

Human Rights, the Millennium Development Goals, and the Future of Development Cooperation

PAUL J. NELSON^{*}
University of Pittsburgh, USA

Summary. — This paper examines the distinct approaches to poverty contained in the human rights movement and the Millennium Development Goals (MDG). MDG advocates and many in the human rights community assert that the goals are consistent with, and indeed a means of operationalizing, human rights standards and principles. This paper finds fundamental differences in the two initiatives' conceptual approaches to poverty reduction, in the policy recommendations they support on key social policy issues, and in the social actors they have been able to mobilize. The research is based on documentary research, and on an examination of 40 development NGOs and social movements.

© 2007 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Key words — poverty, human rights, millennium development goals, accountability, social movements, NGOs

1. INTRODUCTION

At the end of the 1990s, it seemed that social theory had done much to clarify the nature of extreme poverty, and the conditions under which it could be effectively reduced. Sen (1999) had persuaded many that poverty should be understood as a multi-dimensional condition, shaped by constraints on individuals' freedoms and capabilities, and perpetuated by discriminatory institutions and failed political systems. Social capital theory had persuaded actors across the political spectrum of the central roles of "norms and networks that enable people to act collectively" (Woolcock & Narayan, 2000).

At the same time, two initiatives were in process to refocus development cooperation, and these two map out two distinctly different paths and futures for development cooperation. The Millennium Development Goals (MDG) propose to improve the health, nutrition, and well-being of some of the 1.2 billion humans who live on less than the equivalent of a dollar a day. Endorsed by 189 governments at the Millennium Summit and supported by the World Bank, United Nations, and all of the major donor governments, the MDGs mobilize the classic development sector tools: donor

pledges, goals and benchmarks, multi-volume reports, and sophisticated monitoring by United Nations agencies and other major donors.

At the same time, there is growing interest in the implications of human rights—economic, social, and cultural (ESC) rights as well as civil and political rights—for development practice, and a movement toward human rights-based or "rights-based" approaches (RBA) to development cooperation. The RBA rests not on the workings of markets and the generosity of donors, but on internationally recognized human rights standards and principles, to which governments and donors are obliged to adhere.

The MDGs and rights-based approaches both attempt in different ways to refocus and perhaps reinvigorate the development enterprise. The MDGs are a careful restatement of poverty-related development challenges, in language that avoids reference to rights; they are a donor country interpretation of the key issues, for a donor-country audience. Rights-based

^{*} For comments and insights on earlier versions of this paper, the author is grateful to participants in the Workshop on Health, Inequality and Society, University of Pittsburgh; to Dr. Ellen Dorsey; and to two anonymous referees. Final revision accepted: February 1, 2007.

approaches, by contrast, seek to link the development enterprise to social movements' demands for human rights and inclusion, and to tie development to the rhetorical and legal power of internationally recognized human rights.

This article tests two widely held positions: that the MDGs mirror and complement human rights approaches to social policy; and that a global initiative such as the MDGs can mobilize a united system of states, donors, NGOs, and social movements. MDG advocates contend that human rights and the MDGs are complimentary: human rights establish broad principles and standards, and the MDGs create operational goals, indicators, and benchmarks. Both are organized around aspects of well-being (health, nutrition, education, etc.), and the Millennium Declaration that frames the MDGs emphasizes their ties to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. But despite their arrival at the same juncture in the development of development, the MDGs and human rights-based approaches have less in common than appears at first glance. This paper asks how important the differences are, and what can be done to reconcile them. After introducing the MDGs and human rights approaches in Part One, I compare the two initiatives across three dimensions: conceptual, policy, and mobilization.

First, there are important conceptual differences between the MDGs and human rights, having to do with agency, accountability, the analysis of causes, and symptoms of poverty, including political and civic freedoms. The differences, analyzed in Part Two, have important implications for the strategies and policies they embrace. Second, the two tend to be associated with contrasting sets of preferred policies. The differences over health and water policies analyzed in Part Three are among the most heated debates in contemporary development policy, and they suggest that the consensus around a "new poverty agenda" is much less solid than it sometimes appears.

Finally, human rights and the MDGs have provoked distinctly different responses from international organizations (NGOs and inter-governmental), on the one hand, and from social movements and NGOs based in the poor countries, on the other. The ability of domestic constituencies to hold government accountable to anti-poverty commitments is key to rapid and sustained reductions in poverty, and here a final difference between human rights and

the MDGs emerges: human rights have been an important mobilizing resource and source of leverage for social movements and local citizen organizations in demanding government action to protect, respect, and fulfill their rights; the MDGs have not proven to be a motivating force or source of political leverage for such citizen action.

The paper draws on research carried out in 2005, relying on documentary sources and a review of 40 NGO and social movement organizations. Following the three sections outlined above, a concluding section reflects on the significance of the MDG and human rights movements for the global governance of economic and social relations, and for participants in international development cooperation.

2. MDGS, HUMAN RIGHTS, AND DEVELOPMENT

(a) *MDGs*

Building on social policy goals articulated in the 1980s and 1990s, the MDGs are written and institutionalized to mobilize support from the donor countries and their citizens, to accomplish concrete and important tasks. The goals, summarized in Figure 1, are monitored by many United Nations and other donor agencies, and focus largely on the symptoms of underdevelopment: Goals 2 (education), 4 (child mortality), 5 (maternal mortality), and 6 (access to safe drinking water) all propose to extend coverage of minimum social services, a task that aid agencies have often financed effectively.

The goals can be traced to the 1995 World Summit on Social Development (WSSD), which enjoys great legitimacy among NGO and activists from much of the world, thanks to the broad involvement of governmental and NGO participants in the WSSD preparations and negotiations (Bissio, 2003). But unlike the 1995 WSSD, the 1996 "Shaping the 21st Century" document that became a foundation for the MDGs emerged from the OECD's Development Assistance Committee (DAC), involving little such input. Former DAC Director James Michel argues that the MDGs were "based largely on the formulation recommended in *Shaping the 21st Century* and in the World Bank/IMF 2000 paper "A Better World for All," a fact that took the MDGs "from being disparate findings in various Uni-

Goal 1 Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger

Target 1: Halve (1990 to 2015) the proportion of people whose income is less than one dollar/day

Target 2: Halve (1990 to 2015) the proportion of people who suffer from hunger

Goal 2 Achieve universal primary education

Target 3: Ensure that, by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling

Goal 3 Promote gender equality and empower women

Target 4: Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education, preferably by 2005, and in all levels of education no later than 2015

Goal 4 Reduce child mortality

Target 5: Reduce by two thirds (1990 to 2015) the under-five mortality rate

Goal 5 Improve maternal health

Target 6: Reduce by three quarters (1990 to 2015) the maternal mortality ratio

Goal 6 Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases

Target 7: Halt by 2015 and have begun to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS

Target 8: Halt by 2015 and have begun to reverse the incidence of malaria, other major diseases

Goal 7 Ensure environmental sustainability

Target 9: Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programs and reverse the loss of environmental resources

Target 10: Halve, by 2015, the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation

Target 11: By 2020 achieve significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 mn slum dwellers

Goal 8 Develop a global partnership for development

Target 12: open, rule-based, predictable, non-discriminatory trading and financial system.

Target 13: Address needs of least developed countries: tariff and quota-free access for exports; enhanced debt relief; more generous ODA for countries committed to poverty reduction

Target 14: ...needs of landlocked developing countries and small island states

Target 15: ...measures in order to make debt sustainable in the long term

Target 16: ...implement strategies for decent and productive work for youth

Target 17: ...provide access to affordable essential drugs...

Target 18: ...make available the benefits of new [information and communication] technologies

Figure 1. *Millennium development goals and targets.* (Source: United Nations Statistics Division. *Millennium indicators database.*) (<http://millenniumindicators.un.org>).

ted Nations conferences to becoming a unified set of DAC recommendations to the international community..." (Michel, 2005). For this reason, many NGO activists see the MDGs as

a product of the OECD governments and the international financial institutions (Bissio, 2003; Tomlinson, 2005), a perception that compromises the MDGs' ability to mobilize social and political actors.

Scholars and practitioners have raised concerns about the MDGs. Critics see them as insufficiently attentive to past development failures (Sanderson, 2004; Saith, 2006) and unlikely to be met (Clemens, Kenny, & Moss, 2007), particularly in Africa (Sahn & Stifel, 2003). Pogge (2004) argues that back-dating the poverty goal to a base year of 1990, which permitted the MDGs to work from the same baseline as had other goals declared during the 1990s, also meant that the rapid poverty reduction in China in the early 1990s made only an additional 19% real reduction in the incidence of extreme poverty was required to meet the global goal. Clemens et al. (2007), on the other hand, argue that the goals are too ambitious, and that they encourage the illusion that their targets and objectives could be met simply by mobilizing enough additional aid.

(b) *Human rights-based approaches*

Practitioners in human rights and development have led a resurgence of interest in the linkages between human rights and development practice since the mid-1990s. Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch, whose work has come to define human rights, have begun to expand their focus from traditional advocacy on civil and political rights to include ESC rights. A new global network on ESC rights links NGOs working on economic and social human rights worldwide (ESCR-net.org).

Among major development donors, UNDP, UNICEF, and other United Nations agencies, Swedish Sida, Norwegian Norad, British DFID, and the Australian aid agency have adopted rights-based (in Sida's case, human rights and democracy) approaches. The UN agencies' experience is analyzed in Darrow and Tomas (2005), and recent studies including Plipat (2005) document bilateral and NGO experiences. UNDP and UNICEF have played central roles in framing human rights-based approaches, and specialized NGOs such as the Centre on Housing Rights and Evictions (COHRE), Food Information and Action Network (FIAN), Center for Economic and Social Rights (CESR), and the International Women's Health Coalition (IWHC) have taken the lead on many issues Nelson and Dorsey (2003).

Proponents see human rights as a new development framework that can "lend moral legitimacy and the principle of social justice" to human development (UNDP, 2000, p. 3). At Oxfam-America, a rights-based approach addresses discontent with "welfare-based" models of development, unifies diverse development initiatives, and "has proven appealing to the global media..." (Offenheiser & Holcombe, 2003, pp. 4, 18).

Human rights approaches, however, are also subject to criticism. Like the MDGs, human rights are a potential source of legitimacy for aid donors, which are eager to occupy the "high moral ground" (Uvin, 2002, pp. 1–2). Uvin, who is skeptical of the intentions behind development donors' rhetoric, argues that "incorporating human rights terminology into development discourse" is a rhetorical gesture that need not change how policies are adopted and promoted or projects identified, financed, or evaluated.

The difficulty of enforcing state compliance with ESC rights has limited their use to shape social policy (Gauri, 2004), although enforcing these obligations through international human rights mechanisms is not central to most development agency strategies. The imprecision of some standards, bemoaned by some human rights practitioners (Fidler, 1999), is a limiting factor in applying ESC rights; development practice has a stronger record of devising measurable targets and monitoring systems.

Human rights-based approaches have been an undercurrent throughout the history of development, largely within UN agencies and committees. But the present interest is more widespread, applied, and specific, and often linked to social movement campaigns in the poor countries, giving the human rights approach a second, political dimension. NGOs and social movements, for example, advocate for broader access to essential medicines, particularly for those affected by HIV/AIDS. Advocacy for the right to HIV/AIDS treatment has involved close cooperation with poor-country governments, and appeals to ESC rights standards as a counterweight to corporate power and to liberal trade rules (Nelson & Dorsey, 2007). Friedman and Mottiar's (2005) study of the Treatment Action Campaign's (TAC) mobilization strategies in South Africa demonstrate the ability of rights-based advocacy strategies to motivate major changes in social policy.

To understand the differences between these parallel and contemporaneous movements, I

now turn to three conceptual differences that separate them.

3. GOALS, PLEDGES, AND RIGHTS: THE CONCEPTUAL GAPS

Goals and rights are associated with distinct traditions in ethics and political philosophy. Goals are distinctly utilitarian, calculated to maximize welfare gains. Rights make a normative claim, that human dignity entitles each person to certain kinds of treatment, and to protection from others. For development, three sharp conceptual differences are those related to agency (to whom do the rights/goals belong?); the nature of accountability; and the attention given to root causes of poverty.

(a) *Whose goals and whose rights?*

Goals and rights differ in theory, and these differences are fundamental to understanding the politics of the MDGs and human rights. The differences reviewed here relate to two characteristics: agency and the “possession” of rights and goals; and the nature of the obligations or duties associated with them.

Human rights in some cases designate and adhere to groups (children, women, and indigenous people), but the broad range of human rights contained in the UDHR, and in the International Covenants on ESC Rights (ICESCR) and on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), are rights of individuals. Goals, on the other hand, belong to states and the international organizations in which they are negotiated. They *refer* to the people who suffer the indignities of poverty, but those individuals are the objects of the goals, not their agents. The facts that governments adopt as a goal the halving of the number of people living in extreme poverty does not give any particular destitute person a right or a claim on her government. (The Millennium Development Campaign hopes to build ownership of the goals among civil societies, but there is an important difference between this metaphorical use of “ownership” and the literal possession of human rights.) The MDGs are not any individual citizen’s goals in the same sense that the right to food or to information is that individual’s right.

Rights, unlike goals, inherently create duties, and these duties give them their political significance. The claim, for example, that every person has the right to adequate food, even in

time of famine, by virtue of their dignity as a human being, is a meaningful statement in the abstract: human dignity calls for freedom from hunger. But the statement has meaning for policy because it is associated with duties and obligations, and the definition of those duties is among the most difficult and politically charged challenges for human rights. In this case, the duty to respond to acute malnutrition clearly extends, under Article two of the ICESCR, to states and international agencies that are in a position to provide assistance, although the government continues to hold the principal responsibility to assure that resources are marshaled to protect its people.

(b) *Accountability: pledges, goals, and rights*

MDG advocates refer to the goals’ capacity to strengthen accountability, but the meaning of that accountability is rarely clear. Fukuda-Parr (2004) argues that because the MDGs “can be monitored,” they create a “framework for accountability,” empowered by benchmarks, and a “systematic procedure for global monitoring and support” maintained by the United Nations. According to Fukuda-Parr, data collected by the UNDP makes monitoring possible at the “international, national and local levels” (p. 397). Indeed, the MDGs have spawned “an industry of costing, planning, and campaigning in the UN system, among donor governments, the IFIs and many CSOs” (Tomlinson, 2005).

But monitoring does not equal accountability, and accountability “outward” to a donor agency is rarely enough to promote the kind of social change envisioned in the MDGs. Such change requires local and national institutions and practices that make governments accountable to organized citizens, and to an electorate as a whole.

The logic and politics of the MDGs have much more in common with donor pledging than with human rights. One of the principal features of development assistance since the 1970s has been a series of international commitments to soft goals and objectives. In 1974 participants in the World Food Conference pledged their countries’ support for a global effort to eradicate hunger in ten years’ time. Following numerous global meetings and other pledges in the 1980s, the UN-sponsored global conferences of the 1990s again captured significant public attention Jolly (2004). Among these global conferences and the agendas they

set, the goals of the 1995 Copenhagen World Social Summit are linked most directly to the MDGs. Many other meetings have also produced resolutions and pledges, but the MDGs are the best articulated, widest ranging, and most sustained campaign, with a broad UN commitment and a Millennium Development Campaign designed to promote them.

Pledging processes for emergency response, international special initiatives, and global conference agendas rarely feature any meaningful accountability mechanisms, and the MDGs are no exception. Mild, informal “shaming” among donors for failures to deliver on pledged resources has been generally ineffective, and a review of the record of payment on humanitarian pledges is “anything but reassuring” (Walker, Wisner, Leaning, & Minear, 2005). After Hurricane Mitch devastated parts of three Central American countries in 1998, \$9 billion was pledged; five years later, \$4.5 billion had been delivered. The 2003 earthquake that destroyed the ancient city of Bam, Iran, provoked \$1 billion in pledges, but \$130 million had been paid in June 2005 (Patrick, 1998; Walker et al., 2005).

In theory, human rights standards establish much stronger accountability, through periodic self-reporting by governments to UN committees, which have (limited) authority to mount investigations and publicize reports that “name and shame” violators. But in practice, neither ESC rights nor the MDGs has an effective means of holding donors or governments accountable to their pledges or policies. ESC rights and states’ obligations theoretically have the same legal authority as civil and political human rights, but suffer from the weakness of the institutions that monitor them within the United Nations (Felice, 1999). Much of the oversight of economic and social rights depends on the effectiveness of individual special rapporteurs and experts designated by the human rights committee, and on reporting by a handful of NGOs that specialize in ESC rights.

The MDGs, on the other hand, call for greater generosity by the rich countries and commitment by the poor countries, but they introduce no mechanism for accountability by either. Domestic, internal mechanisms in the poor countries, then, are the key to effective political leverage in support of either the MDGs or ESC rights. UNDP Administrator Mark Malloch Brown (2002) argues that while the MDG’s “unique global authority” comes from their endorsement by 189 states, progress will come

when “everyone from a politician here in Berlin to a farmer in Bangladesh or a shop-keeper in Burkina Faso can understand and push for further action by their own governments. . . .” The campaign, he continues, depends on national and global organizing to “build on the success of global campaigns like the debt relief and land mines movements. . . .” (p. 6).

In the absence of meaningful international authority and sanctions, Malloch Brown is correct: if the MDGs are to stimulate change in policies, institutions and spending priorities in the poor countries, they must be able to mobilize community organizations, social movements, local NGOs, and others to generate accountability within national political systems. We return to this issue in Part four.

(c) *Quick impact versus root causes*

Human rights-based approaches tend to call for attention to the *causes and multiple dimensions* of poverty, and to the linkages between poverty and civil and political freedoms; the MDGs are output indicators that aim primarily for progress in some of the worst *symptoms* of poverty. Both in principle and in the practice of many agencies, human rights approaches to social and economic policy have involved tracing the social, economic, political, and other causes of rights deprivation. In theory, this is true because human rights principles call for attention to patterns of discrimination in law, institutions, and policy, because they emphasize the interrelatedness of political and civil freedoms with economic and social rights, and because they emphasize the need to establish effective legal and institutional protections for groups that are subject to discriminatory treatment (Nowak, 2005, esp. pp. 28–29).

In practice, while agencies’ implementation of RBA is uneven, prominent agencies such as CARE, Sida, and ActionAid, among others, affirm that one of the principal advantages of a human rights framework is a structured means of tracing the often multiple causes of poverty, and social exclusion. While for ActionAid this emphasis on causal analysis is largely tied to policy, other agencies stress the applications of human rights principles to understanding causes of poverty in program and project identification and design. In Sida, this practice refers largely to the country-level analysis of poverty and its causes (Sida, 2001). Some CARE programs ground their situation analysis and monitoring in human rights principles

and standards. A country study of CARE-Burundi shows how national staff analyzed patterns of discrimination against the Batwa minority, and their “systematic marginalization,” in devising community development initiatives (Rand, 2002, pp. 30–37). The lesson for program planning, according to CARE, is that “the key was to keep asking *why* [emphasis in original]. Once staff got the knack of capturing the trail of logic, [and] learned to ask *why* certain people had no land or what had happened to the land they previously had, local politics and power relations began to surface” (Rand, 2002). Similarly, CARE has developed methodologies such as a “rights-based monitoring tool” produced for CARE Malawi, which relies on an analysis of discrimination in legal, political, and social institutions and practices to understand what restricts rural households’ access to land, credit, and agricultural inputs (Picard, 2004).

The MDGs and human rights approaches differ in their attention to structural and socio-political factors that cause and perpetuate poverty. The only attention given in the MDGs to discrimination or uneven coverage is in the call for eliminating gender disparities in school enrollment rates (Goal 2, Target 3). Of the structural factors underlying poverty and wealth in poor countries—access to land, labor, wages, credit, and (some would add) entrepreneurial opportunity—none is mentioned by the MDGs. This diversion of attention from difficult, structural features of poverty and inequality should be added to the concerns raised by Maxwell (2001) about the perverse impacts of targets on decision-making by donors and governments.

The MDGs’ proponents argue that because the goals are output measures, not strategies, they do not exclude strategies that expand opportunities and access to productive resources (Malloch Brown, 2003), and critics of the MDGs have called for just this kind of broader effort to address the causes of poverty (Social Watch, 2005). But embracing this strategy for a global anti-poverty initiative does mean that other possible strategies are omitted or de-emphasized.

The MDGs create incentives for donors and governments to favor quick impact over addressing complex social systems. This tendency appears most clearly in the “quick wins” strategy outlined in the 2005 UN report on investing to advance the MDGs, which calls for funding for “high potential, short-term im-

pact” initiatives that can yield “breathtaking results within three or fewer years...” and “start countries on the path to the Goals” (p. 25). These measures include, for example, mosquito bed nets for malaria protection, MDG model villages, immunizations, school meals, and water purification devices. Such investments have two kinds of payoff: they begin to drive down key indicators for the goals, and they offer the prospect of quick impact that can mobilize donors’ aid funds. Most of them involve not systemic change but delivering individual health and education benefits. These “quick win” strategies are not the sole approach of the UN agencies, but the *UN Millennium Project* (2005) has made them central to its campaign, and to its call for “scaled-up” investment in development assistance. Because they are attractive to donor agencies and their domestic constituencies, they attract aid funds and therefore the attention of poor country governments.

Pragmatically, this feature can be seen as a strength of the MDGs: the goals establish benchmarks with attainable levels of progress, and they rely on interventions that can be accomplished without even attempting to address the thorny social and political causes of inequality and deprivation. Accomplishing the goals would mean real improvement in quality of life for some of the world’s poor. But these incentives also imply a quiet retreat from important trends in recent development cooperation toward greater recognition of the right of people affected by development policies to participate influentially in shaping them, and the need to guarantee political freedoms in order to make poverty reduction politically sustainable.

These differences appear at first to be matters of strategy, but upon closer examination, the MDG and human rights-based approaches differ more fundamentally. This is true because most MDG strategies are neither societal nor systematic: the strategy invests in measures that benefit individuals and households, for the most part, without creating social or institutional changes that give reason to hope for follow-on benefits for those not reached. Second, because the MDGs do not call for an analysis of the causes of poverty and its manifestations, they generally do not directly address the structural factors that human rights analysis points to as root causes, nor do they incorporate work toward political and civil freedoms. Third, the MDG campaign has not produced coherent

aid and trade policy among the donors, and is associated with positions and strategies on several economic and social policy issues that are inimical to the ESC rights agenda. I now turn to these substantive policy clashes.

4. POLICY AND POLITICS: THE DIVIDE BETWEEN MDGS AND HUMAN RIGHTS

If, despite these conceptual differences between the MDGs and human rights approaches, they promoted a consistent global set of humane policy initiatives, the differences might be primarily of theoretical interest. Some human rights and development agencies take this position: Oxfam, Action Aid, Christian Aid, Misereor, and many UN agencies have aligned themselves with rights-based approaches, and advocate the MDGs as a step toward the broader realization of these rights. Shetty (2005) articulates this view on behalf of the UN-sponsored Millennium Development Campaign, calling the MDGs the link between human rights and “mainstream economic decisions-making processes” of the international financial institutions. Philip Alston, Advisor to the High Commissioner on Human Rights, also emphasizes the potential for harmonization and coordination, even as his analytic comments highlight the MDGs’ failures to emphasize their grounding in international human rights (Alston, 2005).

But the debates over water privatization and the provision of medicines for HIV treatment reveal stark policy differences of two kinds. First, the aid and trade policies associated with the MDGs are themselves incoherent and contradictory. Goal 8, which calls for creating a global partnership for development, envisions a coherent set of aid, trade and financial institutions and arrangements. (Goal 8 is also the one goal for which donor nations are primarily responsible, and the one goal without benchmarks or deadlines.) Rather than a coherent package, however, while the MDGs focus on aid, rules and institutions on trade, intellectual property and finance are being dominated by the commercial and investment interests of the industrial country governments.

Second, the policy differences demonstrate the strong tendency of social actors affiliated with the MDG process and advocates of human rights approaches to square off on opposite sides of these issues. This brief discussion of the water and HIV/AIDS debates illustrates

these two dynamics among the organizations and actors being mobilized by the human rights and MDG efforts.

(a) *Water*¹

MDG advocates call for donors to step up their assistance for water and sanitation, and the major donors have complied. New resources for potable water are being invested through country programs that generally de-emphasize project funding, instead providing system-wide support to improve and expand water systems. Donor aid from the World Bank and bilateral donors, including British DFID, USAID, and EU agencies, emphasizes a shift to private sector provision, through contracts, franchises, or outright ownership of formerly public water utilities. The 2005 Commission on Financing Water for All, headed by Michel Camdessus, argued that the way to finance “water for all” is to expand and facilitate corporate management of water and sanitation systems (Winpenny, 2005). Although reports of the UN Task Force on the MDG water target carefully avoids taking a position on the question of privatization (UN Millennium Project Taskforce on Water and Sanitation, 2005), the Camdessus report and the advocates of privatization rely heavily on the MDG target to demonstrate the need for public measures to facilitate, insure, and reward private investment. Moreover, the report has been treated as an authoritative statement for financing the MDG target by the Asian Development Bank, World Bank, European Union Water Initiative, and other major donors (Asian Development Bank, 2006; Water Aid, 2005; World Bank, 2003).

Human rights scholarships and activism approaches privatization in an entirely different manner. Social movements of consumers and human rights activists favoring publicly managed solutions call for human rights-based resistance to privatization and commoditization of water. Although water provision by private firms is a longstanding arrangement in a few countries, the present rapid move toward private provision has its origins in the late 1980s. “By the end of 2000, at least 93 countries had partially privatized water or wastewater services...but less than ten percent of all water is currently managed by the private sector” (Snitow & Kaufmann, 2004).

Water provokes and inspires human rights claims directly and urgently: it is arguably a

fundamental right upon which other guarantees depend. In addition to the fundamental question of price and affordability for low-income citizen-consumers, the issue that has produced the deepest controversy is the corporate preference for prepayment arrangements when service contracts include low-income or otherwise high-risk consumers. Profitability is the key to all the arguments for private sector provision—efficiency, incentives to improve infrastructure, and incentives to conserve—and companies have negotiated arrangements to ensure payment from a high percentage of consumers, at relatively low transaction costs. The favored approach has been meters that operate on pre-paid cards or keys, a mechanism that has ignited strong human rights-based opposition, as in South Africa (*Anti-Privatisation Forum*, 2003; *Marvin, Laurie, & Napier*, 2001; *SAMWU*, 2000).

Across Asia, Africa, and famously in some Latin American countries, social movements led by consumers, human rights advocates, unions, and environmentalists have sought to block or modify corporate contracts, invoking human rights. *Conca's* (2005) survey of global water advocacy confirms that human rights have become a dominant frame for social movement activism, and several cases illustrate this pattern of human rights-based opposition to privatization. In Ghana, the Coalition against Privatization of Water in Ghana brings together consumers, trade unions, and NGOs and invokes international human rights (*Ghana National Coalition Against the Privatisation of Water*, 2001). In South Africa, national guarantees, contained in provisions of the 1996 constitution that embraced many of the internationally recognized human rights standards, have allowed a powerful domestic challenge to privatization efforts.

The now-famous resistance to corporate water contracts in several Bolivian cities, and Argentina's quieter disputes, are among many recent setbacks for the privatization movement (*Picolotti*, 2003). In India, human rights arguments figure prominently in legal and political challenges to the National Water Policy of 2002, which provided for private ownership and management of water systems (*Pant*, 2003); and in opposition to transnational beverage bottlers' use of water resources (*India Resource Center*, 2005).

A growing set of UN agencies and international NGO advocates are supporting these movements, particularly since the United

Nations Human Rights Committee's finding in November 2003 that clarify the legal basis for a human right to water. The New York-based Committee on Economic and Social Rights (*CESR*, 2001), *International Water Working Group* (2004), and the UK-based NGO Water Aid are among many agencies employing a human rights approach to water policy advocacy (*Water Aid*, n.d.). *Amnesty International* (2003), the Centre on Housing Rights and Evictions (*COHRE*) (2004), 2005, the *World Health Organization* (*WHO*) (2000), *WHO*, *COHRE* and the *American Association for the Advancement of Science* (2004), and several others have launched new reports or initiatives on the human right to water since 2003.

This is not a difference only of emphasis or strategy, it is a disagreement over ownership or control of water systems, and the fundamental principles and mechanisms on which water systems are to be based.

(b) *HIV/AIDS*

The MDGs (Goal 6) and human rights advocates have made malaria and HIV/AIDS important priorities for action. Donor performance on increasing and targeting aid to the health sector, and to these diseases in particular, has been mixed, and there is much debate over the real amount and adequacy of some governments' new commitments to the Global Fund (*LaFraniere*, 2004). But more fundamentally, the major donors and the trade rule-making process at the WTO have again been at odds with human rights-based prescriptions for improved response to the HIV/AIDS pandemic.

The trade- and aid-related actions of the rich countries are significant here because they are a measure of the MDGs' capacity to mobilize not only generous aid support for the AIDS pandemic but also their seriousness about Goal 8, whose "global partnership for development" is to include trade policy (targets 12 and 13) and debt (target 15).

While donors declare their support for innovative support to patients with HIV, major aid donors and WTO provisions have continued to insist on patent protections for commercial drugs that drive up the cost of treatment. AIDS activists' partial victory in 2001, when the Ministerial Meeting at Doha affirmed that governments' right to act in a public health emergency superseded trade-related intellectual

property rights (TRIPs), and made a temporary exception to the TRIPs rules for HIV/AIDS drugs, opened a further debate over the mechanisms by which poor country governments can act. For countries that cannot produce their own generic anti-retroviral drugs, a low-cost and efficient mechanism for trade in these generic drugs is essential, and there is heated debate over a temporary mechanism created in August 2003 and adopted in December 2005 by the Ministerial Meeting in Hong Kong. Critics argue that the case-by-case approval approach is a cumbersome mechanism that violates the spirit of the 2001 agreement. The US- and EU-supported solution, one letter argues, locks in a "burdensome and unworkable" solution, in the interests of ensuring that no generic drugs find their way into industrial country markets ("[Joint Statement by NGOs](#)" 2005).

The MDGs are not, of course, responsible for the failings of TRIPs, nor of other WTO negotiations. But when WTO rulings are evaluated against the MDG goal of producing a coherent global development partnership, the MDGs appear to be an ineffective instrument for mobilizing and motivating change in the wealthy industrial countries' positions. Trade issues, as Vandemootele, Malhotra, and Lim (2003) argue, are essential to accomplishing the MDGs, yet the goals have not afforded any actors the power needed to insist on real concessions and innovations needed to create the "development partnerships" called for in Goal 8.

5. MOBILIZATION: INTERNATIONAL AND DOMESTIC CONSTITUENCIES

How significant are the MDGs to national and local NGOs and social movements that have the potential to mobilize political support? While the MDGs are coordinated and monitored by a range of inter-governmental agencies, the political impetus for creating enduring changes in priorities, policies, and institutions largely depends on the mobilization of domestic political support. This section reports on a survey of international development NGOs, social movements, and NGOs in the poor countries.

UN Millennium Campaign-sponsored surveys report that many poor-country civil society organizations are on board the MDG campaign, and the Global Call to Action Against Poverty, whose agenda is tied to the

MDGs, lists some 840 civil society organizations "already supporting the [Global Call to Action](#)" (2006). But although poor-country NGOs answer "yes" when asked if they are working on the MDG goals—that is, doing work on education, malaria prevention, child health, etc. (Foster & Wells, 2004)—the critical question is whether citizen organizations are mobilizing to hold their governments accountable to these objectives, and here the answer is different.

The position of Social Watch, the primary NGO effort to monitor the MDGs, is revealing. Social Watch, whose secretariat is located in the Third World Network in Montevideo, Uruguay, emerged from NGO participation in the 1995 WSSD and has member organizations and affiliates in more than 60 countries. Social Watch's comments on the MDGs are contained in a March 2005 "Benchmark" statement that amounts to a systematic critique of the MDGs. It argues, in brief, that the goals should be extended from reducing the incidence of poverty to eradicating it, and deepened from their focus on symptoms to embrace the language of guaranteeing rights, diminishing inequality, reducing social exclusion, and promoting justice (Social Watch, 2005). Social Watch engages with the MDGs, in other words, not by using the goals to leverage policy change, but by arguing that they be transformed into a broader set of structural goals.

To make a broader assessment of the relevance of the MDGs to social movements and NGOs based in the poor countries, I have examined how and whether such organizations make use of the MDGs and of human rights to advance their work. An inspection of publications, press releases, and website documents of 40 NGOs provides some evidence of how relevant the MDGs are to major social movements and development NGOs based in Southern societies.² Twenty Southern-based NGOs and social movement organizations and 20 international NGOs based in the industrial countries were investigated. In each case, five were selected from major national-level NGOs involved in poverty, employment, and health; five more were selected from smaller NGOs working in health-related fields; ten more were chosen at random from the Global Call to Action against Poverty list of supporting civil society organizations.

The Southern NGOs and social movements include large NGOs such as Bangladesh Rural Action Committee (BRAC), the South African

Treatment Action Campaign, and the Self-Employed Women's Association in India; as well as many smaller NGOs working in health, agriculture, gender, and income generation.

The results are summarized in Figure 2, which reports, for 40 organizations, whether their publications and advocacy strategies refer to the MDGs, to human rights, to both, or to neither. The contrast between international NGOs and the Southern NGOs and social movements is striking. While 18 of the 20 international NGOs mention the MDGs prominently, only four of the Southern NGOs make any reference at all. In some cases the MDG references are far from prominent: there is a single reference to the MDG in AMREF documents, in an interview with the foundation's malaria program director. Only the Latin American Llamado Nacional makes reference to the MDGs as a source of policy leverage. Compared to the MDGs, Southern NGOs refer to human rights more frequently (11 of 20), international NGOs somewhat less (10 of 20).

These results suggest that while the United Nations and MDG organizers have had some success in reaching the interested and concerned population in the United States and Europe, the MDGs have not become salient to major organizations and networks based in poor countries. This divide may be a matter of concern for observers of NGOs; for current purposes, it demonstrates the limitations of such goals as tools for internal political leverage over government policies.

6. CONCLUSIONS: DIRECTIONS FOR DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION

The MDGs and human rights approaches to development are divided in theory, in the policy approaches they promote for reducing poverty, and in the social actors they mobilize. These differences are often obscured, rhetorically, by development practitioners, but when the MDG campaign and the human rights-based approaches are considered as ideal types, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that these two trends are being embraced by actors with divergent visions of development, and are becoming normative sources of support for two conflicting development agendas.

The MDG variant envisions a future driven by output goals and challenges to address the symptoms of extreme poverty. Donors are mobilized by the challenge to meet these goals,

pledging aid or other forms of support for a variety of humanitarian, commercial and other foreign policy objectives. The coalition of donors is broad: debates over neo-liberal strategies, trade rules and other points of contention are secondary to the shared objectives of donors from the World Bank to the most progressive of the international NGOs, to build support for improvements in the human condition.

The rights-based approach begins, like the MDGs, from aspects of human well-being: health, nutrition, education, and other desirable conditions. For human rights-based practitioners, however, these are in turn grounded in internationally agreed standards, contained in human rights covenants and treaties. The first difference, then, is philosophical: the human rights standards are not indicators or goals but legally binding statements about rights to which humans are entitled by virtue of their humanity.

These statements are also broader in their coverage, and this difference is significant, not because the human rights agreements include a longer "list" of rights (they do), but because of the nature of those rights, which include the right to be free from discrimination, and civil and political rights such as the right to information and to freedom of expression, that have proven to be preconditions of success for pro-poor movements. The rights-based approach is more conflictive, mobilizing, and providing support to social movements that assert and claim international human rights.

There is considerable evidence that human rights are a more effective means of mobilizing the organized electorate than are donor-supported goals. The MDGs, on the other hand, have other advantages, including the targets, benchmarks, and monitoring systems familiar to development donors. There would seem to be good reason, based both in social theory and in recent experience, to integrate the MDGs more deeply with human rights guarantees. Although the MDGs are framed to avoid the obligations associated with economic and social rights, individual donors could readily tie their work on specific goals much more explicitly to the relevant human rights guarantees.

A starting point for any effort to make this link would be for donors to take seriously the 2002 Draft Guidelines for the application of human rights to poverty reduction strategies. The guidelines, developed by the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, designate nine rights

NGO's name and country	Refers to MDG	Refers to HR	Refers to neither
Ashwinikumar Medical Relief Society (India)			x
Asian Pacific Network on Food Sovereignty		x	
African Medical and Research Foundation (Kenya)	x		
BRAC Bangladesh			x
Children in Need India (CINI)			x
Cambodian Human Rights Association		x	
Center for Science and the Environment (India)			x
CONADES (Peru)		x	
Feminist Dalit Organisation (Nepal)		x	
Greenbelt Movement (Kenya)		x	
Forum for Forest Workers (India)		x	
Llamado Nacional a la Accion Contra Pobreza (Peru)	x		
MST (Brazil)		x	
Rwanda Women's Network		x	
People's Health Movement (Bangladesh)		x	
Philippines Rural Reconstruction Movement			x
Self-Employed Women's Association (India)		x	
Social Watch	x		
Treatment Action Campaign (South Africa)		x	
Uganda Coalition for Sustainable Development	x		
Southern NGOs and Social Movements	4	11	5
Accion International (US)			x
Action Aid (South Africa/UK)	x	x	
CARE (US)	x		
Caritas (Italy)	x		
Catholic Relief Services (US)	x		
CIDSE	x		
Doctors Without Borders	x	x	
Global Campaign for Education	x	x	
Halifax Initiative (Canada)	x	x	
Healthlink Worldwide	x		
International Women's Health Coalition (US)	x	x	
Lutheran World Federation (Switzerland)	x	x	
Mercy Corps (US)	x		
Oxfam (UK)	x	x	
Physicians for Human Rights (US)	x	x	
Project Hope (US)			x
Save the Children (US)	x	x	
Tearfund (Ireland)	x		
Water Aid (UK)	x	x	
World Vision (US)	x		
Northern NGOs	18	10	2

Figure 2. *International and Southern NGOs: links to human rights and MDGs. Sources: Organizations' annual reports and websites.*

as central to poverty reduction strategies, and outline a framework for their application to the process of developing, implementing, and monitoring national poverty reduction strategies (UN Draft Guidelines, 2002).

MDG-inspired effort to finance education, pre- and post-natal care and improved housing for slum dwellers (to take three examples) could be coupled with equally determined efforts to encourage legislation and institutions that allow citizens to assert their rights to these ser-

vices. The MDGs' "quick-win" strategies could be part of an effort to move as rapidly as possible toward state, voluntary and market mechanisms that effectively guarantee citizens access to the minimum levels of services and well-being guaranteed in the ICESCR. But quick-win strategies without an informed and organized public, able to assert its rights, may well mean that gains in the MDGs' indicators last only as long as the UN-sponsored campaign keeps donor funds flowing.

NOTES

1. Portions of the analysis of water and of HIV/AIDS have been reported in Nelson and Dorsey (2007).
2. The investigation was based on the NGOs' worldwide web pages. Because some organizations (Thailand's Assembly of the Poor, for example) have no web presence, this method may bias the survey toward organizations more likely to be engaged with interna-

tional processes. For each organization, the website's internal search engine was first used to search for pages and documents with the keywords "millennium" and "millennium development goals." Next, links to "publications," "campaigns," "our work," and similar sections were followed. For websites without an internal search function, these links were used exclusively.

REFERENCES

- Alston, P. (2005). Ships passing in the night: the current state of the human rights and development debate seen through the lens of the millennium development goals. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 27, 755–829.
- Amnesty International (2003). World Water Forum, on file with authors.
- Anti-Privatisation Forum (2003). The struggle against pre-paid water meters in Soweto, 10 September 2003. <<http://www.labournet.net/world/0309/sawater1.html>>.
- Asian Development Bank (2006). Gurria panel searching for demand-supply equilibrium in water financing. <<http://www.asiadevbank.org/water/Articles/gurria.asp>>.
- Bissio, R. (2003). Civil society and the MDGs. *UNDP Development Policy Journal*, 3(April), 2003.
- Clemens, M., Kenny, C., & Moss, T. (2007). The Trouble with the MDGs: confronting expectations of aid and development success. *World Development*, 35(5), 735–751.
- CESR (2001). Right to water fact sheet #1: global statistics. <www.cesr.org>.
- COHRE (2004). Legal resources for the right to water: national and international standards, Geneva: COHRE. <http://www.cohre.org/downloads/water_res_8.pdf>.
- Conca, K. (2005). *Governing water: Contentious transnational politics and global institution building*. Cambridge: MIT.
- Darrow, M., & Tomas, A. (2005). Power, capture, and conflict: a call for human rights accountability in development cooperation. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 27(2), 471–538.
- Fukuda-Parr, S. (2004). Millennium development goals: why they matter. *Global Governance*, 10, 395–402.
- Felice, W. F. (1999). The viability of the UN approach to economic and social human rights in a globalized economy. *International Affairs*, 3, 563–598.
- Fidler, D. P. (1999). *International law and infectious diseases*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Foster, J., & Wells, P. (2004). *We the peoples: A call to action for the UN millennium declaration*. Ottawa: North South Institute and the World Federation of United Nations Associations.
- Friedman, S., & Mottiar, S. (2005). A rewarding engagement: the treatment action campaign and the politics of HIV/AIDS. *Politics & Society*, 33, 511–565.
- Gauri, V. (2004). Social rights and economics: claims to health care and education in developing countries. *World Development*, 32(3), 465–477.
- Ghana National coalition against the privatisation of water (2001). Accra declaration on the right to water. <<http://www.isodec.org.gh/Papers/accradeclaration.PDF>>.
- Global call to action against poverty (2006). Global call to action against poverty. <http://www.whiteband.org/Lib/about_sup/en>.
- India Resource Center. 2005. Coca-Cola challenged on human rights abuses, press release, April 20, 2005. <<http://www.indiaresource.org/campaigns/coke/2005/cokechallenged.html>>.

- International Water Working Group (2004). Water is a human right, say "no" to prepaid water meters. <http://www.citizen.org/cmep/Water/cmep_Water/>.
- Joint statement by NGOs on TRIPS and public health (2005). <<http://www.cptech.org/ip/wto/p6/ngos12032005.html>> (December 2005).
- Jolly, R. (2004). Global development goals: UN experience. *Journal of Human Development*, 5(1), 69–95.
- LaFraniere, S. (2004). UN fund for halting diseases faces money woes. *New York Times*, April 17, 2004.
- Malloch Brown, M. (2002). Meeting the millennium challenge: a strategy for helping achieve the united nations millennium development goals. <<http://www.inwent.org/ef-texte/mdg/brown.htm>>.
- Malloch Brown, M. (2003). Millennium development goals, poverty reduction strategy papers and the new global development agenda, Address by the UNDP Administrator, New York, 14 February 2003. <<http://www.undp.org/dpa/statements/administ/2003/february/14feb03.html>>.
- Marvin, S., Laurie, N., & Napier, M. (2001). Pre-payment: emerging pathways to water services. <<http://www.aguaboliivia.org/newcastle/documentos/Nina-Marvin-southAfrica.htm>>.
- Maxwell, S. (2001). Heaven or hubris: reflections on the new 'new poverty agenda'. *Development Policy Review*, 21(1), 5–25.
- Michel, J. (2005). The birth of the MDGs, DACNews, September–October 2005. <http://www.oecd.org/document/34/0,2340,en_2649_33721_35295778_1_1_1_1,00.html>.
- Nelson, P., & Dorsey, E. (2003). At the nexus of human rights and development: new methods and strategies of global NGOs. *World Development*, 31(12), 2013–2026.
- Nelson, P., & Dorsey, E. (2007). New rights advocacy in a global public domain. *European Journal of International Relations*, 13(2), 187–216.
- Nowak, M. (2005). A human rights approach to poverty. In *Human rights in development yearbook 2002. Empowerment, participation, accountability and non-discrimination: Operationalising a human rights-based approach to development* (pp. 15–36). Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- Offenheiser, R. C., & Holcombe, S. (2003). Challenges and opportunities in implementing a rights-based approach to development: an Oxfam America perspective. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 32(2), 268–306.
- Pant, R. (2003). From communities hands to MNCs' BOOTS: A case study from india on right to water. Right to water project of rights and humanity, UK. <http://www.righttowater.org.uk/pdfs/india_cs.pdf>.
- Patrick, S. (1998). The check is in the mail: Improving the delivery and coordination of post-conflict assistance, Working Paper, NYU Center on International Cooperation. <<http://www.ciaonet.org/wps/pas01/>>.
- Picard, M. (2004). Measurement and methodological challenges to CARE International's rights-based programming. <<http://www.enterpriseimpact.org.uk/pdf/EINAug04.pdf>>.
- Picolotti, J. M. (2003). The right to water in Argentina, report prepared for rights and humanity, November 5, 2003. <<http://www.cedha.org.ar/docs/doc175-eng.doc>>.
- Plipat, S. (2005). Developmentizing human rights: how development NGOs interpret and implement a human rights-based approach to development policy, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh.
- Pogge, Thomas (2004). The first United National millennium development goal: a cause for celebration?. *Journal of Human Development*, 5(3), 377–397.
- Rand, J. (2002). Care's experience with adoption of a rights-based approach: five case studies. <http://www.crin.org/docs/resources/publications/hrbap/ARExperiences_case_studies.doc>.
- Sahn, D. A., & Stifel, D. C. (2003). Progress toward the millennium development goals in Africa. *World Development*, 31(1), 33–52.
- Saith, A. (2006). From:universal values to millennium development goals: lost in translation. *Development and Change*, 37(6), 1167–1199.
- SAMWU (2000). Joint rural development services network and South African Municipal Workers Union (SAMWU) statement, Johannesburg, August 21, 2000, on the South African Water Services Act, on file with the author.
- Sanderson, S. (2004). Poverty and conservation: the new century's 'peasant question?' *World Development*, 33(2), 323–332.
- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. New York: Random House.
- Shetty, S. (2005). Making rights real: the challenge in meeting the MDGs, 2005. Public presentation, 24 March, 2005, London. Notes on file with the author.
- Sida (2001). *Country strategy development: Guide for country analysis from a democratic governance and human rights perspective*. Stockholm: Sida.
- Snitow, A. & Kaufmann, D. (2004) The new economy of water. <http://www.pbs.org/pov/pov2004/thirst/special_neweconomy.html>.
- Social Watch (2005). A civil society benchmark for the 5-year review of the millennium declaration. <http://www.socialwatch.org/en/noticias/documentos/Benchmark_2005_eng.doc>.
- Tomlinson, B. (2005). The politics of the millennium development goals. <<http://www.realityofaid.org/themeshow.php?id=14>>.
- UN draft guidelines: a human rights approach to poverty reduction strategies. <<http://www.unhchr.ch/development/povertyfinal.html>>.
- UNDP (2000). *Human development report 2000*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- UNICEF (n.d.). Human rights for children and women: How UNICEF helps make them a Reality. <<http://www.unicef.org/pubsgen/humanrights-children/humanrightsendg.pdf>>.
- UN Millennium Project Task Force on Water and Sanitation (2005). Final Report, Health, Dignity, and Development: What Will It Take? <http://www.unmillenniumproject.org/documents/What_Will_It_Take.pdf>.
- UN Millennium Project (2005). A practical plan to achieve the millennium development goals. <<http://www.unmillenniumproject.org/reports/fullreport.htm>>.

- Uvin, P. (2002). On high moral ground: the incorporation of human rights by the development enterprise. *Praxis*, 17, 1–11.
- Uvin, P. (2004). *Rights and Development*. Westport, CT: Kumarian.
- Vandemootele, J., Malhotra, K. & Lim, J. A. (2003). Is MDG 8 on track as a global deal for human development? UNDP Bureau for Development Policy. <http://www.undp.org/povertycentre/publications/mdg/MDG8_OnTrack-UNDP-Jun03.pdf>.
- Walker, P., Wisner, B., Leaning, J., & Minear, L. (2005). Smoke and mirrors: deficiencies in disaster funding. *BMJ*, 330(January), 247–250.
- Water Aid (n.d.). Human rights approach to development. <http://www.righttowater.org.uk/code/HR_approach.asp>.
- Water Aid (2005). An empty glass: The EU Water Initiative's contribution to the water and sanitation Millennium targets. <http://www.wateraid.org/documents/an_empty_glass.pdf>.
- Winpenny, J. (2005). Financing water for all: report of the world panel on financing water infrastructure. Chaired by Michel Camdessus, March 2003. <www.gwpforum.org/servlet/PSP>.
- Woolcock, M., & Narayan, D. (2000). Social capital: implications for development theory, research, and policy. *World Bank Research Observer*, 15(2).
- World Bank (2003). World Bank Group Response to the Report of the World Panel on Financing Water Infrastructure Chaired by Mr. Michel Camdessus, July 14, 2003. <http://www.financingwaterforall.org/fileadmin/Financing_water_for_all/Stakeholders_responses/WBG_Response_to_Camdessus_Report.pdf>.
- World Health Organization, *Right to Water*, 2000. <http://www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/righttowater/en/>.
- World Health Organization, COHRE and American Association for Advancement of Science (2004). Manual on the right to water. <http://www.cohre.org/downloads/water_flyer.pdf>.

Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

