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Preface

The World Economic Forum is pleased to present the third annual report of the Global Governance Initiative, part of our series of public-private and multistakeholder projects to catalyse action on key global challenges.

Each year, the Global Governance Initiative has convened more than 40 leading experts from academia, the private sector and civil society to assess the level of effort around the world on a range of internationally agreed goals in six major areas: peace and security, poverty and hunger, education, health, the environment and human rights. The conclusions of this year’s report characterize the world’s performance in implementing the Millennium Declaration as mixed, with some important new signs of movement but much still left to be done.

The report provides both a scorecard to measure the effort exerted by governments, international organizations, business and civil society during 2005 towards these goals—and a concise discussion of key actions taken and opportunities missed. It then looks ahead to 2006 and outlines what must happen in the coming year for the world to be on track to achieve its goals.

The Global Governance Initiative would not be possible without the generous support of the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, the Centre for International Governance Innovation in Canada, the United Nations Foundation and Nike, Inc. The Forum is also grateful to the dedication of the six expert groups and the organizations they represent, the eminent steering committee for its project guidance and to Ann Florini, Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institution and GGI Project Director, and Parag Khanna, Global Governance Fellow at the Brookings Institution, for their leadership in carrying the Initiative’s work forward. Not every Global Governance Initiative steering committee or expert group member necessarily agrees with the views expressed in this report. Nor do the views necessarily represent an institutional position of the World Economic Forum or its members.

2006 could turn out to be a watershed year for the international goals. Much will depend on how the international community now responds to the new commitments and challenges that received so much public attention during the year. We at the Forum hope the Global Governance Initiative will contribute to progress by helping to hold all of us—governments, business and civil society alike—to greater account for the effort required.

Richard Samans
Managing Director
World Economic Forum
Geneva, December 2005
Executive summary

Five years after world leaders committed themselves and their countries to a broad and urgent array of global goals, hopes ran high that 2005 would be the “turnaround year”, the year when global efforts would finally begin to match global aspirations for humanity’s future. It was not—but it came a bit closer than cynics expected.

2005 proved that the world can make real progress towards achieving its most fundamental goals. It got slightly better at reducing hunger and extreme poverty, improving global public health, ensuring peace and security and providing access to basic education. New and badly needed roadmaps emerged, thanks to the extraordinary reports of the UN Millennium Project, the UK Africa Commission and the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. Under the leadership of UK Prime Minister Tony Blair and the powerful pressure of a heavily mobilized transnational civil society, the G-8 governments agreed to provide substantial new funds to promote development. Large developing countries, notably China, India and Brazil, took major strides, and Asia in general exuded new confidence and excitement.

But 2005 also demonstrated the power of inertia and shortsightedness. At the World Summit of almost all nations in September, political leaders had the opportunity to commit themselves to a “grand bargain” that could have led to real breakthroughs on much of the global agenda, from development to security to human rights. They largely wasted the chance to dramatically improve how they run the world, taking only small steps—not meaningless, but far from the major strides that are both needed and possible. The new aid promised by the rich countries is significant, but even if the promises are met in full—a rarity in the history of such promises—they still fall far short of what is needed. The fight against AIDS alone could use most of the new money.

And on such key issues as human rights and the environment, the world actually did worse than it had in previous years. That matters not only because of the inherent importance of these issues, but because progress in one area depends so heavily on progress in the others. Global public health, for example, requires access to clean water and sanitation. Climate change is already exacerbating malaria, malnutrition and diarrhoea throughout the world. The world’s poorest people need sustainably managed ecosystems to preserve their livelihoods, and the scarcity of natural resources can fuel violent conflict.

Yet 2005 also demonstrated how much non-traditional actors are starting to do. Civil society groups mobilized on an unprecedented scale to force governments to get more serious about their commitments to the world’s poor. Local and regional governments did more than their national counterparts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Private business grappled with notions of social responsibility, and private foundations and pharmaceutical firms now account for an enormous share of the progress on global public health.

Overall, therefore, 2005 was a mixed year of grand opportunities and inadequate actions, leaving ever more riding on what the world can muster the courage to do in 2006. We do not yet know whether the slight improvement in several of the scores for 2005 is a blip in a continuing cycle of neglect and apathy, or the start of a serious trend toward real progress in the human condition. Will historians look back one day and say that 2005 was the real beginning of the 21st century—the century when humanity achieved meaningful stability and prosperity throughout the world?
Goals and scores

Peace and security score: 3/10
The key challenges to global peace and security—to end civil and international wars, to eliminate weapons of mass destruction and to prevent terrorism—affect people everywhere. The year’s headlines were mostly depressing. Major violence continued in Iraq, Darfur, Nepal, Chechnya, Northern Uganda, the Democratic Republic of Congo and a host of other conflicts, while terrorist assaults wrought death and destruction from London to Amman. And there was no real progress in resolving the nuclear crises in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea and Iran.

Despite this depressing record, the world did marginally better in addressing peace and security issues than in 2004. No new wars broke out either within or between countries, and peace agreements gave hopes for an end to long-running conflicts in Sudan and Indonesia. The September UN World Summit, although largely a lost opportunity, produced two major breakthroughs—the creation of a Peacebuilding Commission at the UN and the adoption of the “responsibility to protect” principle.

In 2006 multiple challenges will continue to confront us. Foremost among them are: Iraq; resolving the “big three” African conflicts in Darfur, Northern Uganda and Congo; and resolving the nuclear standoffs in Iran and Korea DPR and regenerating momentum on disarmament and non-proliferation issues.

Those engaged in meeting these challenges can at least have the satisfaction of knowing that their efforts make a real difference. The evidence set out in Human Security Report 2005 demonstrates how the international community has helped achieve significant declines in political violence around the world over the past decade.

Poverty and hunger scores

Poverty: 5/10
Hunger: 4/10
The scores for poverty and hunger alleviation inched up for 2005. Rich-country governments and world leaders promised to increase aid and debt relief. Populous countries such as Brazil, China and India invested in significant pro-poor actions. And massive civil society campaigns kept local and global pressure on governments to cut poverty and hunger in half.

But the global picture remains mixed. Rapid economic growth has not translated into poverty reduction globally. Only East Asia has met the poverty goal, and only Latin America is on track to meet the hunger goal. Lack of preparedness for natural disasters hit the poor hard. The UN Summit largely reiterated commitments already made in other recent summits. The World Trade Organization’s (WTO) ministerial meeting in December made only slight progress towards making a dent in poverty and hunger.

Looking ahead, for the scores to improve, civil society will have to keep the pressure on donor governments to honor their new commitments. Small and medium-size developing country governments will need to improve their governance and will need help to develop their capacity to implement pro-poor policies. And innovative pro-poor partnerships between governments, businesses and civil societies will make a key
difference in realizing “quick wins”. The momentum of 2005 must translate into real action on the ground in 2006.

**Education score: 4/10**

The first international benchmark for education—to eliminate gender disparities at all levels by 2005—has passed us by, and at least 50 countries in Africa and Asia stand no chance of providing all children a primary education by 2015. While such countries as China have moved to eliminate school fees, another 100 still impose them. Donor countries lag badly in fulfilling their promise to bridge the funding gaps for the Education for All Fast Track Initiative (FTI), an international partnership that promised to provide assistance to any country with credible education sector plans.

The debt relief and increased aid pledges in 2005 could fill that funding gap, but rich countries made no specific commitments to education. The UN World Summit and the World Bank–International Monetary Fund (IMF) meetings in the fall also failed to boost funding for education; only US$ 1.5 billion of the estimated US$ 10 billion needed annually is currently being provided. Were it not for civil society initiatives like the Global Campaign for Education and corporate foundation investments such as those in India, there would be even less good news to report.

A hundred million children are still not enrolled in primary school, a number that will not fall substantially unless more resources are committed in 2006. Several dozen countries are devising workable education plans, and donors must boost Fast Track Initiative funding to help turn these plans into reality.

**Health score: 5/10**

2005 provided no shortage of warning signs about the importance of global health. HIV/AIDS continued to spread. Malaria killed upwards of a million more people. And the world did little to reduce the under-five mortality rate and maternal mortality ratio.

Funding boosts for immunization from the European Union and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation contributed to improving the world’s overall score to 5, but nowhere near enough is being done to address myriad shortfalls. The woeful state of the world’s public health infrastructure, the lack of access to laboratory supplies, drugs and medications, and the shortage of health workers make it highly unlikely that Sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia and Oceania will meet the goals. In Africa 35% of children face a greater risk of dying prematurely than a decade ago, while AIDS remains the leading cause of early death. Even though addressing malaria mainly requires deploying known treatments, very little progress was made in 2005 due to only small funding increases for the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria and poor organization of the Roll Back Malaria Partnership.

To reverse the decay of crumbling health infrastructure and information networks around the
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The world will require the commitment of significant additional long-term resources, along the lines outlined in the Millennium Project’s reports.

Environment score: 2/10

The world’s environmental goals—to stabilize atmospheric greenhouse gas concentrations at safe levels, reverse biodiversity loss and cut in half the proportion of people without safe access to drinking water and sanitation—require but did not receive high-level political commitment.

Few countries managed to reduce emissions of heat-trapping gasses. Ecosystem protection frameworks are simply absent. And hundreds of millions of people, particularly in Africa, remain without clean water or sanitation, threatening the achievement of goals on curbing hunger, eradicating poverty and combating disease. High energy prices helped spur renewed attention towards clean and efficient technologies. Local governments and some corporations moved boldly ahead of their national leaders on emission reduction initiatives. And in Asia, particularly in China and India, access to clean water and sanitation has improved, and there is some hope of reaching the goal there.

For 2006 the world must take advantage of high oil prices to boost investment in clean energy and technology transfer. The private sector must emulate General Electric’s newfound commitment to clean technology and emissions reduction, but the market alone will not be our saviour. Other governments must follow the lead of the European Union to take serious action on climate change. And all actors should begin to heed the findings of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment.

Human rights score: 2/10

The status of human rights in the world continued to decline in 2005. Not only did persistent challenges remain unaddressed, but the serious erosion of human rights by counterterrorism policies accelerated.

The International Criminal Court issued its first warrants. But up to 2 million people in Darfur, Sudan, still faced the violent attacks and total impunity of the perpetrators, indicating how far the world has to go to prevent crimes against humanity in the year that marked the 60th anniversary of the Nuremberg Tribunal. And it is still unknown whether the precedent-setting trial of Saddam Hussein will deliver impartial justice or be a political show. From the United Kingdom to Thailand, laws passed in the name of fighting terrorism shifted the center of gravity from protecting rights to restricting them—with uncertain consequences for democracy. The continued practice of outsourcing torture to countries with scant human rights protection, the refusal to end the legal black hole in which Guantanamo Bay prisoners languish, the failure to deal with the systemic attitudes that led to the Abu Ghraib torture—all were unfortunate features of 2005. It remains to be seen whether the proposed Human Rights Council will achieve more legitimacy than its predecessor in the United Nations.

One notable area of progress occurred with the growing requirements and regulations on the private sector to report on the social impact of their activities, measures driven by both the European Union and the voice of civil society. In 2006 much more should be done to spread economic and social rights norms, which will require civil society to continue to strengthen its demands to move from charity to rights.
Introduction

2005 was a year of high hopes and big promises. Five years after the world’s governments agreed on a comprehensive agenda to confront humanity’s most pressing woes, they stepped up the pace of action—a bit. Often they promised new resources or established new programmes because civil society groups mobilized to an extraordinary degree to demand such action. Where those intensive pressures were lacking—notably on environment and human rights—government efforts were especially anaemic. Bubbling under the surface frenzy of high-level commissions and global summits were uncounted numbers of less publicized and smaller initiatives involving everyone from local governments to businesses to dedicated individuals.

What did all the rhetoric and activity add up to over the year? Did it get us on track to achieve the world’s goals?

This report, the third in an annual series produced by the World Economic Forum’s Global Governance Initiative, provides the assessments of some of the world’s leading experts about how large the gap remains between the rhetoric of global goals and the reality of action on the ground. As in previous years, those assessments cover the contributions of all the types of actors on the global stage: governments, intergovernmental organizations, the business community and civil society. Governments are the key actors with the lion’s share of responsibility for ensuring the achievement of the goals, and the intergovernmental organizations they create are essential tools in that struggle. But governments are unlikely to meet the challenge without the active and large-scale participation of both the private sector and civil society.

Our assessments begin with the specific goals agreed on by the world’s leaders in such documents as the UN Millennium Declaration, across the full range of security, development, environmental and human rights issues so fundamental to global stability and prosperity. The Global Governance Initiative takes no position on whether the agreed goals are adequate or the “right” ones for humanity (although we recognize that the goals have become invaluable rallying points to mobilize global efforts). That decision has been made by the most legitimate representatives available—the world’s governments. The point of this exercise is to monitor whether those governments (with support from other actors) are making the effort to carry out their commitments.

This year, as in past years, the Global Governance Initiative has graded the world on its performance in each of six issue areas: peace and security; poverty and hunger; education; health; environment; and human rights. The grades are on a zero to ten scale, with ten representing not stellar effort but merely what the world should be doing to be on track to achieve its basic goals. Every number below ten is a step down from the level of effort needed. One indicates that the total level of effort accomplished essentially nothing, and zero means that human activity over the course of the year moved us in the wrong direction.

Overall the news is positive, but only a bit. On most of the goals the world’s efforts for 2005 earned slightly higher scores than in previous years—although still no score higher than a five, representing a level of effort about half what was needed. And because the scores have for several years fallen far below ten, the gap between action and aspiration is growing ever larger: more will need to be done in the future to make up for what was not done in the past.

Progress came on several fronts. The world got better at agreeing on what is needed to achieve the various goals. The UN Millennium Project released a series of extraordinary roadmaps on exactly what it will take to achieve the set of global goals collectively known as the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), which cover poverty, hunger, health and education. The Africa Commission, chaired by UK Prime Minister Tony Blair, highlighted the need for a massive increase in assistance to that
continent. The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment delivered the first comprehensive evaluation of the state of the world’s ecosystems, along with a sobering set of proposals for what would be needed to maintain them.

Even before the roadmaps emerged, there were signs that people were becoming more willing to act. The UK government, in assuming its presidency of the Group of Eight (G-8) in 2005, had signalled its intention to make action on Africa a major priority. And by the time the G-8 leaders had assembled in July at Gleneagles in Scotland massive global publicity from a world-wide alliance of non-governmental organizations had hammered home for the leaders the need to make immediate progress on poverty reduction. That campaign involved hundreds of thousands of people in marches and a set of Live-8 concerts around the world, watched by an estimated 2 billion people. There was, then, unprecedented pressure from a wide range of sources for the G-8 leaders to act.

At the meeting of the G-8 leaders in July, and at the UN World Summit and the World Bank–International Monetary Fund (IMF) annual meetings in September, the world’s governments agreed to write off the largely uncollectible debts of the world’s poorest countries to international institutions. And richer governments promised to provide more aid—some US$ 50 billion more than 2004 levels, ramping up from about US$ 80 billion to just short of US$ 130 billion a year by 2010—enough to catalyse significant change if it represents truly new and additional commitments. Half this increase in development aid—some US$ 25 billion by 2010—was earmarked for Africa, doubling the aid to that continent.

But 2005 was, unfortunately, not the year that made poverty history. The new promises on aid still fall short of what will be needed in the next few years, if the Millennium Project is correct. The fight against HIV/AIDS alone could take up that much money. And given past donor behaviour, there is no guarantee that all the promised new funding will actually emerge. Moreover, the lion’s share of responsibility for achieving the development goals lies with the developing countries themselves. Some, such as China, India and Brazil, have taken major strides, and Asia in general exudes new confidence and excitement. But other nations are still mired in conflict, destitution and, too often, corruption.

The other major step forward in 2005 should have been a global “grand bargain” to reform the United Nations, revamping international systems for addressing peace and security, human rights and development to make those systems capable of addressing the extraordinary challenges described throughout this report. But in September, at the World Summit at the UN Headquarters in New York, the world’s leaders largely wasted an extraordinary opportunity to dramatically improve the way they run the world. Hard-line intransigence, diplomatic incompetence and fundamentally competing visions of what the United Nations should be—all left the proposed grand bargain in tatters. Instead, the world got only piecemeal reforms—a good move on better structures for peacebuilding, agreement that the international community has the right to step in when national governments fail to fulfil their “responsibility to protect” their own citizens from atrocity crimes, and a vague promise to create a better UN institution on human rights.

Even a fully successful World Summit would not have raised all the scores to perfect tens (and perfect tens in any case represent only a sufficient effort, not an outstanding one). Although such an outcome would certainly have improved the score on peace and security and might have helped raise the horrible score the world earned this year on human rights, it would have made little difference to the equally terrible score on environment. Yet the lack of environmental progress undermines progress on almost all other goals. Global public health depends heavily on access to clean water and sanitation. An article in Nature in November provided data indicating that climate change is
already driving up rates of malaria, malnutrition and diarrhoea (a major killer of children) throughout the world, contributing to more than 150,000 deaths and 5 million illnesses a year. The world’s poorest people need sustainably managed ecosystems to preserve their livelihoods. Scarcity of natural resources can fuel violent conflict.

Indeed, all of the struggles are connected. Sick children don’t go to school, uneducated people are less likely to climb out of destitution, poverty and hunger are strongly correlated with ill health. Violent conflict disrupts societies, impoverishes people and undermines essential ecosystems. Poverty often occurs not as an inherent condition of humanity but as the result of systemic human rights violations.

Despite the disappointing results of the September World Summit, the growing likelihood that we will not meet all of the international development goals and the disastrous performance of governments on environmental commitments, 2005 also had some surprisingly good news. Real innovation was under way, but it was often not to be found in the minutes of the negotiations.

This report contains numerous examples of impressive action by local governments, civil society groups and businesses—sometimes in partnership. It is not yet the norm to think about such actors and their partnerships as the model for problem-solving, and they generally operate on too small a scale to bring about transformational change for the world. But already, pharmaceutical firms and private foundations account for an enormous share of the movement on global public health. Subnational governments and the business sector are doing more than many national leaders on climate change. Governments make progress on the development goals largely in response to civil society pressures. And businesses are beginning to investigate the opportunities to do well by doing good at the bottom of the pyramid.

This project takes a year-by-year approach, necessary to hold decision-makers accountable. Journeys start with single steps. To date, we have taken too few steps every year. We do not yet know whether the slight improvement in several of the scores for 2005 is a blip in a continuing cycle of neglect and apathy, or the start of a serious trend towards greater promise-keeping and accountability. The subsequent chapters each conclude by looking ahead to identify how to pick up the pace in 2006.

These goals also demand a long-term perspective. The development goals, for example, have ten more years to go. But goals themselves are just way stations to further destinations. Even if we achieve the poverty goal, that will still leave close to a billion people in utter destitution. On global warming, it may already be too late to avoid dangerous man-made interference with the climate, and we will be dealing with the problem for generations to come. Overall, we must decide how willing we are to roll the dice on humanity’s future.

These are not reasons for despair. They are, very definitely, reasons to redouble our efforts. If we do, historians may look back one day and say that 2005 was the real beginning of the 21st century—the century when humanity found ways to achieve meaningful stability and prosperity through the world.
Goals

- Free all peoples from the scourge of war, both within and between states.
- Seek to eliminate the dangers posed by weapons of mass destruction.
- Take concerted action against international terrorism.
- End illicit traffic in small arms.

Rationale for the score

The year’s headlines in all these areas were mostly depressing—with major violence continuing in Iraq, thousands still dying every month in Darfur and the Democratic Republic of Congo, nuclear stalemates maintained with the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea and Iran, terrorist attacks from London to Bali, continuing war in Nepal and Chechnya and missed opportunities for UN reform at the September World Summit.

But there was some forward movement. Peace agreements gave hope for an end to long-running civil conflicts in Sudan and Indonesia. The fragility of a number of situations notwithstanding, no new wars began either within or between countries. And two major breakthroughs did come from the World Summit—agreement to fill a longstanding institutional gap with the new Peacebuilding Commission and unanimous embrace of the principle of the “responsibility to protect”, recognizing limitations on state sovereignty in situations of catastrophic internal violence.

On balance, the international community did marginally better in addressing peace and security issues than in 2004—justifying a score of 3 rather than 2—but still much less well than it could do, and needs to do, for the world’s peoples to be freed from the scourge of war and mass violence.

Key events in 2005

The hope that 2005 would be a watershed year for global peace and security governance proved unfounded. The UN’s 60th Anniversary World Summit in September, the largest ever gathering of world leaders, was convened at a time when not only was the need for reform almost universally acknowledged, but a very detailed agenda for achieving it had evolved, distilled in UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan’s *In Larger Freedom* report. He described the Summit as a “once-in-a-generation opportunity” to strengthen and revitalize the multilateral system.

Sadly, the heads of government largely wasted this extraordinary opportunity. There was important movement on post-conflict peacebuilding and the embrace of the new “responsibility to protect” norm, and some lip service paid to the need to reinforce the peacemaking and peacekeeping capacity of the UN and regional organizations, but beyond that nothing of real substance on peace and security. The Security Council remained unrestructured and unrepresentative, and leaders could not agree on a norm-setting definition of terrorism. The attempt to establish guidelines identifying criteria of legitimacy for the use of military force failed. On disarmament and non-proliferation, no agreement could be reached on any of the key issues.

Eliminating war between states

No new interstate wars began in 2005, but there was scant progress in resolving existing ones. The situation in Iraq began to spin out of control. Violence escalated in Afghanistan and continued between Israelis and Palestinians. And an uneasy stalemate between Ethiopia and Eritrea looked close to unravelling. Tensions diminished, however, across the Taiwan Strait and for a second consecutive year between India and Pakistan.

All eyes were again on Iraq in 2005—the world’s deadliest conflict in combat-related deaths. The year began with relatively successful elections in January, but disenchantment with the political process led to a low voter turnout among Sunni Arabs and their underrepresentation in the new interim National Assembly. Kurdish and Shiite
Political violence declines worldwide: International action matters

Significant encouragement for those looking for evidence that good international governance makes a difference in peace and security, as elsewhere, came with the publication in October of the long-awaited Human Security Report 2005, a comprehensive study by the University of British Columbia and supported by five governments. The report demonstrates, counterintuitively for most people, that there has been a dramatic decrease in the number of conflicts (by 40% since the early 1990s)—with battle deaths declining even more dramatically over a longer period. It also shows an even more striking reduction in the number of mass killings (by 80% since the late 1980s) despite Rwanda, Srebrenica and Darfur, and a large increase in the number of civil conflicts resolved by negotiation.

Several factors contributed to these results—including the end of the Cold War, with all its proxy wars and resented authoritarian governments. But the crucial ingredient identified in the study is the huge increase in the level and effectiveness of international preventive diplomacy, diplomatic peace-making, peacekeeping and peacebuilding operations—for the most part authorized and mounted by the United Nations, and strongly supported by many other international players, including non-governmental organizations.

leaders failed to find common ground with Sunni Arabs over the country’s constitution, producing a draft text that, while approved in a nationwide referendum in October, was deeply divisive. The frequency and deadliness of attacks against Iraqi and coalition forces—and Iraqi civilians—increased, as did calls for the withdrawal of allied troops. By year’s end the risk of de facto partition and full-scale civil war remained high.

There were positive steps in the Israel-Palestine conflict, but the prospect of lasting peace remained remote. In February newly elected Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas and Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon brokered an informal ceasefire with Palestinian militant groups, which, while tested to its limits, helped bring casualties in 2005 to their lowest level since 2000. Israel unilaterally withdrew its soldiers and settlers from the Gaza Strip, but construction of settlements and the controversial separation barrier continued in the West Bank.

Elsewhere in the Middle East relations between Lebanon and Syria deteriorated dramatically, with outrage over the shocking February assassination of former Prime Minister Rafik Hariri, forcing the withdrawal of Syrian troops from the country—long demanded by the UN Security Council. A UN inquiry implicated top Syrian officials, with the Security Council demanding Syrian cooperation with the investigation.

The peace maintained by Ethiopia and Eritrea since formal cessation of hostilities in December 2000 frayed dangerously, with neither side showing a willingness to compromise in their ongoing border dispute. The UN expressed its serious concern over the deterioration.
In Asia the conflict in Afghanistan between U.S.-led coalition forces and insurgents intensified, with concern growing over the Taliban’s apparently increasing strength. Attacks against aid and election workers continued. President Hamid Karzai struggled to navigate ethnic and sectarian interests amid a political and economic scene dominated by warlords and drugs.

Tensions eased for the second straight year between India and Pakistan over Kashmir. Bus service resumed across the Line of Control for the first time since partition in 1947, and unprecedented discussions began between moderate Kashmiri separatists and New Delhi. The devastating October earthquake, which killed scores of thousands in Kashmir, created hopes for further relaxation of the separation barrier, but continuing government mistrust left most of them unrealized, and separatist violence continued.

Elsewhere in Asia tensions between China and Taiwan abated after a series of visits to the mainland by Taiwanese opposition leaders and Beijing’s subsequent decision to lift some cross-strait travel restrictions.

Little progress was made in resolving the frozen conflicts in the southern Caucasus—Nagorno-Karabakh, Georgia/South Ossetia–Georgia/Abkhazia and Moldova–Transdniestria.

Eliminating war within states

No new intrastate wars began in 2005, and two major civil conflicts—between the Sudan government and southern rebels and between the Indonesian government and Aceh rebels—ended with peace agreements. But the international community did too little to manage serious ongoing troubles in Darfur and the Democratic Republic of Congo, or to resolve other crises from Haiti to Nepal, Zimbabwe and Côte d’Ivoire.

The conclusion in Sudan of the January 2005 Comprehensive Peace Agreement between the Khartoum government and the southern-based Sudan People’s Liberation Movement, formally bringing to an end one of the world’s longest and most destructive wars, was a good start to the year. But implementation remained fragile, despite the deployment of 10,000 UN peacekeepers to the south.

The security and humanitarian situation in Darfur remained dire. The small and belatedly deployed African Union peace force could not adequately protect displaced civilians, new fighting erupted. With the rebel movement still divided and Khartoum less than cooperative, the political settlement sought by the African Union looked far off. One positive development was the UN Security Council’s referring, with the United States abstaining rather than opposing, Darfur atrocity crimes to the International Criminal Court.

The Democratic Republic of Congo’s shaky transition inched forward amid widespread insecurity, with as many as 1,000 still dying every day from disease, malnutrition and sporadic...
Steps were taken to strengthen the monitoring capability and credibility of the Kimberley Process, the UN-backed voluntary initiative stemming the trade in conflict diamonds

violence. A new constitution was adopted in May, but with preparations lagging the scheduled June elections were postponed to 2006. Militia in the Ituri and Katanga regions, and Rwandan Hutu rebels in the east, continued to prey on civilians. Corruption and mismanagement in the national army left many troops with little or no income, making the army an added threat to locals. The UN peacekeeping force adopted a more aggressive posture but remained inadequately staffed and without the resources or mandate to provide security throughout the country.

Elsewhere in Africa several other states remained on the edge of failure. The transitional government in Somalia was divided into armed camps, led respectively by the president and speaker of the parliament, and a possibly disastrous military intervention by regional governments was only narrowly averted. Côte d’Ivoire looked set to explode as the government of national reconciliation neither reconciled anyone nor managed to prepare credible elections before the end of President Laurent Gbagbo’s constitutional mandate in October.

Zimbabwe’s March parliamentary election gave the ruling ZANU-PF party a controversial landslide over the opposition but failed to resolve the five-year political impasse. It was followed in less than two months by a notorious government clean-up operation that left more than 700,000 slum dwellers homeless or without livelihoods, exacerbating already serious food insecurity and HIV/AIDS crises. In more stable Uganda the government’s on-again off-again peace process with the brutal Lord’s Resistance Army (LRA) rebels yielded no substantial progress, and the International Criminal Court issued its first arrest warrants for LRA leaders.

Better news came with Liberia’s successful elections, choosing in November the continent’s first woman president, Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf. Burundi’s peace process progressed with major victories by the former opposition (and insurgent) CNDD-FDD in communal and legislative elections and with the inauguration in August of its candidate Pierre Nkurunziza.

Steps were taken to strengthen the monitoring capability and credibility of the Kimberley Process, the UN-backed voluntary initiative stemming the trade in conflict diamonds. Participating countries, which now account for more than 90% of the global production of rough diamonds, agreed in November to start monitoring all diamond production in West Africa and profiling all exports from the region.

In Asia a major breakthrough was achieved in Indonesia’s long-running Aceh conflict with the signing of a peace agreement in August. But Central Asia underwent considerable upheaval in 2005, with an uprising in Andijan provoking a murderous crackdown by Uzbekistan’s security forces and with street protestors ousting Kyrgyzstan’s President Askar Akayev.

Democracy collapsed in Nepal following King Gyanendra’s February coup, while Maoist rebels intensified their insurgency before declaring a
unilateral ceasefire in September. In Pakistan sectarian conflict worsened as the military government continued to marginalize secular democratic forces. Thailand’s southern insurgency also escalated, with almost daily killings. There was continuing political violence in Sri Lanka, factional strife within the Tamil Tiger rebel movement and a troubling loss of momentum in the peace process. Haiti’s hope of escaping failed-state status was undermined by fiercely polarized elite/populist politics, a hesitant UN peacekeeping and international civilian presence, and an inept and corrupt transitional government. Colombia continued to be plagued by attacks of the main insurgent group, FARC, which officials expect to worsen before the congressional and presidential elections in March and May 2006.

In Europe the long-awaited and overdue final status process for Kosovo began with the appointment as the UN Secretary-General’s special envoy, Martti Ahtisaari, fresh from his success in mediating Aceh. Destabilized by the unresolved conflict in Chechnya, Russia’s North Caucasus region was the scene of repeated shootouts between police and Islamist militants.

Eliminating weapons of mass destruction

There was no progress towards eliminating weapons of mass destruction in 2005. The Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) review conference in May failed utterly to close the gap between advocates of non-proliferation and disarmament, and the September UN World Summit failed to agree on a single recommendation. Negotiations with Iran and Korea DPR went ahead, but with little progress towards agreement. A measure of the world’s concern that there be renewed effort to address these issues came with the award, 60 years after Hiroshima and Nagasaki, of the Nobel peace prize to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and its head, Mohamed ElBaradei.

September did witness significant movement—or at least the avoidance of a breakdown—in the six-party talks on Korea DPR’s nuclear programmes. But few observers were sanguine about the prospects for real progress. The Iran case was more complicated: talks with the EU-3 broke down in the summer as Iran refused to sustain its suspension of nuclear activities. In September the IAEA Board of Governors passed a resolution finding that the issues “are within the competence of the Security Council”, thus paving the way for possible formal referral to the Council.

In July the United States and India signed an agreement on nuclear cooperation. India accepted some formal constraints on its nuclear programme—though not the cessation of fissile material production or full inspections—in return for
“full civil nuclear energy cooperation”. There was some concern internationally that India received too much return for too few commitments, and that—while re-engagement by the de facto nuclear weapons states in non-proliferation issues was to be welcomed—NPT objectives were not sufficiently advanced by this bilateral deal.

Eliminating terrorism
International efforts to eliminate terrorism were largely unsuccessful in 2005, with coordinated attacks on the London transport system, the targeting of tourists in Egypt and Indonesia, major attacks in Delhi and Amman, insurgents’ continued kidnapping and killing of aid workers in Afghanistan, and daily bombings in Iraq. Although international cooperation among police and intelligence agencies improved, the underlying political and economic causes of the problem remained mostly unaddressed.

The number of significant international terrorist events rose dramatically in 2004, the latest year with statistics. Nearly three-quarters of the attacks took place in Iraq, India and Indian-controlled Kashmir, but the frequency of major incidents also increased outside these regions. It seems likely, when the figures are in, that this trend will have continued in 2005.

Although world leaders at the September Summit condemned terrorism “in all its forms and manifestations”, they failed to agree on a norm-setting definition making clear that any attacks against civilians, whatever the context, were as globally unacceptable as piracy and slavery.

In April the General Assembly did take a step forward with the adoption of the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism, the first international anti-terrorism treaty since the 11 September 2001 attacks, calling on states to develop appropriate legal frameworks criminalizing nuclear terrorism–related offenses.

With much of its leadership captured or killed and its organizational effectiveness drastically reduced, Al Qaeda’s influence in 2005 appears to have become more inspirational than organizational. The London bombings in July increased concern because they were perpetrated by what appear to be small self-motivated groups of alienated second or third generation immigrants. Deadly attacks occurred in Egypt, Bangladesh, Indonesia, India and Jordan as well as the United Kingdom.

Iraq continued to be the scene of the most devastating and regular attacks, blamed variously on followers of Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, Al Qaeda’s reported field commander in Iraq, and disgruntled former Baathists. The rushed constitutional process deepened rifts between Sunni Arabs and Iraq’s two other principal communities—Shiites and Kurds—and fueled rather than dampened the insurgency. Iraqi security forces and recruitment centres were primary targets, as were coalition troops and Shiites.

Suicide attacks in Israel came down dramatically from 2004, as Palestinian militant groups largely adhered to an informal ceasefire brokered in February with the Israeli government.

There was positive news in Northern Ireland, as the Irish Republican Army renounced violence for the first time in its 30-year armed campaign and
committed to pursue its goals exclusively through peaceful means.

**Reducing the availability of small arms**
Though there were some positive developments, 2005 was for small-arms reduction—as documented by the Small Arms Survey—essentially a year for review.

Despite progress in diplomatic peacemaking and peacebuilding, the world has a very long way to go in reducing (where it matters) the number and availability of instruments of war, not only in weapons of mass destruction. Conventional weapons and small arms continue to be produced on a massive scale, with more developing countries entering the international arms trade.

In July the first global treaty on small arms, the UN Firearms Protocol, entered into force, with its state parties undertaking to exercise strict control over the manufacture, export, import and in-transit movement of firearms. In a further development, by year’s end 38 governments had expressed support for an Arms Trade Treaty that would subject international arms transfers to agreed principles, though the four main world traders in small arms and light weapons—the United States, Russia, China and Ukraine, in that order—remain aloof.

There was little movement on arms brokers able to circumvent national laws by operating in one country while arranging deals in others. Despite calls by UN Secretary-General Annan for member states to address the issue and considerable lobbying by civil society activists, the UN Summit failed to produce a commitment to address the international transfer and brokering of small arms.

At the regional and national levels there were some useful developments. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and other international agencies supported disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR) programmes around the world, which can help stabilize societies and improve human security in the aftermath of armed conflict. In September 2005 a new DDR programme began in Indonesia’s Aceh province.

Use of anti-personnel mines around the world decreased in 2005, with almost no international trade in them, according to the Landmine Monitor Report 2005. The year saw three more countries (Bhutan, Latvia and Vanuatu) ratify the landmark 1997 Ottawa Convention. But 40 countries have yet to ratify it, and campaigners remain concerned by U.S. statements suggesting that it may resume landmine production.

**Praise and blame**
Those deserving praise in 2005 included:

- Former Finnish President Martti Ahtisaari—for mediating the Aceh peace agreement.
- Kenyan General Lazarus Sumbeiywo—for leading the successful north-south peace negotiations in Sudan.
- The people of Liberia—for their overwhelming participation in the country’s post-Taylor election, and their selection of Africa’s first woman president, Ellen Johnson Sirleaf.
- The Canadian Government and Prime Minister Paul Martin—for their sustained promotion of the “responsibility to protect”, showing at the World Summit how real political leadership can produce results.

Among the more blameworthy:

- The World Summit “spoilers”—on the one hand a small group of developing countries, with Egypt and Pakistan among the most consistently prominent, and on the other the United States—which, by refusing consensus on numerous issues, undermined what were otherwise overwhelming majorities for change.
- Iran and Korea DPR—for resisting international concern about their weapon-making intentions.
- The nuclear weapons states—for resisting movement on arms control and disarmament.

The UN Summit failed to produce a commitment to address the international transfer and brokering of small arms
initiatives, which are both inherently worthwhile and necessary to strengthen global commitment to non-proliferation.

- Zimbabwe’s President Mugabe—for his government’s callous “clean-up” operation that left more than 700,000 slum dwellers homeless or without livelihoods, driving the country ever deeper into despair.
- Nepal’s King Gyanendra—for his February coup, plunging the fragile country deeper into debilitating conflict.

Looking ahead
Multiple peace and security challenges confront the international community in 2006, with ten most significant:

- Avoiding the disintegration of Iraq and neighbouring countries.
- Resolving the nuclear standoffs in Iran and Korea DPR, and regenerating positive momentum across the spectrum of weapons of mass destruction disarmament and non-proliferation.
- Resolving the “big three” high-mortality African conflicts continuing in Darfur, Northern Uganda and Congo.
- Avoiding major new wars in Côte d’Ivoire and between Ethiopia and Eritrea.
- Maintaining some kind of momentum to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, particularly by ensuring that the wall and the settlements around Jerusalem do not become new flashpoints.
- Achieving sustainable peace and stability in Afghanistan, a resolution of the conflicts in Nepal and Sri Lanka and further progress in India-Pakistan relations.
- Bringing negotiations on the final status of Kosovo to a successful and peaceful conclusion.
- Making the new Peacebuilding Commission operational, and injecting new resources and energy into global and regional capacity building for peacemaking and peacekeeping.
- Making significant progress in the General Assembly on a new umbrella convention on terrorism, containing a definition expressly outlawing violence against civilians, whatever the context.
- Making a success of the 2006 UN Conference on Small Arms.

The primary responsibility for meeting these challenges will fall variously on the United States, the UN Security Council and regional organizations and groupings. There are few quick fixes available. Conflict prevention, peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding involve slow, hard, grinding, sustained work. Those engaged in it—governments, intergovernmental organizations and civil society—at least now have the satisfaction, on the evidence of Human Security Report 2005, that they are not entirely wasting their time.
Poverty and hunger

Goals

- Halve the proportion of people whose income is less than US$ 1 a day (in purchasing power parity) between 1990 and 2015.
- Halve the number of people suffering from hunger by 2015.

Rationale for the scores

Hunger and poverty inched their way up the global agenda in 2005, earning slightly higher scores than in previous years. The improvement reflected a global paradigm shift that saw more recognition of the compelling need to get serious about development. The UN Millennium Project started the year with a powerful and comprehensive set of assessments on what should be done to achieve the development goals. Rich-country governments increased their promised aid and debt relief. Developing countries saw sustained economic growth, and several—notably Brazil, China and India—implemented significant pro-poor policies, driven more by domestic pressures, often from civil society, than from such formal actors as UN agencies. Global civil society mobilized massively in support of the whole range of development goals, through such initiatives as the Make Poverty History campaign and the Live-8 concerts. But massive hunger in Niger and the developing food emergencies in Malawi and Zimbabwe were stark reminders that the progress in 2005, while real, remained inadequate in many countries. And natural disasters, including the Indian Ocean tsunami and the South Asia earthquake, afflicted millions of poor people.

The state of poverty and hunger

News on the poverty and hunger situation in 2005 was mixed. East Asia had already met the poverty goal. Southeast Asia, South Asia and North Africa were on track. And most of Sub-Saharan Africa was not. Latin America was on track to meet the hunger goal; Asia continued to make progress but at lagging rates.

Despite rapid economic growth and significant strides in some countries, the benefits of growth often failed to reach the poor. Following unprecedented growth rates in 2004, economic growth remained robust in 2005. Developing Asia continues to blaze a trail, with real GDP growth rates of 7.4% in 2005. Sub-Saharan Africa is participating too, with 5.2% growth in 2005. Indeed, of the world’s 35 most food-insecure countries, 19 saw an estimated real GDP growth rate of more than 5%.

But economic growth has not been accompanied by corresponding reductions in poverty. In 2005 two influential reports, the UNDP’s Human Development Report and the World Bank’s World Development Report, focused on growing inequality and its consequences for poverty and human well-being. The human development index (HDI) improved in most developing countries but less so in the poorest countries than in the middle-income countries. In 1960–62 the per capita GDP of the 20 richest countries was 54 times higher than that of the 20 countries at the bottom; by 2000–02, it was 121 times higher. Enabling poor people to contribute to and benefit from economic growth is clearly crucial.

In 2005 the lack of preparedness for natural disasters hit poor people very hard. The year began in the wake of the Indian Ocean tsunami, which often had its worst impact on the most vulnerable people, including the poor coastal farming and fishing communities of India, Indonesia, Sri Lanka and Thailand. The tsunami created new food emergencies in Indonesia (Aceh) and worsened the situation in Sri Lanka, after a drought in 2004. The October 2005 earthquake in South Asia also severely affected millions of poor people, destroying livelihoods and compromising their welfare. Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, which hit the U.S. Gulf Coast, affected local poorest communities the most.

Conflict and civil strife, as well as drought and other natural disasters, can severely undermine poor
people’s access to food and livelihoods, resulting in acute hunger. At the end of 2005, 39 countries faced food emergencies. Nineteen of them were suffering from conflict, civil strife or an influx of refugees, with 14 of the conflict zones in Africa. Sixteen countries in Africa faced successive food shortages and drought at the end of the year. The situation worsened in the Sahel region of West Africa, affected by locusts and drought, and severe malnutrition was reported to be on the rise in Mali, Mauritania and Niger. Owing to poor harvests and the lack of policy action in Malawi and Zimbabwe, parts of Southern Africa were sliding into a hunger crisis. And with poor harvests, conflict and displaced populations Sudan continued to face a precarious food situation. But even as transitory hunger received attention, chronic hunger remained widespread and persistent.

**Major policy events and initiatives of 2005**

Since the adoption of the MDGs in September 2000, poverty has climbed to the top of the global agenda, leading to a paradigm shift in development thinking and economic policies across the globe. In 2005 this shift showed up in international decisions on aid, debt and trade and in national development strategies and policies. The year saw a remarkable array of high-level initiatives for addressing poverty and hunger and a new focus on agriculture and rural areas, where most hunger persists.

**International initiatives**

In January 2005 the UN Millennium Project, headed by Columbia University Professor Jeffrey Sachs, released *Investing in Development: A Practical Plan to Achieve the Millennium Development Goals*. Based on the work of 10 task forces supported by about 250 high-level experts from around the world, it provided a wealth of information and valuable guidelines to help developing countries formulate their MDG-based poverty reduction strategies. The report argued that national poverty reduction strategies should anchor the scaling up of public investments, capacity building, domestic resource mobilization and official development assistance. They should also provide a framework for strengthening governance, promoting human rights, engaging civil society and promoting the private sector.

The report called on international donors to identify at least a dozen MDG “fast-track” countries for a rapid scale-up of official development assistance in 2005—and to launch “quick wins” such as free or subsidized distribution of chemical fertilizers, free mass distribution of insecticide-treated malaria bednets and the expansion of school meal programmes using locally produced foods. It argued for a substantial increase in official development assistance and debt relief in support of the global development goals. It also called on high-income countries to open their markets to developing country exports through the Doha “development round” and help least developed countries raise export competitiveness through investments in critical trade-related infrastructure. And it called on international donors to mobilize support for global scientific research and development to address special needs of the poor in areas of health, agriculture, energy, climate and natural resource and environmental management.
Also in January 2005 the UN Millennium Project’s Task Force on Hunger, co-chaired by Pedro Sanchez and M. S. Swaminathan, presented Halving Hunger: It Can Be Done, offering a menu of recommendations for interventions at the global, national and community levels. It called for policy reforms, an enabling environment and priority measures to increase the agricultural productivity of food-insecure farmers, improve nutrition for the chronically hungry and vulnerable, reduce the vulnerability of the acutely hungry through productive safety nets, increase incomes and make markets work for poor people. Hidden hunger (deficiencies of such essential nutrients as iron and vitamin A) received much more attention in 2005 than ever before, and initiatives to address it have been scaled up to large action programmes.

In March 2005 UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan presented In Larger Freedom: Towards Development, Security and Human Rights for All, reviewing progress since the adoption of the Millennium Declaration in 2000. He noted that “[T]he promise of the Millennium Development Goals still remains distant for many” and that “too few governments—from both the developed and developing world—have taken sufficient action to reach the targets by 2015”. Annan’s report presented an agenda of the highest priorities for action to be considered at the United Nations Summit in September. He called for urgent action to recognize the special needs of Africa, an International Financial Facility to support an immediate front-loading of official development, and a worldwide early warning system for all natural hazards, building on existing national and regional capacity.

Commission for Africa. In March 2005 the Commission for Africa, chaired by UK Prime Minister Tony Blair, released Our Common Interest. Pointing to the urgency of tackling African poverty and stagnation, it noted that “on current projections the halving of poverty will come not by 2015 but by 2150—which is 135 years too late”. It made strong recommendations in a number of areas—notably governance, capacity building and peace and security—and guidance on the changes needed to reduce poverty. It called for doubling aid to Sub-Saharan Africa—from US$ 25 billion a year to US$ 50 billion by 2010. It called for a review of progress in 2010, with a possible second stage involving a further US$ 25 billion a year by 2015. For poor countries in Sub-Saharan Africa, it called for 100% debt cancellation as soon as possible.

G-8 Summit. Africa featured prominently at the G-8 Summit in July 2005 at Gleneagles in Scotland. Along the lines of the Commission for Africa recommendations, the G-8 leaders agreed to:

- Double aid for Africa by US$ 25 billion a year by 2010, as part of an overall increase of US$ 50 billion for all developing countries, to be made possible partly by a series of new pledges by G-8 partners in the weeks before the summit.
- Cancel 100% of the multilateral debts of the highly indebted poor countries, which could amount to a total of US$ 55 billion in relief, and adopt a special package of debt cancellation for Nigeria, worth about US$ 17 billion.
Examples of commitments by individual donors include:

- The European Union pledged total official development assistance of 0.7% of gross national income (GNI) by 2015, with official development assistance nearly doubled from € 34.5 billion to € 67 billion by 2010. Half of this increase is earmarked for Sub-Saharan Africa.
- The United States proposed to double aid to Sub-Saharan Africa between 2004 and 2010, through such initiatives as its new US$ 1.2 billion malaria programme and the Millennium Challenge Account.
- Japan committed to increase its total official development assistance to US$ 10 billion by 2010, while doubling assistance to Africa by 2008.
- Canada pledged to double assistance between 2001 and 2010.
- The United Kingdom pledged to double its bilateral spending in Africa between 2003–04 and 2007–08.
- The European Union, Germany and Italy have timelines to reach official development assistance of 0.7% of GNI by 2015, while France pledged to reach 0.7% by 2012, and the United Kingdom by 2013.

Under the 14th Replenishment of the World Bank’s International Development Association, donors agreed to contribute US$ 18 billion, about a 25% increase in grants and loans. And according to estimates from the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, about US$ 6.13 billion has been committed to relief and reconstruction following the December 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami, with more than two-thirds from non-governmental sources.

But there were no guarantees that these pledges would translate into actual new disbursements rather than money shuffled from other aid uses. Moreover, concerns continued about the vexing problem of aid quality and the perennial lack of adequate coordination among donors. Such concerns led more than a hundred donors and developing countries to sign up in March to the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, and they agree to establish indicators and targets to measure aid effectiveness. But by the end of the year, rhetoric remained ahead of reality.

**UN Summit.** In September 2005 world leaders from some 150 countries came together to celebrate the 60th anniversary of the United Nations and to follow up on the outcome of the 2000 Millennium Summit. The September Summit largely reiterated commitments from other summits over the past ten years, but with the decisions of the G-8 Summit in July 2005, it translated some of the goals into more specific commitments.

**WTO Ministerial Conference.** Despite the impetus from increased aid and debt relief at the G-8 Summit, G-8 leaders failed to take the crucial step of establishing a schedule for ending rich-country agricultural subsidies and reducing their high tariffs. At the Sixth World Trade Organization (WTO) Ministerial Conference in Hong Kong, China, ministers from 149 member countries gathered in December to discuss concrete measures to implement the Doha development round of trade negotiations. A key issue was the adverse impact of agricultural subsidies in developed countries on the agricultural trade of developing countries. After intense negotiations the European Union agreed to end export subsidies by 2013 in exchange for U.S. concessions on food aid. There was no progress on eliminating rich-country tariffs and quotas on agricultural imports. The rich countries also agreed to eliminate, by 2008, quotas and tariffs on most categories of goods from the world’s 50 poorest nations—though critics predict the effects will be minimal. These decisions saved the conference from total collapse, but much work remains if the WTO is to conclude the Doha round as a development round in 2006.
National and regional government initiatives

International initiatives can only set the context for appropriate action at the country level, where governments formulate policies, set budgets and establish programmes. In 2005 the world’s largest developing countries made significant policy improvements, driven largely by domestic pressure. China paid more attention to equity, not just growth. Important decisions of 2004–05 included the elimination of the tax on farming, increases in cereal prices and a significant expansion of investment in irrigation and agricultural research and development. In September 2005 the Politburo, China’s top policy-making body, pledged to spread the benefits of economic growth more fairly among all levels of Chinese society and particularly to close the gap between urban and rural areas.

India’s 2005–06 budget allocated substantially more resources for agriculture and rural development, including water resource management and education, health and poverty reduction. Under the National Common Minimum Programme the government initiated the National Food for Work Programme in 2004–05 in the 180 most deprived districts, with the expectation of extending coverage in stages to the entire country within five years. In September India enacted the Rural Employment Guarantee Bill, guaranteeing 100 days of employment a year to at least one member of each rural household and providing the rural poor with a safety net. India also introduced universal health insurance for the poor and a special group insurance scheme.

Brazil streamlined implementation and substantially increased resources for its Fome Zero (Zero Hunger) programme from BRL 5.7 billion in 2003 to BRL 12.2 billion for 2005. Because of the time requirements of the budgetary process, it is only now in 2005, two years after the initiative was announced, that large-scale effects can be expected.

Africa, which now has more democratically elected governments than ever before, saw some promising steps. African governments began to work together effectively through a revitalized African Union and its flagship programme, the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD). More than 20 countries have acceded to the African Peer Review Mechanism. Preparations for the rollout of NEPAD’s Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme were concluded in mid-2005. Ethiopia and Nigeria recently increased their public investments in agriculture and rural areas.

Despite frequent references to increasing the budget for agriculture, there was still no clarity on monitoring progress. Similarly, monitoring systems to track the use of increased aid to Africa for the intended MDG-related purposes remained lacking. Although Transparency International UK has estimated that capital flight from Africa stands at US$ 150 billion a year—six times the annual flow of aid into Africa—little attention was paid to stemming, much less reversing, the trend, despite the known harm to poor people when domestic investment and employment suffer. And questions remained about whether African leaders at the highest political levels were serious about addressing conflict.

Business initiatives

The business sector became more engaged in efforts to achieve the development goals, reflecting both a new sense of corporate social responsibility and a better understanding within the corporate sector of the potential for good business with the poor. The world’s fastest-growing new markets include hundreds of millions of poor people with vast entrepreneurial capabilities and moderate purchasing power. Business can develop innovative products and new marketing models to serve these markets.

In September 2005, for the first time, heads of major agricultural companies met with the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) to discuss areas of potential collaboration for improving the situation of...
small-scale farmers. Another indicator of changed corporate social responsibility was a first international consultation among senior policy-makers, private sector leaders, non-governmental organizations and research institutions on the food chain in New Delhi, India, under the auspices of the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry. Pro-poor public-private partnerships will be developed to unleash win-win business opportunities at the bottom of the pyramid in the dry areas of South Asia.

After the G-8 Summit, Business Action for Africa, a coalition of international companies working to attract investment to Africa, was launched to showcase good business practices and influence pro-poor growth and policies. Business Action for Development—a partnership of the UN Global Compact, the International Business Leaders Forum and the UNDP—brought together executives, civil society leaders and development experts to scale up business contributions to achieving the MDGs. The UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs and the World Economic Forum partnered to stimulate progress on some of the interdisciplinary and public-private problems through a new, informal process to develop policy alternatives and issue recommendations.

In October the public and private sectors came together to launch a Business Alliance for Food Fortification (BAFF) chaired by Coca-Cola, Danone and Unilever, sponsored by the Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition in partnership with the World Bank Institute. The network aims to ensure a long-term, market-viable supply of fortified foods for the 2 billion people living with vitamin and mineral deficiencies that cause untold human suffering and large productivity losses and curative healthcare costs. BAFF will identify new financial mechanisms and new business models, expand scientific knowledge and expertise in fortification and catalyse joint action by companies, development partners and governments.

**Civil society initiatives**

2005 was notable for the mass mobilization of global civil society in support of development goals. Campaigns focused on demands for increased aid, more debt cancellation and greater justice in trade. The initiatives included the Global Call to Action Against Poverty, Make Poverty History (United Kingdom, Ireland, Canada), The One Campaign (United States), Weltweite Aktion gegen Armut (Germany), Hottekenai Sekai no Mazushisa (Japan) and 2005 plus d’excuses (France). The Live-8 concerts before the G-8 Summit meeting in Gleneagles were the largest ever global events calling for an end to extreme poverty. The campaigners also focused on the UN Summit in New York in September and the WTO Ministerial meeting in Hong Kong in December.

The global campaigns helped create the political climate for the positive decisions on increased aid and debt relief. They raised public awareness about the scale of extreme poverty, its moral and political unacceptability in a world of plenty, and some of the key political decisions that must be taken for its eradication. Millions of young people engaged in the campaigns.

The media, an important actor in civil society, did much to raise awareness and stimulate private giving after the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami. But it missed the opportunity in 2005 in Niger, whose food crisis was not reported until very late.

**Praise and blame**

For the poverty and hunger MDGs, praise is due at the global level to the UN Millennium Project’s Task Force on Hunger for its sound research-based recommendations and advocacy for action, the Commission for Africa initiated by Prime Minister Blair for energizing major aid and debt relief initiatives for Africa, and civil society campaigns for assuring that the MDGs stayed high on the global agenda. At the national level, praise goes to leaders in China, India and Brazil for investing in large policy initiatives, such as eliminating taxes on farming in China, initiating a National Employment
Program for the rural poor in India and scaling up Fome Zero in Brazil.

On the negative side, the lack of response by African organizations and the donor community, despite early warnings, to the deteriorating food situation in West Africa, particularly Niger, and in Southern Africa, particularly Malawi, is shameful. Further cases of concern are countries whose human development index moved in a negative direction and whose numbers of hungry people increased in recent years. Zambia, Zimbabwe and Burkina Faso are among them.

**Looking ahead**

For 2006 a key question is whether promised aid increases, debt relief and improved trade policy will really be delivered. Will the industrialized countries seriously accelerate aid flows to developing countries? There are fears that accounting tricks may be applied, such as substituting debt relief for new aid, which could mean that few new resources become available.

On trade, even a successful Hong Kong WTO Ministerial will not make a big dent in poverty and hunger. Trade must be more emphasis on domestic and regional markets, including trade among developing countries. More support should go to organized smallholder farmers—to enable them improve the standards of their marketed output and to gain access to markets.

Most emerging national success stories are in large countries—Brazil, China and India—with sufficient administrative capacity and a critical reservoir of human resources, while developing countries’ poor capacity to absorb aid and to implement better policies remains a very real problem. In Africa particularly, institutional capacity is weak and in many instances getting weaker, with the escalating “brain drain” and health constraints. But implementation will not be effective unless governance is improved to deal with conflict, reduce corruption and strengthen administrative capacity. Better governance will also help reduce capital flight from Africa and make the best use of whatever aid resources are available. The decisions on aid and debt relief for Africa constitute a major accomplishment, but the Commission for Africa’s bold and far-sighted recommendations on governance and capacity building now merit commensurate attention. The world needs to find imaginative ways of tracking progress (and the lack of progress) and in communicating this to the public, to hold accountable the key actors in both developed and developing countries responsible for achieving the MDGs.

In 2006 and beyond, actors other than governments must play major roles too. Interesting innovations are taking place in public-private partnerships, but more needs to be done to provide for better financing and brokering services between the public sector, private sector and non-governmental organizations to serve the poor and the hungry. Where governments are partnering with business and civil society institutions, there is potential for overcoming the capacity constraints and realizing the “quick wins” suggested by the UN Millennium Project.

As energy prices rise, the costs of farm inputs, processing and transport go up. Food prices could rise too, with varying effects, going even higher if agriculture becomes a major source of biomass energy and competition arises between production for food and that for fuel.

Overall, poor people were probably better off in 2005 than in previous years, but pockets of chronic poverty and hunger persist. If all stakeholders ensure that the momentum of 2005 is sustained in 2006, the scores for poverty and hunger can move upward significantly, 2006 must be the year of real action on the ground.
**Rationale for the score**

In 2005 the world took some small steps towards fulfilling the commitments on education made in 2000. Rich countries agreed to substantially increase overall development assistance by 2010. Some developing country governments made real progress at the national level. Several developing countries put forward new action plans for education as part of the Education for All Fast Track Initiative (FTI)—an international partnership that promises to bridge funding gaps for poor countries that develop credible education sector plans. China is revising its “law of compulsory education” to eliminate school fees. In South Asia summits of government leaders gave renewed emphasis to achieving the education goals. Civil society groups mobilized public opinion, spurring government action in these directions.

But 2005 was also the year that we missed the first of the deadlines outlined in the global goals—gender parity in primary and secondary education. The leaders of the rich countries who promised to increase aid failed to specify what that aid would be used for. Donor countries in general failed to honour their financial commitments under the FTI.

**The state of education**

**Universal primary education**

Over the past ten years primary school enrolments were up by some 50 million more children. Some of the poorest African countries have shown particularly rapid progress, with improvements of more than 20% in Benin, Chad, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Guinea, Malawi and Mauritania. But some 100 million children who should be in primary school are not enrolled. Population growth in the poorest countries nearly matches the increases in enrolments, meaning that the percentage of children in school rose only slightly. And the past decade saw actual declines in enrolments in some Central Asian and European countries, where political transition often brought economic difficulties that undermined state services. Economic and political difficulties in some African countries, including Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Kenya, Namibia and Zambia, led to enrolment declines of 5% or more. At current rates of progress, the net enrolment ratio—which stood at 82% of primary-school-age children actually enrolled in 1990—will increase only to 87% by 2015. Nearly 50 countries, mostly in Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia, will fall short of achieving universal primary education by 2015.

**Gender parity**

In 2005 the world failed to eliminate the gap between the numbers of boys and girls in primary and secondary schools. About a third of all countries failed to achieve parity in primary, and nearly two-thirds in secondary. Overall, 94 countries missed the goal, making gender disparities the rule rather than the exception. Why? Usually because households place less value on educating girls than boys—a reflection of broader inequalities outside the home, particularly pronounced in the poorer countries of Africa and South Asia. On present trends, more than 40 poor countries, mostly in Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia, will still not have gender parity by 2015.

But discrimination in schooling is not an inevitable consequence of poverty. Benin, Chad, Gambia, Guinea, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal and Yemen all increased the proportion of girls enrolled relative to boys by 20% or more after 1990. Bangladesh rapidly achieved full gender parity at the primary level, in part by providing stipends for girls at both primary and secondary level. This not only raised the level of girls’ participation in schools—it also...
had other positive side effects, such as enabling girls to marry later and making them more aware of their rights. Tanzania achieved gender parity too. Both impoverished countries show that policy changes (in education and other areas) can shift enrolments towards gender parity—sometimes quickly. What is required is greater public commitment to this objective, a consistent approach to reform and the deliberate provision of resources to support strategic policy changes.

Key events and policies of 2005
In 2005 donor countries made big promises on aid and debt relief, as described in the introduction to this report and in the chapter on poverty and hunger. They promised to increase overall development assistance by about two-thirds (including a doubling of aid to Africa), and they agreed to cancel all the debt owed by the world’s poorest countries to the World Bank, the IMF and the African Development Bank. They did not, however, make any particular commitments on education.

The G-8 meeting in July did not deal with how the additional aid resources should be spent. Such sectoral allocations could have been discussed in September at the UN Summit and at the World Bank–IMF meetings a few weeks later. But the UN Summit barely managed to eke out a general document, merely reaffirming the global commitment to education for all and the need to provide more resources through the FTI in support of country-led plans. It failed even to mention that the world had missed achieving gender parity by 2005, something that should have received major attention. And the World Bank–IMF sessions became consumed with debt relief, with guidance on likely sectoral allocations of the additional aid.

For education this failure to secure agreement is a serious lost opportunity. Education needs (and is ready to absorb) a good bit more money, yet it has historically been underfunded relative to other development sectors. Recent work commissioned by UK government agencies has shown that the total additional aid needed to achieve the goals of universal primary education and gender parity will be approximately US$ 10 billion a year over the decade to 2015. Total aid to basic education is now only about 15%, or US$ 1.5 billion a year. This additional investment alone would account for more than 20% of the total additional aid commitments agreed at the G-8 summit at Gleneagles. If agreed, it would help to set the majority of countries back on track to achieve the education goals.

Donors failed to take advantage of the main mechanism for channelling aid to education. The FTI, established in 2002, is an international partnership to accelerate progress towards universal primary completion by 2015. It aims to achieve this by promoting more efficient aid for primary education, sustained increases in aid,
sound sector policies, adequate and sustainable domestic financing for education and greater accountability for sector results. It emerged in direct response to the promise in Dakar that “no countries seriously committed to education for all will be thwarted in their achievement of this goal by a lack of resources”. It was supposed to raise additional resources to support countries with credible plans to achieve the education goals. But donors have provided few such resources. As a result, the programme (located at the World Bank) shifted to helping build development partnerships between donors and recipients to strengthen domestic capacity in education planning and analysis—and to facilitate increased transfers of aid through the “normal” channels, not through separate, parallel mechanisms.

The FTI could have done much more. Donors and partner countries recognize that it is one of the most important partnerships for delivering on the MDGs. The G-8 communique specifically endorsed it, with the aim “that every FTI-elected country will develop the capacity and have the resources necessary to implement their sustainable education strategies”. In 2005 the number of countries eligible for FTI funding increased to 16, with as many as 44 more to be included in the next two years.

But direct resources for disbursement through the FTI over 2004–07 have remained at about US$ 300 million, and indirect funding raised through bilateral programmes probably amounts to little more—small sums indeed, when compared with the additional US$ 10 billion required each year to achieve the education goals across the developing world.

2005 also saw little progress on ways to deliver additional aid. One potential innovation was the International Finance Facility (IFF) advocated by UK Chancellor Gordon Brown. This proposed facility—to allow international borrowing against future aid commitments, underpinned by long-term economic growth in developed countries, and thus at no net cost to recipients—was advocated as a means of front-loading aid to speed progress on development. Chancellor Brown argued that education would be a particular beneficiary, noting in a January 2005 Lancaster House speech that “with the IFF we can ensure all developing countries have the increased, predictable, up-front funding they need to abolish user fees and enable more effective teacher recruitment and training, greater provision of teaching and learning materials, improvements to school buildings and sanitation facilities, and special help to get girls into
education.” In the event, the United States did not support the IFF, and several other rich countries remained sceptical of its practicability. A small European version of the IFF has gained support and will be used as a pilot for a more comprehensive initiative.

In addition to their broad role in spurring international progress on aid and debt relief, civil society groups continued to contribute directly in education. The Global Campaign for Education—a coalition of non-governmental organizations and teachers’ unions in more than 150 countries—mobilized an estimated 5 million children in 113 countries to produce 3.5 million paper cut-out “buddies”. Some 40,000 buddies were presented to Tony Blair at the outset of the G-8 summit to demand education to end poverty. Later in the year, some 100,000 went to the UN Summit in New York.

**Regional and national initiatives**

Most regions saw a flurry of activities in 2005, inspired in part by the schedule of international meetings, which required preparation, negotiation and lobbying at country and regional levels. And developing countries from Kenya to Madagascar to Moldova put forward education plans that received the endorsement of the FTI.

In South Asia representatives from 200 companies met in March to share knowledge and present lessons from corporate-led initiatives, particularly those relevant to the development goals. The meeting’s closing declaration urged more company initiatives in primary education. In India several private companies started programmes for improving thousands of schools across different states. The Azim Premji Foundation, a charitable organization set up by the founder of WIPRO, the Indian multinational, has invested substantial sums, working with thousands of state schools across the country to improve quality and introduce information technologies in schools as well as helping state governments in governance reforms. The Fifth South Asia Regional Ministerial Conference marked the tenth anniversary of the Beijing gender conference with discussions of the gender parity goals. The Independent South Asian Commission on Poverty Alleviation set out development goals that give priority over the next five years to education. The year saw an expanding profile of non-governmental organizations directly working with schools and a large number of public advocacy campaigns for primary education. They reflect the growing global discourse on basic education as a fundamental right, not merely an instrument for economic development.

China moved to revise its 1986 Law of Compulsory Education to introduce an unprecedented notion of free education. Since 1985 China’s policy of financial decentralization so successfully mobilized local and non-government resources that it led to near-universal attendance and put China close to achieving the enrolment goals. But decentralization also created extreme disparities, leaving poorer regions to rely on themselves to pay the considerable recurrent costs of education. They responded by charging fees on various items, though formal tuition is still forbidden by law. Despite repeated government intervention and continual public pressure, fee-charging remains a severe problem—ironically in regions of poverty where schools lack other means to sustain their operations. Free education entails, however, a minimum cost for local governments and a commitment to students’ rights to education and thus to public resources. Although signifying a fundamental turn in ideology, the new law was nonetheless enthusiastically advocated by the legislators in the National People’s Congress, perhaps a local reflection of a global movement.

Latin America’s progress towards the education goals is generally more advanced than that of other developing regions. But Nicaragua, Honduras and Guyana are each partners in the FTI, supported by finance and technical assistance from the Inter-American Development Bank. Identifying and disseminating best practices in primary education—at conferences in Mexico and
El Salvador—has been a leit motif in the region. In September 2005 a high-profile regional study was launched to identify business interest in primary education, and corporate initiatives for education continued to develop, mainly in the form of sponsorships and school patronage. But education remained very low in the priorities of the region’s corporate sector, which continued to see this mainly as social philanthropy.

African debate was dominated by the report of the UK Commission for Africa, which advocated a major increase in international support to education in the region, supported by domestic reform and good governance. A number of African countries moved towards fee-free primary schooling. Burundi’s newly elected president announced in August that he would make schooling free for all children. Enrolments nearly doubled in response, and the UK Department for International Development provided rapid financial assistance to help Burundi meet the increased demand. Similarly, primary enrolments in Kenya increased by 25% between 2002 and 2005 following the elimination of fees. In 2005 Kenya won international recognition for its innovative programme to deliver resources directly to schools. The programme promotes transparency and accountability by requiring each school to post its expenditures once the funds are received. Resource use at the school level has increased rapidly as a result.

True, the speed and dimension of change, particularly in South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa, remains muted relative to the size of the task. Perhaps buoyed by the economic progress in recent years, at least in South Asia, there was an emerging sense of optimism among government officials and civil society leaders that primary education goals are achievable within the internationally agreed timelines.

Praise and blame

Because 2005 focused generally on development, rather than specifically on the education goals, the leaders and laggards relevant to education are the same as those for many other development goals. The G-8 countries deserve praise for making meaningful financial commitments, though the figures they propose still fall short of what is needed to achieve the whole range of development goals. Non-governmental organization coalitions, such as the Global Campaign for Education and the broader development coalitions, can take real credit for mobilizing public pressure on governments. But the donors who signed up to the FTI failed almost completely to honor their commitments to ensure that developing countries with meaningful education plans would have the resources to carry out those plans.

Looking ahead

In 2005 the world missed the deadline for achieving gender parity in education and failed to invest adequate resources to ensure that within a decade every child will receive at least a basic education. But 2005 leaves something to build on, with more funding generally available for development and more attention to the need to achieve the global goals. The necessary steps to watch for in 2006 are as follows.

The financial gap between what is needed to achieve the development goals and what is likely to be available in developing countries has been significantly narrowed, though not removed, by the new aid commitments announced in 2005. Best estimates indicate that about 20% of the additional annual aid of US$ 50 billion promised by northern aid partners needs to be committed to primary education to achieve the education goals. Will the aid community acknowledge the magnitude of these gaps and agree to dedicate a significant share of the new resources to education? Will donors and recipients find good ways to allocate and deliver the roughly fivefold increase in resources?

The FTI could become a key instrument for channelling such aid. The bilateral donors have agreed to fund partner countries up to the levels identified as necessary, but there is no explicit
agreement among the donors on who will pay what share. Will they reach such agreement and begin to honor their commitments, especially as more and larger developing countries become part of the process?

A reformed aid process needs to demonstrate that countries initiating important reforms for the FTI—such as fee-free primary schooling, which brings many more poor children to school—are strongly and quickly supported. Kenya, for example, recently abolished school fees and joined the FTI during 2005. But the quality of education can suffer as enrolments expand. The opportunity to provide quick and substantial increases in aid resources in such cases would have an important demonstration effect for other countries. The absence of resources could as easily establish an opposite dynamic, leading poorer countries to conclude that they need not bother putting their own very limited resources into education reform because the rich world will not help. Will countries that take such difficult but important steps receive the support they need?

Although the commitment to education is high in most poorer countries, expenditures on education in some cases fall well short of the 5%–6% of GDP typical in richer countries. Some of those that fall particularly short of universal primary enrolment spend less than 2% of GNP on primary schooling. Will enough developing countries increase their national expenditures as part of an international partnership?

The momentum developed in 2005 needs to be strengthened by continuing advocacy and action on the part of international education non-governmental organizations. The Global Campaign for Education has influenced public opinion towards what could and should be achieved by international dialogue. Will such successful lobbying continue?

The business community has done little to promote the education goals. It could do much more, not only by providing direct financial or human support, but by advocating national and international action for education. The quality of national human resources is a central and direct concern of the business sector. Yet business has engaged in only a few efforts for education, particularly in Asia. Will business take on a more active role?

2005 may not have turned out to be a make-or-break year, it leaves us on the cusp of a decisive moment. Developing countries are making plans for—and increasingly adopting—better policies. Civil society groups have mobilized massively in support of the goals. Donors have promised increased support. Will all this come together in a new and improved global compact for education in 2006?
Rationale for the score
Although the world did marginally better in 2005 than in 2004, moving from a score of 4 to 5, it remains far off track on all its health goals. The minor steps forward in 2005 include:

- Renewed attention to global public health issues, particularly child mortality.
- A modest increase in resources for malaria and HIV/AIDS.
- Significant new funds from Europe and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation for immunizations against childhood diseases.
- New resources dedicated to health information systems to better apply resources, to respond effectively and to monitor and evaluate outcomes.
- The UN Millennium Project’s roadmaps for how to achieve health goals.

These steps, while laudable, are nowhere near enough to overcome accumulated shortfalls in global efforts on the public health front.

The state of global public health
The great obstacle to serious progress towards the global health goals remains the woeful state of the world’s public health infrastructure. The trained personnel, medicine, equipment, physical facilities and governance systems to combat infectious disease and other threats to public health simply do not exist to the needed degree in far too many places. Many places lack reliable supplies of essential drugs. Basic laboratory testing supplies and equipment are often unavailable. Health information systems remain inadequate, making it impossible to monitor the delivery and coverage of interventions in a timely and effective way.

The poorer countries, particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa, face dire shortages of health workers. Few are trained to work in rural areas. Many trained people emigrate to countries willing to pay them fair salaries for their skills. And many others die from AIDS. The three regions with the worst problems—Sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia and Oceania—have the least progress and the least chance of catching up to meet the goals.

Key developments in 2005
In early November 2005 the U.S. public television programme NOVA broadcast a six-part series on three consecutive nights, describing in chilling detail the grotesque inadequacies of the global public health system. It showed, for example, that Vietnam, with the largest number of human avian flu deaths, has no effective surveillance for the disease. Countries most affected by HIV/AIDS have little capacity to test for infections or to deliver drugs to those who need them, even if they were available. More than half the people living in the poorest countries lack any source of safe drinking water. But the broadcast raised awareness in a constituency that is key to progress on global health—the U.S. public.

Time magazine hosted a three-day summit that brought together scientists, activists, advocates and celebrities (from Alicia Keyes to Bill Clinton and Bill Gates) to focus on today’s global health problems. The summit stressed that many of those problems, especially those incorporated in the MDGs, can be dealt with today, with existing technology, if only donor nations and the developing world made the commitments and investments they can readily afford.

Global public health is now firmly on the global agenda. But the accomplishments of 2005, detailed below, remain an awkward patchwork of disjointed efforts on a decidedly inadequate scale.
Maternal and child mortality

Mothers and children have not fared well on the global agenda. Child survival, a global priority in the 1980s and 1990s, gave way to the emergence or recognition of other pressing public health problems, from AIDS to tuberculosis. Dying mothers have never figured high on the list of global health priorities. The good news for 2005 was that the world finally seemed to be noticing that half a million mothers and more than six million children die every year—unnecessarily.

The year started with an important development. The UN Millennium Project’s task force on Child Health and Maternal Health issued a call to arms in Who’s Got the Power? Transforming Health Systems for Women and Children, laying out the initiatives the world should undertake to kick-start progress and launch a decade of bold ambition. A renewed emphasis on child and maternal health also appeared in the World Health Organization’s (WHO) World Health Report 2005: Make Every Mother and Child Count. Important groups decided to start working together. To increase their efficiency and impact, the Partnership for Safe Motherhood and Newborn Health, the Healthy Newborn Partnership and the Child Survival Partnership merged into a single Partnership for Maternal, Neonatal and Child Health. Other advocacy initiatives included:

- The choice of maternal and child health as the theme of the 2005 World Health Day.
- The Delhi Declaration on Maternal, Newborn and Child Health.
- The first of a recurring series of international conferences on “Countdown to 2015: Tracking Progress in Child Survival”, in December in London.
- A WHO General Assembly resolution on maternal, neonatal and child health.
- A series on neonatal survival in renowned medical journal The Lancet.

But such baby steps represented only minor tinkering with business as usual. And business as usual means continuing massive human suffering.

On current trends the maternal mortality ratio will not change noticeably, remaining a horrendous 400 deaths per 100,000 live births for the world as a whole. Countries where childbirth is most risky are experiencing stagnation or even reversals. Most developing countries are not on track for the child mortality goal. Reaching the target in Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia, where the problems are most severe, will require drastic action. Of the deaths of children under five, 80% occur in Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia. Sub-Saharan African has reduced under-five mortality by only 7% since 1990. And today more than 35% of Africa’s children face a greater
risk of dying than they did ten years ago. For a number of countries in Sub-Saharan African, this can in part be attributed to mother-to-child transmission of HIV and the orphaning of children whose parents have died of AIDS. Instead of reducing child mortality by two-thirds, we are on track to reducing it by perhaps one-quarter—meaning that every year 4.5 million children, who would have lived had the goal been taken seriously, will die.

It may still be—just barely—possible to salvage the chance of achieving the goals of reducing maternal and child mortality. If all children under five had access to interventions already known to be effective and feasible for delivery at high coverage in low-income settings, 63% of child mortality could be averted. And if all women had access to the interventions for addressing complications of pregnancy and childbirth, especially emergency obstetric care, 74% of maternal deaths could be avoided.

But this will require a vastly increased commitment to bolstering public health systems around the world, especially where they are most badly broken. This must be a long-term commitment. It will take time to build the needed physical and human infrastructure. But the goals will not be met unless that infrastructure is in place.

**AIDS**

AIDS remained the leading cause of early death in Sub-Saharan Africa and the fourth biggest killer worldwide, with 3.1 million deaths in 2004, including 510,000 child deaths. At the beginning of 2005 an estimated 39 million people globally were infected with HIV, just under half of them women. No region in the developing world is on track to stop and reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS. Infections are still increasing in East Asia, South Asia, Oceania and the Commonwealth of Independent States. Prevalence rates in Sub-Saharan Africa and the Caribbean have stabilized at very high levels, with the increasing number of deaths from AIDS roughly matching the number of new infections. HIV/AIDS spending in 2006 is projected to be US$ 8.9 billion, US$ 6 billion short of the estimated amount needed to respond effectively to the crisis.

In 2005 the compelling need to treat HIV/AIDS victims had the world’s attention, if belatedly. While treatment programmes were reinvigorating medical communities in such places as South Africa and Uganda, prevention received short shrift, undermining efforts to halt and begin to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS. According to the WHO, the lack of funds and priority meant that prevention programmes reached only one of every five people who needed them. The Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS) estimates that more than half of available funds should be spent...
on prevention and about 20% on treatment, but some major funding organizations preferred to emphasize treatment. For example, the U.S. President’s Emergency Program for AIDS Relief was required by Congress to spend 70% of its budget on treatment and palliative care and only 20% on prevention (of which a third must be spent on abstinence programmes of unproven effectiveness).

Well intentioned donor programmes sometimes worked at cross-purposes. A major constraint on global health progress continued to be the shortage of personnel capable of providing services and managing programmes, and donor funds sometimes attracted people to higher-paying positions elsewhere. Donor procurement practices that bypass national networks threatened to undermine national systems that desperately needed strengthening for the long struggle against HIV/AIDS. Concerns arose that gains in some countries such as Uganda might be facing reversals due to the availability of anti-retroviral drugs or changes in prevention strategies. Other countries still needed to bolster and strengthen their AIDS programmes. South Africa’s national programme, for example, continued to suffer from a lack of focused leadership.

Malaria
The disease and death burden from malaria remains very high, with something on the order of 300–500 million infections and a million deaths in 2005. No technological breakthroughs are needed to halt and reverse this trend—merely the deployment on available proven effective interventions, for both prevention and treatment. 2005 saw limited progress.

On the positive side, more funding became available through the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, the major international funding mechanism for the global health goals. And new thinking took hold on the need to have one strategic plan for each country, one national coordination mechanism to bring all the pieces together and one monitoring and evaluation system to provide necessary feedback to everyone involved in the effort to control malaria in a given country. On the negative side, the Roll Back Malaria Partnership—formed in 1998 through the joint leadership of the WHO, UNICEF, the World Bank and national governments—continues to suffer from organizational problems and turf battles internally and externally, a serious challenge to major progress against malaria.

Most of the steps forward in 2005, while promising, are more indications of what could be accomplished than significant accomplishments in themselves.

- Over the past few years, 14 of the 42 countries where malaria is endemic increased their use of insecticide-treated bed nets (perhaps the single most effective means of prevention) by as much as tenfold—but for many the increase was from so small a base, 1%-3%, that they remain far short of the target.
- The World Bank announced that a Malaria Booster Program for Africa will spend US$ 500 million over three years, targeted to 17 malaria-endemic countries—but the funds come from existing Bank resources and thus represent just a change of priorities, not new funding.
- U.S. President Bush announced in July 2005 a President’s Malaria Initiative of US$ 1.2 billion over the next five years to battle malaria in Africa—but such pledges for development funding in the past have rarely been met in full.

Fully 90% of malaria deaths occur in Sub-Saharan Africa, so any effort to reverse the spread of malaria must focus on this region. Despite real progress in the delivery of bed nets and insecticides, only 15% of African children in malarial risk areas sleep under a bed net, fewer than 5% under an insecticide-treated bed net. For the majority of African countries with data, at least half the children under five with fever are treated with
Other diseases

The epidemics of AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria are receiving much attention and more resources as diseases of international concern. AIDS is the pandemic of the era. Tuberculosis kills widely, is worsened by HIV, and yet is treatable. And malaria kills an extraordinary number of children, though it is both preventable and treatable with existing interventions. A wide array of other parasitic and infectious diseases, covered in the global goals as “other diseases”, imposes major health burdens and is often preventable or treatable at relatively low cost.

The international community came tantalizingly close to eliminating a major health threat, but in 2004–05 it fell short. Polio is a highly infectious disease that targets children, invades the nervous systems and can cause paralysis in a few hours or even death. Since the 1988 inception of the Global Polio Eradication Initiative, which owed much to Rotary International, the number of polio-infected people declined by more than 99.5%, from 350,000 cases to only 1,262 cases in 2005. Today, only six countries are the source of the polio virus—Afghanistan, Egypt, India, Niger, Nigeria and Pakistan—and Egypt and India could be polio-free within months. But when local governments in northern Nigeria temporarily suspended polio vaccinations two years ago, responding to baseless fears that vaccinations would sterilize Muslims and cause AIDS, they undermined a US$ 4 billion, 17-year worldwide effort to eradicate a disease that once paralyzed 1,000 children each day. Though vaccination resumed in Nigeria in July 2004, the 12-month hiatus allowed polio to rebound across the country and re-infect other countries.

The world thus missed its goal of eradicating polio by the end of 2005. Thanks to vigorous national and international efforts by the African Union, with funding from the European Commission, Canada and Sweden, the polio epidemic was stopped in ten African countries during the year, and they and another 18 African nations launched a “maintenance” programme that aimed to vaccinate more than 100 million children late in 2005. But at its launch in November, the programme was short some US$ 200 million. With appropriate funding, it may still be possible to eradicate polio within the next year to two.

Information

A major development in 2005, with implications for every health programme, is a new focus on information as a key ingredient for decision-making. Many of the statistics and measures cited throughout this report are crude estimates. The lack of comprehensive registration of births or medical certification of death in many countries forces us to rely on proxy indicators and estimates for maternal and child mortality. Estimates of malaria infection and its contribution to illness, debilitation and death are inherently challenging. Although such estimates do provide a general sense of trends and are good enough to show that the global public health picture remains bleak, better measures would make it possible to do a far better job of mobilizing and targeting resources effectively.

To that end the Health Metrics Network, a US$ 70 million seven-year project funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, was launched at the World Health Assembly to assist countries in improving their information systems. The most promising aspect of the project is that the partners who represent the major health donors have agreed to promote and use a common framework “that sets standards for health information systems”. This framework also includes an assessment and monitoring tool. The partnership should spur the development of single, country-owned information systems to replace the multiple systems established to satisfy the peculiar requirements of individual donors. The commitment of the partners and presumably the countries is to ensure that the information collected will be accessible by local, regional and global constituencies.

The year also saw the start of the Ellison Institute for World Health at Harvard University, funded by Larry Ellison, founder of the Oracle Corporation. Its mission is to “improve population health and the efficiency of health-system resources through the regular reporting of inputs, outputs and impacts of the world’s health systems and major health funders”. While the objectives of the institute and the network may appear very similar, there are important differences. The network is essentially governmental, while the institute is an independent non-governmental agency concerned more with the analysis and dissemination of the information to monitor as well as to effect change in health systems and programmes. In addition, it will be developing new methods for assessing population health.
Praise and blame
Progress, where it happens, rarely just happens spontaneously. It is the result of dedicated, often heroic, efforts by specific people, often acting through specific institutions. And the failure to make adequate progress can also be laid at the feet of particular actors carrying out particular policies. Among the most noteworthy actors of 2005 are those responsible for the successes and failures:

Successes:

- The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation—for extraordinary financial and leadership contributions across much of the spectrum of global public health, including long-term investments in malaria vaccines and in reducing the costs of treatment for AIDS and other diseases, and its partnership announced late in 2005 with the Global Fund to reduce the malaria infection rate in Zambia by 75% over three years.

- The UN Millennium Project—for the release of its crucial reports: Who’s Got the Power? Transforming Health Systems for Women and Children; Combating AIDS in the Developing World; Coming to Grips with Malaria in the New Millennium; Investing in Strategies to Reverse the Global Incidence of TB; and Prescription for Healthy Development: Increasing Access to Medicines.

- Brazil—for its continuing commitment to universal access to anti-retroviral medications for all of its HIV-infected citizens. Brazil’s response has also been characterized by the integration of prevention and treatment, local manufacture of medications and capacity building for treatment management. Its prevention programmes are based on evidence and on principles of reducing harm and are community developed.

- The United States—for its important commitment to HIV/AIDS research. The 2005 budget, more than US$ 2 billion, encompassed the entire range of efforts from basic science to epidemiology to therapeutics and the spectrum of preventive strategies (vaccines, microbicides, social and behavioral strategies).

- Several pharmaceutical firms—for renewed attention to developing drugs and vaccines for which there is likely to be little financial return from a traditional corporate perspective. Examples include Merck’s continued large investment in an HIV vaccine, a high-risk, low-financial-reward undertaking, Novartis’s work on tuberculosis and dengue fever, GlaxoSmithKline’s on malaria and tuberculosis, Astra Zeneca’s on tuberculosis and Pfizer’s on a range of infectious diseases.

Failures and missed opportunities:

- The WHO—for its “3 by 5” campaign to treat 3 million AIDS sufferers with anti-retroviral treatments by the end of 2005, which fell short by more than a million.

- The United States—for bypassing multilateral forums intended to coordinate aid on health and for undermining AIDS prevention efforts by promoting approaches not supported by scientific evidence.

Looking ahead
It will not be easy to overcome the major hurdles to achieving the goals. Because facilities are crumbling, they require massive investment. But the goals themselves have proved crucial in focusing attention and mobilizing resources. Now that global public health is so firmly on the world’s agenda, the question for 2006 is whether the world will start investing for the long term, committing resources on the scale necessary to cope with these global threats.

The question for 2006 is whether the world will start investing for the long term, committing resources on the scale necessary to cope with these global threats
Will the various strategies for distributing drugs between and within countries strengthen, or weaken, national health infrastructures?

going beyond individual corporate philanthropy? Will civil society groups mount effective advocacy campaigns around these strategies?

Western countries recognize that they are contributing to the health care crisis in developing countries by enticing away medical personnel on a massive scale. Will that recognition lead to significant efforts to help developing countries keep their medical personnel gainfully employed at home?

On child survival, the London conference at the end of 2005 developed measures and targets so that governments could be held to account for specific actions. What will governments do against those targets in 2006?

Clearly, ensuring a steady supply of HIV/AIDS medications is essential for anyone started on these drugs. Will the various strategies for distributing drugs between and within countries strengthen, or weaken, national health infrastructures?
Rationale for the score
In 2005 the continuing lack of serious high-level political commitment to global environmental goals earned the world a very low score of two for its environmental efforts for the year, one lower than in previous years. Few countries slowed or reduced greenhouse gas emissions, and prospects for an effective global effort to reduce emissions significantly are uncertain at best. No serious frameworks are in place to ensure the integrity of the ecosystems that human societies ultimately depend on. Hundreds of millions of people still lack access to clean water, and very little progress is being made to bring adequate sanitation to the 2.3 billion people who now lack it.

Even in this gloom, flickers of light were perceptible. One significant international agreement on climate change—the Kyoto Protocol—came into effect, as did the European Union’s emission trading system. And many local governments moved boldly ahead of their national leaders on emission reduction initiatives. The landmark Millennium Ecosystem Assessment detailed for the first time humanity’s impact on nature, providing the foundation for better policies. Asia made significant strides in providing access to clean water.

Preventing harmful climate change
Despite compelling evidence, spiraling energy prices, the ratification of a binding international legal framework and available and proven technologies for efficient and lower intensity energy generation, global efforts to prevent climate change remained anaemic.

As a consequence, we are likely to exceed the threshold beyond which climate change becomes dangerous to millions of people. Already the fingerprints of warming are visible, including the steady retreat of polar ice over the last 25 years, an unusually intense hurricane season, including the first recorded hurricane in the South Atlantic, and the melting of glaciers. Possible impacts include rising seas that inundate coastal cities, collapsing marine ecosystems and even a new ice age in Western Europe if the Atlantic Gulf Stream current shuts down.

The Kyoto Protocol became international law in February with 156 parties, which thereby committed themselves to a global regime for slowing and adapting to climate change during 2008–12. But Kyoto requires only small reductions from only a subset of countries, which together account for less than 30% of total emissions. Not all these countries were on track to meet their targets, and the United States, responsible for more than a fifth of all emissions of heat-trapping gases, refused to join Kyoto. That refusal and poor performance by other wealthy nations imperiled efforts to motivate rapidly industrializing countries like China and India to curb their own emissions.
2005 did see other efforts on climate change. UK Prime Minister Tony Blair identified climate change as one of the highest priorities for the G-8 summit he chaired in July. He included several large developing countries in the discussions. By securing agreement for ongoing discussions among the handful of large economies that matter most on climate change, he provided an important supplement to the battered Kyoto/UN process. Also in July the Australia and United States agreed with China, India, Japan and the Republic of Korea on a framework that consolidates their existing technology cooperation agreements, particularly around cleaner combustion of coal. No new resources were included in the package. China, which has publicly recognized its need to enhance the efficiency of its rapidly growing economy, brought stringent vehicle mileage standards into effect. In September the European Union and China agreed on a partnership aimed at developing and demonstrating by 2020 advanced “zero-emissions” coal technology, significantly reducing the cost of key energy technologies, promoting deployment and dissemination and reducing the energy intensity of their economies.

The UN Climate Conference in Montreal in December marked a significant step forward. Most developed countries—including Canada, Japan and those of the European Union—launched new negotiations under the Kyoto Protocol for binding emissions reductions beyond 2012. Under the non-binding framework of the 1992 UN Climate Convention, they agreed with the United States to begin discussions on the future of the global climate regime. Negotiators streamlined the Clean Development Mechanism, which allows emissions reductions in developing countries to be banked and traded internationally. Developing countries, rather than simply pressuring the developed world to do more, became proactive in identifying and supporting domestic efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

The sustained rise in world energy prices helped drive substantial new investment in renewable alternatives and conservation. Already in 2004 about US$ 30 billion was invested in renewable energy worldwide (excluding large hydropower), compared with conventional power sector investment of roughly US$ 150 billion. The fastest growing energy technology is grid-connected solar photovoltaic, which has seen capacity increases of about 60% a year since 2000. Global wind power generation capacity has tripled since 1999, with installations in 2004 up 20% from the year before and projections for 2005 even higher. Brazil, the world leader in “flex fuel” motors that can run on any combination of alcohol or gasoline, saw sales of such vehicles surpass gasoline-only vehicles in August.

The private sector in developed countries increasingly recognized that climate change and emissions regulations are becoming significant issues for shareholder value and global economic stability. A UK coalition of insurance companies reported in June that even a small increase in the intensity of extreme weather events brought on by climate change—and affecting the Europe, Japan and United States—might destabilize capital markets and significantly impede economic growth. The Carbon Disclosure Project, which aims to get leading companies to disclose the regulatory costs or threats to physical infrastructure from climate change, this year doubled the assets it represents to more than US$ 21 trillion. Two-thirds of FT500 companies took steps in 2005 to assess their climate risk and implement strategies to reduce emissions and seize emerging market opportunities.

Carbon became a global commodity with the launch of the carbon emissions trading market in Europe. Such steps are necessary to make carbon emissions controllable through market mechanisms. Within Europe high energy prices—and fears that European industry might exceed emissions targets—boosted prices to € 30 per ton of emissions, almost three times its price at launch, though trading remains light. Seeing an opportunity to attract more foreign investment,
Brazil launched its own carbon credit market, and the voluntary Chicago Climate Exchange in North America enjoyed growing strength and a higher international profile.

Globally, however, the carbon trading system was in its infancy. Under the Kyoto Protocol a “clean development mechanism” is supposed to allow companies to finance projects in developing countries, where emissions reductions can be more cheaply achieved than in their industrial home countries, and receive credit for the resulting emission reductions. This is intended to drive foreign investment in cleaner energy and industrial processes, helping poorer countries to develop faster and more sustainably. In practice, of the 170 projects submitted by July 2005, only 12 had been approved, with the first emission reductions certified in October. The approval process is underfunded and mired in bureaucracy.

In the United States President Bush’s administration found itself more isolated in its refusal to take the problem seriously. In June, by a vote of 53-44, the Senate passed a resolution stating that “It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should enact a comprehensive and effective national programme of mandatory, market-based limits and incentives on emissions of greenhouse gases that slow, stop, and reverse the growth of such emissions . . . .” Lower levels of government went beyond rhetoric to action. California set emission reduction targets that would reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 2000 levels by 2010, and cut them to 80% below 1990 levels by 2050. Nine northeastern states capped emissions from some 600 power stations and worked on plans to reduce them by 10% from 2015 to 2020, while 187 mayors committed to reducing municipal emissions by 7% or more.

Individual corporations also acted. General Electric, the company with the largest market capitalization in the world, announced that it will spend US$ 1.5 billion annually on clean technologies in an initiative to seize market opportunities. It will also reduce its greenhouse gas emissions by 1% by 2012. In October Wal-Mart president and CEO Lee Scott announced ambitious targets, promising to pursue regulatory and policy changes that will encourage utilities to promote energy efficiency and make it easier to feed renewables into the power grid. Wal-Mart also promised to design a green company in China and initiate a program in the United States to show preference to suppliers that set their own goals for aggressive emissions reductions.

**Reversing the loss of biological resources**

Protecting biological resources requires not simply the preservation of individual species but the maintenance of whole ecosystems. The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, released in 2005, provided compelling evidence of our failure to keep pace with the rate at which we are damaging nature. This landmark study, involving more than 1,300 scientists from 95 countries over the past four years, offered an audit of our management of the planet. It showed that most of the 24 ecosystem services key to human well-being are now being degraded or used unsustainably—from fisheries and forests to freshwater resources. The global frameworks for conserving natural systems were simply not in place, and national policies were moving in the wrong direction. For that reason, we gave the world zero out of ten.

Such degradation is not just a matter of losing a few—or even many—cuddly species. Defending ecosystem integrity is key to alleviating poverty, protecting against natural disasters, ensuring global public health and redressing some of the causes of violent conflict. Impoverished rural communities depend overwhelmingly on natural systems and services for survival. That lesson became clear at the end of 2004, when the Asian tsunami did far less damage in coastal areas where mangrove forests and coral reefs were intact than where they had been stripped away by shrimp aquaculture and other development.
activities. In 2005 Hurricane Katrina proved so devastating to the southern United States in part because 1,900 square miles of protective coastal mangrove wetlands had disappeared in Louisiana since the 1930s.

As people push into once-inaccessible wild spaces, as they trade exotic species and as they fail to protect animal health, they disrupt existing ecosystems and render themselves more vulnerable to the spread of disease pathogens, such as avian bird flu, SARS and (originally) HIV. And as natural resources such as water and soil degrade, their scarcity can combine with other stresses to drive violent conflict—a reality recognized in the award of the Nobel Peace Prize to a Kenyan environmentalist last year. In 2005 several aid agencies began compiling lessons from environmental efforts for conflict prevention and reconstruction.

Despite the compelling needs, economic incentives and policy choices continued to drive human behaviour in the wrong directions. Marine ecosystems that supply more than an eighth of the world’s animal protein were collapsing everywhere, the result of rampant overfishing, pollution and other factors. Subsidies of US$ 10–30 billion a year overwhelmed modest efforts at conservation. The European Union, for example, continued to subsidize access to other countries’ fish stocks to make up for overfishing in EU waters. Many of these overseas fleets place no limit on harvesting, in contrast to sharp constraints in domestic waters. The Doha round of international trade negotiations is expected to discuss the need to phase out these “perverse subsidies”, but little progress was expected from the December 2005 Ministerial meeting in Hong Kong.

Brazil and Peru decided to start construction of the long-contested Transoceanic Highway project, without appropriate social and environmental impact assessments or mitigation measures. In their absence, this new strategic link to Asian markets will fuel deforestation and human settlement in the Western Amazon. The United States continued to refuse to become party to the Convention on Biodiversity, the key global mechanism for ecosystem management, despite broad business support.

On a small scale, the need to preserve natural sources of key resources, such as drinking water, led to some innovative efforts to pay private actors to manage the environment sustainably. The Panamanian government and private investors worked with ForestRe, a forest insurance company based in London, to restore key sectors of the Canal’s denuded watershed in order to regulate and improve the quality of its fresh water supplies. Preserving the Canal watershed with reforestation of native species is equivalent to building reservoirs and filtration beds for this gravity-operated canal, though at far less cost.

There were also inroads to the sustainable production of commodities. Certified coffee went mainstream this year, as both Kraft and Nestle launched competing organic or fair-trade products, joining the other dominant players Procter & Gamble and Sara Lee. But sustainable coffee—
including organic, Fairtrade, premium and shade-grown coffee—remained a niche market.

**Delivering water and sanitation**

In 2005, 1 billion people lacked access to safe drinking water, and more than twice that number lacked basic sanitation. China and India have been making significant progress, so the world as a whole will likely achieve the goal of halving the number without safe water, though Sub-Saharan Africa will not. On sanitation, following current trends, we will fall 500 million people short of the international goal by 2012. Because results are so uneven and because effort on sanitation lags far below what is needed, we gave the world three out of ten for progress in 2005.

Unsafe water is the most common cause of illness among the poor, killing a child every 15 seconds. Half the urban population in Africa, Asia and Latin America and the Caribbean suffers from one or more diseases associated with inadequate water quality.

The Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council estimates that the water and sanitation targets could be met by spending as little as US$ 23–60 billion a year until 2015. Today, annual investments total US$ 33 billion for water services and US$ 1 billion for sanitation. Donor support to this sector has steadily declined for years, now accounting for less than 1% of total aid. Even when the fall in overall aid was reversed in 2002, aid to water and sanitation continued to drop, most to a small number of countries, only a few of them low-income. Yet many developing countries, particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa, depend on aid receipts for the bulk of water-related investments: 57% of the total in Zambia, 40% in Malawi.

In 2005 decision-makers began confronting access to water and sanitation with greater resolve. Some countries, such as Bangladesh, Tanzania and Uganda have begun working with stakeholders to develop sector-specific investment plans and performance monitoring frameworks. India’s Total Sanitation Campaign has substantially increased coverage in many rural districts through innovative marketing practices, sanitation and hygiene promotion at schools, and needs-based subsidies and technology choices that respond to variations in socioeconomic levels and water availability. The programme aims to cover the entire country by 2007. Bangladesh set aside 20% of local government funds specifically for sanitation provision, and offers additional funding when independently verified targets are achieved.

In 2005 the UN General Assembly proclaimed the upcoming ten years as the International Decade of “Water for Life”. Kenya sought this year to enshrine a constitutional commitment to water and sanitation access, following similar commitments in South Africa and Uruguay, although voters rejected the constitution in a November referendum. A coalition of NGOs has taken up the cause of assuring a basic right to water and sanitation, with former Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev as their spokesman. The United Kingdom announced a doubling of its water spending in Africa. The European Union has established a new Water Facility to provide € 500 million in additional funds over 2004–07, and the United States has similar legislation pending. Finally, the World Bank has nearly quadrupled its water and sanitation lending since 2002 and will continue to increase its investment in this sector. As with energy, the focus remained more on supply and waste management than on demand. And the catastrophic release of
benzene into the major drinking water source for Harbin, China, in late November provided a painful reminder that even countries doing well on water access still face serious hurdles.

One sign of the growing importance of water investment this year was the return of the megaproject. Despite well documented negative impacts of large-scale hydropower, the World Bank committed to scale up its investments in infrastructure in the developing world in a policy statement this year, notably for large dams, citing the need to respond to urbanization and the demands for water and electricity. Five African nations led by South Africa announced plans to construct the world’s largest dam on the Congo River, to spur development and integration across the continent. In Brazil mass protests and a hunger strike by a leading bishop forced the government to delay construction of a water diversion project from the São Francisco river to the country’s semiarid northeast.

Avid efforts by donors and development banks to privatize water service delivery in the 1990s led to a sobering lesson—these projects are hard to make profitable. Companies became unwilling to accept reputation risks, exchange rate risks and political risks including nationalizations and abrupt contract terminations. Even so, the short-term contracting out of management of water utilities, such as Kampala’s, has in some instances dramatically improved coverage, collection and productivity. With a view towards a more informed and less emotional debate, the multistakeholder Global Review of Private Sector Participation in the Water Sector began documenting experience in Brazil, Indonesia, the Philippines, South Africa and Uganda.

Also in 2005 a unique partnership emerged—Water and Sanitation for the Urban Poor—to develop commercially viable models for expanding water and sanitation services. Comprising NGOs, companies, universities and the United Nations, the coalition agreed to design and implement projects that make a limited profit (capped at 10%) on the resources they commit, while balancing cost recovery for operation and maintenance with delivering services to the poor in a participatory and environmentally sound manner. Projects initiated in 2005 target the needs of slum dwellers in Naivasha, Kenya, and Bangalore, India.

**Praise and blame**

Among the heroes of 2005 were:

- The European Union—for its Emissions Trading System and other environmental regulation efforts.
- China’s State Environmental Protection Administration under Vice Minister Pan Yue—for efforts to dramatically increase energy and resource use efficiency.
- Toyota Motors and Natura Cosmeticos—for demonstrating the viability of more-sustainable products, and the Enhanced Analytics Initiative for driving research on non-financial risks into mainstream financial analysis.
- General Electric—for its new commitment to clean energy and water technology, backed by more than US$ 1.5 billion in research investment annually by 2010.
- Wal-Mart—for its new commitment to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions by 20% in seven years, pursue positive regulatory change and show preference to suppliers that also pursue aggressive emissions targets.
London Mayor Ken Livingston—for implementing an initially unpopular but later successful congestion charge.

Scientist Walter Reid—for conceiving and initiating the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment.

But the year also saw many laggards:

- Governments in general—for failing to live up to commitments on emission caps and biodiversity protection.
- China—for its domestic forest management programme, driving deforestation across Asia.
- The U.S. government—for reversing progress on domestic environmental legislation (Alaskan National Wildlife Refuge, Endangered Species Act) and stalling international efforts on climate change, sending a global signal that these issues do not matter.
- The Brazilian and Peruvian governments—for approving the construction of the Transoceanic Highway without undertaking appropriate impact assessments and implementing necessary mitigation measures.

Looking ahead

The global environmental situation is bad and getting worse. To change that depressing assessment in 2006 will require leadership at all levels and in all parts of the globe.

The lack of adequate and effective action on climate change in the face of clear evidence of damage already under way brings to mind uncomfortable thoughts of Nero fiddling while Rome burned. But there are initiatives worth building on, initiatives that may become politically easier if oil prices stay at high levels. Will other governments follow the European Union’s lead to establish an effective emissions trading system for greenhouse gases? Will more local and regional governments take the kind of action seen within the United States in 2005? Will more business leaders follow the example of General Electric’s new devotion to clean technology? Will governments provide the right incentives to induce the private sector to develop and widely market such technologies? Will governments streamline the Clean Development Mechanism so that it delivers significant emissions reductions while fostering sustainable development in poor countries? More broadly, will governments start to be honest with their publics about the real choices we face, and will they start to reward those citizens more publicly who already lead “low carbon” lives?

Regardless of the alternatives, fossil fuels will continue to supply most of the world’s energy for the foreseeable future. Energy demand is expected to rise by more than 50% by 2025, nearly half of this in Asia. China alone will add some 500 MW of electricity generating capacity each week until 2020, most powered by coal. There is no shortage of proposals for how to cut global carbon dioxide emissions by the 22 billion tons experts say is needed by 2050. Those proposals include replacing 2 billion of today’s cars with hydrogen-powered vehicles, reinforcing shifts away from private car use, sequestering carbon from 1,400 1-GW coal-fired power plants and (most controversially) increasing the world’s current nuclear capacity by a factor of ten. Will the world begin to undertake adequate investment in clean energy technology and carbon capture?

The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment included a report, released in November, on response options, showing that sustainable management of ecosystems will require substantial changes in institutions and governance, economic policies and incentives, social and behavioral factors, and technology and knowledge. Will governments make the needed policy changes?

Another report from the assessment, released in July, laid out related opportunities and challenges for business and industry, which depend on the services provided by ecosystems. Some in the private sector have already begun to act. Perrier-Vittel, for example, has begun paying farmers to adopt modern techniques and organic practices...
to preserve the quality of its water sources. Moreover, the world’s major pension funds are awakening to the long-term risks from environmental mismanagement. Both risk avoidance and new market opportunities could drive action on the part of publicly traded companies on issues ranging from climate change to water use and to green innovation.

Certainly we are seeing less rhetoric and more action from key companies, but will the broader private sector heed the warning?

Moving from these individual initiatives to change at the scale needed requires political leadership. Public sector capacity to regulate, facilitate and provide services needs to be strengthened and supported. Governments must tackle corruption that undermines poverty reduction efforts and adopt legislation in the face of solid scientific evidence. The public sector’s tremendous purchasing power should be oriented preferentially towards more-sustainable products and services, providing a tipping point for these niche products to move into the mainstream. This would complement regulation and public recognition for corporate leaders. Civil society and the media need to do a better job holding public and private decision-makers accountable for these actions, and educating individuals about the consequences of their consumption choices.

Many more governments and companies need to switch on to the urgency of environmental concerns. Only through collaboration can governments ensure that services like water supply and sanitation are provided universally and equitably and that environmental challenges are tackled effectively and efficiently. When incentives align, the private sector will participate—or even lead the way.
Human rights

Goals

- End genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes.
- Ensure counterterrorism measures protect human rights and the rule of law.
- Recognize and implement the international guarantees of economic, social and cultural rights.
- Ensure that trade and business policies do not impoverish people or weaken human rights.

Rationale for the score

2005 continued the trend, evident since 2001, of a retreat on human rights. The score fell to two this year because relevant institutions failed to address chronic problems. Denials of human rights became a more entrenched part of national political rhetoric, as evident in state behaviour on counter-terrorism and labour standards. Internationally, governments fought bitterly over whether to create a new UN Human Rights Council with more authority and teeth to replace the discredited Commission on Human Rights, agreeing only on the name but not the substance of a new body.

The world inched selectively closer to ending impunity for massive human rights violations, as the International Criminal Court issued its first warrants and former political leaders from Chad, Chile, Liberia and Serbian Bosnia were more likely to face justice for their crimes. But in Darfur, Sudan, millions continued to suffer while their attackers enjoyed total impunity. And one effort at accountability—the precedent-setting trial of former Iraqi President Saddam Hussein—raised questions about the justice and fairness of its process.

With new terrorist attacks, governments justified restrictions on such fundamental rights as freedom from torture and freedom of expression, all in the name of counter-terrorism. More countries were ready to expel more people to countries where they faced torture, to hold suspects in secret detention centres or to accept intelligence information gathered through torture.

Marginalized and vulnerable groups increasingly rejected charity in favour of claiming their whole range of rights, including economic, social and cultural rights, sometimes receiving the backing of courts for their claims. But the rights of the poor received short shrift in international trade policy.

On the business front, last year’s polarization over proposed UN norms on the human rights responsibilities of business temporarily eased, with agreement to appoint a UN Special Representative charged with helping to clarify standards for business. In Europe business faced new accountability requirements, as an EU directive required companies to report on the social impact of their activities, while individual European governments imposed even more stringent reporting requirements.

2005 in review

Ending genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes

The agreement on the principle of the international community’s responsibility to protect civilians at the UN World Summit in September represented an important breakthrough. But too many people remained unprotected, and too often the international community was sidetracked into semantic squabbles. In February 2005 a UN commission of inquiry found that Janjawid militias, supported by the Sudanese government, had “conducted indiscriminate attacks, including killing of civilians, torture, enforced disappearances, destruction of villages, rape and other forms of sexual violence, pillaging and forced displacement”. It did not find a genocidal intent, but sought to avoid semantic excuses for inaction by underlining that “the crimes against humanity and war crimes that have been committed in Darfur may be no less serious and heinous than genocide”.

Score

Human rights
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In response to the report in March the UN Security Council took the unprecedented step of referring Sudan to the International Criminal Court for investigation and possible prosecution of individuals responsible. Yet the Sudanese government refused to cooperate with the court. Attacks on civilians continued, despite the belated and modest deployment of African Union peacekeepers. At least 2 million people still required emergency aid. In October the UN Secretary General’s Special Advisor on Prevention of Genocide, Juan Mendez, warned of the continuing “culture of impunity” in relation to Darfur and a lack of “serious good faith” on the government side.

In October the trial of Saddam Hussein and seven co-defendants, charged with killing more than 140 people in Dujail, Iraq, in 1982, opened in Baghdad. The positive message—of accountability and an end to impunity—was tempered by strong misgivings about the process. Created originally by the U.S.-led occupying forces, the court faced an uphill struggle to prove that it could operate independently and deliver calm, fair and impartial justice amidst escalating violence, including the murder of two defence lawyers. Concerns persisted about the precedents that might be set for Iraq and the wider Middle East, including the lowering of the standard of proof, the problems with access to defence, the lack of a right to appeal and the potential imposition of the death penalty after one trial, preventing accounting for many other crimes.

The conflict in Iraq raised concerns about possible war crimes. No authoritative investigation examined allegations that the United States breached the Geneva Conventions by targeting hospitals in its November 2004 attack on Fallujah. Iraqi human rights groups also alleged that Fallujah was the victim of collective punishment. In November 2005 the U.S. military admitted, after earlier denials, that it had used white phosphorous weapons in Fallujah. If used as an incendiary anti-personnel device, this weapon can have a similar effect to napalm, which was banned by a 1980 treaty (which the United States has not ratified).

But 2005 also showed signs of progress on international justice. The International Criminal Court issued its first ever warrants against five leaders of the Ugandan rebel organization, the Lord’s Resistance Army, accused of war crimes and crimes against humanity. It seemed more likely that the Bosnian Serb leaders Radovan Karadžić and Ratko Mladić would be arrested and brought to trial before the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia. In a shift of policy the Serbian government began to cooperate with the Hague tribunal. In Cambodia, after years of political prevarication and despite continuing concerns about the procedures, the Extraordinary Chambers for Prosecution under Cambodian Law of Crimes Committed during the Khmer Rouge Period moved towards bringing human rights violators to justice after more than a quarter century.

Pressure mounted on the Nigerian government to extradite former Liberian ruler Charles Taylor to stand trial before the UN-mandated Special Court in Sierra Leone—on 17 counts of contributing to the murder, rape and mutilation of thousands of people during the Sierra Leone conflict. In November, in a lawsuit brought by two amputees from Sierra Leone, the Nigerian Federal High Court threw out government objections to the court reviewing the asylum granted by the Nigerian government to Taylor.

The year also saw positive steps to put into practice the principle of universal jurisdiction—that those who commit international crimes can be tried anywhere in the world, making it possible to bring human rights violators to justice even if their home countries cannot or will not prosecute. In Canada in October Rwandan national Désire Munyaneza became the first person to face trial under a four-year old Canadian universal jurisdiction law, for alleged involvement in the 1994 genocide in Rwanda. In Senegal the legal
struggle intensified to have former Chadian President Hissène Habré extradited to Belgium, 15 years after he fled to Senegal, to face trial for killings, torture and other crimes during his eight-year rule. In Latin America Agusto Pinochet was charged for human rights violations when he ruled Chile, and former Peruvian President Alberto Fumimori was arrested in Chile and faced possible extradition to Peru.

**Terrorism, counter-terrorism and the rule of law**

The year saw major terrorist outrages in Amman (Jordan), Bali (Indonesia), London (United Kingdom), New Delhi (India) and Cairo and Sharm el-Sheikh (Egypt). In the ongoing intense debate between those who argue that human rights need to be limited in the struggle against terrorism and those who maintain that democratic values are best upheld by a staunch commitment to human rights, 2005 saw early signs of a rhetorical shift at the international level from the former to the latter. The International Summit on Democracy, Security and Terrorism, in Madrid in March, stressed the fundamental role of human rights and the rule of law in anti-terror strategy.

But in practice, as in previous years, governments often responded to terrorist threats by restricting rights and weakening vital protections, creating victims of counter-terrorism to add to the victims of terrorism. Governments were more willing to expel foreigners to countries where they risked torture. The UN Committee against Torture criticized Sweden for deporting to Egypt a man suspected of involvement in terrorism, because Egypt’s diplomatic assurances were not adequate protection against torture, a widespread practice there. Austria, Canada, Germany, the Netherlands and the United States all sought to engage in similar deportations.

The United Kingdom and other governments appeared willing to use information gathered through torture, even if they ban the practice at home, on the rationale that the rights of terror suspects must be balanced against the need to protect ordinary citizens. But under the UN Convention against Torture the prohibition of torture is absolute. When that wall is breached, the consequences are predictable. A refusal to be choosy about the origins of intelligence and the naïve acceptance of assurances from governments with poor records on torture rapidly mutate into the active encouragement of torture. There was continuing evidence in 2005 that the United States persisted with its policy of “extraordinary rendition”—that is, handing suspects to “friendly” intelligence services, which then torture them and hand over the information gathered. Controversy exploded over alleged U.S. secret detention centers in Europe and whether European governments had acquiesced in allowing the United States to run them.

Within the United States new opposition arose to the Bush administration’s apparent willingness to allow torture. Congress considered a bill reaffirming the prohibition on torture and ill treatment by U.S. forces anywhere in the world. The administration argued that the Central Intelligence Agency should be exempt and threatened to veto the bill, but relented as it became clear that the bill would not pass both houses with veto-proof majorities. Although low-level personnel were convicted of abuses at Abu Ghraib and one general was relieved of her command, the United States undertook no action to address the systemic attitudes that led to the Abu Ghraib torture.

Excessive counter-terrorism measures are hardly unique to the United Kingdom and the United States. They have long plagued such countries as Colombia, Egypt, India, Israel, Malaysia and the Russian Federation. Serious human rights concerns were expressed during the year about proposed or adopted new counter-terrorism laws or other actions in the name of fighting terrorism in countries across all regions, including in Australia, Bahrain, Colombia, Egypt, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Nepal, Maldives, Philippines, Swaziland, Thailand and Uzbekistan.
China announced that it would adopt an Anti-Terrorism Law by the end of 2005. None of the provisions under consideration has been made public. China has been conducting a repressive anti-terrorism campaign in the Autonomous Region of Xinjiang, home to 8 million Turkish-speaking Uighurs. But in Canada the pendulum may have begun to swing the other way, with mandates for two reviews of laws brought in shortly after September 2001.

In the name of fighting terrorism several governments, including Nepal, Thailand and the United Kingdom, adopted new laws to restrict freedom of expression. Freedom of expression (unlike torture) is not absolute under international standards, which explicitly prohibit incitement to hatred and violence. Governments suggested that advocating a political platform close to that of the terrorists constitutes incitement. But human rights standards require a much closer causal link between the words spoken and the likelihood of terrorist acts being carried out. Only after sustained opposition did the UK government slightly modify a proposal to make a criminal offence of “glorifying” terrorism—which might have prevented support for former South African President Nelson Mandela had the law been in force during apartheid.

Migrants continued to be especially vulnerable to legal restrictions on their rights in the more xenophobic atmosphere of the “war on terror”. The entire framework of international refugee protection—the right to seek asylum from persecution—was under sustained attack. The Global Commission on International Migration, in its final report issued in October, set out six principles for action, which could help strengthen the rights and protection of migrants around the world.

Although courts faced pressure to fall into line with executive policies, some reasserted their vital role as a check and balance. The UK government was forced to abandon the indefinite detention of foreign terrorist suspects without trial after the country’s highest court declared it was discriminatory and in breach of the European Convention on Human Rights. Rejecting government policy, the House of Lords outlawed the use, in any court, of evidence obtained by torture, even when no UK authorities are involved. In Chile a criminal court acquitted Mapuche indigenous leaders who had been inappropriately charged under anti-terrorist legislation for protesting encroachment on their ancestral lands. In Israel in September the Supreme Court again held that parts of the Separation Barrier, justified because of suicide bomb attacks, inflict disproportionate and acute hardship on Palestinians and must be re-routed. But the court rejected last year’s International Court of Justice opinion that the barrier could never be built on Occupied Territory.

From charity to rights
During the year several marginalized or vulnerable groups argued that they have minimum economic, social and cultural rights that cannot be violated and that they should be able to claim remedies from courts and governments for breaches. The global disability movement led the way in moving from charity to rights. The argument that they must be able to claim their rights to live in dignity drove rapid progress in 2005 towards a new United Nations human rights treaty on the rights of the disabled.

International treaties ratified by many countries already set out the range of economic, social and cultural rights—to education, health, shelter, food, social security and so on. Yet some governments—a shrinking minority—do not recognize the validity of these rights. Some are concerned that these rights represent a hostile political agenda. The treaties do not specify exactly how or when the rights should be realized, though they do imply that the unfettered operation of the market may not always be adequate to achieve such rights.

The focus of the G-8 summit in Scotland in July—on debt cancellation, poverty reduction and trade—again highlighted the claim of rights over charity. Two alternative visions of how the developing world
can lift itself out of poverty were presented. On offer was US$ 40 billion in debt relief (compared with total debt of US$ 2,400 billion in all developing countries and US$ 300 billion in Africa). In exchange the G-8 deal required further economic liberalization and cuts in government spending. In practice this would benefit countries already engaged in structural reforms approved by the IMF and the World Bank. Governments hailed the G-8 deal as a triumph for Africa. But anti-poverty campaigners from developing countries actively advocated their own view, articulated in the language of rights and social justice, not of development and reform. Not by coincidence, these campaigners adopted a slogan from the disability rights movement: “Never about us without us”. The view from developing countries was generally that the types of policy reform tied to debt cancellation were themselves sources of poverty, not routes out of it.

In June the Committee on the Rights of the Child warned that free trade agreements could have a negative impact on access to affordable medicines and social services for the poor. The expert committee raised its concerns as a number of countries were in the process of negotiating or ratifying free trade agreements, including Costa Rica, Ecuador, Nicaragua and the Philippines. Under the Convention on the Rights of the Child countries have an obligation to consider the best interests of the child in all their decisions, including trade policy. The Swiss company Roche’s negotiations with generic drug manufacturers for the cheaper production of Tamiflu to combat avian flu further supported the argument that the internationally recognized right of everyone to the highest attainable standard of health should sometimes override profit-making.

A central plank of the argument that economic, social and cultural rights are not proper human rights is that they are too vague and imprecise to be adjudicated by courts. In reality, courts in many countries, such as Brazil, India and South Africa, increasingly enforce people’s rights to water, shelter, health, education and other basic rights. Governments are wary of courts usurping decision-making, with possibly enormous budgetary implications. But courts are insisting more narrowly that governments comply with constitutional guarantees or strictly adhere to their social policies.

Two recent court decisions in India illustrate how corporations also need to prevent their activities from harming the economic, social and cultural rights of communities their operations affect. Amid allegations that Coca-Cola’s operations in India have caused severe water shortages and produced contamination, the Rajasthan High Court ruled at the end of 2004 that all soft drinks should state the level of pesticides on the product label. Coca-Cola appealed, arguing that small traces of pesticide were not harmful. The court rejected the appeal, saying, “commercial interests are subservient to fundamental rights”. In Kerala, where the local community opposes Coca-Cola’s largest bottling plant in the country because of alleged damage to the water system, the state High Court ruled that groundwater belonged to the people. The government had no right to allow a private party to extract huge amounts of groundwater, “a property held by it in trust”.

**Impoverishment and human rights**

The debate prompted by the G-8 summit relates to the very nature of poverty. It centres on whether poverty is a state in which a large part of the world’s population unfortunately finds itself—or a process of impoverishment, where disadvantage and dependency are constantly renewed. This debate is fundamental, since it goes to the international obligation to realize economic and social rights in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

In 2005 concerns arose that the abolition of the Multi-Fibre Arrangement in January could have a disastrous impact on the rights of workers in many poorer countries. By deregulating export of garments to Europe and the United States, the abolition of the arrangement is likely to shift millions
This year saw significant new attacks on the urban poor’s right to shelter. The most widely condemned was the Zimbabwe government’s Operation Murambatsvina (“Operation Drive Out Trash”), which began in May. Some 700,000 people were deprived of their homes or livelihoods, as officials destroyed ostensibly illegal structures in urban areas. The houses or businesses had often been built with the explicit encouragement of national or local government. An unusually hard-hitting UN investigation concluded that the “indiscriminate and unjustified” evictions violated national and international human rights standards and plunged already poor communities “deeper into poverty, deprivation and destitution”. Murambatsvina appeared to have an explicit political purpose: expelling urban supporters of the main opposition party. Yet disputes over access to urban land and a governmental desire for clean and glittering cities mean that the phenomenon is widespread, including neighbouring South Africa and several major Asian cities.

Praise and blame

Praise:

• For legal efforts to battle impunity and uphold human rights law: civil society groups for seeking extradition of perpetrators of international human rights crimes; the International Criminal Court for steady work leading to its first warrants of arrest; 11 retired U.S. military leaders for supporting a Senate bill that reaffirmed the prohibition of torture or ill treatment by U.S. forces.

• For efforts at promoting economic and social rights: the disability movement and anti-poverty protestors from developing countries for arguing the need for social justice and human rights rather than charity.

Blame:

• For attacks on human rights law: the United States, United Kingdom and other governments for attempting to dismantle the...
absolute prohibition of torture and ill treatment in the name of fighting terrorism.

- **For terrorist attacks**: the groups responsible for killing hundreds around the world in bombings in countries including Egypt, India, Indonesia, Jordan and the United Kingdom.

- **For massive attacks on hundreds of thousands of people**: governments including the Sudanese government (and the Janjawid militia) for continuing attacks on civilians in Darfur—and the Zimbabwean government for forcibly evicting 700,000 people in its cities.

**Looking ahead**

It is urgent that in 2006 the international community calls a halt to the normalization of policies and actions hostile to respect for human rights. Developments to watch for:

- Will there be effective steps to end systematic violence against civilians in Darfur, and will the International Criminal Court receive the political support to prosecute those responsible?
- Will former leaders Charles Taylor of Liberia, Hissène Habré of Chad and Radovan Karadžić and Ratko Mladić of Bosnia be extradited, and will they and former Khmer Rouge leaders face trial?
- Will the trial of Saddam Hussein and his co-defendants deliver impartial and fair justice or be a political show?
- Will governments give substance to the conclusion of the International Summit on Democracy, Security and Terrorism in Madrid in March 2005 that human rights are central to building secure societies where people are safe from terrorism?
- Will governments reaffirm the absolute prohibition on torture and ill treatment? Will they stop sending suspects back to countries where they risk being tortured and stop using information extracted by torture in third countries?
- Will the Guantanamo Bay detainees be able to challenge the legality of their detention in a U.S. court?
- Will the recommendations of the 2005 Global Commission on Migration be implemented?
- Will the impact of the abolition of the Multi-Fibre Arrangement be closely monitored and action taken to protect workers and communities in countries that lose vital textile and garment contracts and investments?
- Will human rights impact assessments be carried out before free trade agreements are concluded?
- Will the hundreds of thousands of people wrongly evicted from their homes in Zimbabwe and other countries receive reparation and justice?
- Will business, civil society and governments agree on the human rights standards that all businesses should abide by and on what this means in practice for their behaviour?
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