

United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD) (Ed.)

**Working Paper**

## A hundred key questions for the post-2015 development agenda

UNRISD Working Paper, No. 2015-7

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD), Geneva

*Suggested Citation:* United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD) (Ed.) (2015) : A hundred key questions for the post-2015 development agenda, UNRISD Working Paper, No. 2015-7, United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD), Geneva

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/148768>

**Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:**

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

**Terms of use:**

*Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.*

*You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.*

*If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.*



United Nations Research Institute for Social Development

**UNRISD**

**SIID**

*The Sheffield  
Institute for  
International  
Development.*

Working Paper 2015-7

# **A Hundred Key Questions for the Post-2015 Development Agenda**

March 2015

UNRISD Working Papers are posted online  
to stimulate discussion and critical comment.



# UNRISD

United Nations Research Institute for Social Development

The United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD) is an autonomous research institute within the UN system that undertakes multidisciplinary research and policy analysis on the social dimensions of contemporary development issues. Through our work we aim to ensure that social equity, inclusion and justice are central to development thinking, policy and practice.

UNRISD, Palais des Nations  
1211 Geneva 10, Switzerland

Tel: +41 (0)22 9173020  
Fax: +41 (0)22 9170650  
[info@unrisd.org](mailto:info@unrisd.org)  
[www.unrisd.org](http://www.unrisd.org)



The Sheffield Institute for International Development (SIID) is an interdisciplinary research institute within the University of Sheffield, United Kingdom. SIID brings together researchers, partners, students and stakeholder groups to develop new approaches to development research. We conduct internationally leading research, high quality postgraduate training, and public engagement.

SIID promotes a vision of international development as a struggle for social justice and a space for activism and engagement. Our mission is to examine and explore the multiple, lived experiences of development and the struggles for a more just global settlement.

SIID, University of Sheffield  
4th Floor, ICOSS  
219 Portobello, Sheffield S1 4DP  
Telephone + 44 (0)114 222 6282  
Email [siidgroup@sheffield.ac.uk](mailto:siidgroup@sheffield.ac.uk)

Copyright © United Nations Research Institute for Social Development and The Sheffield Institute for International Development

This is not a formal UNRISD publication. The responsibility for opinions expressed in signed studies rests solely with their author(s), and availability on the UNRISD Web site ([www.unrisd.org](http://www.unrisd.org)) does not constitute an endorsement by UNRISD of the opinions expressed in them. No publication or distribution of these papers is permitted without the prior authorization of the author(s), except for personal use.



## **About the ID100 Project**

In 2014, SIID led the project “ID100: The Hundred Most Important Questions in International Development”, a wide-ranging consultation and priority-setting exercise on international development research. ID100 offered academics, think tanks, non-governmental and multilateral organizations the opportunity to submit questions. These were then shortlisted to a final set of 100 questions following a debate and voting process during a two-day workshop in Sheffield. The consultation adapted a natural sciences-based knowledge co-production methodology to international development.

More than 700 people from 34 countries took part in the consultation, and 35 experts were involved in the discussion and shortlisting process.

The project stimulated knowledge exchange among academics and international development organizations and allowed questions to be formulated collectively by development stakeholders, researchers and funders, with the aim of directly contributing to international development policy and research, and identifying priorities for funding and international cooperation strategies.

ID100 was facilitated by Johan Oldekop, Lorenza Fontana, Jean Grugel and Nicole Roughton from the Sheffield Institute for International Development, and supported by the Research Exchange for the Social Sciences (RESS) and Research & Innovation Services (RIS) at the University of Sheffield.

UNRISD was a key partner in the project. Katja Hujo has been part of the steering committee and involved in all stages of the consultation, shortlisting process and systematization of the results.

This working paper represents one of the main outputs of the project and includes the list of 100 key research questions identified, alongside a methodological section and a discussion of the results. Its aim is to contribute to the discussion on the post-2015 global development agenda and the new research priorities that it will entail.

For a video and infographics of the project, see <http://id100.group.shef.ac.uk>

For further information on the project, see <http://siid.group.shef.ac.uk/project/id100>



## Contents

Acronyms .....	ii
Acknowledgements .....	ii
List of Authors.....	iii
Summary.....	vii
Introduction .....	1
2. Methods .....	2
2.1 Consultation.....	2
2.2. Shortlisting .....	6
3. Questions .....	9
3.1 Governance, Participation and Rights .....	9
3.2 Environmental Sustainability .....	10
3.3 Food Security, Land and Agriculture .....	11
3.4 Energy and Natural Resources .....	12
3.5 Conflict, Population Dynamics and Urbanization.....	12
3.6 Economic Growth, Employment and the Private Sector.....	13
3.7 Social and Economic Inequalities .....	14
3.8 Health and Education.....	16
3.9 Development Policies, Practices and Institutions.....	17
4. Discussion.....	18
Appendix: Contributing Organizations .....	20
References .....	23

## Acronyms

<b>AFIDEP</b>	African Institute for Development Policy
<b>AIDS</b>	Acquired immunodeficiency syndrome
<b>BOND</b>	Membership body of UK international development NGOs
<b>HIV</b>	Human immunodeficiency virus
<b>IPCC</b>	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
<b>LGBTI</b>	Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex
<b>MDG</b>	Millennium Development Goal
<b>NGO</b>	Non-governmental organization
<b>OHCHR</b>	Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights
<b>PAI</b>	Population Action International
<b>SDG</b>	Sustainable Development Goal
<b>SIID</b>	Sheffield Institute for International Development
<b>UK</b>	United Kingdom
<b>UKCDS</b>	United Kingdom Collaborative on Development Sciences
<b>UN</b>	United Nations
<b>UNDP</b>	United Nations Development Programme
<b>UNICEF</b>	United Nations Children's Fund
<b>UNRISD</b>	United Nations Research Institute for Social Development
<b>WHO</b>	World Health Organization

## Acknowledgements

We are grateful to all the individuals and organizations who submitted questions and took part in the consultation process. We are also thankful to BOND and UKCDS for hosting a dedicated workshop to formulate a series of questions in collaboration with numerous UK-based organizations. This project was financially supported by SIID, the University of Sheffield's Research and Innovation Services (R&IS), and the Innovation, Impact and Knowledge Exchange (IIKE) programme. Opinions expressed in this paper are those of the individual authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of their organizations.

## List of Authors<sup>i</sup>

**Johan A. Oldekop**, Research Affiliate, Sheffield Institute for International Development, The University of Sheffield, United Kingdom; Marie Curie Research Fellow, School of Natural Resources and Environment, University of Michigan, United States; and School of Biology, Newcastle University, United Kingdom

**Lorenza B. Fontana**, Research Associate, Sheffield Institute for International Development, The University of Sheffield, United Kingdom

**Jean Grugel**, Director, Sheffield Institute for International Development; and Professor, International Development, The University of Sheffield, United Kingdom

**Nicole Roughton**, Coordinator, Sheffield Institute for International Development, The University of Sheffield, United Kingdom

**Emmanuel A. Adu-Ampong**, PhD student, Department of Town and Regional Planning, The University of Sheffield, United Kingdom

**Gemma K. Bird**, PhD student, Department of Politics, The University of Sheffield, United Kingdom

**Sara Wallin**, PhD student, Department of Politics, The University of Sheffield, United Kingdom; and Research Associate, Department of Politics, Goldsmiths, University of London, United Kingdom

**Alex Dorgan**, PhD student, Department of Geography, The University of Sheffield, United Kingdom

**Marcia A. Vera Espinoza**, PhD student, Department of Geography, The University of Sheffield, United Kingdom

**Daniel Hammett**, Senior Lecturer, Department of Geography The University of Sheffield, United Kingdom

**Esther Agbarakwe**, Communication and Documentation Officer, Association for Reproductive and Family Health (ARFH), Abuja, Nigeria

**Arun Agrawal**, Professor, School of Natural Resources and Environment, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, United States

**Nurgul Asylbekova**, Country Programme Gender Coordinator, United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women), Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan

**Clarissa Azkoul**, Chief of Mission, International Organization for Migration, London, United Kingdom

**Craig Bardsley**, Head, International Development Research, Economic and Social Research Council, Swindon, United Kingdom

**Anthony J. Bebbington**, Milton P. and Alice C. Higgins Professor of Environment and Society and Director, Graduate School of Geography, Clark University, United States; and Professorial Research Fellow, Institute for Development Policy and Management, University of Manchester, United Kingdom

---

<sup>i</sup> Authors are in order of their degree of involvement in the work, with the most active contributors listed first, followed by those who contributed to the shortlisting and selection of questions in alphabetic order. Sutherland, listed last, contributed in developing the “100 questions” methods used in this paper, providing advice in structuring the exercise and in running the workshop.



**Savio Carvalho**, Senior Advisor, Campaigning on International Development and Human Rights, Amnesty International, International Secretariat, London, United Kingdom

**Deepta Chopra**, Research Fellow, Institute for Development Studies, Brighton, United Kingdom

**Stamatios Christopoulos**, Environmental Sustainability Specialist, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in Europe and CIS, Istanbul Regional Hub, Turkey

**Emma Crewe**, Senior Lecturer, School of Oriental and African Studies, The University of London, London, United Kingdom

**Marie-Claude Dop**, Research Officer, Nutripass, Institut de Recherche pour le Développement, Montpellier, France

**Joern Fischer**, Professor, Sustainable Landscapes, Institute of Ecology, Leuphana University Lueneburg, Germany

**Daan Gerretsen**, Director, Programme Quality, Build Africa, Tunbridge Wells, Kent, United Kingdom

**Jonathan Glennie**, Director of Policy and Research, Save the Children UK, London, United Kingdom

**William Gois**, Regional Coordinator, Migrant Forum in Asia (MFA), Quezon City, The Philippines

**Mtinkheni Gondwe**, Senior Policy Officer, Netherlands Organisation for International Cooperation in Higher Education (NUFFIC), The Hague, The Netherlands

**Lizz A. Harrison**, Disaster Risk Reduction and Emergencies Advisor, Y Care International, London, United Kingdom

**Katja Hujo**, Research Coordinator, United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD), Geneva, Switzerland

**Mark Keen**, Director, IOD Parc, Sheffield, United Kingdom

**Roberto Laserna**, Social Science Researcher, Centre for the Study of Social and Economic Reality (CERES), Cochabamba, Bolivia

**Luca Miggiano**, Global Policy Advisor, Secretariat of the International Land Coalition, Rome, Italy

**Sarah Mistry**, Director of Effectiveness and Learning, British Overseas NGOs for Development (BOND), London, United Kingdom

**Rosemary J. Morgan**, Research Fellow, Department of International Health, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, Maryland, United States

**Linda L. Raftree**, Co-Founder and Principal, Kurante, Washington DC, United States

**Duncan Rhind**, Country Director, iDE Zambia, Lusaka, Zambia

**Thiago Rodrigues**, Professor, International Relations, Department of Strategic Studies and International Relations, Fluminense Federal University, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

**Sonia Roschnik**, Former Director, The Humanitarian Centre, Cambridge, United Kingdom

**Flavia Senkubuge**, Public Health Medicine Specialist, School of Health Systems and Public Health, University of Pretoria, South Africa

**Ian Thornton**, Interim Director, UK Collaborative on Development Sciences (UKCDS), London, United Kingdom

**Simon Trace**, Chief Executive Officer, Practical Action, Rugby, United Kingdom

**Teresa Ore**, Professor of Water Resources, Department of Social Sciences, Catholic University of Peru, Lima, Peru

**Rene Mauricio Valdes**, UN Resident Coordinator and UNDP Resident Representative in Argentina; formerly Chief of Staff of the One Secretariat for Post-2015, UN New York, United States

**Bhaskar Vira**, Director, University of Cambridge Conservation Research Institute; and Reader, Political Economy of Environment and Development, Department of Geography, University of Cambridge, United Kingdom

**Nicola Yeates**, Professor, Social Policy and Criminology Department, The Open University, Milton Keynes, United Kingdom

**William J. Sutherland**, Miriam Rothschild Professor of Conservation Biology, Department of Zoology, University of Cambridge, United Kingdom



## Summary

With a new development framework under way and an increasingly urgent need to address political, socioeconomic and environmental issues on a global scale, this is a critical moment for the international development agenda. Almost 15 years after the Millennium Declaration, a new phase for international development is about to begin and, with it, comes the opportunity to critically assess how new development goals and milestones are likely to be shaped and delivered. This paper assumes that a greater understanding of development needs and practices can better sustain a new agenda for change, and that a key step in this process is to identify priorities based on both new and long-standing knowledge gaps, to help orient decision-making processes and funding allocation in academia and beyond.

This paper presents the results of a consultative and participatory exercise that addresses the need to articulate and better align the research interests and priorities of academics and practitioners working on international development in a post-2015 international development framework. The exercise was organized around a two-stage consultation and shortlisting process. A four-months open consultation was conducted, offering development stakeholders and individuals the opportunity to submit their questions. People were invited to submit questions related to some of the thematic priorities that guided the “World We Want” campaign—a global stakeholder consultation conducted by the UN between 2010 and 2014 involving governments, civil society and lay citizens. In this first phase, 705 individuals from 109 organizations based in 34 countries were involved in the formulation of 704 questions. The questions were then discussed and shortlisted during a two-day workshop with academic and practitioners representing different world regions and areas of expertise, among whom are also the authors of this paper.

After the final shortlisting, questions were regrouped into nine macro-thematic sections: governance, participation and rights; environmental sustainability; food security, land and agriculture; energy and natural resources; conflict, population dynamics and urbanization; economic growth, employment and the private sector; social and economic inequalities; health and education; development policies, practices and institutions.

The final 100 questions address a varied combination of long-standing problems that have hindered the development agenda for decades as well as new challenges emerging from broader socioeconomic, political and environmental changes. Well-established concerns about the rights of women, and of vulnerable groups such as poor workers, small-scale farmers, people with disabilities, children and ethnic minorities feature alongside emerging issues, including the role of business in protecting human rights, and information and communication technologies as tools for empowerment and social integration. Similarly, traditional concerns linked to rural livelihoods, land tenure and agricultural production are presented together with environmental sustainability, natural resource extraction, urbanization, food security, and climate change adaptation and mitigation.

While civil society and the empowerment of marginalized populations are recognized as key for development, questions on new actors including the private sector, emerging economic powers and new middle-income countries as development donors and partners feature heavily in the shortlist. The questions also reflect the mainstreaming of gender perspectives into a wide range of development areas, helping to cement the view that gender should be considered central to future development initiatives. A large

number of the submitted questions (102) specifically addressed broader issues related to development politics, practices and institutions. This outcome, combined with the fact that a number of these were included in the final shortlist, highlights the fact that there is a critical need for a deeper collective reflection on the role and relationships of different actors in international development, and the impact that contemporary economic and political scenarios will have on the development agenda.

We envision our list of 100 questions contributing to inform the post-2015 agenda and future development-related research priorities of international, governmental and non-governmental organizations. But, perhaps more centrally, we believe that these questions can act as starting points for debate, research and collaboration between academics, practitioners and policy makers. The value of research exercises such as this one rely on the ability of a variety of stakeholders to reach consensus around a set of research priorities put forward by anyone willing to engage in the process. We believe that the process of co-production we set out here, of debate and discussion between different stakeholders, is essential for successfully and effectively tackling the key challenges ahead for the international development agenda.

**Keywords:** Millennium Development Goals; Sustainable Development Goals; priority setting; research questions; knowledge coproduction.

## Introduction

The beginning of the twenty-first century heralded a shift in international development priorities and practices. The adoption of the Millennium Declaration at the United Nations in 2000, and ensuing Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), committed the international community to achieving eight ambitious development objectives by 2015. Now, almost 15 years after the Millennium Declaration, a new phase for international development is about to begin. With this phase comes the opportunity to critically assess how new development goals and milestones are likely to be shaped and delivered. This paper, and the research exercise underpinning it, assumes that the international research community, local and international non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and wider civil society have a role to play in shaping the questions that will underlie this new agenda. We present the findings of a wide-ranging consultation on international development research priorities that brought together academics, NGOs and international organizations (see appendix).

In recent years, the debate about international development strategies has largely focused on the direction to be taken by the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), set to supersede the MDGs.<sup>1</sup> Although poverty remains a key priority, it is increasingly being paired with sustainability. According to the recently published draft of the SDGs (UN 2014), efforts to end poverty should be entrenched in long-term strategies that combine inclusive and sustained economic growth, social development and environmental protection (UN 2014). This new focus on green growth, or indeed, alternative measures of economic progress, and the awareness of our globalized and interconnected world, have led to a re-evaluation of the role of industrialized countries, as bearers of shared responsibilities in the implementation of both policy reforms and practical actions (Sachs 2012; Wisor 2012) and to an emphasis on the universality of development concerns, strategies and solutions.

Research that underlies development policy agendas has not always been effectively translated into practice (Fukuda-Parr 2011). This challenge has led to a realization that transdisciplinary efforts for knowledge coproduction combining the expertise of academics, practitioners and policy makers are needed to design problem-driven, usable and solution-oriented approaches. International transdisciplinary research initiatives, such as Future Earth,<sup>2</sup> respond to calls for more inclusive and evidence-based decision-making processes (e.g. Glaser 2012). However, uncertainty remains about how to successfully align research and policy priorities to devise effective approaches for contemporary problems (Dessai et al. 2013). Doing so is fraught with difficulties; beyond designed solutions, there are issues of politics (international, national and local) and challenges of implementation. Nevertheless, a first order problem is that of finding agreement on some fundamental areas that must be the focus of attention.

Here, we present the results of a consultative and participatory exercise that addresses the need to articulate and better align the research interests and priorities of academics and practitioners working on international development in a post-2015 international development framework. To this end, we modify and expand a method to conduct agenda-setting exercises in the natural sciences (Sutherland et al. 2011) to

---

<sup>1</sup> Vandemoortele & Delamonica 2010; Vandemoortele 2011; Sachs 2012; Glaser 2012; Griggs et al. 2013.

<sup>2</sup> Future Earth is a recently launched 10-year international research initiative supported by the United Nations, the International Council for Science, the International Social Science Council and the Belmont Forum, focusing on environmental change and global sustainability.

collaboratively identify 100 questions that have not been yet satisfactorily addressed and that are of critical importance for the new development agenda.

## **2. Methods**

Our exercise was organized around a two-stage consultation and shortlisting process. Although mainly a UK-based endeavour, we engaged with a greater and more varied set of actors than is usually the case in international priority setting efforts (e.g. Sutherland et al. 2010). Doing so allowed us to (i) capture a broader range of perspectives, areas of expertise and experiences from a host of institutions and individuals based in the Global North and South; and (ii) partially address issues of inclusiveness and representation. Structuring this process around the UN “World We Want” thematic priorities<sup>3</sup> allowed us to speak directly to the post-2015 agenda, while opening up conversations beyond the definition of new development goals to engage issues of development politics, practices and institutions.

### **2.1 Consultation**

The first phase of the project used three approaches to arrive at an initial set of candidate questions.

1. Between 17 February and 4 June 2014, the Sheffield Institute for International Development (SIID) conducted an open consultation, offering national and international NGOs, intergovernmental organizations, governmental agencies, think-tanks, academic institutions as well as individuals, the opportunity to submit up to five questions via an online portal or email. To maximize representation from different institutions and geographical regions, SIID invited 839 individuals from 675 organizations based in Africa, Australasia, Europe and the Americas and working on a broad range of themes within the development sector to contribute questions. This list of organizations was compiled using internet searches and assessing the remit and geographical coverage of individual organizations. Of the individuals contacted, 197 were personal contacts or were referred to us by our network of collaborators. To further encourage the submission of questions by individuals and organizations that were not contacted directly during the consultation phase, we complemented these activities with an online social media campaign using Facebook, Twitter (#ID100), and a dedicated website.

2. In May 2014, SIID co-hosted a workshop with the United Kingdom’s membership body of international development NGOs (BOND) and the UK Collaborative on Development Sciences (UKCDS). The event was attended by 50 practitioners and academics, who collectively formulated a series of questions that fed into the consultation process.

3. SIID hosted a two-day workshop in Sheffield on 1–2 July 2014, inviting 30 academics and practitioners with a variety of specialisms and experience in international development issues. Prior to the workshop, each participant was requested to submit between 10 and 20 questions.

---

<sup>3</sup> The World We Want is a global campaign launched by the United Nations. The campaign aims to generate a platform for opinions that will contribute to the definition of the post-2015 development agenda. It is structured around four actions: (i) national and subnational processes led by governments in broad partnership with civil society, the business sector, academia, and territorial networks; (ii) regional and global dialogues and events scheduled over the course of 2014; (iii) global e-dialogue through an online discussion; and (iv) outreach and dissemination of the consultation results ([www.worldwewant2015.org](http://www.worldwewant2015.org)).

Individuals submitting questions were encouraged to discuss ideas with colleagues and formulate questions arising from these conversations, along with a record of how many people participated in these discussions. Individuals were also asked to adhere to the following criteria while formulating their questions (see Sutherland et al. 2011):

- i. Must be answerable through a realistic research design;
- ii. Must be of a spatial and temporal scope that reasonably could be addressed by a research team;
- iii. Must not be formulated as a general topic area;
- iv. Must have a factual answer and must not be answerable with “it all depends”;
- v. Except if questioning a precise statement (e.g. “does the earth go round the sun?”), should not be answerable by “yes” or “no”;
- vi. If related to impact and interventions, must contain a subject, an intervention, and a measurable outcome.

Finally, SIID asked individuals submitting questions to assign one of the 11 themes<sup>4</sup> identified by the World We Want campaign to individual questions, giving them the opportunity to create new categories if they felt that none of the themes was applicable.

During the consultation phase, 705 individuals from 109 organizations based in 34 countries (see appendix) were involved in the formulation of 704 questions. Of the 675 organizations directly invited to contribute during the consultation phase, 35 submitted a total of 115 questions, a response rate of approximately 5.2 per cent. While academic institutions and NGOs submitted the majority of questions (41.5 per cent and 32.1 per cent respectively) think-tanks, intergovernmental organizations and government agencies submitted approximately a quarter. Institutions based in Europe and North America contributed 75.7 per cent of questions, while organizations in Latin America, Africa and Australasia accounted for 22.7 per cent submitted questions. Workshop participants submitted approximately a third of questions (34.9 per cent), with those who were made aware of the project via social media or word of mouth contributing a similar amount (29.7 per cent). Additional questions were submitted by directly invited individuals (16.3 per cent), the remaining authors of this article (10.4 per cent), and BOND/UKCDS workshop attendees (7.7 per cent) (table 1).

---

<sup>4</sup> Inequalities; Health; Education; Growth and Employment; Environmental Sustainability; Governance; Conflict and Fragility; Population Dynamics; Hunger, Food and Nutrition Security; Energy; Water.



**Table 1: Percentage of questions submitted during the consultation phase by different institutions, regions and contributors**

<b>Academic Institutions</b>	<b>Non-Governmental Organizations</b>	<b>Think-Tanks</b>	<b>Intergovernmental Organizations</b>	<b>Governmental Agencies</b>	<b>Consultancies</b>	<b>Private Sector/ Individuals</b>
41.5%	32.1%	12.9%	7.7%	3.3%	1.4%	1.1%
<b>UK</b>	<b>Rest of Europe</b>	<b>North America</b>	<b>Latin America</b>	<b>Africa</b>	<b>Australasia</b>	<b>Undisclosed</b>
49.4%	15.9%	10.4%	9.1%	9.2%	4.4%	1.6%
<b>Workshop participants</b>	<b>Social Media/ Word of Mouth</b>	<b>Direct Invitation</b>	<b>Remaining Authors</b>	<b>BOND/ UKCDS Workshop</b>	<b>Undisclosed</b>	
34.9%	29.7%	16.3%	10.4%	7.7%	1.0%	

**Table 2: Questions submitted by different kinds of organizations under the UN ‘World We Want’ themes and the additional ‘Development Policies, Practices and Institutions’ section.**

	Non-Governmental Organizations	Intergovernmental Organizations	Think-Tanks	Governmental Agencies	Academic Institutions	Consultancies	Other Entities	Total Questions
Conflict and Fragility	14	3	6	2	16	2	0	43
Education	9	0	5	1	14	3	0	32
Energy	7	7	1	6	8	1	1	31
Environmental Sustainability	20	10	7	1	30	1	0	69
Food Security	21	2	6	0	26	0	1	56
Governance	25	10	16	2	43	0	1	97
Growth and Employment	32	5	15	4	22	1	0	79
Health	26	2	2	3	25	1	0	59
Inequalities	22	4	13	0	30	1	1	71
Population Dynamics	8	1	9	2	21	0	0	41
Water	7	1	1	0	15	0	0	24
Development Policies, Practices and Institutions	35	9	10	2	42	0	4	102

## 2.2. Shortlisting

The 704 questions submitted under the 11 World We Want themes (table 2) were regrouped into nine macro-thematic sections in preparation for the shortlisting process.<sup>5</sup> This was done to identify and prevent thematic overlaps and to ensure, as much as possible, that each thematic session discussed a more balanced number of questions. Eight of these sections consisted of questions submitted under the original 11 World We Want themes. The ninth section, “Development policies, practices and institutions”, comprised 102 questions addressing broader aspects of international development.

Two weeks prior to the workshop, 35 experts—including all workshop participants and a number of individuals who contributed questions but were unable to attend the workshop—were asked to identify their top ranking (~20 per cent) questions within at least two of the nine sections. Results from the preliminary voting round formed the basis for the discussions and subsequent refinement and shortlisting during the workshop. To reduce bias, each participant received a spreadsheet containing all questions within each section in a randomized order.

To ensure as broad a set of views as possible during the shortlisting process, four criteria were considered when selecting workshop participants: (i) thematic expertise, (ii) institutional affiliation, (iii) geographic location and experience, and (iv) gender. This allowed us to include representatives based in 15 countries in Africa, the Americas, Asia and Europe,<sup>6</sup> a minimum number of experts in each of the nine sections (three), of whom 14 were women and 16 were men. Academics with a range of expertise, including political science, anthropology, economics, geography, environmental sciences and public health, accounted for about a third of workshop participants (9) while the remaining two-thirds included representatives from NGOs (10), intergovernmental organizations (4), governmental agencies (2), think-tanks (2) and consultancies (2).

The two-day workshop was organized into a series of parallel thematic sessions and a final plenary session. Participants were free to attend individual sessions of their choice but were asked to ensure that each session was attended by an approximately equal number of participants. During each session, questions were iteratively debated, rephrased as necessary, and grouped into “gold”, “silver” and “bronze” categories by discussion, followed by general consensus or voting by show of hands. Tied votes were resolved through an additional show of hands. Low-ranking questions were discussed first. Those to be considered unlikely to make it to the final shortlist by the group were excluded, and poorly formulated questions were redrafted for further discussion. Topic areas that were recognized as being entirely absent were set aside and addressed by rephrasing closely relevant questions or formulating new questions.

Sessions on the first day of the workshop considered each of the nine sections independently and reduced the number of questions from 704 to 240, with each session putting forward between 11–16 gold-ranked questions, 6–8 silver-ranked questions and 6–8 bronze-ranked questions (figure 1A) (this was the process adopted by Sutherland et al. 2013). On the second day of the workshop, the sessions considered two or three of the nine themes jointly. Participants continued to refine and reformulate the previously


---

<sup>5</sup> Environmental Sustainability; Food Security, Land and Agriculture; Energy and Natural Resources, Governance, Rights and Participation; Conflict, Population Dynamics and Urbanization; Economic Growth, Employment and the Private Sector; Development Politics, Practices and Institutions.

<sup>6</sup> Budget constraints and logistic (visa and travel-related) problems impeded a higher participation from Africa, Asia and Latin America.

shortlisted questions, removed overlapping questions and further reduced the number of questions from 240 to 162 (figure 1B). Each session proposed between 18–25 gold-ranked questions, 9–11 silver-ranked questions and 8–11 bronze-ranked questions. This resulted in 85 gold questions, 39 silver questions, and 38 bronze questions that were further refined, rephrased and shortlisted to the final 100 during the plenary session (figure 1C). This final list of questions was subsequently edited by Johan A. Oldekop, Lorenza B. Fontana, Jean Grugel, Nicole Roughton and Daniel Hammett, and then circulated for final editing by the remaining authors.

**Fig. 1. Flowchart depicting the shortlisting of questions during the workshop’s individual thematic sessions during the first day (A), and the second day’s joint thematic sessions (B) and plenary session (C).**



### **3. Questions**

After the final shortlisting, questions were regrouped into one of the original nine macro-thematic sections but were not assigned a rank. Given that questions often cut across themes, the nine groupings chosen and the order in which the questions appear represent only one convenient way of categorizing questions.

#### **3.1 Governance, Participation and Rights**

Governance is exercised through laws, norms, language and power at formal or informal levels, through bureaucracies or participation and through the state or other forms of organization. Formal governance can refer to “mechanisms, institutions and processes through which authority is exercised in the conduct of public affairs” (OHCHR 2006: 10). The definition and creation of spaces for economic and political interactions and decision-making processes is central to the relationship between states and citizens and to the capacity of states and other actors to achieve their goals (Grindle 2004). Governance mechanisms at the subnational, national and international levels constitute the arenas where rights are negotiated, legal frameworks established and implementation measures designed and put into action (Weiss 2014). Elucidating the relationships among different actors and levels of governance, and how these relationships shape the protection of rights and political participation of social groups (including women, young people, indigenous peoples and marginal communities), or fail to do so and reproduce inequalities and conflict, is crucial for the identification of inclusive and responsive development strategies.

1. What governance arrangements best empower local communities to shape development in their area?
2. How can the accountability and capacity of parliaments be strengthened in low and middle-income countries?
3. What support or alliances do women leaders and politicians need in the Global South and how can they best be provided or enabled?
4. What are the most effective ways to encourage women’s political participation in contexts of resistance to gender equality?
5. What interventions promote youth participation in development and how can they be best operationalized?
6. How can governments engage effectively with citizens who mobilize outside the formal arena of politics and in informal spaces of participation?
7. What are the consequences for development outcomes of the shift from national sovereignty to global governance?
8. To what extent are human rights conventions successful in protecting vulnerable groups?
9. How do different actors and agencies deal with conflicts between competing rights’ categories and rights’ holders, and how can these conflicts be addressed?
10. How can businesses be encouraged to better understand and deliver on human rights?

11. How can the rights of marginal and vulnerable groups be protected and enhanced in the process of large-scale infrastructure development?
12. How can the rights of geographically remote and/or mobile social groups be integrated and promoted in national development agendas?
13. Under what conditions are indigenous peoples best able to protect their rights, including land rights?
14. What approaches most effectively protect and promote the rights of children with disabilities and significant mental and physical impairments?
15. What are the barriers to the full realization of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex (LGBTI) rights and how can they be overcome?

### **3.2 Environmental Sustainability**

Deforestation, land degradation, biodiversity loss and natural resource overexploitation exacerbate poverty and deepen inequalities (MEA 2005), as do natural disasters such as floods, droughts, storms and landslides (Wisner et al. 2004). These problems are further compounded by the increasing impacts of climate change with clear ramifications for natural systems and societies around the globe (IPCC 2014). The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (2005) and the Stern Review (2007) have drawn attention to the links between environmental health, human well-being and the quality of the economy. The Hyogo Framework for Action 2005–2015, an international framework for disaster resilience endorsed by the UN General Assembly in 2005, links natural disasters to loss of life, and loss of social, economic and environmental assets (UNRISD 2005). Over the past 20 years, the commodification of ecosystems and their services<sup>7</sup> has dominated environmental policy debates and fed into the design of compensation and incentive mechanisms aiming to address economic development and natural resource conservation at local and regional levels. Such initiatives, however, may have adverse unintended consequences and pay too little attention to questions of distribution and inequality (Peet et al. 2010).

16. How can models of compensation best address the unequal distribution of responsibilities for, and costs of, climate change?
17. How can different institutional structures effectively support climate compatible development strategies?
18. What are the effects of commodifying nature and environmental assets on environmental sustainability, human well-being, and the environmental agenda?
19. How do public perceptions of climate change impact on actions at the individual level?
20. What are the impacts of interventions to mitigate climate change (e.g. Payments for Ecosystem Services and the biofuel sector) on human well-being and natural systems?
21. What evidence is there of transferable good practices in balancing biodiversity and livelihood priorities?

<sup>7</sup> See, for example, Costanza et al. 1997; Heynen et al. 2007; Brockington and Duffy 2011.

22. What are the barriers to generating simple yet representative indicators that combine elements of social and economic development with metrics of environmental health and sustainability?
23. What are the most effective approaches to ensure the wider public pays attention to, and acts on, early warnings related to natural hazards?

### **3.3 Food Security, Land and Agriculture**

Meeting current and future food needs while reducing pressures on land and natural resources is one of society's greatest challenges (Godfray et al. 2010), yet unequal access to land remains one of the greatest causes of poverty, human insecurity and conflict. Poverty, food security and environmental sustainability are inextricably linked to the agricultural sector. The negative environmental (e.g., Rudel et al. 2009) and social (e.g., Weiner et al. 2013) impacts of large-scale, commercial agriculture are increasingly clear, and smallholder agriculture remains an important driver of land-cover change (Rudel et al. 2009). Small-scale farmers whose markets serve the needs of urban areas also form a large proportion of the world's poor and hungry, highlighting areas for both conflict and conciliation between socioeconomic and environmental concerns. Critically, there remain many gaps in our understanding of the kinds of policies and land-tenure systems that support diversified and resilient agricultural systems, sustainable rural livelihoods and resource use, and social inclusion (Williamson et al. 2010).

24. What investment mechanisms strengthen rural people's land rights and promote the diversification of food systems?
25. How best can land governance be made gender inclusive?
26. Under what conditions does greater land tenure security lead to more efficient, equitable and sustainable resource use?
27. How can international trade systems be incentivized to create a conducive environment for more stable and affordable local food systems?
28. How can the direct and indirect contributions of urban agriculture be maximized to create more food secure and sustainable cities?
29. What innovations in smallholder agriculture can be successfully transferred to large-scale agricultural production systems, and vice versa?
30. Under what circumstances and for whom is increasing smallholder agricultural productivity more cost-effective at reducing poverty than the expansion of large-scale commercial agriculture?
31. What are the most cost-effective approaches of sustainably increasing the agriculture productivity and incomes of small-scale farmers?
32. How can agro-ecological farming practices (including those that are not easily commodifiable) be effectively scaled up to address local and global food needs?
33. What can be learned from successful examples of large-scale commercial agriculture's role in incentivizing more sustainable forms of production?



34. What are the most promising agricultural technological innovations and how can they be effectively shared and implemented?

### **3.4 Energy and Natural Resources**

Global, regional and local production and consumption patterns continue to increase demands for energy and natural resources, providing challenges and opportunities for poverty reduction, economic development, sustainability and social cohesion. Unequal access to natural resources and to the revenues generated by their exploitation, combined with the socio-environmental impacts of extractive industries, are among the main causes of social conflicts in the Global South. These conflicts have fuelled debates on the institutional and governance arrangements for natural resources management most likely to generate sustainable and equitable socioeconomic outcomes, and the kinds of social and political environments that can support them.<sup>8</sup> How natural resources and energy systems are governed will also have significant implications for climate change and will be inextricably related to geopolitics and international structures of power (Mitchell 2011).

35. What strategies address the concentrated and unequal distribution of natural resources and what impact do they have on poverty, inequality and conflict?
36. How do states create favourable policy environments to deliver a fair distribution of rents and ensure sustainable resource management within extractive industries?
37. Under what conditions can natural resource extraction and exploitation deliver joint social and environmental benefits?
38. How can natural resource extraction and exploitation support inclusive, accountable and broad-based development?
39. How can resource dependent economies diversify and/or become more resilient?
40. How can reliable, universal, sustainable and affordable electricity services best be financed to the rural poor?
41. What mechanisms would ensure a faster transition to a sustainable, carbon-free global economy?
42. How can marine resources located outside of sovereign exclusive economic areas be used sustainably and equitably?

### **3.5 Conflict, Population Dynamics and Urbanization**

Peace, security and political stability are key conditions for sustainable development. Given that a third of the world's poorest live in countries lacking these conditions (Manning and Trzeciak-Duval 2010), it was surprising that conflict and fragility did not feature within the MDGs (Wisor 2012). This gap was an important justification for including them within the SDGs (goal 16—UN 2014). In recent years, the promotion and protection of human dignity and well-being has faced particularly severe challenges in situations where instability and conflict prevail (Zürcher 2012), with gendered impacts often playing out against women and girls (UNRISD 2005). Changing population dynamics present major challenges to development policy and practice.

<sup>8</sup> Bebbington and Bury 2009; Cuba et al. 2014; Sawyer and Gomez 2012; Hujo 2012.

Global population growth (predicted to reach 9.5 billion by 2050), increasing urbanization, and the intensification of intra- and inter-national migratory flows will increasingly affect local, national and global governance, provision of resources and basic services.<sup>9</sup> Both new and old conflicts are generating particularly fragile scenarios within and beyond country borders, potentially increasing the numbers of displaced people, refugees and asylum seekers.

43. How can women's empowerment in conflict and post-conflict settings be strengthened?
44. What are the development implications of clandestine illegal activities, such as drug trade, prostitution, money laundering, smuggling, human trafficking and trade in counterfeit medication?
45. What are the most effective policies and mechanisms (from local to global) that combat human trafficking?
46. How are information and data collection systems linked to the criminalization and control of migrants and asylum seekers?
47. How can the circumstances of asylum seekers and refugees living in lower- and middle-income countries be improved?
48. How are new migration regimes and patterns influencing the socioeconomic status and family dynamics of those who stay in their countries of origin?
49. What policies maximize the potential developmental benefits of migration while offsetting its negative consequences?
50. What factors best explain the reduction in urban violence where it has occurred?
51. How will governments in lower-income countries be supported to ensure that informal settlements in urban areas are included in political, economic, health and social planning and development?
52. How can local governments with limited budgets respond to the needs of fast growing metropolitan areas?
53. How can architecture, urban design and planning address social sustainability most effectively and contribute to the creation of social equality and inclusion?

### **3.6 Economic Growth, Employment and the Private Sector**

The tone of the high-level discussions at the 2012 UN-led Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20) and the recently published draft of the new SDGs (UN 2014) reflect governments' reticence to comply with targets they fear will restrict their potential for future economic growth (Tollefson 2012). The role of industrialization and the business sector in driving economic development will likely be a central pillar of the post-2015 development agenda, yet the place and role of the informal economy for development remains a challenge. Ensuring the development of new inclusive models of growth and reforms to the international financial system are crucial dilemmas facing an

<sup>9</sup> AFIDEP and PAI 2012; Geiger and Pécoud 2013; United Nations Population Division 2012, 2013; World Bank 2009.

increasingly globalized, but highly segmented and unequal, global economy. Supporting institutions and legal arrangements that can effectively ensure labour rights of adults and young people, and protect children from exploitation will be key for an inclusive and sustainable development agenda (Barrientos et al. 2011; UNICEF 2011).

54. What factors can influence the transition from a global economic system driven by consumption to one driven by the creation of well-being and equity?
55. Which type of policies or strategies carried out by expanding middle-income countries have proven to be more effective for the promotion of a more inclusive and equitable economic growth?
56. What evidence is there that private sector finance has played a major role in the provision of basic services such as access to water, sanitation or energy, for the poorest quintile in lower-income countries?
57. How is the shift from corporate social responsibility to sustainable and socially responsible business practices impacting on business and development outcomes?
58. How can the expansion of small and medium enterprises in lower-income countries be best supported?
59. How can we ensure that private sector investment in climate compatible development is both pro-poor and equitable?
60. What effective policy mechanisms can lower- and middle-income countries adopt to ensure multinational companies comply with tax obligations?
61. What kinds of controls in the Global North have proven effective in reducing tax avoidance by multinational companies operating in lower-income countries and how can they be improved?
62. In cases where opportunities for youth employment have increased, what are the causes and what are the lessons?
63. Which are the most dynamic sectors for “decent” work in different rural and urban contexts and what transferable lessons can be learnt for job creation?
64. How can labour rights and decent working conditions be ensured within and across global supply chains?
65. What are the most effective ways to recognize and address the unequal burden of unpaid care work and facilitate women's participation in paid employment?
66. What new approaches addressing child labour most effectively promote children’s rights and well-being?

### **3.7 Social and Economic Inequalities**

In spite of progress on many aspects of economic and social development, inequalities of different kinds remain a persistent feature within and between societies. In 2014, the United Nations Population Division (2013) reported that over 75 percent of the world’s

population lives in societies in which income is more unequally distributed than in the 1990s. Income inequality maps in complex ways to other forms of inequality, including (dis)abilities, culture, identity, race and gender (Fraser and Honneth 2003). Tackling inequality in its different forms can have major benefits for individual and social well-being including in health, education and nutrition (WHO 2008), poverty reduction, as well as the stability of public institutions and political dynamics (UNRISD 2010; United Nations Population Division 2013). Reducing discrimination and exclusion, and monitoring progress towards more inclusive societies are essential elements of the post-2015 agenda (World We Want 2013).

67. Under what conditions do elites become committed to the reduction of poverty and inequality?
68. What measures have been effective in increasing tax revenues in lower and middle-income countries?
69. What social and political coalitions are associated with equitable growth and poverty reduction?
70. What effective social safety nets will be needed to protect men, women and children from chronic poverty and future threats linked to climate change?
71. What role do social movements and community organizations play in sustainably lifting the poorest in middle-income countries out of poverty?
72. Has the integration of mobile technologies into development programming improved development outcomes for the most disadvantaged women, men and children? If so, where, how and why?
73. How are marginalized groups accessing and using information and communication technologies to produce and use data in ways that strengthen their empowerment?
74. What can be done to build socioeconomic resilience of the emerging middle classes in lower and middle-income countries?
75. Which family policies most effectively promote gender and age equality within households?
76. What is the role of social and women's movements in increasing women's ownership of assets?
77. What has been the impact of the "Girl Effect"<sup>10</sup> on gender analysis and initiatives, and what are the implications for boys and young men?
78. What are the most effective methods and programmes for engaging men and boys as allies in combating all forms of violence against women and girls?

---

<sup>10</sup> This term refers to the positive impact (ripple effect) of girls' inclusion in education, health and economic investment on the prevention of other issues such as child marriage, teen pregnancy, HIV/AIDS and the break of the inter-generational cycle of poverty (Banerjee and Duflo 2011).

79. What is the impact of economic empowerment on violence against women and girls?

### **3.8 Health and Education**

Improving the health of the world population and ensuring access to education for all by creating conditions that support efforts towards universal health care and primary education are at the core of the MDGs and the post-2015 agenda (Burnett and Felsman 2012; Vega 2013). Despite significant progress in some areas, issues related to quality, accessibility, equity and governance of primary health care services and basic education still remain unsolved (Easterly 2009). These issues are likely to increase as the growing populations, changing demographics and evolving disease patterns put further pressure on health and education systems. One of the main challenges is to ensure efficient and effective allocation of resources. A robust response to global health issues, including sexual and reproductive rights, mental health, non-communicable and communicable diseases, access to medicines, and nutrition requires the strengthening of health systems and the implementation of initiatives that support governance at national and international levels (de Savigny and Adam 2009; Adam and de Savigny 2012). Similarly, an inclusive education agenda focusing on quality pre- and post-primary education that promotes enrolment, retention and relevance to emerging job markets will be critical.

80. What are the most effective approaches to ensure that the combined burden of non-communicable and communicable diseases is addressed in lower- and middle-income countries?
81. How can the intellectual property system be transformed so that affordable medicines become available to all?
82. What is the impact of climate change on patterns of ill-health and the burden of disease?
83. What systems of Universal Health Coverage are most effective at providing quality health care for all?
84. What are the most effective approaches to reduce stigma-based discrimination by health workers towards vulnerable groups?
85. What are the most effective new approaches to support the sexual and reproductive rights of adolescents?
86. What has been the impact of different strategies and approaches towards mental health in lower income countries?
87. What factors influence healthy food choices (including taste, culture, prices, marketing, access, control and food budgets), and what policies and interventions can encourage these?
88. How can educational systems be adapted and developed to maximize young people's capacities for sustainable livelihoods through formal and informal employment and/or entrepreneurship?
89. What are the most effective approaches for the delivery of locally appropriate, affordable and high quality education for children and young people with disabilities?

90. How does the transformation of higher education influence development pathways?
91. What interventions are the most successful in improving enrolment, retention and achievement of girls in high/secondary school?

### **3.9 Development Policies, Practices and Institutions**

Over the last two decades, globalization, and a reconfiguration of the global political economy that has strengthened the role of both private actors and emerging sovereign actors such as China and India, have reshaped international cooperation frameworks and dramatically changed the context in which development stakeholders operate. Philanthropic foundations, business and emerging powers are becoming increasingly engaged in shaping the direction of development and the delivery of specific initiatives. These changes are blurring the traditional boundaries between donors and recipients of aid and challenging the traditional supremacy of Western states for determining what “development” consists of (Idemudia 2008; Zimmermann and Smith 2011). New economic and political challenges associated with this changing global order will influence how future development strategies and targets are conceptualized, implemented and supported.<sup>11</sup> At the same time, addressing the role of culture and differing understandings of development itself will also be crucial for innovations in development theory and practice.

92. What are the development and accountability impacts of the increased role of, and funding provided by, philanthropists and philanthropic foundations?
93. How can the prominence and momentum of South-South cooperation be maximized and what will its impact on development practices and discourses be?
94. How can “common but differentiated responsibilities” best be operationalized to deliver the SDGs?
95. What happens to national NGOs and civil society after international aid declines or is withdrawn?
96. How can aid interventions avoid incentivizing short-term development strategies in place of long-term ones?
97. How can we better integrate human dignity and respect into development policy and practice?
98. How can development initiatives best incorporate arts and culture?
99. How do different countries and cultures vary in how they conceptualize, define, and operationalize “development”, and what is the significance of this for development policies and practices?
100. What are the emerging theoretical and empirical (post-development) paradigms challenging mainstream international development frameworks, and what are their contributions and limitations?

---

<sup>11</sup> de Haan 2010; Manning 2006; Six 2009; Fukuda-Parr et al. 2013.

## 4. Discussion

Our efforts to collate an initial set of broad-ranging questions and then jointly shortlist them into a final list tackling a diverse set of unresolved issues in international development were largely successful. While no shortlist can cover all possible development issues worthy of further research, these 100 questions address a varied combination of long-standing problems that have hindered the development agenda for decades as well as new challenges emerging from broader socioeconomic, political and environmental changes. For example, well-established concerns about the rights of women, and of vulnerable groups such as poor workers, small-scale farmers, people with disabilities, children and ethnic minorities feature alongside emerging issues, including the role of business in protecting human rights, and information and communication technologies as tools for empowerment and social integration. Similarly, traditional concerns linked to rural livelihoods, land tenure and agricultural production are presented together with environmental sustainability, natural resource extraction, urbanization, food security, and climate change adaptation and mitigation.

While civil society and the empowerment of marginalized populations are recognized as key for development, questions on new actors including the private sector and emerging economic powers feature heavily in our shortlist: the complex and contested role of middle-income countries as donors and partners, as well as recipients of aid, is one such example (Alonso et al. 2014). Furthermore, the questions shortlisted also reflect the mainstreaming of gender perspectives into a wide range of development areas, helping to cement the view that gender should be considered central to future development initiatives.

A large number of the submitted questions (102) specifically addressed broader issues related to development politics, practices and institutions. This outcome, combined with the fact that a number of these were included in the final shortlist, highlights two important things. First, there is a critical need for a deeper collective reflection on the role and relationships of different actors in international development, and the impact that contemporary economic and political scenarios will have on the development agenda. Second, it suggests that this exercise was able to identify a fundamental gap in our current understanding of development that stretches beyond the post-2015 agenda and the SDGs. This is an important outcome for future coproduction exercises. While this exercise prescribed a specific method and its facilitators defined a clear outcome (a final list of 100 questions related to a set of 11 themes), it was still able to create spaces that allowed identification of priorities that were driven from the bottom-up.

We recognize that our approach has limitations. Like similar previous exercises (e.g. Sutherland et al. 2010; Sutherland et al. 2013), our methodology prioritized the formulation and selection of questions with factual answers that could be addressed within the framework of a research project. Although pragmatic, these criteria are unlikely to generate questions that examine the theoretical assumptions of current development paradigms, and their systems of belief and values. Asking such fundamental questions more routinely could lead to innovative problem framings and solutions (Chappell et al. 2013). Addressing these deeper issues underpinning tangible development challenges will, therefore, be critical for the success of any credible, long-term strategies aiming to promote sustainable and socially just development (Fischer et al. 2012). We recognize that only a small number of the questions in our shortlist address deeper, integral issues and we, therefore, see this exercise as a complement to more fundamental critiques of development paradigms and institutional frameworks.

Like any participatory process, our exercise was not perfectly representative and/or inclusive and did not cover all possible development issues meriting attention. Given the incredibly high number of development stakeholders, we were unable to develop an approach which could guarantee that the views expressed during the consultation phase were perfectly representative of the development community at large. Similarly, the shortlisting process was subject to structural weaknesses of deliberative methods and bias introduced by the disciplinary perspectives of workshop participants as well as by their different degrees of engagement in the discussion.

Problems of representation and inclusiveness are particularly critical when dealing with international development, where historically unbalanced power relations between the Global North and South, colonist and colonized, metropolitan and rural, etc. remain unsolved issues. Although we specifically targeted a wide range of organizations and individuals from the global South during the consultation phase, we witnessed relatively low response rates (~5 per cent). While this might be the result of linguistic, cultural and technological barriers, it could be a reflection that engaging with local stakeholders, for whom a project like this one might not be directly relevant, can be challenging. Adapting a similar methodology to address more specific regional and sub-national contexts is likely to engage national and local stakeholders more effectively, and in doing so, increase the degree of inclusiveness and help overcome the limitations of a consultation exercise with global aspirations. Critically, regionally targeted consultations would provide data for cross-regional comparisons and be useful for aligning research, policy and development initiatives that are capable of responding to local needs.

The fact that we were able to engage a wide range of stakeholders and establish relatively broad and well-balanced debates on many aspects of international development helps to validate the process of transdisciplinary knowledge coproduction, which is increasingly dominating research agendas in both the natural and social sciences. The value of this consultative exercise rests in that it successfully articulated and aligned the interest and priorities of academics and practitioners working on international development related issues. Our extensive multistakeholder consultation and subsequent shortlisting by individuals with a range of different regional and thematic expertise helped to ensure that our output remains salient, credible and legitimate, three criteria that have been identified as key requirements for the definition of satisfactory responses to public issues (Cash et al. 2003).

We envision our list of 100 questions contributing to inform the post-2015 agenda and future development-related research priorities of international, governmental and non-governmental organizations. But, perhaps more centrally, we believe that these questions can act as starting points for debate, research and collaboration between academics, practitioners and policy makers. Future research and sharing of existing knowledge can provide answers to some of the questions that we have collectively identified as important for the future international development agenda and, therefore, likely to be able to make a significant impact on the implementation of the SDGs. We also believe that the process of coproduction we set out here, of debate and discussion between different stakeholders, is essential for successfully and effectively tackling the key challenges ahead for the international community.



## Appendix: Contributing Organizations

1. AbleChildAfrica, United Kingdom
2. Academics Stand Against Poverty (ASAP), United States
3. Africa Research Institute, United Kingdom
4. Age International, United Kingdom
5. Amnesty International, United Kingdom
6. Association of Commonwealth Universities, United Kingdom
7. British Council, United Kingdom
8. British NGOs for Overseas Development (BOND), United Kingdom
9. Building and Social Housing Foundation, United Kingdom
10. Bureau of Integrated Rural Development, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Ghana
11. CARE International, United Kingdom and Ethiopia
12. CARITAS Europe, Belgium
13. Catholic Aid Agency for England and Wales (CAFOD), United Kingdom
14. Caucus for Children's Rights, Tanzania
15. Centre for Engineering and Industrial Design (CIDESI), Mexico
16. Centre for HIV Prevention and Research, Kenya
17. Centre for the Development of People, Ghana
18. Centro de Estudios de la Realidad Económica y Social (CERES), Bolivia
19. Clark University, United States
20. Clash International, Ghana and United States
21. Concern Worldwide, United Kingdom
22. Coordinadora Latinoamericana y del Caribe de Pequeños Productores de Comercio Justo, Colombia
23. Cornerstone International, United States
24. Deakin University, Australia
25. Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE), Germany
26. Economic Policy Research Centre, Uganda
27. European Commission, Belgium
28. Everychild, United Kingdom
29. Fedesarrollo, Colombia
30. Food for the Hungry, United Kingdom
31. Foundation Adamfo Ghana, The Netherlands and United Kingdom
32. Friends of the Earth, United Kingdom
33. Global Vision International, Kenya
34. Health Poverty Action, United Kingdom
35. iDe, Zambia
36. International Institute for Environment and Development, United Kingdom
37. Institut de Recherche pour le Développement (IRD), France

38. International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development, Nepal
39. International Civil Society Centre, Germany
40. International Forestry Resources and Institutions (IFRI) Network, United States, India and Uganda
41. International HIV/AIDs Alliance, United Kingdom
42. International NGO Training and Research Centre, United Kingdom
43. International Rescue Committee, United States
44. Irise International, United Kingdom and Uganda
45. Islamic Relief Worldwide, United Kingdom
46. KPMG, Australia
47. Leuphana University, Germany
48. London International Development Centre (LIDC), United Kingdom
49. Lund University, Sweden
50. Macalester College, United States
51. Medical Research Council, United Kingdom
52. Nadlow, Lithuania
53. Netherlands Organisation for International Cooperation in Higher Education (NUFFIC), The Netherlands
54. Newcastle University, United Kingdom
55. One Acre Fund, United States
56. Open University, United Kingdom
57. Overseas Development Institute, United Kingdom
58. Pan African Institute for Development - West Africa (PAID-WA), Cameroon
59. Planet Earth Institute, United Kingdom and Angola
60. Pontificia Universidad Católica del Peru (PUCP), Peru
61. Positive Runway, United Kingdom
62. Practical Action, United Kingdom
63. Radboud University, The Netherlands
64. Recrear International Youth Organization, Canada
65. Regarding Humanity, United States
66. Retrak, United Kingdom
67. Royal College of Pediatrics and Child Health International, United Kingdom
68. School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS), United Kingdom
69. Secretariat of the International Land Coalition, Italy
70. Sense International, United Kingdom
71. 3SolarAid, United Kingdom
72. The Brooke, United Kingdom
73. The Brookings institution, United States
74. The Humanitarian Centre, United Kingdom
75. The James Hutton Institute, United Kingdom
76. The Postharvest Education Foundation, United States

77. The Vegan Society, United Kingdom
78. Think Universal Power, United Kingdom
79. Trent University, Canada
80. UK Collaborative on Development Sciences (UKCDS), United Kingdom
81. United Nations Development Program (UNDP), Bolivia
82. United Nations Development Program (UNDP), Argentina
83. United Nations Development Program (UNDP), Slovakia
84. United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women), Kyrgyzstan
85. United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD), Switzerland
86. Universidade Federal Fluminense (UFF), Brazil
87. Università Iuav di Venezia, Italy
88. University College London, United Kingdom
89. University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands
90. University of Birmingham, United Kingdom
91. University of Cambridge, United Kingdom
92. University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom
93. University of Leeds, United Kingdom
94. University of Liverpool, United Kingdom
95. University of Nigeria, Nigeria
96. University of Pittsburgh, United States
97. University of Sheffield, United Kingdom
98. University of Warwick, United Kingdom
99. University of Washington, United Kingdom
100. Volunteer Service Overseas (VSO), United Kingdom
101. Women's Global Network for Reproductive Rights (WGNRR), The Philippines
102. World Vision, United Kingdom
103. Y Care International, United Kingdom
104. Young People We Care, Ghana

*An additional five institutions, including governmental agencies, academic institutions, and NGOs based in the United Kingdom, Finland, South Africa and Mali contributed questions but chose to remain anonymous.*

## References

- Adam, T., and de Savigny, D. (2012). Systems thinking for strengthening health systems in LMICs: Need for a paradigm shift. *Health Policy and Planning*, 27, iv1–iv3. (doi:10.1093/heapol/czs084).
- African Institute for Development Policy (AFIDEP), and Population Action International (PAI) (2012). *Population, Climate Change, and Sustainable Development*. Nairobi and Washington, DC: AFIDEP and PAI.
- Alonso, J., Glennie, J., and Sumner, A. (2014). *Recipients and Contributors: Middle Income Countries and the Future of Development Cooperation*. <http://effectivecooperation.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/Recipients-and-Contributors-MICs-and-the-future-of-development-cooperat...pdf>, last accessed 21 July 2014.
- Banerjee, A., and Duflo E. (2011). *Poor economics: A radical rethinking of the way to fight global poverty*. New York: Public Affairs.
- Bebbington, A.J., and Bury, J. (2009). Institutional challenges for mining and sustainability in Peru. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106:17296–17301.
- Brockington, D. and Duffy, R. (2011). *Conservation and Capitalism*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Burnett, N., and Felsman, C. (2012). *Post-2015 Education MDGs*. Results for Development Institute and Overseas Development Institute (ODI). <http://www.odi.org/resources/docs/7776.pdf>, last accessed January 2015.
- Cash, D.W., Clark W.C., Alcock F., Dickson N.M., Eckley N., Guston D.H., Jäger, J., and Mitchell, R.B. (2003). Knowledge systems for sustainable development. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 100 (14): 8086–8091.
- Chappel, M.J., Wittman, H., Bacon, C.M., Ferguson B.C., Barrios, L.G., Barrios, R.G., Jaffee, D., Lima, J., Méndez, V.E., Morales, H., Soto-Pinto, L., Vandermeer, J., and Perfecto, I. (2013). Food sovereignty: an alternative paradigm for poverty reduction and biodiversity conservation in Latin America. *F1000Research* 2: 235 (doi: 10.12688/f1000research.2-235.v1).
- Costanza, R., d'Arge R., de Groot, R., Farber, S., Grasso, M., Hannon, B., Limburg, K., Naeem, S., O'Neill, R.V., Paruelo, J., Raskin, R.G., Sutton, P., and van den Belt, M. (1997). The value of the world's ecosystem services and natural capital. *Nature* 387: 253–260.
- Cuba, N., Bebbington, A.J., Rogan, J., and Millones, M. (2014). Extractive industries, livelihoods and natural resource competition: Mapping overlapping claims in Peru and Ghana. *Applied Geography* 01/2014, (doi: 10.1016/j.apgeog.2014.05.003).
- Dessai, S., Afionis, S., and Van Alstine, J. (2013). Development goals. Science alone cannot shape sustainability. *Nature* 493: 26.

- Easterly, W., (2009). How Millennium Development Goals are unfair to Africa. *World Development*, 37 (1): 26–35.
- Fischer, J., Dyball, R., Fazey, I., Gross, C., Dovers, S., Ehrlich, P.R., Brulle, R.J., Christensen, C., and Borden, R.J. (2012). Human behavior and sustainability. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 10 (3): 153–160.
- Fukuda-Parr, S. (2011). Theory and policy in international development: Human development and capability approach and the Millennium Development Goals. *International Studies Review*, 13 (1): 122–132.
- Fukuda-Parr, S., Lopes, C., and Malik, K. (eds.) (2013). *Capacity for Development: New Solutions to Old Problems*. London: Earthscan.
- Fraser, N. and Honneth, A. (2003). *Redistribution or Recognition? A Political-Philosophical Exchange*. London: Verso.
- Geiger, M., and Pécoud, A. (2013). Migration, development and the ‘Migration and Development Nexus’. *Population, Space and Place*, 19: 369–374.
- Glaser, G. (2012). Base sustainable development goals on science. *Nature*, 491: 35.
- Godfray, H.C.J, Beddington, J.R., Crute, I.R., Haddad, L., Lawrence, D., Muir, J.F., Pretty, J., Robinson, S., Thomas, S.M. and Toulmin, C. (2010). Food security: the challenge of feeding 9 billion people. *Science*, 327 (5967): 812–818.
- Griggs, D., Stafford-Smith, M., Gaffney, O., Rockström, J., Öhman, M.C., Shyamsundar, P., Steffen, W., Glaser, G., Kanie, N., and Noble, I. (2013). Sustainable development for people and planet. *Nature*, 495: 305–307.
- Grindle, M.S. (2004). Good enough governance: Poverty reduction and reform in developing countries. *Governance*, 17 (4): 525–548.
- de Haan, A. (2010). Will China change international development as we know it? *Journal of International Development* 23 (7): 881–908.
- Heynen, N., McCarthy, J., Robbins, P. and Prudham, S. (eds.) (2007). *Neoliberal Environments: False Promises and Unnatural Consequences*. London: Routledge.
- Hujo, K. (ed.) (2012). *Mineral Rents and the Financing of Social Policy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave/UNRISD.
- Idemudia, U. (2008). Conceptualising the CSR and development debate. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship* 29: 91–110.
- IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) (2014). *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability*. <http://ipcc-wg2.gov/AR5/report/final-drafts/>, last accessed January 2015.
- Manning, R. (2006). Will emerging donors change the face of international co-operation? *Development Policy Review*, 24 (4): 371–385.
- Manning, R., and Trzeciak-Duval, A. (2010). Situations of fragility and conflict: aid policies and beyond. *Conflict, Security and Development*, 10 (1): 103–131.

- MEA (Millennium Ecosystem Assessment) (2005). *Ecosystems and Human Well-Being: Wetlands and Water Synthesis*. Washington, DC: World Resources Institute.
- Mitchell, T. (2011). *Carbon Democracy: Political Power in an Age of Oil*. London: Verso.
- OHCHR (Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights) (2006). *Human Rights Frequently Asked Questions on a Human Rights-Based Approach to Development Cooperation*. New York and Geneva: OHCHR.
- Peet, R., Watts, M. and Robbins, P. (eds.) (2010). *Global Political Ecology*. New York: Routledge.
- Rudel, T.K., DeFries, R., Asner, G.P. and Laurance, W. (2009). Changing drivers of deforestation and new opportunities for conservation. *Conservation Biology* 23: 1396–1405.
- Sachs, J.D. (2012). From millennium development goals to sustainable development goals. *The Lancet*, 379: 2206–2211.
- de Savigny, D., and Adam, T. (2009). *Systems Thinking for Health Systems Strengthening*. Geneva: Alliance for Health Policy and Systems Research, WHO.
- Sawyer, S. and Gomez, T. (eds.) (2012). *The Politics of Resource Extraction: Indigenous Peoples, Multinational Corporations and the State*. Basingstoke: Palgrave/UNRISD.
- Six, C. (2009). The rise of postcolonial states as donors: A challenge to the development paradigm? *Third World Quarterly*, 30(6): 1103–1121.
- Stern, N. (2007). *The Economics of Climate Change: The Stern Review*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sutherland, W.J., Adams, W.M., Aronson, R.B., Aveling, R., Blackburn, T.M., Broad, S., et al. (2010). One hundred questions of importance to the conservation of global biological diversity. *Conservation Biology*, 23(3): 557–567.
- Sutherland, W.J., Fleishman, E., Mascia, M.B., Pretty, J., and Rudd, M.A. (2011). Methods for collaboratively identifying research priorities and emerging issues in science and policy. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 2: 238–247.
- Sutherland, W.J., Freckleton, R.P., Godfray, H.C.J., Beissinger, S.R., Benton, T., Cameron, D.D., et al. (2013). Identification of 100 fundamental ecological questions. *Journal of Ecology* 101: 58–67
- Tollefson, J. (2012). Wealth gap curbs Rio goals. *Nature* 487: 447–448.
- UN (United Nations) (2014). Introduction and proposed goals and targets on sustainable development for the post-2015 development agenda. Zero Draft (Rev. 1), Open Working Group 13—Revised version 19 July. <http://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/focussdgs.html>, last accessed January 2015.

- UNICEF (United Nations Children’s Fund) (2011). *UNICEF Annual Report*. [www.unicef.org/publications/files/UNICEF\\_Annual\\_Report\\_2011\\_EN\\_060112.pdf](http://www.unicef.org/publications/files/UNICEF_Annual_Report_2011_EN_060112.pdf), last accessed January 2015.
- United Nations Population Division (2013). *World Population Prospects: The 2012 Revision*. <http://esa.un.org/wpp/>.
- (2012). *World Urbanization Prospects: The 2011 Revision*. <http://esa.un.org/wpp/>.
- UNISDR (United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction) (2005). *Hyogo Framework for Action 2005–2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disaster*. <http://www.unisdr.org/wcdr/intergover/official-doc/L-docs/Hyogo-framework-for-action-english.pdf>, last accessed January 2015
- (2010). *Combating Poverty and Inequality. Structural Change, Social Policy, and Politics*. Geneva: UNRISD.
- UNRISD (United Nations Research Institute for Social Development) (2005). Gender, armed conflict and the search for peace. In *Gender Equality. Striving for Justice in an Unequal World*. Geneva: UNRISD.
- Vandemoortele, J. (2011). If not the Millennium Development Goals, then what? *Third World Quarterly* 32(1): 9–25.
- Vandemoortele, J., and Delamonica, E. (2010). Taking the MDGs beyond 2015: Hasten slowly. *IDS Bulletin* 41(1): 60–68.
- Vega, J. (2013). Universal health coverage: The post-2015 development agenda. *Lancet*, 381(9862), 179–180.
- Weiner, D.E., McClean, M.D., Kaufman, J.S., and Brooks D.R. (2013). The Central American epidemic of CKD. *Clinical Journal of the American Society of Nephrology* 8(3): 504–511.
- Weiss, T.G., (2014). *Governing the world? Addressing ‘Problems without Passports’*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Press.
- World Health Organization (WHO) (2008). *Health Equity through Intersectoral Action: An Analysis of 18 Country Case Studies*. World Health Organization: Geneva. Retrieved from: [www.who.int/social\\_determinants/resources/health\\_equity\\_isa\\_2008\\_en.pdf](http://www.who.int/social_determinants/resources/health_equity_isa_2008_en.pdf).
- World We Want (2013). *Global Consultation and Addressing Inequalities in the Post-2015 Development Agenda. Leadership Meeting*. 19 February, Copenhagen, Denmark Chairpersons’ Summary Statement. Retrieved from: [www.worldwewant2015.org/node/311498](http://www.worldwewant2015.org/node/311498).
- Williamson, I.P., Enemark, S., Wallace, J., and Rajabifard A. (2010). *Land Administration for Sustainable Development*. Redlands, CA: ESRI Press Academic.
- Wisner, B., Blaikie, P., Cannon T. and Davis, I. (2004). *At Risk: Natural Hazards, People’s Vulnerability and Disasters*. Second edition. Abingdon: Routledge.

- Wisor, S. (2012). After the MDGs: Citizen deliberation and the post-2015 development framework. *Ethics & International Affairs* 26(1): 113–133.
- World Bank (2009). *Rethinking Economic Geography: World Development Report 2009*. Washington DC: World Bank.
- Zimmermann, F., and Smith, K. (2011). More actors, more money, more ideas for international development co-operation. *Journal of International Development*, 23(5): 722–738.
- Zürcher, C., (2012). Conflict, state fragility and aid effectiveness: Insights from Afghanistan. *Conflict, Security & Development*, 12(5): 461–480.