

CIVIL SOCIETY PARTNERSHIP PROGRAMME

What do we mean by ‘pro-poor policies’ and ‘pro-poor policy processes’?

Zaza Curran and Paolo de Renzio

1. Introduction

‘Pro-poor’ is a term that has become widely used in the development literature. The general understanding that can be drawn from this literature is that pro-poor policies are those that directly target poor people, or that are more generally aimed at reducing poverty. There is also a general consensus that pro-poor policy processes are those that allow poor people to be directly involved in the policy process, or that by their nature and structure lead to pro-poor outcomes. The current definition used by the Civil Society Partnership Programme is that “the aim of pro-poor policies is to improve the assets and capabilities of the poor”. While this definition does point to some examples of the kinds of policies this might entail, it is similar to other, rather generic definitions in the literature, and does not go into the specifics of what policies are most likely to produce poverty reduction results, in which contexts, and through which policy processes.

One of the reasons for these broad definitions of pro-poor policies and pro-poor policy processes is that there continues to be a lack of consensus on what pro-poor policies and pro-poor policy processes actually mean in practice. On the other hand - and on a more positive note - it also indicates that there is now a common understanding that there can be no ‘blueprint’ for poverty reduction, and that each country is required to ‘mix and match’ its own set of policies and processes which are appropriate to the context in order to achieve the goal of increased and sustainable poverty reduction.

That being said, there is still scope to develop more of a common understanding of the policies that are believed to have greater impact on poverty and, perhaps more importantly, of the processes required to ensure that the appropriate policy decisions are made and implemented effectively. This paper reviews recent development literature to see if it possible to further our understanding of what ‘pro-poor’ actually means. The paper is divided into four sections: the first section looks at some of the main conceptual difficulties in forming a definition of the term ‘pro-poor’. The second section looks at the historical evolution of how pro-poor policies have been understood and gives a picture of the variety of existing views on which policies are thought to be more pro-poor. Similarly, the third section unpacks some of the issues that currently make up our understanding of pro-poor policy processes. The fourth and final section looks at what this deeper insight into pro-poor policies and processes means for the Civil Society Partnership Programme.

2. Definitions of ‘pro-poor’

Defining the term ‘pro-poor’ is a problem faced by many policy-makers and researchers working on poverty reduction issues. The result has been that the definitions often remain vague. This section takes four big dilemmas that are implicit when trying to pin down what is exactly meant by policies or policy processes being ‘pro-poor’.

Absolute vs. Relative

It is understood that pro-poor policies are those that benefit the poor, but there are two ways of determining whether a policy is benefiting the poor. The *absolute* approach looks exclusively at the direct benefit of a policy measure on the poor population. The benchmarks and indicators for such measurement are not prescribed but assume that a 'poverty line' has been specified to differentiate between those below (i.e. the poor) and those above (i.e. the non-poor) the line. Pro-poor policies are therefore defined as those which allow for the maximum number of people to cross above the poverty line, regardless of what happens to the non-poor. The *relative* approach determines the pro-poorness of a policy measure by looking at how much the welfare of the poor improves in relation to the non-poor – or more specifically, how much a policy measure *disproportionately* benefits the poor in comparison with the non-poor. As a consequence, a policy is seen as being 'pro-poor' if its positive impacts are greater for the poor than for the non-poor.

Specific targeting vs. General policies

Should a policy be seen as pro-poor if it specifically targets poor people or the poorest sections of society? Many view this to be the more effective way of ensuring that policies are specifically designed to meet the needs of poor people and, through targeting, most likely to reach their intended beneficiaries. However, it could also be argued that policies with other objectives (growth, agricultural modernisation, infrastructure investment) may generate greater gains for the poor even without any specific targeting. The case here is that the underlying causes of poverty are linked to the whole country's development challenges and that designing targeted policies rather than tackling some of the wider framework issues that prevent poverty reduction will not have a long-term and sustainable impact on poverty.

Policy statements vs. Policy outcomes

Another dilemma is whether the 'pro-poorness' of a policy should be determined by its initial intentions or by its outcomes. Many developing countries have produced poverty reduction strategies which set out the government's poverty reduction aims and the policies it will implement to achieve those aims. The intention of these policies is often

Box 1: Pro-poor growth

Pro-poor growth is often included as a key policy area in development literature. Pro-poor growth is slightly different from other policy areas that adopt the 'pro-poor' prefix as it has developed a clearer meaning and an increasingly well researched theoretical basis. However, some of the same dilemmas remain in determining when growth is pro-poor.

Pro-poor growth also has to tackle the issue of absolute vs. relative approaches. The 'absolute' approach considers only the incomes of poor people. The 'relative' approach compares changes in the incomes of the poor with changes in the incomes of the non-poor making growth pro-poor if the incomes of poor people grow faster than those of the population as a whole (DFID, February 2004). Implicit in both of these approaches, is an emphasis on reducing inequality within a country.

To ensure that growth is pro-poor, a range of additional policies are required. According to the DAC Poverty Guidelines, pro-poor growth requires good governance, prudent macroeconomic management, competitive markets and a vibrant private sector, efficient institutions and sustainable use of natural resources (OECD-DAC 2001). DFID also lists four conditions that need to be met in the design of policies to achieve faster pro-poor growth: creating strong incentives for investment; fostering international economic links; providing broad access to assets and markets; and reducing risk and vulnerability (DFID September 2004)

seen to be 'pro-poor' as they are part of a national poverty reduction project. However, it is not certain on writing such strategies what impact the policies will actually have on poverty reduction. It could therefore be argued that pro-poor policies should only be defined as such according to their outcomes (measurable reduction in poverty). In this case, the intention of the government is not as important as the outcomes.

An important point to highlight at this point concerns the time-scale that should be used for judging the pro-poorness of policies. Long-term success may arise from the proper sequencing of policy measures that have an impact on the welfare of the poor over time. However, judging the pro-poorness of a policy according to either the intention or the (more immediate) outcomes could miss the long-term perspective that may be required to determine what policies are in fact pro-poor.

Income poverty vs. Multidimensional concept of poverty

Linked to the broader debate about the definition of poverty, there is also the issue about how poverty reduction achievements associated to specific policies should be evaluated. The easiest and quickest way to determine the poverty reduction impact of a policy initiative would be to measure changes in the income levels of the poor. However, this does not fit with a multidimensional understanding of poverty, in which case the impact on other aspects of poverty should also be taken into account. The second approach is more time consuming and requires both quantitative and qualitative assessments to be made.

Inclusive vs. technocratic process

The issue of pro-poor policy processes is looked at in more depth below but it is highlighted here as another dilemma that emerges for all stakeholders interested in achieving poverty reduction. The main issue here is whether to have an inclusive process which involves as many poor people as possible in defining the issues, priorities and actions needed to reduce poverty, or to take poverty-reducing policy-making as a more technocratic exercise that requires people with the necessary skills and capacity to analyse and compare the pro-poorness of alternative policies. The obvious benefit of the first approach is that it includes the people who have first-hand knowledge of the challenges they face, and of the changes that are needed to improve their situation. However, this approach is very time consuming, and often results in the definition of individual or community-specific needs which are hard to translate into national policy. The technocratic approach may be less time-consuming and benefit from a national perspective, but there is a danger that the policies adopted are far removed from the needs and realities on the ground.

3. Pro-poor policies

Historical evolution

The early decades of development (from the 1950s) were characterised by an emphasis on modernisation theories. Whatever the political regime or economic model a country followed, the promise of modernisation was that there would be rapid improvements in people's lives – including the very poor – through planned industrialisation and agricultural modernisation. The objectives of development were very simple: to increase per capita GNP through industrialisation and modernisation.

Despite some successes in East Asia, the promise of the 'trickle down' effect of modernisation did not materialise, and the numbers of people living in poverty were not reduced. Many critiques of modernisation emerged, including the then President of the World Bank, Robert McNamara. In 1973, McNamara gave the key note speech at the Annual Meetings in Nairobi on the rural poor and absolute poverty, which he defined as "a condition of life so degraded in disease, illiteracy, malnutrition and squalor as to deny its victims basic human necessities and a condition of life so common as to be the lot of some 40% of the peoples of the developing countries." In 1974, a newly formed World Bank policy arm published a report called *Redistribution with Growth*, which focused on income distribution to benefit the poor.

From this point onwards, poverty reduction emerged more prominently as one of the main objectives of development. However, it still remained a secondary priority to stabilisation during the Structural Adjustment Programmes of the 1980s. These programmes prioritised economic stabilisation and growth and required the scaling back of social services and safety nets in order to balance budgets and accelerate growth. As with early modernisation theories, it was assumed that poverty reduction would happen through growth.

It was only when it became clear in the late 1980s that structural adjustment policies were not generating the anticipated growth that consensus grew around the idea that growth was important but not enough. While poverty reduction had always been part of what was understood by development, it was not until the 1990s that it became central to the meaning of development, and the main focus for development cooperation. This rise of poverty reduction as the core objective of development is evident in a number of strategic policy statements from bilateral donors¹, in guidelines published by the OECD-DAC and in the World Development Reports (WDRs) of 1990 and, most notably, 2000/2001.

The 1990 World Development Report sees the policies required for poverty reduction to be a combination of:

- labour-intensive growth
- development of human capital through access to social services
- provision of safety nets to provide a minimum of welfare for those unable to participate in or benefit from the expanding economy.

OECD-DAC's *Shaping the 21st Century* (1996) was another strong signal that poverty reduction was becoming the overarching goal of development cooperation. This document brought together a number of key commitments agreed during a wave of international conferences in the first half of the decade. The list of commitments was articulated as targets that came to be known as the International Development Targets (IDTs). Gradually, these were embraced by the UN and the World Bank and became the central pillar – somewhat modified – of the internationally agreed Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

¹ e.g. DFID, 1997; SIDA 1997; SDC 2000

Box 2: The Millennium Development Goals

The eight MDGs are:

1. Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger
2. Achieve universal primary education
3. Promote gender equality and empower women
4. Reduce child mortality
5. Improve maternal health
6. Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases
7. Ensure environmental sustainability
8. Develop a global partnership for development

Each goal has one or more associated targets (there are 18 in total); and each target is, in turn, linked to one or more specific, quantifiable indicators which can be used to measure change. A total of 48 quantifiable indicators have been identified for all goals.

The WDR of 2000/01 revisited the theme of poverty reduction that had first been introduced in the 1990 WDR. In this report, instead of the three policy areas listed above, a new model was presented for reducing poverty based on three focal areas:

- opportunity
- security
- empowerment.

The model espoused in the WDR 2000/01 links with the emerging development language related to rights and capabilities. A rights-based approach to poverty reduction includes the following elements: (a) express linkages to all rights (civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights); (b) accountability; (c) empowerment; (d) participation; and (e) non-discrimination and attention to vulnerable groups. The argument is that a rights framework reinforces the view that poverty reduction is no longer purely about increasing income levels. While growth is important, it is not an end in itself and we want growth to achieve some particular aim or end. As with all decisions about which policies to choose and implement, there are trade-offs to be made, especially in low-income countries where resources are limited. What is important is that policy choices are made within a rights framework, to ensure that they do not infringe on peoples' rights and that all policies work towards the progressive realisation of all rights for all people.

Current views

While there is no blueprint about what policies are most likely to result in the reduction of poverty, there are some key recurring themes in the current understanding of poverty reduction which point to the types of policies that could be considered 'pro-poor' (see Annex 1 for more details). In short these are:

- a broader, multidimensional definition of poverty: including private consumption, assets, social consumption, access to services – i.e. health and education – political power and voice, economic capability, security and empowerment;
- the increasing importance of cross-cutting issues such as including and understanding of gender imbalances and environmental aspects of development;
- greater interest in vulnerability and social protection;

- changing perspectives on the role of different development actors in poverty reduction efforts – i.e. the market, the State and civil society – and how they interact with each other.

Although the emphasis is on not prescribing which policies are more pro-poor, it is possible to also see trends in donor support to different sectors which indicates the priority sectors seen as being more ‘pro-poor’. During the 1990s, there was a trend in many donors away from the productive sectors toward the *social sectors*. This reflected the changing nature of the debate about poverty reduction. With the influence of the UN concept of human development (covering health, education and literacy), there was a shift away from economic investment to social service provision.

The increasing focus on *governance* issues relates to the growing perception that managing competing needs and resource constraints is a political process which needs an effective government with capable institutions to ensure that the choices and trade-offs are made for clear poverty reduction objectives. The best policy choices a government can make, therefore, are those that blend the right technical solution with political feasibility.

Box 3: The ‘Asian Model’ – an alternative view?

The ‘Asian Model’ produced positive results between 1960 and 1996 in countries such as Malaysia, Thailand, Singapore and South Korea. This model of development focused on state-led mobilisation of investment and state-directed industrial development. Other characteristics include: relative closure to the import of consumer goods, severe control of foreign investment and financial markets, high domestic savings and a strong emphasis on improving the human capital of the population (health and education).

The Asian economic crisis in 1997, however, suggested that a more transparent and accountable model of economic governance was needed to reduce the likelihood of economic crisis. Even when crisis could not be avoided, its impact should be reduced by having a comprehensive social protection policy in place to ensure that economic recession did not reverse progress in poverty reduction.

The management of this complex process of devising, operationalising and implementing pro-poor policies requires governance structures which are transparent, efficient (including robust public financial management structures), participatory and accountable to citizens. This aspect, along with some of its political underpinnings, will be further discussed in the following section on pro-poor policy processes.

A clear result from the above analysis, however, is that there is no simple, universal blueprint for defining pro-poor policies. What constitutes poverty, poverty reduction and pro-poor actions is largely specific to different periods, different cultures and professional disciplines. Developing countries need to define strategies and policies that are appropriate to their own economic, socio-political, structural and cultural context, while being aware that pro-poor policies may not necessarily be the obvious ones, nor the ones being advocated within prevalent ideological frameworks. And in doing this, they need to take into account a host of other factors, such as choosing the appropriate level of targeting, encouraging participation, assessing complementarities and trade-offs, paying attention to sustainability concerns, and so on (OECD-DAC, 1999).

4. Pro-poor policy processes

Policy processes are the arenas where some of the key discussions on the topics above take place in each country. The encounter of technical assessments with political manoeuvring, of strategies and statements with outcomes and results, of bottom-up definition of needs and priorities with top-down indication of directions and targets represent the stage onto which the 'pro-poorness' of policy choices is negotiated and defined. A 'pro-poor' policy process can be preliminarily defined as one which either significantly involves the poor population or generates policies which work in their favour.

For this to work, one of the necessary starting points is a thorough understanding of the extent and underlying causes of poverty in a country. Included in this analysis should be the political factors that play a role in determining the poverty situation. This analysis should then form the basis of planning to ensure that the policy process focuses on tackling the root causes of poverty. Inevitably, as the understanding of poverty deepens, so will the appropriateness of policies improve. The chain of linkages from an understanding of poverty to determining desired poverty reduction outcomes, and then to public actions is a very complex one. The challenge is to use well-grounded analysis and assessments to ensure that the final public choices and actions remain relevant to the context.

However, effective analysis of the policy-outcome linkages is not common in many policy decisions. A recent study by the World Bank criticises the lack of a proper discussion on linkages between development activities (in this case pro-poor expenditure, although the argument can be made more general) and poverty reduction. It states that "one of the weaknesses of the pro-poor approach is that it has used facile reasoning to link inputs (public spending) with outcomes (absolute poverty levels). An unintended consequence of this approach is that it has suppressed the essential discussion of the linkages between public spending policy and its direct and indirect effects and short and long term consequences' (Paternostro et al., 2005:3).

In response to this, another important tool in pro-poor policy processes is the use of *ex-ante* policy analysis. Poverty and Social Impact Assessments (PSIAs) can be used as a tool to determine the distributional impact of policies. They are also a way of discovering the potential negative affects of policies and either modifying the policy content or introducing mitigating measures. Including participation of the poor in PSIA analyses (as well as *ex-post* monitoring and evaluation) will also increase the potential pro-poor focus and outcome of the policy process. However, it is essential that PSIA are not *ad hoc* exercises that occur on some policy choices but rather that they become embedded in the policy process itself.

Citizens' participation in the policy process is regarded as being a central feature of a pro-poor policy process. Participation has gained ascendancy in recent years and there is much written on the benefits (and risks) associated with including citizens in the development process. It can increase the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of public actions. It can also strengthen the accountability and transparency of government policy processes and ensure that policies get translated into action.

For this to be possible, it is essential that the government is prepared to open the policy space for interrogation and change, and that there is an institutional framework to support participation. Without these factors being present, participation will often result in nothing more than a box-ticking exercise to pacify donors, international NGOs and other development actors.

However, there are some issues that need to be considered before assuming that participation produces pro-poor policies. The causal link between participation and poverty reduction is not clear and requires a number of factors to be in place. A common question is 'who participates?' Most commonly, citizens are represented by civil society organisations, but do these organisations always represent poor and excluded groups? Engaging in the policy process will only produce pro-poor effects if those involved have the technical expertise to discuss different policy options and make feasible and plausible suggestions. This is not always the case in many low-income countries where there are significant capacity issues as well as information and resource constraints.

The PRSP process

The Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) approach was introduced in 1999 as a new way of 'doing' development and can be seen as an attempt to combine an emphasis on poverty reduction, or on pro-poor policies, with pro-poor, inclusive policy processes. The PRSP approach is based on six core principles which emphasise country ownership, participation and promote the formulation of comprehensive, results-orientated strategies for poverty reduction².

The World Bank's Source Book does not include a blue-print of the policies to be included in a PRSP but it does include priority content areas for public action in PRSPs. These include: "macroeconomic and structural policies to support sustainable growth in which the poor participate; improvements in governance, including public sector financial management; appropriate sector policies and programme; and realistic costing and funding (Klugman, 2001:4). Beyond this, the PRSP architects did not prescribe specific policies to be included in PRSPs.

In reality, however, many PRSPs are strikingly similar, with a policy framework that is not very different to that prescribed during the era of structural adjustment in the 1980s (Vandemoortele, 2004:13). Furthermore, there has been considerable attention given to the social sectors as the key to poverty reduction at the cost of growth issues including the productive sectors and employment.

PRSP also require the participation of citizens as a way of strengthening the poverty reduction impact of the strategies. According to the World Bank's Sourcebook, this should take the form of 'outcome-oriented participatory processes', with a focus not on writing the document itself, but on stimulating community actions to reduce poverty (Tikare et al, 2001: 237). In short, the PRSP approach views potential for civil society engagement in 3 ways:

² The six principles are: **country-driven**, involving broad-based participation by civil society and the private sector in all operational steps; **results-oriented**, focusing on outcomes that would benefit the poor; **costed and prioritised** ensuring the strategy is realistic and feasible; **comprehensive** in recognizing the multidimensional nature of poverty and the scope of actions needed to effectively reduce poverty; **partnership-oriented**, involving coordinated participation of development partners (bilateral, multilateral, and non-governmental); and based on a **long-term perspective** for poverty reduction.

- Participation and information sharing - building a more informed approach to poverty reduction
- Strengthening accountability – improving state-society relations, responsiveness and transparency on poverty issues
- Capacity development – strengthening CSO capacity to take forward tackling poverty issues

A lot has been written on participation in PRSPs and the successes and failures of the different country processes.³ The main criticism of the participation process in this first wave of PRSPs was that they were poorly conceived, very narrow (only certain issues – usually ‘safe’ social sectors - were open for discussion), exclusive (the governments decided who was invited) and rushed. In many countries, the processes were rushed because governments were in need of debt relief linked to the PRSP, but in other instances, governments were not interested in including civil society in policy discussions so did the minimal amount of consultation required. The general conclusion of most of this literature is that in the first round of PRSP formulation ‘participation’ consisted of rather superficial ‘poverty diagnostic consultations’ that did manage to contribute to expanding the definitions of poverty but, broadly speaking, were not able to alter the substance of policy choices. However, there are signs of improvement as countries move into their second generation PRSPs (Tanzania and Uganda are examples) as well as improvements in the policy making process.

5. What does ‘pro-poor’ mean for the CSPP?

From the discussion above, it is difficult to draw conclusive definitions of pro-poor policies and policy processes. Quite clearly, there is no specific set of policies which are pro-poor in every context, or one specific process which needs to be followed to ensure pro-poor outcomes. However, the discussion above points to a number of factors that need to be present to ensure pro-poor policies and pro-poor policy processes:

- a deep understanding of the poverty situation;
- thorough analysis on what impact potential different policies are likely to have;
- political will to ensure that the most effective policies are chosen and then, most importantly, implemented;
- mechanisms within government to effectively operationalise and implement policies;
- space and opportunities for citizens (esp. the poor) to engage with the policy process and have their opinions taken into account.

Based on this, there are a number of areas where the Civil Society Partnership Programme could focus, together with partners, to improve the ‘pro-poorness’ of policies and policy processes, such as:

- strengthening civil society organisations’ ability to research and analyse poverty issues and policy options, including performing *ex-ante* analysis of potential policies to determine their impact on the ground, monitor government activities and report back findings;

³ See, for example, McGee et al (2002), Christian Aid (2001), ActionAid (2002) and Driscoll et al (2004)

- deepening civil society's understanding of the nature and structure of the policy process and the drivers that either facilitate or obstruct change, to allow civil society organisations to effectively engage in dialogue with policy makers and promote a poverty focus.

References

- ActionAid, (2002) *Inclusive circles lost in exclusive cycles: an ActionAid contribution to the first Global Poverty Reduction Strategies Comprehensive Review. Based on experiences from ActionAid staff and partners in Haiti, Kenya, Malawi, Nepal, Rwanda, Uganda and Vietnam*, ActionAid USA
- Brautigam, D. (2005) 'The people's budget? Politics, participation and pro-poor policy' [complete ref]
- Brock, K., Cornwall, A. and Gaventa, J. (2001), *Power, knowledge and political spaces in the framing of poverty policy*, IDS Working Paper no.143, Sussex: IDS
- Christian Aid, (2002) *Ignoring the experts: Poor people's exclusion from poverty reduction strategies*, Christian Aid Policy Briefing prepared in partnership with INESC, Rede Brasil, Mozambique Debt Group, LINK, CEDLA, UNITAS, London: Christian Aid
- Christiansen, Karin with Ingie Hovland (2003) 'The PRSP Initiative: Multilateral Policy Role of Research' London: Overseas Development Institute
- Conway, T., Luttrell, C. (nd) 'The politics of pro-poor change in Asia: synthesis of case studies in Cambodia, Indonesia, Madhya Pradesh and Vietnam' paper commissioned by DFID.
- DFID, (September 2004) *How to accelerate pro-poor growth: a basic framework for policy analysis*, Pro-poor Growth Briefing Note 2, London: DFID.
- DFID, (February 2004) *What is pro-poor growth and why do we need to know?* Pro-poor Growth Briefing Note 1, London: DFID.
- DFID (2001) *Making government work for poor people: building state capability*, London: DFID
- DFID (1997) 'Eliminating World Poverty: A Challenge for the 21st Century', *White Paper on International Development*. London: Department for International Development.
- DFID, (nd) *Better Government for Poverty Reduction*, London: DFID
- Driscoll, R. and Jenks, S. with Christiansen, K. (2004), 'An overview of NGO participation in PRSPs' London: Overseas Development Institute
- Duncan, R., and Pollard, S., (2002) *A framework for establishing priorities in a country poverty reduction strategy*. ADB ERD Working Paper series no.15 [complete ref]
- Eurodad, (2002), *Empowering the poor and delivering the MDGs: the coming reality check*, Eurodad Annual Conference 2002, 2-3 November, Copenhagen
- Forster, Mick (2000) 'New Approaches to Development Co-operation: What can we learn from experience with implementing Sector Wide Approaches?' Working Paper No. 140, London: Overseas Development Institute
- Gomes, R. and Lawson, M. (2005) 'Pro-poor macroeconomic policies require poverty and social impact analysis' [complete ref]
- Hentschel, J. (2002) *Pro-poor spending*, presentation at the PREM learning week, Washington D.C.: World Bank
- Kakwani, N. & Son, H.H. (2005) *on assessing pro-poorness of government programmes: international comparisons*, UNDP International Poverty Centre, Working Paper, no. 6, New York: UNDP
- Klugman, J. (2001) 'Overview' in *The PRSP Sourcebook*, Washington D.C.: World Bank

- McGee R. with Levene, J. and Hughes, A. (2002) *Assessing Participation in Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers: a Desk-Based Synthesis of Experience in sub-Saharan Africa* IDS Research Report 52, Sussex: Institute of Development Studies
- McKay, A. (forthcoming) 'Reconciling growth, rights and inequality' in *Human Rights Approaches to Poverty Reduction* London: ODI [Check ref]
- Messner, D (2004), *Rights and Freedoms of people. Political determinants involved in achieving the MDGs*, [complete ref]
- OECD-DAC (2001) *DAC Guidelines on Poverty Reduction*, Paris: OECD
- OECD-DAC (authored by ODI) (1999) *DAC Scoping Study of Donor Poverty Reduction Policies and Practices*, Paris: OECD
- OECD-DAC (1996) *Shaping the 21st Century: the Contribution of Development Cooperation*. Paris: Development Assistance Committee, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.
- Paternostro, S., Rajaram, A., Tiongson, E.R., (2005) *How does the composition of public spending matter?* Policy Research Working Paper 3555, Washington D.C.: World Bank
- Rocha Menocal, A., (forthcoming) *Less political and more pro-poor? The evolution of social welfare spending in Mexico in a context of democratisation and decentralisation*
- SDC (2000) *The Challenges of Eliminating World Poverty*. Berne, Switzerland: Swiss Agency for Development Cooperation.
- Sida (1997) *Sida at work: Sida's methods for development cooperation*. Stockholm: Sida
- Tikare, S., Youssef, D., Donnelly-Roark, P., Shah, P. (2001) 'Participation' in *The PRSP Sourcebook*, Washington D.C.: World Bank
- UNDP, (2000), *Human Rights and Human Development*, Human Development Report 2000, New York: UNDP
- UNDP, (1997), *Human Development to Eradicate Poverty*, Human Development Report 1997, New York: UNDP
- Vandemoortele, J. (2004) *The MDGs and pro-poor policies: can external partners make a difference?* UNDP Poverty Group, New York: UNDP
- World Bank, (2001) *World Development Report 2000/2001: Attacking poverty*, Washington D.C.: World Bank
- World Bank (1990) *World Development Report 1990: Poverty Price*. Washington D.C: World Bank

Annex 1: Examples of poverty reduction strategies and goals in donor literature

While a lot of development literature has avoided setting out a blueprint for achieving poverty reduction through implementing a prescribed set of policies, it has focused rather on main policy goals that are required for poverty reduction. These goals may not be explicitly listed as 'pro-poor', but they are policy goals that are focused on the poor and have the ultimate aim of reducing poverty.

Organisation	Policy goals required for poverty reduction
DFID (Making government work for poor people: building state capacity, 2001)	Seven key governance capabilities that states need to develop (with private sector and civil society) in order to achieve poverty reduction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ to operate political systems which provide opportunities for all people, including the poor and disadvantaged, to

	<p>influence government policy and practice;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ provide macroeconomic stability and to facilitate private sector investment and trade so as to promote the growth necessary to reduce poverty; ▪ implement pro-poor policy and to raise, allocate and account for public resources accordingly; ▪ guarantee the equitable and universal provision of effective basic services; ▪ ensure personal safety and security with access to justice for all; ▪ manage national security arrangements accountably and to resolve difference between communities before they develop into violent conflicts; ▪ develop honest and accountable government that can combat corruption.
OECD-DAC (Poverty Guidelines, 2001)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pro-poor economic growth: pace and quality. ▪ Empowerment, rights and pro-poor governance. ▪ Basic social services for human development. ▪ Human security: reducing vulnerability and managing shocks. ▪ Mainstreaming gender and enhancing gender equality. ▪ Mainstreaming environmental sustainability using sustainable livelihood approaches.
UNDP (Human Development Report 2000)	<p>Three priorities for human rights and development policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensuring civil and political rights: Includes: freedom of speech, association and participation; empowering the poor to claim their social, economic and cultural rights; ▪ For the state to meet its human rights obligations to implement policies and policy-making processes that do the most to secure economic, social and cultural rights for the most deprived and to ensure their participation in decision-making. ▪ Investing economic resources in promoting human rights.
UNDP (Human Development Report 1997)	<p>Six priorities for action for poverty reduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Empower women and men and to ensure their participation in decisions that affect their lives and enable them to build their strengths and assets; ▪ gender equality is essential for empowering women and eradicating poverty; ▪ pro-poor growth; ▪ well managed globalisation; ▪ enabling environment for broad-based political support and alliances for pro-poor policies and markets; ▪ international support for special situations.
World Bank (World Development Report 2000/2001)	<p>Strategy for attacking poverty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Promoting opportunity – how to achieve rapid, sustainable, pro-poor growth: Includes: effective private investment; expanding international markets, building assets of the poor;

	<p>addressing asset inequalities; getting infrastructure and knowledge to poor areas.</p> <p>Requires: good business environment, political and social stability; inequalities to be addressed; market reform; expanding economic opportunities for poor people.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Facilitating empowerment – enhancing the capacity of poor people to influence the state institutions that affect their lives by strengthening their participation in political processes and decision making: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes: making the state and social institutions work in the interests of poor people – to make them pro-poor; governance and accountability. Requires: laying the political and legal basis for inclusive development; creating public administrations that foster growth and equity; tackling social barriers; supporting poor people’s social capital; a shift in focus away from elites to poor people. ▪ Enhancing security – reducing vulnerability. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes: formulating a modular approach to helping poor people manage risk; developing national programmes to prevent, prepare for, and respond to macro shocks; social risk management; civil conflict HIV/Aids.
--	--