



SUMMARY:

Inequality and Social Justice Roundtable Consultation

Dolf te Lintelo

CONTENTS

Background	1
Global and national inequalities: their nature, status and effects	2
Experiences of action advancing equity	5
Recommendations for action to reduce inequalities and promote social justice	7
Next steps	10
<i>Annexes</i>	
Inequality and Social Justice Roundtable:	
Programme	11
Participants list	13

Summary: Inequality and Social Justice Roundtable Consultation
Dolf te Lintelo
First published by the Institute of Development Studies in September 2011
© MDG Achievement Fund and Institute of Development Studies 2011

This publication is copyright, but may be reproduced by any method without fee for teaching or nonprofit purposes, but not for resale. Formal permission is required for all such uses, but normally will be granted immediately. For copying in any other circumstances, or for re-use in other publications, or for translation or adaptation, prior written permission must be obtained from the publisher and a fee may be payable.

SUMMARY: INEQUALITY AND SOCIAL JUSTICE ROUNDTABLE CONSULTATION

Dolf te Lintelo, IDS¹

BACKGROUND

One year ago the MDG Summit in New York produced a new action agenda in which world leaders promised to accelerate progress towards the achievement of the goals. The summit coincided with the publication of a report by the Institute of Development Studies (IDS) and the UN MDG Achievement Fund (MDG-F) that argued that the measurements used to calculate countries' performance disguised a picture of uneven achievement characterised by deep disparities between different social groups. The UN/IDS report *Can the MDGs Provide a Pathway to Social Justice? The Challenges of Intersecting Inequality*² claimed that in every country in every region, people are being excluded from the opportunity to play an active role in social and economic development on the basis of their race, ethnicity, income, religion, gender and, often, location.

On 9th September 2011, amid growing concern within the development sector that inequality urgently needed to be placed at the heart of development agendas, IDS and the UN Millennium Achievement Fund joined forces once again to hold a high-level roundtable Consultation in London on the theme of rising inequalities. 27 participants from the United Nations, (UNICEF, UN MDG Achievement Fund), British academia, INGOs (Save the Children, Oxfam, Christian Aid) and national governments (Brazil, India and the UK) discussed evidence of rising inequalities, nationally and globally, with a focus on policy and action to moderate these trends.

This report sums up a day of lively discussions, focusing on three areas:

1. **Global and national inequalities: their nature, status and effects.** The report synthesises debates on social justice and the underlying causes of inequalities and exclusion. It highlights in particular the impacts of inequalities on health, nutrition and education outcomes.
2. **Learning from experiences of successfully tackling inequalities**, including those of several countries, of UN agencies, and of international NGOs.
3. **Recommendations for action to reduce inequalities** and achieve greater equity, and the steps that will be taken to follow up on the IDS / MDG-F Consultation.

¹ The author wishes to gratefully acknowledge comments and suggestions to spruce up various drafts of the text from Richard Jolly, Ricardo Santos, James Georgalakis, Layla Saad and Ewan Robinson.

² This report was written by Naila Kabeer, SOAS (formerly at IDS).

The Consultation concluded that the reduction of inequalities needs to be an integral and central part of development agendas. Inequalities are not only the outcome of, but also drivers of vulnerability and poverty.

Many inequalities intersect and their effects accumulate over time. Accordingly, the analysis of inequalities needs to look at both horizontal and vertical inequalities. It needs to go beyond income measures and to encompass political and cultural inequalities, as these are part of the root causes of poverty and vulnerability, and help to explain the persistence of inequalities over time.

Because of its link to root causes of poverty, a focus on inequality reduction can contribute to the economic growth agendas currently in vogue amongst donors. But the inequality agenda is more ambitious. It aims for poverty *elimination* rather than just poverty alleviation.

The IDS / MDG-F Consultation identified a number of policy interventions that demonstrably enhance equity. It also found substantial opportunities to enhance our empirical understanding of inequalities and their consequences. There is strong scope for leveraging existing data through disaggregated analyses and new equity-adjusted statistics.

Bringing inequities more clearly into development agendas will require broad-based support. The Consultation identified a distinct need for a **broad coalition of partners** to advocate for equity and reduction of inequalities to be placed at the heart of development agendas. This coalition should include NGOs, social movements, academics, UN agencies, national governments and others.

The Consultation also indicated that reducing inequalities can be a component of balanced strategies for recovering from the current economic crisis.

GLOBAL AND NATIONAL INEQUALITIES: THEIR NATURE, STATUS AND EFFECTS

The Consultation analysed trends in multiple kinds of inequality: in income, in access to health, education, nutrition and sanitation services and in social development outcomes. These trends were analysed at global, national and subnational levels (Ortiz, Morgan).³

Over the last two decades, many developing countries have seen improvements in average incomes thanks to economic growth, in some cases narrowing the gap with average incomes in developed countries. Yet average figures hide growing income inequalities, both between and *within* countries (rich and poor).

Globally, the distribution of income is highly unequal. The 20 per cent of the global population having the highest incomes control 64–80 per cent of all income, while the poorest 20 per cent of people have only 1–3 per cent of all income (Ortiz).⁴ The poorest groups' share of global income has seen remarkably little change over the last two decades. If current trends continue, it will take more than 800 years for the bottom billion people to reach 10 per cent of global income (Ortiz).

Regionally, the distribution of income has become more unequal over the last two decades, despite economic growth. This disparity occurs because in most cases the highest-earning income groups enjoy the lion's share of the benefits of economic growth; i.e. the growth rates in incomes of the richest groups routinely outpace those of the lowest income groups. This was the case for Asia, Eastern

³ Citations refer to the arguments made by participants in the IDS / MDG-F Consultation.

⁴ The first figure in each pair is based on income levels; the second is based on income levels adjusted for purchasing power.

Europe and in Latin America during the period 1990–2007,⁵ while income inequalities remained the same in the Middle East and North Africa. Only in sub-Saharan Africa did income inequalities appear to fall during this period.

Regional data however obscure differences between countries within regions. Countries that have enjoyed high and sustained economic growth, such as India and China, have also seen rising income inequality. Similarly, jobless growth in the US over the last decade has disproportionately benefited the top income groups, leading some commentators to argue that ‘The economy did well, except for the people in it’.

In contrast to the overall trends of growing inequalities, some developing (e.g. Malaysia, Thailand, Mexico, Malawi, Brazil, Chile and Argentina) and a few developed countries (e.g. Denmark) have successfully combined economic growth with reducing income inequalities (Ortiz). These countries require special attention, and more case studies may be required to understand how such success was brought about.

The Consultation concluded that development agendas focusing on economic growth alone, in the absence of equity, are likely to be inefficient at combating income poverty (Saad, Ortiz) and *pro-rich* rather than *pro-poor* (Ortiz).

Measuring inequalities

The Consultation recognised the continued relevance of a long analytical tradition of using income indicators to express inequality. However, it expressed a concern that this approach is no longer sufficient for practical and theoretical reasons.

Practically, income inequality indicators will require greater sophistication in their design and in their use to ensure their continued importance (see recommendations section). Theoretically, income inequality indicators fail to measure wealth (by excluding property and other assets). This omission is crucial, since wealth distributions are even more unequal than those of income (Ortiz). Moreover, income indicators are unable to capture critical aspects of human deprivation and vulnerability and the multidimensional nature of poverty.

A focus on intersecting inequalities⁶ makes clear that cultural, political, spatial and economic inequalities can have cumulative and mutually reinforcing effects, which (re)produce poverty, vulnerability and social exclusion (Saad). Scope remains to consider additional dimensions (e.g. in labour market participation – McKinley) or alternative conceptualisations of inequalities (e.g. as capability inequalities – Hulme). In any case, the concept of intersecting inequalities is better able to recognise horizontal inequalities between groups resulting from and reinforcing ascribed identities based on gender, caste, ethnicity, etc. (Saxena). For instance, discrimination can restrict marginalised groups’ access to health services, even when these services are theoretically adequately provided. Intersecting inequalities thus recognise that poverty and inequality are socially produced and that inequality is not merely an outcome of poverty, but also a cause of it.

⁵ Note that data for this period do not include the effects of the financial, fuel and food crises that are likely to have further entrenched income inequalities between poor and better-off groups.

⁶ Kabeer (2010) *Can the MDGs Provide a Pathway to Social Justice? The Challenges of Intersecting Inequality*, IDS/MDG Achievement Fund.

Inequalities in services and social development outcomes

Income inequalities must be understood in relation to unequal access to services such as sanitation and health (Morgan, Ortiz), and in relation to essential social development outcomes including education, health and nutrition. This is particularly pertinent for children and young people, who make up a disproportionate part of the poorest 40 per cent (due to higher fertility rates).

These inequalities mean that a child being born in a family in the 20 per cent lowest income groups, compared to a child born in a family belonging to the highest 20 per cent income groups is:

- 3 times *less* likely to be delivered by a skilled health professional,
- 3 times *more* likely to be underweight,
- 2 times *more* likely to be stunted,
- 2 times *more* likely to die before her/his fifth birthday.

Moreover, the mortality rates of children under five years in the lowest and highest 20 per cent are often the result of very different causes; the poorest children are particularly affected by highly preventable causes (Knippenberg).

Early childhood deprivations are **cumulative across a person's life span** (Morgan). For instance, malnutrition in the womb and poor childhood nutrition lead to irreversible cognitive damage which affects a person's ability to learn and succeed in education throughout life. This damage furthermore reduces a person's chances to increase earnings, acquire a secure livelihood and escape poverty. These findings underline the importance of actions focused on the first 1000 days of a child's life.

The Consultation recognised the need for further research on the ethical dimension of inequality: at what point does inequality become a concern (Sabates-Wheeler)?

Existing evidence shows that inequality matters for a variety of reasons (Saad, Ortiz):

- Economic growth in its own right is insufficient for reducing inequalities.
- More equal distributions of income are not antagonistic to but supportive of sustained economic growth. High levels of inequalities can impede economic growth in several ways:
 - reducing productivity,
 - lengthening the period before recovery of growth resumes after downturns,
 - inhibiting the evolution of economic and political institutions of accountability,
 - undermining civic and social life that sustains effective collective decision-making.
- Reducing inequalities can foster political stability and reduce the chances of conflict.
- Addressing inequalities will accelerate the achievement of the MDGs.
- Reducing inequalities is central to promoting fairness and social justice. While equality of opportunity is important (achieved by, for instance, preventing discrimination), it is not sufficient. Most of the world's poor and marginalised people occupy highly unequal starting positions, which impede their ability to capitalise on opportunities.
- Reducing inequalities enhances human dignity, self-worth, and fosters inclusive, active citizenship.

The Consultation concluded that the case for reducing inequality is strong. Reducing the tremendous inequalities of income, access to services and social development outcomes (between and within countries) is a highly legitimate development goal. Inequality reduction requires more prominence on policy agendas, and needs to be an integral part of efforts to alleviate and eliminate poverty.⁷

EXPERIENCES OF ACTION ADVANCING EQUITY

With the case for reducing inequalities clear, the critical question is how to achieve this goal. This section of the report describes lessons learnt from action by the UN, international NGOs and governments. It identifies steps that can be taken to address inequalities.

Action by the UN

The UN can play a central role in advancing notions of inequality and social justice in international development agendas. It has long been a critical place fostering innovative ideas, providing a space for the expression of a wide range of development perspectives by various actors. It also plays a leading role in supporting country-level development efforts (Jolly).

Strategically, inequalities occupy a place of prominence in the UN Development for All agenda (Ortiz). They may be given further prominence in the discussions regarding the post-2015 MDG agenda (de Caen). UNICEF has taken a leading role putting equity at the heart of its development agenda (Ortiz, Morgan), while UNDP, UNRISD⁸ and other UN agencies have also begun to emphasise inequality reduction.

UNICEF has also recently commissioned research that shows that contrary to common thinking the delivery of services to poor, remote areas can be highly cost-effective, because greater costs and efforts are offset by economies of scale. Investments in reaching marginalised groups should therefore be a top priority, and can help respond to calls for greater aid effectiveness (Morgan, Knippenberg).

Action by NGOs

NGOs have advanced debate and action on equity through several strategic roles (Whitbread, Green):

1. Using equitable models in their programming (for example, by supplying educational materials in minority languages and supporting community health workers to enhance women's access to public health services),
2. Campaigning, lobbying, and media work at global and national levels,
3. Working with communities and supporting marginalised groups' efforts to claim their rights and entitlements,
4. Brokering between antagonistic parties, such as between communities and governments,
5. Putting existing data to better uses, making the invisible visible.

⁷ Coupling of inequality with poverty is important – illustrated by Anderson's remarks that the British government would not wish to target aid at highly unequal societies where poverty has been eradicated (Anderson)

⁸ Notably, through the *UNRISD Flagship Report: Combating Poverty and Inequality* (2010).

NGOs however face significant challenges in undertaking the above roles, since they:

- have limited capacity to deliver services,
- face security risks (especially in fragile states),
- face political risks when they challenge the status quo,
- need to work in coalition with other state and non-state actors.

The nature of actions needed to address inequality make the task for NGOs even more complicated. Although NGO fundraising often depends on compelling and easily understood ideas and issues, the problems of NGOs need to carefully balance a prophetic and technocratic stance. Strong claims to action need to be supported by firm evidence, often expressed in technocratic jargon that may alienate popular audiences.

Substantively, NGOs must give greater attention to issues of taxation, and must ultimately engage with inequalities in the distribution of power in their campaigns.

Action by governments

The Consultation found that social protection programmes are a critical area in which governments can enhance equity. Brazil is one of the countries that have successfully reduced levels of income inequality over the last decade. The *Bolsa Familia* social protection programme has been crucial to this success, facilitated by a policy environment that ensures and increases minimum wages, inflation control, and other income transfer policies (Pinto).

Bolsa Familia was successful due to several institutional features:

- an intersectoral approach involving all levels of government and various departments,
- a strong involvement of middle-level bureaucracy,
- information sharing, underpinned by monitoring and evaluation mechanisms,
- grounding in a rights-based approach,
- incentives that pushed local levels of government to implement the programme adequately and transparently.

In India, low levels of public investment in social programmes (e.g. 1 per cent of GDP on health, 3 per cent on education) and poor accountability hamper access to affordable and good quality health and education services for the poorest groups (Saxena). Enhancing social expenditures on education, health and sanitation is hence another important area of action (Saxena, Morgan).

Progressive and redistributive forms of taxation can help sustain social spending and support expansion of social protection programmes. At the same time, the governance of social programmes needs improving (Morgan, Knippenberg). In India, leakages and weak monitoring and evaluation mechanisms undermine the efficacy of social protection programmes. Accountability mechanisms also need to be strengthened. In India, despite devolution measures, limited incentives exist for states to show strong social performance. Finally, public expenditures in India may be fruitfully employed to strengthen the performance of a stagnant agricultural economy, from which a majority of Indians derive a livelihood (Saxena).

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION TO REDUCE INEQUALITIES AND PROMOTE SOCIAL JUSTICE

The Consultation recognised a new potential to address inequalities in their multiple forms. This report proposes 13 recommendations for action:

1. **Draw lessons from successful efforts to reduce inequality.** Despite the general trend of rising inequalities over the last two decades, some countries in each world region have managed to defy the trend and reduce inequalities. Further lessons need to be drawn from these success stories. These should identify the social, political and economic processes that enabled success.
2. **Advocate for a range of equity-enhancing policy options,** including those identified in the Consultation (Ortiz, Saad, Pinto, Knippenberg).⁹ These options include providing information and outreach, investing in infrastructure, strengthening the resource base of marginalised groups and facilitating their active involvement in policy processes. Social protection and other social spending programmes are important, but must be backed by progressive systems of taxation if they are to be able to address equity issues. This will often require taxation reforms.
3. **Foster enabling environments that allow equity-enhancing policies to succeed.** Creating an enabling environment can involve passing legislation against discrimination and fostering labour-intensive economic growth with redistribution (Fortin, McKinley). The pursuit of economic growth must lead to ‘economies that do well, because the people in these economies are also doing well’.
4. **Design programmes to be highly sensitive to country-specific contexts.** Programmes must consist of more than ready-made packages of technical intervention. They must engage with issues of governance and with access barriers, demand stimulation and supply bottlenecks in the provision of essential services. They must recognise the importance of social norms, practices and institutions in mediating access and provisioning of these services (Morgan, Ortiz, Saxena, Domingo).
5. **Leverage existing data to measure equity outcomes.** While in recent years, multidimensional measures of poverty have gained attention, the dominant measures of poverty have long been (and continue to be) expressed in terms of income, while distributional issues have received insufficient attention.¹⁰ The Consultation considered the need to make vigorous efforts to devise new equity-adjusted indicators of development, for which governments and UN bodies already often collect high-quality and comparable data. Country league tables are a particularly powerful way of advancing and keeping development issues on political agendas (Vandemoortele). Practically, new indicators must allow for the capture of data that are comparable, of satisfactory quality, sensitive to context and that can be easily disaggregated (e.g. to show fluctuations over the life course).¹¹

⁹ For instance, affirmative action and quota instruments have substantially reduced economic inequalities between *bhumiputra* (indigenous Malay) and other ethnic communities in Malaysia. In Chiapas, Mexico, women’s coalitions successfully advanced equity agendas to ensure that health service provisioning caters more adequately to the needs of indigenous communities to effectively reduce maternal mortality rates (Saad).

¹⁰ Palma, J.G. (2011) ‘Homogeneous Middles vs. Heterogeneous Tails, and the End of the “Inverted-U”: It’s All About the Share of the Rich’, *Development and Change* 42.1: 87–153.

¹¹ Data lags pose an additional challenge, and rapidly changing socio-economic environments suggest the need for rapid monitoring tools (Knippenberg).

Substantively, indicators need to be better able to demonstrate distributional inequities in income (e.g. by comparing top and bottom deciles (d9–d1; d9–(d1–4)),¹² and in access to essential services and resultant health, education, nutrition, sanitation and other social development outcomes. Fortunately, there is clear scope to systematically analyse data at lower, more meaningful levels of aggregation, and this is now happening in UNICEF (Whitbread, Knippenberg, Morgan). For instance, comparing mean scores between countries on indicators such as GNI per capita fails to give attention to vertical and horizontal inequalities in countries. Disaggregating existing data allows one to ‘make the invisible visible’ (Whitbread) and would not require much investment, as these can draw on existing databases (Morgan).

6. **Employ new indicators of development that capture intersecting inequalities.** The way we measure development and poverty has tremendous influence on the direction of policies, public action and public debates (Vandemoortele). For instance, the prevalence of stunting amongst population groups is often a better long-term measure of developmental outcomes than prevailing measures such as Gross National Income per capita (Morgan). The UN and governments should prioritise the development of new criteria and forms of data collection that better reflect the intersecting nature of inequalities. This requires systematic attention to horizontal and vertical inequalities (Saxena). This area is substantially underdeveloped. For instance, on some aspects, such as the prevalence of discrimination in a country, no data exist (Hulme).
7. **Develop strong political intention and action around reducing inequalities.** In its broadest sense, reducing inequalities needs to be at the heart of new social contracts within and across nations; and is inseparable from questions about appropriate levels of taxation and enhanced use of fiscal space (McKinley, Green). Such action may for instance be expressed in a greater prioritisation of social expenditures by governments (Saxena, Pinto). However, this is no mean task. It will challenge entrenched political and economic interests (Saad, Ortiz) and require redistributions of power (Green). Addressing inequalities requires strong political leadership from politicians, heads of state and charismatic public figures (Vandemoortele, Jolly).
8. **Frame a convincing narrative to challenge prevailing discourses which insufficiently problematise inequality,** and which overemphasise the power of inequality to incentivise people to do better (Whitbread, Fortin, Jolly). Such a narrative needs to be inclusive and appeal to a wide section of society if it is to succeed (McKinley). A focus on social exclusion may not appeal to a middle-class audience (McKinley). However, the argument that inequalities affect not only the poorest of the poor, but 40 per cent or 60 per cent of national populations has much wider appeal (Ortiz).

Narratives that contrast income inequalities between developed countries and developing countries are becoming outdated.¹³ However, replacing this narrative with one that succinctly captures the complexity of intersecting and horizontal inequalities may comprise a serious communication challenge (Whitbread). The success of a new narrative can be gauged in whether it translates into the actions and practices of ordinary people (Vandemoortele) or whether it facilitates coordinated action across UN agencies (Ortiz).

¹² Palma, J.G. (2011) ‘Homogeneous Middles vs. Heterogeneous Tails, and the End of the “Inverted-U”: It’s All About the Share of the Rich’, *Development and Change* 42.1: 87–153.

¹³ E.g. witness the recent debate about the appropriateness of continued UK aid to India, itself a donor country.

9. **Advocate for balancing strong economic growth with an even stronger drive for equity** (Mkandawire). A new development narrative must show that a more equal distribution of income is supportive of, not antagonistic to, economic growth. Focusing on the poorest, hardest to reach communities is both the ‘most effective way of making lasting progress’ (Whitbread) and the right thing to do on grounds of cost-effectiveness. Providing services to the poorest constitutes the investments with the highest ‘returns’ in terms of averted morbidity and mortality (Morgan, Ortiz, Knippenberg).
10. **Use discourses of human rights to support new narratives.** While human rights are increasingly absent from major donors’ policy documents, they continue to fundamentally underpin the mandates of UN agencies, and provide principles to guide philosophical and programming choices (Morgan). The Millennium Declaration provides a useful reference point; it clearly prioritises inequality, and is supported by the UN system and a broad set of countries (de Caen; Morgan).
- Rights-based discourses are also at the heart of some of the most exciting policy interventions to address poverty and inequality, including the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Scheme in India (Saxena) and the *Bolsa Familia* in Brazil (Pinto). Southern social movements’ efforts to use rights-based discourses to generate more equitable laws, policies and jurisprudence could provide an important source for learning (Domingo).
11. **Think strategically and pragmatically about the best courses of action.** Are modest ambitions for incremental reductions in child inequalities more likely to achieve policy actions (Hulme)? Greater equity for children appeals to notions of fairness and social justice which bridge political ideological divides (Jolly). Investments in services for children also have clear long-term returns. Raising equity for children can strategically constitute a ‘levelling force for the future’ (Morgan).
12. **Use the discussions of the post-2015 MDG agenda at the UN as a platform for drawing attention to inequalities as a key development problem** (de Caen). The current moment is especially opportune with UNICEF placing equity at the heart of its agenda, and with inequalities holding greater traction in the UN Development for All agenda (Ortiz).
- 13 **Form a broad coalition of partners including NGOs, social movements, researchers, UN agencies, governments and others to advocate for placing equity at the heart of development agendas.** This coalition can advance an alternative to neoliberal development narratives, highlight inequalities and their detrimental effects on poverty, and point to policies and approaches proven to address inequality (Whitbread, Morgan, Saad, Cobham, Molyneux).¹⁴

¹⁴ The roundtable recognises that this raises many questions that need further thinking through, e.g. about modus operandi, division of labour, rules of engagement and the legitimacy of INGOs and their relations to Southern NGOs (who need to be involved at an early stage) (te Lintelo, Jolly) and appropriate engagements with parliaments (Kinnock).

NEXT STEPS

The Consultation aims to have a broad impact through the wide dissemination of its findings. In the short term, multiple media pieces aim to reach different audiences:

- an article on **The Guardian's Poverty Matters blog** authored by Richard Jolly,
- a letter urging action on inequality and social justice, to be submitted to a major UK newspaper.

This report will be widely disseminated through Consultation participants' professional and organisational networks.

In the medium term, we intend to build on the Consultation by producing:

- a pamphlet aimed at policymaking audiences that puts forward the inequality agenda,
- a web-based platform for hosting materials and discussing the inequality agenda.

Finally, we intend to build an informal network or coalition to prioritise reducing inequalities and enhancing social justice, and to take forward the recommendations set out in this report.



PROGRAMME: INEQUALITY AND SOCIAL JUSTICE ROUNDTABLE

Friday 9 September 2011, 9.30am–5.30pm

Convocation Hall, Church House Conference Centre, Westminster, London

Time	Session	Speakers
9.30–9.55	Registration	
10.00–10.05	Welcome	Sophie de Caen Director, MDG Achievement Fund
10.05–10.15	Inequality and social justice: Key findings and recommendations from UN/IDS report on inequality and social justice	Layla Saad Advocacy and Partnership Advisor, MDG Achievement Fund
Morning programme: Inequality and social justice		Chair: Carlos Fortin Research Fellow, IDS
10.15–11.00	Session 1: Intersecting inequalities: the broader challenge	
	Keynote (15 minutes)	Jan Vandemoortele Independent researcher, former UNDP
	Discussant 1 (7 minutes) Discussant 2 (7 minutes)	Terry McKinley – SOAS David Hulme – University of Manchester
	Q&A (15 minutes)	
11.00–11.38	Session 2: Inequalities for women and children	
	Keynote (15 minutes)	Richard Morgan Director of Policy and Practice, UNICEF
	Discussant (7 minutes)	Jasmine Whitbread Chief Executive, Save the Children
	Q&A (15 minutes)	
11.38–12.15	Session 3: Income inequalities	
	Keynote (15 minutes)	Isabel Ortiz Associate Director, UNICEF
	Discussant (7 minutes)	Thandika Mkandawire Department of International Development, London School of Economics
	Q&A (15 minutes)	
12.15–13.00	Lunch	

Time	Session	Speakers
	Afternoon programme: Priorities for action on national and global inequalities – What can be done?	Chair: Layla Saad Advocacy and Partnership Advisor, MDG Achievement Fund
	Session 1: National responses to the inequality agenda	
13.00–14.00	Keynote 1 (20 minutes)	Bruno Camara Pinto Ministry of Social Development and Fight Against Hunger, Brazil
	Keynote 2 (20 minutes)	N C Saxena National Advisory Council of India
	Q&A (10 minutes for each speaker)	
	Session 2: Opportunities for NGO leadership	
14.00–14.45	Keynote (20 minutes)	Jasmine Whitbread Chief Executive, Save the Children
	Discussant 1 (5 minutes)	Duncan Green Head of Research, Oxfam GB
	Discussant 2 (5 minutes)	Pilar Domingo Research Fellow, ODI
	Q&A (15 minutes)	
	Session 3: Priorities for UN leadership	
14.45–15.30	Keynote (20 minutes)	Rudolf Knippenberg Principal Health Advisor, UNICEF
	Discussant (5 minutes)	Richard Jolly Research Associate, IDS
	Q&A (15 minutes)	
15.30–15.45	Tea and Coffee	
	Session 4: DFID's perspectives and opportunities for donor leadership	
15.45–16.25	Keynote (20 minutes)	Michael Anderson Director General for Policy and Global Issues, DFID
	Discussant (5 minutes)	Alex Cobham Policy Manager, Christian Aid
	Q&A (15 minutes)	
	Conclusions	
16.25–17.10	Priorities for action for diminishing rising inequalities – nationally and internationally	Chair: Glenys Kinnock Opposition Spokesperson for International Development, House of Lords
	Rapporteur's summary	Dolf te Lintelo Research Fellow, IDS
	Discussion	Jasmine Whitbread Chief Executive, Save the Children
17.10–17.30	Closing remarks and discussion	Glenys Kinnock Opposition Spokesperson for International Development, House of Lords



PARTICIPANTS LIST: INEQUALITY AND SOCIAL JUSTICE ROUNDTABLE

Peroline Ainsworth, Researcher, IDS/MDG Achievement Fund Inequalities Report

Dr Michael Anderson, Director-General for Policy and Global Issues, DFID

Sophie de Caen, Director, MDG Achievement Fund

Dr Alex Cobham, Chief Policy Advisor, Christian Aid

Tim Conway, Senior Poverty Advisor, DFID

Dr Pilar Domingo, Research Fellow, ODI

Dr Carlos Fortin, Research Associate, IDS

James Georgalakis, Communications Manager, IDS

Duncan Green, Head of Research, Oxfam GB

Professor David Hulme, Executive Director, Brooks World Poverty Institute, University of Manchester

Professor Sir Richard Jolly, Research Associate, IDS

Baroness Glenys Kinnock, Opposition Spokesperson for International Development, House of Lords

Dr Rudolf Knippenberg, Principal Health Advisor, UNICEF

Dr Dolf te Lintelo, Research Fellow, IDS

Jen Marshall, Head of Profession for Social Development, DFID

Professor Terry McKinley, Director, Centre for Development Policy and Research, SOAS

Professor Thandika Mkandawire, Professor of African Development, London School of Economics

Professor Maxine Molyneux, Director, Institute for the Study of the Americas

Dr Richard Morgan, Director of Policy and Practice, UNICEF

Sarah Nelson, Communications Officer, IDS

Dr Isabel Ortiz, Associate Director, UNICEF

Bruno Câmara Pinto, Advisor to the Cabinet of the National Secretariat of Citizenship Income, Ministry of Social Development and Fight Against Hunger, Brazil

Ewan Robinson, Communications Officer, IDS

Layla Saad, Advocacy and Partnership Advisor, MDG Achievement Fund

Dr Rachel Sabates-Wheeler, Research Fellow, IDS

Ricardo Santos, DPhil Student, IDS

Dr N.C. Saxena, National Advisory Council, India

Dr Jan Vandemoortele, Independent researcher, formerly UNDP and UNICEF

Jasmine Whitbread, CEO, Save the Children