provide services and protection for their people.

I think the agenda forces us to recognize and to focus political attention and effort in that area. It's something that, over the next 15 years, hopefully we'll continue to keep

¹ The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

elevated, the importance of those issues to our overall development progress.

PENNY DUCKHAM: John?

JOHN MCARTHUR: Just two quick points on this. I know we need the time. One is I would say that there are many issues in here which are risk-mitigators for exactly the types of problems that we don't want to see. If we look, for example, at climate change the top journals in the world now show that places with higher variance of extreme weather events, temperature, and precipitation are at higher risk of conflict and violence. This is a deep apparent truth in the data that might even well be universal that there are risks to climate change. There's even debate around the extent to which this helps explain some of the trends in Syria itself in reading journals. We see that these are about not just solving the problem, as it exists in its acute form, but tackling the undercurrent. The issues of inequality within many countries, some argue, are fundamental to that.

The deeper point I would say is when you think about these goals these are ultimately starting points, not finishing points. These are about identifying a set of north stars so that everyone can go in the same direction; at least when it's dark outside and it feels dark outside. This is about how we can build, whether it's public-private partnerships, whether it's the scientific collaboration, whether it's the community

¹ The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

working with the national government, whether it's the regional cooperation, or whether it's the international system.

Whatever it might be, getting the different actors to think about a common purpose.

That's why this incredibly inclusive process that's where we are today is so important. It has been the most inclusive global agenda setting conversation ever to take place. The people who worry about oceans are typically their own community. The people who worry about urban infrastructure are typically their own community. They now can all see, and so on and so on, each community, how they fit together into this common agenda in a way that's never been possible before either. In the moment they're celebrating the global political victory of coming to this common agenda, we do have to underscore I think just how much work lies ahead of us to solve these problems. These goals, if used right, in a self-fulfilling manner that we do decide, all of us, to take them seriously; they become a way for us to keep honest in our own conversations with ourselves and with each other, about are we solving the problems that we said we were going to solve? What do we need to be better? What's the transparency of that mechanism? How are we actually doing on the things that we said we care about, because we promised to track this in a serious and earnest way for the next 15 years?

¹ The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

PENNY DUCKHAM: Thank you, John. As a wrap up now, Tony, do you just want to make any final thoughts?

TONY PIPA: Yes. Just to take a step back a bit. 2015 as a year is really a year of development for political leaders and for governments. We had a conference in July on financing for development, which actually touched on many of the things we were talking about around financing, and set in to this consensus that we got on the SDGs. In December, you will have the COP and climate change being a big part of the agenda. This really has been an important year when we talk about development and the sustainable aspects of development in where there's an intersection between reducing poverty, and the commitment to reducing extreme poverty and sustainability concerns.

As well as, I will say, the upcoming two weeks or towards the end of September will bring an extreme spotlight on the political moment for this to be part of how we bring the world's attention to issues of development and sustainable development. We will have the Pope's visit to the U.S. He'll address both Congress and then immediately after the U.N. In fact, he addresses the U.N. the morning before the Summit for Sustainable Development kicks off at the U.N. that will run for a couple days in New York.

There will be the State visit from the Chinese president to the White House as well. You have an opportunity

¹ The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

really to focus. There'll be large public relations efforts that are trying to make the world aware of these particular goals and the meaning they can have: what John was just so eloquently talking about, what the political commitment and that global consensus around these goals can mean for the world, and how citizens can be involved. I think it's just a real opportunity to cherish some of a good news story, frankly, and for people to be more aware of what can be best described as very complicated, and sometimes in times of turmoil, as the world's governments have really worked hard to come up with a global consensus around these issues, and are making a political commitment to really achieve the aspirations that are reflected in these goals. I think that's quite extraordinary and astounding. I think the political moment will be quite exciting.

PENNY DUCKHAM: Thank you to our panelists for covering this so clearly. We will have a recording of today's presentations on our website later today, and a transcript should be available in the coming week. I'm sorry for the few questions that were not addressed. We will try to follow up with you afterwards. There's Katie's email if anybody has additional questions you'd like to send our way.

Thank you for being part of this. I hope you find it helpful as you look ahead to your reporting on these issues in a couple of weeks' time. Thank you for joining us today.

¹ The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

WHAT DO THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS MEAN FOR GLOBAL HEALTH? 42
Kaiser Family Foundation
9/9/15

[END RECORDING 28795-090915_kff_webinar.mp3]

¹ The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.