



# Universality in Focus

John Norris, Molly Elgin-Cossart, and Casey Dunning

May 12, 2014

---

## Overview

U.N. member states and a range of other actors are currently engaged in discussions regarding the contours of the post-2015 global development agenda. This agenda will serve as the successor to the Millennium Development Goals, or MDGs, agreed to in 2000. The MDGs were a 15-year plan of global goals and targets in areas such as health and education. The eight MDGs—which range from halving the rate of extreme poverty to reducing the rate of under-5 mortality by two-thirds—have formed a blueprint to help the world’s poorest people. The MDGs were agreed to by all of the countries and leading development agencies in the world.<sup>1</sup>

The theory behind the MDGs was simple: By establishing a shared set of priorities in crucial areas, setting measurable targets to achieve those goals, and creating transparency around data to track progress, the goals can catalyze resources and action, driving a race to the top. In general, the MDGs were designed to accelerate progress in areas where the world was already making headway, hoping that with more resources, attention, and energy, even more could be achieved. This same emphasis on setting goals and targets that are both aspirational and achievable has also been a guiding principle of discussions on the post-2015 agenda.

The original Millennium Development Goals were targeted exclusively at the developing world and were largely donor driven. The MDGs represented a traditional North-South view of the world, with Northern-dominated donor countries and institutions agreeing on a framework prioritizing how they should assist the developing world, i.e., the South.

However, there have been major changes in the global economic and social landscape since 2000. Countries such as India, China, and Brazil have achieved rapid growth and middle-income status as they have become donors themselves, while still addressing major pockets of extreme poverty within their own countries. Concerns over global patterns of consumption and production have grown acute against the backdrop of accelerating climate change. Continued fallout from the 2008 global economic crisis has left even wealthy countries worried about employment, inequality, and access to economic opportunities in their own societies. In short, the tidy North-South view of the world from 2000 has very little to do with modern realities.

Thus, there has been an emerging consensus that the post-2015 agenda should be universal. By making the new framework universal, every nation would make commitments to embrace specific goals and targets that would make the world less impoverished, more environmentally sustainable, and more equitable. It is important to stress that like the original MDGs, the post-2015 goals and targets are *nonbinding commitments*.

The issue of how universality will be applied in practice has not yet received the level of discussion it deserves, particularly given that universality has the potential to considerably complicate final member-state negotiations on the post-2015 agenda over the next 18 months. Some see universality as a central component of the emerging political agreement to make the new set of goals relevant for all countries and a natural reflection of a world where development exists on a continuum rather than as a simple dichotomy between “developed” and “developing.” Others have expressed worry that universality and an expanded global agenda could potentially undermine the existing focus on the poorest.<sup>2</sup>

This report begins with the assumption that universality will be a feature of the next agenda. It takes the “illustrative goals and targets” provided in the U.N. High Level Panel report submitted to the secretary-general in June 2013<sup>3</sup> as a logical starting point for exploring what universality might mean in very practical terms for a given member state, in this case the United States.<sup>4</sup>

The High Level Panel report adopted a different style than the MDGs when it came to setting its targets, embracing a mixture of global and nationally determined targets. For example, by setting targets that called for no one to live on less than \$1.25 a day and aiming to reduce all preventable under-5 deaths, the panel set minimum global standards in a majority of its focus areas. But in other cases, the panel called on each country to establish its own level of ambition toward a defined target. For example, one nationally determined target was to “reduce by X percent the share of people living below the poverty line,” with national governments and civil society called on to determine what the “X percent” should be within their specific country context. (All targets within this report are marked as to whether they are globally or nationally determined, or a mix of the two.)

This careful blend of globally and nationally established targets was seen as adding an essential element of flexibility to make it so that the framework could be applied universally.

This report mirrors the structure of the High Level Panel report; it is divided into sections by goals and then by the targets under each goal. There is a discussion under each target regarding its implications in the United States. Could the United States achieve such a target? What is the current status of our progress, or lack thereof, related to the issue? Is this an area where the United States has a vested interest in making progress? Is the target framed in such a way that it is measurable, realistic, and achievable? If the panel target were one where the level of ambition is to be set nationally, what might an appropriate range of ambition look like in the United States?

It is important to emphasize that the original MDGs and the emerging post-2015 global development goals are aspirational and target-setting exercises designed to galvanize greater levels of support and action on commonly identified challenges. This report does not discuss the action plans and means of implementation required to achieve each of these targets. However, both the analysis regarding the realism of achieving these targets and efforts to set appropriate levels of ambition for nationally determined targets were broadly shaped by expert opinion and feedback in these areas.

What is perhaps most striking when looking at how the United States stacks up against the High Level Panel targets is that almost all of these areas are already domestic priorities where the United States has significant vested interest in making more rapid progress. It is hard to formulate a cogent argument as to why the United States would not want to reduce maternal mortality, improve educational and learning outcomes, increase youth employment, cut food waste, or make businesses more energy efficient and profitable.

In a number of cases, research suggested that some of the High Level Panel targets were not workable in their current form and will require substantial sharpening and specificity if they are to be of use in setting agreed-upon international aspirations. Targets that are not measurable or informed by mutually agreed-upon data will be either ignored or ineffective; it would be unfortunate if targets around critical issues such as peace, governance, and global partnership are not fully realized because aspirations are not put in concrete, measurable terms.

It is our hope that this report, rather than being the definitive analysis of a broad and complicated set of issues, instead represents the beginning of a broader national and global conversation regarding the practical implications of universality in the post-2015 agenda. Our findings were refined and much improved thanks to the constructive feedback we received from partners in the think tank, NGO, academic, and international institutional community in preparing this report, and we thank the many individuals we called upon for their support and feedback. We urge experts in each of these areas, in the United States and abroad, to rigorously debate our findings and provide suggestions as a means to further refine them.

Goal 1: End poverty

*Target 1a. Bring the number of people living on less than \$1.25 a day to zero and reduce by X percent the share of people living below their country's 2015 national poverty line*

\*[Mix of a global and nationally determined target]

Discussion: This target obviously has two different elements. The first, ending extreme poverty so no one lives on less than \$1.25 a day, is set as a global aspiration. Data on \$1.25 a day poverty in the United States are not as readily available as one might think. Researchers at the National Poverty Center, however, released data in May 2013 that suggested that by mid-2011, “1.65 million households with 3.55 million children were living in extreme poverty in a given month, based on cash income. This constituted 4.3 percent of all non-elderly households with children.”<sup>6</sup> (While these families have very little cash income, many of them may be receiving other forms of support, such as Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP, formerly known as food stamps, and the World Bank’s definition of extreme poverty is based on consumption rather than income.) There is no reason that the United States should not be able to achieve zero people living in extreme poverty by 2030.

The second part of this target encourages countries to move even further beyond the aspiration of ending extreme poverty by reducing their populations living below the national poverty line by a nationally determined percentage. Unlike the extreme poverty data, which are pegged to \$1.25 consumption, national poverty levels are calculated using widely differing sets of measures and methods across U.N. member states. In the United States, the official poverty rate for 2012 was 15 percent, representing some 46.5 million people living at or below the poverty line.<sup>7</sup> These rates are determined by the Census Bureau, with the poverty threshold representing the annual amount of cash income minimally required to support families of various sizes. The methodology for calculating the thresholds was established in the mid-1960s and has not been changed, although periodic adjustments have been made for inflation. A family is considered “poor” if its pretax monetary income is below its poverty threshold; again, however, income does not consider noncash benefits such as public housing, food assistance, or employer-provided health insurance. Some have suggested that measuring poverty through consumption rather than income, as is the case in most low-income countries, may be a more accurate way to gauge the conditions in which people live.<sup>8</sup> By pursuing policies that promote more equitable economic growth, support households’ economic security, and strengthen the social safety net, the share of people living below the poverty line can be reduced by at least 30 percent by 2030.

*Target 1b. Increase by X percent the share of women and men, communities, and businesses with secure rights to land, property, and other assets*

\*[Nationally determined target]

Discussion: This is a target with limited relevance in the United States given that equal legal access to land, property, and other assets are well enshrined in both law and practice.

*Target 1c. Cover X percent of people who are poor and vulnerable with social protection systems*

\*[Nationally determined target]

Discussion: Social protection systems, such as safety nets or social assistance programs, obviously can include a broad array of different programs and interventions in a developed country such as the United States. The World Bank currently defines “safety nets” or “social assistance” to include the following programs targeted at the vulnerable:<sup>9</sup>

- Cash transfers or food stamps, whether means tested or categorical as in child allowances or social pensions
- In-kind transfers, with food via school feeding programs or mother/child supplement programs being the most common, but also of take-home food rations, school supplies and uniforms, and so on
- Price subsidies meant to benefit households, often for food or energy
- Jobs on labor-intensive public works schemes, sometimes called workfare
- In-cash or in-kind transfers to poor households, subject to compliance to specific conditionalities on education or health
- Fee waivers for essential services, health care, schooling, utilities, or transport

As noted, the official poverty statistics are based solely on income and do not include the cash and voucher transfers that federal anti-poverty programs provide, such as SNAP and the Earned Income Tax Credit, or EITC. As noted in a recent analysis by Alan Pyke for ThinkProgress, the Census Bureau began calculating an alternative set of statistics that include those transfers, as well as costs of living that are not captured by the official data.<sup>10</sup> The alternative statistics are called the Supplemental Poverty Measure, or SPM, and they offer a sketch of who and how many people are served by safety net programs.

Translating the SPM data into raw totals of Americans rescued from poverty is complicated, but the Census Bureau reports that Social Security kept 15.3 million people out of poverty, unemployment insurance kept 1.7 million people out of poverty, and SNAP kept 4 million people out of poverty in 2012.<sup>11</sup> Without the EITC, 3.1 million more children would have lived in poverty in 2011. A total of 40 million individuals were lifted out of poverty by federal benefits programs in 2011.<sup>12</sup> The overall poverty

rate under SPM calculations is significantly higher than the official measure at 16.1 percent for 2011. Child poverty is far lower under the alternative statistics, but poverty is far higher among senior citizens using the new measure.

So, in essence, the United States does already have very broad access for poor and vulnerable populations to social safety nets, although the adequacy of protection afforded by those social safety nets is often hotly debated, suggesting that a target comprised of “percentage covered by social safety nets” probably deserves some measure of the quality of safety nets if it is to be meaningful.

*Target 1d. Build resilience and reduce deaths from natural disasters by X percent*

\*[Nationally determined target]

Discussion: The United States, given its large geographic size and sometimes extreme weather patterns, faces a range of challenges related to natural disasters, and is currently listed among the five countries in the world most frequently hit by national disasters.<sup>13</sup> The National Weather Service reported that 528 Americans were killed by weather-related events in 2012, a number higher than recent historical averages, with extreme heat by far the leading cause of fatalities in this number.<sup>14</sup> Natural disaster damage in 2012 was \$110 billion according to the National Climatic Data Center, the second costliest year for natural disasters in the United States since 1980.<sup>15</sup> Hurricane Sandy was the most expensive natural disaster in the world in 2012, with an estimated \$50 billion in economic damage, and the drought in the Southwest and Midwest amounted to some \$20 billion in damage that same year.<sup>16</sup>

The United States generally takes disaster planning seriously, and a number of systemic improvements have been made since Hurricane Katrina in 2005. However, the increasing severity of weather linked to climate change, rising sea levels, and the large percentage of the population living in coastal areas suggests that far more work remains to be done in the areas of disaster preparedness, planning, and mitigation.<sup>17</sup> As extreme weather events are growing in intensity and frequency, it has become apparent that there needs to be increased investment in weather forecasting capabilities.<sup>18</sup> There have been frequent critiques of the National Weather Service in recent years for failing to provide adequate warning of coming storms and the expected severity. However, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, or NOAA, has received increased funding in recent years to upgrade its aging weather satellites.<sup>19</sup> There is also a great need to increase investment in both green and gray infrastructure, such as protecting and restoring coastal wetlands, and wastewater treatment and recycling.

Public education campaigns about the risk of heat-related health problems may have the greatest impact in lowering the annual fatalities in the United States, and an effort should be made to cut natural disaster fatalities by 40 percent by 2030, although the financial costs of such disasters will likely continue to rise and reflect the urgent need to more effectively address climate change.

## Goal 2: Empower girls and women and achieve gender equality

### *Target 2a. Prevent and eliminate all forms of violence against girls and women*

\*[Global target]

**Discussion:** This target is specifically formulated as a rights-based target to strengthen the commitment to the rights of women around the world. It also can and should be actionable, however. Although eliminating all forms of violence against girls and women by 2030 is perhaps unrealistic, significant progress can and should be made, including in the United States.

Recent data from the Bureau of Justice Statistics highlights some encouraging trends. For example, from 1995 to 2005, sexual violence against U.S. female residents aged 12 or older declined 64 percent from 5 per 1,000 females to 1.8, and remained unchanged through 2010. The report also notes that in 2010, females in the United States experienced 270,000 rape or sexual assault victimizations at a rate of about two victimizations per 1,000 females aged 12 or older, a 60 percent reduction from 1995.<sup>20</sup>

However, while the rate of rapes and sexual assaults in the United States have declined significantly, there continues to be an alarming reluctance, driven by a complex array of factors, to report rape as a crime in the United States. In 1995, 29 percent of rape or sexual assault victimizations against females were reported to the police. This percentage increased to 56 percent in 2003 before declining to 35 percent in 2010.<sup>21</sup> The Bureau of Justice Statistics reported a similar arc in the trends for domestic violence in the United States more broadly.<sup>22</sup> Intimate partner violence declined from about 2.1 million victimizations in 1993 to around 907,000 in 2010, a 64 percent decline in the rate of intimate partner violence over the 18-year data collection period.<sup>23</sup> The statistics for child abuse of girls continue to be appalling, with the Department of Justice reporting that as many as one in three girls may be abused at some point in their childhood, with only 30 percent of these cases reported to authorities.<sup>24</sup> Public education that all forms of violence against women and girls are unacceptable will continue to be a powerful tool, and creating a climate where victims of such violence have confidence that the justice system will respond appropriately to such charges is essential. As a practical step toward this target, the United States should look to significantly improve reporting rates for these crimes, and reduce domestic violence rates and rapes by 40 percent.

### *Target 2b. End child marriage*

\*[Global target]

**Discussion:** This target depends in part on how age and other parameters are set for the target. UNICEF defines child marriage as any union—whether it is formal marriage or sexually active cohabitation—where either person involved is less than 18 years old.<sup>25</sup> While U.S. laws vary widely by state, as a rule of thumb, individuals in the

United States may marry or cohabit with express parental and/or court approval if they are between the ages of 16 and 18, although there are a number of states where even younger marriage remains permissible.<sup>26</sup> The most recent data from the Census Bureau's 2012 American Community Survey show a significant drop in marriages for 15- to 19-year-old women, with 1.3 percent of women and girls in this cohort married, and 0.7 percent of men in this cohort married. This amounts to some 136,557 15- to 19-year-old girls married in the United States. This is a significant drop from 2000 when 4.5 percent of all 15- to 19-year-old women were married.<sup>27</sup> Considering the continuing drop in teenage pregnancies in the United States, however, the decrease in young marriages is not too surprising, although teen pregnancy is not the sole factor in underage marriages.<sup>28</sup> For effective tracking of such a potential target in the United States, there would need to be data more effectively disaggregated by age. Setting targets in this area is further complicated by the fact that marriage eligibility in the United States is set at the state and not the federal level. In general, this target could be better defined as attempting to end early and forced marriage.

*Target 2c. Ensure equal right of women to own and inherit property, sign a contract, register a business, and open a bank account*

\*[Global target]

Discussion: Again, this is a target with limited relevance in the United States given that these rights are well enshrined in both law and practice.

*Target 2d. Eliminate discrimination against women in political, economic, and public life*

\*[Global target]

Discussion: This is another rights-based target, but again one that can and should be actionable. Although currently poorly defined, it likely will be better refined in any final intergovernmental agreement. Some likely indicators around such a target might include:

- Representation. Women currently hold 98—or 18.3 percent—of the 535 seats in the 113th U.S. Congress: 20 seats (20 percent) in the Senate and 78 (17.9 percent) in the House. Five of the 50 governors are currently women (10 percent), and 10 of the 50 lieutenant governors are women (20 percent). About 25 percent of the more than 7,000 state legislators in the United States are women.<sup>29</sup>
- Employment. According to Bureau of Labor Statistics data released on October 22, 2013, the share of women employed in the nonagricultural sector is 49.4 percent. However, only 18.5 percent of those employees are in supervisory positions. Currently, the female unemployment rate (6.7 percent) is lower than that of males (7.7 percent).<sup>30</sup>



- Women in nongovernmental leadership positions. There are currently 22 female CEOs of Fortune 500 companies, a 4 percent increase between 2011 and 2012. In 2012, women held 14.3 percent of executive officer positions at Fortune 500 companies and 8.1 percent of executive officer top-earner positions. In both 2011 and 2012, one-fifth of companies had 25 percent or more women executive officers, yet more than one-quarter had no women.<sup>31</sup>
- Educational leadership. In 2011, 26.4 percent of college and university presidents were women.<sup>32</sup>

### Goal 3: Provide quality education and lifelong learning

*Target 3a. Increase by X percent the proportion of children able to access and complete pre-primary education*

\*[Nationally determined target]

Discussion: According to the World Bank, as of 2010, some 69 percent of U.S. pre-primary aged students were able to utilize education services compared with a 2011 figure of 97 percent in the European Union.<sup>33</sup> Given the significant social and educational gains associated with pre-primary education,<sup>34</sup> the United States has a deeply vested economic and social interest in achieving universal pre-primary education in the United States. Indeed, President Barack Obama recently announced universal pre-primary education as a goal of his administration, and the United States should aim to achieve 100 percent pre-primary access by 2030.<sup>35</sup>

*Target 3b. Ensure that every child, regardless of circumstance, completes primary education able to read, write, and count well enough to meet minimum learning standards*

\*[Global target]

Discussion: Primary school completion rates in the United States remain essentially universal, with the World Bank putting this figure at approximately 100 percent.<sup>36</sup> However, as in many countries, the quality of this education remains widely variable. For example, the United States is often reported as having 99 percent of those aged 15 and older able to read and write, although this figure falls sharply with more rigorous testing, and estimates of people lacking functional literacy skills in the United States have been found to be close to 20 percent in some studies.<sup>37</sup> Currently, 45 states and the District of Columbia have adopted the Common Core State Standards, which aim to provide a uniform, minimum standard for primary and secondary school students.<sup>38</sup> While these are contested standards, American fourth and eighth graders showed incremental gains in reading and math in 2013.<sup>39</sup> There remain, however, significant achievement gaps between different racial and ethnic groups and income classes. An ambitious target for the United States in this area would be to achieve functional literacy and numeracy for 95 percent of 15 year olds by 2030.

*Target 3c. Ensure that every child, regardless of circumstance, has access to lower secondary education and increase the proportion of adolescents who achieve recognized and measurable learning outcomes to X percent*

\*[Mix of a global and nationally determined target]

Discussion: The first half of this target has limited relevance in the United States given that it provides free universal access to secondary education. The second half of the target—increasing the proportion of adolescents who achieve recognized and measurable learning outcomes to X percent—appears to be a nationally determined target, but without a clearer statement of what exactly is being measured, it is impossible to determine both where the United States stands today and what it should aim for by 2030.

*Target 3d. Increase the number of young and adult women and men with the skills, including technical and vocational, needed for work by X percent*

\*[Nationally determined target]

Discussion: While this target could be better defined, appropriate workplace skills are obviously a key consideration in reviving economic growth. As the October 2013 Survey of Adult Skills by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, or OECD, argued, the workforce skills most needed are rapidly evolving in a place such as the United States:

*With manufacturing and other low-skill tasks in the services sector becoming increasingly automated, the need for routine cognitive and craft skills is declining, while the demand for information-processing skills and other high-level cognitive and interpersonal skills is growing. In addition to mastering occupation-specific skills, workers in the 21st century must also have a stock of information-processing skills, including literacy, numeracy and problem solving, and “generic” skills, such as interpersonal communication, self-management, and the ability to learn, to help them weather the uncertainties of a rapidly changing labour market.<sup>40</sup>*

Unfortunately, this same report found that the United States compared poorly to other major developed countries in terms of technology, math, and literacy, with the results indicating an unusually high level of stratification: the United States usually had more people in the highest and lowest percentiles than other major industrial countries. Addressing this skills gap and embracing support for lifelong learning will be absolutely essential if the United States hopes to compete economically over the long term, although considerably more work needs to be done to best capture the emphasis on appropriate technical and vocational skills in a viable post-2015 target.

## Goal 4: Ensure healthy lives

### *Target 4a. End preventable infant and under-5 deaths*

\*[Global target]

Discussion: “Preventable” child deaths is generally understood to imply a rate of no more than 20 child deaths per 1,000 births under the age of five, and the World Bank places the United States rate at 7 per 1,000, well within this range.<sup>41</sup> Yet this is an area where substantial improvement can still be made. According to World Bank data, both Norway and Sweden have under-5 mortality rates less than half that of the United States.<sup>42</sup> The United States should aim to bring its under-5 mortality rate down to 3 child deaths per 1,000 births by 2030.

### *Target 4b. Increase by X percent the proportion of children, adolescents, at-risk adults, and older people that are fully vaccinated*

\*[Nationally determined target]

Discussion: As the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention notes, “High vaccination coverage in children by age 2 years has resulted in historically low levels of most vaccine-preventable diseases in the United States, but coverage must be maintained to reduce the burden of disease further and prevent a resurgence of these diseases, particularly in populations with lower vaccination coverage.”<sup>43</sup> Aiming for a 40 percent reduction in those not covered by immunizations by 2030 seems a reasonable goal in the United States.

### *Target 4c. Decrease the maternal mortality ratio to no more than X per 100,000*

\*[Nationally determined target]

Discussion: The most likely numerical value for this target if set at a global level would be 100 deaths per 100,000 people, although a number of different proposals are currently being considered.<sup>44</sup> According to the latest U.N. Human Development Report, the United States currently has a maternal mortality rate of 21 per 100,000.<sup>45</sup> While this number is already below whatever would likely be established in the post-2015 agenda, it is clear that considerable improvements could be made in this area. Norway, Australia, and Germany have all achieved maternal mortality rates of 7 per 100,000—exactly one-third of the rate in the United States. At a minimum, the United States should try to halve its maternal mortality rate by 2030.

*Target 4d. Ensure universal sexual and reproductive health and rights*

\*[Global target]

Discussion: This target will be difficult to measure unless member states can agree to what “ensure” means and the best way to measure it. At its core, this target seeks to provide both the fundamental assurance that each person may make his or her own sexual and reproductive decisions, and that the practical institutions and materials to deliver on any such decisions are available, whether they be family planning options or better rural clinics in which a woman may give birth. According to the World Bank, 99 percent of births in the United States are attended by a skilled health worker,<sup>46</sup> and the World Health Organization finds 6 percent of women in the United States have an unmet need for family planning.<sup>47</sup>

However, there is much to be desired in the access and quality of sexual and reproductive services. The rate of unintended pregnancies in the United States remains high—approximately one-half of births—suggesting a lack of access to contraception and or education, and family planning clinics are under constant threat due to burdensome laws and regulations, driven by the politics over sexual and reproductive health options.<sup>48</sup> The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services’ *Healthy People 2020* campaign aims to reduce unintended pregnancy by 10 percent—from 49 percent of pregnancies to 44 percent of pregnancies—over the next 10 years, and a drop of 15 percent by 2030 seems attainable.<sup>49</sup>

*Target 4e. Reduce the burden of disease from HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, malaria, neglected tropical diseases, and priority noncommunicable diseases*

\*[Global target]

Discussion: Although this target is meant to allow for national-level differences, it is overly broad as currently constructed. The focus on noncommunicable diseases, or NCDs, goes to the greatest health challenges facing the United States, such as cardiovascular disease, obesity, cancer, respiratory illnesses, and diabetes; chronic NCDs are the number one cause of death and disability in the world.<sup>50</sup> Encouragingly, most NCDs are largely preventable by limiting risk factors such as alcohol and tobacco use, lack of exercise, and unhealthy diets. The World Health Organization noted in 2011 that 87 percent of all deaths in the United States are due to NCDs, some 16 percent of the population smokes, and 43 percent are physically inactive.<sup>51</sup> On average, blood pressure has decreased since 1980, but body mass index has increased, as have glucose levels.<sup>52</sup> Getting a handle on these long-term trends will be essential for the United States to promote health and contain a major drain on productivity and public budgets.

A target aimed at NCDs could be crafted around increasing healthy life expectancy, a population health measure that combines mortality data with morbidity or health status data to estimate expected years of life in good health for persons at a given age. The United States should aim to achieve the OECD average prevalence for obesity of 18 percent,<sup>53</sup> and reduce the percent of smokers by 20 percent and increase the rate of those regularly engaging in physical activity by 20 percent, as these are all factors in preventing NCDs.

## Goal 5: Ensure food security and good nutrition

*Target 5a. End hunger and protect the right of everyone to have access to sufficient, safe, affordable, and nutritious food*

\*[Global target]

Discussion: The World Food Programme estimates that less than 5 percent of the U.S. population is undernourished.<sup>54</sup> However, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, or USDA, points out that the larger problem of food insecurity is disturbingly prevalent in the United States. A September 2013 USDA report estimated that 14.5 percent of American households were food insecure at least at some point during the year in 2012, meaning that “they lacked access to enough food for an active, healthy life for all household members.”<sup>55</sup> This number was relatively flat from the previous year, and the prevalence of very low food security was 5.7 percent. In keeping with the post-2015 agenda, the United States should strive to eliminate very low food security by 2030, and halve periodic food insecurity during that same time frame.

*Target 5b. Reduce stunting by X percent, wasting by Y percent, and anemia by Z percent for all children under the age of 5*

\*[Nationally determined target]

Discussion: Stunting (chronic malnutrition) and wasting (low weight for height) among children under the age of 5 is not a pervasive problem in the United States; the World Health Organization finds that 3 percent of children are stunted<sup>56</sup> and only 0.6 percent of children under 5 experience wasting. As such, a potential target for the United States for these two conditions might be to eliminate stunting and wasting. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, however, anemia remains a serious concern in the United States.<sup>57</sup> Some 14 percent of American children aged 1 to 2 suffer from iron deficiency, with this figure dropping to 4 percent among children aged 3 to 5. Anemia is linked to more than 4,000 deaths in the United States annually, with 1.6 deaths per 100,000.<sup>58</sup> A goal of reducing anemia by 30 percent by 2030 seems realistic.

*Target 5c. Increase agricultural productivity by X percent, with a focus on sustainably increasing smallholder yields and access to irrigation*

\*[Nationally determined target]

Discussion: U.S. agriculture has a long history of steady improvements in efficiency although some of these efficiencies have at times brought with them clear environmental costs. U.S. agricultural growth has been driven in a very large part by steady innovation, best practices, and improved technologies. One area for increased investment and innovation is in aquaculture. While the United States imports 90 percent of its seafood, half of that is farm raised<sup>59</sup>—an efficient means of production, but also destructive to the environment. The United States could take the lead on research into more sustainable practices to be shared with other member states.

Although access to irrigation and smallholder yields are less of an issue in the United States, the country should aim for a 20 percent increase in productivity by 2030.

*Target 5d. Adopt sustainable agricultural, ocean, and freshwater fishery practices, and rebuild designated fish stocks to sustainable levels*

\*[Global target]

Discussion: Although much will depend on the definition of “sustainable” in this target, the United States has made important strides in adopting sustainable agricultural, ocean, and freshwater fishery practices. The 1996 Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act required that overfished ocean fish stocks be rebuilt in as short a time period as possible, not to exceed 10 years, with limited exceptions.<sup>60</sup> In 2013, the Natural Resources Defense Council, or NRDC, completed an evaluation of those fish stocks that were subject to these requirements and for which sufficient information was available, a total of 44. The evaluation found that 28 fish stocks—or 64 percent—had been designated rebuilt or met their rebuilding targets, or had made significant rebuilding progress; 21 stocks had been designated rebuilt or met rebuilding targets and have not been designated as again approaching an overfished condition. Seven had made significant progress, at least 50 percent of the rebuilding target and a 25 percent increase in abundance since the start of its rebuilding plan.<sup>61</sup> Progress, however, has been spotty, with some regions falling behind in rebuilding, and continued overfishing a concern, depleting stocks faster than they can be rebuilt. Additionally, there are gaps in rebuilding, especially with stocks that are not federally managed. The United States should aim to rebuild all designated stocks, including the 16 that have not yet met existing federal requirements, and to ensure that those stocks that have been rebuilt remain that way.

As for sustainable agriculture, there is growing concern about the excess fertilization of farm land, which creates runoff oversaturated with nutrients known as “hypoxia,” creating “dead zones” at the mouths of rivers, killing all marine life.<sup>62</sup> NOAA’s National Ocean Service has found that the frequency and duration of nutrient pollution has increased exponentially, affecting more than half of U.S. estuaries—the biggest at the mouth of the Gulf of Mexico is the size of the state of New Jersey.<sup>63</sup> The National Ocean Service is currently running programs to combat hypoxia under the Harmful Algal Blooms and Hypoxia Research and Control Act, originally enacted in 1998 and up for renewal in 2014.<sup>64</sup> In 2008, the Environmental Protection Agency established a goal of reducing “the five-year running average size of [Gulf of Mexico hypoxia] zone to less than 5,000 square kilometers by 2015,”<sup>65</sup> which by 2013 was evaluated as an attainable goal. Similar programs could be set for other major dead zones throughout the country.

*Target 5e. Reduce postharvest loss and food waste by X percent*

\*[Nationally determined target]

Discussion: According to the United Nations, roughly one-third of the food produced for human consumption every year simply gets wasted, and it is estimated that close to 40 percent of agricultural production is lost post-harvest in the United States.<sup>66</sup> The impact of such inefficiency is enormous, costing billions of dollars, wasting millions of gallons of water, and helping accelerate climate change due to the increased fuel and other resources required to produce extra food.<sup>67</sup> The United Nations estimates that the cost of wasted food in the United States surpasses \$43 billion a year,<sup>68</sup> and the Natural Resources Defense Council places an even higher price tag on this waste, estimating \$165 billion of food waste in America every year, or 240 pounds of food per American annually.<sup>69</sup> In fact, U.S. grocery stores alone discard \$10 billion to \$15 billion in food that is close to its sell-by date or damaged.<sup>70</sup> Yet sell-by dates are something of a myth; they are designed to measure optimal quality rather than food safety.

Similarly, the pressure for perfect-looking food also contributes to a great deal of waste in more developed countries. Farmers in the United States also tend to plant extra crops in case yields are lower than expected, and then many of these crops are simply discarded if yields are higher or market prices are not competitive. Aggressive advocacy campaigns in the United Kingdom have already helped cut food waste in that country by 21 percent since 2007,<sup>71</sup> and the USDA and EPA launched a similar effort in the United States in June.<sup>72</sup> The goal should be to reduce post-harvest loss and food waste in the United States by 35 percent by 2030.

## Goal 6: Achieve universal access to water and sanitation

*Target 6a. Provide universal access to safe drinking water at home and in schools, health centers, and refugee camps*

\*[Global target]

Discussion: The United States can currently be seen as meeting this target.

*Target 6b. End open defecation and ensure universal access to sanitation at school and work, and increase access to sanitation at home by X percent*

\*[Mix of a global and nationally determined target]

Discussion: The United States can currently be seen as meeting this target.

*Target 6c. Bring freshwater withdrawals in line with supply and increase water efficiency in agriculture by X percent, industry by Y percent, and urban areas by Z percent*

\*[Mix of a global and nationally determined target]

Discussion: According to a March 2013 article published in the journal *Water Resources Research*, “Projected freshwater withdrawals in the United States under a changing climate,” drawn from U.S. Geological Survey data, the United States has made considerable progress in managing its water resources more efficiently.<sup>73</sup> The report notes that withdrawals for industry and thermoelectric plants have become significantly more efficient per unit of output over the past 45 years, and per-capita public and private usage in most regions of the west have also dipped: “If these efficiency trends continue and trends in water use drivers proceed as expected, in the absence of additional climate change the desired withdrawals in the United States over the next 50 years are projected to stay within 3 percent of the 2005 level despite an expected 51 percent increase in population.” That would be an impressive accomplishment. However, climate change could substantially undermine this progress by forcing increases in irrigation and home and work-space cooling. While the impact of climate change on water use varies significantly by model employed, it underscores the highly linked nature of the post-2015 goals and targets. The aim should be to increase water efficiency in all three areas by 25 percent.

*Target 6d. Recycle or treat all municipal and industrial wastewater prior to discharge*

\*[Global target]

Discussion: This target is not as obviously applicable to the United States, as it addresses the problem of wastewater being discharged untreated directly into rivers, lakes, or the oceans.<sup>74</sup> 1972 Amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act—commonly known as the Clean Water Act, or CWA—established the foundation for wastewater discharge control in the United States. The CWA established a control program for ensuring that communities have clean water by regulating the



release of contaminants into the country's waterways. More than 75 percent of the U.S. population is served by centralized wastewater collection and treatment systems, with the remaining population using septic or other onsite systems.<sup>75</sup> The CWA requires that all municipal wastewater treatment plant discharges meet a minimum of "secondary treatment."<sup>76</sup> (Secondary wastewater treatment is the second stage of wastewater treatment that takes place after the primary treatment process and consists of removing or reducing contaminants or growths that are left in the wastewater from the primary treatment process.) More than 30 percent of the wastewater treatment facilities today produce cleaner discharges by providing even greater levels of treatment than secondary.<sup>77</sup> An appropriate target might be to raise the level of discharge above that of secondary treatment for 100 percent of wastewater treatment facilities.

## Goal 7: Secure sustainable energy

### *Target 7a. Double the share of renewable energy in the global energy mix*

\*[Mix of a global and nationally determined target]

Discussion: It is important to note that this target is aimed at the overall mix of global energy use rather than set percentages for any one given country. Renewables made up about 20 percent of the global energy mix in 2011, according to data from the International Energy Agency.<sup>78</sup> Although with a global target, the United States—as a disproportionately large consumer of energy—will have considerable impact on whether such a goal could be achieved. According to the U.S. Energy Information Administration, renewable sources of energy accounted for about 9 percent of total U.S. energy consumption and 12 percent of electricity generation in 2012.<sup>79</sup> In 2011, the Obama administration set a goal to double clean energy use over the next 25 years, suggesting that doubling clean energy use by 2030 would be an even more ambitious but potentially realizable target.<sup>80</sup>

### *Target 7b. Ensure universal access to modern energy services*

\*[Global target]

Discussion: The United States is broadly considered to have universal access to modern energy services.

### *Target 7c. Double the global rate of improvement in energy efficiency in buildings, industry, agriculture, and transport*

\*[Global target]

Discussion: Energy efficiency has economic as well as environmental benefits. However, because gains in energy efficiency tend to require large upfront costs for long-term return, they tend to suffer from underinvestment. In 2010, the United States consumed 40.3 quads of energy in both residential and commercial buildings.<sup>81</sup> The

United States building sector alone accounted for 7 percent of global primary energy consumption and 41 percent of U.S. primary energy consumption in 2010, indicating that U.S. action on energy efficiency in buildings would be globally significant.<sup>82</sup>

With that said, the United States has already put into practice a target around energy efficiency in buildings that aligns with the above target. The U.S. Department of Energy, or DOE, has set itself the task of reducing energy use in American buildings by 50 percent compared to a 2010 baseline.<sup>83</sup> The department has also proactively spearheaded the Better Buildings Challenge, a public-private partnership to reduce commercial building energy use by 20 percent by 2020. The United States is also currently the leader in LEED-certified projects, a green building certification program, with 44,270 projects as of May 2013.<sup>84</sup> The next closest country, Canada, has 4,212 LEED-certified projects.<sup>85</sup> The president's Climate Action Plan, announced in 2013, also calls for a reduction in carbon pollution by at least 3 billion metric tons by 2030 through new efficiency standards for appliances and federal buildings.<sup>86</sup>

Agriculture-related activities comprise a substantial portion of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, and the United States is the fourth-highest contributor to agricultural emissions. However, progress is being made through initiatives such as the Rural Energy for America Program, which improved efficiency in 4,000 small businesses in fiscal year 2010 alone, producing enough energy to power 390,000 American homes for one year.<sup>87</sup>

The Department of Energy estimates that more energy is lost as wasted heat in power generation in the United States than the total energy use of Japan, and it has announced a plan to use combined heat and power, or CHP, to increase 40 gigawatts of new, cost-effective CHP by 2020.<sup>88</sup> Achieving this goal would save American manufacturers and companies \$10 billion each year in energy costs.

*Target 7d. Phase out inefficient fossil-fuel subsidies that encourage wasteful consumption*  
\*[Global target]

Discussion: The United States joined in reiterating in 2012 the G20 group of countries' 2009 pledge to "phase out inefficient fossil fuel subsidies that encourage wasteful consumption over the medium term."<sup>89</sup> And during his January State of the Union address, President Obama called for the phasing out of an estimated \$4 billion in tax breaks and incentives—many dating back a century to when oil exploration was dangerous and far more expensive—that U.S. companies enjoy every year.<sup>90</sup> Freeing up money from inefficient fossil-fuel subsidies—a very small portion of which actually benefit the poor, such as subsidies for heating oil for poor families in the winter—could free up enormous resources for other priority investments around the globe. The International Monetary Fund estimates that global fossil-fuel consumption and production subsidies are more than half a trillion dollars annually.<sup>91</sup> However, eliminating fossil-fuel subsidies both in the United States and abroad remains politically contentious, with powerful interest groups aligned against such changes. That said, the merits of eliminating such subsidies remain overwhelming.

## Goal 8: Create jobs, sustainable livelihoods, and equitable growth

*Target 8a. Increase the number of good and decent jobs and livelihoods by X*

\*[Nationally determined target]

Discussion: The International Labour Organization, or ILO, is currently examining definitions for good and decent work; in an advanced economy such as the United States, decent jobs are the standard that should be sought.<sup>92</sup> The ILO broadly defines decent work as “productive work for women and men in conditions of freedom, equity, security and human dignity.”<sup>93</sup> An often-cited measure of a “decent wage” in the United States is equal to two-thirds the median hourly wage, which is currently \$11.25.<sup>94</sup> In his January State of the Union address, President Obama called for a raise in the minimum wage to \$10.10, which has been cited as the wage required to lift a family of three above the federal poverty line.<sup>95</sup> As of 2012, 75.3 million Americans over the age of 16 were paid at an hourly rate, with 1.6 million of those employees earning the federal minimum wage of \$7.25 per hour, but many states have significantly lower minimum wages.<sup>96</sup> In addition, women and minorities hold the majority of minimum-wage positions.<sup>97</sup> There is also a push to ensure paid sick days in the workplace and institute paid maternity leave for all women and parents.

A larger issue with this target for the United States, and for all countries, is how “good and decent jobs and livelihoods” is defined and thus measured. Without such a definition, the United States might be better served using this target to focus efforts on an increase in federally mandated minimum wage. An emphasis on greater income equality would also be welcome, and a major 2014 report by the International Monetary Fund found that rising levels of income equality around the globe threaten to undermine prospects for long-term growth.<sup>98</sup>

*Target 8b. Decrease the number of young people not in education, employment, or training by X percent*

\*[Nationally determined target]

One way to improve and increase educational and vocational training would be through the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, or STEM, program. Currently, the United States is not lacking for postsecondary students—in 2013, there were approximately 19.9 million postsecondary students—but the United States consistently ranks low in producing graduates for jobs in the math and science industries, which are the fastest growing.<sup>99</sup> Proposals for apprenticeship programs for American workers have gained traction in recent years; opportunities to “earn while you learn” have been shown to increase lifetime earnings and the number of opportunities available to individuals.<sup>100</sup> Not only do apprenticeships provide opportunities for individuals to upgrade their own skills, but also employers experience less turnover and earn a greater return on investment in the workers they train.<sup>101</sup>

Another area to consider in addressing this goal would be to focus on ensuring post-secondary education affordability. This could be done through increased education subsidies, President Obama's college affordability plan, or capping college tuition. According to the OECD, the United States has averaged just more than 15 percent of young people not in education, employment, or training in recent years, which is roughly average for OECD countries.<sup>102</sup> The target should be to cut this rate by 40 percent by 2030, a realistic effort given the sharp spike in these numbers caused by the 2008 global financial crisis.

*Target 8c. Strengthen productive capacity by providing universal access to financial services and infrastructure such as transportation and information and communications technology, or ICT*

\*[Global target]

Discussion: This target comprises many sectors that have varying levels of applicability within the U.S. context.

The United States provides near-universal access to financial services, however, the quality and predatory nature of those services can differ quite dramatically. As a first step, the United States must tackle affordability and access to basic bank services; currently 17 million Americans do not have a bank account.<sup>103</sup> The United States could pledge to reach these people with basic financial services by 2030.

While universal access to infrastructure has been met in the United States, affordability is an issue, as housing and transportation costs outpace incomes. Under an expanded definition of affordability prepared by the Center for Neighborhood Technology—in which housing and transportation costs consume no more than 45 percent of income—only 28 percent of communities in the United States are affordable.<sup>104</sup> Thus, the United States has more work to do to invest in infrastructure, in particular to reduce transportation costs and to ensure home affordability for low- and middle-income families.<sup>105</sup>

While the United States is broadly considered to have universal coverage of ICT services, affordability of these services also remains an issue. Currently, 60 million Americans are unable to afford Internet in their own homes.<sup>106</sup> Telephonic coverage and usage is nearly universal across the United States.<sup>107</sup>

*Target 8d. Increase new startups by X and value added from new products by Y through creating an enabling business environment and boosting entrepreneurship*

\*[Nationally determined target]

Discussion: The U.S. economy thrives on the strength of entrepreneurship, and fosters an excellent enabling environment, ranking fourth on the World Bank/International Finance Corporation Ease of Doing Business Index.<sup>108</sup> However, ensuring equal access to small-business loans would improve the business climate and prospects for broader growth.<sup>109</sup> That said, while the aims of this target are to be applauded, the target's design is not particularly sound. Simply increasing the sheer number of new startups is an isolated statistic that does not seem indicative of a country's overall health or even its dynamism. Increasing new startups by 20 percent is not of particular utility if they all fail, for example. The post-2015 agenda should capture efforts to invigorate growth and entrepreneurship, but this target is probably not the best means to do so.

## Goal 9: Manage natural resource assets sustainably

*Target 9a. Publish and use economic, social, and environmental accounts in all governments and major companies*

\*[Global target]

Discussion: The theory behind economic, social, and environmental accounts is not new, and draws upon a vast body of economic literature about the need for efficient economic outcomes to better capture activities that may fall outside market activities. For example, pollution affects health and well-being, yet these costs are not included in current accounting systems.<sup>110</sup> However, designing an accurate system to integrate such external activities into the standard national accounts is complex, as is agreeing on the terms of its use. The U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis made an effort to build a system of environmental accounts in 1994—the Integrated Economic and Environmental Satellite Accounts, or IEESA—but little progress has been made on implementing the system. The U.N. System of Environmental-Economic Accounting, or SEEA, along with the complementary World Bank partnership of Wealth Accounting and the Valuation of Ecosystem Services, or WAVES, has been developed recently and is being piloted in several countries, though not in the United States. The United States could work toward greater efficiency by focusing on one or two priority areas, for example, water resources or air pollution, using either the IEESA or SEEA.<sup>111</sup>

*Target 9b. Increase consideration of sustainability in X percent of government procurements*

\*[Nationally determined target]

Discussion: As with other targets in this goal, better precision is needed so that countries might measure and track progress. In this case, both sustainability and consideration would need to be defined. With that said, the Executive Order on Federal Leadership in Environmental, Energy, and Economic Performance, or EO 13514, committed the U.S. government to leading by example, making ambitious improvements in the overall sustainability of the federal government. Because of the enormous purchasing power of the government, steps to increase the sustainability of acquisitions can have enormous economic, social, and environmental benefits. The U.S. government's General Services Administration is currently undertaking a program of work to implement more sustainable procurement, including looking at new tools and technologies to facilitate the shift. A target of increasing the sustainability consideration in 95 percent of federal government contracts seems reasonable, and is supported by the executive order.

*Target 9c. Safeguard ecosystems, species, and genetic diversity*

\*[Global target]

Discussion: As of May 2014, 1,527 animal or plant species are listed as endangered or threatened in the United States; there are 1,147 listings with active recovery plans—or about 75 percent of listed species.<sup>112</sup> Moving active recovery plans to 90 percent of these species seems a reasonable target by 2030.

*Target 9d. Reduce deforestation by X percent and increase reforestation by Y percent*

\*[Nationally determined target]

Discussion: The U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization, or FAO, provides a Global Forest Resources Assessment every five years, with the most recent having taken place in 2010.<sup>113</sup> The United States has a solid record with regard to deforestation and reforestation broadly. The FAO estimates that the United States added 383,000 hectares of total forest cover annually between 2005 and 2010. Aiming for double that figure by 2030 would be a suitably ambitious target.

*Target 9e. Improve soil quality, reduce soil erosion by X tons, and combat desertification*

\*[Mix of a global and nationally determined target]

Discussion: The United States is a signatory of the 2001 Convention to Combat Desertification.<sup>114</sup> However, as of 2006, the United States was losing soil 10 times faster than the natural replenishment rate, leading to \$37.6 billion in production losses.<sup>115</sup> As well, the World Economic Forum predicts that the world has only 60 years of topsoil left.<sup>116</sup> There is little recent data on soil quality in the United

States—most dates back to the mid- to late-1990s—and international bodies such as the United Nations and the World Bank have no data on soil degradation or desertification for the United States. The initial step for the United States would entail establishing better baseline data and a concrete action plan with specific targets to reduce soil erosion and desertification. There is also concern for the United States that desertification in developing nations could trigger increased migration pressures across the globe. Establishing a realistic target with regard to the United States would require the collection of clearer baseline data and the formulation of an appropriate target based on those data.

## Goal 10: Ensure good governance and effective institutions

*Target 10a. Provide free and universal legal identity, such as birth registrations*

\*[Global target]

Discussion: The United States currently meets this target.

*Target 10b. Ensure people enjoy freedom of speech, association, peaceful protest, and access to independent media and information*

\*[Global target]

Discussion: While improvement can always be made in these areas, the United States already broadly meets all of these criteria.

*Target 10c. Increase public participation in political processes and civic engagement at all levels*

\*[Global target]

Discussion: While obviously desirable to increase public participation, participation is difficult to define, and there are challenges in drawing out more specific definitions at the multilateral level. For example, the Economist Intelligence Unit's Democracy Index is the favored indicator for the Open Government Partnership, and by this measure, the United States has work to do, ranking 21st in 2012 due to political infighting and declining civil liberties in the face of national security concerns.<sup>117</sup> One could use overall voter turnout as a measure of civic engagement, but voter turnout is a very imperfect indicator. (There are numerous examples of highly repressive countries reporting 100 percent electoral participation.) This target will likely require further refinement.

*Target 10d. Guarantee the public's right to information and access to government data*

\*[Global target]

Discussion: The United States' general budget practices and the Freedom of Information Act, or FOIA, guarantee the public's right to information and access to government data, but there is always more work to do to bridge the gap between law and practice. The United States is also an active signatory to the Open Government Partnership to create a more transparent, effective, and accountable government.<sup>118</sup> Specifically, the United States has taken steps to modernize FOIA by simplifying processes to increase citizen participation and by actively releasing information before requests are made.<sup>119</sup> It is now working to standardize and streamline FOIA processes across government agencies and foster dialogue between the public and the federal government on improving disclosures and administration of the FOIA.

*Target 10e. Reduce bribery and corruption and ensure officials can be held accountable*

\*[Global target]

Discussion: Measures for instances of bribery and corruption are largely based on perception surveys, the use of which will likely be controversial diplomatically within the post-2015 negotiations among member states. The United States currently ranks 89th according to the Worldwide Governance control of corruption indicator<sup>120</sup> (on a scale of 1 to 100, 1 indicating the total presence of corruption and 100 indicating the total absence). According to Transparency International, the United States ranks 19th out of 176 countries in corruption perceptions, garnering the same rank as Uruguay.<sup>121</sup> The United States could pledge to make progress on these measures or commit to collecting more systematic data on the instances of petty bribery, grand bribery, and corrupt practices that occur. Through its Open Government Partnership National Action Plan, the U.S. government has committed to increase the transparency of legal entities formed in the United States. These legal entities can mask the identity of illicit actors, facilitate financial crime, shelter assets, and evade taxes; improving their transparency is important to reducing corruption. The United States can currently be seen as meeting the latter half of this target to ensure officials can be held accountable through its justice system. Although this target poses some challenges in measurement, cooperative agreements across member states to reduce illicit financial flows and corruption would greatly help facilitate the post-2015 agenda.



## Goal 11: Ensure stable and peaceful societies

*Target 11a. Reduce violent deaths per 100,000 by X and eliminate all forms of violence against children*

\*[Mix of a global and nationally determined target]

Discussion: According to a 2010 analysis by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, “Each year, about 55,000 violent deaths occur in this country and cost the United States \$60 billion in medical care and lost productivity. Tragically, more than 38,000 people die by suicide in the United States each year. Homicide claims another 16,000 people in this country annually.”<sup>122</sup> Approximately 7,500 children are admitted to the hospital for the treatment of injuries sustained from guns each year in the United States, and more than 500 children die during hospital admission from these injuries.<sup>123</sup> The U.S. target should be to reduce violent deaths by 20 percent and violence against children by 35 percent by 2030.

*Target 11b. Ensure justice institutions are accessible, independent, well resourced, and respect due-process rights*

Discussion: Some parts of this target, such as asking that justice institutions be “well resourced,” are poorly defined, and generally targets within the Millennium Development Goals have avoided a focus on budget inputs, instead and rightly focusing on outcomes. The United States can be seen as broadly meeting this target, though some vulnerable groups still suffer from discrimination and are not able to fully realize their rights and equality in the eyes of the law. Given the importance of justice and the rule of law in successful development, it is hoped that this target is better refined over time.

*Target 11c. Stem the external stressors that lead to conflict, including those related to organized crime*

\*[Global target]

Discussion: While the United States may be broadly considered to have met this target with respect to its own borders, it can play an integral role in stemming global external stressors including small arms and narcotics trade and criminal elements. According to the Congressional Research Service, the United States is the top small arms exporter, exporting \$220.6 billion worth of weapons to developing nations from 2004 to 2011.<sup>124</sup> In addition, U.S. consumption of narcotics has long helped fuel narcotrafficking in Latin America. However, to be a meaningful target, specific external stressors would need to be clearly enumerated and defined so as to be measurable and accountable, and such a process will pose a number of keen diplomatic challenges.

*Target 11d. Enhance the capacity, professionalism, and accountability of the security forces, police, and judiciary*

\*[Global target]

Discussion: Without a sharper definition of this target and its measurement, member states, including the United States, will be challenged in determining if they are meeting it.

Goal 12: Create a global enabling environment and catalyze long-term finance

*Target 12a. Support an open, fair, and development-friendly trading system, substantially reducing trade-distorting measures, including agricultural subsidies, while improving market access of developing country products*

\*[Global target]

Discussion: The United States is a member of the World Trade Organization and currently supports a number of development-friendly trade measures including the African Growth and Opportunity Act, or AGOA, the Andean Trade Preference Act, the Caribbean Basin Initiative, and the Generalized System of Preferences, or GSP. AGOA and GSP—a U.S. trade program designed to “promote economic growth in the developing world by providing preferential duty-free entry for up to 4,800 products from 129 designated beneficiary countries and territories”<sup>125</sup>—accounted for roughly \$91 billion in U.S. imports in 2012.<sup>126</sup> With that said, the United States could commit itself to promote more development-friendly trade practices, including adding more countries and products to preference programs and reducing quotas and duties of developing-country imports. An important step in this direction would be to offer developing-country firms stability by ensuring that preference programs such as GSP, which legally expired in July 2013, receive timely re-authorization. In addition, the United States might use AGOA reauthorization and/or the pending Power Africa legislation as vehicles with which to place special emphasis on ending extreme poverty and achieving the post-2015 agenda.

The United States also provides significant agricultural subsidies, paying roughly \$14.9 billion in 2012 in direct subsidies to domestic farmers.<sup>127</sup> Recent efforts included in the 2014 Farm Bill take some steps to curb these subsidies and could be a significant contribution to the United States meeting this area of the target, although far more work obviously needs to be done.<sup>128</sup>

The United States should also help lead the effort to reduce the global transmission costs of remittances—the costs faced by migrants when they send money home to their country of origin—a vital source of revenue for millions of people in the developing world. In 2009, the G8 adopted a pledge to reduce the global average cost of remittance transfers from 10 percent to 5 percent within five years.<sup>129</sup> There already existed a number of consortiums between American and foreign banks that

partnered to undercut traditional transfer companies such as Western Union and reduce transfer costs; Citigroup and Banamex partnered in 2004, and as a result, the cost of remittances from the United States to Mexico is only 2 percent.<sup>130</sup> As of December 2013, the average cost of sending money from the United States is below both the global and G8 averages.<sup>131</sup>

*Target 12b. Implement reforms to ensure stability of the global financial system and encourage stable, long-term private foreign investment*

\*[Global target]

Discussion: Almost all member states agree that after the 2008 global financial crisis, far more work needs to be done in promoting the stability of the global financial system and protecting the most vulnerable from sharp fluctuations in prices for key commodities such as food and energy. This target needs much more work to be credibly concrete and sufficiently measurable.

*Target 12c. Hold the increase in global average temperature below 2° C above pre-industrial levels, in line with international agreements*

\*[Global target]

Discussion: No one country can ensure that this goal is met. Yet, as the world's highest per-capita carbon producer, the United States has a pivotal role to play in determining if this target can be met. The Obama administration's Climate Action Plan, which includes a suite of executive actions to curb U.S. emissions, is a promising step in this direction, but will not be sufficient in and of itself.<sup>132</sup> Embracing targets similar to those in the High Level Panel report, helping forge a new international climate change agreement, and fundamentally reassessing patterns of production and consumption in the United States will all be vital steps forward in meeting this target.

*Target 12d. Developed countries that have not done so to make concrete efforts toward the target of 0.7 percent of gross national product, or GNP, as official development assistance to developing countries and 0.15 percent to 0.20 percent of GNP of developed countries to least-developed countries; other countries should move toward voluntary targets for complementary financial assistance*

\*[Global target]

Discussion: The United States is the largest donor of bilateral development assistance in the world, and support for international development has been reaffirmed many times, including by President George W. Bush, who pledged in 2002 to increase official development assistance, or ODA, by 50 percent over 2000 levels by 2006, a goal that was achieved by 2003.<sup>133</sup> The United States focuses more on the quality and effectiveness of aid rather than its quantity, especially when ODA can complement other sources of financing for development. Part of this stance reflects dissatisfaction with the method by which ODA is calculated. For example, private charitable international giving in the United States, which is larger than government spending and a substantial portion

of worldwide flows, is not reflected in ODA. This philanthropy is facilitated by the U.S. government's favorable policies toward charitable giving.<sup>134</sup> And while countries continue to see ODA levels as a bellwether of commitment to development, ODA comprises only 13 percent of total global funds directed toward development.<sup>135</sup>

Perhaps more importantly, the United States and other member states should strive to develop a fuller and more robust concept of financing for development that includes but goes beyond traditional ODA, and these discussions should complement ongoing negotiations regarding climate finance.

*Target 12e. Reduce illicit flows and tax evasion and increase stolen asset recovery by \$X*  
\*[Nationally determined target]

Discussion: The United States signed on to the Lough Erne declaration, stemming from the G8 meetings in June 2013, agreeing to end corporate tax evasion and tax havens; the post-2015 agenda presents a welcome opportunity to spell out how best to make such commitments more concrete.<sup>136</sup> The United States could work with partner countries to ensure that all trusts and limited liability corporations are required to publicly disclose their stakeholders, and that these stakeholders are responsible for meeting their appropriate tax burdens. A target of reducing illicit flows connected to the United States by 25 percent seems realistic.

*Target 12f. Promote collaboration on and access to science, technology, innovation, and development data*  
\*[Global target]

Discussion: As currently constituted, this target risks inaction due to a lack of specificity and measurability. It might be interesting to explore if it is possible to create a global hub for development innovation and research, ideally located in the global South, to facilitate cutting-edge research, promote North-South and South-South cooperation (the sharing of development expertise by developing countries themselves), and help bring new technologies to scale in partnership with the private sector.

The United States currently promotes technology innovation, dissemination, and transfer through multiple agencies from the U.S. Agency for International Development to the U.S. Trade Representative to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. It has also embarked on a number of public-private partnerships such as the New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition and the Private Capital Group for Africa. These partnerships transfer not only technology but also new models of business and systems delivery.

The United States has committed to publishing all development data to the International Aid Transparency Initiative, or IATI, and currently publishes its development data to the Foreign Assistance Dashboard quarterly.

---

## Concluding discussion

The goals and targets set out in the next development agenda will comprise a global to-do list, a roadmap for a better world in 2030. Like the MDGs, they would be aspirational rather than binding, but should be comprehensively monitored through improved statistics and increased citizen engagement. They are practical steps to move an ambitious vision into action for a more just, prosperous, and sustainable world.

This report is meant to provide a starting point for discussion of some potential practical steps for the United States. Agreeing to the post-2015 targets entails complex public policy, as well as economic, social, and political considerations, but seems well worth the investment.

Several key points appear when reviewing the data in this report.

- First, the post-2015 agenda will need to embrace a careful balance between targets set at the national level and those at the global level. Allowing some targets to be set nationally allows for greater flexibility and is important in shaping an agenda that can be truly universal. However, if the agenda excessively relies on national targets, it may quickly lose its broad aspirational and mobilizing qualities—the features that made the MDGs a success in the first place.
- Second, an important element not covered in this report is the High Level Panel’s vision for implementing an agenda to “leave no one behind” by specifying that no target can be met until it is met for all relevant income and social groups. To realize true equality of opportunity, the High Level Panel suggested that “relevant indicators should be disaggregated with respect to income (especially for the bottom 20 percent), gender, location, age, people living with disabilities, and relevant social group.”<sup>137</sup> These data are mostly available in the United States, though some efforts to improve data will be needed. There is much work to be done to ensure that every person is able to realize her full potential.
- Third, good data are crucial in setting effective targets and progress toward them. A transparent, evidence-driven, consultative process of gathering, analyzing, and reporting on progress is needed. Such a process necessarily will involve multiple government departments and agencies, and could be coordinated effectively at the highest level, for example, by the National Security Council.
- Lastly, it is clear that achieving these goals and targets ultimately would serve the interests of the United States well at both home and abroad. Healthier, more prosperous, productive, and stable societies make for good trading partners and reliable allies.

*John Norris is the Executive Director of the Sustainable Security and Peacebuilding Initiative at the Center for American Progress. Molly Elgin-Cossart is a Senior Fellow with the National Security and International Policy team at the Center. Casey Dunning is a former Senior Policy Analyst for the Sustainable Security and Peacebuilding Initiative at the Center.*

---

## Endnotes

- 1 United Nations, "Millennium Development Goals," available at <http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/> (last accessed May 2014).
- 2 Mark Suzman, "Stay the Course on Post-2015 Development Goals," *Impatient Optimists*, March 7, 2013, available at <http://www.impatientoptimists.org/Posts/2013/03/Stay-the-Course-on-Post2015-Development-Goals>.
- 3 United Nations, "A New Global Partnership: Eradicate Poverty and Transform Economies Through Sustainable Development" (2013), available at <http://www.post2015hlp.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/UN-Report.pdf>.
- 4 While the High Level Panel report is just one of a number of important inputs into member state deliberations, it does reflect the most concrete manifestation to date of what the post-2015 goals and targets might look like, and thus offers a useful starting point.
- 5 United Nations, "A New Global Partnership."
- 6 H. Luke Shaefer and Kathryn Edin, "Rising Extreme Poverty in the United States and the Response of the Federal Means-Tested Transfer Programs." Working Paper 6 (National Poverty Center, 2013), available at [http://npc.umich.edu/publications/working\\_papers/?publication\\_id=255&](http://npc.umich.edu/publications/working_papers/?publication_id=255&).
- 7 Thomas Gabe, "Poverty in the United States: 2012" (Washington: Congressional Research Service, 2013), available at <https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL33069.pdf>.
- 8 Bruce D. Meyer and James X. Sullivan, "Five Decades of Consumption and Income Poverty." Working Paper 7 (University of Chicago Harris School of Public Policy Studies, 2010), available [http://harrisschool.luchicago.edu/sites/default/files/working-papers/wp\\_09\\_07.pdf](http://harrisschool.luchicago.edu/sites/default/files/working-papers/wp_09_07.pdf).
- 9 Margaret Grosh and others, "For Protection and Promotion: The Design and Implementation of Effective Safety Nets" (Washington: The World Bank, 2008), available at <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/SAFETYNETSANDTRANSFERS/Resources/ProtectionandPromotion-Overview.pdf>.
- 10 Alan Pyke, "Social Safety Net Programs Kept Tens of Millions Out of Poverty," *ThinkProgress*, September 17, 2013, available at <http://thinkprogress.org/economy/2013/09/17/2633881/poverty-data-shows-importance-safety-net-programs-millions/>.
- 11 Carmen DeNavas-Walt, Bernadette D. Proctor, and Jessica C. Smith, "Income, Poverty and Health Insurance Coverage in the United States: 2012" (Washington: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2013), available at <http://www.census.gov/prod/2013pubs/p60-245.pdf>.
- 12 Sister Simone Campbell, "We need work to support anti-poverty measures that work," *Reuters*, September 17, 2013, available at <http://blogs.reuters.com/great-debate/2013/09/17/we-need-to-support-anti-poverty-measures-that-work/>.
- 13 Debarati Guha-Sapir, Philippe Hoyois, and Regina Below, "Annual Disaster Statistical Review 2012: The numbers and trends" (Brussels: Center for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters, 2013), available at <http://reliefweb.int/report/world/annual-disaster-statistical-review-2012-numbers-and-trends>.
- 14 National Weather Service, "Summary of Natural Hazard Statistics for 2012 in the United States" (2013), available at <http://www.nws.noaa.gov/om/hazstats/sum12.pdf>.
- 15 Megan Gannon, "2012 Second Costliest Year for Natural Disasters," *Live Science*, June 13, 2013, available at <http://www.livescience.com/37426-2012-natural-disasters-second-costliest.html>.
- 16 Debarati Guha-Sapir, Philippe Hoyois, and Regina Below, "Annual Disaster Statistical Review 2012."
- 17 U.N. Atlas of the Oceans, "Human Settlements on the Coast," available at <http://www.oceansatlas.org/servlet/CDSServlet?status=ND0xODc3JjY9ZW4mMzM9KiYzNz1rb3M~> (last accessed April 2014).
- 18 International Panel on Climate Change, "Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation" (2012).
- 19 Michael Conathan and Shiva Polefka, "The Top 5 Challenges Facing the New NOAA Administrator," *Center for American Progress*, March 5, 2014, available at <http://www.american-progress.org/issues/green/news/2014/03/06/80920/the-top-5-challenges-facing-the-new-noaa-administrator/>.
- 20 Bureau of Justice Statistics, "Over 60 Percent Decline in Sexual Violence Against Females from 1995 to 2010," Press release, March 7, 2013, available at <http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/press/fvs9410pr.cfm>.
- 21 Michael Planty and others, "Female Victims of Sexual Violence, 1994-2010" (Washington: U.S. Department of Justice, 2013).
- 22 Shannan Catalano, "Intimate Partner Violence, 1993-2010" (Washington: U.S. Department of Justice, 2012).
- 23 Bureau of Justice Statistics, "Intimate Partner Violence Dropped 64 Percent from 1993 to 2010," Press release, November 27, 2012, available at <http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/press/ipv9310pr.cfm>.
- 24 Office of Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending, Registering, and Tracking, "Facts, Myths, and Statistics," available at [http://www.nsopw.gov/\(X\(1\)S\(af4ciy3ne3hynd0tr531rys\)\)/en/Education/FactsMythsStatistics?AspxAutoDetectCookieSupport=1](http://www.nsopw.gov/(X(1)S(af4ciy3ne3hynd0tr531rys))/en/Education/FactsMythsStatistics?AspxAutoDetectCookieSupport=1) (last accessed May 2014).
- 25 UNICEF, "Child marriage," available at [http://www.unicef.org/protection/57929\\_58008.html](http://www.unicef.org/protection/57929_58008.html) (last accessed April 2014).
- 26 Cornell University Law School, "Marriage Laws of the Fifty States, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico," available at [http://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/table\\_marriage](http://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/table_marriage) (last accessed April 2014).
- 27 U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Marital Status: 2012 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates," available at [http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?\\_afpt=table](http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?_afpt=table) (last accessed April 2014).
- 28 Office of Adolescent Health, "Trends in Teen Pregnancy and Childbearing," available at <http://www.hhs.gov/ash/oah/adolescent-health-topics/reproductive-health/teen-pregnancy/trends.html> (last accessed May 2014).
- 29 Center for American Women and Politics, "Women in the U.S. Congress 2014" (2014), available at [http://www.cawp.rutgers.edu/fast\\_facts/levels\\_of\\_office/documents/cong.pdf](http://www.cawp.rutgers.edu/fast_facts/levels_of_office/documents/cong.pdf).
- 30 Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Table A-1. Employment status of the civilian population by sex and age," available at <http://www.bls.gov/news.release/empstat.t01.htm> (last accessed April 2014).
- 31 Bryce Covert, "Number of Women CEOs at Major Companies Jumps by 4 Percent," *ThinkProgress*, July 8, 2013, available at <http://thinkprogress.org/economy/2013/07/08/2266831/number-of-women-ceos-at-major-companies-jumps-by-4-percent/>.
- 32 Sarah Gibbard Cook, "Women Presidents: Now 26.4% but Still Underrepresented," *Women in Higher Education* 21 (5) (2012), available at <http://www.wihe.com/printBlog.jsp?id=36400>.

- 33 The World Bank, "School Enrollment, preprimary (% gross)," available at <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SE.PRE.ENRR/countries/EU-US?display=graph> (last accessed May 2014).
- 34 Hirokazu Yoshikawa and others, "Investing in Our Future: The Evidence Base on Preschool Education" (Ann Arbor, MI: Society for Research in Child Development, 2013), available at <http://fcd-us.org/sites/default/files/Evidence%20Base%20on%20Preschool%20Education%20FINAL.pdf>.
- 35 The White House, "Early Learning," available at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/issues/education/early-childhood> (last accessed May 2014).
- 36 The World Bank, "Primary completion rate, total (% of relevant age group)," available at <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SE.PRM.CMPT.ZS> (last accessed May 2014).
- 37 National Center for Education Statistics, "Fast Facts: Adult Literacy," available at <http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=69> (last accessed April 2014).
- 38 States and territories that have adopted the Common Core State Standards as of May 2014: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming, District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, U.S. Virgin Islands, and Northern Mariana Islands. Common Core Standards Initiative, "Standards in Your State," available at <http://www.corestandards.org/standards-in-your-state/> (last accessed May 2014).
- 39 Kimberly Hefling, "Not Good Enough: Math, Reading Scores Up Slightly," Associated Press, November 7, 2013, available at <http://bigstory.ap.org/article/us-report-card-scores-not-all-news-good>.
- 40 *OECD Skills Outlook 2013: First Results from the Survey of Adult Skills* (OECD Publishing, 2013) [http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/oecd-skills-outlook-2013\\_9789264204256-en](http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/oecd-skills-outlook-2013_9789264204256-en)
- 41 The World Bank, "Mortality rate, under-5 (per 1,000 births)," available at <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SH.DYN.MORT/countries> (last accessed May 2014).
- 42 Ibid.
- 43 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, "National, State, and Local Area Vaccination Coverage Among Children Aged 19-35 Months – United States, 2011," *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 61 (35) (2012), available at [http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/mm6135a1.htm?s\\_cid=mm6135a1\\_e%0D%0A](http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/mm6135a1.htm?s_cid=mm6135a1_e%0D%0A).
- 44 For a good brief discussion of possible parameters around this target, see Maternal Health Task Force, "Setting the post-2015 maternal mortality target globally and for each country: A proposal," available at <http://www.mhtf.org/2014/01/14/setting-the-post-2015-maternal-mortality-target-globally-and-for-each-country-a-proposal/> (last accessed May 2014).
- 45 U.N. Development Programme, "Human Development Report 2013—The Rise of the South: Human Progress in a Diverse World" (2013), available at <http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/human-development-report-2013>.
- 46 World Health Organization, "World Health Statistics 2013" (2013).
- 47 United Nations, "World Contraceptive Use 2010" (2011), available at [http://www.un.org/esa/population/publications/wcu2010/WCP\\_2010/Data.html](http://www.un.org/esa/population/publications/wcu2010/WCP_2010/Data.html).
- 48 Population Institute, "The State of Reproductive Health Rights: 50-State Report Card" (2014), available at <http://www.populationinstitute.org/external/report-card/2013/overview.pdf>.
- 49 Guttmacher Institute, "Fact Sheet: Unintended Pregnancy in the United States" (2013), available at <http://www.guttmacher.org/pubs/FB-Unintended-Pregnancy-US.html>.
- 50 GlobalHealth.gov, "Global Health Topics: Non-Communicable Diseases," available at <http://www.globalhealth.gov/global-health-topics/non-communicable-diseases/> (last accessed May 2014).
- 51 World Health Organization, "WHO maps noncommunicable disease trends in all countries," Press release, September 14, 2011, available at [http://www.who.int/mediacentre/news/releases/2011/NCDs\\_profiles\\_20110914/en/](http://www.who.int/mediacentre/news/releases/2011/NCDs_profiles_20110914/en/).
- 52 Ibid.
- 53 Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, "Health at a Glance 2013: OECD Indicators" (2013).
- 54 World Food Programme, "Hunger Map: United States of America," available at <http://cdn.wfp.org/hungermap/#US> (last accessed May 2014).
- 55 Alisha Coleman-Jensen, Mark Nord, and Anita Singh, "Household Food Security in the United States in 2012" (Washington: U.S. Department of Agriculture, 2013), available at <http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/err-economic-research-report/err155/report-summary.aspx#Uw-ZaPldWSp>.
- 56 World Health Organization, "Poverty and hunger: Children aged <5 years underweight (%): Latest available year," available at [http://gamapservr.who.int/gho/interactive\\_charts/mdg1/atlas.html](http://gamapservr.who.int/gho/interactive_charts/mdg1/atlas.html) (last accessed March 2014).
- 57 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, "Anemia or Iron Deficiency," available at <http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/fastats/anemia.htm> (last accessed May 2014).
- 58 Sherry L. Murphy, Jiaquan Xu, and Kenneth Kochanek, "Deaths: Final Data for 2010," *National Vital Statistics Reports* 61 (4) (2013), available at [http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nvsr/nvsr61/nvsr61\\_04.pdf](http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nvsr/nvsr61/nvsr61_04.pdf).
- 59 FishWatch, "Farmed Seafood: In the U.S.," available at [http://www.fishwatch.gov/farmed\\_seafood/in\\_the\\_us.htm](http://www.fishwatch.gov/farmed_seafood/in_the_us.htm) (last accessed March 2014).
- 60 *Sustainable Fisheries Act*, Public Law 104-297, 104th Cong. (October 11, 1996).
- 61 Brad Sewell, "Bringing Back the Fish: An Evaluation of U.S. Fisheries Rebuilding Under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act" (Washington: Natural Resources Defense Council, 2013), available at <http://www.nrdc.org/oceans/files/rebuilding-fisheries-report.pdf>.
- 62 National Ocean Service, "Overview of Hypoxia and Nutrient Pollution," available at <http://www.cop.noaa.gov/stressors/pollution/> (last accessed March 2014).
- 63 National Centers for Coastal Ocean Science, "2013 Gulf of Mexico Dead Zone Size Above Average But Not Largest," Press release, August 9, 2013, available at <http://coastalscience.noaa.gov/news/coastal-pollution/2013-gulf-of-mexico-dead-zone-size-above-average-but-not-largest/>.
- 64 *Harmful Algal Bloom and Hypoxia Research and Control Amendments Act of 2013*, S. 1254, 113th Cong. 2 sess. (Government Printing Office, 2014), available at <http://beta.congress.gov/bill/113th-congress/senate-bill/1254/actions>.
- 65 Mississippi River Gulf of Mexico Watershed Nutrient Task Force, "Reassessment 2013: Assessing Progress Made Since 2008" (2013).
- 66 Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, "Food waste footprint: Impacts on resources" (2013), available at <http://www.fao.org/docrep/018/i3347e/i3347e.pdf>.
- 67 Ibid.
- 68 U.N. Environment Programme, "Food Waste Facts" available at <http://www.unep.org/wed/2013/quickfacts/> (last accessed May 2014).



- 69 Dana Gunders, "Wasted: How America is Losing up to 40 Percent of its Food from Farm to Fork to Landfill" (Washington: Natural Resources Defense Council, 2012), available at <http://www.nrdc.org/food/files/wasted-food-IP.pdf>.
- 70 Serri Graslie, "Willing to Play the Dating Game with Your Food? Try a Grocery Auction," NPR, August 23, 2012, available at <http://www.npr.org/blogs/the-salt/2012/08/23/159601015/willing-to-play-the-dating-game-with-your-food-try-a-grocery-auction>.
- 71 Tom Quested, Robert Ingle, and Andrew Parry, "Final Report: Household Food and Drink Waste in the United Kingdom 2012" (Waste & Resources Action Programme, 2013).
- 72 U.S. Department of Agriculture, "USDA and EPA Launch U.S. Food Waste Challenge," Press release, June 4, 2013, available at <http://www.usda.gov/wps/portal/usda/usdahome?contentid=2013/06/0112.xml&contentidonly=true>.
- 73 Thomas C. Brown, Romano Foti, and Jorge A. Ramirez, "Projected freshwater withdrawals in the United States under a changing climate," *Water Resources Research* 49 (3) (2013), available at <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/wrcr.20076/abstract>.
- 74 U.N. Environment Programme, "Sick Water? The Central Role of Wastewater Management in Sustainable Development" (2010), available at [http://www.unep.org/pdf/SickWater\\_screen.pdf](http://www.unep.org/pdf/SickWater_screen.pdf).
- 75 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, "Basic Information about Water Security: Wastewater," available at <http://water.epa.gov/infrastructure/watersecurity/basicinformation.cfm#ww> (last accessed May 2014).
- 76 Environmental Protection Agency, "Secondary Treatment Standards," available at <http://cfpub.epa.gov/npdes/tech-basedpermitting/sectreat.cfm> (last accessed April 2014).
- 77 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, "Primer for Municipal Wastewater Treatment Systems" (2004), available at [http://water.epa.gov/aboutow/owm/upload/2005\\_08\\_19\\_primer.pdf](http://water.epa.gov/aboutow/owm/upload/2005_08_19_primer.pdf).
- 78 International Energy Agency, "Renewables to surpass gas by 2016 in global power mix," Press release, June 26, 2013, available at <http://www.iea.org/newsroomandevents/press-releases/2013/june/name,39156,en.html>.
- 79 U.S. Energy Information Administration, "Frequently Asked Questions: How much U.S. energy consumption and electricity generation comes from renewable sources?," available at <http://www.eia.gov/tools/faqs/faq.cfm?id=92&t=4> (last accessed May 2014).
- 80 The White House, "Blueprint for a Secure Energy Future" (2011), available at [http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/blueprint\\_secure\\_energy\\_future.pdf](http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/blueprint_secure_energy_future.pdf).
- 81 U.S. Department of Energy, "Buildings Energy Data Book" (2011), available at <http://buildingsdatabook.eren.doe.gov/ChapterIntro1.aspx>.
- 82 Ibid.
- 83 U.S. Department of Energy, "Efficiency: Buildings," available at <http://energy.gov/eere/efficiency/buildings> (last accessed May 2014).
- 84 U.S. Green Building Council, "Infographic: LEED in the World," May 3, 2013, available at <http://www.usgbc.org/articles/infographic-leed-world>.
- 85 Ibid.
- 86 The White House, "FACT SHEET: President Obama's Climate Action Plan," Press release, June 25, 2013, available at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2013/06/25/fact-sheet-president-obama-s-climate-action-plan>.
- 87 The White House, "Blueprint for a Secure Energy Future."
- 88 U.S. Department of Energy, "Top 10 Things You Didn't Know About Combined Heat and Power," October 21, 2013, available at <http://energy.gov/articles/top-10-things-you-didn-t-know-about-combined-heat-and-power>.
- 89 G20, "Pittsburgh G20 Leaders Declaration," available at [https://www.g20.org/sites/default/files/g20\\_resources/library/Pittsburgh\\_Declaration\\_0.pdf#page=3](https://www.g20.org/sites/default/files/g20_resources/library/Pittsburgh_Declaration_0.pdf#page=3) (last accessed May 2014).
- 90 The White House, "President Barack Obama's State of the Union Address," Press release, January 28, 2014, available at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2014/01/28/president-barack-obamas-state-union-address>.
- 91 International Monetary Fund, "Energy Subsidy Reform: Lessons and Implications" (2013), available at <http://www.imf.org/external/np/pp/eng/2013/012813.pdf>.
- 92 International Labour Organization, "Jobs and livelihoods at the heart of the post-2015 development agenda," November 16, 2012, available at [http://ilo.org/global/topics/post-2015/documents/WCMS\\_193483/lang--en/index.htm](http://ilo.org/global/topics/post-2015/documents/WCMS_193483/lang--en/index.htm).
- 93 International Labour Organization, "Report of the Director-General: Decent Work" (1999), available at <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/standards/relm/ilc/ilc87/rep-i.htm>.
- 94 Per the OECD, the international standard for "decent wage" is calculated as two-thirds the median hourly wage; the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics reported in April 2014 that the median hourly wage for all occupations is \$16.87 as of May 2013 (most recent data). Data available at U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, "May 2013 National Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates," available at [http://www.bls.gov/OES/current/oes\\_nat.htm](http://www.bls.gov/OES/current/oes_nat.htm) (last accessed May 2014).
- 95 Adriene Hill, "\$10.10: Just a nice even number?," Marketplace, January 28, 2014, available at <http://www.marketplace.org/topics/economy/1010-just-nice-even-number>.
- 96 Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Characteristics of Minimum Wage Workers: 2012" (2013), available at <http://www.bls.gov/cps/minwage2012.htm>.
- 97 Bureau of Labor Statistics, *BLS Reports: Characteristics of Minimum Wage Workers, 2013* (U.S. Department of Labor, 2014).
- 98 International Monetary Fund, "Sound Policy Design: the Efficient Way to Cut Inequality," March 13, 2014, available at <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/survey/so/2014/POL031314A.htm>.
- 99 National Student Clearinghouse Research Center, "Term Enrollment Estimates: Fall 2013" (2013), available at <http://nscresearchcenter.org/wp-content/uploads/CurrentTermEnrollment-Fall2013.pdf>.
- 100 Ben Olinsky, "6 Policies to Combat Inequality," Center for American Progress, January 28, 2014, available at <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/economy/news/2014/01/28/82929/6-policies-to-combat-inequality/>.
- 101 Ibid.
- 102 Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, "Percentage of young people in education, in employment and not in Education, Employment or Training (NEETs) by sex and age group," available at <http://www.oecd.org/gender/data/percentageofyoungpeopleineducationinemploymentandnotineducationemploymentortrainingneets-bysexandagegroup.htm> (last accessed May 2014).
- 103 Joe Valenti and Deirdre Heiss, "Financial Access in a Brave New Banking World" (Washington: Center for American Progress, 2013), available at <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/economy/report/2013/10/16/77016/financial-access-in-a-brave-new-banking-world/>.
- 104 Center For Neighborhood Technology, "National Index Reveals Combined Housing and Transportation Affordability Has Declined Since 2000," Press release, February 28, 2012, available at <http://www.cnt.org/2012/02/28/national-index-reveals-combined-housing-and-transportation-affordability-has-declined-since-2000/>.
- 105 U.S. Department of the Treasury and the Council of Economic Advisers, "A New Economic Analysis of Infrastructure Investment" (2012), available at <http://www.treasury.gov/resource-center/economic-policy/documents/20120323infrastructurereport.pdf>.

- 106 Edward Wyatt, "Most of U.S. is Wired, but Millions Aren't Plugged In," *The New York Times*, August 18, 2013, available at [http://www.nytimes.com/2013/08/19/technology/a-push-to-connect-millions-who-live-offline-to-the-internet.html?\\_r=1&](http://www.nytimes.com/2013/08/19/technology/a-push-to-connect-millions-who-live-offline-to-the-internet.html?_r=1&).
- 107 Lee Rainie, "Cell phone ownership hits 91% of adults," Pew Research Center, June 6, 2013, available at <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2013/06/06/cell-phone-ownership-hits-91-of-adults/>.
- 108 Doing Business, "Economy Rankings," available at <http://www.doingbusiness.org/rankings> (last accessed May 2014).
- 109 The World Bank, "Trade Workshop: The Fragmentation of Global Production and Trade in Value-Added – Developing New Measures of Cross Border Trade," available at <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/TRADE/0,,contentMDK:22894003~menuPK:2644066~pagePK:64020865~piPK:51164185~theSitePK:239071,00.html> (last accessed May 2014).
- 110 Nicholas Z. Muller, Robert Mendelsohn, and William Nordhaus, "Environmental Accounting for Pollution in the United States Economy," *American Economic Review* 101 (2011), available at [http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rc=tj&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CgQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.researchgate.net%2Fpublication%2F227357208\\_Environmental\\_Accounting\\_for\\_Pollution\\_in\\_the\\_United\\_States\\_Economy%2Ffile%2F9cfd50d0a6f67303f.pdf&ei=acNWU\\_TfBeLLsQSn4G4Aw&usq=AFQjCNGGUXPuuEQVKMWv1CYwB-Lvhj4KJQ&bvm=bv.65177938,d.cWc](http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rc=tj&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CgQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.researchgate.net%2Fpublication%2F227357208_Environmental_Accounting_for_Pollution_in_the_United_States_Economy%2Ffile%2F9cfd50d0a6f67303f.pdf&ei=acNWU_TfBeLLsQSn4G4Aw&usq=AFQjCNGGUXPuuEQVKMWv1CYwB-Lvhj4KJQ&bvm=bv.65177938,d.cWc).
- 111 See Muller, Mendelsohn, and Nordhaus, "Environmental Accounting for Pollution in the United States Economy," and U.N. Statistics Division, "System of Environmental-Economic Accounting (SEEA)," available at <https://unstats.un.org/unsd/envaccounting/seea.asp> (last accessed May 2014).
- 112 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, "Summary of Listed Species Listed Populations and Recovery Plans [as of May 5, 2014]," available at [http://ecos.fws.gov/tess\\_public/pub/boxScore.jsp](http://ecos.fws.gov/tess_public/pub/boxScore.jsp) (last accessed May 2014).
- 113 Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, "Global Forest Resources Assessment 2010" (2010), available at <http://www.fao.org/forestry/fra/fra2010/en/>.
- 114 U.N. Convention to Combat Desertification, "About the Convention," available at <http://www.unccd.int/en/about-the-convention/Pages/About-the-Convention.aspx> (last accessed May 2014).
- 115 Susan S. Lang, "'Slow, insidious' soil erosion threatens human health and welfare as well as the environment, Cornell study asserts," *Cornell Chronicle*, March 20, 2006, available at <http://www.news.cornell.edu/stories/2006/03/slow-insidious-soil-erosion-threatens-human-health-and-welfare>.
- 116 World Economic Forum, "What If the World's Soil Runs Out?," *TIME*, December 14, 2012, available at <http://world.time.com/2012/12/14/what-if-the-worlds-soil-runs-out/>.
- 117 The Economist Intelligence Unit, "Democracy index 2012: Democracy at a standstill" (2013), available at [https://portoncv.gov.cv/dhub/porton\\_por\\_global.open\\_file?p\\_doc\\_id=1034](https://portoncv.gov.cv/dhub/porton_por_global.open_file?p_doc_id=1034).
- 118 The Open Government Partnership, "National Action Plan for the United States of America" (2011), available at [http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/us\\_national\\_action\\_plan\\_final\\_2.pdf](http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/us_national_action_plan_final_2.pdf).
- 119 Ibid.
- 120 The World Bank, "Worldwide Governance Indicators: Interactive Data Access," available at <http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/index.aspx#reports> (last accessed March 2014).
- 121 Transparency International, "Corruption Perceptions Index 2013," available at <http://cpi.transparency.org/cpi2013/results/> (last accessed May 2014).
- 122 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, "National Violent Death Reporting System (NVDRS)" (2010), available at [http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/nvdrs\\_fact-sheet-a.pdf](http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/nvdrs_fact-sheet-a.pdf).
- 123 American Academy of Pediatrics, "Prevalence of Household Gun Ownership Linked to Child Gun Shot Wounds," Press release, October 27, 2013, available at <http://www.aap.org/en-us/about-the-aap/aap-press-room/Pages/Prevalence-of-Household-Gun-Ownership-Linked-to-Child-Gun-Shot-Wounds.aspx>.
- 124 Richard F. Grimmett and Paul K. Kerr, "Conventional Arms Transfers to Developing Nations, 2004-2001" (Washington: Congressional Research Service, 2012), available at <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/weapons/R42678.pdf>.
- 125 U.S. Customs and Border Protection, "Generalized System of Preferences (GSP)," available at [https://help.cbp.gov/app/answers/detail/a\\_id/266/~generalized-system-of-preferences-%28gsp%29](https://help.cbp.gov/app/answers/detail/a_id/266/~/generalized-system-of-preferences-%28gsp%29) (last accessed May 2014).
- 126 See discussion at Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, "Generalized System of Preferences (GSP)," available at <http://www.ustr.gov/trade-topics/trade-development/preference-programs/generalized-system-preference-gsp> (last accessed March 2014).
- 127 Environmental Working Group, "Total USDA Subsidies in United States, 2012," available at [http://farm.ewg.org/top\\_recips.php?fips=00000&progcode=total&yr=2012&regionname=theUnitedStates](http://farm.ewg.org/top_recips.php?fips=00000&progcode=total&yr=2012&regionname=theUnitedStates) (last accessed May 2014).
- 128 Ron Nixon, "House Approves Farm Bill, Ending a 2-Year Impasse," *The New York Times*, January 29, 2014, available at [http://www.nytimes.com/2014/01/30/us/politics/house-approves-farm-bill-ending-2-year-impasse.html?\\_r=2&gwh=B5882D0434ADF7A3232F9399C81737F0&gwt=pay](http://www.nytimes.com/2014/01/30/us/politics/house-approves-farm-bill-ending-2-year-impasse.html?_r=2&gwh=B5882D0434ADF7A3232F9399C81737F0&gwt=pay).
- 129 Group of Eight, "Responsible Leadership for a Sustainable Future" (2009), available at [http://www.g8italia2009.it/static/G8\\_Allegato/G8\\_Declaration\\_08\\_07\\_09\\_final\\_0.pdf#page=49](http://www.g8italia2009.it/static/G8_Allegato/G8_Declaration_08_07_09_final_0.pdf#page=49).
- 130 Natalie Kitroeff, "Immigrants Pay Lower Fees to Send Money Home, Helping to Ease Poverty," *The New York Times*, April 27, 2013, available at [http://www.nytimes.com/2013/04/28/us/politics/immigrants-find-it-cheaper-to-send-money-home.html?pagewanted=all&\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2013/04/28/us/politics/immigrants-find-it-cheaper-to-send-money-home.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0).
- 131 The World Bank, "Remittance Prices Worldwide: An Analysis of Trends in the Average Total Cost of Migrant Remittance Services" (2013), available at [https://remittanceprices.worldbank.org/sites/default/files/RPW\\_Report\\_Dec2013.pdf](https://remittanceprices.worldbank.org/sites/default/files/RPW_Report_Dec2013.pdf).
- 132 Executive Office of the President, "The President's Climate Action Plan" (2013), available at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/image/president27climateaction-plan.pdf>.
- 133 U.S. Department of State, "International Financial and Technical Cooperation for Development: Key Developments Since Monterrey," April 15, 2008, available at <http://2001-2009.state.gov/e/eeb/rls/othr/2008/106391.htm>.
- 134 Carol Adelman and others, "Index of Global Philanthropy and Remittances 2013: With a Special Report on Emerging Economies" (Washington: Hudson Institute, 2013), available at <http://www.hudson.org/research/9914-2013-index-of-global-philanthropy-and-remittances-with-a-special-report-on-emerging-economies>.
- 135 Ibid.
- 136 Akinyi Ochieng, "Tackling Tax Havens," Center for American Progress, July 31, 2013, available at <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/security/news/2013/07/31/70955/tackling-tax-havens/>.
- 137 United Nations, "A New Global Partnership."