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Executive Summary

INTRODUCTION

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and its 17 global Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and 169 targets were adopted by all Member States of the United Nations in September 2015. It officially came into effect on January 1st 2016 and is to be achieved by 2030. The 2030 Agenda applies to every country.

This Reference Guide for Mainstreaming the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development was created by the United Nations Development Group (UNDG) to assist UN Country Teams in helping Member States with adapting the global SDGs to national contexts. This updated version includes new tools and country examples of mainstreaming and guidance for countries affected by conflict and fragility. The UNDG is a consortium of 32 UN agencies created by the Secretary General in 1997 to improve the effectiveness of UN development activities at the country level. The Reference Guide is a product of the UNDG’s new MAPS approach for Mainstreaming-Acceleration-Policy Support. Under MAPS, UN agencies provide coordinated support to Member States in implementing the 2030 Agenda.

WHO SHOULD USE THIS GUIDE?

The Mainstreaming Reference Guide was created for UN Country Teams who are called upon by Member States for assistance with adapting the global SDGs to national contexts and mainstreaming them into national development plans and planning processes. The Guide presents a comprehensive set of eight practice areas for mainstreaming the 2030 Agenda along with a special section for countries in complex situations. With specific implementation steps, practical tools, and case examples from developed and developing countries, the Mainstreaming Reference Guide is directly useful to Member State governments who are interested in adapting the global SDGs to their national contexts.

THE EIGHT PRACTICE AREAS

The Reference Guide includes eight practice areas as opportunities for mainstreaming the 2030 Agenda and SDGs into national strategies, plans and planning processes. These practice areas all relate to the traditional plan-do-check cycle of strategic planning.

Of the eight practice areas, five are particularly important to initiate in the early stages of mainstreaming. These areas include: Raising Public Awareness; Applying Multi-stakeholder Approaches; Reviewing Plans and Adapting the SDGs to National Contexts; Creating Horizontal Policy Coherence; and Monitoring, Reporting and Accountability. These five areas represent key opportunities for Member Steps to mainstream the 2030 Agenda and SDGs. The remaining three practice areas including Achieving Vertical Policy Coherence, Financing and Budgeting for the Future, and Assessing Risk and Fostering Adaptability, are critically important for deep mainstreaming and accelerating progress toward achieving nationally adapted SDGs by 2030.

Practice Area #1: Raising Public Awareness of the 2030 Agenda and SDGs

Building public awareness of the SDGs and their relevance to national strategies and plans is a critical initial and ongoing step in successful implementation. The practice areas outlined in the Reference Guide include:

A. **An introductory workshop series:** to sensitize government officials and stakeholders to The 2030 Agenda and SDGs;
B. **Creating a public awareness campaign:** to communicate The 2030 Agenda and SDGs to the general public, including women, children, youth, and others as applicable, such as internally displaced persons, and non-nationals such as refugees and stateless persons; and
C. **Opportunity management:** to leverage other government and UN-sponsored meetings and forums to sensitize government officials and stakeholders to The 2030 Agenda and SDGs.

**Featured Tool:** The SDG Action Campaign Toolkit

Practice Area #2: Applying Multi-stakeholder Approaches for Reviewing National Plans and Adapting the Global SDGs to National Contexts

Core to the quality and legitimacy of a society-wide agenda is the application of multi-stakeholder approaches for policy development and implementation to encourage and facilitate partnerships between government and nationally and sub-nationally active stakeholder networks of civil society, universities, think tanks, the private sector and other development actors. Key areas include:

A. **Initial multi-stakeholder engagement:** for increasing public awareness of The 2030 Agenda and SDGs;
B. **Working with national multi-stakeholder bodies or forums:** for reviewing existing plans;
C. **Guidance on multi-stakeholder dialogue:** to assist with the process of engagement; and
D. **Fostering public-private partnerships:** to leverage the ingenuity, scaling-up ability, and investment potential of business.

**Featured Case:**

German Council for Sustainable Development

Practice Area #3: Reviewing National Plans for Alignment with the 2030 Agenda and Adapting SDGs to the National Context

Important in the early stage is a common understanding of how well existing national, sub-national and local development plans and sectoral strategies align – in content and ambition – against the comprehensive scope of The 2030 Agenda and SDGs. This will provide the basis for establishing criteria for enhancing national plans whilst avoiding an à la carte approach. This practice area inherently requires applying multi-stakeholder approaches to understand complexity and to advance legitimate recommendations. Included are the following:

A. **Reviewing existing strategies and plans and identifying gaps:** to scan the landscape of existing strategies and plans at the national, sub-national and local levels and then compare against the global SDGs and targets to identify gaps and provide the basis for recommending areas for change;
B. **Mapping SDG interconnections:** for identifying and understanding potential co-benefits and trade-offs to inform strategies and priorities;
C. **Making initial recommendations to the leadership of the national government:** for addressing SDG gaps in existing strategies and plans whilst recognizing that the SDGs “...are integrated and indivisible and balance the three dimensions of sustainable development: the economic, social and environmental”;
D. **Setting nationally-relevant targets:** for nationally-adapted and inclusive SDGs that are achievable, yet ambitious; and
E. **Formulating visions, strategies and plans using foresight, scenarios and systems thinking:** to incorporate the recommendations and the insights from the above steps into strategies and plans and matching ambition and commitments with resources and capacities.

**Featured Tool:** Rapid Integrated Assessment (RIA)
The tool supports countries in assessing the alignment of national development priorities with the SDGs and
examining the interlinkages of SDGs in the national development plans and strategies.

**Practice Area #4: Creating Horizontal Policy Coherence (Breaking the Silos)**

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development reminds us that the issues we face are “interrelated and call for integrated solutions...To address them effectively, a new approach is needed.” There is for the most part, a shared understanding of the inherent interconnectedness and complexity of sustainable development. But what has remained mostly elusive over the years is how to deal with this reality. How do we undertake strategy-making, planning and policy-making that is based in systems thinking and delivers an integrated view?

A. **Integrated policy analysis:** to ensure that proposed policies, programmes and targets are supportive of nationally-adapted SDGs;

B. **Coordinated institutional mechanisms:** to create formal partnerships across sectoral line ministries and agencies;

C. **Integrated modelling:** to help clarify and articulate the interconnected system of goals and targets and to analyse and inform key policies, programs and projects for their impact on nationally-adapted SDGs.

**Featured Case: Colombia**

Among Colombia’s new institutions for mainstreaming and implementing the 2030 Agenda are its High-level Inter-Institutional Commission for SDGs with a technical secretariat, technical committee and transverse and inter-sectorial working groups.

**Practice Area #5: Creating Vertical Policy Coherence (Glocalizing the 2030 Agenda)**

Creating policy coherence, integration and partnerships in the vertical direction among governments, civil society, the private sector and other actors is the essential and complimentary aspect to the horizontality described above. ‘Glocalizing’ the agenda within a country is an imperative if the SDGs are to be realized with no one left behind in the 2030 timeframe. This can be accomplished through:

A. **Institutional coordinating mechanisms:** to foster partnerships and coordination across levels of government;

B. **Multi-stakeholder consultative bodies and forums:** to create partnership and coordination;

C. **Local Agenda 21s and networks:** for scaling up action for sustainable development at the local level;

D. **Monitoring and review at the local level:** as a means for localizing nationally-adapted SDGs;

E. **Impact assessment processes:** to ensure that nationally and locally-adapted SDGs are taken into consideration in large public and private development projects;

F. **Integrated modelling:** to explore the benefits and impacts of key national policies and programs at sub-national and local levels.

**Featured Case: Indonesia**

Riau Provincial Government through its Planning Office is collaborating with the UN and others to localize the SDGs at the provincial and district level. The Provincial Government held its first multi-stakeholders’ consultation in May 2016 and has selected three districts to pioneer the SDG District Action Plan development.

**Practice Area #6: Financing and Budgeting for the Future**

The 2030 Agenda states that “cohesive nationally owned sustainable development strategies, supported by integrated national financing frameworks, will be at the heart of our efforts.” Additionally, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda lays out a “series of bold measures to overhaul global finance practices and generate investments for tackling a range of economic, social and environmental challenges”. The practice areas suggested for mainstreaming the 2030 Agenda include:

A. **Taking stock of the array of financing sources for The 2030 Agenda:** by considering all sources of financing as outlined in the Addis Ababa Action Agenda;

B. **Taking stock of the array of financing instruments:** by considering the diversity of traditional and new financing instruments that are available, including climate finance; and

C. **Effective use of financing:** through outcome-based budgeting and subsidy reform and strategies to reduce future expenditures through financing resilience and disaster risk reduction, taxing ‘public bads’ and other budget mainstreaming measures (i.e., gender and environment).

**Featured Case: Pakistan**

Committed US$ 15.5 million as co-financing to set up SDG Support Units in collaboration with the UN at the Federal level and in four provinces.
Practice Area #7: Monitoring, Reporting and Accountability

Follow-up and review is a core component of The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, to ensure that the data systems, capacities, methodologies and mechanisms are in place to track progress, with the engagement of citizens, parliaments and other stakeholders. Key elements include:

A. Indicator development and data collection: comparative assessment between existing national statistics and the global set of SDG indicators proposed by the Inter-agency and Expert Group on SDG Indicators
B. Disaggregating data: the commitment to ‘leaving no one behind’ and tackling inequality and discrimination in the SDGs requires disaggregation of data by sex, age and other salient socio-economic characteristics, including income/wealth, location, class, ethnicity, age, disability status and other relevant characteristics;
C. Participatory monitoring and data collection: for involving citizens directly in the measurement process;
D. Monitoring and reporting systems: to work with existing data and metadata reporting systems and to create online systems for information exchanges, including reporting on key indicators and providing opportunities for both horizontal and vertical coordination;
E. Voluntary National Reviews: providing Member States with a mechanism to share their progress toward implementing the 2030 Agenda and achieving the SDGs, and representing an important mainstreaming opportunity in and of itself;
F. Country reporting guidelines: act as a reference for UNCTs supporting country-level SDG reporting; and
G. Other review processes and mechanisms: for reviewing progress on nationally and sub-nationally adapted SDGs.

Featured Case: Egypt
National statistical agency, CAPMAS, established an SDG Coordination Unit to contextualize and set the national indicator framework necessary to monitor and track Egypt’s progress of SDGs, and with the support of the UN is implementing a comprehensive assessment of its capacities and data systems to monitor the SDGs.

Practice Area #8: Assessing Risk and Fostering Adaptability

Identifying risks and emerging issues such as climate change, economic crises, pandemics, etc., will be a critical part of achieving The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Careful reflection of lessons learned during implementation and making timely course corrections along the way, are integral to effective follow-up and review.

A. Adaptive Governance: to provide a general framework for effectively navigating uncertainty, change and surprise across all of the guidance areas;
B. Risk analysis and management: for the systematic identification and management of the risks facing the implementation of national, sub-national and local plans; and
C. Scenario planning and stress testing: to be applied regularly in the development planning and policy-making process for detecting emerging issues and examining the ability of plans, policies and programmes to perform under a range of plausible future conditions.

Featured Tool: Scenarios and Scenario Planning
Scenario planning is a multi-stakeholder process for envisioning a range of plausible and even desirable futures for purposes of stress testing the performance of proposed plans and policies and creating adaptive strategies.

Special Section: Mainstreaming Guidance for Countries in Complex Situations

Countries in complex situations are often inundated with a multitude of overlapping humanitarian, peacebuilding, and development needs. Mainstreaming the SDGs in such contexts should consider and balance the tensions among:

a) striving to attain a deeper understanding of the root causes of violent conflict and fragility; b) enabling a prioritization of development goals that is guided by the imperatives of countries in complex situations; and c) recognizing the political dynamics of complex contexts, including especially situations of protracted or continually evolving conflict.

Special guidance is provided for each of the eight core mainstreaming areas and is based directly on UNDP’s ‘SDG Ready’ publication for SDG implementation in complex situations.

For more information contact:
maps@undg.org
PART A: INTRODUCTION
Section A1: Purpose and Context

Purpose of This Reference Guide
This document is designed as a reference guide for UN Country Teams (UNCTs), under the leadership of the UN Resident Coordinators, that wish to support Member States and national stakeholders in adapting The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development to national contexts (“mainstreaming”) while protecting its integrity. As such, this guide does not seek to be either prescriptive or exclusive, but rather to spark thinking by UNCTs on how they may wish to proceed.

It features an array of approaches and tools that UNCTs can discuss with Member States to adapt the Agenda to national, sub-national and local conditions and realities, incorporating regional perspectives where appropriate. These approaches and tools should be treated by UNCTs as a menu of options, with the case studies providing examples of how some countries have begun to develop and use relevant tools.

Though this reference guide was primarily prepared for UNCTs, the steps it describes, the case studies it highlights, and the publicly available tools that it refers to, might also be of direct use to a broader audience of government officials and development practitioners.

Context
At the UN Sustainable Development Summit (25-27 September 2015), Member States of the United Nations adopted The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development with a set of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) at its core. Applicable to all countries, it officially came into effect upon expiry of the Millennium Development Goals on 1 January 2016 and will run through 2030. The Agenda strives for a world that is just, rights-based, equitable and inclusive. It commits stakeholders to work together to promote sustained and inclusive economic growth, social development and environmental protection and to benefit all, including women, children, youth and future generations. It is to be implemented in a manner consistent with existing obligations of states under international law (para 18). This new universal agenda will require an integrated approach to sustainable development and collective action, at all levels, to address the challenges of our time, with an overarching imperative of ‘leaving no one behind’ and addressing inequalities and discrimination as the central defining feature.

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development speaks to the core mandate and values of the UN System, including promoting and encouraging respect for human rights for all, without discrimination. UN agencies, funds and programmes can broker relevant knowledge and technical assistance on sustainable development challenges, opportunities and solutions. They can also support Member States in identifying and convening key stakeholder groups. The 2030 Agenda has been embraced not only by development actors but also by humanitarian and peace actors, as there is a recognition that leaving no one behind means that we need better integration and coherent approaches. This was recognized during the WHS and the Commitment to Action, which delineates a “New Way of Working” among development and humanitarian actors.
Humanitarian needs have risen to a level not seen since the end of World War II, with 60 million displaced and 125 million people affected\textsuperscript{2}. The 2030 Agenda’s call to ‘leave no one behind’ must be heard at this humanitarian, development and peacebuilding nexus. More than ever global crises are the result of interdependent challenges like climate change, conflict, pandemics or population growth. Therefore, humanitarian emergencies can no longer be viewed as isolated, short-term events\textsuperscript{2}.

Moreover, through the QCPR 2017-2020, Member-States are calling upon the UNDS, in full compliance with their respective mandates, to enhance coordination with humanitarian assistance and peacebuilding efforts at the national level in countries facing humanitarian emergencies, in countries in conflict and post-conflict situations.

Responding to Member States’ request for coherent and integrated support from the UN development system to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, the United Nations Development Group (UNDG) has identified elements in support of a future common approach for effective and coherent implementation support, under the acronym MAPS (Mainstreaming, Acceleration and Policy Support). The present reference guide is a key component of its first pillar on mainstreaming.

Section A2: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and SDGs

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development\(^3\) sets forth “a plan of action for people, planet and prosperity” and “seeks to strengthen universal peace in larger freedom.”

It is an integrated plan of action structured in four main parts: (i) a Vision and Principles for Transforming our World as set out in the Declaration; (ii) a results framework of global Sustainable Development Goals – SDGs; (iii) a Means of Implementation and Global Partnership; and (iv) Follow-up and Review.

**AGENDA STRUCTURE**

**DECLARATION**

Vision, Shared Principles and Commitments, A Call for Action to Change Our World

**Sustainable Development Goals**

17 SDGs and 169 Targets

**FOLLOW-UP AND REVIEW**

National, Regional and Global

**IMPLEMENTATION**

Means of Implementation and Global Partnership

**Declaration**

The Vision and Principles are outlined in detail in the declaration and include “areas of critical importance for humanity and the planet” encompassing people, planet, prosperity, peace and partnership. The declaration further describes that nations are...

“...resolved to free the human race from the tyranny of poverty and want and to heal and secure our planet. We are determined to take the bold and transformative steps which are urgently needed to shift the world onto a sustainable and resilient path. As we embark on this collective journey, we pledge that no one will be left behind.”

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development seeks to realize human rights for all (Preamble) and is grounded in the UN Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, international human rights treaties and other instruments, including the Declaration on the Right to Development (para 10), whilst

---

\(^3\) Available at: [https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/post2015/transformingourworld](https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/post2015/transformingourworld)
emphasising the responsibilities of all States to respect, protect and promote human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction of any kind (para 19).

Results Framework
The results framework of The 2030 Agenda includes 17 SDGs with 169 targets. The SDGs “seek to build on the Millennium Development Goals and complete what these did not achieve.” Additionally, the SDGs are “integrated and indivisible and balance the three dimensions of sustainable development: the economic, social and environmental.” Furthermore, the SDGs are “universally applicable, taking into account different national realities, capacities and levels of development and respecting national policies and priorities.” With regard to the targets, they are defined as “aspirational and global, with each government setting its own national targets guided by the global level of ambition but taking into account national circumstances.” And importantly, “Each government will also decide how these targets should be incorporated in national planning processes, policies and strategies.”

The new agenda also envisages a world of universal respect for human rights, equality and non-discrimination, and the overriding message of the new agenda is “to leave no one behind”, to ensure “targets met for all nationals and peoples and for all segments of society” and “to reach the furthest behind first”, with two dedicated goals and relevant targets on combatting inequality and discrimination as well as a commitment to broadening the disaggregation of data in order to track progress and ensure that no one is left behind.

Means of Implementation
Through The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, nations acknowledge the imperative of a revitalized global partnership – “an intensive global engagement in support of implementation of all the goals and targets, bringing together Governments, civil society, the private sector, the United Nations system and other actors and mobilizing all available resources.” The scale and ambition of the new agenda require the inclusion of new partners such as national parliaments, regional and local authorities, academia, volunteer groups and the private sector. The revitalized global partnership will endeavour to deliver the means of implementation through “domestic public resources, domestic and international private business and finance, international development cooperation, international trade as an engine for development, debt and debt sustainability, addressing systemic issues and science, technology, innovation and capacity-building, and data, monitoring and follow-up.” So important are the means of implementation to the Agenda that it forms the basis for SDG 17 and its supporting targets.

Follow-up and Review
In the spirit of continuous improvement and accountability, nations commit via The 2030 Agenda to “fully engage in conducting regular and inclusive reviews of progress at sub-national, national, regional and global levels.” The High Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development (HLPF) was established at the Rio+20 Conference with the aim to strengthen Sustainable Development governance at the UN. With the adoption of the 2030 Agenda, the Forum was given mandates to “have a central role in overseeing a network of follow-up and review processes at the global level, working coherently with the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and other relevant organs and forums, in accordance with existing mandates”. (para 82, The 2030 Agenda). One of the HLPF’s functions is to facilitate the review of progress on the 2030 Agenda and achievement of the SDGs by Member States.
through Voluntary National Reviews (VNRs)\(^4\). The VNRs are voluntary and state-led, yet involving partnerships of major groups and other stakeholders.

Supporting the *Review and Follow-up* of the SDGs is a global indicator framework outlining a practical set of indicators. The *Inter-Agency and Expert Group on SDG Indicators* is responsible for creating the indicator framework and proposed a set of 230 global indicators in March 2016 to support the monitoring, reporting and review of SDG progress\(^5\).

\(^4\) High Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development. Available at: https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/hlpf.

\(^5\) Official list of SDG indicators from the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on SDG Indicators. Available at: http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/indicators/indicators-list/.
Section A3: MAPS: Mainstreaming, Acceleration and Policy Support for the Implementation of the 2030 Agenda

Responding to requests from Member States for coordinated support from the UN development system in implementing The 2030 Agenda, the United Nations Development Group (UNDG) endorsed MAPS as elements in support of a future common approach set out in the MAPS Concept Note. MAPS stands for Mainstreaming, Acceleration and Policy Support.

It focusses on policy coherence and multi-stakeholder engagement, paying special attention to the cross-cutting elements of partnerships, data and accountability.

- **Mainstreaming** means landing *The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development* at the national and local levels, and integrating into national, sub-national, and local plans for development; and subsequently into budget allocations;
- **Acceleration** refers to targeting national (and UN) resources at priority areas identified in the mainstreaming process, paying special attention to synergies and trade-offs across sectors (reflecting the integrated nature of the agenda), bottlenecks, financing and partnerships, and measurement; and
- **Policy Support** is about making sure that the skills and expertise held in the UN development system is made available in a timely manner and in the most efficient way possible.

These components will often not be separate or follow in chronological order, but they can act as framing to describe the support that the UN development system intends to provide.
The present reference guide relates to the ‘Mainstreaming’ component. There will be complementary UNDG tools and guidelines to accompany the other components, including a toolkit to support the Acceleration phase of MAPS and relating to national reporting on progress towards achieving the SDGs.

In particular the work undertaken in the mainstreaming phase should be helpful in providing content information for UN Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAFs) that support implementation of SDG-based national plans.6

Related activities should be coordinated through UNCTs in line with the Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs)7, as applicable. In doing so, attention should be paid to acting in accordance with the six core principles on how the UN engages at the country level:

1. Strong ownership by governments and other national stakeholders and leadership by national governments;
2. Significant simplification and reduction of programming, business and service transaction costs for Governments, other national stakeholders, development partners and the UN system, including by further integrating and harmonizing common and agency-specific business processes;
3. Empowerment of UN Country Teams, under the leadership of the UN Resident Coordinator, to address country-level needs, based on good practices and experiences in “Delivering as one” countries, both pilots and voluntary adopters;
4. Flexibility to allow for innovation by UN Country Teams;
5. Drive towards common delivery of results along four main programming principles including: (1) Human rights, gender equality and women’s empowerment; (2) Sustainable development and resilience; (3) Leave no one behind; and (4) Accountability.; and
6. Emphasis on the shared values, norms and standards of the UN system.8

---

6 The new edition of the UNDAF Guidance will be release in early 2017 while the Interim UNDAF Guidance is available at https://undg.org/home/guidance-policies/common-country-programmingundaf.
8 For guidance on integrating human rights into the work of the UN at country level see the UNDG Guidance Note on Human Rights for Resident Coordinators and UN Country Teams (Forthcoming). Also see “Embedding human rights into development: Standard Operating Procedures for “Delivering as One”. Available at: https://undg.org/home/undg-mechanisms/undg-hrm/knowledge-management/newsletter-content/embedding-human-rights-into-development-standard-operating-procedures-for-delivering-as-one/.
Section A4: How to Use this Reference Guide

“The SDGs and targets are integrated and indivisible, global in nature and universally applicable, taking into account different national realities, capacities and levels of development and respecting national policies and priorities. Targets are defined as aspirational and global, with each government setting its own national targets guided by the global level of ambition but taking into account national circumstances. Each government will also decide how these aspirational and global targets should be incorporated in national planning processes, policies and strategies. It is important to recognize the link between sustainable development and other relevant ongoing processes in the economic, social and environmental fields.”

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (UN 2015)

Scope and Content of this Reference Guide
This document covers eight implementation guidance areas that can serve as the basis for UNCT assistance to governments and stakeholders in landing The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and SDGs at the national level, sub-national and local levels. The Guide also includes a special section on mainstreaming the 2030 Agenda for countries in complex situations.

Mainstreaming Guidance Areas
for implementing the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and Adapting the SDGs to National Contexts

1. Raising public awareness
2. Applying multi-stakeholder approaches
3. Adapting SDGs to national, sub-national and local contexts
4. Creating horizontal policy coherence (breaking the silos)
5. Creating vertical policy coherence (glocalizing the agenda)
6. Financing and budgeting for the future
7. Monitoring, reporting and accountability
8. Assessing risks and fostering adaptability
9. Special section on mainstreaming guidance for countries affected by conflict and fragile situations

What this Reference Guide is not:

- This Reference Guide is not intended to be an exhaustive and prescriptive rulebook;
- It is not intended to provide guidance for the design of specific policy instruments, although many of the approaches and tools listed are applicable for the design, implementation and monitoring of strategies/plans and specific policies; and
- It does not describe operating procedures for the engagement of UNCTs with Member-States, but instead provides high-level guidance; and
This Reference Guide does not provide information on sources of funding for UNCTs to deliver their support to Member States (other than outlining financing sources and instruments for implementing The 2030 Agenda as put forth in the Addis Ababa Action Agenda).

Countries will be at different stages with respect to their awareness and integration of The 2030 Agenda and SDGs. Some will have already started integrating the SDGs into their national planning processes, while other countries may only be aware of the agenda and SDGs through the agency that participated in the Post-2015 Development Agenda process on behalf of their governments. This Reference Guide is applicable to all stages of implementation.

Roadmap to this Reference Guide
The eight guidance areas presented in this document are summarized below and are meant to provide an integrated approach. It is recommended that governments embark on efforts across all eight guidance areas – to go beyond ‘governance as usual’ and match the transformative ambition of The 2030 Agenda and SDGs.

Five of the guidance areas should be initiated as soon as possible given their core role in landing The 2030 Agenda and SDGs at the national level. These include:

- Raising Public Awareness (Section B1);
- Applying Multi-stakeholder Approaches (Section B2);
- Adapting SDGs to National, Sub-national and Local Contexts (Section B3);
- Horizontal Policy Coherence (Section B4); and
- Monitoring, Reporting and Accountability (Section B7 – in relation to governments following the progress of the Inter Agency and Expert Group on SDG Indicators (IAEG-SDGs) and beginning work toward identifying nationally-relevant and human rights-sensitive indicators, targets, and establishing baseline data).

Three of the guidance areas address deeper levels of mainstreaming and can be initiated over time, including:

- Creating Vertical Policy Coherence (Sections B5);
- Financing and Budgeting for the Future (Section B6); and
- Assessing Risk and Fostering Adaptability (Section B8).

Indeed, many of the specific aspects underpinning these latter guidance areas can take five or more years to establish (i.e., formal multi-stakeholder bodies and institutional mechanisms, innovative financing sources and instruments, and risk management protocols).

Each Guidance Area section in this document is structured in the same way: first describing the purpose and then followed by specific guidance for UNCTs and Member States, a Toolkit summary, and References and Links. Each section includes a series of information boxes to convey lessons learned from country experiences and relevant innovative case examples featuring developed and developing country approaches and tools.
The 2030 Agenda Mainstreaming Guidance Areas
for implementing the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development
and Adapting SDGs to National Contexts

**Plan**

1. Public awareness
   a. Introductory Workshop Series
   b. Public Awareness Campaign
   c. Opportunity Management

2. Multi-stakeholder approaches
   a. Initial engagement
   b. Working with formal bodies / forums
   c. Fostering public-private partnerships
   d. Guidance on dialogues

3. Reviewing Plans and Adapting SDGs to National Contexts
   a. Reviewing existing strategies / plans
   b. Recommendations to leadership
   c. Setting nationally-relevant targets
   d. Formulating plans using systems thinking

4. Horizontal policy coherence
   a. Integrated policy analysis
   b. Cross-cutting institutions
   c. Integrated modelling

**Do**

5. Vertical policy coherence
   a. Multi-level institutions
   b. Multi-stakeholder bodies / forums
   c. Local Agenda 21s and Networks
   d. Local-level indicator systems
   e. Integrated modelling
   f. Impact assessment processes

6. Financing & budgeting
   a. Tracking stock of financing mechanisms
   b. Tracking stock of financing instruments
   c. Effective use of financing

**Check**

7. Monitoring, reporting and accountability
   a. Indicator development and data collection (including baseline)
   b. Disaggregating data
   c. Participatory monitoring
   d. Monitoring and reporting systems
   e. Voluntary national reviews
   f. SDG country reporting guidelines
   g. Other review processes and mechanisms

8. Assessing risks and fostering adaptability
   a. Adaptive governance
   b. Risk analysis and management
   c. Scenario planning and stress testing
PART B: GUIDANCE

Mainstreaming *The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*
Section B1: Building Awareness

Purpose
Building public awareness and engaging national, sub-national and local stakeholders in The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and SDGs is a critical initial and ongoing step in successful implementation. Beyond just awareness, achieving a similar level of understanding among governmental and non-governmental stakeholders is critical. This means reaching out to all levels and sectors with information that is tailored to their specific functions, roles, and responsibilities.

A clear understanding of the benefits of aligning national and sub-national plans and policy-making processes with The 2030 Agenda and SDGs as well as building ownership for it among people, including the marginalised, provides the foundation for its real and lasting delivery. Done well, this step can enhance the impact of all other guidance areas in this note (B2 through B9), and ultimately, the impact of the agenda itself. Given that the SDGs are a global agenda, it is critical to support national audiences in linking them to local concerns, thus helping to ensure sustainable public support for the SDGs.

Guidance
Member States can begin building public awareness on The 2030 Agenda and SDGs as an opportunity to promote an existing or forthcoming national development strategy or plan and to display its intentions to be part of the global partnership to make progress toward the SDGs in their national, sub-national and local contexts.

A foundation for any effort in raising the public awareness of The 2030 Agenda is its universal and integrated nature - connecting the global and local, leaving no one behind, promoting human rights and gender equality, and addressing economic, social and environmental sustainability.

To assist Member States in building awareness of the profound importance of The 2030 Agenda and SDGs, a parallel and multi-pronged approach can be facilitated by UNCTs, possibly led by their country communications groups, including:

1. **An introductory workshop series**: to sensitize government officials and stakeholders to The 2030 Agenda and SDGs (and to review national development plans for their alignment with the SDGs – see Section B3);
2. **A public awareness campaign**: to communicate The 2030 Agenda and SDGs to the general public, including women, children, youth, and others as applicable, such as internally displaced persons, and non-nationals such as refugees, stateless persons and economic migrants; and
3. **Opportunity management**: to leverage other government and UN-sponsored meetings and forums to sensitize government officials and stakeholders to The 2030 Agenda and SDGs.

Recommendations for SDG Implementation based on MDG Experience

Vast experience was gained through the MDG era and this was synthesized in 2016 by UNDP in the report entitled ‘From the MDGs to Sustainable Development for All: Lessons from 15 Years of Practice. (UNDP 2016). This experience was distilled into ten recommendations for SDG implementation as illustrated and summarized below.
1. **Act early and leave no one behind:** The time to deliver is already short. Stepped up, early action is needed to get SDGs on track to eradicate extreme poverty, hunger, preventable disease and deliver essential services by 2030.

2. **Set targets that reflect people’s priorities for the future:** To get traction, national SDG targets should be agreed through an inclusive national process considered legitimate in all communities.

3. **Empower local change agents:** Under the MDGs, change agents in government, civil society and the private sector proved that Global Goals can drive progress when used to re-engage hope in a better future, enable people to find common ground, tie local challenges to global solutions, drive political action and inspire collaboration.

4. **Invite broad engagement:** SDG campaigns led by government, parliaments and/or loosely organized coalitions should develop clearly defined outreach objectives. Particular audiences, such as local businesses, community groups, academic institutions and parts of government should be asked to articulate their contributions; track results and advance mutual accountability.

5. **Realize sub-national strategies:** The SDGs should be seen as an invitation to improve intra-governmental coordination and accountability and strengthen local capacities. Agreement on a clear division of labour, based on the comparative advantage, role and capacities of local and national governments should guide SDG resource mobilization and monitoring.

6. **Pursue “big picture” strategies:** Scenario-building can help governments elaborate and sequence strategies, avoid risks, and find opportunities to close gaps in technology, financing and capacity [58]. It should also empower political leaders with the ability to adjust policy levers in order to advance multiple goals at once, achieving faster, more coherent progress by harnessing synergies.
7. **Prioritize policy accelerators:** Prioritization does not imply bypassing relevant SDG targets but rather identifying specific areas that can serve as an entry point for the transformational change sustainable development demands.

8. **Strengthen adaptive capacity:** Success at scale is possible when and where local actors can adopt new approaches, analyse and adjust initiatives until they work.

9. **Build a big tent:** Solutions to real-life problems generally lie outside the boundaries of individual ministries, tightly focused initiatives or disciplines. It is therefore essential for leaders to find ways of working outside the silos and divisions that make solutions hard to find and even harder to implement.

10. **Use SDG reporting to engage all of society:** Ongoing citizen feedback should be fed into regular participatory, public reviews of SDG progress to ensure concerns are heard and responded to. Public Hearings, Social Audits, Citizen Report Cards and Participatory Budgets should be pursued as ways to build trust between government and citizens; improve the responsiveness of public institutions and public services.

Source: UNDP (2016).

Building public awareness should be understood as a first step towards a participatory process in implementing the 2030 Agenda. Genuine participation and access to information are cornerstones of empowerment; participation having many instrumental gains as a result of using local knowledge, exposing local preferences, raising resource allocation efficiency, and maximizing ownership and sustainability of development. Consequently, awareness raising efforts should be participatory processes, which are critically assessed, to see whether they:

- Reflect minimum standards for the process, which should be agreed on by all participants;
- Operate at all stages, including the design, implementation and monitoring of development strategies;
- Include women and marginalized groups and develop specific channels of participation if this is necessary;
- Prevent elite capture and reinforcement of existing social hierarchies and power relations;
- Are transparent and provide sufficient and accessible information;
- Provide accountability mechanisms to ensure that the participatory process is held to these standards. (OHCHR 2008)

**Early Action for Raising Awareness**

Building public awareness of the SDGs and their benefit to national development is a critical initial and ongoing step in successful implementation. Among some of the early actions in this regard were:

- **El Salvador** – Organized and delivered 17 days of SDG training for government officials to in order to strengthen the knowledge of public servants on the 2030 Agenda.
- **Finland** – Implemented its new approach called ‘Society’s Commitment to Sustainable Development’, bringing together the public sector, companies, civil society actors, organizations and citizens in a unique way by asking them to select a commitment and record on the website of the Finnish National Commission for Sustainable Development, and monitor an indicator (FNCSD 2015).
- **Indonesia** – Produced SDG shows on the nation’s biggest national TV Channel to talk with young children about development in Indonesia and the importance of reaching the SDGs; created an SDG partnership with one of Indonesia’s premier and largest radio networks.
• **Mauritania** – Held a free music concert of local artists to promote the SDGs and raise awareness on the role of each citizen for their achievement; organized a national SDG photo contest giving the chance for all Mauritanians to depict an SDG of their choice.

• **Morocco** – Translated the SDGs into the Amazigh language; convened digital entrepreneurs, civil society activists, celebrities, journalists and activists to raise awareness about the transition from MDGs to SDGs.

• **Sierra Leone** – Carried out a nationwide campaign to promote the SDGs through photo exhibitions in various city council halls and universities, and through engagement with mayors, lecturers, teachers, students and pupils; trained journalists to familiarize them with the SDGs and how to objectively report and monitor progress and challenges in implementation in light of the Ebola crisis.

• **Uganda** – Delivered media orientation training on the SDGs for 50 journalists and engaged five eminent Ugandans to serve as SDGs ambassadors to help raise awareness through participation in events and voicing radio messages.

*Source: UNDG (2016), or as otherwise noted.*

---

**Introductory Workshop Series on The 2030 Agenda and SDGs**

UNITAR prepared a Post-2015 National Briefing Package entitled ‘Preparing for Action’ (UNITAR 2015a). This package consists of a series of interactive workshop training modules and can be adapted for sensitizing national government officials and stakeholders to *The 2030 Agenda* and SDGs. A series of slides have also been prepared in support of this Mainstreaming Guide and can be adapted to help at this stage. The website of the new SDG Action Campaign is another key resource (see next sub-section for details).

The starting point for UNCTs is to meet with the Member State government ministry that participated directly in the Post-2015 process to determine how much awareness raising has already occurred. A series of *Introductory Workshops* can then be planned accordingly. A comprehensive *Introductory Workshop Series* to sensitize government officials, civil society organizations, including women’s organizations, businesses and other stakeholder groups to the structure and content of *The 2030 Agenda* and SDGs could include the following phases:

- **Phase 1:** Introductory workshop with the government agency(s) responsible for national development planning and national statistics. Working with these agencies, other workshops can be planned, including:
  - **Phase 2:** Introductory workshop with remaining national government departments and other national stakeholders. To foster increased national ownership, the participants of the first phase might be facilitators or presenters for the second and third phases; and
  - **Phase 3:** Introductory workshops in key cities and/or regions of the sub-national governments (inviting the sub-national government, city government, local businesses, civil society organizations, indigenous peoples groups, and persons affected by displacement, statelessness or living through complex emergencies).

The introductory workshop process will also allow for stakeholders to define the context and how they envision the SDGs being realised within their country. This is particularly important within a humanitarian or conflict/post-conflict context. The selection of stakeholders in all instances must be

---

9 ‘Post-2015 Development Agenda’ was the terminology used in the prelude to the ‘2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development’
carefully managed to ensure real representation of all sectors of the population and government, not just the line ministries and favored individuals (see Section B2 on Applying Multi-stakeholder Approaches).

**Innovative Case Example:**

**UNITAR’s National Post-2015 Development Agenda Briefing Package in Uganda**

The Ugandan government was the first in piloting this briefing package in Kampala, together with the UN Country Team and two training experts from UNITAR. The event unfolded over two days and was led by the government and facilitated by representatives from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development; and the National Planning Authority. Experts from UNDP and the UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA) also contributed to facilitation by presenting a global perspective on the evolving issues of global partnership, financing for development, review, follow-up, and SDG synergies.

The exercise highlighted how the government of Uganda has already made significant progress in integrating the proposed SDGs into national planning. Specifically, the proposed National Development Plan II (NDPII) already includes many of the SDGs and a significant portion of the proposed targets have been adjusted to the national context.

*Source: UNITAR (2015b).*

**Public Awareness Campaign on The 2030 Agenda and SDGs.**

The mass outreach and marketing of sustainable development concepts and agendas has been one of the critical weaknesses of efforts since the 1992 Earth Summit. While sustainable development has entered the vocabulary of experts and the interested public, the terminology and concept has yet to fully permeate the general public and political discourse. Given today’s Internet and social media platforms, combined with traditional media, as well as the outreach capacity of civil society organizations and volunteer groups, there are more avenues than ever to reach the general public. These are particularly relevant to reach younger audiences, whose members will be both key actors as well as the inheritors of the world the SDGs seek to create.

Continuing the work of the Millennium Campaign, the UN’s new SDG Action Campaign provides support to UN Country Teams in three key areas (UN SDG Action Campaign 2016a):

- Engaging stakeholders and individuals to support Member States and UN Country Teams in SDGs implementation through direct peoples’ engagement;
- Encouraging public ownership of SDGs through creative and innovative communications, campaigning and policy advocacy with a goal to create awareness (i.e., including via the My World Survey); and
- Sponsoring people-driven processes to strengthen accountability mechanism and monitor progress of the SDGs, promoting the role of citizen science.

Through its Global Service Center Office in Bonn (Germany), the SDG Action Campaign provides support to Country Teams and partners to advance SDGs initiatives on the ground. The Campaign provides ready-made partnerships and models to develop long-term sectorial partnerships with media creative partners, parliamentarians, local authorities, academia, civil society, faith-based organizations, youth-led organizations, women’s groups, technology and communications partners, the private sector and other novel actors to activate people from different sectors in the achievement of the 2030 Agenda.
Innovative Case Example
The SDG Action Campaign Toolkit

The Campaign has created an SDG Action Campaign Toolkit providing detailed guidance on taking ten key actions for advocacy, awareness raising and public engagement in the SDGs:

1. **My World 2030:** to monitor SDG progress, build accountability, and create dialogue between citizens and decision makers;
2. **We the Peoples Exhibitions:** These events are an artistic and interactive display of citizen data, ‘Humans’ storytelling pictures and our signature Virtual Reality films. Using large touch screens, viewers can touch and play with the data, making “citizen data” fun and exciting.
3. **Join the World We Want:** A jointly owned initiative by United Nations agencies and civil society, designed as a model to bring the voices of multi-stakeholders into political deliberations, especially focused on including the voices of marginalized communities. This has been achieved through online and offline consultations, building civil society networks, and data visualizations;
4. **Goals Day:** The SDG Action Campaign calls for an international day or week to mobilise, engage, vote and advocate for the SDGs. This ‘Goals’ day would be an opportunity for public engagement moments in iconic settings, social media campaigns, lessons in schools, radio campaigns and citizen feedback on progress around the Goals through the MY World survey;
5. **Convene a Peoples’ Voices Challenge:** The Peoples Voices’ Challenge is an annual competition that seeks to reward the best advocacy and communications initiatives around the SDGs. This yearly event is held during the UN General Assembly, recognizing partners for their commitment to including peoples’ voices into the development process.
6. **Create a Human of MY World Project:** The Humans of MY World (HOMY) Facebook page (UN SDG Action Campaign 2016b) shares the personal stories of some of the individuals who voted in MY World. Create your own national or local HOMY project using the toolkit (UN SDG Action Campaign 2016c) as a guidance note;
7. **Host a Virtual Reality Screening:** The UN SDG Action Campaign has coordinated the Virtual Reality Series Project to bring the world’s most pressing challenges home to decision makers and global citizens around the world, pushing the bounds of empathy. A new free downloadable app makes it even easier to access the films;
8. **Watch and Share:** Three films have been developed through a partnership between UN SDG Action Campaign, UNDP, UNF and Project Everyone (UN SDG Action Campaign 2016d): We Have a Plan; Numbers in Action; and Leave No One Behind;
9. **Download the App:** Keep an eye on what’s going on now and in the future by downloading the Sustainable Development Goals Action app created in partnership by GSMA, Project Everyone and DPI (UN SDG Action Campaign 2016e); and
10. **Global Festival of Ideas for Sustainable Development:** The Global Festival is a ground-breaking annual event powered by the UN SDG Action Campaign with the support of the German federal government, which will bring together the global community working to deliver the SDGs.

*Source: UN SDG Action Campaign (2016f)*
Awareness-raising is a continuous process. Specific outreach initiatives should occur with the scope, frequency, and objective varying from country to country. A first wave can sensitise the public regarding the SDGs overall, and what they mean for the nation in the context of its existing development vision and plan. It is important to note that public awareness of the SDGs within a country should be done in the context of the country’s national development vision and plan, so as to be clear that it is a nationally-owned process. A second wave could be more specifically linked to the nationally adapted SDGs with national targets and timelines (see Section B3).

With assistance from UNCTs, Member States could work to increase public awareness of their existing national development strategy/plan, while at the same time marketing The 2030 Agenda and SDGs to the general public and how local and regional governments (LRGs), businesses and civil society organizations (CSOs) can be part of a national and global partnership.

A work plan could be developed for a sustained media outreach campaign utilizing traditional avenues (i.e., TV, Radio, newsprint) and Internet and social media platforms to communicate the salient aspects of the country’s national development plan and how, through achieving and improving its own plan, it will contribute towards progress of The 2030 Agenda globally.

Awareness raising efforts are a space for considerable creativity and innovation. For example, Uganda has ‘goal ambassadors’ to raise public awareness, with a Nobel Laureate representing Goal #16 on Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions. Other examples of creativity in Uganda include illustrating the alignment of the SDGs to the Ugandan national anthem, use of the UNICEF U-report process and an SDG-Journey publication, and asking the president to wear a Goal#16 t-shirt on peace, justice and strong institutions. Also, training of local media on reporting on SDGs was undertaken and in this regard, reporters will be supported to open a media platform on SDGs, but also to prepare investigative pieces on relevant topics.

As a further illustration, consider the case of Colombia where a Mayors online training course was developed in collaboration with UNITAR. This course was inundated by 2000 applications, providing leaders with the opportunity to talk about the relevance of the various SDGs. Also, in Belarus the UN70 Express Train for SDGs provided a unique exercise to engage broad groups of people from different backgrounds into an open conversation about their priorities and specific challenges (see Innovative Case Example below).

### Innovative Case Example
**The UN70 Belarus Express Train for SDGs**

The UN in Belarus, in collaboration with the Government has recently organized an initiative called the UN70 Belarus Express for SDGs – a train that traveled around the country in October 2015 visiting seven regional cities with a goal to raise awareness about SDGs and foster a dialogue at the local level on the priorities, challenges and opportunities within the new development agenda. The UN70 Belarus Express for SDGs involved more than 150,000 persons in its activities all over the country.
The train itself was not just a means of transportation, but also a platform for numerous discussions and events focused on SDGs. Ministers, Government officials, parliamentarians, all the regional Governors, more than 100 NGOs, more than 25 private sector partners, more than 30 embassies, students, journalists, religious leaders from all faiths, artists and celebrities, representatives of vulnerable groups such as people living with disabilities, people living with HIV, victims of domestic violence and human trafficking, youth at risk, refugees and displaced persons and more than 240 UN staff from both resident and non-resident agencies took part in the Initiative.

A video was produced and is available depicting the experience\(^\text{10}\).

*Source: UN Belarus (2015), UNGD and UNDP (2015)*

Additionally, ‘Project Everyone’\(^\text{11}\) has worked together with a number of UN partners. It includes multiple traditional and social media assets and tools to reach a maximum number of people. Such a campaign could be emulated at a national level, with an objective to reach every citizen in the country to share information about the existing or forthcoming national plan and how it will endeavour to integrate the SDGs at the national level and how sub-national and local governments could follow suit.

A key element of the Project Everyone global outreach campaign is building awareness of the world’s children and youth. For example, *The World’s Largest Lesson*\(^\text{12}\), where UNICEF serves as a founding partner, is a global initiative aimed at bringing the SDGs to the classroom through lesson plans, videos, comics and other creative content – available freely and in a multitude of languages for educators to download, use or adapt for their classrooms.

In its simplest iteration, the *World’s Largest Lesson* can be an annual learning moment to introduce students to the Goals, taking place as a one-hour assembly. However, there is also a wide array of lesson plans on topics ranging from *gender equality* to *prevention of violence* to *climate change* – covering all of the SDGs -- that can be used with existing school curricula and subject areas to deepen children’s awareness of and interest in these topics throughout the school year. A strength in this modular approach is that content can be easily adapted and used within existing education structures and curricula.

\(^{10}\) See [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wFkJMAAgCwl](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wFkJMAAgCwl)

\(^{11}\) See [www.globalgoals.org](http://www.globalgoals.org)

\(^{12}\) See [http://worldslargestlesson.globalgoals.org/](http://worldslargestlesson.globalgoals.org/)
The Education 2030 Framework for Action, developed through an inclusive, consultative process facilitated by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and its partners, including UNICEF, the World Bank, UNFPA, UNDP, UN Women and UNHCR, and adopted in November 2015 by 184 Member States of UNESCO, advances a common understanding of SDG4 and related targets. It provides a foundation not only for the future of education, but also for sustained public awareness on sustainable development and systems thinking through education (UNESCO 2015). UNESCO is working to support Member States and partners to operationalize this Framework for Action in order to achieve SDG 4 and the education-related targets of the other goals in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

UNESCO has also developed the Guide ‘Unpacking SDG4-Education 2030’ (UNESCO 2016a) which gives a deeper understanding of SDG4 and translates these global commitments at national levels. Moreover, UNESCO convenes the SDG-Education 2030 Steering Committee which is a high-level, democratic, multi-stakeholder coordination mechanism. Its main objective is to support Member States and partners to achieve SDG 4 and the education-related targets in other goals of the overall 2030 Agenda. One of the key activities of the Steering Committee is advocacy. In addition, UNESCO is also organizing with partners regional and national SDG4-Education 2030 consultations and activities to provide capacity development to strengthen country efforts to deliver on their SDG4 commitments (UNESCO 2016b).

**Opportunity Management**

Other forms of engagement can be leveraged to sensitize government officials and to raise public awareness that are perhaps less formal (and less costly), but can also be effective and build on existing channels. These opportunities could include for example, dedicated sessions on SDGs at donor coordination meetings, press briefings or meetings with the press (on and off the record), UN-wide town hall meetings, opinion pieces in the local press, the use of existing social media tools such as Twitter, Facebook, and mobile phone messaging (e.g., UNICEF’s U-Report initiative\(^\text{13}\), see Innovative Case Example below). Existing coordination mechanisms and structures within the governments can be used to help sensitize government officials as well as to promote a multi-sectoral approach.

---

**Innovative Case Example:**

**Reaching People with the Messages of the SDGs and Asking for their Views on Issues and Progress**

U-Report is an innovative communication technology developed by UNICEF and revolutionizes social mobilization, monitoring and response efforts: It equips mobile phone users with the tools to establish and enforce new standards of transparency and accountability in development programs and services (UNICEF 2012). It was originally developed in Uganda and has since spread to over 30 countries and has nearly 3 million users (http://ureport.in/).

U-Report can be leveraged for SDG implementation in a number of ways including: increasing awareness of users about the SDGs and asking users to share their opinions and perceptions on SDG-related issues. It is and will increasingly be a useful tool for supporting people’s participation in SDG implementation, including monitoring, follow-up and review.

\(^{13}\) See [www.ureport.org](http://www.ureport.org)
"U-report is gaining popularity because it has given Ugandans the ability to inform other Ugandans and to take action...We can ask questions about issues throughout the country and get answers right away – by district, by gender, by age – and that helps us know where to concentrate our limited response resources and how best to advise our governments and aid partners (UNICEF 2012)."

**Toolkit**

**UN SDG Action Campaign**
- SDG Action Campaign Website
- MY World 2030 Toolkit
- SDG Action Campaign Toolkit outlining 10 Actions to take for advocacy, awareness raising and public engagement in the SDGs

**UNITAR National Briefing Package**
The UNITAR Post-2015 National Briefings (UNITAR 2015a) are “a self-explanatory integrated toolkit designed to support national facilitators in planning and delivering briefings at the country level (UNITAR 2015c).” The package includes:

- Detailed program, organized in six modules with guidance for facilitators;
- Discussion questions prepared with guidance from the UNDG Sustainable Development Working Group;
- Kit with presentations, quizzes, videos, participants’ manual and methodologies for discussion groups.

Modules 1 and 2 are particularly suited to the *Introductory Workshop Series on the 2030 Agenda and SDGs*. An easy 10-step process is outlined to help UNCTs organize a national briefing (UNITAR 2015b).

**Project Everyone**
‘*Project Everyone*’ is part of the global outreach campaign for *The 2030 Agenda* and uses multiple outreach platforms, including online collaborations with Google/YouTube, Huffington Post, Yahoo, Facebook, LinkedIn and Wikipedia. A key aspect of the *Project Everyone* outreach campaign is *The World's Largest Lesson*, a collaboration with UNICEF to get information on the SDGs in classrooms around the world (UNICEF 2015b).

**Social Media**
Outreach potential today has a tremendous advantage compared to the post-1992 Earth Summit era. This is due primarily to the Internet and its social media platforms such as Facebook, Google+, Twitter, Youtube, Instagram, to name a few. For example, UNICEF’s U-report initiative. These platforms could be
used to their fullest advantage for reporting as well as for advocacy and consensus-building, in accordance with the national government’s guidelines on the use of social media.

Advanced Tool: Strategic Social Marketing

Commercial marketing and advertising has evolved over the decades into a hugely successful discipline for the private sector in promoting products and services. The use of similar approaches by the public and not-for-profit sectors for social change purposes is termed ‘social marketing’. The International Social Marketing Association notes that “Social Marketing seeks to develop and integrate marketing concepts with other approaches to influence behaviours that benefit individuals and communities for the greater social good (ISMA 2015).” Some practitioners distinguish between ‘operational social marketing’ – addressing specific behavioral issues (i.e., anti-smoking campaigns), and ‘strategic social marketing’ – to inform policy and strategy development (NSMC 2015). For more information see ‘The Big Pocket Guide to Using Social Marketing for Behavioral Change’ (NSMC 2015).
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Section B2: Applying Multi-stakeholder Approaches

Purpose

“The Dialogues call for governments to create spaces and mechanisms for engagement, not only as a way to strengthen people’s basic political rights but also because it helps to create better policies and generate better development outcomes.”

Post-2015 Dialogues on Implementation (UNDG 2014)

As evidenced by the quotation above, central to the legitimacy and quality of a society-wide agenda is the design of multi-stakeholder policy development and implementation modalities to encourage and facilitate partnerships between government and nationally and sub-nationally active stakeholder networks of civil society, universities, think tanks, the private sector, workers’ and employers’ organizations, other development actors, and national human rights institutions (UNDP-OHCHR 2012). In reaching out, it is important that actors reach out to all groups, including ones that are at times vulnerable and marginalised, such as refugees, internally displaced and stateless persons, in recognition that the SDGs are built on a principle of universality and a pledge that no one shall be left behind from sustainable development.

As further rationale, consider the conclusions of the Post-2015 Dialogues on Implementation with regard to participation and inclusion (UNDG 2015):

- “The Dialogue on localizing the agenda pointed to the need for stronger engagement of local stakeholders in the definition, implementation and monitoring of the post-2015 development agenda, as the achievement of many of the MDGs depended on the work of local governments and stakeholders.
- Community participation and ownership, rooted in local culture, are instrumental in development programmes, including for environmental protection, for sustainable urban development and for gender equality and women’s empowerment.
- An engaged business sector is critical for innovation, technological advancement and sustainable economic growth.
- Governments and civil society already have working models to tap into people’s desire and capacities for engagement; but these examples are too few and not yet fully institutionalized into how public policy is developed and delivered.
- While consultations are a good start, they should not be one-off events but, rather, mechanisms that provide for a continued dialogue with feedback loops that inspire ownership from various stakeholders.
- The inclusion of the full diversity of stakeholders means paying specific attention to the inclusion of all voices, including women and children, with a particular focus on marginalized groups and individuals. People living in poverty, indigenous communities and other minorities, persons with disabilities, refugees, others forcibly displaced and stateless persons, children and young people, migrants and the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) community are some of the groups and individuals who are not necessarily included in policy-and decision-making processes.”
This section presents guidance for involving stakeholders in the process of adapting SDGs to the national context, and is applicable also at the sub-national and local levels.

**Guidance**

The need for multi-stakeholder approaches is ubiquitous across the eight guidance areas in this document. Four specific aspects are presented below to clarify the means by which Member States can engage an array of different stakeholders at different stages of mainstreaming *The 2030 Agenda* and SDGs.

It is recognized that all nations already have in place existing processes for planning, budgeting and monitoring, with varying degrees of stakeholder involvement. The guidance areas herein strive for transformation, to go ‘beyond governance as usual’ and match the transformative ambition of *The 2030 Agenda*.

1. **Initial multi-stakeholder engagement**: for increasing public awareness of *The 2030 Agenda* and SDGs;
2. **Working with national multi-stakeholder bodies or forums**: for reviewing existing plans;
3. **Guidance on multi-stakeholder dialogue**: to assist with the process of engagement; and
4. **Fostering public-private partnerships**: to leverage the ingenuity, scaling-up ability, and investment potential of business

These guidance aspects represent successively deeper integration of *The 2030 Agenda* and SDGs, starting with sensitization of *The 2030 Agenda* (guidance aspect #1) and evolving to a purposeful analysis by formal multi-stakeholder bodies, forums and planning commissions for how the SDGs could be practically reflected in development strategies and plans at the national, sub-national and local levels (#2). For governments that are already about to engage in a visioning process for their national plan or are interested in a deep conversation with their citizens on how to land the global SDGs at a national, sub-national or local level, the guidance on multi-stakeholder dialogue (#3) will be useful.

**Early Action for Inclusive Participation**

Core to the quality and legitimacy of a society-wide agenda is the application of multi-stakeholder approaches for policy development and implementation to encourage and facilitate partnerships between government and nationally and sub-nationally active stakeholder networks of civil society, universities, think tanks, the private sector and other development actors. Early actions by countries included:

- **Dominican Republic** – The High Level Inter-institutional Sustainable Development Commission was created and is made up of Government Ministers, the private sector as well as NGO representatives, giving particular attention to populations that have traditionally received insufficient attention in public policy. **Germany** – Promoted the comprehensive involvement of diverse stakeholders through a variety of dialogue formats in revising the National Sustainable Development Strategy as well as preparing for the Voluntary National Review at the 2016 High-level Political Forum on Sustainable Development. (The German Federal Government 2016)

- **Pakistan** – Invited non-state partners to a national launch to discuss the country’s SDGs roll-out plans. The Parliamentary Task Force on SDGs invited representation from civil society in a
national consultation workshop on SDGs focusing on malnutrition. Provincial consultations involved senior provincial officials, civil society organizations, think tanks, and academia.

- **Somalia** – An extensive consultation mechanism was implemented ensuring participation of different government levels, civil society, private sector as well as academia. Dedicated consultation events – for instance with the private sector and women groups – were organized.
- **Turkmenistan** – Engaged with diverse stakeholders from the initial stage of introducing the 2030 Agenda and rolling out the first stage of their SDG campaign.

*Source UNDG (2016), or as otherwise noted.*

**Initial Multi-stakeholder Engagement for Increasing Public Awareness of The 2030 Agenda and SDGs**

As a first stage of multi-stakeholder engagement for mainstreaming The 2030 Agenda and SDGs, Member States with guidance from UNCTs can begin raising public awareness of the global agenda and also the country’s existing national development plan and planning process. Guidance in this regard was provided in Section B1, including the types of stakeholders that could be engaged and the content that would be useful to share at this early stage.

**Working with National Councils or Forums on SDG Review and Implementation**

“Arrangements for engaging stakeholders need to be flexible to take account of changing patterns of stakeholders’ organisation. But they can be strengthened by institutional arrangements to enable long-term engagement to flourish and deliver results. National Councils for Sustainable Development, Commissioners or Ombudsmen for Future Generations, Economic and Social Councils can all play a valuable part. Such bodies can develop expertise in the creation of strategies and the policies pursued within them and in the monitoring and review of progress. They can build crucial relationships of trust with all the parts of Government that are concerned and with the major stakeholder groups in society.”

Report to the European Economic and Social Committee by the Stakeholder Forum (2015)

Stakeholders have collectively made the call “for governments to create spaces and mechanisms for engagement.” In some countries these ‘spaces’ have already been institutionalized as some type of formal multi-stakeholder council or similar body and may have a proven track record in facilitating national stakeholder dialogue on sustainable development issues. Notable examples from developed countries include the German Council for Sustainable Development and the Finnish National Commission for Sustainable Development (Stakeholder Forum 2015). Examples of similar national councils can also be found in a number of developing countries from around the world, such as in the Philippines, Vietnam, Mozambique, Mauritius, and Dominican Republic (GN-NCSDS 2015).

In countries where multi-stakeholder bodies currently exist, or where planning commissions operate in collaboration with multi-stakeholder forums, such bodies represent a logical starting point for raising public awareness and creating a broader media or social marketing campaign (Section B1). Such consultative bodies are also the logical point of departure for reviewing existing development plans and

---

14 It is worth noting that in some countries, such formalized stakeholder bodies have already come and gone for a myriad of reasons. Notable examples include the United Kingdom’s Sustainable Development Commission, Canada’s National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy and the Tasmania Progress Board (Bertelsmann Stiftung, 2013a). Perceived reasons for the dissolution of these bodies vary from fiscal pressures, to not reflecting current government policy, and to the perception that sustainable development is already sufficiently integrated within government.
the process of adapting SDGs to national contexts (Section B3), as well as a mechanism for facilitating ongoing national dialogue on the implementation of nationally-adapted SDGs. In many countries, the tripartite social dialogue structures between governments, business and workers can serve as platform for the development of more comprehensive implementation and accountability mechanisms.

**Innovative Case Example:**
**Germany’s Engagement with Multi-stakeholders**

The German Council for Sustainable Development organises numerous campaigns to encourage dialogue on the principle of sustainability. The establishment of Regionale Netzstellen Nachhaltigkeitsstrategien (regional network points for sustainability strategies) is to strengthen the nationwide networking of sustainability initiatives launched by federal, state and local governments. The German Council for Sustainable Development also supports the international networking of councils for sustainable development and similar stakeholders.

The German Government has also organized a dialogue forum three to four times a year, convening the government, local authorities, NGOs, churches, the scientific and academic community and the private sector, in order to facilitate a regular exchange of ideas and information on the sustainability agenda. Acknowledging the importance of the involvement of all social groups for SDG achievement, the German Government also supports the development of multi-stakeholder initiatives, such as the Partnership for Sustainable Textiles and the German Initiative on Sustainable Cocoa.

*Source: The German Federal Government (2016)*

Where such formal bodies or forums do not already exist in a country, governments could convene a consultative forum for purposes of SDG review and implementation.

For example, at the EU level the European Economic and Social Committee (EESC) in 2015 announced the idea of creating a European Sustainable Development Forum in partnership with the European Commission “as a platform involving a broad range of civil society organisations and stakeholders in the implementation of SDGs in the EU (EESC 2016)” with the aim to provide a regular, structured and independent space for informed dialogue on sustainable development between the EU institution and non-governmental stakeholders as well as between non-government stakeholders from different constituencies, ensure strong involvement of non-governmental stakeholders in the ongoing monitoring and review of the 2030 Agenda at EU level, and encourage non-governmental stakeholders, players and grass root initiatives to share suggestions, best practice and solutions for meaningful implementation of the 2030 Agenda (EESC 2016).

Excluded groups, including women, children, adolescents, people with disabilities and ethnic minorities often lack adequate forums in which to build consensus and articulate demands for their social, economic and other rights, and UNCTs may wish to examine how to foster the development of new stakeholder groups, where necessary.
Innovative Case Example:
Somalia

The development and implementation of a compact in Somalia under the ‘The New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States’ framework is a good example of applying a multi-stakeholder approach to implementation of the SDGs.

In 2013, with the adoption of a new Constitution, formation of a new Parliament and selection of the President, a window of opportunity for a new phase of stabilization and peacebuilding in Somalia was presented. In order to help manage the transition process, the Federal Government of Somalia (FGS), with civil society, parliament and other Somali stakeholders, and the international community agreed to develop a Compact, guided by the principles of the New Deal.

As part of the Compact, which was produced on the basis of a fragility assessment, the FGS and international community defined mutual roles and responsibilities including a financing architecture and setting up of overall framework for advancing peacebuilding and state-building in Somalia. The compact was the result of an inclusive process and strong partnership between the FGS, the United Nations, the World Bank, EU and donors and other key partners. The FGS and partners made sure there was strong alignment between international assistance and the Somali Compact priorities and partnership principles. With support from the UN, the government established an Aid Coordination Unit for effective coordination and implementation of the compact.

Source: UNICEF.

Guidance on Multi-stakeholder Dialogue

Some countries may already be poised for deeper dialogue on the integration of SDGs, for example, if it is about to engage in a national visioning process. In such instances, guidance on how to conduct large-scale multi-stakeholder dialogues will be helpful to Member States.

To inform the Post-2015 ‘World We Want’ Global Conversation initiated in 2012, the UNDG issued guidelines to UNCTs for conducting national consultations (UNDG 2012). The national dialogues were designed to “stimulate an inclusive, bottom-up debate on a post-2015 development agenda in order to complement the existing intergovernmental process.” In the context of the dialogues, the guidelines provided “ideas for how to promote inclusive consultations with government representatives, NGOs, civil society, community-based organizations (CBOs), indigenous peoples, women’s and social movements, youth and children, and the private sector, among others (UNDG 2012).”

Two core process principles were put forth as a foundation for the consultation guidelines:

- **INCLUSION**: Efforts should be made to open the consultations to all stakeholders in the country who will be affected by the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, with particular focus on effectively involving those who are commonly underrepresented or marginalized in decision-making processes; and

- **ACCOUNTABILITY**: Efforts should also be made to ensure that people who participate in the consultations have access to relevant information and can provide feedback and influence the results and the process of the consultations. More specifically, a critical aspect of accountability in any kind of consultation process has to do with who controls the information that is generated, how that information is analysed and how it is subsequently used. Another very important aspect of accountability is transparency — not just about how the results of the consultation are arrived at, but also transparency in how the consultation itself will relate to the wider process of decision-making about the 2030 Agenda.
In relation to accountability, it is also necessary to highlight the importance of mutual accountability in applying multi-stakeholder approaches—all participants are accountable for following through with commitments.

**Innovative Case Example:**

**National Post-2015 Consultations Across Africa**

The post-2015 consultation processes in Africa largely benefited from the legacy of formulating long-term development plans (vision documents) and short- to medium-term plans (poverty reduction strategy papers, PRSPs, and national development plans, NDPs)—processes which have demanded broad consultations with different stakeholders.

The post-2015 consultations, therefore, built on this foundation and included new forms of consulting stakeholders and bringing in other groups that would not normally participate in national planning processes. The methodologies used were largely similar, with a few exceptions. Most of the consultations in Africa were organized by the various UN country teams (UNCTs), national governments (mainly ministries/departments of planning or finance) and key actors of civil society, including women and youth groups, people with disabilities, people living with HIV/AIDS, academia and the private sector.

![Image](image1.png)

Face-to-face meetings in various formats dominated consultation methodologies in all the 30 countries conducting national consultations. To increase inclusion and accountability, however, focus group discussions, stakeholder interviews, radio phone-in programmes, television panel interviews and specific group and expert group meetings were used. In addition, on- and off-line surveys were used in several countries including MY World surveys and the use of text messaging, which managed to obtain feedback from 17,000 young people in Uganda.

In total, close to 350,000 stakeholders were consulted on the post-2015 agenda in Africa. Many of the countries conducted consultations in selected districts, regions, provinces or zones as representative samples of entire countries followed by consultations and validation at the national level.

*Source: UNDG (2013)*

**Fostering Public-Private Partnerships**

“*Private business activity, investment and innovation are major drivers of productivity, inclusive economic growth and job creation. We acknowledge the diversity of the private sector, ranging from micro-enterprises to cooperatives to multinationals. We call on all businesses to apply their creativity and innovation to solving sustainable development*
challenges. We will foster a dynamic and well-functioning business sector, while protecting labour rights and environmental and health standards in accordance with relevant international standards and agreements and other on-going initiatives in this regard, such as the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights and the labour standards of ILO, the Convention on the Rights of the Child and key multilateral environmental agreements, for parties to those agreements.”

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (para 67)

Partnerships with the business sector will be a crucial part of implementing The 2030 Agenda. Businesses around the world have experience with integrating sustainable development and corporate social responsibility (CSR) principles into planning and reporting practices through the adoption of volunteer guidelines such as the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI 2015), the Carbon Disclosure Project (CDP 2015) and Greenhouse Gas Protocol, UN Global Compact (UN-GC 2015), the ‘Equality Means Business’ Women Empowerment Principles (UN Global Compact & UN Women, 2010), Principles for Responsible Investment, and the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (2011), and the Children’s Rights and Business Principles (2012), just to name a few. Most recently the World Business Council for Sustainable Development in partnership with the Global Reporting Initiative and the UN Global Compact have created the ‘SDG Compass’ to provide “guidance for companies on how they can align their strategies as well as measure and manage their contribution to the realization of the SDGs (WBCSD 2015).”

The innovativeness of the private sector can bring new insights to the solution of systemic sustainable development issues. Also the ubiquitous nature of supply chains and the potential to align industries and corporates’ core business strategies and operations with the SDGs, represent leverage points for scaling up the impact of sustainability practices and advancing human rights, with special attention to the most vulnerable groups, including children, young people and women. In this regard, business has a critical role to play in minimizing their negative impact and maximizing their positive social contribution to respecting, protecting and promoting human and children’s rights in the workplace, marketplace and community. Thus, combined with the investment potential of the private sector in driving local, sub-national, national and global development, the necessity of public-private partnerships for implementing The 2030 Agenda is clear.

Given this context, Member States with the support of UNCTs where required can endeavor to include the private sector in advocacy and awareness raising efforts (Section B1) and as valued stakeholders in adapting SDGs to national, sub-national and local contexts (Section B3), creating horizontal and vertical policy coherence (Sections B4 and B5), budgeting for the future (Section B6), monitoring, reporting and accountability (Section B7), and in assessing risk and fostering adaptability of plans and policies (Section B8).

Innovative Case Example:
Public-Private Partnerships: UNEP/GEF’s en.Lighten – A Global Efficient Lighting Partnership

The initiative is a public/private partnership between the United Nations Environment Programme, OSRAM and Philips Lighting, with the support of the Global Environment Facility. The National Lighting Test Centre of China became a partner in 2011 and the Australian Government joined to support developing countries in Southeast Asia and the Pacific in 2013.
Interested countries make a dedicated pledge signaling the intent to work with *en.lighten* to design and implement a set of policies and approaches that will enable the transition to energy-efficient lighting quickly and cost-effectively. Emphasis is placed on an integrated approach for designing policy measures so that the transition can be sustained by the domestic market without continued external support or resources.

*Source: UNEP-GEF (2015).*

From the philanthropic perspective, this is a diverse sector that is growing and expanding worldwide, yet it is not connected to global and national development processes (UNDP 2016). To bridge this gap the SDG Philanthropy Platform was created as a “global initiative that foundations and philanthropists with knowledge and networks that can deepen collaboration, leverage resources and sustain impact. The Platform acts as a facilitator, connecting philanthropic organizations to each other and to key stakeholders, processes and policies driving SDG delivery within national development planning (UNDP (2016)).” It is currently implemented in Kenya, Ghana, Indonesia, Colombia, Zambia and the US (without UNDP), with expansion planned to India and the MENA region in 2017. A Guide for country offices of why and how to engage philanthropy using the SDG Philanthropy Platform is available (UNDP 2016).

**Toolkit**

*UNDG National Consultation Guidelines*

In 2012 the UNDG issued national consultation guidelines for UN Country Teams to “facilitate post-2015 consultations ...to stimulate discussion amongst national stakeholders, and to garner inputs and ideas for a shared global vision of *The Future We Want.*” These guidelines can be of use today in a country’s efforts to engage multiple stakeholders in a dialogue on how to improve an existing national strategy or plan through the integration of the global SDGs. The process-related guidance included the following areas (UNDG 2012):

- **Whom to engage?** (a) Identifying stakeholders, (b) Considerations for selecting stakeholders
- **How to engage?** Preparing an inclusive consultation. (a) Questions to ensure inclusiveness and accountability when planning, (b) Format (or ‘shape’) of the consultation process, (c) Designing of consultation activities
- **Which method should be used?**
- **The role of the facilitator**
- **Logistics:** Preparing a consultation. (a) Preparations, (b) Venue of meeting, (c) Post-consultation

**Human Rights Guidance**


Children’s Rights and Business Principles. UNICEF, Global Compact, Save the Children (2012). This initiative provides a child rights lens and framework to business’ role in sustainable development, guiding companies on the full range of actions they can take in the workplace, marketplace and community to respect and support children’s rights. The related toolkit provides a set of resources and tools for implementation (Children’s Rights and Business Principles (2012)).

Information Report of the European Economic and Social Committee on CSO Involvement in the Post-2015 Development Agenda at the EU Level

The EESC information report on civil society involvement in the Post-2015 Development Agenda at the EU level provides guidance that is relevant to any country (EESC 2016).

Knowledge and experience sharing resources for multi-stakeholder engagement

- OpenSDGclub.Berlin: international forum for multi-stakeholder discussion on the mainstreaming and implementation of the 2030 Agenda and SDGs, hosted by the German Council for Sustainable Development (RNE 2016).
- The Sustainable Development Transition Forum: Annual forum for national governments and other stakeholders on the mainstreaming and implementation of the 2030 Agenda and SDGs, hosted by the United Nations Office for Sustainable Development in Incheon, Republic of Korea (UNOSD 2016).
- European Environment and Sustainable Development Councils: network of advisory bodies established by national or regional governments in Europe (EEAC 2016).
- The Global Network of National Councils for Sustainable Development and Similar Bodies: aims to help strengthen national level sustainable development bodies through information exchange and collaboration. Operated by the UK-based Stakeholder Forum for a Sustainable Future, the network’s website maintains a global database of existing national councils or similar bodies and provides links to useful research and guidance (GN-NCSDS 2015).

Mainstreaming SDGs in Business

- The SDG Compass (WBCSD 2015)
- Universality and the SDGs: A business perspective (SDGF 2016)
- (g7+ 2014, IDPS 2016). See Section B8 for more detail.
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Section B3: Adapting SDGs to National, Sub-national and Local Contexts

Purpose

“The SDGs and targets are integrated and indivisible, global in nature and universally applicable, taking into account different national realities, capacities and levels of development and respecting national policies and priorities. Targets are defined as aspirational and global, with each government setting its own national targets guided by the global level of ambition but taking into account national circumstances. Each government will also decide how these aspirational and global targets should be incorporated in national planning processes, policies and strategies. It is important to recognize the link between sustainable development and other relevant ongoing processes in the economic, social and environmental fields.”

“We will implement the Agenda for the full benefit of all, for today’s generation and for future generations. In doing so, we reaffirm our commitment to international law and emphasize that the Agenda is to be implemented in a manner that is consistent with the rights and obligations of states under international law.”

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (UN 2015)

As the excerpt from The 2030 Agenda describes, the SDGs and targets are aspirational and global with each government called to: (a) decide how the SDGs should be incorporated into national planning processes, policies and strategies; (b) set their own national targets guided by the global level of ambition, but taking into account national circumstances; and (c) in the implementation of the Agenda build on existing commitments and in accordance with international human rights standards for the full benefit of all. Appropriate tools will need to be developed to translate the international normative framework into practical instruments to support operations at the national level.

The purpose of this section is to provide guidance to UNCTs for assisting Member States in taking stock of how The 2030 Agenda and SDGs are currently reflected in the national development strategy and planning processes and to identify potential areas for change. It is important at this stage to help create a common understanding of how well existing national, sub-national and local development plans and sectoral strategies align – in content and ambition – against the comprehensive scope of The 2030 Agenda and SDGs. This will provide the basis for establishing criteria for enhancing national plans whilst avoiding an à la carte approach. It will also be critical throughout the tailoring process to ensure that implementation targets do not fall below existing international standards, including legally-binding human rights obligations (OHCHR 2006).

This guidance builds on Section B2 which deals with multi-stakeholder processes because adapting SDGs to national contexts is inherently a complex task, and as such, necessitates that multiple perspective are brought to bear in the process of doing so.

Guidance

Member States can undertake a process for comparing the content of existing national, sub-national and local development strategies and plans with the SDGs outlined in The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Doing so at all levels of government is important at this stage as it provides a map of the existing landscape of development strategies and plans across the country and creates a knowledge
base for providing guidance with regard to both vertical and horizontal policy integration and coherence (sections B4 and B5, respectively).

Adapting the SDGs to national contexts involves a multi-stage process whereby initial recommendations are made for addressing gaps and then undertaking a more in-depth systems analysis to prepare the foundation for creating policy coherence, identifying synergies and translating intermediate targets into national policy frameworks, including recognition of the interconnectedness of national, transnational, regional and global policy frameworks (by the country and on the country).

Specifically, the guidance offered in this section for UNCTs and Member States includes:

1. **Reviewing existing strategies and plans and identifying gaps**: to scan and detail the landscape of existing strategies and plans at the national, sub-national and local levels and then compare against the global SDGs and targets to identify gaps and provide the basis for recommending areas for adjustment;
2. **Mapping SDG interconnections**: for identifying and understanding potential co-benefits and trade-offs to inform strategies and priorities;
3. **Making initial recommendations to the leadership of the national government**: for addressing SDG gaps in existing strategies and plans whilst recognizing that the SDGs “...are integrated and indivisible and balance the three dimensions of sustainable development: the economic, social and environmental.”
4. **Setting nationally-relevant targets**: for nationally-adapted and inclusive SDGs that are achievable, yet ambitious; and
5. **Formulating strategy and plans using foresight and systems thinking**: to incorporate the recommendations and the insights from the above steps into strategies and plans and matching ambition and commitments with resources and capacities.

**Early Action for Reviewing Plans and Adapting SDGs**

Important in the early stage is a common understanding of how well existing national, sub-national and local development plans and sectoral strategies align – in content and ambition – against the comprehensive scope of The 2030 Agenda and SDGs. This will provide the basis for establishing criteria for enhancing national plans whilst avoiding an à la carte approach. Among the early country actions in this regard were:

- **Dominican Republic** – As part of the UN support to the new High Level Inter-institutional Sustainable Development Commission, the UN Country Team has started a Rapid Integrated Assessment to determine the level of preparedness of the country for the implementation of the agenda.
- **Georgia** – Prioritized 13 of the 17 SDGs and 79 global targets for the next 5-7 year period. Additionally, 40 targets were translated and adjusted into local ones, and 5 new national targets set.
- **Germany** – In 2015 the German Council for Sustainable Development (RNE) created an analysis spreadsheet for each SDG and engaged with experts to explore the question: Does the SDG address a topic that Germany is dealing with domestically? (RNE 2015)
- **Indonesia** – Performed a mapping exercise for the goals and targets of the national plan with the SDGs, finding that 108 out of 169 SDG targets are matched.
- **Mauritania** – Facilitated a rapid integrated SDG assessment of its Strategic Framework to Fight against Poverty to inform the formulation of Mauritania’s upcoming Strategy of Accelerated Growth and Shared Prosperity for the period 2016-2030, finding that 92 targets are currently prioritized.
- **Montenegro** – Adapted its new National Sustainable Development Strategy to align with the 2030 timeframe and compared it with the SDGs, revealing on average, about 78% of the SDGs and targets are taken up.
- **Morocco** – Thirty-five high-level panelists from the Parliament along with other agencies and stakeholders probed collectively into implementation challenges in the arenas of policy coherence, adequate financing, and monitoring and evaluation systems.
- **Sierra Leone** – Held a technical retreat to critically look at the SDGs against the landscape of existing strategies and plans, including the Agenda for Prosperity and the three-year rolling Medium Term Expenditure Framework, and to draft an SDGs Adaptation Report.
- **Turkmenistan** – Hosted national consultations to assess the relevance of the global SDG targets and indicators to national context.

*Source: UNDG (2016), or as otherwise noted.*

**Reviewing Existing Strategies and Plans and Identifying Gaps**

The task of reviewing existing strategies and plans and identifying areas for change can be viewed as a two-step process involving: (a) scanning and detailing the landscape of existing strategies and plans; and (b) comparing existing goals and targets with the global SDGs and targets.

**A) Scanning and Detailing the Landscape of Existing Strategies and Plans:** Most countries today have some form of national strategy or plan. The common types of plans are:

- **National Level**: Long-term national vision / national development plan or strategy / Medium-term development plan / National strategy for sustainable development (NSDS) / National economic plan or green economy plan / National human rights action plan (NHRAP) / Poverty reduction strategy (PRSP) / Annual budget plan / Sector strategies / Regional strategies / Medium Term Expenditure and Financing Frameworks (MTEFFs) / International and regional commitments;
- **Sub-national Level**: Development plan / Sustainable development strategy / Economic plan or green economy plan; and
- **Local Level**: Municipal plan / Local Agenda 21 or sustainable development strategy / Community quality of life, wellbeing, or sustainability indicators.

UNCTs could work with Member States to review existing strategies and plans to help identify where multiple strategies could be merged into one integrated plan, as in the case of Belize (see Innovative Case Example below); to explore how existing environmentally-focused sustainable development strategies could be broadened to also cover social and economic dimensions; to identify and eliminate implementation bottlenecks, to look at ways to ensure that no group is “left behind”, and illuminate key synergies between national and sub-national goals.
Innovative Case Example:
Merger of Development Plans in Belize

In the process of considering future SDG implementation in Belize through a collaboration among the Government of Belize and UNDESA & UNDP, the country’s Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy was merged with the National Sustainable Development Strategy into one unified and coherent strategy and planning process now called the Growth and Sustainable Development Strategy.

Source: UNDESA & UNDP (in UNDESA-DSD 2015a)

UNCTs and Member States can undertake, ideally as part of the Introductory Workshop Series introduced in Section B1, a scan of existing plans and strategies. This provides a hands on participatory exercise that stakeholders at the national, sub-national and local levels can do as a way to better understand the content and level of inclusion of the SDGs as well as their own plans. The UNITAR Post-2015 National Briefing Package (module 6, slides 55-60) provides a rough guide and template for doing such a scan of existing plans and strategies. Section B3 on Applying Multi-stakeholder Approaches provides guidance on the identification and engagement of stakeholder groups.

Information from sources such as Multi-lateral Environmental Agreements and recommendations made to a country by UN human rights mechanisms (such as the UPR) are valuable sources of information on the existing environmental and human rights commitments, including in relation to specific groups (such as women, children, and persons with disabilities) and specific issues (such as education, health, access to justice). Human rights recommendations can also help identify which groups are “being left behind” (OHCHR, Universal Human Rights Index).

B) Comparing Existing Goals and Targets with the Global SDGs and Targets: Using multi-stakeholder approaches (Section B3), Governments can undertake an analysis comparing the goals and targets and their outreach contained in existing development plans to those in the SDGs in order to assess areas of compatibility or conflict as well as any gaps in content as well as outreach to vulnerable groups. This could be done at both the goal level (17 goals), and the target level (169 targets).

Comparisons at the goal level can ideally be accomplished as part of the Introductory Workshop Series introduced in Section B1, as an extension to the participatory scanning exercise described above. Such an exercise not only sensitizes stakeholders at the national, sub-national and local levels to the content and coverage of the SDGs, but also amplifies the content of their own plans.

The Rapid Integrated Assessment tool developed by UNDP supports countries to review the national and sub-national development plans and relevant sector strategies, and provides an indicative overview of the level of alignment with the SDG targets. It also helps examine whether the interlinkages across goals and targets are reflected in the country’s development plans and strategies. See the innovative case example below for more detail.

UNITAR’s National Briefings Package provides a simple tabular tool that stakeholders in a workshop setting can apply to make comparisons at the goal level between SDGs and existing plans (see slide 64 of module 6; Note that this requires participants to have access to a copy of their own plan during the workshop to use as a basis for the exercise).
A comparative analysis can also be undertaken at the target level. This is perhaps the most important aspect for policymaking. Given the large number of targets (169) supporting the 17 SDGs this analysis is best done at an expert working group level, rather than as part of a general participatory workshop setting described previously for the goal level.

**Innovative Case Example:**

**Rapid Integrated Assessment Tool.**

UNDP’s “Rapid Integrated Assessment” tool assists countries in mainstreaming SDGs into national development plans. It maps SDG targets against national (and sub-national) priorities to assess the degree of alignment of the two; offers an entry point for countries to consider their national priorities against global commitments and to reflect these commitments into their national planning; and examines whether the interlinkages across SDGs and targets are reflected in the country’s development plans and strategies.

The tool has been applied in more than 15 countries as of December 2016, including in Bhutan, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Dominican Republic, Democratic Republic of Congo, India (Haryana), Jamaica, Kazakhstan, Liberia, Mauritania, Mexico, Madagascar, Mauritius, Namibia, Tajikistan and Tonga. These exercises have been quite influential. In Bhutan, the RIA analysis is helping the government develop a social protection policy to ensure that no one is left behind. In Cambodia and Liberia, the RIA analyses are informing the mid-term review of the National Development Plan. In the Democratic Republic of Congo, the RIA has been integrated into the national report on mainstreaming the SDGs. The report has been validated by the government and is pending approval by parliament. In Jamaica, the RIA validated the planning approach of the government embodied in its Vision 2030, and helped identify four entry points for accelerating the implementation of the 2030 Agenda in an integrated way, with a focus of leaving no one behind.

**SDG Profile - All Planning Docs**

*Note: The diagram shows that out of 115 global SDG targets relevant to Jamaica, 105 are fully or partially reflected in all planning documents and sectoral strategies of Jamaica.*

*Source: UNDP, Bureau for Policy and Programme Support.*
Specific tools have also been created recently that can take the comparative analysis even further. For example, the U.K.-based Stakeholder Forum developed an SDG Scorecard that can serve as a tool “to illuminate a national conversation or consultation with stakeholders about the relative applicability of the different goals and targets in that country, so as to focus implementation strategies and action plans around the highest priority elements.” The scorecard enables an expert to assess each global SDG target against each of the three following categories:

- **Applicability**: Is it relevant to domestic challenges and related public policy? Is it there already domestic action or policy relevant to the goal/target?
- **Implementability**: Is the goal/target realistically achievable within the timeframe outlined? Can the goal/target be easily translated into action at the national level? Is the necessary data currently available? and
- **Transformationalism**: Is the framework more ambitious than the mere continuation of current trends? Will the achievement of the goal/target result in more sustainable outcomes both domestically and globally? Does the goal/target address the root causes and drivers of the identified challenges?

The Sustainability Analysis Grid Tool developed by the éco-conseil de l’Université du Québec à Chicoutimi is another such tool that can be used to assess SDGs in a national context (éco-conseil 2015).

A clear understanding of the SDGs and their associated targets is necessary for any comparative analysis. Efforts are underway in the context of many of the goals to help provide a common understanding of specific goals and targets. The climate agreement reached at the 21st Conference of the Parties (COP21) of the Framework Convention on Climate Change is one notable example. Other examples include the Education 2030 Framework for Action and the Cairo Declaration on Gender Equality. See the Innovative Case Examples below for more information.

**Innovative Case Example:**

**Education 2030 Framework for Action**

Building on broad consultations with the education community over the past three years, the Education 2030 Framework for Action (FFA) was developed by UNESCO in close consultation with the Education for All Steering Committee, composed of representatives from Member States, UN agencies, multilateral organisations, NGOs, the teaching profession and the private sector.

The FFA provides guidance on the implementation of Education 2030 which is encapsulated in SDG 4. The FFA aims at creating a common understanding of the global education targets. Recognizing that country-led action will drive change, the FFA recommends that governments ‘translate global targets into achievable national targets based on their education priorities, national development strategies and plans, the ways their education systems are organized, their institutional capacity and
the availability of resources. This requires establishing appropriate intermediate benchmarks (e.g. for 2020 and 2025) through an inclusive process, with full transparency and accountability, engaging all partners so there is country ownership and common understanding.

Intermediate benchmarks can be set for each target to serve as quantitative goalposts for review of global progress vis-à-vis the longer-term goals. Such benchmarks should build on existing reporting mechanisms, as appropriate. Intermediate benchmarks are indispensable for addressing the accountability deficit associated with longer-term targets.'

Source: UNESCO (2015)

Innovative Case Example:
The Cairo Declaration – A Regional Commitment to Gender Equality

In a region where many countries have reservations to The Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), brokering government commitment to the gender equality agenda – and doing this through a consultative process with input from civil society – is a success that resulted in the Cairo Declaration by the Arab League. The Declaration is the single most comprehensive document on gender equality in the Arab region, and was followed up with an action plan to guide implementation, calling for empowered Arab states to achieve and guarantee all women’s rights at all levels and during all stages of life by 2030. Equality will be established between men and women within the context of achieving the goals of the post-2015 development agenda.

The action plan, adopted by the League of Arab States, has eight key outcome areas committing member states to: 1) create a more gender sensitive legislative environment; 2) mainstreaming gender in all planning, policies and budgets; 3) increase women’s participation in decision making by 30%; 4) a 50% increase in women’s participation in the labor market; 5) access to social protection and services, including health, education and legal aid; 6) free women and girls from violence, while ensuring access to services for those who are affected by violence; 7) establishing national frameworks for women, peace and security, and; 8) establishing national frameworks to protect women and girls in humanitarian emergencies, and to address terrorism and insecurities.

Source: UN Women

Mapping SDG Interconnections

Maintaining the integrity of the SDGs is a critical part of implementing the 2030 Agenda. The 17 SDGs are indeed “indivisible” and “balance the three dimensions of sustainable development.” As such there is considerable benefit to understanding the system of SDG interconnections in a national context.

In 2015 UNDESA used social network analysis to map the interconnectedness of the 17 SDGs and its 169 targets (see the Innovative Case Example below, UNDESA 2015b). The global analysis undertaken by UNDESA can provide a generic template from which Member States and UNCTs could perform a similar analysis from a national perspective, providing key insights for priority setting and strategy development, as well as helping to foster policy coherence (Section B4) through the identification of important stakeholders (UNOSD 2016).
Using network analysis techniques, UNDESA revealed that the SDGs and targets can be seen as a network, in which links among goals exist through targets that refer to multiple goals.

“Because of these connections, the structure of the set of SDGs has implications for policy integration and coherence across areas. For many of the thematic areas covered by the SDGs, targets relating to those areas are found not only under their namesake goal (when it exists), but across a range of other goals as well. In designing and monitoring their work, agencies concerned with a specific goal (e.g. education, health, economic growth) will have to take into account targets that refer to other goals, which, due to the normative clout of the SDGs for development work coming forward, may provide stronger incentives than in the past for cross-sector, integrated work. Similarly, for institutions concerned with monitoring and evaluation of progress under the goals, it will be necessary to look at multiple goals – indeed, all those which include targets referring to one institution’s area of interest. This may enable greater integration across goals.”

Source: UNDESA (2015b)

The Toolkit at the end of this Section lists a variety of ‘mind mapping’ and ‘outcome mapping’ tools that can be used by UNCTs and Member States to map the system of SDG interconnections and identify leverage points where multiple co-benefits could be realized or where important trade-offs need to be understood. These tools are best used in a multi-stakeholder setting where multiple perspectives can inform the identification of key interconnections. The Theory of Change online tool (TOCO) is one such tool and is featured below.
Innovative Case Example

Theory of Change Online Tool

The ‘Theory of Change’ online tool (TOCO) can be used to help identify the system of interconnections across the 17 SDGs (UNOSD 2016). Theory of Change is described as follows: “...a comprehensive description and illustration of how and why a desired change is expected to happen in a particular context. It is focused in particular on mapping out or “filling in” what has been described as the “missing middle” between what a program or change initiative does (its activities or interventions) and how these lead to desired goals being achieved (Source: Center for Theory of Change 2016a).”

Theory of Change is used by development organizations such as UNICEF and is also recommended by the UN Development Group in the crafting of UN Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDG 2016). A cloud-based TOCO has been created by the Center for Theory of Change to assist development practitioners in mapping outcome frameworks (Center for Theory of Change 2016b) and can be used to facilitate multi-stakeholder workshops for mapping interconnections among SDGs.

Making Initial SDG Recommendations to Leadership of the National Government

With a review in hand of how the goals of existing national strategies and plans already support the SDGs as well as any gaps, and a mapping of key SDG interconnections, government officials and stakeholders can explore initial narrative recommendations to the leadership of their national government relating to how the comprehensive scope of the SDGs across economic, social and environmental dimensions can help reach long-term national development objectives and how existing national plans could be augmented to support the SDGs and targets. This requires a good understanding of the current and evolving political process in respective countries by all stakeholders.

The kind of recommendations that are referred to here are about suggesting ways forward that help ensure that the integrity of the 2030 Agenda is maintained at national level in that the SDGs “...are integrated and indivisible and balance the three dimensions of sustainable development: the economic, social and environmental” (2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development). While it will most likely be the case that governments will need to set priorities to achieve their nationally adapted targets over time, the recommendations that emerge out of a comparison of existing national plans and the SDGs (including all their targets) should aim at providing a foundation for both medium and long-term plans that are dedicated to unlocking the synergies of progress across all three dimensions of sustainable development, with a particular eye to leaving no one behind.

The exploration and formulation of recommendations delivered to leadership should address not only the substantive issues relating to the need for new or revised goals and targets, but also issues related to the means of implementation. This could include recommendations such as the integration of two separate planning tracks, as in the case of Belize (see previous Innovative Case Example), or how to bring the SDGs directly into the next national planning cycle, as in the case of Uganda (see Innovative Case Example Below).
Innovative Case Example:

SDG Integration in Uganda’s Second National Development Plan

In its 2nd National Development Planning process in support of the country’s Vision 2040, the Government of Uganda discovered that the SDGs “offered an initial framework through which different sectors could trace their linkages to the national priority areas (in UNDESA-DSD 2015a).” “SDGs were included directly in Chapter 3 of the NDPII that sets out the broader context for Ugandan development strategies. An important share of SDG targets was adjusted to national circumstances and included in the NDPII results framework. The Government is planning to further incorporate SDG targets and indicators in a more detailed results framework and refine it using the SDGs structure (in UNITAR 2015a).”

[Diagram: Mainstreaming the SDGs into Ugandan NDPII]

Given the complexity inherent in the task of making recommendations for SDG integration, a multi-stakeholder body or forum is uniquely able to deliver both the credibility and legitimacy of a diverse set of views in a timely and cost-effective manner.

The case of Germany, featured below, illustrates how recommendations for adapting The 2030 Agenda and SDGs to the national context were explored, formulated and delivered by the independent German National Council for Sustainable Development (RNE). These recommendations addressed both means of implementation as well as specific recommendations to change their National Sustainable Development Strategy to revise existing goals and create new ones to help deliver the SDGs nationally and globally.

Innovative Case Example:

SDG Recommendations to the German Government

In 2015 the German Council for Sustainable Development (RNE) submitted its statement on ‘Germany's Sustainability Architecture and the SDGs’ to the federal government. The content of the recommendation report included the following areas:

- **General**: 2 recommendations dealing with the publishing of the recommendations and broadening the public debate on sustainable development
Setting Nationally-Relevant Targets

Adapting the SDGs to national contexts inherently involves Member States setting their own targets guided by the level of ambition of the global SDGs and targets, but taking into account national circumstances. UNCTs can assist Member States with general guidance for target setting in relation to the guidance offered below.

Setting time-bound targets requires the identification of specific indicators and an understanding of the level and disaggregation of measurement for those indicators. At the global level, the SDGs and targets will be followed-up and reviewed using a set of global indicators proposed by the UN Statistical Commission's Inter Agency and Expert Group on SDG Indicators. Therefore target setting efforts by countries in the tailoring of SDGs to national contexts can be informed by this framework of indicators.

Additionally, The 2030 Agenda recognizes “that baseline data for several of the targets remain unavailable” and calls for “increased support for strengthening data collection and capacity building in Member States, to develop national and global baselines where they do not yet exist.” And through The 2030 Agenda, Member States “commit to addressing this gap in data collection so as to better inform the measurement of progress, in particular for those targets below which do not have clear numerical targets.”

The setting of targets for any specific indicator can be informed by several different types of criteria, for example (UNEP 2007):

- **Benchmarks**: Comparison with a documented best-case performance related to the same variable within another entity or jurisdiction;
- **Thresholds**: The value of a key variable that will elicit a fundamental and irreversible change in the behaviour of the system;
- **Principles**: A broadly defined and often formally accepted rule;
- **Standards**: Nationally and/or internationally accepted value (i.e., a water quality standard); and
Policy-specified: Determined in a political and/or technical process taking past performance and desirable outcomes into account.

In most situations, target setting is an involved process that is both deliberative and analytical. For example, consider the logical framework for the process of setting targets used by the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe and the World Health Organization in the context of the Convention on the Protection and Use of Trans-boundary Watercourses and International Lakes. In this case, the process of setting targets begins with the identification of key stakeholders and proceeds with baseline analyses to inform the agreement of broad-based targets and further consultation to agree on specific targets.

Recognizing that threats to people’s survival, livelihood and dignity can vary considerably within countries and at different points in time, the human security approach can assist UNCTs and Member States to adapt national SDG implementation plans to specific sub-national and local contexts (UNTFHS 2015). While national-level indicators can overlook variance at the sub-national and local levels, based on people-centred and context-specific, comprehensive and prevention-oriented principles, the human security approach provides a set of tools to gather data on people’s actual needs, vulnerabilities and capacities that is disaggregated by region, gender, ethnic identity and religion, among others. The approach has led to inclusive and participatory processes which have revealed gaps in existing strategies and mismatches between local realities and national policies and programmes (see Innovative Case Example below). The approach works to strengthen synergies between national goals and actions at sub-national and local levels to ensure that nobody is left behind.

From: UNECE & WHO (2010)
Innovative Case Example:
Human Security in Theory and Practice

The national human development report in Benin, titled “Human Security and Human Development in Benin”, provides a practical example of the Human Security approach in action. Using the human security tools, a household survey greatly expanded the understanding of the challenges faced by communities in different regions to compliment the quantitative data gathered through the national Human Development Index. It provided additional information on the inter-related challenges people face in their daily lives and highlighted their uneven distribution across the country and between the different segments of the population. Subsequently, the report laid out a human security-based national development plan that enabled the Government and the UNCT to tailor national development priorities to diverse local contexts.

Furthermore, in support of national development and stabilization efforts in Egypt, UNIDO, UN Women, UN-HABITAT, ILO and IOM, in close partnership with the local Government, are applying the human security approach through a joint programme in the Minya Governate, a region often overlooked by national development initiatives. Local “Human Security Forums” have been established as means to integrate national development strategies and tailor their implementation to the local context. These inclusive Forums provide a unique opportunity for communities to participate in setting local priorities and defining local development strategies as well as a conduit to link local and sub-national agendas with national development plans.

Source: United Nations Human Security Unit

Formulating Strategies and Plans Using Foresight and Systems Thinking

This step involves the obvious, yet challenging task of incorporating the relevant SDG gap recommendations into the national development plan and supporting sector plans. Every Member State has in place their own procedures for creating a national strategy or plan, and these should be the focus for implementing SDG recommendations. UNCTs could begin discussing with Member States how to incorporate systems thinking and foresight approaches and tools to help prioritize key policies, programmes and projects that have the greatest potential for systems-level change and realizing co-benefits across multiple issue areas.

Foresight is defined as “a systematic, participatory, future-intelligence-gathering and medium-to-long-term vision-building process aimed at enabling present-day decisions and mobilising joint actions (EC 2007).” The approach is often used in creating long-term strategies and plans and has four main characteristics, namely (EC 2007):

- **“Action-oriented**: Foresight is not only about analysing or contemplating future developments, but supporting actors to actively shape the future;
- **Open to alternative futures**: Foresight assumes that the future is not pre-determined. The future can therefore evolve in different directions, which can be shaped to some extent by the actions of various players and the decisions taken today. In other words, there is a certain degree of freedom to choose among the alternative, feasible futures, and hence increase the chance of arriving at the preferred (selected) future state;
- **Participatory**: Foresight is not done by a small group of experts or academics, but involves a number of different groups of actors concerned with the issues at stake. The results of the Foresight exercise are disseminated among a large audience from which feedback is actively sought; and
- **Multidisciplinary**: Foresight is based on the principle that the problems we face cannot be correctly understood if reduced to one dimension...Instead, Foresight provides an approach that
Backcasting is one type of foresight approach that is central to a strategic approach for sustainable development. It is a way of planning in which a successful outcome is imagined in the future, followed by the question: “what do we need to do today to reach that successful outcome? (The Natural Step 2016)” For more information see the Innovative Case Example below.

**Innovative Case Example**
**Backcasting for Sustainable Development**

In the context of sustainability, we can imagine an infinite number of scenarios for a sustainable society – and ‘backcasting from scenarios’ can be thought of as a jigsaw puzzle, in which we have a shared picture of where we want to go, and we put the pieces together to get there. However, getting large groups of people to agree on a desired future scenario is often all but impossible. Further, scenarios that are too specific may limit innovation, and distract our minds from the innovative, creative solutions necessary for sustainable development.

So strategic sustainable development relies on ‘backcasting from sustainability principles’ – which are based in science, and represent something we can all agree on: if these principles are violated, our global society is un-sustainable. To achieve a sustainable society, we know we have to not violate those principles – we don’t know exactly what that society will look like, but we can define success on a principle level. In that way, backcasting from principles is more like chess – we don’t know exactly what success will look like, but we know the principles of checkmate – and we go about playing the game in strategic ways, always keeping that vision of future success in mind.

*Source: from The Natural Step (2016)*

Systems thinking is a foundational approach for the pursuit of sustainable development. It “encompasses a large and fairly amorphous body of methods, tools, and principles, all orientated to looking at the interrelatedness of forces, and seeing them as part of a common process (Senge et al. 1994).” The SDG Mapping guidance described earlier in this section is a tool for systems thinking in the context of the SDGs.

As SDG implementation becomes more mature, there is growing interest in leveraging such systems thinking to help countries prioritize SDGs and make investment decisions. UN agencies are in the process of developing a number of tools that will assist in undertaking such exercises tailored to specific country contexts.
The case of Belize is a good example of the incorporation of systems thinking and foresight in the formulation of their national development plan (see Innovative Case Example below).

Innovative Case Example:
Systems Thinking and Strategy Formulation in Belize based on the VISIS Approach

UNDESA-DSD jointly with UNDP provided technical assistance to the Belize government in 2014-15 in relation to SDG integration. The open source and backcasting-based VISIS methodology (Vision > Indicators > Systems > Innovation > Strategy; Atkisson 2010) was used as a guide and as part of this process insights on key cause-and-effect linkages emerged yielding important policy linkages across immigration, health and environmental issues (Atkisson 2015).

Additionally, the Belize government created a multi-factor analysis tool to help prioritize actions that have the greatest potential for system-level change (see below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree to which an action is required in order to avoid near-term, systems-critical disruptions or missed opportunities</td>
<td>Degree to which an action leads to visible and measurable improvements in quality of life in the medium term</td>
<td>Extent to which resources (budgetary or external) have already been, or can be, committed to the action</td>
<td>Extent to which an action contributes, over time, to the integrated achievement of the Critical Success Factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High = Failure to implement the action in the near-term is likely to result in serious damage to the current and future prospects of Belize</td>
<td>Medium = The action will lead to quick, visible, and measurable improvements in quality of life for Belizeans</td>
<td>High = Funds and human resources are already allocated, can easily be allocated, or can (with high levels of certainty) be mobilized from extra-governmental sources</td>
<td>Medium = The action contributes to advancing one or two Critical Success Factors with little to no trade-off required regarding the other Critical Success Factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium = The action is desirable in the medium term and delay in implementation significantly increases the risk that objectives will not be met in a timely fashion</td>
<td>Medium = The action will have noticeable and measurable positive effect on quality of life in the medium term, but the effects will be more noticeable in subsequent periods</td>
<td>Medium = Resources are expected to be available for allocation, with lower levels of certainty</td>
<td>Low = The action contributes only one Critical Success Factor, at the expense of progress on (or at the cost of damage to) other Critical Success Factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low = The action can be postponed at low risk to the current and future prospects of Belize</td>
<td>Low = The positive effects of the action on quality of life will not be felt or be measurable until after the current planning period</td>
<td>Low = Political and economic circumstances make it very difficult to identify and/or allocate resources at this time</td>
<td>Low = The action advances only one Critical Success Factor, at the expense of progress on (or at the cost of damage to) other Critical Success Factors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: in UNITAR (2015a)
The importance of implementing cross-cutting programmes and policies was emphasized at the 2014 Sustainable Development Transition Forum hosted by the UN Office for Sustainable Development. Participants at this global forum agreed that “anticipating the very real challenges that all countries will face in securing adequate financing for sustainable development and the future fiscal pressures posed by climate change adaptation and recovery from economic shocks, doing more with less will become a basic operating principle in the decades ahead (UNOSD 2014).”

**Toolkit**

**UNITAR National Briefing Package**
- Scanning the landscape of existing strategies and plans: UNITAR Module 6, slides 55-60.
- Comparative analysis of SDGs and existing goals (goal level): UNITAR Module 6, slide 64.

**UNDP Rapid Integrated Assessment Tool**
This spreadsheet-based assessment tool provides an indicative overview of a country’s level of alignment with the 2030 Agenda through a gap analysis of SDG targets that are not prioritised in the current national development plans and strategies, and relevant sector strategies (UNDP, Bureau for Policy and Programme Support).

**SDG Scorecard**
Created by the U.K.-based Stakeholder Forum, the SDG Scorecard enables an assessment of each global SDG target in relation to its applicability, implementability and transformative potential in a national context (Stakeholder Forum 2015).

**Sustainability Analysis Grid Tool**
Advanced tools have been developed over the years for analysing existing plans and projects for their alignment with sustainability principles, and some of these have already been customized to work with the SDGs. For example, éco-conseil de l’Université du Québec à Chicoutimi, has developed the *Sustainability Analysis Grid* tool (éco-conseil 2015). This tool was featured at the 2015 UNDESA Workshop on Integrated Approaches to Sustainable Development (UNDESA-DSD 2015a) and is being adapted for application to SDGs at the national level (Villeneuve 2015).

**Mapping SDG Interconnections**
- UNDESA’s SDG Interconnection Map (UNDESA 2015b).
- Theory of Change Online Tool (TOCO) (Center for Theory of Change 2016b)
- Mindjet (2016)
- iMindMap (2016)

**Logical Framework for the Process of Setting Targets**

**Human Security Analysis Guidance**
Foresight and Systems Thinking for Strategy Formulation

- **VISIS (Vision > Indicators > Systems > Innovation > Strategy)** is “an open-source methodology for inter-disciplinary collaboration in the context of sustainable development (Atkisson 2015; Atkisson 2010).”
- Belize’s Multi-Factor Analysis Tool for Action Prioritization (UNITAR 2015a).
- Backcasting using the Natural Step (The Natural Step 2016)

**Human Rights Guidance**

- UN Common Learning Package on HRBA to Programming (UNDG-Human Rights Working Group 2011)
- The UN Practitioners’ Portal on Human Rights Based Approaches to Programming (www.hrbaportal.org)

**Gender Mainstreaming Guidance**

- Repository of gender mainstreaming policies in UN System entities (UN Women, 2015).
- Repository of tools and resources for gender mainstreaming (UN Women, 2015).

**Decent Work Guidance**

- UN CEB Toolkit for Mainstreaming Employment and Decent Work: Country Level Application (ILO 2007). The CEB Toolkit is under review with regard to updating requirements on SDGs.
- The assessment of the country situation in the rights-based perspective should also include the ILO Conventions ratification status, which can be accessed via the NATLEX Database (ILO 2015)
- Social protection floor initiative and social protection assessment based national dialogues (ILO 2014)

**Education Guidance**
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Section B4: Creating Horizontal Policy Coherence (breaking the silos)

Purpose

“The challenges and commitments contained in these major conferences and summits are interrelated and call for integrated solutions. To address them effectively, a new approach is needed. Sustainable development recognizes that eradicating poverty in all its forms and dimensions, combatting inequality within and among countries, preserving the planet, creating sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth and fostering social inclusion are linked to each other and are interdependent.”

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (UN 2015)

The purpose of this section is to heed The 2030 Agenda’s call ‘for integrated solutions’ by featuring guidance and tools that connect and break down traditional sector silos and create horizontal policy coherence, integration and partnerships. This is relevant to all levels of governance: national, sub-national and local.

Guidance

There is for the most part, a shared understanding of the inherent interconnectedness and complexity of sustainable development. But what has remained mostly elusive over the years is how to deal with this reality. How do we undertake strategy-making, planning and policy-making that is based in systems thinking and delivers an integrated view?

Fortunately, some very useful approaches and tools have been developed over the past decades since the 1992 Earth Summit. But they require considerable effort and strong leadership to apply, and for that reason, their application in development planning is still somewhat limited. The 2030 Agenda is telling us that time is of the essence on most critical issues (see quotation above) – it is asking us to urgently roll up our sleeves, so-to-speak, and to use ‘integrated solutions’ with ‘new approaches.’

The guidance provided in this section for creating horizontal policy coherence, integration and partnerships is three-fold:

1. **Integrated policy analysis**: to ensure that proposed policies, programmes and targets are supportive of nationally-adapted SDGs;
2. **Coordinated institutional mechanisms**: to create formal partnerships across sectoral line ministries and agencies;
3. **Integrated modelling**: to help clarify and articulate the interconnected system of goals and targets and to analyse and inform key policies, programs and projects for their impact on nationally-adapted SDGs.

**Early Action for Horizontal Coordination**

Early country action toward mainstreaming the 2030 Agenda has placed renewed focused on institutional arrangements. For example:

- **Brazil** – A Task Force on Agenda 2030 was established in 2014 with the aim to facilitate close cooperation with between the Brazilian federal government and UN agencies on the issues of the new Agenda, especially on the SDGs and indicators.
- **Georgia** – The Government Planning & Innovations unit led the nationalization process and horizontal policy coordination, while the Donor Coordination Unit led interface between the government administration and international organizations. The head of the government’s *Policy Coherence Unit* was engaged in the nationalization process.

- **Montenegro** – National Council for Sustainable Development and Climate Change made the decision to modify the planned revision of the 2007 National Strategy for Sustainable Development (NSSD) to include a longer time horizon congruent with the 2030 Agenda.

- **Pakistan** – Established *SDG Support Units* at the federal level with UN assistance, along with creating the *SDG Secretariat* within Parliament.

- **Somalia** – *National Development Council* discusses progress of the National Development Plan and serves as a high level coordination forum and premier "technocratic" platform for policy discussions on such issues as improvement in the aid coordination model and the localisation of SDGs.

- **Uganda** – Established a *National SDG Task Force* which is informed by *Technical Working Groups* and *Sector Working Groups*. A parallel coordination structure was also created within the UNCT.

*Source: UNDG (2016)*

**Integrated Policy Analysis**

Integrated policy analysis is an approach that UNCTs could share with Member States as a means to screen policy and programme proposals for their potential to either benefit or negatively impact on specific national issues of concern. The approach then ideally asks for policy revisions before they can be submitted to cabinet for approval.

Two countries in particular provide good examples and guidance for integrated policy analysis: Bhutan and Switzerland. Consider first Bhutan’s *Gross National Happiness Policy Screening Tool*, featured in the Innovative Case Example below.

**Innovative Case Example:**

**Application of Bhutan’s GNH Policy Screening Tool**

Gross National Happiness (GNH) comprises four pillars and nine domains and is Bhutan’s “holistic and sustainable approach to development (GNH Centre 2015a).” The *GNH Policy Screening Tool* is used by the government’s Gross National Happiness Commission to “assess/review all draft policies, programmes and projects through a GNH lens” and furthermore, “[w]hilst it is not the determining factor for ultimately approving/endorsing policy, it highlights specific recommendations and feedback to review the policy within the scope of the 9 domains of GNH (GNH Centre, 2015b).”
“An intriguing example of the screening tool in action was the proposal for Bhutan’s accession to the WTO. Initially 19 of 24 GNHCS (Gross National Happiness Commission Secretariat) officers voted in favour of joining. After putting the policy through the Screening Tool, 19 officers voted against on the basis that the policy was not GNH favourable. To date Bhutan has not joined the WTO.”


Switzerland has a long history of applying integrated policy analysis methods in the form of ‘sustainability assessment (SA). The Federal Office for Spatial Development (ARE) provides guidelines and tools for SA which are “intended as instructions on how to evaluate Federal Government initiatives (laws, programmes, strategies, concepts and projects) to find out how they comply with the principles of sustainable development (ARE 2015a).” Accompanying the online SA guidelines is an MS Excel-based tool to help government officers to conduct assessments.

In addition, the Swiss ARE collaborated with representatives from 30 Swiss cantons and local municipalities to prepare guidelines for “assessing project sustainability at cantonal and municipal level (ARE 2015b).” The guidelines are available online and describe the benefits of assessment, how the sustainability assessment process can be initiated and provides assistance for choosing the right assessment tool (ARE 2015b).”

There are other types of integrated analysis tools that can be helpful for mainstreaming the 2030 Agenda. Institutional and Context Analysis (ICA) is one such example developed by UNDP to support SDG implementation. This tool is featured in the Innovative Case Example below.

Innovative Case Example
Institutional and Context Analysis

The Institutional and Context Analysis (ICA) tool helps reveal policy gaps, as well as various issues that prevent existing policies from being implemented. It can be used to identify the reasons for gaps between formal rules such as laws or regulations (or how things should work in theory) and informal ones (how things really work in practice), and to map those elements influencing the status quo. These could be political factors, cultural practices, or a specific bias in the application of legislation. It then looks at the various stakeholders at international, national and local levels that can influence events and practices with regard to a particular issue, and what kind of interests and incentives guide their actions.

The analysis leads to practical recommended actions with basis on the specific characteristics of the context in question, including political economy dimensions, and the profile of relevant stakeholders.

In Mongolia, the ICA showed that conflicts of interest within the national government and lobbying by the tobacco, alcohol and food industries made it difficult to implement policies leading to better health outcomes (SDG 3). Recommendations included engaging with private sector companies who had productivity losses as a result of lifestyle diseases, as using the analysis to advocate for tobacco and alcohol excise taxes vis-à-vis likeminded Members of Parliament.

In Ukraine, the ICA found that IMF requirements made it very difficult for the state to enact policies to facilitate job creation and fight tax evasion and illegal employment, but it also found that recently carried out reforms made it easy to start a new business as regulations were simplified. As a result, the analysis led to recommendations to scale up SME development in order to bring in people from the informal to the formal economy, and to form a working group with key economic sectors in public and private institutions to discuss a common employment policy.
In Sri Lanka, the ICA revealed that the challenges for SDG coordination are systemic and have their roots in de facto “power sharing” between the Prime Minister and the President. While this presented many practical challenges for the UNCT, the arrangement and the existence of “two centres of power” was key for stability and peace in the country.”

Source: UNDP (2017)

Another integrated analysis tool is the Framework for Cooperation for the system-wide application of Human Security (Framework for Cooperation) developed by the Inter-Agency Working Group on Human Security. This approach offers practical guidance on how to harness the potential of the human security approach in areas including implementation of The 2030 Agenda (UN-HSU 2015). The human security approach is people-centered, context-specific, comprehensive and prevention-oriented. The approach advances both top-down protection and bottom-up empowerment solutions. The Framework for Cooperation offers an analytical framework that advances comprehensive and integrated solutions and breaks through the conventional single-agency style of planning and programme implementation, and is a key tool for the United Nations system in supporting The 2030 Agenda’s call for integrated solutions.

Coordinated Institutional Mechanisms
Formalized institutional mechanisms in the form of inter-agency coordinating bodies are another key approach that UNCTs could discuss with Member States for purposes of creating horizontal policy coherence, integration and partnerships. With the involvement of the highest level offices in government (i.e., Prime Ministers and Presidents offices, Cabinet Offices), these coordinating institutions can serve to connect and break down silos across government.

Good practice examples in Bhutan, Finland and Colombia provide relevant guidance for this aspect. Bhutan’s Gross National Happiness (GNH) Commission is an example of an inter-agency coordinating body designed to foster horizontal coherence, integration and partnerships across government sectors. The GNH Commission is “the Government of Bhutan’s Planning Commission and is charged with ensuring that GNH is mainstreamed into government planning, policy making and implementation (GNH Centre 2015c).” The GNH Commission coordinates the country’s Five Year Plan (FYP) process and is composed of all ministry secretaries with planning officers that provide links between individual ministries and the GNH Commission (Bertelsmann Stiftung 2013b).

The inter-ministerial secretariat of the Finnish National Commission for Sustainable Development (FNCSD) is another example of an inter-agency coordinating body that facilitates horizontal policy coherence, integration and partnerships. Steered by the Ministry of the Environment, the secretariat “comprises of about 20 members from different ministries, each taking the lead in preparing themes within their area of expertise (ESDN 2015).” The secretariat facilitated horizontal coordination over the years, including striking a sub-committee for integrating multiple strategies from across government and other stakeholder groups (Bertelsmann Stiftung 2013c).

Innovative Case Example:
Colombia’s Horizontal Institutions
As an original champion of the SDGs in the run-up to Rio+20, Colombia has enjoyed early political commitment to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. This commitment gained momentum through involvement as a member of the Open Working Group and its SDGs consultations, and through its role in the Inter-Agency Expert Group on SDG indicators. This inherent
government commitment has enabled Colombia to make early progress on mainstreaming the 2030 Agenda.

Among Colombia’s new institutions for mainstreaming and implementing the 2030 Agenda are its High-level Inter-Institutional Commission for SDGs with a technical secretariat, technical committee and transverse and inter-sectorial working groups.

**Source:** UNDG and UNDP (2015)

**Integrated Modelling of the System of Interconnected Goals and Targets**

The 2030 Agenda states that the SDGs are “integrated and indivisible and balance the three dimensions of sustainable development: the economic, social and environmental.” This statement highlights the imperative of an integrated approach to contextualizing issues and planning, implementing and monitoring their solutions.

While the basic groundwork for adapting the SDGs to national context can be set through deliberative processes such as described above, adapting of specific targets requires more detailed analysis and deliberation. UNCTs could discuss with Member States approaches for: (i) ‘mapping’ the system of interconnections among a nation’s goals and targets (see Section B3); and (ii) support the mapping with integrated models to better understand and inform the setting of potential targets.

Government planning agencies can use integrated modelling tools to gain a systems-wide perspective on sustainable development issues to inform the setting or achievable and ambitious targets for plans and policies. A variety of integrated modelling tools are listed in the Toolkit at the end of this Section and described below.

UNDESA’s 2015 workshop on Integrated Approaches to Sustainable Development (IASD) hosted by the Division for Sustainable Development featured many such tools in its deliberations (Crawford 2015). For example, the Millennium Institute’s Threshold 21 model has been applied by governments in the national planning process to generate “scenarios describing the future consequences of the proposed strategies (MI 2015).” In Mali the T21 model was applied to support the country’s poverty reduction strategy and analyze the coherence between the strategy and the MDGs (MI 2015). In Kenya the model was used to analyze the risks of climate change on multiple economic sectors (MI 2011). A companion
model has recently been developed by the Millennium Institute, iSDG, which “simulates the fundamental trends for SDGs until 2030 under a business-as-usual scenario, and supports the analysis of relevant alternative scenarios (MI 2015).”

**Innovative Case Example:**

**The iSDG Integrated Simulation Tool**

The proper integration of policy interventions in different areas can make the difference between achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and failure. The Integrated model for Sustainable Development Goals strategies (iSDG) offers this capability.

The iSDG model enables policy makers and planning officials at all levels of governance to understand the interconnectedness of policies designed to achieve the SDGs and test their likely impacts before adopting them. An integrated analysis is required to successfully address complex development issues that balance social, economic, and environmental development. By bringing together the three dimensions of sustainable development into one framework, the iSDG model enables broad, cross-sector and long-term analyses of the impacts of alternative policies.

The model simulates the fundamental trends for SDGs until 2030 under a business-as-usual scenario, and supports the analysis of relevant alternative scenarios. It also traces the trends beyond the SDGs’ time span to 2050. The iSDG model is especially useful both in the early stages of policy design, to support scenario exploration, and in its advanced stage, when specific interventions designed for various sectors can be jointly simulated to assess their combined effect and the emerging synergies.

The model interface can be implemented in any language as requested and also supports running Montecarlo simulations and sensitivity analysis for those who prefer to work with probability distributions rather than deterministic scenarios.

*Source: MI (2016)*
Economy-wide models are another type of integrated modelling approach that governments can use (Sánchez 2015). Examples include the World Bank’s MAMS model (Maquette for MDG Simulations) which is a “dynamic Computable General Equilibrium (CGE) model that has been extended to cover the generation of outcomes in terms of growth, MDGs, and the educational make-up of the labor force, as well as the interaction of these outcomes with other aspects of economic performance (World Bank 2015).”

Additionally, UNDESA has made available online a suite of modelling tools for SDG analysis (UNDESA 2016, see the Tools section for more details). Supporting this suite of integrated models is an outreach training course developed by UNDESA, UNDP and academic partners to enhance understanding of how modelling tools can be used to unveil the interlinkages across different policy areas and their relevance for decision making as they engaged in the transformations sought by the 2030 Agenda (UNDP and UNDESA 2016).

**Innovative Case Example:**

**Decision Theatres – The Future of Evidence-based Policy-making**

There is a growing trend in the construction of ‘Decision Theaters’ for bringing together the benefits of integrated modelling with multi-stakeholder deliberation in a visually-immersive environment. Decision Theaters have been referred to as the future of evidence-based policy-making (Cornforth et al. 2014), with facilities operating in the United States (ASU 2015), Canada (UBC 2015), and China (HUST 2015).

**Decision Theater at Arizona State University**

Source: ASU (2015)

Arizona State University was a pioneer in the development of Decision Theaters. With two facilities situated in Arizona and Washington, D.C., ASU provides “meeting rooms with large-format displays and on-site computer systems, tools and personnel that can provide specialized geographic information systems (GIS), systems modeling, business intelligence, 3D spatial modeling and simulation (ASU 2015).” The ASU Decision Theater has assisted with a range of policy issues in the U.S. including pandemic preparedness, energy grid planning and sustainable water use.

**Toolkit**

UNITAR National Briefing Package

**Integrated Policy Analysis Tools**

- Bhutan GNH Policy Screening Tool (GNH Centre 2015b).
- Swiss Sustainability Assessment at Federal and Canton level (ARE 2015).

**Institutional Coordinating Mechanisms**

- Bhutan GNH Commission (GNH Centre 2015c).

**Integrated Models**

Some examples of integrated models include:

- Threshold 21 (T21, MI 2015) and iSDG (MI 2016)
- CLEWS – Climate, Land-use, Energy and Water Strategies (Howells et al. 2013)
- MAMS (World Bank 2015)
- Integrated micro-macro modeling (UNDESA 2013)
- Stella (ISEE 2016)
- DESA Modelling Tools for Sustainable Development (UNDESA 2016), including: (1) Economy-wide models based on national accounts and econometric knowledge; (2) Socio-economic micro-simulation to probe into detailed impacts of policies on issues related to social inclusion with a focus on the household or individual level; (3) Integrated assessment of climate, land, water, and energy systems (Clews); (4) the Energy Systems Dynamic Model to find the least cost energy infrastructure and generation mix under alternative policy scenarios and help assess the effects on emissions; and (5) the Universal Access to Electricity Model to find the lowest cost technology to give access to electricity to localities.

**Employment and labour market modelling**

- ILO Dynamic Social Accounting Matrix (ILO 2011)
- Computable General Equilibrium modelling of regional integration and labour market impacts (ADB and ILO 2014)

**Gender Mainstreaming Guidance**

- Gender Mainstreaming in Development Programming – A Guidance Note (UN Women 2014)

**Decision Theatres**

- Arizona State University Decision Theater in the U.S. (ASU 2015)
- Huazhong University of Science and Technology in China (HUST 2015)
- Decision Theatre at the Center for Interactive Research on Sustainability, University of British Columbia, Canada (UBC 2015)
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Section B5: Creating Vertical Policy Coherence (Glocalizing the Agenda)

Purpose

“Local and Regional Governments (LRGs) are critical for promoting inclusive sustainable development within their territories, and as such for the implementation of the post-2015 agenda.”

“Local strategic planning would allow a greater integration of the three pillars of development: social, economic and environmental. Likewise, further integration between urban and rural areas needs to be promoted, in order to foster greater territorial cohesion.”

Post-2015 Dialogues on Implementation (UNDG 2015)

Creating policy coherence, integration and partnerships in the vertical direction among governments, civil society, the private sector and other actors is the essential and complimentary aspect to the horizontality described in Section B4. ‘Glocalizing’ the agenda within a country is an imperative if the SDGs are to be realized with no one left behind in the 2030 timeframe. The word ‘glocal’ means reflecting both local and global considerations\(^\text{15}\). While examples of successful vertical coherence across national, sub-national and local governance scales around are not plentiful, the level of activity emanating from the local and sub-national levels towards achieving sustainable development, quality of life and wellbeing is abundant, in all corners of the globe (Bertelsmann Stiftung 2013c). And with this, we can be optimistic that mechanisms for creating vertical policy coherence and integration can indeed be realized.

Guidance

UNCTs can begin exploring with Member States the various mechanisms available for creating vertical policy coherence, integration and partnerships. The guidance provided in this section is five-fold, proposing the use of:

1. **Institutional coordinating mechanisms**: to foster partnerships and coordination across levels of government;
2. **Multi-stakeholder consultative bodies and forums**: to create partnership and coordination;
3. **Local Agenda 21s and networks**: for scaling up action for sustainable development at the local level;
4. **Monitoring and review at the local level**: as a means for localizing nationally-adapted SDGs;
5. **Impact assessment processes**: to ensure that nationally and locally-adapted SDGs are taken into consideration in large public and private development projects;
6. **Integrated modelling**: to explore the benefits and impacts of key national policies and programs at sub-national and local levels.

**Early Action for Vertical Coherence**

Examples of early action by countries in mainstreaming the SDGs at the sub-national and local levels include the following:

---

\(^{15}\) See Oxford Dictionaries at: [http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/glocal](http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/glocal)
• **Indonesia** – Riau Provincial Government, through its Planning Office collaborated with the UNDP and the Tanoto Foundation to localize the SDGs at the provincial and district level. The Provincial Government held its first multi-stakeholders’ consultation in May 2016 and has selected three districts to pioneer the SDG District Action Plan development.

• **Pakistan** – At the provincial level, the government has begun the process of integrating the SDGs, including establishing approaches for the analysis of Annual Development Plans to help identify gaps in progress and financial allocations.

• **Philippines** – At the subnational level, the Mindanao Subnational Offices of the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA) have passed a resolution requesting the establishment of an operational and integrated mechanism for the localization of the SDGs within the NEDA.

• **Somalia** – National Development Council is composed of the federal ministry of planning and regional planning ministries with participation of all regions. Consultation events were organised in each of the regions of the country.

• **Uganda** – Trained technical staff in Local Governments and undertook extensive quality assurance of draft sub-national plans to facilitate alignment with the National Development Plan and SDGs.

*Source: UNDG (2016)*

---

**Institutional Coordinating Mechanisms**

To promote vertical coherence and integration governments can create explicit institutional links between sustainable development strategies and supporting processes at the federal and sub-national levels.

In Austria for example, a common strategy framework was prepared in the form of the Federal-State Austrian Strategy for Sustainable Development (ÖSTRAT) with “the desire to combine the strengths of the state and federal levels in a common strategic and organizational framework (Austria 2015).” A number of vertical coordination mechanisms were put in place under this common framework, including: (i) an Expert Conference on Sustainability Coordinators; and (ii) Working Group on Distributed Sustainability Strategy (Local Agenda 21) which serves as a “platform of LA21 coordinators of the Länder and the federal government for the results-oriented implementation of the Joint Declaration on Local Agenda 21 in Austria (Austria 2015).”

**MDG Lessons**

**Integrating the MDGs into the local development context: Lao PDR**

Under the UNDP and UNCDF supported Governance and Public Administration Reform (GPAR) and Service Delivery project - the UNCDF’s District Development Fund (DDF) initiative lays out one structure that facilitated the integration of the MDGs into local development. Building on the core elements of the GPAR programme, the proposed approach for delivering MDG-based services to districts included the following elements:

- Building **legitimacy and commitment through wide awareness** in districts about the PM’s Orders on strengthening district administration, and plans, targets and tasks for each district to achieve the MDGs by 2015.
- Developing **capacity and carrying out field assessments** as well as preparing local responses including dialogue with kumbans on validating baseline conditions related to MDGs, applying
localized MDG planning tools and evidence based needs assessment and facilitating localized action plan preparations and resource allocation.

- Establishing **frameworks for providing and utilizing financial resources**, which would cover the provision and use of untied capital grants for expanding MDG-related infrastructure, provision and use of operational expenditure block grants to support MDG service delivery, use of scholarships, pensions, safety nets and social protection mechanisms for vulnerable households and individuals, implementation of the computerized National Accounting System, which will enable central monitoring of expenditures on real time basis, transparency and disclosure with local stakeholders, as well as comparative assessment with peers (other districts) on financial performance.

- Assigning tasks related to MDGs, and monitoring performance of district staff through clarification and revision of Job Descriptions, implementation of **Performance Management** and the use of Personnel Information Management System to support the above.

- Establishing a **One Door MDG Service Centre** to enable individuals and Village Chiefs to receive information and advice on support available under the MDGs, receive applications and plans for support like pensions, grants and sector services, and make suggestions and complaints on delays and difficulties.

- Disseminating information and creating linkages with external stakeholders including civil society, creating wide awareness and demand for services through community radio and access to information initiatives, forming village-level MDG Task Forces to address highly visible MDG issues, leveraging and delegating specific MDG-related tasks to CSOs depending on their strength, organizing progress reviews with kumban chiefs.

*Source: UNDP and UNCDF, Lao PDR.*

In Switzerland, the Swiss Federal Office for Sustainable Development (ARE) leads an array of horizontal and vertical coherence, integration and partnership mechanisms (ESDN 2012). For more information see the Innovative Case Example below.

**Innovative Case Example:**

**Swiss Vertical Coordination Across Federal, Canton and Municipal Levels**

Accountability and implementation of Switzerland’s sustainable development strategy uses institutional mechanisms for creating both vertical and horizontal coherence, integration and partnerships:

- The **Federal Council** has supreme political responsibility for Switzerland’s sustainability policy.

- The Federal Council gives the **Federal Office for Spatial Development** (ARE) the task of coordinating the implementation of a sustainability strategy (controlling implementation as well as performing monitoring and evaluation tasks) at federal level and also in collaboration with cantons, municipalities and other stakeholders.

- The **Interdepartmental Sustainable Development Committee** (ISDC) is headed by ARE. This committee furthers the Confederation’s sustainable development policy, and serves as a platform for sharing information on the Confederation’s numerous sustainability activities. Around 30 Swiss government agencies affiliated to ISDC perform tasks relevant to sustainable development.

- In the **Sustainable Development Forum**, ARE works closely with cantons and municipalities and promotes sustainability processes at cantonal, regional and local level.
Multi-stakeholder Consultative Bodies and Fora

Multi-stakeholder bodies can be leveraged by governments to create vertical policy coherence across levels of governance. The European Sustainable Development Network (ESDN) describes how consultative bodies have served as important vertical coordination mechanisms for sustainable development strategies and their implementation in Europe. It is noted that while consultative bodies “provide some platforms for coordination of policies between the political levels”, compared to the institutional mechanisms described above, “coordination is done more on a case-by-case or ad-hoc basis (either in a specific project or in a specific policy topic) (ESDN 2010).” For guidance on applying multi-stakeholder approaches, including consultative bodies and forums, see Section B2.

Innovative Case Example:
City to City – South-South Cooperation

City-to-city South South Cooperation has emerged as an effective way to share knowledge and solutions and contribute to the localization of the sustainable development agenda. The ILO and the United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG) have signed an agreement to promote bottom-up interventions responding to local needs to create decent jobs and boost local economic and social development. Recent activities have stimulated cooperation between Maputo (Mozambique), Durban (South Africa) and Belo Horizonte (Brazil) in the promotion of safe and health work environments in the informal economy.

Source: ILO (2013) City-to-City and South-South and Triangular Cooperation, Geneva

Local Agenda 21 Processes and Networks

A Local Agenda 21 is a concept for local sustainable development strategies born out of the 1992 Earth Summit. Through continued and increased support of Local Agenda 21 processes, national governments can realize a tremendous mechanism for creating vertical policy coherence.
Local Agenda 21s have achieved appreciable success in some countries over the past two decades. The Republic of Korea was an early adopter and by the year 2000 close to 86% of regional government units had adopted a Local Agenda 21, fostered in part by the country’s National Action Plan of Agenda 21 through financial and capacity support and the establishment of the Korean Council for Local Agenda 21 made up of local government officers to better co-ordinate the implementation process (Swanson et al. 2004).

Today an even greater level of success can be witnessed in Spain’s Basque Country. Udalsarea21 is a network of municipalities in Spain’s Basque country whose mission is to “promote the effective establishment of the Action Plans of the Local Agenda 21 and to integrate sustainability criteria in all the municipal management areas.” In 2000 the vast majority of municipalities had not initiated a local Agenda 21 plan of action; however, by 2010 through effective promotion and networking, 95% of municipalities had approved plans. Cited among the main reasons for the network’s success is “close coordination and alignment of Local Agenda 21 with supra-municipal policies” including the Basque Country’s EcoEuskadi Sustainable Development Strategy 2020 (Udalsarea21 2012).

Switzerland too has a vibrant Local Agenda 21 process (ESDN 2012) where 239 municipalities have sustainability processes ongoing, representing about 35% of the population (ARE 2015d).

**MDG Lessons**

**Localization of MDGs: Factors for Success and the Case of Albania**

Looking at the growing body of literature and case studies, four broad factors appear to be critical to the success of MDG localization efforts. These include:

- Involvement of non-state actors;
- Capacity at the local level;
- Coordination across development policies and strategies, and coherence between different levels of government; and
- Availability of financial resources.

**Albania: Strengthening Civil Society and Local Government Cooperation**

A rapid shift from a central party system to a multi-party democracy in 1991 introduced new concepts to the national and local governments and citizens of Albania. There was no tradition of citizen engagement in planning processes, and the idea of government being accountable for the services it provides was new.

SNV and UNDP supported local governments and civil society in participatory planning processes in a project with three distinct phases: first, a needs assessment was done; second, a package of capacity development interventions. Among the lessons learned from the initiative were the following:

- Partnerships for capacity development can only be successful if they put the client’s interest first – in this case, the local governments and CSOs in Albania. Furthermore, a thorough capacity assessment is crucial to develop a full understanding of the needs, and to ensure that any support that is provided is demand driven.
- A key factor in the success of this project was the willingness of regional and municipal governments to enter into a constructive dialogue with CSOs to engage in more participatory planning processes. The government, however, did not know how to find the right entry points to consult with the people. The CSO networks could provide such entry points.
The project approach of working with and relying on local partners (CSOs and CSDCs) to bring in local knowledge and expertise proved very successful in understanding the capacity constraints and strengths of local non-state actors. The choice of civil society partners was crucial. Credibility in the eyes of local government was essential to gain their confidence in the process, which is a prerequisite for institutionalization of consultative mechanisms between civil society and local government. Furthermore, the approach of working with local organizations to support the capacity development of civil society builds confidence among local actors, and invests in the long-term sustainability of capacity development interventions.

In Albania, the long-term presence of SNV in Fier and Peshkopi contributed to the success of the programme. Local authorities and civil society had trust in SNV, which facilitated a good start and constructive collaboration with SNV and UNDP.

Source: SNV and UNDP (2009)

Monitoring and Review at the Local Level

Monitoring and review processes are an important mechanism for countries to create vertical policy coherence, integration and partnerships across levels of government.

In the context of monitoring there exists a tremendous opportunity today for localizing The 2030 Agenda through integration with community indicator systems in cities around the world. The U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) cites community indicators as “a vehicle for encouraging civic engagement both through the system’s development process and through action once the indicator system is in place (GAO 2011).” The GAO also noted that such systems “help address community or national challenges by facilitating collaboration of various parties inside and outside of government” and “provide solutions to long-term challenges.” Community indicator systems are created and implemented in myriad ways, including by local government, civil society organizations, or a partnership among both (IISD 2014).

Innovative Case Example:
Community Indicator Systems

The U.S.-based Community Indicators Consortium (CIC), an international network of local government monitoring systems across North America “seeks bridges that span the gap between community indicators use and performance measurement, providing ways for community groups and governments to coordinate efforts and jointly enhance knowledge about the use of indicators to leverage positive change (CIC, 2015).”

In 2013 the CIC recognized the efforts of the Jacksonville Community Council Inc. in the U.S. state of Florida “as one of the most enduring and impactful institutions in community indicators work (CIC 2013).” Since their inception in 1985, JCCI has released 30 community quality-of-life report.

Among the CIC’s 2014 Impact Award Winners was ‘Peg’, the Canadian city of Winnipeg’s state-of-the-art community indicator information system, in recognition of its unique interactive visual explorer, maps utility and indicator stories (CIC 2014, Peg, 2015).
For specific guidance related to monitoring, review and accountability, see Section B7 of this Guidance Note.

Impact Assessment Processes

Project level and cumulative impact assessment processes represent opportunities for governments to localize nationally tailored SDGs given their place-based scope of application.

These assessments go by different names in different jurisdictions. Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), Social Impact Assessment (SIA), Regional Impact Assessment (RIA), Cumulative Effects Assessment (CEA) are but a few of the names and classes of impact assessment processes used by countries around the world to assess the future impacts of proposed public and private sector projects. Criteria used in these assessments could potentially be tailored to test their contribution to the long-term economic, social and environmental goals of national development plans and SDGs.

Integrated Modelling

Integrated modelling approaches of the type described in Section B4 for creating horizontal policy coherence, are also useful for achieving vertical coherence owing to their ability to explore regionally specific impacts of national strategies and policies.

Toolkit

Institutional Mechanisms

- Swiss Federal Office for Spatial Development (ARE 2015).
- Linking Regions and Central Governments: Contracts for Regional Development (OECD 2007)

Multi-stakeholder Approaches

- See Section B2 for tools on applying multi-stakeholder approaches
Examples of Local Agenda 21 Networks
- Udalsare21, Basque Network of Municipalities for Sustainability (Udalsarea21 2012).

Community Indicator System Examples
- Jacksonville Community Council Inc. (JCCI 2015).
- Peg Community Wellbeing Indicator System (PEG 2015).
- Governing Regional Development Policy - The Use of Performance Indicators (OECD 2009)

Integrated Models
- See Section B4.
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Section B6: Financing and Budgeting for the Future

Purpose

“Cohesive nationally owned sustainable development strategies, supported by integrated national financing frameworks, will be at the heart of our efforts.”

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (UN 2015a)

As described above in the declaration of The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, political commitment combined with more and better financial resources and improved policies and institutional capacities to reduce financial needs will be paramount in the achievement of the SDGs. The purpose of this section is to provide an initial orientation in the effective mobilization and better use of financial resources in support of the SDGs.

Guidance

At the Third International Conference on Financing for Development in July 2015 countries agreed on the Addis Ababa Action Agenda (AAAA). Described as a “series of bold measures to overhaul global finance practices and generate investments for tackling a range of economic, social and environmental challenges” the AAAA lays the foundation for implementing the 2030 Agenda by looking at the contribution all sources of finance can make in support of the SDGs and covering international cooperation on a range of issues including technology, science, innovation, trade and capacity building (UN 2015b). In particular, the mobilization of domestic resources is described as being central to the agenda (UN 2015b). For example, the AAAA outcome document describes an array of measures aimed at “widening the revenue base, improving tax collection, and combatting tax evasion and illicit financial flows (UN 2015c).” Additionally, the continued importance of ODA is emphasised and countries “reaffirmed their commitment to official development assistance, particularly for the least developed countries, and pledged to increase South-South cooperation.”

This section takes stock of the array of financing sources and instruments available for implementing The 2030 Agenda while at the same time striving to improve national budgeting processes to support the results-based nature of the SDGs. Guidance offered in this section is three-fold:

1. Taking stock of the array of financing sources for The 2030 Agenda: by considering all sources of financing as outlined in the Addis Ababa Action Agenda;
2. Taking stock of the array of financing instruments: by considering the financing instruments outlined in the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and the relevant section of the Paris Agreement on Climate Finance; and
3. A review of strategies for more effective financing: through, for example, outcome-based budgeting, reforms of harmful subsidies and other strategies and policies to reduce future needs and expenditures (through for instance investing in resilience and disaster risk reduction or taxing ‘public bads’).

Early Action for Financing and Budgeting

Among some of the early actions taken by countries in financing the 2030 Agenda and mainstreaming the SDGs into national budgeting processes are:
Cabo Verde – Having graduated from ‘least developed country’ status, and being a small island developing state, Cabo Verde held national workshop on ‘Mainstreaming and Financing the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development which examined finance available from other countries and discussed options to re-orient existing public expenditures and make them more efficient as well as options to mobilize new revenues (domestic and external, public and private).

Indonesia – Piloted the SDGs Philanthropy Platform to facilitate dialogue for collaboration on the SDGs. Launched the philanthropic forum “Philanthropy and Business - Indonesia SDGs for better Indonesia”.

Philippines – Initiated an assessment of how the SDGs can be mainstreamed into the budgeting process, through existing public financial management reforms, such as the medium-term expenditure framework and performance-based budgeting, among others.

Source: UNDG (2016)

Taking Stock of the Array of Financing Sources for The 2030 Agenda

The AAAA outlines financing sources as domestic, international (or external), public and private, the full scope of which should be considered for the implementation of The 2030 Agenda. The role of other enabling drivers of financing such as trade and technology is also acknowledged. UNCTs with the support of relevant UN agencies and other development partners are being asked to provide assistance to Member States in crafting financing strategies for achieving the SDGs that are consistent with national realities and circumstances, and are supported by different national stakeholders.

Domestic public resources: Domestic revenues are mobilized mainly through national tax systems, and they are widely considered the largest, most important and most sustainable source of financing for development. They are also on the rise in developing countries. According to the World Bank, domestic revenues increased annually by on average 14 percent between 2000 and 2012, although data is weak in some countries. This means that in 2012, there was about US$ 6 trillion more entering developing country treasuries than there was in 2000. The IMF predicts further large increases in domestic resources over the next few years. Nevertheless, challenges remain for many low-income countries, some small island developing states, land-locked developing countries and those emerging from conflict. Developing countries that are modernizing their tax systems can switch to smarter forms of taxation such as green taxes and taxes on tobacco products that do not only generate revenues but also incentivize sustainable behaviours and correct market failures. On the other side domestic resources continue to be threatened by tax evasion and elusion. UNDP has estimated that each year, illicit financial flows from the LDCs are roughly equivalent in volume terms to the amount of development aid received by those same countries. Furthermore, when it comes to proposals to reform domestic taxation systems and/or implement new taxes, powerful political or business interests may resist these even though there may be a strong rationale/benefit for the proposed reforms.

Domestic and international private business and finance: It is widely acknowledged that ODA will be insufficient to finance the 2030 Agenda and that private sources, including FDI, bank loans, bond issuances, wealth held by institutional investors and private transfers will need to be mobilized and invested in the achievement of the SDGs. Between 2000 and 2010, domestic and foreign investments in developing countries quadrupled from US$1.6 trillion, to US$6.9 trillion, and, according to estimates, they could double again within the current decade. However, access to private capital market is not a panacea. Many private finance flows are pro-cyclical in nature and can exacerbate economic and social crisis. Some investors are only looking for short term gains while others, like pension or mutual funds, are more eager to take longer-term positions. The emergence of a thriving impact investments market and the wider adoption of sustainability standards and safeguards are promising innovations. In addition to private capital, private philanthropy has also emerged as a major force for the achievement of the SDGs. The total funding from foundations worldwide for 2010-2013
is estimated at circa US$100 billion, even if a large share of these resources do not reach developing countries.

- **International development cooperation:** While ODA at approximately US$130 billion annually will be insufficient to finance the 2030 Agenda it will remain a cornerstone of development for several developing countries. For example in the LDCs and some small islands, development aid is often the single largest source of external finance. For those countries that have little or no access to international capital markets, official concessional finance continues to represent a key source of development finance. The path to graduate from aid dependence may take for some countries over a decade or more. ODA can also be used catalytically and innovatively to crowd in private finance, for example via the extension of guarantees or the development of blended finance instruments, where private and ODA resources are invested towards the same goal. ODA practices can vary, some being more effective than others. Some ODA financing may come with heavy conditionalities, other with helpful technical assistance or technology. ODA can be delivered on-budget and channelled through country systems and in other cases, it is channelled through intermediaries. Some donors can be unpredictable, making aid a volatile source in some instances.

- **International trade:** Trade and finance are intrinsically linked as it concerns FDIs, trade finance and a number of taxes and duties. More and better trade can help country balance their payments and obtain foreign currency. The gains from trade are numerous on their own, and extend beyond the commercial benefits. Trade can contribute to sustainable development by helping to increase the variety and quality of goods available to consumers, and help lower the likelihood of political conflicts between countries. Yet, the links between the SDGs and trade are complex and not always easy to discern. Trade flows, similarly to capital flows may be volatile. The benefits may also be accrued only by small elites and may not generate jobs or raise workers’ wages.

- **Debt and debt sustainability:** Debt financing is expected to grow rapidly as a source of development finance, particularly for countries securing a credit rating at or above investment grade. The expansion of sovereign debt entails risks and may in the long term reduce a country’s policy space. Governments may find it difficult to extend maturities beyond a few years, leaving them vulnerable to refinancing risk. While private debt—typically pro-cyclical—carries short maturity profiles, multilateral debt facilities may play instead an important countercyclical function, for example in maintaining operational trade finance facilities during crisis.

While it is given that all sources of finance will play a critical and complementary role, the landscape of development finance has changed dramatically over the past decade. Sources of finance have expanded over recent years, and so has the variety and sophistication of financial instruments and financing approaches and the ways in which resources are both mobilized and spent have become increasingly ‘innovative’ and diversified. Understanding these changes and their implications is important to make the best use of all financing sources (AP-DEF 2015). The figure below from the Asia Pacific Development Effectiveness Facility (AP-DEF 2015) visualizes different sources.
To help Member States and UN partners to measure and assess development finance flows UNDP and other organizations have started to develop tools and guidance material. A UNDP handbook on financing the 2030 Agenda (forthcoming 2017) will provide an overview of current and recent trends in financing for development and outline a methodological approach for country-level support on financing for development. ‘The Development Finance Assessments (DFAs)’ provides decision makers with a strategic support tool capable of providing a panoramic dashboard-like view of all financing options available along with the relevant information to use them wisely (AP-DEF 2015). The online platform Financing Solutions for Sustainable Development guides policy makers and planners further in the review, design and operationalization of available financing options or solutions. The platform tags the solutions according to the SDGs, sectors, instruments and financial results they aim to achieve. A number of other platforms exist or are in the design stage to facilitate the mobilization of specific flows, e.g. South-South Cooperation; partners, e.g. the SDG Philanthropy Platform; deal-matching platforms such as for crowdfunding or impact investment; or platforms built around specific challenges, e.g. to reduce the financing gap on sustainable infrastructure. The right “financing mix” will differ from one country to the next. Different sources of finance have very different characteristics that make them more (or less) suitable for the financing of different interventions.

**Innovative Case Example:**

**Development Finance Assessments**

Development Finance Assessments (DFAs) assess financing policies and institutional arrangements with a view to strengthening coherence and links between different financial flows and national priorities and the Sustainable Development Goals. Through the provision of clearly understandable data on financial flows and the sponsoring of evidence based discussions and validation, the DFAs

---

16 Available at [www.undp.org/content/sdfinance](http://www.undp.org/content/sdfinance)
may also provide a platform for stronger accountability across government and non-governmental actors.

The DFA studies share a common general framework that is later adapted to different country realities.

- **Introduction**: main changes in the global development finance landscape, new actors, sources and instruments and potential implications on fiscal planning at country level
- **Socio Economic and Political Context**: macroeconomic, social and political development, including progress on MDGs, human development and governance indicators
- **Institutional and Policy Context**: for each flow: (i) institutional arrangements (government department or non-government agency responsible and actors involved) and data management; (ii) policies in place; (iii) whether and how the flow enters into fiscal planning process
- **Development Finance Flows, Mapping and Analysis**: flows are grouped according to six general categories: (i) domestic public flows; (ii) domestic philanthropic flows; (iii) domestic private flows; (iv) ODA; (v) other external assistance; (vi) private, cross-border flows. For each flow the analysis covers sectoral allocation (national/subnational levels) and implications for development effectiveness
- **Comparative Analysis of Development Finance Flows and Scenario Analysis**: areas of analysis include (i) main characteristics of different flows (similarities, differences and overlapping areas), (ii) changes in the modalities associated with the different flows, (iii) discussion of two scenarios for the evolution of key development finance flows in the next 5-10 years, (iv) untapped sources of development finance the country may access, (v) feasibility and capacity to generate resources in the next 5-10 years to finance public expenditure
- **Conclusions and Policy Options**: key areas for reforms (institutional arrangements for decision-making, funding, delivery and monitoring of development finance flows); sustainability of development finance flows in the next 5-10 years

Among the key insights from DFAs undertaken in the Asia and Pacific Region was that domestic sources of finance had a rapid expansion in all countries, and that for most counties this is likely to continue. Additionally it was observed that there are good opportunities for increasing non-tax revenues in the near future and that most countries were getting ready for climate finance, but were not quite there yet.

Taking Stock of the Array of Financing Instruments

The development finance assessment can provide a detailed diagnostic of flows and contribute to the identification of vulnerabilities—e.g. an unsustainable foreign debt service—and opportunities—e.g. positive trends for increasing domestic taxation. Additional analysis and political commitment is required to transform these findings and recommendations into viable solutions that are linked to the SDGs and national and sectoral planning. Just as it is important to take stock of the various sources of development finance, so too is it critical to understand the array of financing instruments that best fit a particular country's needs. Some might not be appropriate for low income countries or available only for certain categories of countries, e.g. market access or funds for LDCs and countries in complex situations. These instruments can be smart taxes such green and carbon taxation.

No single financial instrument can be designed in a vacuum but it has to be attached to a goal, a strategy, a plan, a project or an alliance. Sometime the instrument itself can take the form of a regulatory change, for example the modification of the parameters used in fiscal allocation formula or in the criteria for disbursements cash transfers and social benefits. The figure below visualizes different instruments, tools and solutions depending on the volume of funds to be mobilized and the breadth of sectoral applications. It further labels them according to their source or connotation as efficiency improvement.
Innovative finance has spurred new forms of public-private partnerships that leveraged private sector resources. These include for example, the International Finance Facility for Immunisation and the GAVI Matching Fund, debt swaps, crowdfunding, challenge and innovation funds, social impact bonds, and diaspora bonds. Examples are offered below, looking both at the capacity to mobilize resources as well as innovation in delivery that can save resources, reduce risks and achieve greater impact.

Relating to resource mobilization:
- **Airline ticket tax**: where airlines add a small charge to air tickets which is then channelled to UNITAD for health spending;
- **The International Finance Facility for Immunization (IFFIm)**: under which bonds are issued on international capital markets to pay for child immunization repayable by future aid;
- **Crowdfunding**: the practice of raising funds for a project by soliciting monetary contributions from large numbers of people;
- **Diaspora financing**: where funds are raised from the diaspora for development projects;
- **Green bonds**: bonds which tie the proceeds of a bond issuance to investments in projects producing environmental benefits;
- **Sharia compliant (Islamic) finance instruments**: such as Islamic bonds or sukuk that provide bondholders with an equity stake in the underlying asset;
- **Development impact bonds**: where investors are repaid once results are achieved; and
- **Debt swaps/buy-backs**: where a portion of debt is cancelled and the foregone debt service channelled to environmental protection or health).

Relating to resource delivery:
- **Vertical funds**: typically public-private partnerships that funnel money to one or two key causes;
- **Blended finance**: where public aid monies or private philanthropic funds are mixed with public or private sector loan financing;
- **Lending in local currencies**: so as to reduce risk in case of volatile currency markets;
- **GDP-indexed loans**: where debt repayments are linked to variations in economic output;
- **Countercyclical loans**: where debt service is allowed to fall when a major shock occurs;
- **Weather or catastrophe insurance schemes**: an insurance to cope with the financial consequences of natural catastrophes;
- **Guarantees for development**: a type of insurance policy that protects governments, banks or investors from the risk of non-payment or loss of value of an investment; and
- **Multilateral and bilateral funds and mixed public-private funds for climate and biodiversity finance**: many fund managers use, in turn, innovative approaches to both mobilize resources as well as carry out their mandate, including user fees, payment for environmental services, carbon and biodiversity offsets, benefit-sharing/revenue-sharing schemes, payments for results and certification mechanisms.

There is no single receipt for the selection and identification of the different instruments. After the conduction of assessments such as the DFA or more detailed expenditure reviews and costing exercises, options would vary depending on “what” is going to be funded. The instruments need to be matched with identified needs (e.g. financing a certain strategy or programme) or financial challenges (e.g. reducing the debt service or expanding domestic taxation).
Innovative Case Example
The Green Climate Fund

The Green Climate Fund (GCF) was established with a mission to advance the goal of keeping the temperature increase on our home planet below 2 degrees Celsius. The Fund is a unique global initiative to respond to climate change by investing into low-emission and climate-resilient development. The GCF was established by 194 governments to limit or reduce greenhouse gas emissions in developing countries, and to help adapt vulnerable societies to the unavoidable impacts of climate change.

It is crucial that developing countries are able to effectively access and deploy resources from the Green Climate Fund. That is why the Fund provides early support for readiness and preparatory activities to enhance country ownership and access. This "country readiness" funding is a dedicated and cross-cutting programme that maximizes the effectiveness of the Fund by empowering developing countries.

Source: Green Climate Fund (2016)

Innovative Case Example
The UNCDF’s Last Mile Trust Fund

In regard to financing mechanisms at the micro level, the UN Capital Development Fund (UNCDF) offers last mile financing models through which public resources – including ODA – lay the groundwork for private investment. UNCDF does this in two ways: a) Through savings-led financial inclusion which expand the opportunities for individuals, households and small businesses to participate in the local economy; and b) By showing how localized public finance (through fiscal decentralization, innovations in municipal finance, and structured project finance) can drive public/private funding for local development plans to underpin local economic expansion. In this context, the Government of Sweden and the UNCDF launched in June of 2016 the ‘Last Mile Finance Trust Fund’, a multi-partner trust fund to support Least Developed Countries (LDCs) in their pursuit of the SDGs and their graduation targets in the context of the Istanbul Programme of Action.

The Last Mile Finance Trust Fund is structured around five thematic windows to address development issues considered critical to poverty eradication in the LDCs within the 2030 Agenda.
They represent areas where UNCDF is providing workable public/private finance models that address barriers to access in the last mile. They build on previously established and/or evolving partnerships with UNDP, other UN system partners, and international development banks, and across the public and private spheres.

Thematic windows of the Last Mile Trust Fund:
1. **Green Economy** (via the Local Climate Adaptive Living Facility and CleanStart)
2. **Food Security and Nutrition** (via Finance for Food-f4F)
3. **Economic Empowerment of Women and Youth** (via Inclusive and Equitable Local Development; Finance for Women Economic Empowerment; Shaping Inclusive Finance Transformations (SHIFT); YouthStart Global)
4. **Infrastructure and Services** (via the Municipal Investment Financing Facility; Local Finance Initiative; Local Cross Border Initiative; and Local Transformative and Uplifting Solutions (LOTUS))
5. **Financial Inclusion and Innovation** (via Making Access to Financial Services Possible (MAP); Mobile Money for the Poor (MM4P); and MicroLead)

*Source: UNCDF (2016)*

**Effective Use of Financing**

The effective use of finance is another critical dimension in the achievement of the SDGs. The assumption is that finance should not be mobilized only by expanding the financial envelope but also by spending current resources more effectively. Similarly, by taking actions to avoid future expenditures, scarce public and private resources will be freed for development spending. This section describes a number of approaches, including outcome-based budgeting, subsidy reforms, and strategies to reduce future expenditures.

**Results-based Budgeting and Budgeting for Outcomes**: *Results-based budgeting (RBB), or performance-based budgeting (PBB)*, is a means for organizing and reporting a government’s allocation of fiscal resources along the lines of high-level goals. These approaches are suggested as a possible means for governments to provide a more transparent way for the public to see and understand the expenditure priorities of government, and to keep more systematic track of the alignment of fiscal resources with agreed goals and targets.

For example, the *Results-based Budgeting Act* in the Canadian Province of Alberta provides an interesting case example of the type of budget reporting that is suited to outcome-focused agendas. The government’s annual performance report, *‘Measuring Up’* is a requirement of the *Government Accountability Act* and prepared under the direction of the Deputy Minister of Treasury Board and Finance (in IISD 2014). The *Measuring Up* report introduces *Results-based Budgeting* (RBB) as required in the *Results-based Budgeting Act* which became law in 2012. The RBB system “prioritizes the allocation of government resources to ensure the relevant programmes and services are meeting their intended outcomes; and, are being delivered in the most effective and efficient way possible (Government of Alberta, 2013a and 2013b).” Released every June, the *Measuring Up* performance report compares actual progress toward targets listed in the province’s three-year strategic plan and is reviewed by an Audit Committee established under the *Auditor General Act*.

**Innovative Case Example:**

*Peru’s National Budget System Reform Strategy*
Peru has launched a National Budget System Reform Strategy including Results-Based Budgeting (RBB) with the aim to ensure the government provides people with the planned quantity and quality of good and services. The RBB includes several elements:

- Clear and objective definitions of the results to be achieved;
- Commitment by government entities to achieve these results;
- Responsibilities for both implementing instruments and accountability of public expenditure;
- The establishment of mechanisms for generating information on products, results and management efforts.

This strategy is implemented by the Ministry of Economy and Finance through: i) the budget programmes, ii) performance monitoring based on indicators, iii) independent evaluations, and iv) management incentives.

Source: BIOFIN (2016)

Innovative Case Example:
Budgeting for Outcomes – State of Washington

Budgeting for Outcomes (BFO) is an innovative variant of RBB/PBB that takes the focus on performance further by creating a process for defining the outcomes that citizen’s want as the first step in the budgeting process. Pioneered by the U.S. state of Washington, BFO turns the traditional budgeting process on its head by asking first what results the citizens want, rather than starting with the programs the agencies already fund (Osborne and Moore, 2010; Osborne and Hutchinson, 2006). The basic steps in the BFO process are as follows (Chrisinger 2010):

1. **“Set the price of government”**: Decide up front how much citizens are willing to spend. Get political agreement on a revenue forecast and any tax or fee changes, or just go with the revenue forecast.
2. **Set the priorities of government**: Define the outcomes that matter most to citizens, with citizen input, and identify indicators to measure progress. Allocate the funds available among the priority outcomes.
3. **Develop a purchasing plan for each priority**: Create a team to act as a purchasing agent for citizens, including citizens, for each priority. Ask each team to research and identify the strategies that will best produce the desired outcome.
4. **Solicit “offers” to deliver the desired outcomes**: Have the teams issue “requests for outcomes” to all comers, public and potentially private: “tell us what outcomes you can deliver for what price.” Critique initial offers and negotiate better deals.
5. **Prioritize the offers**: For each outcome, fund the best offers, those that will provide the best results within the money available. Do not fund the other offers.
6. **Negotiate performance agreements with the chosen providers**: Spell out the expected outputs and outcomes, how they will be measured, the consequences for performance, and the flexibilities and support needed to maximize provider performance.”
With participatory mechanisms already built into the BFO process, combined with the use of indicators for setting and monitoring targets, this approach is considered as a useful tool for the collective pursuit of sustainability, accountability and adaptability (IISD 2014).

Gender mainstreaming is another example of result-based budget mainstreaming. For example, in Mexico a gender-mainstreaming tool was applied to identify and disaggregate how much is spent on women’s issues in all sectors in a year (in UNDESA-DSD 2015). UN Women has also developed a handbook that explores the rationale for costing gender equality and introduces the main approaches and methods, including step-by-step process for undertaking a costing exercise (UN Women 2015). Additionally, UNICEF has a number of innovative experiences in monitoring social expenditures related to children and using this monitoring as a basis for successful advocacy for increased and more effective social investment (e.g., Paraguay, Peru, etc.).

Environment is another issue area that has been the focus of result-based budget mainstreaming approaches. The UNDP-UNEP Poverty-Environment Initiative has developed a handbook for mainstreaming the environment for poverty reduction and sustainable development (UNDP-UNEP Poverty-Environment Initiative 2015). Additionally, the UN Capital Development Fund (UNCDF) has created the ‘Local Climate Adaptive Living Facility’ to support climate resilience at the local level (UNCDF 2013).

**Innovative Case Example**

**Mainstreaming Environment into the Budget Formulation Process, Malawi**

**Demonstrating the Benefits:** The Malawi Ministry of Economic Development Planning, with support from the UNDP-UNEP Poverty-Environment Initiative, conducted an economic analysis of sustainable natural resource use in the country. The analysis showed that unsustainable natural resource use is costing the country the equivalent of 5.3 per cent of its GDP. It also found that soil erosion reduces agricultural productivity by 6 per cent; recovering this yield would lift an additional 1.88 million people out of poverty between 2005 and 2015.

**Providing Guidance:** The results of the economic analysis focused both the Ministry of Economic Development Planning and the Ministry of Finance on the concept of environmental sustainability. The Poverty-Environment Initiative provided specific guidance on how to better integrate sustainable environment and natural resource management in Malawi’s budget process. To this end, along with the Overseas Development Institute, it developed guidelines that were adopted in 2012, and followed up with substantive dialogue with the government.

**Results:** The 2013/14 budget guidelines issued by the Ministry of Finance (Malawi Government 2014) included a chapter on adherence to the sustainability guidelines; this was further strengthened in the 2014/15 guidelines, which include references on how poverty reduction and growth are linked to environmental sustainability.

*Source: UNDP-UNEP Poverty-Environment Initiative*

Public Expenditure and Institutional Reviews (PEIRs) represents a useful tool for budget mainstreaming. PEIRs help accelerate accountability and responsiveness of budgets for sustainable development by identifying the baseline of current allocations and expenditures in relation to particular issues of sustainable development and highlighting how the budget process can better prioritise investments. For
example, UNDP has supported Climate Public Expenditure and Institutional Reviews (CPEIRs) since their first implementation in Nepal in 2011. CPEIRs or similar exercises have been implemented in at least 30 countries (UNDP 2015). Likewise, Biodiversity Public Expenditure and Institutional Reviews have been implemented in the Philippines; Disaster Risk Management Public Expenditure and Institutional Reviews are underway in three countries of the Asia Pacific; and plans to implement Non-Communicable Diseases PEIRs are being taken forward in the Pacific, Iran and Mongolia.

Application of results-based budgeting approaches requires the systematic use of a clearly defined results-based framework, or logical framework as it is often called. Such a results-based framework serves as an important integrating platform across the related functions of planning, budgeting and reporting as described in Sections B2, B6 and B7, respectively.

**Subsidy Reform:** Subsidy reform in certain sectors represent significant cost saving opportunities that can be leveraged to help finance and achieve the SDGs.

But subsidies come in many shapes and sizes, for instance (IISD 2006):

- **Grants and other direct payments:** a time-limited payment, either in connection with a specific investment, or to enable an individual, company or organization to cover some or all of its general costs, or costs of undertaking a specific activity;
- **Tax concessions:** tax exemptions (when a tax is not paid), tax credits (which reduce a tax otherwise due), tax deferrals (which delay the payment of a tax) and a host of other instruments;
- **In-kind subsidies:** for example, subsidized housing, specific infrastructure (like a road servicing a single mine or factory), the services required to maintain that infrastructure, and various services to help exporters;
- **Cross subsidies:** exists when a government-owned enterprise, such as a public utility, uses revenues collected in one market segment to reduce prices charged for goods in another;
- **Credit subsidies and government guarantees:** such as when a government loans money to a company at a lower rate of interest than a commercial bank would offer, or requires less collateral to back up its loan, defers repayment or allows for a longer period to pay off the loan, the company saves money;
- **Hybrid subsidies:** including tax-free government bonds and tax increment financing (TIF);
- **Derivative subsidies:** including sympathetic support, compensatory or countervailing support, and subsidy clusters;
- **Subsidies through government procurement:** can exist when a government purchases goods and a benefit is thereby conferred; and
- **Market price support:** may derive from domestic price interventions (for example, a minimum-price policy), and is usually supported by foreign trade barriers such as a tariff or quantitative restriction on imports.

While the benefits in subsidies’ reforms are estimate in the range of US$ trillions, there are important safeguards to consider. National authorities should evaluate the costs and benefits of subsidy reforms. In particular, lessons learned from earlier reforms have highlighted the importance of appropriate timeframes for the phasing out subsidies and of exclusion clauses to reduce negative impacts to vulnerable groups. The International Monetary Fund (IMF) notes that “while there is no single recipe for successful subsidy reform, country experiences suggest that the following ingredients are needed:
• A comprehensive energy sector reform plan with clear long-term objectives with an analysis of the impact of reforms;
• Transparent and extensive communication and consultation with stakeholders, including information on the size of subsidies and how they affect the government’s budget;
• Price increases that are phased-in over time;
• Improving the efficiency in state-owned enterprises to reduce producer subsidies;
• Measures to protect the poor through targeted cash or near-cash transfers or, if this option is not feasible, a focus on existing targeted programs that can be expanded quickly; and
• Institutional reforms that depoliticize energy pricing, such as the introduction of automatic pricing mechanisms (IMF 2016).”

Eliminating global energy subsidies “could reduce deaths related to fossil-fuel emissions by over 50 percent and fossil-fuel related carbon emissions by over 20 percent (IMF 2015).” It is estimated that the revenue gain from eliminating energy subsidies could approach US$2.9 trillion or 3.6 percent of global GDP (IMF 2015). For subsidy reform in the energy sector it is estimated that advanced economies would gain enough revenue “to halve corporate income tax or cover one quarter of public health spending (IMF 2015).” In emerging economies, savings from energy reform is “worth double their corporate income tax revenues or public health spending.” And in low-income countries, “it is about one and half times corporate income tax revenues or public health spending (IMF 2015).” In addition to reforms in the energy sector, the revision of subsidy programmes in water, agriculture, fishery and manufacture could greatly facilitate the realization of environment related SDGs, without necessarily compromising economic productivity or people wellbeing.

**Strategies to reduce future expenditures** are another critical dimension of any holistic financing for development strategy. Strategies to reduce future expenditures can take many forms, for instance taxes on sugary beverages as a tool to improve health and reduce future health costs; investments in risk-reduction and resilience are another. Avoiding the need for future public expenditures can free up resources for investment in other areas. The examples and benefits of expanding climate and disaster insurance coverage and of introducing tobacco taxation are highlighted below.

The United Nations Office of Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR) describes disaster risk reduction as the “concept and practice of reducing disaster risks through systematic efforts to analyse and reduce the causal factors of disasters. Reducing exposure to hazards, lessening vulnerability of people and property, wise management of land and the environment, and improving preparedness and early warning for adverse events are all examples of disaster risk reduction (UNISDR 2016a).” The Sendai Framework for disaster risk reduction highlights as one of its four priority action areas to invest in disaster risk reduction for resilience, noting that public and private investment in disaster risk prevention and reduction through structural and non-structural measures are essential to enhance the economic, social, health and cultural resilience of persons, communities, countries and their assets, as well as the environment (UNISDR 2016b).

Damaged production facilities, shattered transportation infrastructure and business interruption produce direct losses and indirect costs in the form of foregone output. This is what natural disasters produce. In 2015 the number of natural catastrophes surpassed the 1,000 threshold for the first time, with an estimated loss of over US$90 billion out of which only 30 percent was insured. Losses have risen significantly over the last three decades due to economic development, population growth,
urbanization, and a higher concentration of assets in areas exposed to climate change. Climate change is predicted to continue to exacerbate the impact and number of calamities resulting in lower agricultural productivity, difficult access to water, energy stress and higher incidence of diseases. The development of disaster risk insurance products is a cost-saving and risk-management strategy in response to the above mentioned events. The value of pay-outs is dependent to the insurance coverage, catastrophes’ geography and type of events and can vary greatly year by year. Insurers paid out about US$27 billion for natural disaster claims in 2015, mostly in developed countries. Other than pay-outs, disaster risk insurance can generate savings due to cost-efficiency: the African Risk Capacity, shows that for each US$1 of insurance pay-out US$4.4 of international aid is not needed (UNDP 2016).

Tobacco excise taxes are taxes applicable on tobacco products, including cigarettes. They can raise fiscal revenues, improve health and well-being, and address market failures—i.e. lost economic output from tobacco-related death and disease as well as the externalization of avoidable health costs for society to treat tobacco-related diseases. Tobacco taxation can generate significant direct revenues as well as cost-savings through reduced health care costs and avoided economic productivity losses. In relation to the latter, for example, diabetes alone costs the world more than US$ 827 billion in direct costs each year (tobacco increases the risk of Type 2 diabetes by 30-40 per cent). While the exact cost of tobacco to the global economy is unknown, the American Cancer Society and World Lung Foundation estimate it to be more than US$ 1 trillion per year (UNDP 2016).

### Toolkit

**Development Finance tools**
- Development Finance and Aid Assessments (UNDP 2015; NEDA 2014; MOPI 2014)
- Last Mile Trust Fund (UNCDF 2016)
- Green Climate Fund (2016)

**Results-based Budgeting and Budgeting for Outcomes**
- Performance-based Budgeting Manual (CLEAR 2015)
- Results-based Budgeting Act (Government of Alberta, 2013a and 2013b)
- Budgeting for Outcomes methodology (Chrisinger 2010; Osborne and Hutchinson 2006)
- Local government fiscal transfer system: Performance Based Grants and Local Development Funds (UNDG Tools Synthesis 2015)

**Budget Mainstreaming**
- Handbook on costing gender equality (UN Women 2015)
- Inclusive and Equitable Local Development – IELD (UNCDF 2014).
- Local Climate Adaptive Living Facility (UNCDF 2013).
- Climate Public Expenditure and Institutional Reviews (UNDP 2015).

**Human Rights Guidance**
- Budgeting Human Rights (HRBA Portal 2015)

Draft publication provisionally titled "Human Rights and Government Budgets" (OHCHR (forthcoming).

Social Protection

Inter-agency social protection assessment tools (ISPA) under development by the Social Protection Inter-agency Cooperation Board (SPIAC-B), led by the ILO and the World Bank (SPIAC-B 2015)
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Section B7: Monitoring, Reporting and Accountability

Purpose

“We commit to engage in systematic follow-up and review of implementation of this Agenda over the next fifteen years. A robust, voluntary, effective, participatory, transparent and integrated follow-up and review framework will make a vital contribution to implementation and will help countries to maximize and track progress in implementing this Agenda in order to ensure that no one is left behind.”

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (UN 2015)

Follow-up and review is a key aspect of The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Ensuring that the statistical systems, capacities, methodologies and mechanisms are in place to track progress and ensure accountability, with the engagement of citizens, parliaments and other national stakeholders. This is especially critical with regard to the most excluded and marginalized populations, which are often not represented or under-represented in current national data collection. The 2030 Agenda also requires follow up and review processes to be informed by country-led evaluation and notes the need to build capacity for national data systems and evaluation programmes. The purpose of this section is therefore to provide guidance in relation to approaches and tools for monitoring, reporting and accountability in relation to the implementation of national development plans and strategies.

Guidance

This section provides specific guidance in relation to key aspects of monitoring, reporting and accountability. The guidance addresses the following specific aspects:

1. **Indicator development and data collection**: to undertake comparative assessment between existing national statistics and the data needs of the global set of SDG indicators proposed by the Inter-agency and Expert Group on SDG Indicators
2. **Disaggregating data**: the commitment to ‘leaving no one behind’ and tackling inequality and discrimination in the SDGs will require going beyond averages to target efforts towards reaching the most excluded population groups. To do so requires disaggregation of data by sex, age and other salient socio-economic characteristics, including income/wealth, location, class, ethnicity, age, disability status and other relevant characteristics as a means for ‘leaving no one behind’;
3. **Participatory monitoring and data collection**: involving citizens directly in the measurement process, for example through citizen science;
4. **Monitoring and reporting systems**: to work with existing data and metadata reporting systems and to create online systems for information exchanges, including reporting on key indicators and providing opportunities for both horizontal and vertical coordination;
5. **Follow-up and review through Voluntary National Reviews (VNRs)**: provides Member States with a mechanism to share their progress toward implementing the 2030 Agenda and achieving the SDGs, and represents an important mainstreaming opportunity in and of itself;
6. **SDG country reporting guidelines**: act as a reference for UNCTs supporting country-level SDG reporting; and
7. **Other review processes and mechanisms**: for reviewing progress on nationally and sub-nationally adapted SDGs.
Early Action for Monitoring, Reporting and Accountability

Examples of early actions by countries relating to monitoring, reporting and accountability in the context of the SDGs are:

- **Egypt** – National statistical agency, CAPMAS, established an SDG Coordination Unit to contextualize and set the national indicator framework necessary to monitor and track Egypt’s progress of SDGs.
- **Pakistan** – Preliminary data gap assessment for SDGs undertaken showing that of 229 indicators requiring reporting at the national level, partial data for around 79 indicators could be made available. A detailed gap assessment exercise has been designed with the Planning Commission and the Bureau of Statistics.
- **Philippines** – Two technical national consultation workshops on indicators examined the initial list of SDG indicators within the context of the Philippines’ development objectives and identity relevant indicators. 23 additional national indicators were proposed.

Source: UNDG (2016), or as otherwise noted.

Indicator Development and Data Collection

The most important guidance to be provided at this early point in time with regard to indicator development, is to stress the importance of the country implementing/coordinating agency to establish a partnership as soon as possible with the agency that currently tracks progress indicators for the national development plan or strategy. In most countries this would require close coordination between the National Statistical Office, other data producers within the National Statistical System (such as line Ministries) and the Ministry of Planning or specialized designated agency in charge of leading the implementation of the National Development Strategy. This could be undertaken as part of raising public awareness and an introductory workshop series (see Section B1) and could include a comparative assessment between existing national statistics and the global set of SDG indicators proposed by the Inter-agency and Expert Group on SDG Indicators (IAEG-SDGs).

The **IAEG-SDGs** proposed a set of 230 global indicators in March 2016 to support the monitoring, reporting and review of SDG progress (IAEG-SDGs 2016), which are still being negotiated by Member States. The full list can be downloaded from the IAEG-SDGs website in PDF and MS Excel formats.\(^{17}\)

Where indicator and data gaps are identified, proposals can be made to address them, including establishing baseline data. In countries with limited national statistical capacity, the revision of the National Strategy for the Development of Statistics and the elaboration of five-year or ten-year plans for data collection for the monitoring and evaluation of the SDGs can be undertaken. The UN system can assist in creating a joint programme for the implementation of the data collection plan.

More generally speaking, capacity development of national bodies in charge of Statistics is a critical element so that countries can have the ability to handle data generation activities in a durable way. This

also has a direct link with financing as investing in national capacity development may allow considerable savings to countries in the future.

**Disaggregating Data**
The importance of the disaggregation of data was a critical lesson from the MDG implementation period. In *The 2030 Agenda*, the disaggregation of data will be one of the mechanisms for realizing the ‘Leave no one behind’ principle. And so important is this aspect that it forms the basis for SDG Target 17.18: *By 2020, enhance capacity-building support to developing countries, including for least developed countries and small island developing States, to increase significantly the availability of high-quality, timely and reliable data disaggregated by income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other characteristics relevant in national contexts.*

**MDG Lessons**
**Monitoring activities need to be Sufficient in Terms of Coverage, Disaggregation of Data and Timeliness**

Looking ahead to the post-2015 era, more monitoring and evaluation investments are going to be required at the national as well as the international level to effectively monitor and evaluate the sustainable development goals. In the words of the Secretary-General, “we must significantly scale up support to countries and national statistical offices with critical needs for capacities to produce, collect, disaggregate, analyse and share data crucial to the new agenda” (see A/69/700, para. 142).

UNDG has also recommended that the United Nations development system “intensify support to strengthening of national statistical capacity, greater disaggregation and ‘localization’ of national data and address all data ‘dark spots’, using the distinctiveness of the United Nations global footprint and the capacities and scope of the United Nations system’s joint data coverage”

*Source: UN ECOSOC (2015).*

It has been noted that, in the case of the MDGs, progress on the goals focussed on tracking changes in national averages. The focus on averages can mask disparities between groups and exclude population groups that may be among the poorest of the poor or the most vulnerable and marginalized (OHCHR 2015).

Therefore, the guidance imparted in this section for UNCTs is to recommend to Member States that when working with their statistical agencies in the formulation of indicators in support of nationally-relevant SDG targets, it is important to support the ‘data revolution’ by investing in the regular and systematic collection of disaggregated data in accordance with SDG Target 17.18. This might require larger sample sizes, specialized surveys to capture specific marginalized groups, as well as specific training for survey enumerators and recording officers (in the case of administrative records).

Addressing gaps in the production of gender statistics in particular will be critical for tracking progress in achieving the SDGs for women and girls. Moreover, to better capture intersectional inequalities throughout the framework, disaggregation by sex, age and other salient socio-economic characteristics, including income/wealth, location, class, ethnicity and other relevant characteristics will be required.
Innovative Case Example:
Gender statistics in Latin America: innovation and knowledge sharing for policy making

Innovation and knowledge sharing on gender statistics are key to ensure effective implementation of SDG 5 and related targets. Mexico spearheaded regional efforts in gender statistics for policy making in Latin America and the Caribbean. Thanks to a long standing partnership between the National Statistics Institute (INEGI) and the National Women’s Institute (INMUJERES), UN Women and ECLAC, a vast knowledge platform for the production and use of gender statistics was developed and consolidated.

For many years, national statistics on violence against women have informed policies for women’s access to justice, leading to the establishment of emergency alert systems such as the Gender Violence Alert. The National Survey on violence against women was carried out in 2003, 2006 and 2011 (next edition in 2016) and is fully integrated into national statistics. Moreover, using south-south cooperation modalities - 19 countries in the region implemented Time Use Surveys and Satellite Accounts to measure women’s time use and unpaid work, which proved critical in better understanding women’s contribution to the economy and design related policies.

These innovations shed light on the role that time use plays on women’s economic empowerment in Latin America and the Caribbean. Such instruments demonstrated that the time that women dedicate to domestic and care work is 2 to 5 times more than that of men. Data and analysis on the impact of unpaid work on the economic empowerment of women has clearly positioned the issue on the policy agenda of Latin American many countries, with national plans and policies now featuring care work as a primary concern.

Statistical institutions and policy makers from the region meet annually at the International Meetings of Experts in Time-Use and the International Gender Statistics Meetings to discuss best practices and emerging knowledge to further innovate and strengthen national capacities for the production and use of gender statistics.

Source: UN Women

Participatory Monitoring and Data Collection

Serious consideration should also be given to going beyond governance as usual and pursuing participatory-based monitoring opportunities (see Innovative Case Example below). For example, one lesson from the global conversation leading up to the adoption of The 2030 Agenda is that crowdsourced data can be a powerful complement in advocating for policy change. Building on the MY World survey (see Innovative Case Example below), MY World 2030\(^{18}\) will seek to build upon the global network of MY World partners and undertake a “people’s baselining” exercise as part of the global rollout of the SDGs.

Through an online, mobile and offline component, MY World 2030 will contribute to efforts to report back on progress by collecting globally comparable data to monitor how people feel their lives are changing. This data could feed into official monitoring efforts both locally and globally and contribute to an enhanced mechanism for effective monitoring and implementation of the goals. A second contribution will be to build dialogue between decision makers such as parliamentarians, local

---

\(^{18}\) See [www.myworld2030.org](http://www.myworld2030.org)
governments, mayors and citizens, with young people in particular to contribute a “people’s perspective” on how to implement the new agenda at different levels. It is envisaged that this dialogue will be aggregated at national, regional and global levels. Volunteers will be a key component for the new phase of offline rollout of the survey in order to enhance people’s engagement with the agenda beyond the collection of data. The demand for this has been demonstrated by the MY Municipality initiative in Macedonia and the continued expansion of U Report globally.

Innovative Case Example:
Participatory Monitoring and Data Collection

**UNICEF – Peru:** “UNICEF Peru, in its paper ‘Community Surveillance Systems for Early Childhood and Development: A participatory approach’, exemplified how community surveillance systems (CSS) in Peru were essential to the growth and development of children and pregnant mothers.” (UNDG 2015, p 19)

**UNICEF U-Report:** An “innovative communication technology developed by UNICEF and revolutionizes social mobilization, monitoring and response efforts: It equips mobile phone users with the tools to establish and enforce new standards of transparency and accountability in development programs and services (UNICEF 2012).”

**Thailand iMonitor:** “Thailand described how its iMonitor application for smart phones and other devices is tracking and evaluating public HIV services, as well as creating an opportunity for dialogue with authorities to address challenges.” (UNDG 2015, p 19)

**Zambia M-WASH:** “Zambia noted the use of M-WASH, a mobile/web-based monitoring, evaluation and reporting system that covers 1.7 million people and advances accountability by making water and sanitation data transparent. The technological component inspires competition among districts by publishing results and maps that demonstrate which districts and provinces are making the most progress towards improved access to water and sanitation.” (UNDG 2015, p 19)

**MY World survey:** The global MY World survey was an options survey requesting people to choose six out of sixteen key issues important for themselves and their families. The survey gathered over 8.4 million votes through online, mobile and offline channels. 80% of the votes were collected offline through volunteer effort and 80% of the voters were under 30 years of age. The survey facilitated the dialogue among different stakeholders and increased interest in and momentum for the [2030 Agenda]. Its open-source, real-time results were fed into the intergovernmental negotiations of the agenda and were used by many stakeholders for advocacy purposes.

**Monitoring and Reporting Systems**

“They [follow-up and review processes] will be open, inclusive, participatory and transparent for all people and will support the reporting by all relevant stakeholders.”

Online indicator information systems already exist in many countries for monitoring and reporting on progress toward the national development plan, strategy and/or MDGs. These systems can be updated to incorporate any new or revised indicators that are identified in the process of adapting the SDGs to national contexts (Section B3) and the indicator assessment described above.
For example in Mexico, a *National Coordinating Committee* helped put in place an MDG information system in 2011 that provides national and sub-national dis-aggregations. Approximately 80% of MDGs are updated annually (UNDESA-DSD 2015c). This became a “benchmark in the inclusion of high quality, transparent and accessible information (Gov. of Mexico 2016)”. Now a SDGs National Platform will be developed together with the National Statistics Office and the National Digital Strategy Office and building on the MDG Platform (UNOSD 2016). It will be an open source tool using open data to “enable greater collaboration towards an accountable monitoring and effective delivery of goals (Gov. of Mexico 2016).”

Other national monitoring and reporting systems are also quite innovative, incorporating multiple ways to view and examine the indicators. The Swiss MONET system is a prime example (see the Innovative Case Example below).

**Innovative Case Example:**
**The Swiss MONET Indicator System**

The MONET Indicator System is Switzerland’s mechanism for tracking progress towards its sustainable development strategy. It combines several novel ways to view and analyse indicators:

- **All Indicators:** a view to all 75 indicators that describe the “current situation and development in Switzerland with regard to the social, economic and environmental aspects of sustainable development.”
- **Global Indicators:** a subset of indicators showing “how sustainable interactions between Switzerland and other countries are related to the use and distribution of the environmental, economic and social resources.”
- **Key indicators:** a view of progress relating to 17 aggregated indicators.
- **The cockpit:** the cockpit provides access to the data and to the detailed description of individual indicators.

- **Klartext card game:** The card game with exciting information about Switzerland based on the MONET indicators for sustainable development. A game for the whole family for 2 to 4 people over 14 years with 161 cards.

MONET is a joint activity of the Federal Statistical Office (FSO), the Federal Office for the Environment (FOEN), The Federal Office for Spatial Development (ARE) and the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC).
Monitoring and reporting systems provide a mechanism for both horizontal and vertical coordination. Horizontally, the relationship among seemingly disparate indicators (i.e., issues) can more readily be explored, as in the case of Belize (See Section B3). Vertically, local indicators can aggregate up to sub-national indicators, and similarly, sub-national indicators can aggregate up to national indicators. Growth in the use of online sustainability monitoring and reporting systems at all levels of government are creating new opportunities for the coordination of plans across levels of government given their transparent and accessible nature.

It is also suggested that innovative monitoring approaches including the collection of qualitative data be developed and implemented in order to assess early outcomes, learn and adapt interventions and strategies at national, sub-national and even local levels.

At the global level, the SDG Index and Dashboards developed and compiled by the Sustainable Development Solutions Network in partnership with Bertelsmann Stiftung represent analytical, communicative, and collaborative tools to support national, regional and global debates on country-level plans, policies and programs (SDSN 2016). As illustrated in the Innovative Case Example below, the SDG Index is meant to be complimentary to other review and follow-up processes with an eye to identifying gaps and promote cross-cutting and mutually reinforcing strategies (in UNOSD 2016).

**Innovative Case Example**

**The SDG Index**

The SDG Index and its global report covers 149 countries using 63 indicators and 14 additional variables for OECD countries (SDSN 2016). The SDG Index aggregates available data on all SDGs into a composite index. The Dashboard is a data visualization tool that presents country results starting on each SDG. The Index uses only published indicators from among official SDG indicators where possible: an indicator is included only if data is available for 80% of countries with a population greater than 1 million. There is no imputation of missing data, except for a few metrics of extreme deprivation including poverty, undernourishment, research expenditures and child labor.

Among the key findings were that progress is uneven across countries and that existing deprivations and challenges require coherent and urgent action by all countries. Additionally, it is clear that poor countries face significant obstacles including extreme poverty in all its forms, social
inclusion, access to essential infrastructure, and environmental degradation. Richer countries face more specific but nonetheless major challenges such as climate change mitigation, inequality, and sustaining the global partnership. Filling in the data gaps will be crucial to support implementation of the 2030 Agenda.

*Source: UNOSD (2016)*

**Follow-up and Review through Voluntary National Reviews**

The High Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development (HLPF) was established at the Rio+20 Conference with the aim to strengthen Sustainable Development governance at the UN. It is a universal intergovernmental platform that replaced the former Commission on Sustainable Development. With the adoption of the 2030 Agenda, the Forum was given mandates to “have a central role in overseeing a network of follow-up and review processes at the global level, working coherently with the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and other relevant organs and forums, in accordance with existing mandates”. (para 82, The 2030 Agenda) One of the HLPF’s functions is to facilitate the review of progress on the 2030 Agenda and achievement of the SDGs by Member States through Voluntary National Reviews (VNRs; UN DESA 2016). The VNRs are voluntary and state-led, yet involving partnerships of major groups and other stakeholders. Twenty-two countries participated in the Voluntary National Reviews (VNRs) with representation from around the world including seven European countries, five from across the African continent, three countries in special situations, e.g. least developed countries, and one small island developing state.

Importantly, through the experience of the first round of VNRs it has been observed that the very process of a country undertaking a VNR can enhance mainstreaming and implementation of the 2030 Agenda (UNOSD 2016). Furthermore, it is believed that taking the VNRs even further within a country through sub-national voluntary reviews could further amplify the benefits of VNRs by localizing SDGs and fostering the disaggregation of statistics (UNOSD 2016). Indeed, the Government of Mexico is considering such a process (UNOSD 2016).

**Innovative Case Example**

**Voluntary National Reviews and the High Level Political Forum**

The High Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development (HLPF) is the central platform for reviewing and following up on the agenda and SDGs at the global level (HLPF 2016). The HLPF is expected to: provide political leadership, guidance and recommendations on implementation and follow-up; keep track of progress through thematic reviews Voluntary National Reviews (VNRs); spur coherent policies informed by evidence, science and country experiences; enhance the integration of the three dimensions of sustainable development; address new and emerging issues; and strengthen the science-policy interface.
The 2016 HLPF held in New York illustrated its potential to be an integrative platform for follow-up and review of the 2030 Agenda and the SDGs at the global level. The Forum’s thematic focus on certain issues produced valuable in-depth analysis and recommendations. It also showed that Voluntary National Reviews (VNRs) will be important in gaining insight on national efforts for implementing the 2030 Agenda. And this first gathering of the HLPF reinforced that engagement of all stakeholders at all levels is the only way to implement 2030 Agenda and SDGs.

Source: UNOSD (2016), HLPF (2016)

In an effort to assist countries with voluntary national reporting a multi-stakeholder network, ‘Partners for Review’ has been established with support of German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (GIZ 2016). This transnational network is for government representatives and stakeholders from civil society, the private sector and academia who are involved in the national review and monitoring process towards achieving the SDGs. The network will build on the exchanges and retreats in the lead-up to the HLPF and help meet the demand for extended follow-up (GIZ 2016).

**SDG Country Reporting Guidelines**

Country reporting is critical not only for tracking national progress but also in providing baselines and more regular progress overviews to inform national SDG implementation and monitoring. Country reports support the Voluntary National Reviews by countries at the HLPF, and link in with the follow up and review processes of other UN major conferences and functional commissions, at the global, regional and national levels.

To ensure UNCTs are adequately supported in this process, the UNDG Sustainable Development Working Group (with UNDP and DESA as co-leads) is preparing the **SDG Country Reporting Guidelines**, which will act as a reference for UNCTs supporting country-level SDG reporting. To prepare these Guidelines, UNDG is building on its substantial experience from the MDG era – during this time, approximately 550 country reports were prepared, and the associated guidelines continuously evolved in response to feedback on the changing development needs of countries. The initial MDG reporting guidelines focused heavily on awareness and advocacy, whereas later iterations focused more on ‘unfinished business’ and going beyond averages. The lessons learned from the era are invaluable, and are being taken into account in the development of the new **SDG Country Reporting Guidelines**.

The process so far has been collaborative and inclusive, with UNDG members offered the opportunity to provide extensive feedback and comments to the initial draft presented to them in June 2016, and then to the second draft in September 2016. The last round of reviews will take place in December 2016, then the final draft will be presented for formal UNDG endorsement. The launch and dissemination of the Guidelines will take place by the end of 2016. Dissemination efforts will involve webinars, direct advocacy with countries involved in the HLPF, and leveraging exist platforms and networks.

**Other Review Processes and Mechanisms**

*The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development* provides guidance for reviewing progress toward the SDGs at the national, regional and global levels, building on existing monitoring mechanisms, including the international human rights monitoring mechanisms.

At the national level, *The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development* notes the following:
“We also encourage member states to conduct regular and inclusive reviews of progress at the national and sub-national levels which are country-led and country-driven. Such reviews should draw on contributions from indigenous peoples, civil society, the private sector and other stakeholders, in line with national circumstances, policies and priorities. National parliaments as well as other institutions can also support these processes (The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development).”

Good practice examples for national review of progress can be seen in many European countries implementing national sustainable development strategies, where it is noted that “Multi-level and multi-stakeholder review processes also receive great importance, together with for instance, national parliaments or existing institutions such as the National SD Councils (ESDN 2015).” In a summary of national review practices, the European Sustainable Development Network describes a three-part typology that captures the state-of-practice across Europe (ESDN 2015):

1. **Internal Reviews:** Some countries have a bi-annual review process that culminates with the publication of a so-called progress report (e.g. Austria, Luxembourg, Latvia, and Lithuania). Some others perform annual reviews or annual progress reports (e.g. France, Slovakia, Slovenia, and Switzerland). Several countries have a less tight schedule that does not display regularity or is represented by a one-off exercise (e.g. Poland, Spain). Germany has a four-year review process cycle. Also, for the Austrian ÖSTRAT (the Austrian joint national strategy addressing both the federal and regional levels), evaluation is intended to be done every four years.

2. **External Reviews:** “Two options are usually employed: Either the responsible institution for the NSDS review process commissions a private consultant (e.g. Switzerland, Finland) or the task is given to independent researchers (e.g. Austria).”

3. **Peer Reviews:** “Peer reviews have been conducted in four countries: France (2005), Norway (2007), the Netherlands (2007), and twice in Germany (2009, 2013). The idea behind the peer reviews of NSDSs is to identify and share good practices in a process of mutual learning where, usually, other countries are taken as peers in the process. The peer review of an NSDS is voluntary and is undertaken upon the initiative of the country concerned. The peer reviews are intended to address all three SD pillars and the peer-reviewed country is free to choose to undertake a review of the whole NSDS or focus on one or more specific issues.”

Additionally, countries with a long history and culture of planning also have well-developed review processes for their respective national development plans. In a 2014 review of practices in Latin America and the Caribbean undertaken by the Sustainable Development Planning Network, it was observed that “There are national monitoring systems that track progress towards the goals of the national plan in four-year cycles, attempting to gauge the percentage of progress made over time. A central body such as the planning department oversees the process, engaging stakeholders and the public in the monitoring process at these intervals. In Costa Rica, for example, the National Assessment System operates in the Planning Ministry (Ministerio de Planificación Nacional y Política Económica), which carries out monitoring and evaluation of goals and policies of the plan and of public policies. Furthermore, the legislature and the Comptroller General’s Office give periodic accountability reports (SDplanNet 2015).”

4. **Audit Agencies:** A fourth type of national review mechanism can be considered in addition to the three listed above in the European context. Audit departments in many countries currently provide an independent internal review mechanism for governments that covers the full range of government operations and services. And some countries have development specific...
functions within their audit departments for addressing sustainable development issues. For example, Canada’s Commissioner of the Environment and Development resides in the Office of the Auditor General of Canada (OAG 2015). An interesting innovation in audit agencies is the trend toward creating commissioners that act on behalf of future generations. For example, in Wales a ‘Future Generations Commissioner’ was recently established under the innovative ‘The Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act’ (see Innovative Case Example Below). Hungary was a pioneer in this regard with their efforts in creating an Ombudsperson for Future Generations (World Future Council 2007).

5. Evaluation of public policy: A number of countries have developed strong evaluation systems to evaluate public policy and inform national decision making. For example, Mexico and Brazil have both used evaluations of social protection systems to confirm the benefits of such systems and inform expansion of these systems. The USA and Canada have each made periodic evaluation of government funded programmes mandatory in order to provide assurance that such programmes are appropriate, effective and cost effective, providing a powerful mechanism for follow up.

Innovative Case Example:
Welsh Future Generations Commissioner

On 29 April 2015 ‘The Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act’ became law in Wales. The Act “is about improving the social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being of Wales (Welsh Government 2015a).” Specifically, the Act includes:

- Lays out a set of seven well-being goals to provide a shared vision for public bodies;
- Puts in place a sustainable development principle with five elements: Long term; Prevention; Integration; Collaboration; and Involvement;
- A Future Generations Commissioner to act as a guardian for the interests of future generations in Wales and published one year before an Assembly election;
- A number of steps relating to transparency and accountability, including: A well-being statement; Annual reporting; Responding to the Future Generations Commissioner;
- An Auditor General to carry out examinations of the public bodies;
- National indicators and milestones to track progress toward achieving the well-being goals, and a Future Trends Report to be published within one year after an Assembly election;
- Public Service Boards for each Local Authority whose role includes improving the economic, social, environmental and cultural wellbeing of its area by working to achieve the well-being goals.


Toolkit
Data and Indicators
- Official list of SDG indicators from the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on SDG Indicators (IAEG-SDGs 2016)
- National SDG Data Assessments in the Asia and Pacific region (UNDG Asia-Pacific, forthcoming)
- Data for Development: A Needs Assessment for SDG Monitoring and Statistical Capacity Development (SDSN 2015)
- UNEPLive (UNEP 2015)

**Participatory monitoring systems**
- Peru Community Surveillance Systems for Early Childhood and Development (UNDG 2015)
- Thailand iMonitor (UNDG 2015)
- Zambia M-WASH (UNDG 2015)
- Most Significant Change (MSC) Technique (Davies and Dart 2005)

**Online Monitoring Systems**
- Swiss MONET System (FSO 2015)
- Mexico MDG Information System (Mexico 2015)
- SDG Index (SDSN 2016)

**Review processes**
- Voluntary National Reviews (HLPF 2016)
- Partners for Review (GIZ 2016)
- Internal Review: Belgium (ESDN 2015b)
- External Review: Finland (ESDN 2015c)
- Peer Review: German Peer Review (RNE 2013)
- Outcome Mapping: Building learning and reflection into development programs (IDRC 2001)

**Human Rights Guidance**

**Gender Mainstreaming Guidance**
- UN Statistical Commission Guide to Minimum Set of Gender Indicators (UN 2013)
- UN Women Position Paper: monitoring gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls in the 2030 agenda for sustainable development: opportunities and challenges (UN Women 2015)
- UN Guidelines for Producing Statistics on Violence against Women (UN 2014)

**Decent Work Indicators**
- ILO Manual on Decent Work indicators (ILO 2012).
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Section B8: Assessing Risk and Fostering Adaptability

Purpose

“It [follow-up and review] will mobilize support to overcome shared challenges and identify new and emerging issues.”

“They [follow-up and review] will maintain a longer-term orientation, identify achievements, challenges, gaps and critical success factors and support countries in making informed policy choices.”

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development

Identifying risks and emerging issues, and adapting to them, will be a critical part of achieving The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Additionally, careful reflection of lessons learned during the implementation of The 2030 Agenda and making timely course corrections along the way, are integral to effective follow-up and review.

The purpose of this section is to provide basic guidance for assessing risk and fostering adaptability in the pursuit of The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

Guidance

The 2008 global economic crisis, the 2014 Ebola outbreak, and the 2015 Syrian refugee crisis served up stark reminders to the importance of understanding and addressing risk in development planning. Refugee and migration crises for example, represent not only increasing pressure on host countries and communities to adapt development targets and resources to the changing demographics, but also on countries of origin suffering from “brain drain” and the negative impact of conflict on the development process, in human, social, political, economic and ecological terms. Issues that emerge slowly over time can be just as crippling – the costs of adapting to climate change, for example, are upsetting the development trajectories of even the wealthiest of nations (IHDP 2013).

The path to achieving the SDGs by 2030 can ill afford to experience such crises along the way. Yet in reality, such risks are ever-present, and every effort must be taken to detect, manage, and ultimately avoid them. Fortunately a variety of approaches and tools have been created over the years for such purposes.

Member states can explore a range of approaches for assessing risk and fostering adaptability at the plan and policy level. Guidance for UNCTs in this regard is three-fold:

1. **Adaptive Governance**: to provide a general framework for effectively navigating uncertainty, change and surprise across all of the guidance areas covered in this document (B1-B7);
2. **Risk analysis and management**: for the systematic identification and management of the risks facing the implementation of national, sub-national and local plans; and
3. **Scenario planning and stress testing**: to be applied regularly in the development planning and policy-making process for detecting emerging issues and examining the ability of plans, policies and programmes to perform under a range of plausible future conditions.
Adaptive Governance

“Recognizing that humanity is encroaching on critical planetary boundaries, new modes of adaptive governance are needed to initiate transition management and achieve internationally agreed goals and targets.”

5th Global Environment Outlook, UNEP

Acknowledging the inherently unpredictable nature of development, the 5th Global Environment Outlook report of the United Nations Environment Programme stated “it is nearly impossible to create a fail-proof blueprint or to formulate optimal policies. What is required instead is an inclusive, learn-by-doing process with careful monitoring of policy effects, and an ability to make critical choices and improvements consistent with the trajectories leading to established goals (UNEP 2012).”

The UNEP report further elaborated the core elements of adaptive governance (below) and each of these elements serve this Guidance Note either as additional rationale and context for guidance areas previously presented, or as new guidance that can be incorporated into the formulation of development strategies, plans and supporting policies and programs.

- **Multi-actor deliberation and agenda building.** “Many stakeholders influence societal change. Governance must, therefore, be participatory to recognize advantageous leverage points, the levers for change and the correct direction to move them; to achieve coherent coalitions for creating shared notions of goals and ambitions; and to strengthen policy design and implementation.”

  This element is reflected in Section B2 of this Guidance Note and it also amplifies the importance of applying multi-stakeholder approaches in the process of adapting SDGs to national, sub-national and local contexts (Section B3).

- **Futures analysis and long-term collective goal setting.** “Integrated and forward-looking assessments are critical tools that inform ongoing processes of change by systematically reflecting upon the future and developing shared notions of future goals and targets.” This element is covered directly later in this section on guidance for scenario planning and stress testing of plans and policies.

- **Enabling self-organization and networking.** “Creating opportunities for cooperation and replicating successes, ensuring that social capital remains intact, and guaranteeing that members of the population are free and able to interact, are all fundamental elements of building the capacity of actors and policy itself to plan for and adapt to surprises.”

  This element is perhaps the least intuitive of the adaptive governance elements, but it is critical for scaling up the impact of policies and plans. It speaks to the important role that social capital plays in helping stakeholders adapt to unanticipated shocks (i.e., natural disasters, pandemics, economic crises) and even slower, more subtle change (i.e., climate change adaptation). This social capital comes in many forms such as through informal networks, faith-based groups, and professional associations and grass-roots civil society organizations in helping stakeholders respond to unanticipated events. Additional guidance for enabling self-organization is provided in the Toolkit section (Swanson and Bhadwal 2009).

- **Variation, experimentation and innovation.** “Diversity of responses [i.e., policies and programs] forms a common risk-management approach, and continuous reflection and improvement helps to develop a context in which innovation for desired change can thrive.”

  This element provides guidance for the selection of policies and programmes in support of development strategies and plans (see Section B3 in relation to the formulation of strategies and plans using systems thinking).
Reflexivity and adaptation. Systemic [i.e., formalized] review of past, present and future sustainability conditions and policy performance through interaction and cooperation with a range of stakeholders is critical for continuous improvement and social learning.

This element of adaptive govern amplifies the important function that follow-up and review plays in The 2030 Agenda and within that, the importance of applying multi-stakeholder approaches in the design, implementation, review and improvement of policies and programs. Many stakeholders have developed platform for knowledge and experience sharing in implementing monitoring and evaluation of development policy and programmes. These systems could be better disseminated and tailored to fit SDG purposes.

Innovative Case Examples:

Kyrgyzstan
Following the 2010 inter-ethnic violence in the south of Kyrgyzstan, it was recognised that a multi-sector approach was needed to help build bridges between communities involved in the ethnic conflict, and to support sustainable peace. In a 6-month inception phase, a number of reports, surveys and assessments were conducted to understand the context and needs of vulnerable children, women and their families. The resulting programme design addresses inequitable access to basic services and lack of opportunity, which was identified as a driver of conflict.

The long inception phase allowed interventions to be tailored to specifics of municipal contexts. The preparatory work, and the engagement with stakeholders at the assessment and design stage, allowed UNICEF to achieve more than it had originally planned in less time than anticipated.

India
A Risk Informed Development Planning System (RIDPS) was developed by UNICEF in India as a system that aim at producing real-time data for risks and vulnerabilities using climate and other hazard indicators and child risk indicators. It is designed to: support risk informed development planning; analyse multiple sectors in one tool at the same time; and identify data collection gaps and enhance data collection and analysis skills. The tool allows users to access, analyse, visualize and export data to meet risk informed analysis, planning and reporting needs, quickly and easily. It allows users and sector specialists to select, aggregate, disaggregate and cross-analyse multiple indicators into composite indexes; and supports the identification of correlations and composite levels of vulnerability across sectors, contributing to risk informed development programming.

The system has been developed initially for use in Bihar and Rajasthan States, with indicators relating to WASH, education, health and nutrition sectors together with demographic and economic indicators which are child focused, and which have been selected because government data exists already or, where there is no government data, it is needed to make informed decisions. The picture of disaster proneness produced is constantly updated in the light of real time data, meaning that the State Governments have a current overview on levels of vulnerability. The system includes previously uncollected data collected via SMS from front line workers in remote areas (e.g., government health workers) so that vulnerabilities from these remote areas inform regional government planning.

From 2014, RIDPS data has informed state planning. The RIDPS has wide potential applicability in multiple risk settings.

Source: UNICEF.
Risk Analysis and Management

Risk analysis involves the identification and study of uncertainties that can impact negatively on performance. It is a practice that governments can use not just in the early stages of formulation development plans, but as a regular and formalized process for ongoing improvement. The annual Global Risk Report of the World Economic Forum is a good example of the type of information and exercise that countries can pursue at national, sub-national and local levels to help navigate the complex and dynamic terrain of the 21st century (see Innovative Case Example below).

Innovative Case Example:

For a decade now the World Economic Forum in its Global Risk Report has been “highlighting the most significant long-term risks worldwide, drawing on the perspectives of experts and global decision-makers” and in the context of economic, environmental, societal, geopolitical and technological issues. The 2015 report warns that the world is “insufficiently prepared for an increasingly complex risk environment”, stressed by renewed concerns of inter-state conflict, the emergence of cyber-attacks, failure of climate change adaptation, and strained public finances and rising unemployment in the wake of the 2008 economic crisis.

Global Risk Trends Interconnections Map
Risk management is a process that includes the identification, assessment and prioritization of risk, combined with the allocation of resources to minimize, monitor and control risk (Douglas 2009; see also ISO 2009). Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) is the more formal terminology, and while it grew out of the private sector, many government audit departments, at all levels, undertake some form of risk management at the programme and project level. It is a process that can be incorporated as part of follow-up and review (see Section B7).

The International Standards Organization (ISO) has established ISO 31000 on risk management principles and guidelines. The basic steps of risk management as outlined in ISO 31000 are depicted below and elaborated as follows: “All activities of an organization involve risk. Organizations manage risk by identifying it, analysing it and then evaluating whether the risk should be modified by risk treatment in order to satisfy their risk criteria. Throughout this process, they communicate and consult with stakeholders and monitor and review the risk and the controls that are modifying the risk in order to ensure that no further risk treatment is required (ISO 31000 – 2009).”

These guidelines can be applied within any type of public or private organization. In regards to application by governments to manage risks associated with achieving their development plans and nationally-adapted SDGs, this scope is set within the first step on ‘Establishing the Context’. This includes both the internal context—the “internal environment in which the organization seeks to achieve its objectives (ISD 31000-2009)” and the external context—“the cultural, social, political, legal, regulatory, financial, technological, economic, natural and competitive environment, whether international, national, regional or local; key drivers and trends having impact on the objectives of the organization; and relationships with, and perceptions and values of external stakeholders (ISO 3100-2009).”

ISO 31000 on Risk Management
Furthermore, the ISO 31000 notes the following in relation to the application of risk management in organizations: “Although the practice of risk management has been developed over time and within many sectors in order to meet diverse needs, the adoption of consistent processes within a comprehensive framework can help to ensure that risk is managed effectively, efficiently and coherently across an organization. The generic approach described in this International Standard provides the principles and guidelines for managing any form of risk in a systematic, transparent and credible manner and within any scope and context (ISO 31000 – 2009).”

Disaster risk reduction management is one area that has seen the creation of formal risk assessment and management institutions and processes. The Sendai Framework is one such prominent example that provides detailed guidance to countries on risk and resilience.

**Innovative Case Example**
**The Sendai Framework**

The Sendai Framework is a 15-year, voluntary, non-binding agreement which recognizes that the State has the primary role to reduce disaster risk but that responsibility should be shared with other stakeholders including local government, the private sector and other stakeholders. It aims for the following outcome: The substantial reduction of disaster risk and losses in lives, livelihoods and health and in the economic, physical, social, cultural and environmental assets of persons, businesses, communities and countries.

The framework’s four priorities for action include:

- **Priority 1.** Understanding disaster risk
- **Priority 2.** Strengthening disaster risk governance to manage disaster risk
- **Priority 3.** Investing in disaster risk reduction for resilience
- **Priority 4.** Enhancing disaster preparedness for effective response and to “Build Back Better” in recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction

*Source: UNISDR (2016).*

Institutional mechanisms have been put in place for risk management in countries. For example, see the innovative case example below featuring the Ecuadorian Secretariat for Risk Management.

**Innovative Case Example:**
**Ecuadorian Secretariat for Risk Management**

The Ecuadorian Secretariat for Risk Management is the Governmental institution that is concerned with risk reduction and emergency and disaster management. Its mission is to ensure the protection of people and communities from the adverse effects of natural or man-made disasters,

19 See [http://www.gestionderiesgos.gob.ec/](http://www.gestionderiesgos.gob.ec/)
through the generation of policies, strategies and standards that promote the identification, analysis, prevention and mitigation of risks, emergency situations and disasters.

In Ecuador three volcanos are experiencing eruption processes and the El Niño is approaching strong category strength. Today the UN system is supporting the National Risk Management Secretariat and other public entities in developing scenario planning and potential damage estimations and costing of potential natural disasters (UNDG and UNDP 2015).

Source: UN Office for Outer Space Affairs (2015).

Tools have also been developed for broader risk assessment and management. One example is the INFORM risk analysis model.

**Innovative Case Example:**

**INFORM – Index for Risk Management**

INFORM is an open-source index for risk management. It is “the first global, objective and transparent tool for understanding the risk of humanitarian crises.” It was developed by the UN Inter-agency Standing Committee Task Team for Preparedness and Resilience and the European Commission.

INFORM uses 50 indicators to better understand exposure, hazards, vulnerability and coping capacity in a given country. Data and country profiles are available for 191 countries, showing trends, comparisons with countries having similar risk, regional and income-group averages and more information at the indicator level.

INFORM can also be used at the sub-national level to show how crisis and disaster risk varies across a country or region. Current sub-national applications include Sahel, the Greater Horn of Africa, Lebanon and Colombia.
Scenario Planning and Stress Testing

Scenario planning is a participatory approach designed to create “frameworks for structuring executives’ perceptions about alternative future environments in which their decisions might play out (Ralston & Wilson, 2006).” It is commonly applied in environmental planning and management, and more recently, for stress testing strategies and policies in the financial sector. As such, the application of scenario planning is recommended here in the formulation of development strategies and plans as a means for detecting and addressing emerging issues and identifying a variety of policies and programmes that are robust across a range of plausible futures.

Innovative Case Example:
Environment Outlook for Latin America and the Caribbean

The Division of Early Warning and Assessment of the UN Environment Programme undertakes regular scenario analysis via their Global Environment Outlook (GEO). The GEO process also works with national governments to undertake regional outlooks to help inform policy development.

The 2010 Environment Outlook for Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) considered the socio-economic and environmental implications of four plausible future scenarios, namely: (i) relegated sustainability; (ii) sustainability reforms; (iii) unsustainability and increased conflicts; and (iv) transition to sustainability.

In applying scenario analysis the LAC outlook report provided the following guidance: “The scenarios must be prepared with the necessary detail when making the basic characterization of the object under study at different spatial and temporal scales; they must be plausible, coherent and reflect – as far as possible – how the disciplines of the natural, social and other sciences are integrated. They have a qualitative component, where experts in different branches of learning explain what they know about the driving forces, their potentialities and inter-relationships; and a quantitative component fundamentally based on the results of statistical models and that, as a guiding element, takes into account the basic assumptions defined in the qualitative analysis.”
The general steps of scenario planning can be parsed into the general phases of foresight to insight to action (Institute for the Future 2013). There will be differences in the implementation of scenario planning depending on the purpose of the exercise (IISD 2014): “the steps will vary somewhat if the exercise is meant to illuminate vulnerabilities of an existing strategy or plan (stress testing), versus if the exercise is meant to explore plausible futures that might unfold to provide context for policy recommendations (scenario analysis), or to develop a vision of the future and back-cast a plan for getting there (visioning). In practice, there is often a little of each of purpose imbedded in any exercise.”

The UN Environment Programme’s Inquiry into the Design of a Sustainable Financial System highlights the importance of scenarios in their recommendation to governments to undertake stress testing across financial sectors and markets (UNEP 2015). Specifically, they recommend to “develop scenario based tools to enable a better understanding of the impacts of future climate shocks on assets, institutions and systems.” Additionally, in 2015 the European Financial Review recommended that “Leaders need to anticipate major market shifts, looming crises, and changes in regulation or disruptive offerings by rivals. War gaming, systems thinking, and scenario planning are some of the tools that can help accomplish this urgent need.”

Policy Wind Tunnels are a form of stress testing that is used in the process of creating adaptive policies and strategies. This approach involved identifying key factors affecting policy and strategy performance and then using scenarios to explore the potential future evolution of these factors and their impact on performance (Swanson and Bhadwal 2009). When done in a multi-stakeholder manner, policy wind tunnels can provide insights into robust actions and important indicators that can be used to trigger timely policy, plan or strategy adjustments to help achieve desired goals.

**Toolkit**

**Scenario Planning and Foresight**
- Scenario Planning Handbook (Ralston and Wilson 2006)
- VISIS (Vision > Indicators > Systems > Innovation > Strategy): “an open-source methodology for interdisciplinary collaboration in the context of sustainable development (Atkisson 2015; Atkisson 2010).”
- Backcasting using the Natural Step (The Natural Step 2016)
- Policy Wind Tunnel (Swanson and Bhadwal 2009)
- Adolescents Shaping their Future: A Foresight Toolkit (UNICEF 2016)

**Risk Analysis and Management**
- ISO 31000 - Risk management (ISO 2009)
- A Structured approach to Enterprise Risk Management and the Requirements of ISO 31000 (AIRMIC, ALARM, and IRM 2015)
- INFORM index for risk management (INFORM 2015)

** Adaptive Governance and Policy-making**
- The Fifth Discipline Fieldbook (Senge et al. 1994)
Creating Adaptive Policies: A Guide for Policy-making in an Uncertain World (Swanson and Bhadwal 2009)

ADAPTool – the Adaptive Design and Assessment Policy Tool (IISD 2015)
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Section B9: Mainstreaming the 2030 Agenda in Countries in Complex Situations

Note to reader: All guidance in this section is based on UNDP’s ‘SDG Ready’ publication on SDG implementation in complex situations (UNDP 2016).

Purpose
There has been a tendency among some development actors and practitioners operating in very difficult crisis-affected and complex situations to consider that the SDGs are not for countries affected by crisis and fragility, at least not until the crisis in question is over. However, governments and citizens in countries that find themselves in these difficult situations are stating precisely the opposite: that the 2030 Agenda is of paramount importance for them and has to be implemented in their countries as soon as possible.

Guidance
Complex settings are often inundated with a multitude of overlapping humanitarian, peacebuilding and governance, and development needs. Some complex situations are in crisis, while others are in the immediate post-crisis phase, and still others are transitioning to more stable development contexts, but with pockets of conflict, insecurity and life-saving concerns. Mainstreaming the SDGs must consider and balance the tensions among: a) striving to attain a deeper understanding of the root causes of violent conflict and fragility; b) enabling a prioritization of development goals that is guided by the imperatives of fragility; and c) recognizing the political dynamics of complex situations, including especially situations of protracted or continually evolving conflict.

Guidance for mainstreaming the 2030 Agenda in countries affected by conflict and complex situations is provided in this section for each of the eight core areas of SDG Mainstreaming.

Awareness Raising and Multi-stakeholder Engagement
Initiating and sustaining meaningful citizen engagement in mainstreaming and monitoring of SDG implementation in complex situations poses particular challenges in promoting the voices of the most marginalized, including women, children and youth, and ensuring that their perspectives are taken into account in national development planning and implementation. This is even more complicated in situations where people are displaced and infrastructures (roads, communication, etc.) and security are poor.

Section B1 outlines the major steps for awareness-raising. The additional considerations should be kept in mind in awareness raising and multi-stakeholder engagement for countries in complex situations such as special attention to children and youth, gender equality and women’s empowerment, and strategic partnerships.

Engaging children: The SDGs cannot be achieved without reaching the millions of children affected by humanitarian crises. They are also critical agents of change in the implementation of the SDGs, helping to change their own lives and their communities with fresh ideas and boundless energy for action. These children have the greatest stake in the future, as they have the most to gain – or lose. When disasters or
conflicts strike, they are among the most affected. They are especially vulnerable to disease, malnutrition and violence, and their welfare and access to education becomes a low priority. They are also exposed to new risks such as being separated from their families and exploited by armed forces and groups, and face increased threats of gender based violence, exposure to landmines and unexploded ordinance, and psychosocial distress. The impact of crises are even greater on the most vulnerable or excluded, such as children with disabilities, orphans, indigenous or ethnic minorities, those living in extremely poor communities, the displaced, girls, infants, young people, among others. It is therefore critical that in conflict and emergency situations, particular attention is given to ensuring that children’s rights are upheld and safeguarded, and that children are also actively involved and given fair opportunities to voice their opinions about sustainable solutions.

Engaging children and youth: Given the large demographic that youth represent in countries in complex situations, their inclusion in political processes and in achieving the SDGs is imperative. Ensuring the participation of young women, men, boys and girls in the implementation of the SDGs and in peacebuilding is also a UN system-wide priority. The recent adoption of the ground-breaking Security Council Resolution 2250 (2015) on Youth, Peace and Security signals a recognition of the importance of engaging with children and youth as SDG champions and positive agents of change to build sustainable peace. Security Council Resolution 2282 (2016) on the ‘Review of United Nations Peacebuilding Architecture’ further recognizes the need to support youth participation in decision-making at all levels and in peacebuilding processes as well as create enabling environments for children and youth to be protected and supported as partners for change. Important considerations in this regard include:

- Supporting the participation and leadership of youth in the resolution of violent conflicts;
- Help catalyse the expansion of employment opportunities through innovation and private sector engagement;
- Support disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration initiatives and the stabilization of post-conflict situations;
- Engage youth in inclusive political processes including promoting peaceful elections; and
- Form youth champions for SDG implementation and ensure that the aspirations of youth are integral to SDG prioritization processes.

Promoting gender equality and women’s and girl’s empowerment through mainstreaming: The precariousness produced by fragility has a strong gender dimension. While both men and women may suffer in crisis and fin complex situations, the relatively disadvantaged situation of women and girls, their differentiated social obligations and responsibilities, and their increased vulnerability to gender-based violence often means that they are disproportionately affected in these environments. For this reason, an explicit focus on the needs of women is needed. The exclusion of women from peacebuilding and recovery processes, and from decision-making on issues that directly impact their lives including development planning, and the existence of significant structural gender inequalities (SDGs 5 and 10) all combine to undermine achievement of the SDGs. Addressing the gender inequality challenge features prominently in the SDGs, but much remains to be done.

Engaging business: Businesses can play a major role in humanitarian efforts. Companies with operations or supply chains inside and outside countries that are facing humanitarian crises can be engaged to take action individually or in partnership with others to support children and families at risk, affected by, or recovering from humanitarian crises. Those actions may include financial or in-kind contributions, including relief items, volunteering efforts and strategic social investments to support
governments, development and humanitarian organizations and the UN, including direct support to affected communities. In addition, businesses can be engaged at national and global level for their capacity to help amplify the voices of children within their spheres of influence (with customers, employees, civil society, media, business and government networks) to promote children’s survival, development, protection and participation. They can use their digital and traditional channels of communication to deliver key messages to communities and raise awareness among customers, employees and other stakeholders. Business can also contribute with data and analytics to facilitate evidence-based advocacy and engage with governments for policy changes.

**Strategic partnership to advance SDG implementation in complex situations:** No single group or entity can support SDG implementation in complex situations by itself. The role of partnerships and coherent engagement is critical. A new blend of partnerships, involving traditional and non-traditional donors, governments, international financial institutions, philanthropists, the private sector and a wide range of national and international NGOs, is a necessity for achieving the SDGs in complex situations.

**Innovative Case Example**

**UNDP’s partnerships and interagency mechanisms**

Partners within the UN system, include the Department for Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO), Department of Political Affairs (DPA), and the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) and UN Country Teams. Through the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC), UNDP engages with international NGOs in crisis settings to advance SDG implementation. Most of the UN interagency partnerships – such as the UNDP-DPKO-led Global Focal Point for Police, Justice and Correction, the UNDP-DPA joint programme on Building National Capacities for Conflict Prevention and the UNDP-UN-World Bank Interagency Platform on Core Government Functions – target complex situations.

The Integrated Mission Planning Process also provides an important framework at the design and implementation stages of transitions of peace operations. The Senior Peacebuilding Group serves as a forum for policy discussion related to peacebuilding and guidance with regard to the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF). These will remain vital to mainstreaming and achieving the SDGs in complex situations.

*Source: UNDP (2016)*

Strengthen partnerships with global peacebuilding, climate change and disaster risk reduction and resilience policy institutions is another important element. For example, the UN system participates in the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding (IDPS), which includes UNDP’s co-chairmanship of the International Network on Conflict and Fragility (INCAF), and its support to the g7+ group of countries in complex situations. The UN system contributes towards shaping the jointly agreed policy initiatives and positions emerging from these processes and adopts and applies them in its ongoing work. In this context, UNDP and the g7+ group of countries entered into a Memorandum of Understanding on 5 April 2016 to jointly support SDG implementation in g7+ countries. Additionally, UNDP has also signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the Vulnerable-twenty (V-20) group of countries, i.e. group of finance ministers from 43 countries that are most vulnerable to climate change, established to strengthen prevention and preparedness against climate change- and disaster-related risks.

**Reviewing Plans and Adapting the SDGs to the National Context**

Mainstreaming includes, first, aligning the SDGs with existing national visions, and national, local and sectoral development plans. This must be followed by a prioritization exercise to determine what the
country wants to carry forward from current development plans while ensuring that the selected goals
are consonant with the core principles of the SDGs and the New Deal\(^\text{20}\), particularly the principle of
leaving no one behind. A third important task is to harmonize all existing development, peacebuilding
and humanitarian planning frameworks to ensure a coherent single planning framework to which all
partners will contribute. These areas are further elaborated below.

**Integrated and multidimensional fragility assessment:** Development planning must begin with
understanding the fragility context. Fragility is multidimensional and requires the integration of a
number of analytical tools to fully understand its dimensions. This includes understanding the power
relations and the drivers of fragility, and identifying and analyzing the drivers of conflict, institutions and
institutional context, natural hazards, and disaster exposure and vulnerability.

Among the tools are the New Deal Fragility Assessment, the Conflict and Development Assessment
(CDA), the Core Government Function Assessment, and the Disaster Risk Assessment. The Recovery and
Peacebuilding Assessment (RPBA, formerly PCNA) and the Post-Disaster Needs Assessment (PDNA)
frameworks jointly designed by the UN, EU and WBG are important tools for strengthening multi-
stakeholder partnerships for joint assessments and planning in recovery settings.

**Alignment and balancing:** Alignment of the SDGs with national development frameworks, particularly in
complex situations, must begin with stocktaking to determine the progress already made on critical
MDGs and which the 2030 Agenda mainstreaming process has identified as constituting a ‘last mile
challenge’. There should also be an assessment of the opportunities for accelerating progress in these
areas. The review should assess the development planning process, including how prioritization was
done, existing institutional arrangements, resource mobilization, and accountability systems.

The stocktaking exercise lays the groundwork for dialogue on the other important areas, including the
extent to which SDG targets and indicators may already be reflected in current development
frameworks, as well as the need for further consolidation and harmonization of the development
planning landscape.

**Rapid Integrated Assessments:** See Section B3 for a description of the Rapid Integrated Assessment Tool.
Initial lessons from the application of the Rapid Integrated Assessment tool in complex situations show
that, in these contexts, development priorities tend to be skewed to the risks or crisis. For instance, in
conflict-related crisis contexts, the emphasis tends to be on peacebuilding and state-building solutions,
whereas, in disaster-related situations, the emphasis is on disaster risk reduction and governance. While
these are obvious, the emerging gap is the failure to link these solutions to the overall development
agenda in these complex contexts.

**Prioritization:** Prioritization of development must be driven and owned by national actors at all levels of
the society. But determining the priorities that a country pursues in its development plan, if not well
managed, can be driven exclusively by the political imperatives of the elite. This is especially true in
complex situations. While politically driven prioritization is not necessarily a bad thing, in complex

\(^{20}\) The New Deal is a key agreement between fragile and conflict-affected states, development partners, and civil society to
improve the current development policy and practice in fragile and conflict-affected states. (see
https://www.pbsbdialogue.org/en/new-deal/about-new-deal/)
situations where politics tends to be polarized, efforts should be made to make prioritization inclusive, based on a set of agreed principles and criteria for prioritization.

Prioritization must include a) identifying those areas and populations that are lagging furthest behind; b) accelerating actions on areas where the country has made considerable progress and for which reaching the ‘last mile’ is in sight; and c) focusing on those areas that will help address the country’s critical development challenges while also addressing the root causes of fragility.

**Harmonizing existing planning frameworks:** In complex situations, there often are parallel humanitarian, peacebuilding and development planning frameworks, delivery channels and oversight authorities. The SDG framework is indivisible. Maximizing its domestication in complex situations requires promoting coherence and synergy across diverse humanitarian, peacebuilding, transition and development frameworks. Harmonization begin with supporting an assessment of how to develop a single planning framework as well as delivery and coordination architecture across humanitarian, recovery, transition, peacebuilding, and development actions, where applicable. It then involves supporting dialogue on the possible re-classification of the national budget and budget cycle in line with the new SDG framework.

**Institutional Arrangements and Horizontal Policy Coherence**
Institutional arrangements are important considerations in countries affected by complex situations, as is enhancing policy coherence across these institutions. Key aspects to consider are outlined below and include engaging national and local institutions and strengthening and using country systems.

**Engaging National and Local Institutions:** Current institutions and institutional arrangements in countries facing complex situations were mostly designed either to respond to crisis, to manage transition and support recovery or to achieve the MDGs. These institutions and the entire institutional context will need to be reviewed and adapted to long-term development planning and implementation to achieve the SDGs. The SDGs demand higher quality performance and results focus, more effective coordination and coherence in recognition of the interlinkages of the goals. They also require fluid interaction and coordination between the local and national levels as well as effective and efficient supply management systems to expedite development delivery in a way that enables first reaching those farthest behind. This level of institutional efficacy requires innovation and a firm commitment across society to succeed.

**Strengthening and using country systems:** Strengthening and using institutions and systems in complex situations has been a perennial challenge. While there has been some progress on this commitment, it is quite modest. Development partners are still reluctant to use country systems for their development support primarily because of the continuing weakness of those systems, their limited absorptive capacity, and the real and perceived fiduciary risks involved.

Some partners have argued that the overall political economy in complex situations still makes the risk of using country system very high. However, the success of the SDGs would be significantly enhanced by building capable and resilient institutions that can drive and sustain development gains. Without the strengthening and use of country systems, it will be impossible to build capable and resilient institutions.

Convening dialogues between national stakeholders and international development partners to discuss the necessary changes required to the budget system to advance the SDGs is an important aspect. Many complex situations are incrementally adopting the medium-term expenditure framework (MTEF), which
is designed as part of public financial management efforts, to help governments examine public spending to best serve national development objectives in the medium term. While the impact of this framework on the quality of development is still being investigated, SDG mainstreaming and implementation call for a dedicated assessment of the suitability of the MTEF for SDG planning, considering its emphasis on sector-based planning.

Vertical Policy Coherence
As is the case in all situations, localizing the 2030 Agenda is also a critical part of mainstreaming for countries affected by conflict and resilience. And urban considerations are becoming increasingly important in this regard.

Localization: In many complex contexts, development is often centralized and predominantly concentrated in the capitals. Even in capitals, development tends to overlook slum dwellers. Localization refers to the process of designing, implementing and monitoring SDG strategies in ways that acknowledge and address the development priorities and opportunities at the subnational level. The principle of ‘leaving no one behind’ provides impetus for the localization of SDG implementation in complex settings. In any country regardless of political context, local governance remains for the vast majority of men and women the most accessible level of engagement with public authority and state institutions. The subnational level is understood as the key site of delivery and development.

Urbanization: The support needed to strengthen the social contract is increasingly located in urban settings where there have been rising inequalities for decades. Addressing fragility through the SDGs will require paying far more attention to urban manifestations of fragility, conflict and violence, and to how decision makers organize urban spaces to address the challenges of social, economic and political integration. One quarter of the world’s urban population lives in slums without basic services and social protection and this percentage is expected to double rapidly in the next decades. These challenges are compounded with the majority of migrants and displaced populations moving to urban areas, partially as a result of conflict and to seek better economic opportunities. Important aspects for helping countries meet these goals are:

- Supporting improved understanding of the role of cities in achieving the SDGs and support the design and prioritization of an urban SDG roadmap;
- Establishing linkages and coherence across and between national and local planning and budgeting instruments and processes; and
- Convening local, national and international multi-stakeholder dialogues and south-south exchanges to develop solutions to complex urban development issues including violence and organized crime.

Innovative Case Example
Governing Safer Cities: Strategies for a Globalised World

**A Framework to Guide Urban Policy-makers and Practitioners**

In its Framework to Guide Urban Policy-makers and Practitioners the UN Office on Drugs and Crime highlights that in order for states to maintain security and safety, the infrastructure to deliver basic public services across all communities are crucial. In cities or neighbourhoods where such service provision, including access to justice, is lacking, and where governance and rule of law is limited, criminal groups have filled the power vacuum by offering alternative forms of governance and expanding their business. Indeed, as long as large
proportions of urban populations are socially and economically excluded, crime (and associated violence), often associated with the trafficking of guns, drugs or human beings, can be seen as the only possible option for many, especially young people.

The challenge for urban institutions is to find ways to realistically engage in supporting communities and citizens; to build viable and trustworthy propositions of governance; and to provide the necessary oversight and transparency that will prevent these being subverted by illicit interests. That reinforces the requirement to focus on the rule of law, and building fair and inclusive institutions, in line with Goal 16 of the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda.

Source: UNODC (2016)

Financing and Budgeting for the Future

While Official Development Assistance (ODA) still remains a vital source of development finance in complex situations, the scale of resources required to advance progress on the SDGs in complex situations requires exploring and tapping into a range of other sources of financing. These include, but are not limited to, a hybrid combination of savings; loans and insurance; remittances; government social safety nets; subsidized and free contributions in kind from the private sector and philanthropists; crowdfunding and cash transfer from domestic, regional and global humanitarian actors; etc.

Important elements of SDG financing and budgeting countries in complex situations include assessing the policy and institutional context for development financing, undertaking public and private expenditure reviews to expand the fiscal space, costing development plans, and developing a robust development financing strategy. These elements are elaborated in the paragraphs below.

Innovative Case Example

Online Guidance Platform for SDG Financing

To respond to the challenge of linking development policies with financing instruments, tools and strategies, UNDP has launched a new online platform (www.undp.org/content/sdfinance/). The platform provides guidance on how to review financing solutions – from green bonds and impact investment to fuel taxes and ecological fiscal transfers – to develop national SDG financing strategies.

The website is a compass to navigate across financing solutions. It is an intelligent database that describes the advantages, disadvantages, risks and main characteristics of each financing option in the bundle. It profiles case studies and refers to multiple external sources, including e-learning and advanced guidance material, where available. Solutions can be searched depending on the financing option sought, the financial instrument used and the sector or most relevant SDG(s).

Source: UNDP (2016)

Support context-specific comprehensive assessment of current expenditures, financing needs and opportunities: An important first step is supporting national authorities to undertake a comprehensive financing needs assessment, including determining the volume of current public and private expenditures and the investment required for the given country to design and implement development plans that are based on the SDGs. The assessment should include a thorough analysis of:

- Current patterns of expenditures and investment opportunities for private financing and the policy requirements for harnessing these opportunities;
• Existing accountability framework for monitoring and reporting on investments, including how to harmonize and aggregate investment needs across all the priority areas of a development or sector plan;
• How to build capable, transparent and accountable institutions and how to achieve measurable progress in fighting corruption in all its forms and to promote efficiency savings to expand the fiscal space; and
• How to improve country systems to adhere to global principles for effective development cooperation.

Already, UNDP’s biodiversity finance initiative, the UNDP-UNEP poverty and environment initiative and climate-related portfolio have reviewed expenditure and investment patterns in more than 50 countries (see Section B6). This experience and materials will be drawn upon to support countries in complex situations.

**Strengthen national and local capacities for domestic revenue generation:** Significant international attention is being paid to domestic resource mobilization. Domestic resources are the largest and most important source for sustainable development financing. At the same time, it is widely acknowledged that tax avoidance and evasion, in particular by wealthy individuals and multinational companies, are major challenges for countries in complex situations where institutional capacities, including tax regulation and revenue institutions, are weak. At the Third International Conference on Financing for Development in Addis Ababa in July 2015, governments made a strong commitment to “enhancing revenue administration through modernized, progressive tax systems, improved tax policy and more efficient tax collection” and agreed to “improve the fairness, transparency, efficiency and effectiveness of tax systems”.

**Innovative Case Example**
**Tax Inspectors without Borders**

The UNDP-OECD project “Tax Inspectors without Borders” is designed to tackle the challenge of weak tax audit capacity by deploying experienced tax audit experts for a pre-agreed period of time in developing countries’ tax administrations. Under the Tax Inspectors without Borders (TIWB), audit experts are deployed to work alongside local staff on specific tax audit cases and to share knowledge and skills with local officials through a targeted, real-time ‘learning-by-doing’ approach.

Countries in complex situations have been supported through this initiative. The resource is available at the request of countries in complex situations, with funding from the New Deal Implementation Support Facility.

*Source: UNDP (2016)*

**Private sector investment and blended instruments:** The private sector can create jobs, drive infrastructure development and strengthen the sense of normalcy and peace. Many countries in complex situations do not attract private sector investment primarily due to lack of infrastructure, weak governance, and political constraints. Since 2012, the UN system has worked with the International Financial Institutions (IFIs) and other development partners to leverage additional resources and expertise for working with the private sector. A particular focus of this engagement has been innovative finance for enterprise development in complex situations and exploring the linking of IFI instruments such as equity (venture capital), loans and guarantee facilities, etc.
Advocating for targeted and predictable development assistance: ODA plays a significant role in exiting fragility and eradicating poverty in all of its forms. It will continue to do so in the SDG era. In some countries affected by fragility, ODA constitutes 55 percent of gross domestic product (OECD 2014). To achieve tangible results and leverage sustainable development, however, ODA must be significant, targeted, catalytic and sustained. Knowledge and technology will play a major role in crisis prevention, and so will programme targeting, service delivery and monitoring and quality control.

Mobilizing external grants: In recent years, the number of countries outside of the OECD-DAC that is more favorable to concessional assistance to countries affected by fragility, has been growing considerably. These include the BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa), some countries in Latin America and Southeast Asia, and some Arab countries. The UN system can support countries in complex situations to tap into these new sources of funding as part of its support to broadening the resource base.

Monitoring, Reporting and Accountability
Establishing reliable M&E systems based on disaggregated indicators that can be monitored at national and subnational levels is pivotal to SDG implementation in complex situations. In the MDG era, many countries affected by fragility were seriously deficient in monitoring and accounting for development progress. Quality indicators did not exist. Where some indicators existed, the sources of data were limited. These countries continue to have the lowest capacity and experience in monitoring and reporting on development results.

The 2030 Agenda further complicates the accountability challenge in complex situations, considering its ambitious and integrated nature. Its principle of leaving no one behind and first reaching those furthest behind dictates countrywide monitoring of all data sources. The SDGs also transcend the state-centrism that characterized the MDGs. States that are part of regional ‘zones of fragility’ will need to collaborate with other governments in the affected region to monitor transnational indicators that affect sustainable development and peaceful coexistence.

UNDP helped pioneered capacity development for accountability and for the production of peace and governance statistics and indicators, through its support to the African Union Commission (AUC) within the framework of the AUC’s Strategy for the Harmonization of Statistics in Africa (SHASA). UNDP is supporting the Praia City Group21, under the UN Statistical Commission, to expand on that experience by incorporating governance and peacebuilding indicators in all national official statistics. The Open Government Partnership, the Community of Democracies, and UNDP are helping countries at their request to develop periodic scorecards to monitor Goal 16 progress and data gaps.

Drawing on this wealth of experience, the UN system can provide demand-based support to national and local governments in complex situations in the following ways:

- Support assessments of data requirements, data harmonization capacity and the human and technological resource needs of national statistical offices;

---

21 The Praia City Group is a grouping of national statistical offices with the mandate to develop international recommendations on the production of official statistics on governance, particularly to advance SDG 16.
• Accompany authorities in the development of national policies and strategies for building sustainable M&E systems and develop the capability to coordinate data production mechanisms, and to use big data;

• Help review existing sector-specific data systems and link them all together through web-based national portals and dashboards to establish data ecosystem that can be monitored in real time;

• Promote the development and entrenching of the culture of evidence-based development planning through education, support to civic groups and regular dialogues and conferences on statistics and accounting for development; and

• Facilitate South-South exchange on monitoring and reporting and on developing and managing national statistical systems among countries affected by fragility through the g7+, the V20 and other platforms of countries affected by fragility.

Assessing Risk and Fostering Adaptability

Risk-informed governance is about mobilizing a whole-of-society approach to designing coordinated, integrated and comprehensive fragility analyses to inform all development planning processes. It allows for:

• The design of early warning and early actions mechanisms to monitor the impact of development efforts on fragility as well as the impact of exogenous risks on development progress;

• The anticipation and prevention of violent conflicts and natural hazards; and

• The strengthening of preparedness systems to mitigate the impact of disasters and to help communities recover from crisis quickly and better.

The processes used to achieve these goals also leverage established mechanisms, institutions and processes that enable citizens to articulate their interests, exercise their legal rights and obligations and mediate their differences to promote cohesive societies. Initial first steps toward promoting stronger risk governance include:

• Improving the legal and policy environment, including updating relevant laws and regulations as well as strengthening the implementation of disaster risk governance, conflict prevention and social protection programmes for the most vulnerable populations;

• Strengthening analytical capability among government actors, the private sector and civil society to identify and analyze the drivers of the environmental, economic, social, political and security domains of fragility; and

• Building early warning and early action infrastructure at all levels of society, with particular focus on supporting women’s groups as primary early warning actors for conflicts and disasters.

Innovative Case Example

Fragility Assessment

For countries affected by conflict and complex situations, the New Deal suggests that an important launching point for mainstreaming the SDGs into national development plans is a Fragility Assessment. It is defined as “an inclusive and participatory exercise carried out by national
stakeholders to assess a country’s causes, features and drivers of fragility as well as the sources of resilience within a country (IDPS 2014).” The IDPS recommends that a Fragility assessment consist of three main outputs including:

- Synthesis Report providing an analysis of the root causes of fragility, the drivers of conflict, and the sources of resilience;
- Detailed Report that captures the full findings of the assessment, an analysis of conflict, fragility and resilience, on the one hand, and how they relate to each PSG, on the other; and
- The Fragility Spectrum\(^{22}\) is an important component of a detailed report.

Source: IDPS (2014), g7+ (2013)

**Toolkit**

**Awareness raising and multi-stakeholder engagement**
- SDG Action Campaign (2016)
- UNDP’s partnerships and interagency mechanisms (UNDP 2016)
- See Section B1 and B2

**Reviewing plans and adapting the SDGs to the national context**
- Fragility Assessment (IDPS 2014, g7+ 2013)
- Rapid Integrated Assessment (UNDP Bureau for Policy and Programme Support)
- The New Deal’s FOCUS Principles including One Vision One Plan and the Peace and Statebuilding Goals (IDPS 2016b)
- Conflict and Development Assessment (UNDG 2016)
- Core Government Function Assessment (UNDP 2014)
- Disaster Risk Assessment (UNDP 2010)
- The Recovery and Peacebuilding Assessment (RPBA, formerly PCNA) (World Bank 2016)
- Post-Conflict Needs Assessment (UNDG 2007)\(^{23}\) [now called ‘Recovery and Peacebuilding Assessment]
- Post-Disaster Needs Assessment (EU, UNDG, and WB 2013)
- See Section B3

**Institutional arrangements and horizontal policy coherence**
- See Section B4

\(^{22}\) “A fragility spectrum is a tool developed by the g7+ to allow fragile and conflict-affected states to analyse and assess the nature of their own fragility. They can situate themselves according to a number of stages of fragility relating to each of the five PSGs. It is a qualitative diagnostic tool that draws on local knowledge to facilitate the self-assessment process, to help countries understand their current position in the transition process and to adjust planning to the needs of that specific stage. It aims to identify directions and track incremental progress (g7+ (2013)).”

\(^{23}\) Post-Conflict Needs Assessment will be replaced by the forthcoming Recovery and Peacebuilding Assessment, a joint tool by EU, UN and WB.
**Financing and budgeting for the future**

- Online Guidance Platform for SDG Financing (UNDP 2016b)
- Tax Inspectors without Borders (OECD and UNDP 2016; also, in UNDP 2016)
- Development Finance and Aid Assessments (UNDP 2015; NEDA 2014; MOPI 2014)
- Last Mile Trust Fund (UNCDF 2016)
- Green Climate Fund (2016)
- See Section B6

**Monitoring, reporting and accountability**

- See Section B7

**Assessing risk and fostering adaptability**

- Fragility Assessment (IDPS 2014, g7+ 2013)
- See Section B8
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