This note is largely influenced by the experience and analysis of social exclusion in South Asia, which registers particular forms of social exclusion, and offers sets of policies that deserve constructive scrutiny as good practices.

I.) Preliminaries: Social exclusion vectors and domains

Societies are not homogenous, and include wide ranges of identities of the individuals and groups living in them. Identity can be a source of strength and social cohesion, can underpin creative multicultural environments, and be a source of inspiration. Identity can also be a source as well as an outcome of processes of social exclusion, and negate fundamental human rights. Vectors of social exclusion can be clustered into groups. In South Asia, they include as an overarching factor gender which is resulting in a universal exclusion or systematic disadvantage of women and girls; factors around livelihoods such as income, class and professional group, caste, clan and biraderi which are sources of and outcomes of exclusion; factors such as language, ethnicity, or religion which are conveyors or exclusion around the world; location in terms of particular areas in a country or distance from “preferred places”, terrain and physical accessibility which plays out particularly in districts which are hard to reach because of their elevation – a factor across the Himalayas and in the sea-locked countries in South Asia; abilities and disabilities and health conditions – visible illness is a particularly strong conveyer of exclusion; status as a citizenship or migrant, internally displaced person or refugee; sexual preferences; and last not least situations such as age – with the very old and the very young often excluded; or the period of menstruation which in some cultures confers a notion of pollution on women and girls; or persons affected by humanitarian emergencies – be they civil strife or natural catastrophes which often lead to displacement and stigmatisation and at the same time, those groups directly affected by humanitarian crises tend to be vulnerable, socially excluded groups.

Exclusions overlap and compound, with income poverty and gender reinforcing other vectors, and functioning as sources of exclusion as well as resulting in exclusion.

1 The views are expressed in a personal capacity and do not necessarily reflect those of the UN agencies with which I am affiliated.

2 I am deliberately not using the word “citizen” since, in a “globalising” world, most countries have a combination of citizens, residents who do not have citizenship rights, migrants and refugees living in them.

3 Biraderi is a grouping by hereditary occupational groups and is found a vector of exclusion for example in Pakistan. See Emma Hooper, Agha Imran Hamid, Scoping Study on Social Exclusion in Pakistan. DFID/ADB. Islamabad. October 2003

4 In South Asia, religion has a peculiar role in that one of the predominant faiths, Hinduism, is the “purveyor” of caste-based social exclusion which is constructed as hereditary.
How does social exclusion function? Some examples

Health and education professionals treat users differently depending on their social background. For example, some doctors are reluctant to touch low caste patients whom they consider to be polluting. In some schools, Dalit children sit separately or stand at the back of the classroom; they tend to be verbally abused, beaten or ridiculed with impunity more frequently than children of other communities. Teachers miss school as they do not find it worth their effort to make their way to excluded communities. Village water points are segregated and Dalit women cannot collect water at the 'upper caste' end of the village. In markets, buyers may not accept produce from socially excluded groups; in India, cases have been reported where cooperatives refuse to buy milk from cows owned by Dalits, or to sell to Dalits. Dalit or tribal youth are hesitant to apply for employment in non-traditional occupations. (Annie Namala, *Children and Caste-based Discrimination: Policy Concerns*, Naila Kabeer, *Past, Present and Future: Child Labour and the Inter-generational Transmission of Poverty*, in: Social Policy: Towards Universal Coverage and Transformation for Achieving the MDGs. UNICEF ROSA, Kathmandu 2006)

What is the evidence for these vectors of social exclusion? Social exclusion remains a reality for large groups of people across the globe. The single most urgent form of exclusion may be one that is only recently being clearly recognised: the majority of the poor are children – suggesting that age is a key factor in exclusion.\(^\text{5}\) The effects of social exclusion are also documented in many other human development outcomes. The MDG agenda, though of itself blind to social exclusion and disparities, has helped generate much needed and compelling evidence on the extent and impact of social exclusion.

In South Asia, for example, there is clear evidence on the spatial distribution of income poverty and of malnutrition. There is a poverty belt across Northern India and stretching into Pakistan and Afghanistan; moreover, poverty is also known to be more pervasive in rural than in urban areas.\(^\text{6}\) Access to education is clearly skewed, by income groups and by caste – with the lowest quintiles and the so-called lower castes having the lowest education access. For example, primary school net attendance rates range from 39.6% for girls to 65.5% for boys in Afghanistan, and from 50.9% for girls to 61.9% for boys in Pakistan. Attendance is strongly marked by income: across South Asia, the poorest quintiles have up to 30 percentage points lower attendance ratios than the highest.\(^\text{7}\)

Less data are available for access to health services, but anecdotal evidence suggests that minority ethnicity and religious affiliation, and again caste, results in worse access to health services. For example, in India, a child born in lowest quintile households is three times as likely to die before her or his 5\(^{\text{th}}\) birthday than one born into the highest quintile, and three times less likely to receive full immunisation.\(^\text{8}\) An outcome indicator for health is longevity; again, anecdotal evidence shows that socially excluded groups are systematically disadvantaged. Often, location and ethnicity or religious affiliation overlay, suggesting that social exclusion as much as less potent economic resources lead to disparate outcomes.

One of the starkest sets of evidence is on gender-based exclusion, which often takes the form of outright violence against women and girl children. The first are the sex ratios for South Asia, which reveal that there is widespread female foeticide: the biological ratio would be 1060 women per 1000 men. In India, however, the ratio stood at 933 women per 1000 men (2001 data) – despite legislation banning sex-selection techniques.\(^\text{9}\) The second is the life expectancy at birth, which biologically is longer for women than for men, but in Afghanistan, for instance, as a result of high maternal mortality, gender-specific malnutrition and violence against women, it is actually shorter for women.\(^\text{10}\)

---


\(^{9}\) SAARC and UNICEF. State of the SAARC Child. Kathmandu 2006. p. 77

\(^{10}\) Information from Unicef Afghanistan 2008
The indicators presented below illustrate the point about disparities poignantly for one country in South Asia, but are representative of many parts of the region.

**Comparative situations of Dalits and the national average, Nepal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>National Average</th>
<th>Dalit Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average age (years)</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 5 years age child mortality rate/1000</td>
<td>104.8</td>
<td>171.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant mortality rate/1000</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>116.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproduction rate/woman</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy (%)</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduates and above (%)</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty (%)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landless (UNDP, 2004) (%)</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44% of Terai Dalits, and 15% Hill Dalits


Beyond these specific examples, many of these “vectors” of social exclusion are recognised at the “normative” or legislative level. They have found their way into national legislation, conventions or action plans, signaling that there are issues around identity. Most notable examples are the Convention of the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) and the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC); they are joined recently by the Convention on Rights of persons with disabilities, the Declaration on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, the Madrid International Plan of Action on the Ageing, and the World Programme of Action for Youth. Normative frameworks include the Copenhagen documents and the Millennium Declaration. But as the Aide Mémoire points out, there is a disconnect between legislation and action. A vital question is therefore what can be done to address, redress and eliminate social exclusion.

Before turning to policies and interventions conducive to overcoming social exclusion, it is prerequisite to examine what it is that social exclusion excludes from: it can be argued that the impact of social exclusion unfolds in four domains in which dominant groups consistently and systematically discriminate against and deny access to the specific groups and the vulnerable.

1) Exclusion from sources of livelihoods

The first and perhaps most disempowering domain of exclusion is economic: on the basis of gender, ethnicity, location, ability and other vectors, individuals and groups are denied access to employment and other sources of livelihood. This takes on many forms of exclusion:

---

Denial of access to land and other natural resources such as fuel-wood, irrigation water (because of scarcity, landlessness, lack of legal entitlement) or access to productive land and to land tenure;

Denial of enabling agricultural livelihoods, because inputs that would increase productivity or labour availability or market access are not in place. One example is the lack of markets for agricultural products of members of the dalit community in India – they cannot sell milk to agricultural cooperatives as it is considered polluted;

Lack of access to formal and informal employment because of labour market segmentation, and because of the compounded effects of inadequate education and soft skills;

Lack of access to affordable and sustainable credit because of a lack of collateral as well as the absence of trust, confidence and social capital and networks.

As a result of social exclusion in the economic domain, most countries of South Asia have highly skewed income and wealth distribution patterns, and a worsening Gini coefficient. 12

2) Exclusion from access to social services

Entitlements to social services are a second key area. This is a denial of the more accepted basic human rights to education and health. 13 Access to reliable, inclusive, and high-quality social services is moreover generally a precondition for access to livelihoods and decent work. 14

For socially-excluded groups, there are persistent problems of access to core social services in health, education, protection, and notably child protection which play out, for example, in the distance and ease of physical access to schools or health posts; in the appropriateness and language of curricula and teaching; in under-the-table user costs; and in attitudes of the provider towards socially excluded groups. There is also evidence on anti-pollution rituals undertaken after socially-excluded caste members have used a particular space. There are also access issues with regard to ancillary social services or key necessities: water/sanitation/hygiene, housing and utilities such as electricity.

3) Exclusion from political organisation and representation

Political exclusion is a pervasive and crosscutting area of social exclusion. It relates to the political economy of the environment concerned, and to power relations. 15 Social exclusion manifests itself as a denial of access to political processes and representation at the country level, and to a lack of genuine inclusion in decision-making about resource allocation and priority-setting at the community level. Often, the socially-excluded do not have political representation, because formal political processes are geared to the interests and views of dominant groups, and informal processes do not accord voice and active, equal participation to the excluded. Exercising political rights requires time and other resources, and where social exclusion overlaps with economic and time poverty, political participation becomes very difficult. But this is also a risky area for policy, since forms of affirmative action or ethnicity-based political parties can reinforce patterns of social exclusion, if not designed carefully, leading to token participation and participatory exclusion (Agarwal), or cementing existing divisions.

---

12 As one indicator: for South Asia, the respective shares in national consumption of the poorest and the richest quintile is 9 and 42 % respectively. World Bank, Global Monitoring Report 2008
13 While the UDHR includes a right to work, right to food, right to social security, the development discourse until recently focused primarily on the right to education and the right to primary health care. With reference to the MDG agenda, these exclusions affect goals 2 through 7.
14 See Various MDG Reports by the governments of the South Asian countries
4) Family- and community-based exclusion

A fourth domain of social exclusion not generally integrated into the discourse on social exclusion is the issue of entrenched exclusionary patterns of behaviour at the micro level – within communities and within families. Prejudice and discrimination within families may be based on gender, age, ability, or sexual orientation, and in communities on these vectors as well as on religion, ethnicity, language, and caste. Examples include hierarchical and gendered intra-household access to food, and family and community violence vis-à-vis minorities.

It also needs to be acknowledged, however, that patriarchal and discriminatory behaviours are internalised and reproduced at the family and community level. Cases in point are when women prohibit that their daughters in law seek medical attention, or excluded castes who teach their children survival strategies. Dalit children in India and Nepal, for example, do not enter the homes of Brahmans, and are taught by their mothers not to wear colourful clothes, nor to expect elaborate wedding ceremonies, as this would not be “proper”.

Family- and community-based exclusion is an area that is not amenable to conventional policy thinking and policy making, since it reaches into the private domain. However, without behaviour change towards equality and empowerment for all members of a household or community, economic, social and political inclusion will not materialise.

II.) Policies I: Examples of good practices and lessons learned in an inclusive policy process

What then are practices and approaches to tackling social exclusion that could address the vectors and domains of exclusion and introduce rights-based, inclusive policy processes? What are good practices-appropriate in a particular time, space and in specific institutional and societal contexts – and are there “generic” approaches that lend themselves to replication in other settings? What are common or unexpected pitfalls - when well-designed and well-intentioned policies and approaches metamorphose into exclusionary practices?

South Asia is a repository of policy interventions which explicitly or implicitly respond to the Copenhagen and MDG agenda, and go beyond it in the form of policies sensitive to social inclusion.  

1) Political inclusion

The best-known examples are those around political inclusion. India has a long practice of affirmative action in the form of “reservations” – quotas – for different caste groups, defined in a classification system introduced at India’s independence, and broadened in 1979 by the Mangal Commission established by the Prime Minister. The purpose is to give priority access to higher education – and by implication to facilitate access to the better paid and more prestigious professions and government service - for students from socially disadvantaged backgrounds. Also in India, there are provisions to ensure representation of women

---


17 Annie Namala, op. cit.

in local level bodies at the community level; in some cases, there is also a small stipend provided to compensate for opportunity costs. Most recently, Nepal’s constituent assembly stipulated a composition of its members to have at least one third women, and a proportional representation of so-called low caste groups, as well as of the various ethnic groups, with the result that the country now has a highly-diverse assembly which will draw up the new, post-conflict constitution.

The downside of affirmative action is that it can over-emphasise identity and create rifts in the population and turn into politically divisive and centrifugal processes.

2) Economic inclusion

Policies in place for economic inclusion pivot around employment and poverty. Three countries in South Asia, building on a longstanding programme in the Indian State of Madhya Pradesh, have or are in the process of introducing employment schemes linked to a notion of a right to work, and comprising an offer of 100 days of paid work on public works schemes in the rural economy, at guaranteed minimum wage. In India, the scheme has been in place since 2007; in Nepal, it is contained in the Three Year Interim Development Plan for food-insecure regions; and in Bangladesh it is likely to comprise an element in the PRSP 2010 onwards. In the Indian programme, the social inclusion element comes explicitly in the form of equal pay for equal work and provisions for child care, and implicitly in monitoring exercises that are meant to ensure that all caste groups are aware and party to the programme. Similar programmes exist across the region in the form of food for work and cash for work, but these programmes are not anchored in a right to work.

The shortcoming of public works is that they by their very design become self selecting for the very poorest and hence stigmatise. There is also a serious concern over the impact of such schemes – usually in construction of public infrastructure – on the health and safety of women, on the care provided to children of women workers, and on an inadvertent effect of pulling in child labour where the work is paid as piece work.

3) Inclusion in social services access

Access to social services – centrally to health and education – is an area where good strategies can be “transformative” in the longer run by closing the gaps in education and health outcomes experienced by disadvantaged groups. Well-known interventions include across-the-board approaches such as school meals, which de facto address dual goals of improving nutrition and serving as an incentive for attending school, and could notionally be progressive in that the school meal has a much higher value to groups who live in poverty, and are socially excluded and disadvantaged.

One approach to inclusion is that of stipends in cash or kind for girl children or for children from so called lower castes, and recently, countries are experimenting with incentives for teachers or doctors – such as an effort in Afghanistan to offer “food for training” to women teachers for whom it is difficult to leave home for learning events, or salary top-ups in Nepal to encourage doctors to accept difficult health posts. Additional efforts are however needed in the sphere of culture, prejudice and behaviours since much of the absenteeism and discrimination displayed by service providers can only change if they are subject to discourse and reflection from a rights-based angle.

21 For an overview, see Köhler/Stirbu, op. cit.
One interesting South Asian policy around gender inclusion is the secondary school stipend introduced for all girl children in Bangladesh in 1994. Girl students receive a monthly stipend, deposited in a bank account to their name, provided they remain in school, have a fair success rate in exams, and do not marry. The success in gender parity in education in Bangladesh – achieved in 2005 - is partly ascribed to this intervention.\(^{22}\)

Critics of such schemes point out that they may merely reinforce inequalities and exclusion, since they are one-dimensional tools in a multi-faceted societal process. In stipend schemes, for example, students from low-income groups are disadvantaged on many counts, not merely financially, but more crucially in terms of time and support received at home. The Bangladesh secondary school stipend, for example, may be seeing an overrepresentation of middle-class students in the scheme. \(^{23}\) In India’s school mid-day meal programmes, caste discrimination can be intensified, if parents and teachers do not accept joint cooking or eating among different castes. \(^{24}\)

### III.) Policies II: From sector strategies to social protection as an inclusion policy approach

Recent social development discourse has rediscovered social protection, possibly as a reaction to the successes in Latin American cash transfer schemes. Two questions which need to be addressed include the effect which social protection mechanisms could conceivably have on social inclusion and how they would need to be designed to have a deliberate effect towards enabling and enhancing inclusion of vulnerable and excluded groups.

A prime role of social protection as a policy approach would be to underpin more equitable MDG achievement, and to break intergenerational poverty. To do this, it needs to

- addresses vulnerability in the form of reactive actions to redress the impacts of exclusion and prevent the worst effects of livelihood shocks, as well as
- offer “transformative” support to enable socially excluded and vulnerable individuals and groups to move into situations of inclusion.

To achieve this requires a set of social protection “principles” which seem to be emerging in different places, including in recent discourse in South Asia. Such principles include a shift towards universalising social protection, even if gradually or incrementally, as institutions and resources permit and a need for an “institutionalised system of social protection in place of current ad hoc strategies.” \(^{25}\) Moreover, a clear case needs to be made for the additionality of social protection: social protection must not displace existing public services in health, education and water and sanitation but instead be additional and complementary. One might speak of four essential public “goods” (and services) – health, education, water and sanitation and social protection; or five, if one includes basic care services as a distinct element within social protection.

One effort to bring social protection to a new level is the proposal around a global social floor which has been defined as a basic and modest set of social security benefits for all citizens: \(^{26}\)

- Financing universal access to essential health care
- Income security for all children through child benefits
- Some modest conditional support for the poor in active age (employment programmes, benefits), and

---


\(^{23}\) See reviews in the Bangladesh press.

\(^{24}\) Sukhadeo Thorat, SOCIAL EXCLUSION/ DISCRIMINATION AND INEQUALITY. Towards a Socially Inclusive Approach to Children. DRAFT Paper prepared for UNICEF. November 2005

\(^{25}\) Kabeer, 2008, op. cit., p 20

\(^{26}\) Isabel Ortiz (UN DESA) and Michael Cichon (ILO). A Global Social Floor. UNICEF ROSA REGIONAL SYMPOSIUM ON SOCIAL PROTECTION. 15-17 April 2008. Dhaka, Bangladesh. CD-rom of the Symposium.
Income security through basic, tax-financed, universal non-contributory pensions for older persons, persons with disabilities and those who lost the main breadwinner in a family.

The challenge is, then, to develop strategies that ensure inclusiveness in social protection in situations where societies are characterised by deeply entrenched processes of social exclusion. In other words, the conundrum is to build into a universalist social protection approach - covering all members of society - a set of measures to proactively include the excluded, i.e. go beyond universal coverage.

Conventionally, this is achieved by targeting – by designing elements complementary to social protection, such as cash transfers which are means tested, so as to favour the economically disadvantaged; or geographically targeted, to favour hard-to-reach districts; or categorically targeted, to cover vulnerable age groups or people living with particular health conditions. A la limite, stipends towards the education of girls or disadvantaged castes would constitute a form of inclusion-oriented social protection. However, targeting, conceptually speaking, is not rights-based as it is designed by – well-intentioned - technocrats responding to received social exclusion; by design or default, it can be patronising.

A different approach would social protection designs that guarantee that the excluded are aware of their rights to social protection, are in a position to claim those rights, and are “served” in an equitable manner. In that light, inclusive social protection might need to be incorporated into a tri-fold approach comprising:

- Social protection transfers to households in the form of social assistance, pensions, child benefits as well as health insurance, and
- The provisioning of trained and salaried care and protection services by government or the non-profit sector which would be responsible for inclusion, while
- Ensuring enhanced, inclusive social services delivery in education, health, water and sanitation, housing, and other areas.

By ratcheting up public sector or publicly-financed employment, such a tri-fold approach could combine the special effort needed to include the excluded with a universalist approach, as well as generate employment – which in turn can create inclusion. Thereby, it could redress an intrinsic shortcoming of social protection – that it can be an evasive policy, because it eschews looking into structural transformations of situations – such as enabling decent work and livelihoods.

**INSIGHT: One form of inclusive policy making: child-sensitive social protection**

There is an emerging notion of child-sensitive social protection which emphasises the key rights and development needs of children. It could therefore be read as an example of a universal approach combined with “special measures” or a pro-active approach.

‘Child-sensitivity’ in social protection strikes as a new concept, although it features as an objective in many social protection strategies, both in developed and developing countries. Child-sensitive social protection may incorporate a set of principles such as:

- Addressing the age and gender specific risks and vulnerabilities of children;

---

28 The recent interest in cash transfers – one instrument of social protection – seems to have eclipsed discussions around employment strategies and decent work. Social protection is needed in its “trampoline” or transformative mode – where it enables those who seek decent work to find it. See Tim Conway and Andy Norton “Nets, Ropes, Ladders and Trampolines: The Place of Social Protection within Current Debates on Poverty Reduction, Development Policy Review 2002, 20 (5). Beyond the protective mode, social protection needs to be part of a larger effort to create decent work for all who can and would like to work in the formal sector.
29 Alexandra Yuster, Child sensitive social protection. Discussion draft. Unicef New York, June 2008. also see work by Mariana Stirbu.
30 See for example Isabel Ortiz, Social Protection in Asia and the Pacific, Asian Development Bank, Manila 2002
• Intervening as early as possible where children are at risk, in order to prevent irreversible impairment or harm to children;

• Recognising that families raising children need support to ensure equal opportunity for children and to ease the childcare-work dichotomy for parents/caregivers;

• Making special provision to reach children who are most vulnerable and excluded, including children without parental care, as well as children who are marginalized within their families or communities due to their gender, disability, ethnicity or other factors.

The reasons for focusing on children when designing and evaluating the impact of social protection are compelling:

• Children comprise the largest proportion of the population in all developing countries; with the youngest populations often in the poorest countries. In South Asia, for example, children comprise 41% of the total population, and in absolute terms, they represent almost a quarter of the world’s children. Realising their rights and ensuring their protection is a **sine qua non** of successful socio-economic development in the region.

• Across the globe, children are over-represented among the poor. Again referring to South Asia, some 54% of all children live in absolute poverty. That is approximately 300 million children.

• Moreover, inequality and disparities have been increasing across the various socio-economic development sectors, with children suffering the most. There are large gaps and disparities in children development outcomes based on location, gender, age, ethnicity, religion, and other vectors of exclusion, as seen above. Effective social protection mechanisms could assist in closing the gaps and equalising access to the opportunities available to children.

• Chronic poverty, social exclusion and external shocks in childhood irreversibly affect children’s lifetime capacities and opportunities. Much evidence suggests that the most direct and effective means of reducing poverty is through social protection measures. For instance, in OECD countries child benefits have reduced child poverty by over 50%.

• Economic growth alone is not sufficient to achieve poverty reduction, and ensure adequate standards of living for all, as the experience of both developing and developed countries has amply demonstrated throughout the last century. Redistribution based on a concept of solidarity, social justice, and social cohesion is essential to achieving better living standards for all. In South Asia, this approach is most timely, as it would support the struggle to exit existing patterns of exploitative economic relations, as evidenced by the phenomenon of child labour juxtaposed with youth unemployment, and a concentration of the working poor in the informal economy. Addressing the situation of these groups through social protection would have significant implications for the current wellbeing and rights of children as well as their situations when they become adults.

• And last, not least: by virtue of their age and status in society, children are practically and legally less able to claim their rights.

In a “minimalist” approach, child-sensitive social protection would privilege those provisions in social protection that cater to and directly address the rights of children and

- Directly address child poverty, by making available cash transfers and services for children in or outside a family environment who live in poverty

- Ensure that those social protection measures that target adults or parents directly contribute to improving the situation of children in those families. For instance, introducing social protection for low income groups and the unorganised sector could have direct effects on the situation of children in those families such as reducing child malnutrition; improving access to health and medication; improving child attendance in school; and reducing reliance on child labour for essential income support.

In a “maximalist” approach, child sensitive social protection systems could – as a trend - conflate with transformative social policy: they would embrace strategies to structurally redress adult poverty, which impinges on the capability of families to provide for their children. Elements which might prove pivotal to child sensitive social protection might include
An emphasis on participatory design and a built-in right to claim social protection and critique delivery, and build capabilities, thus embracing the idea of generative social protection. Generative social protection means “designing social protection to protect the poor and vulnerable, but containing the seeds of future change, the potential to generate increased productivity, develop human capital and capabilities and to build voice, agency and citizenship among marginalised groups. A ‘generative’ model of social protection includes the possibility of transformative change but also allows for impacts that fall short of it but may provide the preconditions to build linkages to economic growth, human development and good governance”;  

The idea of portability of rights, including the right to social protection, within each member state and at a later stage across the region, so as to ensure that no family and child (including migrants) is left behind mainstream social protection and development efforts; and  

An emphasis on social change – thus embracing the notion of social transformation and overcoming the intergenerational transmission of poverty.

---

**IV. Outlook I - Inclusive policy making and inclusion policy**

In closing, some reflections on the larger policy universe may be useful, distinguishing between inclusive social policy and inclusion policy proper. The underlying normative principle for both would be to address

---

exclusion and vulnerability in a participatory and capability enhancing manner. Two segments of policy making would deserve attention. The first is to have specific inclusion or integration policy, while the second revolves around inclusive policies.

- **Creating inclusion policies**

This might include culture or integration policy, in terms of raising awareness for social exclusion and introducing or revising various forms of affirmative action and special measures within a universalist approach. To some extent, this is a top down” approach – needed, but not sufficient. A second element in specific inclusion policies is action around behaviour change, and in order to not be invasive and preserve the right to privacy while tackling rights-violating behaviours and attitudes, such policies or interventions need to be “bottom up”. One could argue for inclusive forms of inclusion. An inspirational approach to inclusion policy would be to advocate, for example, for a universal citizenship and the portability of basic human rights across borders.

- **Creating inclusive policies**

This refers to mainstreaming social integration/inclusion as a positive and proactive development tool into sector strategies. This would apply to the social sectors - education, health, water and sanitation or housing, as well as to the economic policy sectors – ensuring that social exclusionary impacts of trade, investment or employment polices are made visible, and addressed.

---

### Turning social exclusion into an opportunity for economic inclusion

An interesting opportunity to transform social exclusion into constructive and productive social inclusion could come from the policy area of “creative industries”. Creative industries – covering creative products and services such as media, visual and performing arts, design, and heritage - build on cultures of identity and use them to add value. By adding value, and generating income for the communities concerned, creative industries could serve to valorise particular cultures, or identities, and “switch” a vector of exclusion into a source of economic and social inclusion.

---

### V. Outlook II – implications for UN Social policy advice

Since the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and aspirations for a unified or at least united UN system – “One UN” - the need to view and review policy is on the front burner. This means there is a necessity to bring together policy areas which are located in different agencies. One of the accomplishments of the UN reform agenda is the creation of the social and economic development pillar, which conceptually unites policy thinking in macroeconomics, trade, investment, migration, and social development and integration/inclusion related policies. A next step is to come up with a core set of policy stances – the non-negotiables, rooted in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Millennium Declaration, and hence acknowledging the primacy of employment and decent work, poverty eradication and social inclusion in a rights-based framework. Obviously, specific types and points of intervention cannot be “dictated”, but it does suggest the need for consensus building on key evidence based “policies that work”. And it posits the need to make cross references and synergies among mandates and programmes more visible and – tangible, for concrete results to inclusively include those who are excluded.

---

32 DESA Draft Aide memoire, p. 11
33 The DESA Draft Aide Mémoire reminds that one should not «ignore the social costs of globalization, trends in international trade, investment flows, the evolution of domestic markets and labour market developments” all of which have a “definite impact on the social inclusion agenda” (p. 12). In a similar vein, also see Isabel Ortiz, Social Policy Guidance Note, DESA 2007.