



Copyright: Didier Gentilhomme

UNDERSTANDING GLOBAL AND LOCAL INEQUALITIES: AN EU-AFD INITIATIVE

MINUTES

Paris – 15 January 2018

Table of Contents

1. Objectives	3
2. Background and Challenges	4
3. Roundtable sessions	6
3.1. Global Inequalities	6
3.2. Local Inequality and Social Cohesion	9
4. Perspectives for the Future	13
Annex	14

1. Objectives

AFD has made the fight against inequality one of its strategic priorities, and in recent years it has launched various research projects on this topic: inequality and social cohesion in South Africa, trends in income distribution in Latin America, implications of middle classes for public policy, etc.

The new collaboration with the European Commission (EC) in the context of the Research Facility on Inequalities will allow AFD to deal with the issue on a new scale. There is a new opportunity to launch ambitious research projects and to create dynamics on the topic of inequality. These dynamics involve all European and UN donors and strengthen the ties between academia, research partners and partner countries. The objective of the Research Facility is to enhance the knowledge and understanding of economic and social inequalities, their drivers and their underlying factors at various spatial levels. It also includes analysis of effective policies and approaches to address and reduce these inequalities.

As an underlying objective, the action intends to:

- initiate a common reflection with Member States on ways to strengthen the contribution of EU Development Cooperation to the fight against inequalities, within the framework of the implementation of the 2030 Agenda;
- contribute to the EU development policy in achieving the objective of poverty eradication.

This conference, the first of the Research Facility, aimed at presenting the activities as well as the research programme that will be funded and at putting these into perspective with the current research on inequalities. The purpose was to provide a forum for discussion on the trends of global inequality, its impact on local inequalities, the links between inequality and poverty, and the policy options in terms of fighting inequality.

2. Background and Challenges

Background

World wealth is increasingly unevenly distributed. Seven out of ten people live in a country where the gap between the rich and the poor is greater than it was 30 years ago. In OECD countries, the income of the richest 10% is 9.6 times that of the poorest 10%; the same ratio was 7 to 1 in the 1980s. In the few Latin American countries that have experienced a decline in inequality, the Gini coefficient, which measures income inequality, remains at high levels.

But these trends are not an inevitability. For the first time, reduction of household income inequality has been set as a goal in the international agenda. It explicitly appears among the universal Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) adopted in September 2015 by the United Nations. Inequality is also now recognized as economically inefficient: the OECD indicates that its member countries have lost an average cumulative growth rate of 4.7% over two decades due to inequality.

Inequalities are a threat to both people and social cohesion; they can lead to social unrest, which drives economic and then political instability, which entails governance. A very negative scenario can arise, ending up in conflicts.

Key role for research in development implementation

The term “inequalities” must be clarified in order to understand its complexity in terms of absolute inequality and regional inequalities. Defining all the challenges it implies helps to determine what is at stake. It also contributes to measurement of the various drivers of inequalities, as economics is not everything and inequalities are also driven by social, political and climate factors.

While relative global inequalities between countries have declined, inequalities within countries are increasing. The international community must understand why in order to tackle them. And before being able to implement or recommend efficient policies, it needs a better understanding of contexts: for that, credible data are necessary. To tackle these challenges, research has a key role to play: it can recommend topics and foster decision-making.

As for international aid, it is effective but its amount limited. The share of aid is decreasing and its impact on inequalities is not direct. The attribution of aid is a challenge that donors must anticipate. International aid actions will increasingly act as incentives to local counterparts to establish local policies aiming at reducing inequalities through fiscal or social policies. This is also challenging the way AFD can interact with its partners: it is working increasingly with tools such as budget support and political recommendations to provide such support to its development partners.

This context of rising inequalities and decreasing aid money has significant implications for European cooperation, and it requires a particular level of tailoring actions to address inequalities—especially because they affect developing countries. This is why cooperation among all partners is important. In the case of an intervention, it is important to prioritize and choose which actions or policies to finance and support. When we invest money in the field of human development and inequalities, we have to make it right. This money is invested to attain goals and achieve results. The partners have to have an

active and detailed knowledge of the situation. The specific local characteristics of social inequalities in South America are not the same as in Africa, South Africa or Asia.

This is why the AFD Research Department is continuing its work on inequality and social cohesion. The main topics are the middle classes in Latin America and Côte d'Ivoire, although work on inequalities in South Africa is also being pursued. AFD researchers also work closely with the rest of the AFD departments because inequality reduction is part of the 2030 Agenda. The goal is to develop an inequality index and to assess to what extent AFD projects are in line with the 2030 Agenda. Thus, the Research Department is mobilised for thinking out this issue and helping implement the AFD inequality and poverty reduction strategy so that it is more compatible with the global agenda.

The EC supports AFD with a €4 million grant to work on better understanding the contexts of inequalities in developing countries and in municipalities. The partnership through this Research Facility is an important investment that will profit not only AFD and the European Commission, but all the donors and partners. Both AFD and the EC wish to develop this common good, with the goal of acquiring collective knowledge that is useful for each counterpart. The objective is to understand and describe social inequalities in emerging countries. If international donors and development actors have a better understanding of inequalities' drivers and underlying factors, they can recommend and support policies that will be more effective in addressing these issues.

3. Round table sessions

3.1. Global Inequalities

Key facts

According to the report by Thomas Piketty *et al.* from the Paris School of Economics, from 1980 to 2016, while the bottom 50% captured 12% of global growth, the top 1% captured 27%. The share of national income captured by the top 10% in 2016 was 30% in Europe and 61% in the Middle East. The growth of inequalities is thus not the same in the different regions of the world, meaning that national and local institutions can play a huge role. Besides taxation, low wages, public capital, public investment in health and education play a very important role in fighting inequalities. The report by these economists shows a narrow increase in public capital net of debt, with the situation already negative in the US and the UK. China is the only country where the government has tried to maintain a high level of public capital.

Global inequality and sustainability (Gaël Giraud)

A report by the World Bank says that, by 2030, 100 million people could fall below the extreme poverty threshold because of climate change. This might mean that all the effort put into practice in the last 40 years, in an attempt to save people from extreme poverty, might be destroyed by climate change in the coming decades.

At the world level, there is a kind of Pareto law, according to which the top 10% of the population are responsible for 50% of greenhouse gas emissions, whereas the bottom 50% are responsible for only 10%. Conclusion: it is essentially a problem of rich people emitting too much greenhouse gas. Thus, experiments carried out by AFD ask the following question: what would happen if we were to jump from today to tomorrow, to a perfectly egalitarian world, where everybody would earn the mean average income?

Using data computed by Piketty and Chancel (2015), setting the world average income at around \$8,000 would lead to a minor reduction of CO₂ emissions: richer people would emit less but poorer people would emit much more. Those two effects compensate one another, and the situation would be as disastrous as before. Perfect egalitarianism therefore does not lead to a significant reduction in CO₂ emissions. The experiment can be conducted with different income levels and leads to the same conclusion. The link between income and greenhouse gas emissions thus is not a matter of equality, but essentially a matter of rich people being too rich. It is a matter of absolute reduction of income, not reduction of inequality.

If we consider the expected levels of greenhouse gas emissions under the Paris Agreement instead of the incomes that people earn, there is the same kind of result. To respect the target set for the end of this century, the budget cap at the world level is 1,000 gigatons. The question is how to distribute this budget among the countries. One way is to set out plenty of criteria to allocate the current budget: historical responsibility of the country, current or historical GDP, growth rate, etc. Then take all these criteria together and try to see if there is one distribution of the carbon budget that would have more chances than the others in the negotiations. For purely statistical reasons, a single distribution would emerge: the wealthiest countries would have more carbon budget to

emit than the poorest, even though the wealthy nations would have to make an effort and reduce their consumption somewhat. But this is the distribution that has more chances than the others. And statistically, no matter how we negotiate in the future or according to each criterion, this is the most probable distribution of the carbon budget.

Global inequality: Trends and Issues (Finn Tarp)

Example: three individuals in 1986, 1996 and 2006 in Vietnam. The first had an income of \$400, the second \$800 and the last \$1,600. If they all have the same income growth rate, equal to the national growth rate, the first ends with \$3,200 in 2016, the second with \$6,400, and the third with \$12,800. It's substantial absolute progress and substantial increases in absolute inequality. In this example, inequality as measured by economists stays the same. Relative inequality has not changed between these three people. It has grown substantially in absolute terms, but not in relative terms. Relative inequality is a factor of real importance to discuss between disciplines.

There are two very different conceptual approaches to think income inequality: the relative measure and the one economists focus on. Trying to answer the question "has global inequality risen or declined?", the absolute measure might be considered a more radical approach to income inequality. It stays the same in absolute terms whether you are rich or poor. But using the Gini coefficient might show different trends. In particular, it can reveal drivers of inequality levels. It is useful to keep this distinction between relative and absolute in mind. It does lead to different interpretations and possible policy implications of how to address these issues. There are substantial differences across world regions. Both relative and absolute inequalities have increased substantially and steadily in recent decades.

There is much heterogeneity in the inequality trends across and within regions. Southern Africa drives the levels of inequality in sub-Saharan Africa. But when the attention focuses on the absolute increases, there are dramatic increases in inequality. Income inequality estimates are underestimated because of the omission of top earners.

Asking "What can policy actually do?" suggests that policy has a lot to do with the levels of inequalities observed. What happened in Latin America happened because of decisive policy changes.

Mainstreaming the Reduction of Inequalities in Development: Cooperation why and how (Françoise Millecam)

Inequalities could have a primary, secondary and tertiary source, and the impacts of policies would be different.

There is a difference between vertical inequality and horizontal inequality. Research is very much concentrated on vertical inequality, which is about the distribution of wealth and income in a society. Horizontal inequality looks at inequality between groups: gender equality, disabilities, ethnic groups, minorities, etc.

Most measures—such as the Gini coefficient or Atkinson—relate to income inequalities. But there is increasing admission that income is a very narrow measure of the inequality problem. An indicator should take into consideration all sectors, including economic inequalities, social inequalities and/or political inequalities (meaning power), and/or



cultural inequalities at the cultural level (i.e. cultural status or recognition). When DEVCO talks about inequalities, it tries to have a plural approach and to assess inequalities in all their dimensions.

Talking about developing countries, it is true that global inequalities have increased, and there are the Chinese and Indian situations. There are countries with extremely high levels of inequality, but the situation is very mixed, especially in Africa. South Africa, for example, is more unequal than countries of Western Africa.

How do policies influence the level of inequalities? It is important to differentiate between primary and secondary inequalities, and social inequalities. A lot of research has been done on secondary and tertiary inequality, and not so much on primary. Primary inequalities are those that prevail before taxation and redistributive policies, including inequalities of wealth and non-wealth. Secondary inequalities are those determined by systems and social transfer. Last but not least, social and economic inequalities depend on public expenditure choices.

At the global level, all the development partners are committed to the 2030 Agenda, and to SDG 10, which concerns inequalities. There is a strong need to advocate for policy changes in development cooperation in order to take this dimension into consideration. There is a need to change measures of progress. They should not only relate to growth rates, but also to other dimensions of inequalities. Promoting fairer international trade agreements could have the effect of decreasing inequalities. When it comes to primary inequalities, this is a sign that the returns to labour are not properly taken into account.

Taxation raises the issue of progressive taxation, and that is part of the Addis Action Plan. We need to build alliances with like-minded donors, as we are trying to do with AFD and others. There is really a role to play in advocating the reduction of inequalities.

It is really important to understand and correctly assess the levels of inequalities in countries, taking into account not simply income but all other criteria. Development partners could play a significant role in advocating social protection, which is a major measure to address inequalities through redistributive policies; also, social protection in line with the ILO social protection clause must not be forgotten. There is a continuing need to invest in the quality of education, especially primary education, to fight against inequalities. The gap between rural and urban areas is also very significant, and territorial disparities must be assessed.

A few studies have been launched, including one on income inequality reduction in Africa. The European Research Network is also mobilised on finding how development cooperation can better commit to the reduction of inequalities. This is why DEVCO launched its Research Facility on Inequalities. Mobilisation of researchers is truly important in order to get results and to try to translate the meaning of this research into the formulation of policy and tools to address inequality.

Assessing Policy Inclusiveness (John Crowley)

Successful pathways to tackle inequalities are unlikely to be abstract and global. This is consistent with the universal thrust of the 2030 Agenda, which engages all UN member states. But it also contextualizes and is specific: each state is called upon to find its own solutions to problems that are globally common but specific to each national setting.

Why? Partly, because policies need to be feasible. Having global policy prescriptions that cannot be applied is pointless, because policy communities and national electorates will never buy them. Also, responses need to be locally relevant, in particular to the historical patterns from which the current configurations of inequality have emerged.

The policy environment is essential to all this. It designates deliberate actions taken by public authorities, and by which societies create new spaces, options and dynamics. Sometimes the outcome is positive; in some cases it weakens the capacity for collective action, including through established institutions (trade unions) or through new dynamics. This policy environment is part of the problem undermining the ability to create a more equal society.

A new social science research agenda is needed to accompany and inform pathways to greater equality. The idea that the State has a leading role to play in directing the economic destiny of the nation needs to be re-established. Thus, it will produce a more equal, more dynamic, more fraternal and more internationally cooperative society.

UNESCO's programmes had been working on how it could promote a more sophisticated and comprehensive debate about what inclusive policy-making might actually look like. Taking the 2030 Agenda as a whole is important when thinking in terms of an egalitarian conception of inclusion.

3.2. Local Inequality and Social Cohesion

Introduction

Economists like Thomas Piketty have made inequality a major political issue and have shown that its impacts are global and local. Capitalism has produced two main effects. The first is that it is committed to reduce extreme poverty thanks to economic growth. The other has been the growth of inequalities. Between countries, inequality tends to decrease, but within countries inequalities keep increasing when capitalism is not regulated.

How can we reduce inequalities? This depends mainly on political and administrative efficiency. African states are taxing their domestic resources increasingly better and are depending less and less on the rich countries. So while the implementation of social systems in those countries is a major step for reducing inequalities, it is not enough.

Local Inequality and Social Cohesion in South Africa (Murray Leibbrandt)

South Africa might be the most unequal country in the world, and Southern Africa the region where inequality is the highest in the world. After the Apartheid era, the new South Africa failed at building a new non-racist and socially coherent society. Inequalities have not been brought down.

A research project was implemented to measure social cohesion and its trends in order to understand what was driving these trends and specifically identify the role of inequalities. Studies showed that inequalities are not only an economic problem, but also and mainly, a social problem, especially in a country marked by Apartheid policies for so many years. South Africa has the highest Gini coefficient in the world for income. Even if

it doesn't necessarily impact everybody's behaviour on a daily basis. But perceived inequality is important in explaining social cohesion. This means that what people think is happening in their society in terms of inequality impacts how they interact with fellow members of their society. Still, inequality in an objective sense does influence social cohesion and needs to be measured at more local levels.

The spatial disparity of inequality in South Africa was also explored. Inequality can be high in both high-poverty and low-poverty areas. It turns out to have important impacts on socio-economic variables. The clustering of inequality is less pronounced than spatial poverty. If you look at poverty maps that tend to cluster, you have higher poverty areas. But inequality is a bit more complicated.

Racial segregation very strongly marked public facilities, spaces and interactions. Apartheid is a legacy that South Africa has been striving to overcome. Social engineering put some race groups at the bottom of all inequality distributions and some others at the top. Recently, popular perception has been that social cohesion has been worsening in South Africa. But the real questions on inequalities and perceived inequalities research had to answer are: Was the apparent decline in social cohesion driven by an increase in inequality? What sorts of inequality? Is inequality vertical amongst individuals or horizontal between groups? Is it a national phenomenon or a local one?

Using the Annual South African Reconciliation Barometer survey and South Africa Census, Murray Leibbrandt's team built the Social Cohesion Index, which describes individual behaviour in terms of inter-racial and social interactions. While all racial groups differ in their trends, there has been a global decline in desire for social and inter-racial interactions in South Africa. But race is not the only driver of this desire for interactions. The living standard and the position in the income distribution remain important. But the dominant finding is the perceived inequality by race group. It turns out to be very important in driving inter-racial interactions. That is a key finding.

To study the same subject, AFD designed an indicator to show how social cohesion evolved across the years. It took into account five dimensions: inclusion (whether people participate in economic and social life), belonging (how they identify themselves in daily life with the national community or smaller communities), social relationships (the persons they trust and socialise with), participation (their political commitments) and legitimacy (trust in institutions and in representative systems). This research found out there has been a decrease in intra-race grouping inequality.

***Inequality reduction through aid policies: what challenges for economic policy makers?
(Pierre Gaudin)***

Can foreign aid help reduce poverty and inequalities, especially in Africa? There are many challenges and issues for aid and development policy and the people responsible for it in donor countries.

Three principles are agreed upon by the vast majority of donors and aid actors. First, there is a link between inequality and growth developments. If inequality is hardly avoidable and absolute inequality difficult to fight over time, there are definitely things to do, especially for opportunity inequalities. Secondly, it is widely admitted, even by institutions like the IMF, that growth policies could increase inequality. Thirdly, excessive

inequality can damage growth. Many simulations and theoretical studies have been performed, such as the IMF Regional Economic Outlook, which shows that if inequality in sub-Saharan Africa were to be reduced to the level observed in the ASEAN region, annual economic growth would be one point higher in the area.

Globally, foreign aid, as a transfer of funds from developed to developing economies, should reduce cross-country inequality. But total foreign aid is nothing compared to world GDP: only \$140 billion a year. The redistributed effect is very limited and so must be the impact on within-country inequality that is difficult to measure on the ground. Therefore, donors have to prioritise when defining inequalities and projects to tackle them.

The same factors do not have the same effects, and not at the same level in different countries. And, in some countries, perhaps inequality reduction is not even the first potential driver of development. Indeed, sometimes the main growth drivers are more traditional, like physical and human capital. The question that donors always face then is whether they should try to reach the largest overall impact of development or fight inequality. And the answer should probably be both.

What is also important to notice is that foreign aid in social sectors such as education and health is not necessarily redistributed. It can have a counter-redistributive effect, especially if it does not target the poorest and most vulnerable populations. This is also true for national policies in developing countries. The appropriate level of redistribution in a country is a highly political choice. It has perhaps prevented or led to aid agencies having a certain reluctance to act: it is a core issue of the sovereignty of the countries in question.

How can donors try to better integrate inequality reduction into the public policies of developing countries? First of all, fiscal policy has to be sustainable and include domestic revenue mobilisation, which means mobilising tax revenue in a progressive system and preventing tax evasion. It also means addressing spatial inequality with an adequate sharing of fiscal revenue to central and local government in order to support equal development of all territories, with no guarantee of efficiency. It can contribute to inequality reduction. Secondly, counter-cyclical action by fiscal policy is essential. There was progress over the past few years when too heavy cuts in social spending as part of international bailout programmes were avoided. Cutting social spending is not necessarily the most sustainable answer. Finally, growth policies are part of all this, with the objective of raising global income to drive inequality down.

In developing countries, it is essential to implement policies to give access to basic services, so that infrastructure and human capital can be developed. There is a lot of work towards universal health coverage and the quality of education, especially for primary and early secondary education. Access to these services is sometimes fostered by conditional cash transfers, operated either by international aid or by national policies, and some results have been recorded. Other points that are essential in order to enhance development and inequality reduction are access to communication networks and energy as well as financial inclusion. Objectives in the fight against inequality seem to be public policies in developing countries; progressivity; and better targeting both of tax, public spending and public services. In many cases, policies are not targeted enough or not progressive enough.

On the spending side, a solution can be to set up basic social protection schemes to fight factors of inequality such as poor health and disease. Good management of natural resources could also be a target, because mismanagement of resources leads to inequality within the country. The final element is technology, which can help in many of these issues (mobile money in Africa for example).

Country policies remain the major driver of inequality reduction. Aid has undeniable impacts, but it will never turn things around all over the world. How can we influence these policies with aid: by connecting pilot projects, or by influencing multilateral institutions, or by thinking of the best ways to reduce inequality?

Therefore, the main message is to maintain aid concentration on the poorest countries. Inequality reduction should be more systematically integrated into frameworks of projects, strategic plans and in the work with the other aid agencies. Legal governance framework can also play an important role in trying to eliminate legal restrictions and in supporting counter-powers actors that can play a role in inequality reduction, such as civil society and NGOs.

Assessing Policy Inclusiveness (Martin Ravallion): trends of inequalities and extreme poverty on a global scale and using the Indonesian example.

Indonesia is now seeing rising inequality. Its historical trajectory is close to that of Brazil. Inequality fell during the 1990s crisis, and there have been some signs of stabilisation recently. Now the government is making some serious efforts to try to deal with this. It should be careful on the measurement of poverty. The development measures found in Western Europe like those of Eurostat and the OECD, or numbers researchers use, can be highly disputable and are specifically good to use in analysis of developed countries. They are more debatable when used in developing countries, as they tend to underestimate poverty in developing countries. Of huge importance is to think locally by standards typical of the country. A sort of relative approach of poverty can be interesting to use.

Are the poorest left behind? This is another way of looking at poverty. Policies could help assure pro-poor growth. Literature and policy discussions point to the need to develop human and physical aspects, such as better-quality services, because they make markets work better for poor people. There are many challenges in credit markets, labour markets and land markets. Two ideas: remove negative discrimination and remove biases against the poor in public spending and taxation. Much progress has been made in this field, but not enough. Investing in local public goods, in construction and in intelligent investments in poor areas should be combined with removing major restrictions on migration between different countries, because this helps foster labour absorption.

Human development is therefore crucial for fighting poverty and inequality. In every country in the world, poorer people are less likely to develop to full potential because they lack health care and education. In general, the cards are stacked against them in very poor countries, where inequality will probably increase. Attention should be more focused on human capital development for poor populations. But for countries such as Indonesia, education expansion – in quality and quantity – tends to be pro-poor. Redistributive policies could complement pro-poor growth. Indonesia is a country with

somewhat lower-than-average but rising inequality in market incomes, and less redistributive effort. The difference between Indonesia and Brazil is that Indonesia devotes 5% of GDP to social spending whereas Brazil spends 24% of its GDP. But Brazil has a much bigger inequality problem in terms of market income.

Six recommendations for going forward in the fight against poverty and inequality: tailor policies to realities of the setting, tap local information with plenty of state support, focus on poverty reduction, protect and promote people, monitor and evaluate, and learn from mistakes.

4. Perspectives for the Future

AFD will continue its work with the actors of research on development. The Research Facility is a reflection of its commitment. It supports its policy framework, which shows that AFD wants to invest in that field. AFD wants to show that it does not intend to leave anyone behind and will continue to work on both a national and local development paths, to maximise possible social impacts. Finally, the Research Facility will produce the knowledge to better inform its decisions and set the framework of its projects implementing the 2030 Agenda.

Annex
PROGRAMME

8.30 am – 9 am	Welcome coffee
9 am – 9.15 am	Welcome remarks (15') <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Jean-Louis Ville, acting Director People and Peace, DEVCO B3</i> ➤ <i>Vincent Caupin, Director, Economic Assessment and Public Policy Department, AFD</i>
9.15 am – 10.35 am	Global Inequalities - Moderator <i>Christian Chavagneux</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Global Inequality and sustainability (20') <i>Gaël Giraud, Chief Economist, AFD</i> ➤ Global Inequality: Trends and Issues (20') <i>Finn Tarp, Director, United Nations University World Institute for Development Economics Research</i> ➤ Mainstreaming the reduction of inequalities in development cooperation: why and how (20') <i>Françoise Millecam, Head of Sector Employment and Social Inclusion, DEVCO B3</i> ➤ Assessing Policy Inclusiveness (20') <i>John Crowley, Chief of Section for Research, Policy and Foresight, Division of Social Transformations and Intercultural Dialogue, UNESCO</i>
10.35 am – 11 am	Q&A (25')
11. am – 11.20 am	Coffee Break
11.20 am – 11.40 pm	Presentation of the research facility (20') <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Alessandro Batazzi, Policy Officer, DEVCO B3</i>
11.40 am – 12.00 pm	Q&A (20')
12.00 pm – 2 pm	Lunch break

<p>2 pm – 3 pm</p>	<p>Presentation of the research projects funded under the research facility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Presentation of two global research projects funded by the facility (20') <i>Rohen D'Aiglepierre, Research Officer, AFD</i> <i>Hélène Ehrhart, Research Officer, AFD</i> ➤ Overview of country/city research projects funded by the facility (20') <i>Anda David, Research Officer, AFD</i> ➤ Presentation of the Oxfam/LSE “Inequality framework” (20') <i>Alex Prats, Inequality Lead, Oxfam Intermón</i>
<p>3 pm – 3.25 pm</p>	<p>Q&A (25')</p>
<p>3.25 pm – 3.45 pm</p>	<p>Coffee Break</p>
<p>3.45 pm – 4.55 pm</p>	<p>Local inequality and social cohesion - Moderator <i>Vincent Grimault</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Local Inequality and Social Cohesion in South Africa (20') <i>Murray Leibbrandt, Professor of Economics, University of Cape Town</i> <i>Anda David, Research Officer, AFD</i> ➤ Inequality reduction through aid policies: what challenges for economic policy makers? (20') <i>Pierre Gaudin, Head of the Foreign Aid Unit at the French Treasury (Economy and Finance Ministry)</i> ➤ Measures and policies for fighting poverty and inequality (30') <i>Martin Ravallion, Edmond D. Villani Professor of Economics, Georgetown University</i>
<p>4.55 pm – 5.20 pm</p>	<p>Q&A (25')</p>
<p>5.20 pm – 5.30 pm</p>	<p>Concluding remarks and ways forward (10')</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Hélène Djoufelkit, Deputy Director, Economic Assessment and Public Policy Department, AFD</i> ➤ <i>Jean-Louis Ville, acting Director People and Peace, DEVCO B3</i>