



A RESEARCH PROGRAMME FOR POLICY COHERENCE FOR DEVELOPMENT ANALYSIS¹

NATALIA MILLÁN, PABLO MARTÍNEZ, IGNACIO
MARTÍNEZ, M^a LUISA GIL, ANTONIO SANABRIA,
SHIRLEY OSPINA Y HÉCTOR GARCÍA

Plataforma 2015 y más

1. INTRODUCTION

Since the 1990s, the concept of Policy Coherence for Development (PCD) has gradually gained ground in analysis performed within academic circles concerned with development. What makes the PCD approach increasingly significant is the fact that in order to gain a sound understanding of a State's potential contribution to promoting a fairer, more equitable world, all of the public policies that it carries out must be evaluated, as well as their results and the impact they have on other countries and persons. This requires going beyond the one-dimensional analysis paradigm traditionally used in social sciences to establish a comprehensive, cross-cutting vision enabling a State's potential role in promoting and guaranteeing human rights, social justice and environmental sustainability to be evaluated.

The PCD approach plays an increasingly significant role in the Post-2015 Development Agenda because it presents a broad, complex prism through which to grasp issues related to human vulnerability, poverty, inequality, and sustainability, both domestically and globally. Although the Post-2015 Agenda is still under construction, the fact that a so-called "global conversation"² has been taking place on the aspects this new agenda requires –unlike when the MDGs were being developed– has brought to light the need to take care of issues using a more plural and comprehensive approach to development factoring in its patent trans-nationalization and tackling the contradictions and weaknesses of the approach that has thus far prevailed in the international aid institutions. Stated otherwise, it requires

¹ This article, translated by Beth Gelb, is part of the research project "Building a Policy Coherence for Development Index" conducted by Plataforma 2015 y más.

² The UNDP has explained this on its website: "Post-2015: Inicia la conversación global" <http://www.undp.org/content/undp/es/home/librarypage/mdg/global-conversation-begins.html> (30/06/2015).



overcoming the technocratic notion of development issues represented by the “aid effectiveness” agenda and its proposals focused on modifying policy practice without taking into account the relationships between the actors and their interests in the system. Furthermore, this notion is still embedded in a North-South divide identifying donor and receiving countries. Yet this division no longer allows for explaining the dynamics at play in current world society or the issues at stake in development.

Converging with this broadly demanded orientation observed during the building of the Post-2015 Agenda, this article aims to explain the implementation of a research programme based on a cosmopolitan, *intermestic*³, comprehensive view of PCD using a multidimensional prism for human development. This research programme aims to develop methodological tools to study coherence based on two pillars: a quantitative analysis pillar on public policy formulation, action and impact imbued with a cosmopolitan outlook regarding the multidimensional promotion of development⁴; and quantitative research pillar based on building a Policy Coherence for Development Index (PCDI).

The PCDI aims to be an index encompassing the analysis of 21 policies including an evaluation of their behaviour as related to the four dimensions of sustainable development (SDSN, 2013), taking into account their interdependence, indivisibility and the fact that they cannot be placed in any hierarchical order. This evaluation is based on a “human” notion of sustainable development that calls for people to be placed at the heart of the various dimensions. This is why, when defining the evaluation of the 21 policies in any of these dimensions, the following criteria are used:

³ Bearing in mind the gradually increasing interdependency between players, countries and persons, the dividing line between domestic and international is becoming ever more blurred and ‘porous’ (Sanahuja, 2008). As a result, the dichotomy between domestic and international policy seems to be an extemporaneous approach to understanding an increasingly globalized and interconnected world. The intermestic view aims to describe all public policies as having both local and transnational impacts meaning that they must be evaluated with the full complexity that the newly globalized world imposes. (Evans *et al.* 1993). One example of the intermestic nature of a given policy can be observed when analysing energy policies. When poorly designed, these policies can have significantly negative impacts domestically (in terms of energy poverty, energy prices, infrastructure problems or local pollution) but also pernicious effects for the rest of the countries in the world (in terms of environmental pollution, international energy prices and contribution to climate change), see Barbero and Llistar (2014).

⁴ Since 2011, Plataforma 2015 y más has conducted extensive research on PCD, focusing on both the concepts underpinning it and its implications (Millán, 2012; Millán, 2014a), the implications of this agenda within Spain (Millán, *et al.*, 2012; Millán, 2014b); the European Union’s role in promoting human development (Millán, 2014c) PCD in decentralized spheres (Martínez, I., 2013a; Martínez, I., 2013b), the possibilities for developing a PCD index (Martínez, P., 2013; Martínez, P., 2015a); and the analysis of specific policies and their impact on human development (Santander and Millán, 2014; Barbero and Llistar, 2014; Gil, 2015; Pérez, 2015; Millán, 2015). In addition, Plataforma 2015 y más has contributed to the latest OECD report on PCD (yet to be published) with an explanation of its proposal to build a PCD index.



a) criteria stemming from a normative understanding of human rights based on their universality and indivisibility; b) criteria obtained from a radical, unrelinquishable biological concept of human life which therefore implies development's ecological nature; and c) criteria stemming from feminist approaches that point to the unveiling and overcoming patriarchal power driving political, economic, social and cultural configurations. Though they may afford more obvious examples in certain policies and dimensions than they do in others, these three criteria cut across the entire PCD analysis performed. Undoubtedly, this will not only make these approaches visible in the analysis outcomes, but will enable specific lines of research to be spawned on the basis of the PCDI itself.

In addition to outlining PCD-centred research, this article aims to substantiate the relevance of building a policy coherence for development index, as well as presenting development from the perspective on which it is based and the policy coherence approach on which it is built. In order to do so, this introduction is followed by a second section explaining the relevance of and methodology involved in developing a PCD research programme. The third section analyses the human development prism and PCD on which both the PCDI and the broader research programme encompassing it are based. The fourth section explains the central idea behind the PCDI, and to conclude, the final section concludes with some brief thoughts and ideas about the contribution the index can make to promoting human development and the Post-2015 Development Agenda.

2. WHY DO RESEARCH ON POLICY COHERENCE FOR DEVELOPMENT? AND HOW?

One of the least advanced areas in PCD studies refers to the establishment of multidimensional methodological approaches enabling both quantitative and qualitative research geared to ascertaining the degree to which the human development perspective is integrated into public policy design in all countries around the globe. The research programme therefore aims to generate a novel conceptual, methodological and analytical approach to researching PCD.

The programme has a twofold intention, pedagogical and political, as it aims to offer a new framework for understanding public policy. It sets its sights on building an approach that enables countries' behaviour to be evaluated through the analysis of their development policies, factoring in both biological constraints and a universal human rights ethic. The idea is therefore to build a tool that pedagogically opens avenues to redirect policy in order to avoid the current (ecological, economic and social) crisis we are experiencing. These avenues involve a cosmopolitan understanding of the world around us that gears public policy decisions towards the global public



interest. Furthermore, against the backdrop of the Post-2015 Development Agenda, accountability mechanisms regarding public policy's impact on ecological, economic, social and political issues and their interaction must be bolstered.

Meanwhile, complementarily, a PCD research programme like the one put forward here –and its clear concretion in a PCDI– also carries with it the aim of social transformation. Defending multidimensionality and an intermestic nature of policy coupled with the effort to develop an analysis tool encompassing all types of policies has the potential of attaching a more prominent place to development in the political and social debate. The objective is to bring to light the cosmopolitan nature of social phenomena that allude to the problems, vindications, concerns and aspirations of different groups in society. In contrast to the ostensibly domestic, unrelated nature of these phenomena, this research programme, and specifically the PCDI, attempts to highlight the links between them and facilitate their understanding in public decision-making spaces in the various countries.

The programme put forward here therefore has several objectives. First, it aims to generate knowledge on the complex and interdependent rationales, dynamics, policies, interests and players involved in development. Secondly, based on that knowledge, it aims to develop a tool for advocacy so that the debate on development can be taken beyond its usual anchoring in cooperation policy. Thirdly, it aims to promote a tool for communication and social transformation geared towards bolstering accountability mechanisms on global issues and enhancing both citizens' and civil society organizations' critical awareness.

3. METHODOLOGICAL PROPOSAL FOR DEVELOPING A RESEARCH PROGRAMME

The research programme's novelty lies not only in its attempt to take the concept of human development on board, but also to provide a methodology for analysis that purports to broaden the "conventional" approach to PCD research.

Our approach is based on the principle that, directly or indirectly, certain countries' public policies affect the chances for development of citizens in other countries. The tenet in the PCD approach is therefore that in order to truly evaluate a country's commitment to human development (and particularly of those countries considered to be "developed"), one must assess the transnational impact of trade, agricultural, defence or financial policy (just to mention a few examples). Thus, the PCD approach is based on the fact that, in an increasingly interdependent *trans-nationalized* world,



development issues acquire a global dimension that inevitably affects all economies around the globe. Based on this concept, PCD research has tended to focus on the political impact that rich countries' policies have on the chances for progress in developing countries by analysing the potential impact of specific policies and programs.

This approach entails three analytical constraints: i) first, it is an orientation based on the distinction between the global North and South which precludes grasping changes in the international system and the responsibilities that all countries have for promoting global development; ii) secondly, it evaluates policies merely based on their impact abroad, yet divorced from the domestic consequences these policies have for the national population; iii) lastly, this approach fails to include an analysis of countries' internal decision-making processes which is fundamental to gaining an understanding of the interests motivating their governments' political actions.

TABLE 1. THE "CONVENTIONAL" PCD ANALYSIS APPROACH	
PCD ANALYSIS	
Approach constraints	Implications
Divide between countries in the "North" and in the "South".	Places the responsibility solely on countries considered to be in the "North".
Fails to include an analysis of the players, interests and motivations that guide policy design in rich countries.	Focused solely on policy but not its political nature, therefore leading to a technocratic view of public action.
Fails to consider the impacts on their own citizens of public policy of countries in the "North".	Focuses solely on evaluating the impact of policies from countries in the "North" on those in the "South".

Source: own data.

In order to move beyond the bounds of this "conventional" PCD approach, other different visions and analytical prisms must be used. A key reference point in the research put forward here is *public policy*⁵ analysis. Generally speaking, the public policy approach is based on the fact that in order to understand decision-making processes affecting public policy one must analyse the agendas, interests, motivations, players, processes and impacts

⁵ It is worth mentioning that public policy studies are characterized by a vast diversity of approaches and methodologies where there are significant divergences in the very definition of what is under study (Reyes, SF). In this research, the theoretical approach to be used includes an analysis of public policy formulation, an analysis of the players (both public and private), and an analysis of the power relationships and conflicts of interest between public and private players.



that these decisions have. The first thing to evaluate is how power leads certain issues and concerns to be placed at the top of governments' political agenda. In this same vein, the various players' ability to interfere in public policy decisions is relevant to say the least. These players may be public or private, meaning that the presence of interest groups attempting to interfere in governments' action must be evaluated.

Having said this, the *public policy* approach also has its limitations and weaknesses in that it seems to overlook the significance of trans-national aspects of decision-making. This shortfall seems to crystalize in two ways. Firstly, the consequences and impact that certain public action can have on the human rights and other societies' and countries' possibilities for development are not taken into account. Secondly, it seems to overlook the significance of the international sphere in national decision-making.

TABLE 2. PUBLIC POLICY ANALYSIS APPROACH	
PCD ANALYSIS	
Approach constraints	Implications
Fails to consider the public policy impact on other countries or persons	Public Policies are analysed from a "domestic" perspective
Fails to factor in the significance of trans-national aspects in national decision-making	

Source: own data.

This research programme intends to develop an approach to analysis pooling from both strands in order to address the issue in a broader and more comprehensive fashion, considering not only all of the elements related to decision-making, but also its potential impact on citizens around the globe. The division between domestic and foreign citizens therefore disappears. This broad orientation facilitates understanding of power relations and the interests behind public policy, together with processes, the resistance on the part of bureaucracies, and the impact of human development policy.

Lastly, as explained above, we will stress the cosmopolitan approach of the research programme, which calls into question a nationalist vision where nationality is used as a criterion for including or excluding a given political community. Conversely, the cosmopolitan doctrine sustains that human rights are inalienable and to the extent that they are exercised in the public space, they must be extended to cover all who share that space, i.e. ultimately the entire world. This vision involves transcending the global/local dichotomy that is systematically used to divide and compartmentalize



citizens' rights. The cosmopolitan approach holds that social sciences have developed on the assumption that the world is politically, socially and economically divided by borders between the authority of one state and that of its neighbours (Strange, 1997; Beck, 2005). However, globalization, interconnection and trans-nationalization have reconfigured the international system and have diluted borders, thereby generating increasing interdependence between countries as well as global risks. All of these processes have ended up questioning the conventional notions of "national" and "international" (Held, 2004).

In short, this research programme takes a novel analysis approach including conventional PCD analysis elements while accommodating for the significance of researching public policy decision-making. But it also takes a cosmopolitan approach that calls into question the national versus international division that has been conventionally used to demarcate analysis in political science and particularly in international relations.

4. WHAT SORT OF DEVELOPMENT FOR WHAT SORT OF COHERENCE?

4.1. THE HUMAN DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT UNDERPINNING THE RESEARCH PROGRAMME

Debate on the definition, scope and implications of human development has become fundamental to development studies. Originally, the so-called "pioneers in development"⁶ closely linked this concept to economic growth and developed several theories on the problems experienced by the economic structures of the poorest countries. Since then, there has traditionally been a trend to identify human welfare with economic growth as one of the main theoretic and methodological principles of economic orthodoxy (Unceta, 2009). Thus, for decades, development has been evaluated taking into account only monetizable activity and overlooking other theoretical considerations such as environmental sustainability, gender equality, the redistribution of wealth and the quality of institutions (Unceta, 2009). Furthermore, this approach to growth is based on environmentally unsustainable patterns of consumption and production that fail to consider the planet's natural limitations (UNDP, 2010; Oxfam, 2011).

Nevertheless, as development studies have progressed and broadened, the definition of development has become more complex, and basic elements

⁶ The "pioneers in development" are those whose research on economic development prevailed between 1940 and 1960. Its most salient authors were Lord Bauer, Colin Clark, Albert Hirschman, Sir Arthur Lewis, Gunnar Myrdal, Raúl Prebisch, Paul Rosenstein-Rodan, Walt Whitman Rostow, H.W. Singer and Jan Tinbergen. For further information see Meyer and Seers (1986).



for life such as environmental sustainability, gender equality, human rights and the redistribution of wealth have gradually been included. Thus, the notion of human development refers to the broadening of capabilities, freedoms and options of all the people on the planet and that of future generations. In this same vein, Amartya Sen, the Nobel laureate in Economics, describes development as freedom: freedom so that human beings can choose how to live their lives entails ensuring that citizens enjoy the full and free exercising of their rights (Sen, 1999).

Thus, development could be defined as “a right that allows people to have increasing opportunities to make their choices freely and safely, in respect for diversity, equality and justice, in a clean and healthy environment, and in ensuring this right to development for future generations.” (Spanish Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation, 2009b: 5).

This notion leads to reconfiguring the economic, social and political setting, placing ethics at the heart of policy formulation and bringing normative deliberation on the objectives of public policy to the fore as opposed to the prevailing technocratic debates in orthodox economics that conceal their normativity behind complex mathematical models (Deneulin and McGregor 2010, 507-508).

TABLE 3. THE CONCEPT OF DEVELOPMENT'S EVOLUTION	
Development as economic growth	Development as freedom
A unidirectional, economistic view	A multidimensional (political, social, ecological, feminist) view
Need-based approach	Rights-based approach
National vision	Cosmopolitan vision
Does not account for redistribution	The promotion of equity as a basic element for development

Source: own data.

Other non-Western philosophical notions of human development could be included in this concept: Sumak Kawsay or “good living” establishes a balance between nature and all living things, highlighting the importance of brother and sisterhood and spirituality in Andean countries (Cortez, 2009); eco-feminism is critical of the symbolic, patriarchal capitalist order, and based on an alternative paradigm focusing on the conservation of human life (Herrero, 2012); the economy of the common good rests on the principle that the economy must be based on promoting social welfare and the common good through a change of production model... In short, this analysis is based on a multidimensional concept of human development



that includes fundamental dimensions such as environmental sustainability, the feminist perspective, and a rights-based approach. It also entails a quest to safeguard the rights of all human beings, without restrictions imposed by their belonging to one State or another or as a result of any other trait.

4.2. WHAT IS POLICY COHERENCE FOR DEVELOPMENT?

PCD refers to any activity (whether public or private) geared towards systematically mainstreaming the human rights and sustainable development perspective into all decision-making related either directly or indirectly to public policy. This vision of PCD goes beyond the conventional concepts that merely aim to reduce contradictions or generate synergies between policies. It takes on a cosmopolitan perspective where all countries have the responsibility to promote human rights. Furthermore, it considers that public policies should be evaluated according to their potential impact on citizens around the world, without making distinctions between the national and foreign population.

In addition, bearing in mind the interdependence generated by globalization, development issues have taken on a transnational nature that necessarily requires a collective, multi-level solution arrived at by all actors in the international system. From this standpoint, PCD also becomes an imperative for collective action among States, and this requires progress towards coordinated, shared solutions that promote the building of a fairer, more sustainable world for all the people on the planet.

PCD would therefore aim for a comprehensive global commitment from governments in their promotion of development. Yet this remains extremely ambitious and significant obstacles still stand in the way of implementation (Alonso *et al.*, 2010). The concept is compelling because the end goal in working towards coherence is that of gradually modifying public policy so that the human development perspective can be mainstreamed into it. As the dividing line between what is domestic and what is international becomes more blurred and more porous, the agenda takes on an “intermestic” nature (Evans *et al.*, 1993), meaning that the human development dimension must be mainstreamed into both domestic and international policy under the assumption that all of these policies have significant consequences on the progress of other countries and individuals.

This vision of PCD is underpinned by several assumptions. The following are among the most relevant.

First comes the notion that a government’s action must be geared towards human development. It should be noted here that the concept of coherence has “instrumental value” subordinated to the objectives that are defined as priority within the public administration (Alonso *et al.*, 2010). In other words,



the congruousness of objectives, values, policies and instruments may be contingent on various interests, and human development is not necessarily a priority interest. So although there does appear to be a clear awareness among government officials that progress must be made towards public policy coherence (from a more technical standpoint), the true challenge remains to determine (through consensus) the ultimate end this coherence should have. Prioritizing development as a means to ensure coherence across all policies reflects a given view of the world and a specific political choice backed by the principles of the universality of human rights and the sustainability of life on the planet as the major common political and ethical engagements. The ethical imperative to realize human rights is therefore added to the political imperative for social justice, the sustainability of life and the planet as the most realistic choice for ensuring peaceful coexistence without jeopardizing the planet's environmental limits, thereby making human life unviable.

Secondly, although by definition conflicting legitimate interests coexist in democratic societies, work towards human development must be taken into account throughout the entire political action cycle. Furthermore, countries enshrine delicate and complex combinations of interests, groups, standards and rules, and attaining absolute coherence may therefore become an incompatible and, in any case, a hardly desirable objective in a plural, open and participatory system (Alonso, 2003). However, in PCD work, although it may not be the sole or main priority of any particular policy, the human development perspective must be present in decision-making.

In the third place, although not much dealt with in academic research, the potential interference of lobbies and other private actors in the design of public policy should also be incorporated, as it is particularly relevant for understanding PCD (Millán and Santander, 2014). The extent to which public policy is permeable to the interests of various power groups should therefore be analysed. This is particularly important since, if private actors have the capacity to interfere in public policy, in all likelihood, these policies will not pursue the promotion of human development, but rather interests that depart from the common good.

Fourthly and closely tied to the last item, it must be accepted that, in order to progress step by step towards PCD, the task involves a certain degree of conflict because interests must be prioritized in public decision-making. The establishing of a hierarchy of priorities may affect national and international players as well as public and private players who are potentially adversely affected by these decisions. When public policies systematically benefit power groups, institutions and structures are created to uphold these benefits. And it is here that the potential conflict of interest that the work towards coherence attempts to tackle becomes visible.

Finally, within the context of globalization, the PCD agenda must not be restricted to the exclusive responsibility of developed countries. Increasing



interdependence requires all States to understand that the policies they implement have a significant impact on the potential development of other countries and individuals. Therefore, integrating PCD does not only mean improving the potential for global development, it also means that countries, whatever their degree of development, must take responsibility for considering the consequences that their public action may have on other societies and individuals.

4.3. WHAT BASIC TRAITS MUST BE PRESENT FOR A POLICY TO BE CONSIDERED COHERENT WITH HUMAN DEVELOPMENT?

Bearing in mind the definition established for human development, the basic principles that must be taken into account when analysing public policy must now be clarified.

In the first place, any public policy must include a certain amount of redistribution among members of society. Here, when referring to redistribution, allusion is made to building a society where opportunities and freedoms reach the greatest possible portion of citizens. If, as previously explained, human development means freedom for all persons to choose how to live their lives, then political action generating redistribution in various senses must at the same time favour truly equal opportunities.

Secondly, public policy that is truly coherent with development must have an intrinsically feminist outlook. The feminist perspective in promoting public action includes not only combatting discrimination between men and women, which occurs in all societies, but also understanding that within the very capitalist system there has been a sexual division of labour where women have taken on the role of reproduction and care. This phenomenon entails a differentiation of men's and women's roles in reproduction and social production causing women to be segregated into (generally non-remunerated) domestic work, lower rates of employment, and leading to the existence of male and female occupations (Beechey, 1999). Feminist economics points to the need to overcome approaches focusing sheerly on monetary aspects and to include processes generating resources needed to live in the analysis. These processes are usually related to non-remunerated work performed mainly by women in the home. In the face of this discrimination, the feminist perspective puts forward an alternative in order to understand the production and exchange system, and this leads to questioning the supremacy of the market as the epicentre of all economic and social life in a given society. Upholding and caring for life as a way to generate a fairer, more sustainable society stands at the heart of feminist economics. The idea is to build ways of life based on mutual caring within a group and to recognize human beings as vulnerable and interdependent.



In the third place, policies coherent with human development must be environmentally sustainable. As has been argued in various academic studies, the capitalist system that characterizes most of the economies around the globe is based on profitability and the accumulation of capital, thereby requiring ongoing growth in technology, science and the productive system to promote an expansion of demand and consumption until a virtually unlimited production of goods and services is attained (Kaplan, 1998). The consequences of this development and consumption pattern crystalize in an “environmental crisis”, a “development crisis” and an “energy crisis” all belonging to the same phenomenon and the same problem (UNEP, 2007). This paradigm brings with it several pernicious consequences for the planet: climate change, the extinction of species, the loss of fertile land, desertification, the diminishing of available freshwater for consumption, and the accumulation of radioactive waste (UNEP, 2007). Given the physical impossibility of maintaining the current patterns of production and consumption, there is a patent need to move towards environmentally sustainable policies. Three elements could be considered to contribute to environmental policy’s coherence with human development: i) the promotion of a change in the energy (and production) model leading to a gradual shift away from fossil fuels towards non-polluting renewable energy; ii) the protection of ecosystems and biodiversity; iii) implementation of action tending to prevent and correct pollution and environmental degradation; iv) a gradual shift away from cultural models based on unlimited growth in the capacity for consumption of capitalist societies.

Finally, as has been mentioned, any public policy should entail progress in citizens’ human rights, and this involves empowering communities. Human rights contribute to human development by ensuring that privileged groups cannot monopolize processes, policies and programmes for development. According to the human rights framework, facilitating and fostering development for all persons, regardless of their race, gender, nationality or sexual orientation, is the duty of institutional agents. The aim is to move beyond the moral imperative established by the 1970s approach based on the fulfilment of basic needs, and to generate a framework of guarantees so that citizens can stake a claim for their legally enforceable rights.

The basic criterion for being able to evaluate a public policy is underpinned by the principles guiding the human rights approach, i.e. i) no ground lost; ii) minimal essential levels; iii) maximum available resources (budget); iv) gradual realization; v) equality and non-discrimination; vi) transparency, accountability and participation. The rights-based approach, that takes the fulfilling of these principles into account, may be incorporated by using the analysis performed by both Balakrishnan and Elson (2008) and the Center for Economic and Social Rights (Center for Economic and Social Rights, 2012).



5. CAN POLICY COHERENCE FOR DEVELOPMENT BE MEASURED? A PROPOSAL FOR A POLICY COHERENCE FOR DEVELOPMENT INDEX

In the light of what we have seen so far, this chapter will describe the building of a PCD index put forward by Plataforma 2015 y más.

Developing a complex analytical framework and an ambitious approach to PCD analysis appears to be the right path to make a threefold contribution: furthering research on development; generating information for decision-making; and enhancing citizens' knowledge and interest in order for a global outlook to be taken on development in the context of social transformation.

While it allows us to comprehend a complex reality, defining a complex framework for analysis also significantly hampers the "PCD measurement" exercise that building a policy coherence index entails. Despite this, and in the awareness that any measurement exercise must necessarily simplify or standardize, the objective of political and social transformation behind the implementation of this research project not only substantiates but also makes it advisable to embark on the adventure of building the PCDI.

The index will measure a great number of public policies as well as their impact on citizens around the globe. The starting point is an analysis of 21 policies divided into five categories defined on the basis of links between those policies whose common matrices could facilitate certain aspects of analysis (See Table 4).

TABLE 4: ANALYSIS OF 21 POLICIES AS A STARTING POINT FOR BUILDING THE INDEX	
Trade Monetary and Financial Tax	Education and Culture Health Social Security Equality Employment
Industry Infrastructure and Transport Tourism	Cooperation Peace and Security Human Mobility and Migrations
Environment Agriculture (Rural Development) Fisheries	Justice

Source: own data.



For methodological reasons and due to specific characteristics and practical limitations, information will not be built from scratch. Instead, indicators that have already been included in several databases will be used. An initial constraint arises given that these indicators do not usually pool from multidisciplinary or intermestic approaches. The most complex challenge faced by the index is that of finding robust, consistent indicators allowing for an evaluation of the human development implications in each dimensions analysed. Overcoming this challenge will require a significant search for and analysis of the contents, characteristics and methodologies of each indicator in the various databases of international bodies and institutions. It is important to note here that, although the aim is to use the indicator that best suits the human development outlook, any indicator chosen will, by its very nature, be limited in its capacity to encompass the multidimensionality of the approach.

Through this analysis, the aim is to obtain a complex determination for each policy by analysing the most relevant aspects of each when assessing their degree of coherence with development and their economic, social, ecological, governance and gender dimensions. Again, the idea is not to ascertain the behaviour of policies vis-à-vis each of these dimensions separately, but rather to be able to perform a comprehensive evaluation of each policy on the assumption that human development can only be a multidimensional, articulated compendium.

The ultimate goal is to arrive at a distilled PCD index enabling a ranking of countries to be established according to their PCD commitment. The index will analyse public policy in terms of human development both domestically and abroad based on the intermestic outlook established by its framework for analysis.

Obviously, the aim of evaluating all countries entails significant challenges in PCD analysis. Using the principle of shared yet differentiated responsibilities, countries will be analysed in groups based on their structures, capabilities and specific traits.

In short, this index is based on a very broad, cross-cutting PCD outlook whose assumption is that it is important for all policies to promote human rights without discriminating between citizens in the global North and South, and in an attempt to generate greater not only greater critical awareness among citizens, but also a tool for advocacy enabling the oversight and modification of public policy with due regard for sustainable development and the human rights of persons across the globe.



6. FINAL THOUGHTS. THE PCDI IN THE LIGHT OF THE POST-2015 AGENDA

The outlooks that have traditionally predominated on the international cooperation agenda have led to an extremely limited view of development promotion and the fight against poverty. Generally speaking, the international donor framework has chosen a totally restrictive approach to the fight against poverty and has based all of its efforts on improving ODA “effectiveness” from an exceedingly technical, bureaucratized standpoint. What seems to account for this is the fact that the international ODA agenda did not aim to challenge the international system that has generated an extremely unequal and unsustainable world, but has instead aimed mainly to act on the consequences of these policies that lead to hunger, extreme poverty and human vulnerability.

Taking this background into account, 2015 stands as a true opportunity to configure the global agenda to promote sustainable, equitable development. Against this backdrop, at least discursively speaking, the prevailing standpoints advocate building a comprehensive global agenda affecting all countries and assuming that the fight against poverty entails challenging –and modifying– global public policies generating asymmetries and human vulnerability around the globe. This concurs with the approach put forward by this research programme on PCD, which aims to place the right of all persons to development, without any discrimination on grounds of nationality, race, gender, sexual orientation or any other consideration, at the heart of public policy.

It can easily be concluded that there are two outlooks in the international system, and that they reflect different and clashing interests, beliefs and expectations. The first outlook, which has thus far prevailed, aims to place the responsibility for combatting poverty on the poorest countries and focus strictly on aid “efficiency” without generating any debate on the global policies producing poverty and inequality in the world. The second takes a much broader, more integrative approach, challenging not only the public policies countries carry out, but also an unfair, asymmetric, unsustainable system in terms of production and economics.

We consider it necessary to bolster and promote research programmes, taking a political and critical view of the international system and production model that has led to serious development problems. These programmes can enable social organizations to monitor and denounce incoherent public policy. This is why we are putting forward a PCD index with which to monitor countries’ various public policies as well as their implications on environmental protection and the realization of the human rights of citizens around the world. Our vision is therefore political, advocating that a significant role be played by civil society organizations (academia, NGOs,



social movements, and so forth) in promoting and building a fairer world. Yet it also understands that study and analysis are fundamental to generate the empirical evidence to back this work.

In short, the research programme put forward, and particularly the PCDI, could not only provide social organizations with an important political and social instrument, but also be a means of monitoring and oversight for the Post-2015 Development Agenda. 🍷

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alonso, José Antonio (2003): "Coherencia de políticas y ayuda al desarrollo: el caso español", in Alonso, José Antonio and Fitzgerald, Valpy, *Financiación del desarrollo y coherencia en las políticas de los donantes*, Los Libros de la Catarata, Madrid, pp. 235- 266.
- Alonso, José Antonio, Aguirre, Pablo, Madrueño, Rogelio and Millán, Natalia (2010): *Coherencia de políticas para el desarrollo en cinco donantes del CAD: lecciones para el caso español*, Documento de trabajo n.º 42, Fundación Carolina, Madrid.
- Balakrishnan, Radhika and Elson, Diane (2008): "Auditing economic policy in the light of obligations on economic and social rights". *Essex Human Rights Review*, 5(1), 1-19.
- Barbero, Celia and Llistar, David (2014): "El modelo energético español. Un análisis desde la Coherencia de Políticas para el Desarrollo", *Cuadernos 2015 y más n.º 5*, Editorial 2015 y más, Madrid.
- Beechey, Veronica (1999): "The sexual division of labour and the labour process: a critical assessment", in Stephen Wood: *The degradation of work? Skill, deskilling and the labour process*, Hutchison, Londres.
- Beck, Ulrich (2005): *La mirada cosmopolita o la guerra es la paz*, Paidós, Barcelona.
- Center for Economic and Social Rights and Christian Aid (2014): "A Post-2015 Fiscal Revolution", Human Rights Policy Brief.
- Cortez, David (2009): "La construcción social del "Buen Vivir" (Sumak Kawsay) in Ecuador; Genealogía del diseño y gestión política de la vida", in *Actas del Congress for Intercultural Philosophy: Good life as Humanized life, v. VIII*, Ewha Womans University, Seoul, pp. 5-10.
- Gil, María Luisa (2015): "People and planet centered economy policy", *Papeles 2015 y más n.º 23*, Editorial 2015 y más.
- Deneulin, Séverine, and McGregor, J. Allister (2010): "The capability approach and the politics of a Social Conception of Wellbeing». *European Journal of Social Theory* 13 (4): 501-19. doi:10.1177/1368431010382762.



- Evans, Peter, Harold K. Jacobson and Robert D. Putnam (1993): *Double-Edge Diplomacy. International Bargaining and Domestic Politics*, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Held, David (2004): *Un pacto global*, Taurus, Madrid.
- Herrero, Yayo (2012): "Propuestas ecofeministas para un sistema cargado de deudas", *Revista de Economía Crítica*, n.º 13, primer semestre 2011.
- Kaplan, Marcos (1998): "La crisis ambiental: análisis y alternativas", in *La responsabilidad jurídica en el daño ambiental*, Instituto de Investigaciones Jurídicas, UNAM, México, pp. 87-122.
- MAEC (2009b): *Plan Director de la Cooperación Española 2009- 2012*, DGPOLDE.
- Martínez, Ignacio (2013a): "Coherencia de políticas: una mirada a los gobiernos descentralizados", in (several authors): *X Informe anual de la Plataforma 2015 y más: Otro mundo está en marcha*, Editorial 2015 y más, Madrid, pp. 75-86.
- Martínez, Ignacio (2013b): "Policy Coherence for Development: The role of local authorities", *Papeles 2015 y más n.º 15*, Editorial 2015 y más.
- Martínez, Pablo. (2013): "Un índice de coherencia de políticas para el desarrollo (ICPD) como agenda post-2015". *Dossier EsF n.º 11. La agenda de desarrollo post-2015: ¿más de lo mismo o el principio de La transición?*, Economistas sin Fronteras.
- Martínez, Pablo. (2015): "Construcción de un Índice para medir la Coherencia de Políticas con el Desarrollo", *Dossier EsF n.º 18. Otra economía está en marcha*, Economistas sin Fronteras, gone to press.
- Meiers, Gerald and Seers, Dudley (1986): *Pioneros del Desarrollo*, Banco Mundial.
- Millán, Natalia (2012): "Coherencia de políticas para una gobernanza global", in (several authors): *Políticas coherentes para una ciudadanía global*, Noveno informe anual de la Plataforma 2015 y más, Editorial 2015 y más, Madrid, pp. 39-47.
- Millán, Natalia (2014a): "The Study of Policy Coherence for Development: Considerations and main dimensions", *Papeles 2015 y más n.º 7*, editorial 2015 y más.
- Millán, Natalia (2014b): "Un análisis multidimensional de la Coherencia de Políticas para el Desarrollo en España", *Papeles 2015 y más n.º 2*, Editorial 2015 y más.
- Millán, Natalia (2014c): "The Dual Role of the European Union in Promoting Human Development", *Papeles 2015 y más n.º 19*, Editorial 2015 y más.



Millán, Natalia; Santander, Guillermo; Aguirre, Pablo and Garrido, Anabel (2012): *La coherencia de políticas para el desarrollo en España*. Editorial 2015 y más, Madrid.

Oxfam Internacional (2011): *Cultivar un mundo mejor*, Campaña CRECE.

UNDP (2007): *Perspectivas del Medio Ambiente Mundial GEO-4*, Phoenix Design Aid, Copenhagen.

Pérez, Javier; (2015): *La política española de internacionalización de la empresa. Un análisis desde la coherencia de políticas con el desarrollo*, Editorial 2015 y más, Madrid.

Reyes, Román (s/f): "Políticas públicas", *Diccionario crítico de ciencias sociales*, available at http://pendientedemigracion.ucm.es/info/eurotheo/diccionario/P/politicas_publicas_b.htm

Sanahuja, José Antonio (2008a): "¿Un mundo unipolar, multipolar o apolar? El poder estructural y las transformaciones de la sociedad internacional contemporánea", in (several authors), *Cursos de Derecho Internacional de Vitoria-Gasteiz 2007*, Universidad del País Vasco, Vitoria-Gasteiz, pp. 297 -383.

SDSN (2013): *Una agenda de acción para el desarrollo sostenible. Informe para el secretario general de las Naciones Unidas*, Sustainable Development Solutions Network.

Strange, Susan (1986): *Casino Capitalism*, Manchester University Press, London.

Unceta, Koldo (2009): "Desarrollo, subdesarrollo, maldesarrollo y postdesarrollo: una mirada transdisciplinar sobre el debate y sus implicaciones", *Carta Latinoamericana. Contribuciones en desarrollo y sociedad en América Latina*, 7, pp. 1-34.

This publication has been produced with the financial support of the Spanish Agency of International Development Cooperation (AECID), under Contract 10-CO1-117 "Applied research, social communication and citizen participation for human development, through the promotion of public policy coherence based on Human Rights, gender equality, environmental respect and fair trade". The contents of this publication are the sole responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the opinion of AECID.

