Presented at the UNDP Workshop on

Potential and Challenges in
Human Development Reporting

Operationalising Regional and National HDRs in Policies and Programmes

TAKING STOCK OF THE HDR EXPERIENCE: POTENTIAL, LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Anuradha K. Rajivan

Colombo, September 24-26, 2003

TAKING STOCK OF THE HDR EXPERIENCE: POTENTIAL, LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Anuradha K. Rajivan[1]

I. Introduction

Human Development Reports, the HDRs, seem to have come to stay as accepted advocacy documents in the international development arena. This paper aims to take stock of the HDR experience of the last fourteen years. Both, the potential and limitations of the HDRs are examined and possible future directions explored. Starting with examining the concept of human development and difficulties in operationalising it, issues of mapping and measurement are discussed. This is followed by examining the range of human development reports – global, regional, national and sub-national – with their corresponding strengths and limitations. A brief examination of the Millennium Development Goals, the MDGs, is also attempted as part of this stock taking to explore the extent to which the MDG reports complement or compete with the Human Development reports. A comparison of the HDRs with the MDGRs follows, leading to identifying their comparative advantages and, therefore, respective niches, in order to minimize overlap. Finally, a case is made for assessing impact of the HDRs as advocacy documents.

II. On the Concept of Human Development

The philosophical basis for human development draws inspiration from ideas of a human centered approach. The importance of people has been recognized from as far back as Aristotle, going on to Adam Smith, and even Arthur Lewis, to the extent he emphasized the importance of economic growth because it expanded choices. This was lost sight of in development writing in the 1960s and 1970s, only to be revived by Amartya Sen in the 1980s. The human development concept brings together observations and experiences from around the world leading to a common understanding that places human beings at the center of development concerns, in contrast with the primary pursuit of economic ends.

The well-being and capabilities of human beings leading to expansion of choices, creating an enabling environment for people to lead long, healthy and creative lives captures the essence of the idea of human development (HDR 1990). The concept has evolved over the years with UNDP contributing to this evolution through the Human Development Reports which have triggered debate and facilitated the dissemination and sharpening of the concept. At a very

fundamental level, three basic human choices relate to a long and healthy life, to be educated and to enjoy a decent standard of living. Additional choices include participation, human security, political freedom, guaranteed human rights and self-respect (HDR, 1990). Human development is both a process and an outcome.

UNDP's approach to HD goes beyond the ideas of neo-liberalism rooted in an emphasis on freedom of choice, to the need to strengthen human capabilities if choices are to be realistically exercised. Wolfgang Sachs has argued in his statement at the 'Globalization and Development' Conference of the Development and Peace Foundation in 1997, that UNDP's approach has broken the long dominant primacy of economics in development, by bringing in the primacy of politics, thus giving the state a stronger role as compared with markets.

It has challenged the neoclassical approach along with the traditional theories of economic development which focus on growth in incomes. Discourse in traditional development economics and development policy tends to revolve around policy gaps in the context of economic growth. This tends to ignore policy gaps for human development in other areas which have far weaker links with growth like inadequate human security, absence of political freedom, violation of human rights, etc. If exploration of policy gaps is limited to economic growth, it gives growth an unduly unique status – as the only way to achieve human development. This is in direct contrast with the human development approach where policy gaps in other than growth areas are equally critical.

Human development is development of the people, for the people and by the people (Jahan, Selim, 2002). The concept has a seductive appeal, deep foundations and clear linkages with Amartya Sen's work (Sen, 1989, 1999) on 'functionings' and 'capabilities'. As it is commonly understood today, human development is the process of enlarging people's choices to have a meaningful and creative life with human dignity. In sum, HD is multi-disciplinary rather than just economic, focuses on people, not markets and incomes. Incomes, while no doubt important, are treated as a means to human development rather than ends in themselves.

Yet, its operationalisation can be problematic. Being rather broad, one way to operationalise has been to identify critical dimensions of human development. Four dimensions have been identified in the Global HDR 1995:

- Sustainability
- Equity
- Empowerment
- Productivity

Arranged in this order, this is S-E-E-P, indicating the importance of benefits *seeping* down to the worst off. These dimensions, though undoubtedly narrower than the concept of human development, are much better understood than 'enlarging people's choices'. Specific policies can be assessed with respect to sustainability, equity, empowerment and productivity.

Nevertheless, considerable definitional problems remain which inhibit operationalisation. Even though we have had human development reporting in place for fourteen years, or perhaps because of that, definitions, strategies and policies have proliferated. As Richard Jolly points out (2003), political leaders and policy makers have used the phrase casually as many have found the idea of human development attractive since it 'puts people at the centre'. For example, one sub-national HDR in India prompted the government to announce through newspaper advertisements that it aimed to achieve the highest human development index in Asia[2]. Some economists have picked up on human resource development through investments in education and health, confusing it with human development[3]. UNDP itself has made no attempt to standardize interpretations in the preparation of national, regional and sub-national HDRs, contributing to a variety of approaches[4]. Moreover, the term itself is used differently in different disciplines. The medical profession has been using human development to mean the physical and cognitive development of a person from infancy to adulthood.

Due to the proliferation of definitions and usage, the term has tended to be used rather loosely. A consequent criticism of the HDRs has been a casualness in analysis and reliance on relatively weak data, in contrast with the economic development approach which relies on better quality data and easier to measure variables. This brings us directly to a discussion on measurement issues.

III. Issues in Human Development Mapping and Measurement: the Human Development Reports

Systematic measurement of specific aspects of human development started through the Human Development Reports (HDRs). Since the publication of the first global Human Development Report in 1990, HDRs have turned into a near-movement for the mapping, measurement and reporting on human development. There is a clear distinction between the **concept** of HD and its **measurement.** Measuring dimensions of human development using specific indictors and

---

[2] Government of Maharashtra made this a budget announcement for the fiscal year 2003-04. Financial Express, May 1, 2003.

[3] For example the World Bank's unit dealing with education and health is the Human Development Unit, though it is aimed more at human resource development.

[4] This may be due to a highly decentralized approach followed in human development reporting, the difficulties of managing the enormous task of harmonization of definitions and limitation of resources.

aggregating selected indicators to create summary indices is in the realm of mapping and measurement of HD.

Operationalisation of HD as a concept through indicators and indices has had three advantages:

- Of specificity, providing an opportunity to evaluate evidence for or against an argument, say, for support to primary education
- Of being able to set goals and targets with mechanisms to move towards the targets
- Of monitoring progress towards the achievement of the goals and targets.

Of course, there are disadvantages of specificity too. It narrows down an inherently broad concept. The concept is obviously wider than what is measured or even measurable, just as the concept of a nation's economic status is wider than summary measures of GDP.

Human development as such cannot be directly measured. Operationalisation of the concept of human development takes place through measurement of that which can be observed and measured.

Measurement is necessarily constrained by data limitations. Practical challenges and constraints relating to data have been discussed in greater detail in a companion paper (Seeta Prabhu, K., 2003). As the number of reports have proliferated (Annexes 1, 2,3 and 4) there has been an increasing demand for data on an ever-widening set of indicators[5]. Types of data users have proliferated with new demands from members of civil society and elected representatives at sub-national levels, requiring more user-friendly presentation.

Official statistical systems are not geared to providing these data on a regular basis. Traditionally they have concentrated on date collection relating to economic indicators, demographic data, crime records, i.e., fulfilling traditional data requirements. Human development reporting has made demands for thematic data on new and ever widening subjects. This problem is further complicated by not standardizing definitions through systematic consultations with the official statistical systems. Criticising official statistical systems has become common. Moreover, urgency in demands for data has increased putting even more pressure on official statistical systems without supporting them with technical and financial resources. The fault lies not with the statistical systems as much as the lack of systematic engagement with them and absence of support for coping with the ever widening data needs.

---

[5] For example, gender disaggregated data, below national level data, data on under-height and underweight children including disaggregation by sex, rural-urban disaggregation, process data for monitoring like immunization coverage, school enrolments and retention by levels, access to protected drinking water, etc.

Other limitations arise from data imperfections due to questions on accuracy, timeliness, comparability across nations or sub-national units, comparability over time due to definitional changes, and variations in the strength and reach of statistical systems across countries.

Measurement limitations also arise from inherent difficulties in quantifying important aspects of human development like peace, conflict and security, cultural choices, political freedoms[6], civil rights, environment quality, etc. On environment there is no clear agreement on what should be identified as desirable outcomes. Consequently, though important, difficult to measure aspects of human development tend to get left out.

There has been considerable methodological debate and discussion on the human development indices (the four main ones are HDI, GDI, GEM, HPI[7]) which have evolved over time. There are statistical problems in aggregating stock and flow variables, outcome and process variables. For example, in the HDI the stock variables of adult literacy and life expectancy are combined with the flow variable of annual per capita income and gross enrolment ratio for a year. In respect of the HPI there is a combination of outcome and process indicators – percentage of children under five who are underweight with percentage of population not using safe drinking water. The intercorrelation between the two cannot be ignored either. Similarly, life expectancy at birth is correlated with income so if income is included, rather than life expectancy at birth, it should be the IMR that is used. However, while this may work for developing countries, IMR does not adequately segregate developed countries. Furthermore, adult literacy and life expectancy are current outcomes of past effort, hence they do not necessarily reflect the current status alone (Raworth and Stewart, 2003). There are problems in directly comparing GDP and HDI rankings as one is a flow variable and the other a stock-flow combination. Alternate indicators could be used for the same goal provoking disagreements about what is best suitable for a country, region or cultures.

Human development is slowly but surely entering into the development curriculum of schools and universities. It is also translating into training modules not just for academic work, but also for practitioners, policy makers, and other stakeholders. Some examples are:

- The Human Development Report Office, in collaboration with the University of Oxford, has developed a short course on theory, concepts and practical applications of the Human Development approach and framework

---

[6] An attempt was made in the Global HDR 1992 to compose a Political Freedom Index.

[7] HDI – Human development Index; GDI – Gender Development Index; GEM – Gender Empowerment Measure; HPI – Human Poverty Index.

- The Los Andes University has an inter-disciplinary distance learning course on human development in Spanish

- A toolkit for those starting work on the production of HDRs is in the pipeline at HDRO which includes issues of the process and advocacy as well

- In India a one-day orientation module and a week-long training module for government officials is ready. The training of trainers is also planned

- In Nepal the HDR has entered into the curriculum of Master's courses in economics and sociology. The trade union movement has also been using it as a learning resource in the training courses organized for trade union members

These developments are expected to sharpen and enrich the debate on concepts, mapping and measurement. If combined with a formal engagement with the official statistical systems, many of the problems could begin to be addressed.

In spite of the variety and number of issues raised, the idea of measuring *human* development, going beyond the traditional *economic* development is a very important one. It has also influenced other mainstream reports like the World Development Report where there is now more attention to social indicators. Because of the simplicity of the HDI its advocacy potential is high through its ability to confront the other single most widely used aggregate, the GDP per capita. It has been accepted as a summary measure of the development situation of people in a politico-geographic situation: region, country, sub-national.

IV. Range of Human Development Reports: Potential and Limitations

4.0 Human Development Reports have grown to spread over four broad coverage ranges: global, regional, national and sub-national. This indicates the validation of an understanding that there is an underlying commonality of what is of value to human beings, regardless of where they come from or live. Both general and theme based reports are produced. As the number of HDRs have grown, a question doing the rounds has been whether such reports should continue to be produced. The conclusion is that each type of HDR has its own specific niche and potential, yet it is necessary to examine objectively the limitations and challenges faced as well without which their relevance may be seriously diluted.

4.1 Global HDRs

At the global level 14 HDRs have been published, without missing a single year. Starting in 1990 with the concept and measurement of human development, global reports have taken up a wide range of themes like people's participation, gender, consumption, human rights, etc. A summary may be seen in Annexe 1.

Global HDRs can be powerful tools for exploring alternative viewpoints on critical development issues. Cross-country analysis has been found to be of enormous interest to individual nations and donor agencies. Their potential, of course, is directly related to their credibility. The more credible they are, the greater is the extent to which they can inspire a growing movement in every region to commit itself to the human development approach.

Limitations of global reports arise due to near absent national ownership, limited follow up at country levels and the relatively lower potential for influencing national policies as compared with national reports.

4.2 Regional HDRs

Nesting between the G-HDRs and the national HDRs are the multi-country Regional HDRs for identified geographic regions. R-HDRs are intended to address issues that cut across national boundaries in a specific region. They provide opportunities to policy makers, advocacy groups and civil society to take up *supra national* issues based on well researched information. In the context of increasing globalization, one criticism of the HDRs (Sachs, W., 1997) was their excessive focus on the nation-state with HDRs trapped within a nation-state perspective, unable to grasp trans-national realities like the flow of goods, knowledge and people across countries. *R-HDRs occupy the niche that allows HDRs to break out of this.* The effect of trade across national boundaries, including the movement of natural persons[8], has considerable effects on human development – positive as well as negative. How can governments and other stakeholders facilitate the enhancement of the positive effects and minimize the negatives is the subject of a forthcoming Asia-Pacific HDR. Similarly, regional co-operation issues can be the subject of an R-HDR. As the global consumer class widens the divide between the haves and have-nots, rapidly converting natural resources into items of ever increasing consumption, natural resource related issues could also be a subject of interest. Sensitive issues that cannot easily be addressed at the national level can be taken up at the regional level. For example, human rights, HIV/AIDS, corruption and governance, etc., are easier handled at the regional level. They can help focus attention on emerging multi-country issues.

In all 22 regional reports have been published so far. Summary data on regional HDRs and their themes may be seen in Annexe 2. The first R-HDR was in 1994, a general report for the Pacific. West Africa was next with a report on poverty and

---

[8] Natural persons are human beings as against juridical persons. A registered trust, society or company is a juridical person. Persons, whether natural or juridical, can sue and be sued.

human development in 1995. The late 1990s saw a spurt in regional HDRs on a varied set of issues. The regions of Eastern Europe and South Asia have been specially prolific and regular in publishing R-HDRs with six and seven R-HDRs respectively over the 1995 to 2003 period. Other regions have had just one or two reports.

Regional HDRs, being closer to country levels than the global HDRs, have a greater ownership potential within a region, they can help in setting standards, consolidating knowledge and creating wider consensus around an issue of cross-border interest. International agencies can use this information to target financial support. Regional HDRs can also leverage policy and work with national HDRs.

The process of preparation of R-HDRs (as of other HDRs) itself has enormous advocacy and dissemination potential. As it requires the participation of experts, UN agencies, research organizations, discussions with governments and civil society from various countries in the region, it provides a forum and a set of tools to explore transnational issues that affect human development, enriching transnational learning, experience sharing and co-operation to address issues that cut across national borders. Thus, the multi-country participatory process of producing regional reports can be used to improve regional and national capacities for cross-country analysis, promote networking for exchange of information, best practices and expertise, and build partnerships for promoting regional co-operation and influencing change.

One limitation of multi country R-HDRs is the lesser potential for national ownership, in contrast with national HDRs (and the sub-national ones). The latter can and are generally prepared in partnership with or directly by national governments (or state governments). Consequently, the potential for building direct linkages with national policies and programmes is inherently weaker. However, such linkages can be brought in indirectly through specific policy briefs. The limitation can also be overcome to some extent by R-HDRs providing inputs relevant for N-HDRs and vice versa. To the extent R-HDR and N-HDR linkages are forged and policy briefs are informed by the HDRs, the problem could be minimized.

Two, assessing impacts of Regional HDRs is harder than that of N-HDRs. What could be the expected impact itself is less clear, especially in the short run.

4.3 National and Sub-national

National reports can be used as a tool for national policy debates that place human development at the forefront of the political agenda. A useful strategy has been to produce theme based N-HDRs, at least after a first general report. They have been used as a tool for policies to better reflect people's priorities, identification of gaps, engaging national partners, identification of inequities by region, gender, rural-urban, ethnic groups, etc., and measuring progress.

Over 135 countries have produced more than 420 N-HDRs during the 12 year period, 1992 to 2003 (Annexe 3). Of these about 100 are general HDRs, 300 thematic and few are a combination of both. The first N-HDR was produced in 1992 in Bangladesh on *Local Action Under National Constraints*. Bulgaria and Costa Rica have produced 8 N-HDRs each, the largest numbers for a country.

Four countries have produced sub national HDRs as well. Of the 17 in this category (Annexe 4), the lion's share goes to India with 9 of the 17. Larger countries like India where states are federal constituents of the nation with their own elected assemblies, a proliferation of sub-national HDRs at the state level indicate the heightened and sustained interest even at this level for addressing human development issues. The presence of the Human Development Resource Center in India has contributed to the large number of sub-national reports.

There is also a beginning being made of HDRs being built up from below – through a process of consolidation of village level reports. Two interesting experiments may be seen in India: one, in Chattisgarh where around 17,000 village reports (each called a *Jan Rapat* in the local language) were used to build a district and then the state level report which is currently in the finalization stage and, two, in Kerala where this bottom-up approach is being attempted on an experimental basis in two blocks[9].

As the numbers of the national and sub-national reports being produced grows, it is natural to expect questions on quality. Given the diversity of local situations in countries there is bound to be a variety of processes, types of reports, with concomitant quality variations. It would be useful to do an assessment of their quality so that their advocacy potential does not get diluted over the years. While there is no reason to curb diversity and innovations in the process, production and applications of the national and sub-national HDRs, it is useful to consider setting minimum standards before a document is called a human development report.

Towards this end, the Human Development Report Office (HDRO) of the UNDP, New York, has been working on a very useful toolkit enriched by wide consultations for guiding the work. The toolkit contains six broad principles (Box 1) to promote excellence, most of which are applicable for regional HDRs as well (http://hdr.undp.org/nhdr/toolkit/default.cfm)

---

[9] Blocks Aryad and Kanjikuzhy in the district of Alappuzha.

Ownership can be very strong in national and sub-national reports, especially when the government is directly or closely involved. This is their biggest advantage, especially when it comes to influencing development policy, strategy and corresponding budgeting. As seen in section I, a state government in India historically known for its growth orientation, actually announced that its official budget "…is not just a game of numbers…it is for human development" (Financial Express, May 1, 2003). Even though this may be a political statement, the pro human

development position taken publicly can provide a useful opening for future accountability and genuine budgetary commitments.

On the other hand, ownership and independence may be seen as incompatible principles. The HDRO recognizes this contradiction. One solution suggested is the incremental approach – trying to walk the tight rope of objectivity without directly taking on official positions. This is easier said than done. Here is where multi-country regional reports are inherently stronger, even though they are weaker on ownership.

V. HDRs and MDGRs: Complementarity or Duplication?

In recent years another type of report, the MDGR, has also started to gain visibility. After the 2000 New York Millennium Summit, the eight MDGs are now considered accepted tools to monitor development across countries (Annexe 5). Since then 28 countries have already published MDG Reports (Annexe 6). In the Asia-Pacific region Cambodia was the first to come out with its MDG Report in 2001. In all five countries in the Asia and the Pacific have produced MDGRs.[10]

Now, like the HDRs, the MDGRs are also supposed to be advocacy documents. Before we look at the issues regarding complementarity versus duplication, there are two issues regarding the MDGs worth noting.

One, under the eight millennium goals are eighteen specific targets of which many are relative in nature. For example,

- halve the proportion of people whose income is less than a dollar a day

---

[10] Bhutan (2002), Cambodia (2001), Nepal (2002), Philippines (2003) and Vietnam (2002).

- halve the proportion of people who suffer from hunger
- reduce by two-thirds the under five mortality rate
- reduce by three quarters the maternal mortality ratio
- halve the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water

Since different countries have different base year levels[11], the goals are actually different for each country. This does not quite synchronise with the idea of human development – where all human beings regardless of politico-geographic location are viewed as eligible for the same standards and choices.

Two, the extent of difficulty in meeting the targets will vary, among other factors, with the start levels in the base year.

We now examine the complementarity versus duplication issue. Apart from the fact that both types of reports are used as advocacy tools for improved human development, some HDRs are themselves about the MDGs, adding to the potential confusion about their respective roles. For example, the Bosnia-Herzegovina NHDR 2003, Zambia NHDR 2003, and the Global HDR 2003 are on the MDGs. There have been many questions raised about what the two types of reports are expected to achieve. Some of the common issues raised are:

- Both have similar messages, so why have both?
- Both are for advocacy and raising public awareness, is this not superfluous?
- Both share an overlapping audience
- HDRs have statistical data and annexes reflecting pretty much the MDGs
- Don't too many similar reports create 'report fatigue'?
- Is this duplication of effort not a waste of resources?

It is important to address these concerns directly. A very useful way to think of the roles and relationship between the MDGRs and HDRs is that between Marx's *Communist Manifesto* and *Das Kapital* (Martim Maya, 2003). While closely linked, with common overall ends, they are quite distinct and aim to serve related but different purposes and are aimed at overlapping but also different audiences. The differences need to be well understood so that the reports are made complementary with a synergistic relationship, rather than competitors or superfluous. Some of the important differences are as follows:

One, the MDGs and HD, though intimately related, are very different things. The former is a set of goals agreed across nations; the latter is a philosophical idea that has evolved over the years into an alternate development approach. Thus, while the MDGs do in fact capture some aspects of human development, the

---

[11] The base year is taken as 1990 even though the Millennium Declaration was signed in 2000.

concept of HD is much wider. This is what should be reflected in the two types of reports.

Two, MDGRs are a UN product (presently facilitated by the UNDP) while the HDRs are seen as a UNDP product with a UNDP brand image and signature.

Three, HDRs can be 'independent', 'nationally owned' or may even straddle the chasm between ownership and independence. The MDGRs are more 'neutral' with straight reporting on the 48 agreed indicators.

Four, the level of analysis is quite different. HDRs are expected to be backed by solid research, in-depth analytical work, using national and international experts, leading to policy alternatives focusing on human development. MDGRs are limited to providing country specific monitoring of the MDGs, helping a country show progress, identify challenges and opportunities under each goal. They are also very useful in encouraging official statistical systems improve data availability and reliability.

Five, HDRs are more useful for *policy* and *public* advocacy while the MDGRs may be more suitable for *straight tracking*. Both help to build consensus around critical development issues. Yet, each has a distinct comparative advantage which can be effectively leveraged and made complementary.

Six, MDGRs are relatively limited in scope as they report on a list of 48 agreed development indicators across the eighteen targets for the 8 goals, serving as a useful checklist to track progress on the identified indicators. HDRs, on the other hand, have unlimited scope. They have covered a very wide range of issues – from the basic health, education, etc., to the emerging issues of environment, governance and human rights as well.

Seven, MDGs are desirable outcomes that the MDGRs help in monitoring. Unlike HDRs, the MDGRs can be a useful results oriented management and monitoring tool. However they are not strategies providing possible ways to achieve the outcomes. Thus, publication of MDGRs may generate more questions than answers. HDRs, on the other hand, can address the strategies issue.

Eight, HDRs can and are usually theme based. They provide an opportunity to select a theme of relevance to a country, region or the globe, and delve into it at depth, do cross country comparisons, etc. MDGRs are always about the eight MDGs (8goals-18targets-48indicators).

Nine, MDGRs need not take up prescriptive positions, restricting themselves to reporting on the situation as it prevails. To complement them, HDRs have the potential of taking up the work of identifying ways to get back on track on specific issues where an MDGR identifies a gap. For example, if an MDGR identifies HIV/AIDS prevalence as a gap, the corresponding HDR could assess what policy

changes are needed to achieve the goal, what are the cost implications, strategy choices, etc.

To improve complementarities, it would be useful not only to understand the differences and the relative strengths of the two types of products, but also to establish a shared agreement about them within and outside UNDP. This way work in the direction of harmonizing data sources, advocacy and launch strategies, use of experts, and so on can proceed apace with minimum overlap. Used thus, they can be powerful complementary tools for informed policy and public debate and advocacy among stakeholders. So there is room for both types of reports and campaigns. It is very important that one does not eliminate the other.

VI. Impact Assessment

As part of taking stock, assessing the impact of HDRs is obviously important. It can help in addressing and minimizing limitations thereby enhancing potential to promote human development. For this it is necessary to be able to answer questions about the different ways in which a protagonist of the HDRs could expect impact. One might reasonably expect impact during all three phases of an HDR – the preparation process, the publication of the product, and its dissemination. However, the expected impacts are quite different for regional and national (and even sub national) reports arising out of the distinct objectives they aim to serve. Further, short term impacts are likely to be different from long term ones. Some questions of relevance for assessing impact are:

- *Different roles/niches of Regional and National HDRs*
    - could expected impacts be different for the two types of reports ?
    - will short term impacts be different from medium and longer term ones?
    - how could expected impacts vary by theme chosen?
    - could the method of choosing themes itself influence impact?
- *Participation*
    - how wide and how effective was the participation in the preparatory process of the HDR
- *Ownership*
    - how should it be assessed and how does it affect impact?
    - What is national ownership - government versus civil society?
- *Independence*
    - how should it be assessed and how does it affect impact?
- *Ownership-independence trade-off*
    - to what extent does independence distract from ownership?
    - how does this influence impact?
- *Publication*
    - effectiveness of the launch to maximize impact
- *Users*

- ■ what is the range of users
- ■ government, media, trade unions, private sector, civil society
- *Dissemination*
  - ■ feedback on media coverage, advocacy
  - ■ incorporation in training, learning, syllabus
- *Demand*
  - ■ what is the demand for the reports?
  - ■ institutions and individuals demanding HDRs
  - ■ demand for language translations, popular versions
- *Themes*
  - ■ are themes selected for the HDRs such that they would have maximum impact?
  - ■ what is the method for selection of themes?
  - ■ what type of themes are left out and what included?
- *Public debate*
  - ■ how much and where?
  - ■ e.g., in parliament, among academia, CSOs, trade unions, etc.
- *Influence on governments*
  - ■ official statements, public announcements
  - ■ government plans, budgets
  - ■ public expenditure
- *Influence on multilateral organisations*
  - ■ IMF, World Bank, IFAD, ILO, etc.
  - ■ use of HD language
  - ■ funding commitments and selection of sectors/schemes
- *Influence on the private sector*
  - ■ discussion and demand for HDRs among for-profit organizations
  - ■ discussion and demand among trade associations
- *Policy briefs*
  - ■ role
  - ■ subjects selected
  - ■ depth, precision
  - ■ impact on national policies
- *Impact assessment indicators*
  - ■ quantitative
  - ■ official government plans, budgets
  - ■ identification of factors that inhibit impact like language, price, access, etc.
  - ■ identification of factors that promote impact like participatory process, extent of dissemination, language, type of presentations, popular versions, etc.

To begin work on impact assessment the NHDR toolkit being finalized would be a very good starting point. A companion toolkit on impact assessment for regional and national HDRs may be a useful future direction.

VII. Conclusion

This paper sought to take stock of the HDR experience. After a brief discussion of some issues on the concept of human development like multiplicity in understanding and usage, with difficulties in operationalisation of the idea, we examined the issues in its mapping and measurement. The HDRs themselves and as other studies in human development become increasingly mainstreamed in academic and training curricula, we can expect further sharpening of the indicators and indices. The section on potential and limitations of the different levels of human development reporting – global, regional, national and sub-national – concluded with a strong bid for maintaining quality and a recognition of the vexatious trade-off between independence and ownership. Next was a brief examination of the newly introduced reporting on the MDGs, the MDGRs also being advocacy documents, and the extent of complementarities and duplication with the HDRs. The conclusion was that the two, while closely related are quite distinct. A common understanding about their comparative strengths and roles is necessary to build synergies and complementarities as well as minimise duplication. Being advocacy documents, it would be useful in future to be able to assess the impact that the different HDRs have. Toward this end some preliminary questions relevant for impact assessment were identified.

The sound philosophical basis of the concept of human development is its fundamental strength. UNDP is identified with the Human Development Reports which have become its recognizable brand. Clearly, the HDRs do have enormous potential for influencing policies and development strategies. Yet the limitations need to be continuously addressed. Given that HDRs are meant to be advocacy documents, their impact assessment would provide critical inputs for continuous improvement. For UNDP, this would strengthen the organisation's role-relevance in countries and regions and add to spheres of influence where the human development philosophy and approach can be absorbed.

Annexe 1
Global Human Development Reports by Year and Theme

S.No.	Theme	Year
1.	Millennium Development Goals: a compact among nations to end human poverty	2003
2.	Deepening democracy in a fragmented world	2002
3.	Making new technologies work for human development	2001
4.	Human rights and human development	2000
5.	Globalization with a human face	1999
6.	Consumption for human development	1998
7.	Human development to eradicate poverty	1997
8.	Economic growth and human development	1996
9.	Gender and human development	1995
10.	New dimensions of human security	1994
11.	People's participation	1993
12.	Global dimensions of human development	1992
13.	Financing human development	1991
14.	Concept and measurement of human development	1990

Source: HDRO website (www.undp.org/hdro)

Annexe 2
Regional Human Development Reports by Year and Theme

S.No	Region (No. of RHDRs)	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
1.	Arab States (1)									Arab HDR - Creating opportunities for future generations	
2.	Caribbean (1)									HDR for the organisation of the East Caribbean States – Building Competitiveness in the face of vulnerability	
3.	Central America (2)						State of the Region in Human Develop-ment			Central America and Panama – The state of the region	
4.	Eastern Europe (6)		Gender and Develo pment	Human Settlement s under Transition – The Case of Eastern	The Shrinking State – Governance and Sustainable Human	Poverty in Transition?	Regional Transition 1999 - The Human cost of Transition: Human security in				Avoiding the Dependency Trap: The Roma HDR

#	Region										
				Europe and CIS	Develop-ment		South East Europe				
5.	Pacific (2)	General HDR					Creating Opportuni-ties				
6.	Southern Africa (2)					Governance and Human Development in Southern Africa		SADC Regional HDR			
7.	South Asia (7)				The Challenge of Human Development	The Education Challenge	The Crisis of Governance	The Gender Ques-tion	Globalisa-tion and Human Develop-ment	Agriculture and Rural Development	HDR on HIV/AIDS and Development in South Asia 2003
8.	West Africa (1)		Poverty and Human Development								
Total	22	1	2	1	2	3	4	2	1	4	2

Source: HDRO webite (www.undp.org/hdro)

Annexe 3
Number of National HDRs by Country

S. No.	Countries	No. Of HDRs Published
	Asia-Pacific	
1.	Bangladesh	7
2.	Bhutan	1
3.	Cambodia	5
4.	China	3
5.	East Timor	1
6.	Fiji	1
7.	Indonesia	2
8.	India	2
9.	Iran	1
10.	Laos	2
11.	Maldives	2
12.	Mongolia	2
13.	Myanmar	1
14.	Nepal	2
15.	Pakistan	1
16.	Palau	1
17.	Papua New Guinea	1
18.	Philippines	4
19.	Samoa	1
20.	Solomon Islands	1
21.	South Korea	1
22.	Sri Lanka	1
23.	Thailand	2
24.	Tuvalu	1
25.	Vanuatu	1
26.	Vietnam	2
	Arab States	
27.	Algeria	1
28.	Bahrain	2
29.	Djibouti	1
30.	Egypt	7
31.	Iraq	1
32.	Jordan	1
33.	Kuwait	3
34.	Lebanon	3
35.	Libiyan Arab Jamahiriya	1
36.	Morocco	2
37.	Occupied Palestinian Territories	2
38.	Somalia	2
39.	Tunisia	2
40.	United Arab Emirates	1
41.	Yemen	2
	Countries of the Economic Community of West Africa (ECOWAS)	
42.	Benin	5
43.	Burkina Faso	4
44.	Cape Verde	3

45.	Cote D'ivoire	2
46.	Gambia	2
47.	Ghana	4
48.	Guinea	3
49.	Guinea-Bissau	1
50.	Liberia	1
51.	Mali	4
52.	Mauritania	4
53.	Niger	4
54.	Nigeria	3
55.	San Tome And Principe	1
56.	Senegal	2
57.	Sierra Leone	2
58.	Togo	3

Countries of the Economic Community for Central Africa (ECCAS)/ East African Countries (EAC)

59.	Burundi	2
60.	Cameroon	4
61.	Central African Republic	2
62.	Chad	3
63.	Congo	1
64.	Democratic Republic of Congo	2
65.	Equatorial Guinea	2
66.	Ethiopia	2
67.	Gabon	1
68.	Kenya	2
69.	Rwanda	1
70.	Uganda	5

Countries of the South African Development Community (SADC) and the Indian Ocean

71.	Angola	3
72.	Botswana	3
73.	Comoros	3
74.	Lesotho	1
75.	Madagascar	4
76.	Malawi	3
77.	Mozambique	4
78.	Namibia	5
79.	South Africa	2
80.	Swaziland	3
81.	Tanzania	2
82.	Zambia	4
83.	Zimbabwe	3

Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States

84.	Albania	5
85.	Armenia	7
86.	Azerbaijan	7
87.	Belarus	6
88.	Bosnia And Herzegovina	5
89.	Bulgaria	8
90.	Croatia	5

91.	Czech Republic	4
92.	Estonia	7
93.	Georgia	7
94.	Hungary	4
95.	Kazakhstan	7
96.	Kosovo	1
97.	Kyrgyztan	7
98.	Latvia	6
99.	Lithuania	7
100.	Macedonia	4
101.	Malta	1
102.	Moldova	6
103.	Poland	7
104.	Romania	7
105.	Russian Federation	7
106.	Slovak Republic	5
107.	Slovenia	3
108.	Saint Helena	1
109.	Tajikistan	7
110.	Turkey	6
111.	Turkmenistan	6
112.	Ukraine	6
113.	Uzbekistan	6
114.	Yugoslavia	2
Latin America and the Caribbean		
115.	Argentina	7
116.	Belize	2
117.	Bolivia	4
118.	Brazil	2
119.	Chile	4
120.	Colombia	3
121.	Costa Rica	8
122.	Cuba	2
123.	Ecuador	2
124.	El Salvador	3
125.	Guatemala	5
126.	Guyana	1
127.	Haiti	1
128.	Honduras	3
129.	Jamaica	1
130.	Mexico	1
131.	Nicaragua	3
132.	Panama	1
133.	Paraguay	3
134.	Peru	2
135.	Trinidad And Tobago	1
136.	Uruguay	2
137.	Venezuela	7

Source: HDRO website (www.undp.org/hdro)

Sub-National Human Development Reports by Theme and Year

S. No.	*Country (No. of HDRs)*	*1995*	*1996*	*1997*	*1998*	*1999*	*2001*	*2002*	*2003*
1.	*Argentina* (4)		The challenge of Human Development for the Province of Buenos Aires, a Commitment to Human Development and the Human Development Paradigm	Sub-national HDR – Province of Buenos Aires	Sub-national HDR – Human Security in the Province of Buenos Aires	General HDR on Inequity – Province of Buenos Aires			
2.	*Bolivia* (3)	1.General HDR Santa Cruz 2.General HDR La Paz 3. General HDR Cochabamba							
3.	*Bulgaria* (1)			General HDR – The City of					

				Sophia					
4.	*India** (9)	Madhya Pradesh: General HDR			Madhya Pradesh: General HDR	Karnataka: General HDR	Sikkim: General HDR	1.Madhya Pradesh: Third HDR – Using the Power of Democracy for development 2.Rajasthan: General HDR 3.Maharashtra: General HDR 4.Himachal Pradesh General HDR	Tamil Nadu HDR
Total	*17*	4	1	2	2	2	1	4	1

*Source: Human Development Resource Centre, New Delhi
Source: HDRO website (www.undp.org/hdro)

Millennium Development Goals, Targets and Indicators

Goals and Targets	Indicators
Goal 1: Eradicate Extreme Hunger and Poverty	
Target 1: Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people whose income is less than one dollar a day	1. Proportion of population below $1 a day (PPP values)
	2. Poverty gap ratio (incidence X depth of poverty)
	3. Share of poorest quintile in national consumption
Target 2: Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people who suffer from hunger	4. Prevalence of underweight children (under five years of age)
	5. Proportion of population below minimum level of dietary energy consumption
Goal 2: Achieve Universal Primary Education	
Target 3: Ensure that, by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling	6. Net enrolment ratio in primary education
	7. Proportion of pupils starting grade 1 who reach grade 5
	8. Literacy rate of 15-24 year olds
Goal 3: Promote Gender Equality and Empower Women	
Target 4: Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education preferably by 2005 and to all levels of education no later than 2015	9. Ratio of girls to boys in primary, secondary and tertiary education
	10. Ratio of literate females to males of 15-24 year olds
	11. Share of women in wage employment in the non-agricultural sector
	12. Proportion of seats held by women in national parliament
Goal 4: Reduce Child Mortality	
Target 5: Reduce by two-thirds, between 1990 and 2015, the under-five mortality rate	13. Under-five mortality rate
	14. Infant mortality rate
	15. Proportion of 1 year old children immunized against measles
Goal 5: Improve Maternal Health	
Target 6: Reduce by three-quarters, between 1990 and 2015, the maternal mortality ratio	16. Maternal mortality ratio
	17. Proportion of births attended by skilled health personnel
Goal 6: Combat HIV/AIDS, Malaria and Other Diseases	
Target 7: Have halted by 2015, and begun to reverse, the spread of HIV/AIDS	18. HIV prevalence among 15-24 year old pregnant women
	19. Contraceptive prevalence rate
	20. Number of children orphaned by HIV/AIDS
Target 8: Have halted by 2015, and begun to reverse, the incidence of malaria and other major diseases	21. Prevalence and death rates associated with malaria
	22. Proportion of population in malaria risk areas using effective malaria prevention and treatment measures
	23. Prevalence and death rates associated with tuberculosis
	24. Proportion of TB cases detected and cured under DOTS (Directly Observed Treatment Short Course)

Goal 7: Ensure Environmental Sustainability	
Target 9: Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes to reverse the loss of environmental resources	25. Proportion of land area covered by forest
	26. Land area protected to maintain biological diversity
	27. GDP per unit of energy use (as proxy for energy efficiency)
	28. Carbon dioxide emissions (per capita) [plus two figures of global atmospheric pollution: ozone depletion and the accumulation of global warming gases]
Target 10: Halve, by 2015, the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water	29. Proportion of people with sustainable access to an improved water source
Target 11: By 2020, to have achieved a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers	30. Proportion of people with access to improved sanitation
	31. Proportion of people with access to secure tenure [urban/rural disaggregation of several of the above indicators may be relevant for monitoring improvement in the lives of slum dwellers]
Goal 8: Develop a Global Partnership for Development*	
Target 12: Develop further an open, rule-based, predictable, non-discriminatory trading and financial system Includes a commitment to good governance, development, and poverty reduction – both nationally and internationally	*Some of the indicators listed below will be monitored separately for the Least Developed Countries (LDCs), Africa, landlocked countries and small island developing states.* Official Development Assistance 32. Net ODA as percentage of DAC donors' GNI [targets of 0.7% in total and 0.15% for LDCs]
Target 13: Addresses the Special Needs of the Least Developed Countries Includes: tariff and quota free access for LDC exports; enhanced programme of debt relief for HIPC and cancellation of official bilateral debt; and more generous ODA for countries committed to poverty reduction	33. Proportion of ODA to basic social services (basic education, primary health care, nutrition, safe water and sanitation) 34. Proportion of ODA that is untied 35. Proportion of ODA for environment in small island developing states 36. Proportion of ODA for transport sector in land-locked countries **Market Access** 37. Proportion of exports (by value and excluding arms) admitted free of duties and quotas
Target 14: Address the Special Needs of landlocked countries and small island developing states (through Barbados Programme and 22nd General Assembly Provisions)	38. Average tariffs and quotas on agricultural products and textiles and clothing 39. Domestic and export agricultural subsidies in OECD countries 40. Proportion of ODA provided to help build trade capacity **Debt Sustainability**

Target 15: Deal comprehensively with the debt problems of developing countries through national and international measures in order to make debt sustainable in the long term	41. Proportion of official bilateral HIPC debt cancelled 42. Debt service as a percentage of exports of goods and services 43. Proportion of ODA provided as debt relief 44. Number of countries reaching HIPC decision and completion points
Target 16: In co-operation with developing countries, develop and implement strategies for decent and productive work for youth	45. Unemployment rate of 15-24 year olds
Target 17: In co-operation with pharmaceutical companies, provide access to affordable, essential drugs in developing countries	46. Proportion of population with access to affordable essential drugs on a sustainable basis
Target 18: In co-operation with the private sector, make available the benefits of new technologies, especially information and communications	47. Telephone lines per 1000 people 48. Personal computers per 1000 people

* The selection of indicators for Goals 7 and 8 is subject to further refinement
Source: UNDP, MDG website (www.undp.org/mdg)

Millennium Development Goal Reports

S. No.	Country	Year of Publication
1.	Bosnia and Herzegovina	2003
2.	Bulgaria	2003
3.	Guinea	2003
4.	Kenya	2003
5.	Kyrgyzstan	2003
6.	Panama	2003
7.	Philippines	2003
8.	Ukraine	2003
9.	Albania	2002
10.	Bolivia	2002
11.	Bhutan	2002
12.	Cameroon	2002
13.	Chad	2002
14.	Egypt	2002
15.	Guatemala	2002
16.	Kazakhstan	2002
17.	Lithuania	2002
18.	Mozambique	2002
19.	Nepal	2002
20.	Poland	2002
21.	Saudi Arabia	2002
22.	Vietnam	2002
23.	Armenia	2001
24.	Cambodia	2001
25.	Madagascar	2001
26.	Mauritius	2001
27.	Senegal	2001
28.	Tanzania	2001

Source: UNDP, MDG website (http://www.undp.org/mdg/countryreports.html)

References

Jahan, Selim, 2002. *Measuring Living Standard and Poverty: Human Development Index as an Alternate Measure*. Political Economy Research Institute (PERI), University of Massachusetts-Amherst.

Jolly, Richard, 2003. *Human Development and Neo Liberalism: Paradigms Compared.* In Fakuda-Parr, Sakiko and A.K. Shiva Kumar, Readings in Human Development. Oxford University Press, New Delhi.

Maya, Martin, 2003. SURF-HDR E Discussion Series: MDGRs and NHDRs – Ensuring Complementarity and Avoiding Duplication. September 12.

Prabhu, Seeta K., 2003. *Social Statistics for Reports on Human Development and Millennium Development Goals: Challenges and Constraints*. Paper presented at an ADB workshop for Regional Technical Assistance (RETA) 6007 on Enhancing Social and Gender Statistics, June, Bangkok, Thailand.

Raworth, Kate and David Stewart, 2003. *Critiques of the Human Development Index: A Review.* In Fakuda-Parr, Sakiko and A.K. Shiva Kumar, Readings in Human Development. Oxford University Press, New Delhi.

Sachs, Wolfgang, 1997. *On Earth as it is in the West.* At 'Globalization and Development' Conference, Development and Peace Foundation, SEF-UNDP Partnership Conference.

Sen, Amartya, 1989. *Development as Capability Expansion*. Journal of Development Planning, 19: 41-58.

Sen, Amartya, 1999. *Development as Freedom*. New York: Oxford University Press.

UNDP, 1990. *Concept and Measurement of Human Development*. Human Development Report. Oxford University Press, New York.

UNDP, 1995. *Gender and Human Development*. Human Development Report. Oxford University Press, New York.

UNDP, *Human Development Report Office Website*, http://hdr.undp.org/default.cfm

UNDP Website, *Millennium Development Goals Webpage*, http://www.undp.org/mdg/