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REACHING THE UNREACHED:
Cross-sector partnerships, business and the post-2015 development agenda

Reaching the unreached, those left behind in the MDG era, is a mission-critical issue for the post-2015 project:

- The ‘Means of Implementation’ needs to focus collective resources and to encourage innovation to meet the needs of the unreached

- Cross-sector partnerships have the potential to deliver the innovation that is needed

- The business component of these cross-sector partnerships can be aligned in a way that maximises the benefits to the most vulnerable.
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Executive summary

The post-2015 development agenda must not only build on the MDGs (Millennium Development Goals) but go much further and finish the job. This means that the most vulnerable – those who have been left behind in the MDG era – need to be reached. A business-as-usual approach is insufficient and will not deliver the kind of development gains that are essential to reaching zero targets in areas such as ending preventable maternal, newborn and child deaths and eliminating hunger.

Cross-sector partnerships – between government, business and civil society – are one of the primary modalities through which it is hoped that the necessary innovation will be created and delivered. Given this, it is surprising that there is so little in the post-2015 dialogue, or in the broader literature, that intentionally considers how cross-sector partnerships can be used to address this mission-critical issue (for the post-2015 project) of reaching the unreached. World Vision decided, therefore, to undertake a qualitative research study to explore this question: How can cross-sector partnerships help to meet the needs of the most vulnerable (and so help further the goal of ending poverty)? This study consisted of 31 interviews with key informants from government, business and civil society. This discussion paper includes not only the main feedback from the interviews, but also World Vision’s own reflections and proposed recommendations.

If cross-sector partnership interventions are going to make a substantive contribution to meeting the needs of the most vulnerable, they need to be sustainable in the medium term. Sustainability is most likely to be achieved if the business contribution to the partnership comes from its core business, that is, that the intervention is market based as opposed to purely donor funded. However, interviewees were split on how realistic they felt a market-based approach to be when it comes to reaching the most vulnerable; the challenge is that there are usually significant barriers to entry (and growth).

Across the interviews with those who felt it was feasible to include a market-based component in such cross-sector partnerships, there was a clear view that such solutions are only viable at this very base of the pyramid if there is an element of ‘subsidy’ in the cross-sector partnership mix to offset the short- to medium-term market entry/development costs. Interestingly, those interviewees who did not see market-based solutions within cross-sector partnerships as viable for reaching the most vulnerable were not, in principle, against the concept of market-based solutions in a development context. Rather, most made positive comments about the value that market-based approaches can bring, but only at the higher strata of the pyramid; they saw reaching the most vulnerable as still needing to be achieved through a purely philanthropic approach.
The challenge of reaching the most vulnerable is most acute in Fragile States. It is perhaps not surprising, then, that none of the interviewees felt that market-based cross-sector partnerships were a viable option for reaching the most vulnerable in fragile contexts. This is not to say, though, that business cannot make a contribution in these places. For example, World Vision strongly encourages companies to play a role in promoting, and advocating for, good governance within a country, that is, to do more than simply comply with existing governance structures. Companies should consider how they can partner with civil society actors to drive these types of systemic change (as well as partnering on more traditional philanthropic initiatives).

World Vision believes that the post-2015 framework has to ensure that the financial, political and technical resources of the international community are directed to the most vulnerable, to those places and people who are missing the benefits of broad-based growth. To the same end, World Vision recommends that companies, also, take a holistic, portfolio view of their investments to ensure they are aligned in a way that maximises the benefits to the most vulnerable. This could include, for example:

- Focusing their philanthropic funding on those of the world’s most vulnerable who live in Fragile States, and channelling (more of) these philanthropic funds through global fund mechanisms, so as to support donor harmonisation and the capture of scale benefits
- In non-fragile contexts, increasing their investments in inclusive, sustainable business models for the base-of-the-pyramid ‘market’, with a medium-term view to releasing more government and donor funds to serve those at the very bottom of the pyramid.

Finally, it is noted that all of the above must be set in the context of the primacy of domestic funding: increasing the domestic revenue base of poorer nations is essential to achieving a sustainable end to poverty. World Vision supports the momentum that is building on addressing tax avoidance and recommends that the post-2015 framework include measures to ensure companies make full and proper contributions of tax – and noting that developed countries also have responsibilities on this issue.

World Vision will be convening further discussions with governments, business, civil society and the United Nations (UN) around the proposed recommendations in this discussion paper before submitting final recommendations to the post-2015 dialogue.

This paper is the second in a short series by World Vision on the subject of business and post-2015. The first paper explores in more detail how targets for cross-sector partnerships could be captured and articulated in the post-2015 framework.
1. Introduction

The post-2015 development agenda must not only build on the MDGs (Millennium Development Goals), but go much further and finish the job. This means that the most vulnerable – those who have been left behind in the MDG era – need to be reached.

Despite global progress in the last 15 years, poverty persists, with millions of children continuing to die from preventable causes and others failing to reach their potential. Rising levels of inequality, both within and between countries, are highlighting the egregious consequences of poverty more and more starkly. World Vision, amongst many others, is calling for zero-based targets in the next development agenda, including the elimination of preventable maternal, new-born and child deaths and of hunger. A business-as-usual approach will not be sufficient and will not deliver the kind of development gains that are essential to reaching these zero targets.

Cross-sector partnerships² – between government, business and civil society – can deliver much-needed innovation. Within cross-sector partnerships, partners typically leverage their respective core knowledge, skills, resources and assets to create solutions which none of the partners could have developed on their own. For example, governments might provide technical, policy and regulatory expertise; businesses their product and/or service development, delivery competencies, and value chains; and civil society organisations their understanding of, relationship with and ‘last mile access’ to local communities.³
For meeting the needs of the most vulnerable, then, it is perhaps the potential innovation that business can bring to help address hitherto seemingly intractable challenges, which is of most interest. Given that cross-sector partnerships are one of the primary modalities through which such innovation is expected to be created and delivered, it is surprising that there is so little in the post-2015 dialogue, or in the broader literature, that intentionally considers how cross-sector partnerships can be used to address this mission-critical issue (for the post-2015 project) of reaching the unreached. We feel it is important, therefore, to explore this issue.

(Note that the word ‘partnership’ in this paper, unless otherwise stated, refers to cross-sector partnerships. It does not mean the ‘Global Partnership’: rather, cross-sector partnerships are one of the ‘Means of Implementation’ within the Global Partnership.)

World Vision believes that business4 will be an essential contributor to the effort to achieve the sustainable end to poverty that is necessary if the needs of the most vulnerable are to be met. Business’s impact, both good and bad, on the international development space is multifaceted and wide reaching; any failure to ‘Do No Harm’ can be particularly damaging to the poorest and most disenfranchised in societies.

At its simplest, a healthy and responsible business sector is critically important to the economic development of states, increasing the national resource base and the potential to improve the well-being of citizens. These benefits can be very quickly eroded, however, if companies do not fulfil their basic societal responsibilities, which World Vision believes include the following:

- ensure that their operations and investments ‘do no harm’ in a country. This includes the need for careful mitigation of the particular risks associated with interventions in fragile contexts
- comply with international standards and voluntary codes of good practice (as well as with legislation)
- respect universal human rights (regardless of country context), including those of the child
- take responsibility for practice within their supply chains, including addressing child labour issues
- provide employment and skills development for the local workforce
- make full and proper payments of tax, and not employ tax avoidance measures
- continuously earn their ‘social license to operate’ and not buy it or take it
- commit to transparency and anti-corruption practices
- take a ‘sustainability’ view of their operations and investments in a country, including proper reporting
If all the above were consistently fulfilled by all companies, then this in itself would result in a substantial positive impact on the ills of poverty and injustice – particularly for the most vulnerable. It is important to note that all of the above also apply to civil society actors. Governments also have a critical role to play in creating and enforcing the necessary regulatory environment. Further, governments are also an actor in this environment; for example, World Vision is currently calling on G20 governments to develop a common approach to the reform of public procurement policies in order to address the issue of child labour in global value chains.5

Philanthropy and corporate social responsibility (CSR) in a variety of modalities are now commonplace in business, as increasingly is a sustainability focus on core business operations. Leading companies are also engaging with concepts such as ‘shared value’6 (where economic value is created in a way that also creates value for wider society) and establishing a track record in newer areas such as inclusive, sustainable business models and aligning these activities with their core business. World Vision welcomes all these positive contributions from business, assuming that they are delivered in such a way that they support the full realisation of human rights. World Vision also encourages companies to use their influence to advocate, where necessary, for pro-poor government policies and practices – as well as acting as role models in their own behaviour.

Given all of the above, and the importance of reaching the most vulnerable through the post-2015 development agenda, as part of an ongoing engagement with the post-2015 process World Vision has conducted a qualitative research study seeking to develop recommendations on the following question: How can cross-sector partnerships help to meet the needs of the most vulnerable (and so help further the goal of ending poverty)?

Whilst business is increasingly viewed by itself and others as a development actor – in addition to its critical role as an economic actor – it is still a relative newcomer to this space. As such, whilst this paper touches on the role, contribution and responsibilities of all three partners within cross-sector partnerships (government, civil society and business) its main focus is on the issues raised by business’s participation.

Please note that, unless otherwise stated, the proposed recommendations made throughout this paper are World Vision’s and do not necessarily represent the views of the individuals or organisations interviewed for this study.
Methodology

The study consisted of 31 interviews with key informants from government, business, and civil society: a list of the organisations that participated is provided at the start of this paper. The interviews were semi-structured, meaning that flexibility was applied to the question set dependent on the flow and focus of each discussion. The interviews (most of them held during March 2014) were conducted by World Vision staff; each one was typically an hour in length, and the large majority of them were conducted over the phone.

To provide a focus for the interviews, and some coherence across them, the study was placed in the context of the health and nutrition space, with interviewees being selected, in part, because of their organisation’s involvement in that sector. However, it is believed that the large majority of the following findings and proposals are equally relevant across most development sectors and issues.

This paper includes not only feedback from the interviews, but also World Vision’s reflections and proposals – based on both the interview data and on our own experience as a development actor. Specifically, the paper puts forward a number of proposed recommendations on reaching the most vulnerable. World Vision will be convening discussions around these (with governments, business, civil society and UN Agencies) before refining them, submitting them to the post-2015 process, and calling on Member States to support them.

“I know many children in my community who are neglected…. Abandoned children receive less attention, and most of the time they are not loved.”

— Bridget, aged 10, Malawi (from a World Vision community survey of children’s voices) © 2014 Wezzie Banda/World Vision
2. Using cross-sector partnerships to reach the most vulnerable

The MDGs catalysed significant improvements in the lives of millions, but there are many millions more who are yet to be reached. In part, this is because not every goal will be met by 2015 – for example, the international community urgently needs to address the shortfalls in MDGs 4 and 5 (child and maternal health). However, even if MDGs 4 and 5 were met, there would still be four million preventable child deaths every year, with the majority of these deaths concentrated in the poorest communities and among the most vulnerable children. Indeed, even under the best-case scenario of all the MDGs being fulfilled, the overall job will still be left unfinished after 2015, because the MDGs aim only to halve world poverty. The focus of the MDGs on global aggregates and ‘one size fits all’ global targets has allowed many states to meet their MDG targets without addressing the needs of the poorest and most vulnerable.

The group that suffers most from the stark inequities in the world is children. The ‘most vulnerable children’ are defined by World Vision as those whose quality of life and ability to fulfil their potential is most limited by extreme deprivation and violation of their rights. These children often live in catastrophic situations and relationships characterised by violence, abuse, neglect, exploitation, exclusion and discrimination. The most at risk are defined not only by depth of economic poverty, but also typically include those living in remote rural locations or urban slums; those in highly vulnerable groups such as refugees, trafficking victims, child labourers, child
soldiers, orphans and child-headed households; and/or those discriminated against on the basis of gender, race, ethnicity, caste and sometimes religion, language or other characteristics like disability.

The contribution of business to cross-sector partnerships for the most vulnerable

From a development perspective, a cross-sector partnership intervention for the most vulnerable needs to have the following inherent characteristics:

- **Be Scalable:** As noted above, there are millions of people still in need. There are some very encouraging cross-sector partnership initiatives emerging, but one of the key challenges currently is lack of scale. If partnerships, as a mechanism, are to make a meaningful contribution to a challenge of the magnitude of ending global poverty, they need to move more quickly out of pilot format, into replication, and on to affecting populations of significant size.

- **Be Sustainable:** Interventions need not only to be responsible in their use of natural resources and in social impact, but also to be fundable in the long term. Interventions that are self-funding within a reasonable time period have the obvious advantage of not being dependent on uncertain and limited aid flows (public or private).

- **Result in Systemic Change:** To deliver tangible and enduring benefits, interventions need to get beneath the immediate problems or symptoms and tackle underlying causes.

Business can contribute a range of values to cross-sector partnerships: from cash, gifts-in-kind and services-in-kind through to leveraging their core competences, influence, operations and value chains. Generally though, cross-sector partnerships are more likely to be scalable, sustainable and result in systemic change if the business contribution is market based – for example, being focused on increasing the social impact of a company’s core business or the development of new inclusive and sustainable business models.

‘Wherever market-based solutions have impact and are commercially viable, we want to see them scale up so that they can change the lives of more of [the poorest] people.’ Looking at the characteristics of vulnerable populations, however, it is clear that there might be significant barriers to entry and growth for market-based interventions:

- For example, whilst there may be a market at the ‘bottom of the pyramid’, the most vulnerable are at the very bottom of that base economically and may not be able to engage in a market in any substantive way. (Although Prahalad states that ‘even here our goal should be to build capacity for people to escape poverty and deprivation through self-sustaining market-based systems.’

- To take another example of a potential barrier, how high might the costs be to access people in remote rural areas where there is little or no public infrastructure?
A further barrier that cross-sector partnerships often have to overcome in reaching the most vulnerable populations is a lack of data. Those people who have been ‘left behind’ are very often invisible: children whose births and deaths are never registered and individuals and communities who have no voice. Without an understanding of the size and characteristics of the population to be served, it is extremely difficult to build a solid ‘business case’, and this, in turn, is a very shaky foundation on which to build a market-based initiative. ‘A lot of multi-stakeholder partnerships set out with the aim of reaching the bottom of the pyramid, but limited good-quality data on household income means it is often overestimated and eventually the economics prove unworkable’ (Interviewee from Government of the United Kingdom).

‘Companies themselves are rarely best placed or best suited to address such structural constraints and must usually collaborate with those outside the private sector’ to address them.

Given these challenges, we asked the interviewees in all three sectors (government, business and civil society) how realistic they felt it was for companies to take a market-based (as opposed to a philanthropic) approach to their participation in cross-sector partnerships when targeting the needs of the most vulnerable.

In the first instance (even though this wasn’t a quantitative study), it was interesting to note that all the government representatives interviewed felt that it should be possible, with the right support (see comments below), for cross-sector partnerships to have a market-based component even at the very lowest levels of the base of the pyramid. Civil society interviewees, on the other hand, felt the opposite: that such a proposition was neither realistic nor, for some of those interviewed, desirable. Those participating from the business sector were split equally between yes and no.

The different responses from the business interviewees were coloured to some degree by their own experiences – as one might expect. The interview data suggested that there might also be differences in viability of such market-based solutions for the very poorest across industry types. For example, a market-based approach may be more viable in the mobile communications sector than in the health sector.
industry, given the existing widespread access to cell phones in developing countries. And access to the lowest points of the base of the pyramid may be a more realistic proposition for companies with products at a lower price point (such as some fast-moving consumer goods) and/or for those in industries which are more likely to have existing in-country supply chains. It is clearly not possible, however, to draw any solid conclusions on this from a qualitative interview base.

Across the interviews with those who felt it was feasible to include a market-based component in cross-sector partnerships, there was a clear view that such solutions are only viable at the very base of the pyramid if there is an element of ‘subsidy’ in the cross-sector partnership mix to offset the short-to-medium-term market entry/development costs. ‘Where the level of risk of entering new markets or developing new products is too high, but the development benefits are high, financial support – in the forms of grants, loans or loan guarantees and even equity stakes – from governments, international donors and foundations might reduce or mitigate that risk to make it a viable investment.’ Several of the interviewees stressed that it was important to recognise that these subsidies are, or should be, a necessary component of a project design and not a financial inducement to secure a company’s involvement. ‘For example, market guarantees provide a necessary (interim) surrogate for the market, where a market would not otherwise exist’ (Interviewee from Becton, Dickinson & Co.).

It is not difficult to see the potential public-relations challenges in donor governments or multilateral agencies being seen, or perceived, to give funding to companies to create markets for their products – regardless of the underlying development narrative. ‘Donor governments want to see business contributing in this way, but there is great sensitivity about giving funding to the private sector’ (Interviewee from SUN Business Network) – although alternative funding models such as loans and equity, rather than straight grants, are perhaps more palatable. It is important to note that there are also ways in which a company may be able to carry a large proportion of the subsidy requirement itself; for example, cross-subsidisation, or differential pricing, enables companies to use the profits from products sold at a relatively high price-point to middle- and upper-income households to subsidise much lower-priced products for the poor. World Vision also encourages companies to cross-subsidise, at least in part, their market-based development interventions from their own philanthropic funds, as well as product cross-subsidisation, rather than leveraging government or donor money.

Interestingly, those interviewees who did not see market-based solutions within a cross-sector partnership as viable for reaching the most vulnerable were not, in principle, against the concept of market-based solutions in a development context. Rather, most made positive comments about the value that market-based models can bring, but only at the higher strata of the pyramid, seeing reach to the most vulnerable still being a purely philanthropic approach. A number of interviewees also related their experience or observation that leveraging market-based solutions above, say, the US$2/day income level can ‘free up’ government and other resources to address the needs of the poorest (below US$2/day).
3. Cross-sector partnerships in fragile contexts

The discussions above with interviewees about addressing the needs of the most vulnerable were largely grounded in the context of middle-income countries (MICs) and stable low-income countries (LICs). As MICs are now home to the largest number of people in poverty in the world, the potential of cross-sector partnerships to make a difference in these countries is very important, particularly if these new, market-based solutions can release international funding to address the very particular problems of Fragile States.

The MDGs have failed to create momentum in Fragile States; it is estimated that 1.5 billion people have missed out on a decade of concerted international action on poverty reduction and on the progress experienced in more politically stable countries. Up to one-half of all global infant deaths occur in Fragile States; a child born in a Fragile State is twice as likely to die before age 5 as a child born in a more stable LIC. Addressing the challenges in Fragile States is no small task, but it must be taken up in the new post-2015 framework.

Given that many of the desired characteristics of an enabling environment for business and cross-sector partnerships will be absent in fragile contexts, it is perhaps not surprising that none of the interviewees felt that market-based cross-sector partnerships were a viable option in Fragile States. Many of the challenges in Fragile States are caused by a lack of capacity and/or political will on the part of government to address the needs of its most vulnerable citizens. In these cases it can be very difficult to partner with government. However, whilst usually and perhaps ideally conceived as a three-way relationship between government, business and civil society, it is important to note that cross-sector partnerships can also be formed successfully between just business and civil society actors. In such cases, perhaps, global, multilateral donors or the UN can ‘stand in the gap’ to provide some of the necessary financing or even to act as liaison between the cross-sector partnership and the host government. (One of the interviewees stressed the value of the Global Fund and the GAVI Alliance playing this role in countries where it is difficult for companies to deal with the government directly.)
Civil society and UN agencies play a critical role in Fragile States, particularly in areas such as service delivery and emergency response, and in building capacity and space for social accountability. It is equally important, however, that these roles are complemented by actions to drive systemic change, including holding governments to account as the primary duty bearers for essential services and the protection of human rights. Business can partner with civil society in these areas, as well as on more traditional philanthropic initiatives. For example, multi-national companies and large national corporations can choose to exert their influence with governments, directly or indirectly, to advocate for action on poverty and injustice – and the development/delivery of the post-2015 framework provides an important opportunity for such conversations. Business’s first responsibility is to set an example with its own behaviour – it should continuously earn its ‘social license to operate’, not buy or take it – but in Fragile States World Vision strongly encourages companies to do more than just comply with existing governance structures; rather, they should also play a role in promoting, and advocating for, good governance within a country.
4. An equity perspective on companies’ development activities

World Vision believes that the post-2015 framework needs a built-in equity lens to ensure that the collective efforts of the international community are focused on the most vulnerable, channelling combined resources to those places and people who are missing the benefits of broad-based growth. To the same end, World Vision encourages companies to view their development activities through an equity lens and to take a holistic, portfolio view of their investments to ensure they are aligned in a way that maximises the benefits to the most vulnerable.

The ability to do this will be dependent on breaking down organisational silos. Whilst the most progressive business leaders see no distinction between their core business and their philanthropy activities, several of the interviewees reported that this was far from the norm, saying, for example: ‘In theory, these different groups work together, but in practice they don’t’; ‘There is still a big internal divide between the “Foundation” and CSR bits of businesses and their core operations.’

‘The Unilever Foundation and consumer brand programmes focused on WASH and nutrition sit within our core business; this is a reflection of our overall corporate philosophy and strategy… and helps us to develop and fund sustainable and inclusive solutions, for example through cross-subsidisation.’

— Interviewee from Unilever
In summary (see Figure 1), in order to maximise the impact of their development activities on the most vulnerable, World Vision encourages companies to consider:

- Focusing their philanthropic funding on those of the world’s most vulnerable who live in Fragile States
- Channelling more of these philanthropic funds through global fund mechanisms, so as to support donor harmonisation and the capture of scale benefits
- In non-fragile contexts, increasing their investments in inclusive, sustainable business models for the ‘base of the pyramid’ market, with a medium-term view to releasing more government and donor funds to serve those at the very bottom of the pyramid
- Where needed, contribute seed funding for their inclusive business model pilots from their own philanthropic funds.

*Figure 1: Maximising the impact of companies’ development activities on the most vulnerable*
5. Business and domestic resource mobilisation

It is important to close with a reminder that all of the above must be set in the context of the primacy of domestic funding. National development is the responsibility of governments, and increasing the domestic revenue base of poorer nations is essential to achieving a sustainable end to poverty. World Vision welcomes the emphasis on a variety of aspects of domestic resource mobilisation in the post-2015 narrative to date. In particular, World Vision supports the momentum that is building on addressing tax avoidance.\(^\text{19}\) Governments and companies both have responsibility to address this injustice. Governments are responsible for establishing regulatory environments and incentives to ensure that the corporate sector contributes effectively to economic development through, amongst other things, contributing fully to the tax base. This, of course, requires political will – donors can play a critical role here by providing support to LICs for capacity-building of their tax authorities. Companies have a responsibility to make full and proper payments of taxes, and governments and civil society should ensure they are held to account on this.

---

**The Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI)** is a global standard – implemented by individual countries – that was established to ensure transparency of payments from natural resources. Under this methodology, extractive companies disclose the payments they make and governments disclose receipt of payments, with both being independently verified, reconciled and published in an EITI report.

An area in which the issue of transparency of payments is particularly acute – and where experience, such as the establishment of the EITI\(^\text{20}\) (see text box), might usefully be leveraged for broader application – is extractive industries. Some of the countries in most need of more domestic funds for basic services also have some of the world’s richest endowments of natural resources.\(^\text{21}\)

Critical to achieving a sustainable end to poverty in such countries is ensuring that all extractive companies are making fair payments, that these are ending up in government funds, and that the wealth is then used for pro-poor development. For example, governments could ‘earmark’ natural-resource revenues to fund specific post-2015 goals and commitments. World Vision calls for the post-2015 discussions to consider the very particular needs of these poor but ‘resource rich’ countries.
6. Proposed recommendations for discussion

In summary, World Vision is proposing the following recommendations related to the use of business and cross-sector partnerships to reach the most vulnerable:

**World Vision–proposed recommendations for the post-2015 framework**

- That the framework ensures no one is left behind and that the efforts of the international community are specifically directed to the most vulnerable
- That the ‘Means of Implementation’ include mechanisms that will ensure the combined resources of the international community are focused on those places and people that are missing the benefits of broad-based growth
- That governments establish platforms within which they can work with business and civil society to determine how cross-sector partnerships might be used to meet the specific needs of the most vulnerable
- That the post-2015 framework include measures to ensure companies make full and proper contributions of tax, so as to increase the domestic resource base in developing countries – and noting that developed countries also have responsibilities on this issue
- That all countries which are rich in natural resources sign up to and achieve compliant status on EITI; further, that all these governments have budget allocation and accountability mechanisms in place that ensure that natural-resource revenues fund post-2015 priorities benefiting the most vulnerable
- That the framework ensures effective, robust accountability systems, particularly related to the rights of the most vulnerable, including:
  - Ensuring that citizens from all social groups are engaged in the setting, monitoring and evaluation of contextually appropriate local targets and that data from citizen monitoring is used to improve delivery processes and meet national equity targets
  - Government enforcement of requirements on businesses to respect universal principles on labour, environment, anti-corruption and human rights as articulated in international agreements, including the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights
  - Consideration of mandatory sustainability reporting for companies above a certain market capitalisation.
Additional World Vision–proposed recommendations for business

- That all companies take a holistic, portfolio view of their investments to ensure they are aligned in a way that maximises the benefits to the most vulnerable, such as
  - focusing their philanthropic spending on Fragile States and channelling more of these funds through global fund mechanisms, so as to support donor harmonisation and the capture of scale benefits
  - in non-fragile contexts, increasing their investments in inclusive, sustainable business models for the ‘base of the pyramid’ market, with a medium-term view to releasing more government and donor funds to serve those at the very bottom of the pyramid; contributing necessary seed funding for these models from their own philanthropic funds or cross-subsidisation of product lines.

- That, in Fragile States in particular:
  - Companies consider how they can partner with civil society actors to drive systemic change – as well as partnering on more traditional philanthropic initiatives – including holding governments to account as the primary duty bearers for essential services and the protection of human rights
  - Companies set an example with their own behaviour, but also do more than just comply with existing governance structures; rather, they should also play a role in promoting, and advocating for, good governance within a country.
Endnotes


2 For the purposes of this study we are using the following working definition: ‘A cross-sector or multi-stakeholder partnership is an ongoing working relationship between organisations combining their resources and competencies and sharing risks towards achieving agreed objectives while each achieving their own individual objectives’ (from The Partnering Initiative).


4 Note that this study focuses primarily on the role of ‘big business’: multinationals and large, national companies


9 ‘Inclusive and sustainable business models’ are defined for the purposes of this paper as those that expand access to products, services and livelihoods for those at the base of the pyramid in a manner that is commercially viable, scalable and within environmental limits.


12 Ibid., 8.


14 World Vision would welcome the need for these types of data being reflected in any post-2015 proposals related to the ‘The Data Revolution’.


16 Ibid.


20 See the EITI website. <http://eiti.org/>

21 For example, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, currently ranked joint lowest (of 187 countries) on the UN’s Human Development Index and with one of the worst rates of under 5 mortality in the world, is sitting on an estimated 24 trillion dollars of mineral wealth. World Vision International (2013), ‘Business – A Vital Contributor to the Post-2015 Agenda’.


23 See the Publish What You Pay website. <http://www.publishwhatyoupay.org/>
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