Chapter 4
Realizing Human Security in the Post-2015 Era: Principles to Promote Inclusive Development and Resilience

Ryutaro Murotani

1. Introduction

As 2015, the target year for the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), approaches, the discussion regarding the post-2015 development goals is attracting attention. Unlike the process of creating the MDGs in the 1990s and 2000s, the global community is trying to organize as inclusive a dialogue as possible and listen to the voices of people from all around the world. The United Nations, for example, has been coordinating national and regional consultations, thematic consultations, and web-based online dialogues. Recognizing the value of such inclusive and participatory dialogues, this chapter aims to supplement the discussion through various empirical analyses of international development since the adoption of the MDGs. While the impact of the MDGs on raising public awareness has stimulated people to debate the new goals, careful examination of the experience of the MDGs is necessary to understand the state of the world today and design the new development framework for the future.

From the experiences of the MDGs we can learn two principal lessons. Firstly, the MDGs were based on the Millennium Declaration. Although some important issues from the Declaration were missing, the Millennium Declaration did serve as a guiding principle for the MDGs. In the same vein, a guiding principle is needed for the new development framework. Secondly, as the achievement of the MDGs has varied both across and within countries and regions, we need to analyze what has been achieved and what has not. This analysis is the first step towards establishing crucial elements for a guiding principle.

With these ideas in mind, this chapter first examines the MDGs

achievements. Based on that examination, it is argued that inclusive development and resilience are two perspectives that should be incorporated into the post-2015 framework. The chapter then discusses the potential of the human security concept as a guiding principle within which these two perspectives can be incorporated. It will also elaborate on the added value of having the human security concept as a guiding principle, and provide some concrete suggestions.

2. Achievements under the MDGs framework

In discussing the post-2015 development agenda, we should first learn from the experiences of the MDGs framework. The results of the MDGs framework vary across regions, countries, goals, and indicators. By closely looking at the MDGs achievements, we can recognize unfulfilled goals that need to be continuously pursued and find new challenges that are not included in the MDGs.

International organizations, such as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the United Nations (UN), have published their monitoring reports on the progress of the MDGs so as to demonstrate the overall trend of the MDGs achievement.[1] World Bank and IMF (2012) estimated that Goal 1A of halving poverty has already been met. However, many countries in Sub-Saharan Africa and those identified as low-income countries (LICs) are far behind the MDGs targets due to the combination of low starting points and difficult circumstances. Several large middle-income countries allegedly drove the global achievement of the MDGs. China led the way in global poverty reduction as it reduced the poverty rate from 60 per cent in 1990 to 14 per cent in 2008. While global poverty was reduced from 47 per cent to 24 per cent during this period, developing regions excluding China only reduced the rate from 41 per cent to 28 per cent (United Nations 2012).

Through an examination of the achievement of the MDGs, Sapkota and Shiratori (2013) have found disparities between and within nations. Their cross-country analysis also illustrates that Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia are lagging behind in achieving the target of halving poverty (Goal

---

1. While various reports and analyses have been published, this chapter only briefly introduces some of them. The present chapter depends on Sapkota and Shiratori (2013) for more comprehensive review.

1A). Inequality between countries expanded between 2000 and 2010, as the average annual poverty reduction rates are lower in countries with higher initial poverty rates. Growing disparity was also observed in the under-five mortality rate (U5MR). On the whole, Sub-Saharan African countries, low-income countries (LICs), and fragile states are far behind the MDGs targets. Disparities within countries are another problem. Although most countries made progress on both rural and urban poverty reduction, some countries have shown an unbalanced pattern of urban and rural poverty reduction. The majority of countries experienced a higher rate of poverty reduction in urban areas than in rural. There are also some countries that experienced a heightening of the Gini coefficient in the years from 2000 to 2010. As the MDGs are often only monitored at the national level, these disparities were not well captured. The new development framework should be designed to cope with variations within countries so that it leaves no one behind. Promoting inclusive development will be the key to this challenge.

Several issues have been observed as factors that slow down and sometimes hinder the achievement of the MDGs. Downside risks and threats such as violent conflicts, natural disasters, infectious diseases, and economic crises can easily destroy development gains over a very short period and can obstruct the achievement of the MDGs. While nearly 1.5 billion people live in countries affected by fragility, conflict, or large-scale organized criminal violence, no fragile or conflict-affected low-income countries have achieved a single MDG. On average, a country which experienced major violence between 1981 and 2005, had a poverty rate 21 percentage points higher than a country that saw no violence. A child in a fragile or conflict-affected state is twice as likely to be undernourished as a child in another developing country, and nearly three times as likely not to be in primary school. If we exclude the four populous developing/emerging countries (Brazil, Russia, India, and China), fragile and conflict-affected states and those recovering from conflict and fragility account for 70 per cent of infant deaths, 65 per cent of people without access to safe water, and 77 per cent of children missing from primary school (World Bank 2011). Resource-rich countries face difficulties in effectively and peacefully translating their natural resources into socio-economic development. They face higher risks of onset of war and conflict (Fearon 2010). Natural disasters are also detrimental to development. The UN Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR) (2012) estimated that disasters associated with natural

hazards have affected 4.4 billion people, caused US$2 trillion of damage, and killed 1.3 million people since 1992. In light of these various shocks and in attempting to make development progress more sustainable, it is essential to enhance the resilience of societies to cope with these downside risks and to quickly recover from the shocks. While the MDGs indicators measure achievements at a particular point, they pay no attention to the process of achievement, the sustainability of the results, or their resilience against crises.

3. Principles for the post-2015 development framework

Through an examination of the achievement of the MDGs, we found two perspectives, which were not incorporated in the MDGs framework, to be essential to the new development agenda: inclusive development and resilience. The large disparities across and within countries demand that future development progress should be more inclusive. The lack of attention to the capacity of societies to cope with and bounce back from external shocks alerts us to the need to be more conscious of the importance of building resilient societies. These two perspectives are interrelated and can be encapsulated by the concept of "human security". Those who are excluded from development progress tend to be more vulnerable to downside risks. The human security principles emphasize the need to address the insecurities of those people. In fact, the two perspectives are crucial elements for realizing human security in any given society.

Inclusive development

Since large disparities have been observed within and across countries, the need for inclusive development to address such disparities is essential. Inclusive development ensures that all stakeholders, including those who are lagging behind in the achievement of the MDGs, enjoy equitable opportunities to achieve socio-economic development. In order to achieve inclusive development, particular attention should be paid to those who are excluded from the process of development such as the poor, the vulnerable, and the disadvantaged.

Inclusive development, as defined by Kozuka (2014), should enhance people's well-being through advancing equality of opportunity. Inequalities of outcome, including income inequality, may be acceptable

as long as they are the result of differences in the degree of effort by individuals, rather than differences in their circumstances. In cases where unequal conditions create inequalities of outcome, policies need to be implemented to redress such inequalities and to level the playing field. Income redistribution policies might sometimes be necessary where they serve as an alternative or a complementary policy option to redress inequality borne out of the differing circumstances of individuals. Kozuka (2014) insists that income redistribution is not necessarily mandatory, but rather it is important to choose the best mixture of policy options, depending on the specific situations in each country to achieve inclusive development.

As both health and education are fundamental to equalizing opportunities, the provision of universal health coverage (UHC) and basic education to all can be regarded as the core instruments for building fundamentals for inclusive development. Lamichhane et al. (2014) illustrate how education has reduced poverty rates for people with disabilities in Nepal, despite the fact that people with disabilities are not always provided with equal opportunities for education. Infrastructure can be an effective tool for providing equal opportunities, as indicated by Sapkota (2014), who illustrated the cross-country evidence on the impact of infrastructure development on health and education.

Resilience

Although various shocks, including violent conflicts and natural disasters, obstruct development progress and interrupt the achievement of the MDGs, the MDGs framework does not look at the capacity of countries and/or societies to deal with these shocks. In the post-2015 framework, a society's capacity to cope with these disturbing shocks needs to be considered not only to maintain the achievement of the MDGs but also to realize long-term sustainable development in countries facing such shocks. Resilience – the capacity to cope with external shocks and recover from them – is an important element that needs to be mainstreamed in the post-2015 development agenda.

The importance of resilience has been highlighted recently in various fields, as the world witnesses an increasing number of disasters, including natural disasters, technological disasters, armed conflicts, and economic crises (Sawada et al. 2011, 2). A resilient society should have

the capacity to adapt to disturbances and recover. Although it may in some cases be impossible for a society to restore its pre-disaster state, resilient societies can recreate dynamism and build back better. Investment in preparedness for external shocks is also cost-effective in terms of development. It is often argued that one dollar of investment in disaster preparedness can save four to seven dollars in the aftermath of disaster (e.g. IPU and UNISDR 2010, 35).[2] As climate change increases the frequency of natural hazards, the social capacity to adapt and cope with such hazards becomes even more important.

Numerous policy options and perspectives have been suggested as ways of enhancing the resilience of societies against risks of violent conflicts and natural disasters. On prevention of violent conflict, Mine et al. (2013) focus on horizontal inequalities (HIs), people's perceptions, and political institutions for mitigating the risks of conflict and instability. With regards to natural disasters, Shimada (2014) points out the importance of job creation and social capital for reconstructing and recreating disaster-hit societies. Japan International cooperation Agency (JICA) promotes the disaster management cycle (DMC), which emphasized coordination and combination of prevention, response, and recovery and reconstruction tools. The Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) also provides direction for building up the resilience of nations and communities to natural disasters. Given the increasing economic and human losses caused by natural hazards, the importance of disaster risk management has been increasingly emphasized by various scholars and policy makers (e.g. Mitchell and Wilkinson 2012).

Realizing human security through promoting inclusive development and resilience

The concept of human security integrates the two perspectives of inclusive development and resilience. By putting people at the center of focus, the human security viewpoint shows that the intersection of the two perspectives is at the heart of serious insecurities. Those who suffer from crises such as violence and conflict, as well as from natural

---

2. The cost-effectiveness of disaster risk reduction is very difficult to assess. UN agencies, including the UNISDR, often refer to the estimate of four to seven dollars return to one dollar investment. However, it is acknowledged that estimates can vary depending on definitions, hypothesis, and/or calculation methodologies (e.g. United Nations and World Bank 2010). Further research needs to be carried out in order to provide a more accurate assessment of cost-effectiveness.

disasters, are excluded from the upward development process. Moreover, those who are excluded from the upward development process are those most likely to be vulnerable to shocks including natural disasters and economic crises. Poor countries suffer disproportionately from natural disasters. Of the 3.3 million deaths from natural hazards since 1970, almost 1 million occurred as a result of the Africa's droughts alone (United Nations and World Bank 2010, 10). The poor are more vulnerable to natural disasters as they are more likely to live in higher risk areas and in poorly constructed houses. Poorer people are more dependent on public services. They therefore need to live as well as work in riskier places on cheaper land exposed to hazards, if public transportation is not reliable. This fact exists even if people know the hazard risks they face (United Nations and World Bank 2010, 2). In Bogota, Colombia, property prices differ based on the distance from earthquake-prone areas. The property price in the furthest quintile from the top 10 riskiest neighborhoods is more than six times higher than the comparable property in the closest quintile (United Nations and World Bank 2010, 4-5). Economic crises also inflict greater damage on more vulnerable people. The poorest populations in societies were affected more adversely by the global economic crisis that began in 2007. In particular, the poorer sectors of society were subject to layoffs, reduced work hours and wages, price shocks, reduced remittances, and reduced demand for jobs abroad (Turk et al. 2010). The human security perspective focuses on those who are socially weak and vulnerable, as well as those whose lives and dignities are under threat. The human security perspective tries to deal with various threats comprehensively, realize freedom from fear and want for those who are vulnerable to these threats, and promote protection and empowerment for these people.

Clearly, the two perspectives discussed above – inclusive development and resilience – are the indispensable elements for realizing human security. Inclusive development, through efforts to provide every individual with equitable opportunities, embodies the central perspective of human security – putting people at the center. The human security perspective focuses on people who are under threat and in the most difficult circumstances in order to prevent suffering among vulnerable populations. Promoting resilience, through building capacity to cope with various threats, embodies the perspective of human security to deal with downside risks. As Amartya Sen described in the Report by the Commission on Human Security (CHS), *Human*

Security Now, human security has a strong emphasis on downside risks for each individual, particularly for vulnerable people to cope with and possibly overcome sudden deprivation (CHS 2003, 8). Through this emphasis, the human security concept supplements the upward orientation of the human development concept. At present, the MDGs framework solely focuses on positive achievements through human development. However, the inclusion of the perspective of resilience, a focus on risks based on the human security concept, will supplement this framework to be more sustainable by dealing with serious threats that can destroy development achievements.

4. Human security

The concept of human security

Since it was discussed in the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)'s *Human Development Report 1994*, the definition of human security has been debated by diplomats, government officials, scholars, practitioners, and many others. Despite the lack of consensus on its definition, human security is at the heart of the work of the United Nations. The UN Charter recognizes the link between development and peace (Fukuda-Parr and Messineo 2012, 24). The three pillars of the United Nations – human rights, development, and peace and security – can be integrated within the human security concept. The UN General Assembly Resolution on Human Security[3] adopted in September 2012 (A/RES/66/290) is a clear sign of the convergence of understandings. The Resolution will become a foundation for a clearer definition.

Although there is not yet a fully agreed definition of human security, the CHS report in 2003 provides the basic understanding and framework of the concept. The report highlights the following points as the characteristics of the concept:

> 1) People-centered: Human security concerns 'the individual and the community rather than the state.' It shifts the focus of security from defending the state against external aggression to protecting people from a range of menaces.
> 2) Menaces: 'Menaces to people's security include threats and

---

3. The Resolution A/RES/66/290 is officially titled as "Follow-up to paragraph 143 on human security of the 2005 World Summit Outcome".

conditions that have not always been classified as threats to state security.' Human security includes 'protection of citizens from environmental pollution, transnational terrorism, massive population movements, such infectious diseases as HIV/AIDS, and long-term conditions of oppression and deprivation.'

3) Actors: 'The range of actors is expanded beyond the state alone.'

4) Empowerment: 'Achieving human security includes not just protecting people but also empowering people to fend for themselves.' 'In many situations, people can contribute directly to identifying and implementing solutions to the quagmire of insecurity.' (CHS 2003, 4-6)

In comparison with the concept of human development, although both share a people-centered focus, the concept of human security is more concerned with insecurities that threaten human survival. While the human development perspective focuses more on upward-oriented and positive development progress, the human security perspective supplements this focus by protecting vulnerable people from downturns and empowering them to cope with, and when possible overcome, downside risks. This contrast is aptly described by Sen as follows:

> Human security as an idea fruitfully supplements the expansionist perspective of human development by directly paying attention to what are sometimes called 'downside risks' … Human security demands protection from these dangers and the empowerment of people so that they can cope with – and when possible overcome – these hazards (CHS 2003, 8).

Sen uses the phrases 'growth with equity' and 'downturn with security' to encapsulate the two concepts (CHS 2003, 8). Mine and Gomez (2013) describe the concepts with the labels 'light and shadow'. Differences, commonalities, and links between human security, human development, and human rights have been well articulated by many scholars (see for example Gasper 2007; Tadjbakhsh and Chenoy 2007).

Inclusive and equitable development is referred to as an important element of the human security principles in the CHS report (2003). As the human security perspective puts people, rather than states, at the center of analysis, it accordingly pays attention not only to the national average but also to inequality within states. While the human security approach

presupposes the need for economic growth, given that protection and empowerment require a certain level of public goods provision and private sector activities, growth is expected to be more inclusive and equitable in terms of opportunity. The human security approach, which emphasizes empowerment for people who realize their own potential, is consistent with development through advancing equality of opportunity. Moreover, economic activities are interrelated with multiple dimensions of survival, livelihood, and dignity. In relation to the economic element of post-conflict recovery, the report says '[e]quitable and inclusive economic growth is critical to promoting political and social stability, while enlarging opportunities for people' (CHS 2003, 58). While the human security thinking is clearly concerned with extreme deprivation, the extent of such concerns within inclusive development depends on the way in which inclusive development is defined.

Resilience is referred to even more frequently in the report (CHS 2003). On many occasions the term resilience is discussed in relation to the empowerment of individuals and communities. The human security approach encourages prevention and mitigation of risks, urgent responses to sudden shocks, and recovery from damage. Consequently, community and individual empowerment is emphasized as crucial components in these risk-coping measures. The insistence of Chandler (2012) on the importance of resilience and human security in relation to violent conflicts highlights the inclination of the human security concept towards prevention and empowerment. He argues that the focus on resilience – working upon the empowerment of the vulnerable – can move the discussion on helping people in conflict and post-conflict zones beyond the debate over the use of force. Furthermore, resilience is becoming even more important in the context of the increasing number of natural disasters, which are often influenced by climate change. These debates can inform and enrich the understanding of the human security concept. Brown (2012) argues that debates on resilience provide views on how systems can deal with disturbances and surprise, and how they can adapt to change, while discussions on human security often emphasize system stability. On the other hand, in social ecological literature the focus is on systems and how they operate, and prominence is not given to the role of individuals in responding to changes (Brown 2012, 112–13). The human security perspective can bridge this gap by promoting the empowerment of individuals and communities in dealing with crises.

Debates on human security

The concept of human security has often been a source of controversy in the international community; however, a common understanding has been increasingly accepted in recent years. Since the publication of the CHS report, debates around the definition have continued, but they are now approaching a consensus. While issues around humanitarian intervention have been contested more and more within the concept of the responsibility to protect (R2P), the broader scope of the human security concept has been acknowledged by various scholars (e.g. Tadjbakhsh and Chenoy 2007). The term 'human security' has been included and discussed in a number of policy documents including those produced by Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), the G8 summits, and the World Economic Forum, as well as in the two Reports of the UN Secretary-General[4], and the World Bank's *World Development Report 2011.*

The UN General Assembly Resolution on Human Security in September 2012 (A/RES/66/290) is a clear sign of the convergence of understandings on human security. The Resolution will become a foundation for a clearer definition. It states that 'human security is an approach to assist Member States in identifying and addressing widespread and cross-cutting challenges to the survival, livelihood and dignity of their people.' (para. 3) It also recognizes that 'development, peace and security and human rights are the pillars of the United Nations and are interlinked and mutually reinforcing, achieving development is a central goal in itself and the advancement of human security should contribute to realizing sustainable development as well as the internationally agreed development goals, including the Millennium Development Goals.' (para. 4.) The Resolution reaffirms that the notion of human security is linked to the MDGs and eventually the ultimate objectives of the United Nations.

Important elements of the human security perspective have also been recognized by the High-Level Panel of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda for the UN Secretary-General. The communiqué of their third meeting in Monrovia, Liberia, stated: 'The protection and empowerment of people is crucial' and '[t]his is a global, people-centered and planet-sensitive agenda…' The communiqué of their

---

4. The UN Secretary-General has issued two reports on Human Security as the follow-up to the paragraph 143 of the 2005 World Summit Outcome (A/RES/60/1). The first report (A/64/701) was issued on 8 March 2010, and the second report (A/66/763) on 5 April 2012.

fourth meeting in Bali, Indonesia, also stated: 'we agreed on the need for a renewed Global Partnership that enables a transformative, people-centered and planet-sensitive agenda…' Their final report in May 2013 refers to human security as a concept around which 'an agenda can be built' that will 'leave no one behind' (United Nations 2013a, 4).

The subsequent report by the Secretary-General, though not directly mentioning the term 'human security', recognized the important interlinkages between development, peace and security, and human rights by saying that 'upholding human rights and freeing people from fear and want are inseparable' and "[t]here can be no peace without development and no development without peace' (United Nations 2013b, 3, 15). In the UNGA Resolution on Human Security, human security recognizes the links between the three pillars of the UN in the same way. The report also recognized the basic principle of 'placing people at the centre' as a prerequisite for the success of the MDGs framework (United Nations 2013b, 4).

Human security has received attention in various consultation meetings organized by the UN. For example, the Dili Consensus, adopted at the Dili International Conference on the Post-2015 Development Agenda[5] in February 2013, reads '[w]hile our specific needs and priorities may differ, we all envision better lives for our people, based upon human security' (Dili Consensus, para 6).[6] In their open letter to the UN General Assembly, the network of civil society organizations coordinated by Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC) and others[7] insisted that 'there can be no development without human security' and that '[a] strong human security approach to development is indeed the means through which long-lasting impact is ensured' (Peace Portal website 2013).

---

5. The Dili International Conference was organized as a participatory consultation meeting for government and civil society representatives from fragile and conflict-affected countries, and the Asia-Pacific region.

6. The whole text of Dili Consensus is posted on the organizer's website (see g7+ website 2013).
http://www.g7plus.org/news-feed/2013/3/1/the-dili-consensus-is-presented-and-endorsed-at-the-dili-int.html.

7. The letter was initiated by four civil society organizations: GPPAC (Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict); IKV-Pax Christi; Alliance for Peacebuilding; and Civil Society Platform for Peacebuilding and Statebuilding. As of October 2013, the Consensus had been signed by 20 organizations from various countries including several conflict-affected countries in Africa.

5. Human security as a guiding principle

Based on the above-mentioned analyses and discussions, it is evident that the concept of human security has the potential to be a guiding principle for the post-2015 development agenda framework. The concept itself can shape the various directions of the debate surrounding the agenda. Koehler et al. (2012) have already featured the human security concept as a conceptual framework for the post-MDGs agenda. They argue that the notion of human security can: 1) combine human rights dimensions and the notion of human dignity and choice; 2) capture all the MDGs areas in a more interconnected and systematic fashion; 3) emphasize 'joined-up' thinking; 4) include the impact of income and wealth inequalities, and social exclusion; 5) acknowledge the importance of good governance; 6) examine objective situations and subjective perceptions, equity and well-being, social inclusion and social cohesion; 7) be used as a point of departure for participation; 8) emphasize environmental sustainability and integration of climate change adaptation in development strategies; 9) exhibit universal challenges; and 10) open new perspectives for the objectives, instruments, and management of the international system (Koehler et al. 2012, 18–20).

(1) Principles suggested by the human security concept

This chapter argues that the concept of human security can provide a conceptual backbone for the new development agenda framework. As a guiding principle, the concept implies various points that will give direction to the global community in the coming decades. These points will further enhance the strengths and supplement the weaknesses of the MDGs framework. They provide guidance for setting global goals as well as realizing them.

Focus on extreme difficulties

The human security perspective focuses on people facing extreme difficulties or dangers. It indicates the importance of poverty eradication and support for those who cannot achieve the MDGs. It suggests that we should address inequalities, social exclusion, and vulnerabilities. The human security perspective is concerned with violent conflicts and deprivation including poverty, pollution, illness, and lack of education. The definition given to human security by the CHS is 'to protect the vital core of all human lives in ways that enhance human freedoms and human

fulfillment' (CHS 2003, 4). The concept calls for addressing challenges to survival, livelihood, and dignity as fundamental for every individual.

Emphasis on preparedness

The human security perspective highlights concerns with various threats and perils such as wars, violent conflicts, natural disasters, and catastrophic accidents and illness. Society as a whole has to enhance its preparedness for these shocks. Because it is unrealistic and inefficient to expect each country to be prepared for every potential threat to every individual, international partnerships are required to collaboratively share the risks and strengthen societal resilience towards sudden shocks. Regional cooperation and global cooperation have to be developed to enhance preparedness to deal with large-scale hazards and mitigate the damage from disasters.

Multi-sector and comprehensive approach

The human security thinking integrates important sectors and challenges (including all the MDGs) through its comprehensive understanding of threats including freedom from fear, freedom from want, and freedom to live in dignity. By focusing on individuals, the MDGs can be analyzed as a set of interrelated goals. Putting people at the center also enables us to recognize challenges not included in the MDGs, measures for achieving the MDGs and other goals, subjective perceptions on threats and well-being, and the importance of the natural environment and sustainability.

Multiple actors

Various threats have to be dealt with by various actors. By putting people at the center of focus and analysis, we can identify various actors that can deal with these threats to individuals. As the human security approach promotes the combination of protection and empowerment, it can combine national policies with inter-governmental cooperation as well as with initiatives by local governments, civil society, private organizations, local communities, and people themselves. The human security approach encourages not only national governments but also non-state actors, such as civil society, to work together to address urgent threats. While the human security approach, as summarized by the UNGA Resolution on

Human Security, highlights the primary role and responsibility of national governments and societies, various actors should support efforts to realize human security and mutually reinforce state security and human security.

The idea of mobilizing various actors together might suggest a new global architecture to solve global problems, as problems are increasingly becoming too complicated to be addressed by a single actor. Governments have to collaborate with other actors, including people themselves, to tackle diverse challenges. At the international level, regional and global partnerships are needed. As the dichotomy between the North and the South becomes less and less relevant, both industrialized and developing countries are searching for new solutions to address complicated challenges. The human security approach encourages the collaboration of a broad range of actors and institutions, including individuals themselves, to create solutions to daunting challenges.

Sustainability

With climate change and natural disasters becoming an increasingly significant threat to human beings, the human security perspective not only focuses on the well-being of individuals but can also offer a people-centered and planet-sensitive perspective. The significance of the environment has long been recognized in the human security thinking. UNDP's *Human Development Report 1994* recognized 'environmental security' as one of seven components of human security. The human security approach emphasizes the importance of prevention of and readiness for unexpected threats. Climate change, by its nature, is a cross-cutting and multi-dimensional problem that requires mitigation and adaptation strategies, making it consistent with the principles of the human security approach. Climate change also increases threats to human security such as natural disasters and violent conflicts. Scholars have debated how the human security concept can place people, and the ways in which climate change threatens their needs, rights, and values, into climate change discussions that tend to be driven by models of environmental processes and to overlook people (Sygna et al. 2012). The human security concept tries to balance and integrate the social, economic, and environmental dimensions of sustainability by protecting and empowering people.

(2) Lessons from operationalization experiences

The concept of human security can also provide concrete and practical applications for the new global development framework because it has been recognized and developed as a practical concept. The experience of operationalization can provide lessons for the future endeavor to achieve new global goals and realize human security. In the past decade, based on the framework defined by the CHS, the UN and international society have made efforts to turn the concept into reality. The UN worked for norm setting through the debates in the Security Council, institutionalization through the establishment of the United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security (UNTFHS), and application through the UN agencies' projects and programs (Kubo 2010).

Various concrete experiences illustrate how the concept can be applied to tackle various threats to human beings through the combination of top-down protection and bottom-up empowerment. The concept of human security is often said to emerge from urgent demands on the ground, where humanitarian and development workers have witnessed serious insecurity threats. The CHS report (2003) described violent conflicts, migration, recoveries from violent conflicts, economic security, health, and education as major issues for human security. Subsequently, the UN took the initiative of addressing these issues through the human security principles. The UN Human Security Unit (HSU) exemplifies the application of the human security approach in its activities on climate change, peace-building, migration, urban violence, poverty reduction, and health (UN-HSU website).

The concept of human security has already been operationalized by various development organizations. The UNTFHS has encouraged UN agencies and organizations to adopt human security principles in their project implementation. JICA has also developed guidelines for applying the concept and has endeavored to use these in its operations.

Since its establishment in 1999, the UNTFHS has funded more than 200 projects by UN agencies in over 80 countries. Each of these projects was designed to exemplify the five basic principles for operationalizing human security: people-centered, comprehensive, context-specific, prevention-oriented, and protection (top-down) and empowerment (bottom-up) (UN-HSU website). According to the evaluation by

Universalia (2013), the human security approach was applied and found relevant in various contexts such as post-conflict, natural disasters, and severe development challenges. It encouraged more synergetic, people-responsive, and holistic modes of delivery in the UN operations. It also stimulated local and individual ownership. In Ituri, in the eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), a multi-agency project by UNDP, UNICEF, UNHCR, and FAO addressed the full range of insecurities faced by individuals and communities, particularly those most affected by the conflict. In one of the most difficult post-conflict environments, bottom-up empowerment through the participation of local people at various levels enabled them both to identify their own needs and to collaborate with the local authorities and the UN agencies to strengthen their own resilience to current and future challenges.

When Mme. Sadako Ogata took up the presidency of JICA, the agency adopted the 'application of the human security concept' as one of the three pillars of its 2004 reform plan. Since then, it has tried to operationalize the concept in the field. The basic principle, four priorities, and four approaches to human security[8] have been disseminated widely among stakeholders as guidance for understanding and applying the concept in their operations. In such ways, the human security principles have been gradually mainstreamed within JICA. The support offered to the conflict-affected areas of Mindanao in the Philippines for example, was a case in which a comprehensive approach involving human security principles fostered the peace process. JICA began to provide socio-economic development assistance before the peace agreement, as it aimed to promote human security in the most vulnerable conflict-affected areas. The bottom-up support to local communities was supplemented by Japan/JICA's engagement in facilitating peace talks and monitoring the ceasefire. The combination of these top-down and bottom-up policies sustained the peace-building process and eventually enabled the framework agreement for peace between the Philippine government and the Moro Islamic Liberation Front (MILF) (Tsunekawa and Murotani 2014).

---

8. JICA's approach towards human security is defined as follows:
- Basic principle: Aid should be people-centered, and delivered to the people.
- Four priorities: (1) Cross-sectoral issues, (2) Combination of top-down and bottom-up approaches, (3) Partnership with various actors, and (4) Risk management.
- Four approaches: (1) To comprehensively target freedom from fear and want, (2) To pay consideration to the socially vulnerable, (3) To establish mechanisms to protect and empower people, and (4) To address global risks.

Through these operational experiences, the concept of human security has policy implications not only for designing the new development goals but also for achieving them and can provide practical lessons for policy makers and practitioners.

(3) Implications for setting goals and indicators

While the concept of human security can provide concrete principles for the new development framework, it might not be regarded as a useful tool for selecting goals and indicators for that framework. As it is comprehensive, multi-dimensional, and often subjective, human security is not an easy concept to translate into performance indicators. Numerous attempts have been made to define a human security or insecurity index (e.g. Brecke 2002). The Human Security Report Project, a research group in Canada, has published the Human Security Report several times. The most recent report highlighted sexual violence in wars and the negative impact of wars on education (Human Security Report Project 2012). Gomez et al. (2013) summarized the efforts by National Human Development Reports (NHDR) by multiple UNDP country offices, and classified them into several alternatives. Some NHDR dealt with various threats comprehensively, while others focused on specific threats (such as citizen security). Many reports have attempted to use people's perception of threats as a key indicator of imminent human insecurity issues. However, creating human security indicators is very complicated as the content of human security or human insecurity is in some respects situation-specific.

Nevertheless, in designing the new goals and indicators, the human security concept can suggest several principles. Inclusive development and resilience, both of which are recognized as crucial elements for human security, can be helpful in setting goals in line with the human security principles.

People-centered

Goals and indicators should address not only the national level, but should capture the situation of every individual so as to 'leave no one behind' (United Nations 2013a, 4; United Nations 2013b, 13). This requires consideration of inclusiveness and horizontal inequalities (HIs). UHC, providing every individual with access to healthcare systems, is

one example of this. Socio-economic infrastructures, such as roads, electricity, sanitation, and education, also represent important elements of development. These need to be measured not only at the national level but in terms of their inclusiveness in coverage and quality. Improved statistical data based on household surveys will be helpful in measuring development progress at the micro-level.

Comprehensive

Goals and indicators should not only cover specific sectors but should reflect the interrelation between freedom from fear, freedom from want, and freedom to live in dignity. People-centered approaches should shed light on how different threats are interrelated at the individual level. They need to embody cross-cutting issues including climate change. Resilience in the face of threats caused by climate change is not a single sector issue, but a multi-sectoral challenge. While simple goals and indicators have been effective in achieving specific issues, such as controlling particular infectious diseases, the empowerment of people needs a more comprehensive approach such as comprehensively enhancing health systems and/or establishing UHC.

Context-specific

While global goals and indicators are necessary, the new development framework should also be sensitive to contextual variations across countries, across localities within countries, or between individuals within localities. Particular attention should be paid to people's perceptions when considering different risks and vulnerabilities. In fact, recognizing the importance of context-specificity, many attempts at creating a human security index have incorporated subjective measures for feeling secure (Gomez et al. 2013). Freedom to live in dignity depends greatly on people's perceptions of their circumstances.

Prevention-oriented

The new development framework has to be sensitive to obstacles to human development and downside risks. Prevention of these hazards and disasters should be prioritized. Conflict prevention and natural disaster risk management are major challenges for the new framework. Goals and indicators have to be developed to measure societies'

preparedness for natural hazards and conflict risks. Indicators for preparedness have to consider the effectiveness of public institutions such as consensus-building mechanisms and public administration. They also need to pay attention to individual and societal empowerment, as reflected both in individual capacity and social capital.

Protection and empowerment

As both top-down protection and bottom-up empowerment are necessary to realize human security, the goals and indicators should not be limited to protection measures but should include perspectives for risk reduction, prevention, and the strengthening of resilience. Strengthening of social capital is an important element for community empowerment. As people themselves can contribute directly to identifying and implementing solutions, individual and societal capabilities need to be measured and monitored.

While these suggestions are not specific enough in themselves to identify the indicators, they can provide direction for policy-makers and experts on selecting goals, targets, and indicators. Although human security may not be a clear-cut concept that helps us to pick up appropriate indicators, as is evident from the analysis of the achievement of the MDGs, we not only need better indicators for the new development agenda framework but a principle that can overcome the weakness of the MDGs framework. We find inclusive development and resilience to be the key elements required in the new framework. The concept of human security will be a guiding principle for realizing this proposal. The global community should commit to achieving development for all, building social capacity to cope with various downturns, and realizing human security for all.

References

Brecke, Peter. 2002. *Notes on Developing a Human Security/Insecurity Index.* Atlanta: Georgia Institute of Technology, Sam Nunn School of International Affairs

Brown, Katrina. 2012. "Social Ecological Resilience and Human Security." In A *Changing Environment for Human Security: Transformative Approaches to Research, Policy and Action*, edited by Linda Sygna, Karen O'Brien and Johanna Wolf, 107-16. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.

Chandler, David. 2012."Resilience and Human Security: The Post-interventionist Paradigm." *Security Dialogue*, 43 (3): 213–29.

CHS (Commission on Human Security). 2003. *Human Security Now.* New York: Commission on Human Security.

Fearon, James D. 2010. "Governance and Civil War Onset." World Development Report 2011 Background Papers. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Fukuda-Parr, Sakiko, and Carol Messineo. 2012. "Human Security." In *Elgar Handbook of Civil War and Fragile States*, edited by Graham K. Brown and Arnim Langer, 21-38. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Gasper, Des. 2007. "Human Rights, Human Needs, Human Development, Human Security: Relationships Between Four International "Human Discourses."" *Forum for Development Studies* 34 (1): 9-43.

Gomez, Oscar A., Des Gasper, and Yoichi Mine. 2013. "Good Practices in Addressing Human Security Through Human Development Reports." Human Development Report Office Occasional Paper. UNDP.g7+ (g7 plus, the group of fragile states) website. 2013. "Dili Consensus." Last modified March 1, 2013. http://www.g7plus.org/news-feed/2013/3/1/the-dili-consensus is-presented-and-endorsed-at-the-dili-int.html

Human Security Report Project. 2012. *Human Security Report 2012: Sexual Violence, Education, and War: Beyond the Mainstream Narrative.* Vancouver: Human Security Press.

IPU, and UNISDR. 2010. "Disaster Risk Reduction: An Instrument for Achieving the Millennium Development Goals." Advocacy Kit for Parliamentarians. UNISDR website, accessed 12 April 2014 http://www.unisdr.org/we/inform/publications/15711

Koehler, Gabriel, Des Gasper, Richard Jolly, and Mara Simane. 2012."Human Security and the Next Generation of Comprehensive Human Development Goals." IDS Paper. London: Institute of Development Studies.

Kozuka, Eiji. 2014. "Inclusive Development: Definition and Principles for the Post-2015 Global Development Agenda." In *2015 Agenda*, edited by Hiroshi Kato. Tokyo: JICA Research Institute.

Kubo, Hitomi. 2010. "Operationalising Human Security: A Brief Reviewof the United Nations." In *New Perspectives on Human Security*, edited by Malcolm McIntosh and Alan Hunter, 31-47. Sheffield: Greenleaf Publishing.

Lamichhane, Kamal, Damaru Ballabha Paudel, and Diana Kartika. 2014. "Analysis of Poverty Between People with and without Disabilities in Nepal." JICA-RI Working Paper No. 77. Tokyo: JICA Research Institute.

Mine, Yoichi, Frances Stewart, Sakiko Fukuda-Parr and Thandika Mkandawire, eds. 2013. *Preventing Violent Conflict in Africa: Inequalities, Perceptions and Institutions*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mine, Yoichi, and Oscar A. Gomez. 2013. "Multiple Interfaces of Human Security: Coping with Downturns for Human Sustainability." *Journal of Human Security Studies* 2 (1): 10–29.

Mitchell, Tom, and Emily Wilkinson. 2012. "Disaster Risk Management in Post-2015 Policy Frameworks: Forging a More Resilient Future." ODI Briefing Paper No. 75. London: Overseas Development Institute.

Peace Portal. 2013. "Open Letter to World Leaders at UN General Assembly: Make Human Security the Organizing Logic Behind the Post-2015 Development Agenda." Peace Portal website, last modified September, 23 2013 http://www.peaceportal.org/blogs/-/blogs/civil-society-open-letter-to-un-general-assembly/maximized?p_p_auth=a1QW0Z0m

Sapkota, Jeet Bahadur. 2014. "Access to Infrastructure and Human Development: A Cross-Country Evidence." JICA-RI Working Paper No. 70. Tokyo: JICA Research Institute.

Sapkota, Jeet Bahadur, and Sakiko Shiratori. 2013. "Achieving the Millennium Development Goals: Lessons for Post-2015 New Development Strategies." JICA-RI Working Paper No. 62. Tokyo: JICA Research Institute.

Sawada, Yasuyuki, Rima Bhattcharyay, and Tomoaki Kotera. 2011. "Aggregate Impacts of Natural and Man-made Disasters: A Quantitative Comparison." RIETI Discussion Paper Series 11-E-023. The Research Institute of Economy, Trade and Industry. Tokyo: RIETI.

Shimada, Go. 2014. "Resilience and Social Capital." In *Perspectives on Post-2015 Agenda*, edited by Hiroshi Kato. Tokyo: JICA Research Institute.

Sygna, Linda, Karen O'Brien, and Johanna Wolf, eds. 2012. *A Changing Environment for Human Security: Transformative Approaches to Research, Policy and Action*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.

Tadjbakhsh, Shahrbanou, and Anurandha M. Chenoy. 2007. *Human Security: Concepts and Implications*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.

Tsunekawa, Keiichi, and Ryutaro Murotani. 2014. "Working for Human Security: JICA's Experience." In *Post-Conflict Development in East Asia*, edited by Brendan M. Howe. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Turk, Carolyn, A. Mason, and P. Petesch. 2010. *Impacts of the Economic Crisis on Vulnerable Population Groups: Midcourse Findings From a Qualitative Monitoring Project in 12 Developing Countries*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

UNDP. 1994. *Human Development Report 1994: New Dimensions of Human Security*. New York: Oxford University Press.

UN General Assembly, Resolution 290. 2012. "Follow-up to Paragraph 143 on Human Security of the 2005 World Summit Outcome" 66th Session, A/RES/66/290. Oct. 25, 2012. New York: United Nations.

United Nations. 2012. *The Millennium Development Goals Report 2012*. New York: United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs.

———. 2013a. *A New Global Partnership: Eradicate Poverty and Transform Economies through Sustainable Development*. Report of the High-Level Panel of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda. http://www.post2015hlp.org/the-report/

———. 2013b. *A Life of Dignity for All: Accelerating Progress Towards the Millennium Development Goals and Advancing the United Nations Development Agenda Beyond 2015*. Report of the Secretary-General. A/68/202. http://undocs.org/A/68/202

United Nations, and World Bank. 2010. *Natural Hazards, UnNatural Disasters: The Economics of Effective Prevention*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

UN-HSU (United Nations Human Security Unit) website, "Publications
    and Products by Human Security Unit".
    < http://unocha.org/humansecurity/resources/publications-and-
    products > (accessed 13 October 2013).
UNISDR (United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction). 2012. *The
    Impacts of Disasters since the 1992 Rio De Janeiro Earth Summit.*
    Geneva: United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction.
Universalia. 2013. *The Rapid assessment of the United Nations Trust Fund for
    Human Security.* Report commissioned by and submitted to the
    UN-HSU, available at
     <https://docs.unocha.org/sites/dms/HSU/Rapid%20
    Assessment%20of%20UNTFHS%20-%20Final%20Report.pdf
    >(accessed 12 April 2014).
World Bank. 2011. *World Development Report 2011: Conflict, Security, and
    Development.* Washington, DC: World Bank.
World Bank and IMF. 2012. *Global Monitoring Report 2012: Food, Nutrition,
    and the Millennium Development Goals.* Washington, DC: World
    Bank.