



Implementing the OECD Recommendation on Policy Coherence for Sustainable Development: Guidance Note



This document, as well as any data and map included herein, are without prejudice to the status of or sovereignty over any territory, to the delimitation of international frontiers and boundaries and to the name of any territory, city or area.

Photo credits: Cover © MintBlac/Shutterstock.com.

Please cite this document (OECD 2021) as Implementing the OECD Recommendation on Policy Coherence for Sustainable Development - Guidance Note COM/DCD/DAC/GOV/PGC(2021)1

Corrigenda to publications may be found on line at: www.oecd.org/about/publishing/corrigenda.htm. © OECD 2021

The use of this work, whether digital or print, is governed by the Terms and Conditions to be found at <http://www.oecd.org/termsandconditions>.

Implementing the OECD Recommendation on Policy Coherence for Sustainable Development

Guidance Note

Table of contents

1 Introduction	6
Purpose	6
Process	7
2 A strategic vision for achieving the 2030 agenda in a coherent manner	8
Principle 1. Build a strong, inclusive political commitment and leadership at the highest political level	8
Why is this important?	8
Overview of trends	9
Actions to consider	10
Links with the global methodology for SDG indicator 17.14.1	15
Principle 2. Define, implement and communicate a strategic long-term vision that supports policy coherence	16
Why is this important?	16
Overview of trends	16
Actions to consider	17
Links with the global methodology for SDG indicator 17.14.1	20
Principle 3. Improve policy integration to capitalise on synergies across economic, social and environmental policy areas	20
Why is this important?	20
Overview of trends	21
Actions to consider	22
3 Effective and inclusive institutional and governance mechanisms to address policy interactions	30
Principle 4. Ensure whole-of-government coordination to promote mutually supporting actions across sectors	30
Why is this important?	30
Overview of trends	30
Actions to consider	31
Links with the global methodology for SDG indicator 17.14.1	36
Principle 5. Engage appropriately sub-national levels of government to promote coordinated actions	36
Why is this important?	36
Overview of trends	37
Actions to consider	38
Links with the global methodology for SDG indicator 17.14.1	39
Principle 6. Engage stakeholders effectively to sustain broader support for policy coherence	40
Why is this important?	40
Overview of trends	40

Actions to consider	41
Links with the global methodology for SDG indicator 17.14.1	46
4 Responsive and adaptive tools to anticipate, assess and address domestic, transboundary and long-term impacts of policies	47
Principle 7. Analyse and assess policy and financing impacts to avoid negative impacts, in particular on developing countries.	47
Why is this important?	47
Overview of trends	48
Actions to consider	48
Links with the global methodology for SDG indicator 17.14.1	54
Principle 8. Strengthen monitoring, reporting and evaluation systems to collect evidence on the impact of policies and report progress on policy coherence.	55
Why is this important?	55
Overview of trends	55
Actions to consider	56
a) Monitor and report back on policy and financing impacts	56
Links with the global methodology for SDG indicator 17.14.1	59

References 61

Boxes

Box 1.1. Pillars and Guiding principles of the PCSD Recommendation	6
Box 2.1. Principle 1	9
Box 2.2. Explicit commitment to PCSD in national strategic documents	10
Box 2.3. Political commitment to consider the impacts of policies on developing countries	11
Box 2.4. Action plans for policies that take into account developing countries	12
Box 2.5. Promoting political commitments at international level	13
Box 2.6. Integrating national gender equality strategies into SDG agendas	14
Box 2.7. Finland: National Commission on Sustainable Development	15
Box 2.8. Principle 2	17
Box 2.9. Long-term timeframes	18
Box 2.10. Strategic foresight for the engagement with developing countries	19
Box 2.11. Principle 3	22
Box 2.12. Finland: State budget planning as a tool for policy integration	23
Box 2.13. Sweden: Public procurement	24
Box 2.14. Assessing public procurement systems' readiness for delivering on SDGs	24
Box 2.15. Sweden: Integration of 2030 Agenda goals as targets for state-owned enterprises	25
Box 2.16. Enhancing policy coherence through responsible business conduct	26
Box 2.17. Japan: supporting the localisation of the SDGs	27
Box 2.18. Mobilising and aligning private finance for sustainable development in developing countries	27
Box 2.19. Applying taxation principles	29
Box 3.1. Principle 4.	31
Box 3.2. Central co-ordination mechanisms at the highest level	32
Box 3.3. Mandates and co-ordination across government on the effects in developing countries	33
Box 3.4. Switzerland: '2030 Agenda Steering Committee' and coordination mechanisms at different levels	34
Box 3.5. Poland: Building civil service skills for the SDGs	35
Box 3.6. Engagement of National Schools of Public Administration	36
Box 3.7. Principle 5	37
Box 3.8. Luxembourg – Taking inventory of local initiative to foster vertical coherence	38
Box 3.9. Decentralised development co-operation	39
Box 3.10. Principle 6	41
Box 3.11. Norway - Establishing a Policy Coherence Forum for broad stakeholder participation	42
Box 3.12. Norway: Inclusive and consultative service delivery to vulnerable populations	42
Box 3.13. Australia – mobilising stakeholders for sustainable development	42

Box 3.14. Consulting stakeholders with development expertise	43
Box 3.15. Consulting with governments and key stakeholders in developing countries	43
Box 3.16. Finland: Reporting on the 2030 Agenda creates a framework for structured dialogue between the Government, Parliament and stakeholders	44
Box 3.17. Including stakeholders in government bodies that foster sustainable development: the case of National Contact Points for Responsible Business Conduct	45
Box 3.18. Engaging the public to become development-aware citizens	45
Box 4.1. Principle 7	48
Box 4.2. Sustainability Impact Assessments	49
Box 4.3. Impact assessments of effects in developing countries	50
Box 4.4. Access to medicine in developing countries	51
Box 4.5. Sweden – Antimicrobial resistance	52
Box 4.6. Switzerland: Return of illegal assets to developing countries	52
Box 4.7. Germany – transboundary impacts in SDG reporting	53
Box 4.8. European Union: Trade facilitation	53
Box 4.9. Ireland: Tax Treaties	54
Box 4.10. Principle 8	56
Box 4.11. Strengthening capacity for data production and use	57
Box 4.12. Monitoring and reporting on action and effects in developing countries	58
Box 4.13. Evaluation of actions that have effects in developing countries	59

1 Introduction

Purpose

This document presents the final draft Guidance Note that aims to help Adherents and interested stakeholders in implementing the OECD Recommendation on Policy Coherence for Sustainable Development [[OECD/LEGAL/0381](#)] (PCSD Recommendation), adopted by the Council in 2010 and revised in 2019. It builds on OECD as well as international experience and efforts in advancing the global Target 17.14 on enhancing policy coherence for sustainable development for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda on Sustainable Development (2030 Agenda).

The PCSD Recommendation provides a comprehensive standard to help countries equip policy-makers and key stakeholders with the necessary institutional mechanisms and policy tools to enhance policy coherence, address integrated economic, social and environmental goals, and accelerate progress towards the sustainable development goals (SDGs). It supports Adherents in ensuring that measures implemented to address and recover from the COVID-19 crisis are consistent with efforts to achieve the SDGs at home and abroad. In this sense, the Recommendation can provide a roadmap for governments to boost their capacity to address global challenges and deliver on international commitments. The work under the PCSD Recommendation will also inform ongoing OECD work on Pillar 3 of the Reinforcing Democracy Initiative related to the capacity of national governments to address global challenges [GOV/PGC(2021)1].

The draft Guidance Note is structured according to the three pillars and eight guiding principles of the PCSD Recommendation (Box 1.1 **Error! Reference source not found.**). It provides the rationale for the three pillars and related guiding principles; suggests actions and provides good practice examples, to help Adherents and interest stakeholders translate the Recommendation into practice. It also highlights links with the global indicator for measuring progress on SDG target 17.14 on enhancing policy coherence for sustainable development.

Box 1.1. Pillars and Guiding principles of the PCSD Recommendation

I. A strategic vision for achieving the 2030 Agenda and the SDGs in an integrated and coherent manner.

1. **Political Commitment and Leadership** - Mobilise whole-of-government action and orient policy development towards sustainable development.
2. **Strategic Long-term Vision** - Support present needs and those of future generations in a balanced manner.
3. **Policy Integration** - Capitalise on synergies and address trade-offs between economic, social and environmental policies, in addition to specific areas such as security policy and human rights.

II. Effective and inclusive institutional and governance mechanisms to address policy interactions.

4. Whole-of-Government Coordination - Resolve divergences between policies, including between domestic and external policies.

5. Subnational Engagement - Align priorities and promote coordinated action at different levels of government.

6. Stakeholder Engagement - Engage all relevant actors to identify challenges, set priorities, align actions and mobilise resources.

III. A set of responsive and adaptive tools to anticipate, assess and address impacts of policies.

7. Policy and Financing Impacts - Systematically consider the effects of policies on people's well-being "here and now", "elsewhere" and "later".

8. Monitoring, Reporting and Evaluation - Inform decision-making, and adjust policies in light of potential negative effects.

Process

The PCSD Recommendation, includes a provision whereby the Council instructs the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) and the Public Governance Committee (PGC), in consultation with other relevant committees, to: "develop through an inclusive process an implementation toolkit, which would include an accompanying guidance note with good practice examples, to help Adherents design their own policy coherence strategies and implement this Recommendation according to their specific national circumstances [...]".

The present draft builds on inputs from several countries provided via the National Focal Points on Policy Coherence, PGC and DAC, as well as inputs received from across the OECD Secretariat and feedback from relevant OECD committees including the Regulatory Policy Committee (RPC), Education Policy Committee (EDPC), Economic Policy Committee (EPC), Economic and Development Review Committee (EDRC), Environment Policy Committee (EPOC), Trade Committee (TC), Committee for Agriculture (CoAG), Fisheries Committee (COFI), Investment Committee (IC), Regional Development Policy Committee (RDPC), Committee on Statistics and Statistical Policy (CSSP), Committee on Fiscal Affairs (CFA) and Development Centre's Governing Board (DEV). Next steps will include:

- the publication of this practical guidance note for policymakers, practitioners and stakeholders;
- the development of an interactive web-based version, which will be continuously updated to further strengthen national abilities to engage globally;
- the identification of thematic priorities with a view to develop in-depth thematic guidance notes as well as an analytical report on institutional capacity to enhance policy coherence and a monitoring methodological framework, as reflected in the 2021-22 Programme of Work and Budget [GOV/PGC(2020)3/ANN2/REV3].

2 A strategic vision for achieving the 2030 agenda in a coherent manner

Effectively achieving the 2030 Agenda and the SDGs requires a strategic vision for transformation. This vision needs to be supported by a professional and capable public service that is responsive to today's fast-changing world and equipped to cope with unexpected global challenges.

According to the 2021 UN Secretary-General's Progress Report on the SDGs, the pandemic-related economic downturn pushed between 119 and 124 million more people into extreme poverty in 2020, further compounding challenges to poverty eradication such as conflict, climate change and natural disasters. The crisis is also exacerbating inequalities: in 2020, the equivalent of 255 million full-time jobs were lost, and an additional 101 million children and young people fell below the minimum reading proficiency level, wiping out the education gains achieved over the previous two decades. (United Nations, 2021^[1]).

As countries move towards recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic, policy coherence will be essential to supporting a transition towards sustainable development. Policy coherence is needed to balance short-term economic growth objectives and long-term sustainability and resilience goals. A sustainable recovery requires a strategic vision and policies that orient investments and support behavioural changes to reduce vulnerabilities and the likelihood of future shocks. This involves incorporating transboundary and long-term perspectives to assess, for example, whether or not economic recovery measures or stimulus leads to investment in long-lived high-emitting activities and infrastructure that may lock-in greenhouse gas emissions far into the future, undermining efforts in achieving SDGs and climate change goals. It also entails aligning recovery with long-term goals such as reducing emissions, increasing resilience to climate impacts, halting biodiversity loss, and ensuring sustainable production and consumption patterns, which are at the core of the SDGs.

However, putting a strategic vision into practice and communicating it across the public administration, with key stakeholders and the wider public is not a simple matter. Governments need to strengthen their mechanisms and develop leadership and strategic capacity throughout public sector organisations. This will enable them to integrate in a balanced manner economic, social and environmental priorities into decision-making processes and policy implementation. Policy makers also need capacities and tools to anticipate future trends; understand the transformational shifts they can bring about in economic, social and environmental conditions; and adjust reforms accordingly.

Principle 1. Build a strong, inclusive political commitment and leadership at the highest political level

Why is this important?

The sustainability of the democratic model of governance will depend on governments' capacity to effectively address global challenges such as climate change, the COVID-19 pandemic and international migration, or deliver on the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. In this context, progress towards

policy coherence for sustainable development starts with strong leadership and explicit commitment at the highest political level. Given the potential for conflict among various interests and priorities both in the public and private sectors, strong political leadership is needed to shape national debate on how to shift towards a sustainable path and pursue a common whole-of-government agenda. Political commitment and leadership are essential to orient policy development in line ministries and translate commitments into concrete and measurable actions at local, regional, national and international levels. Commitment to policy coherence also involves working with parliaments and civil society. It entails translating political commitment into concrete and measurable actions and ensuring that such commitment to PCSD outlives electoral cycles, government programmes or cabinet compositions.

The interconnected nature of the health, economic and social crises caused by the COVID-19 pandemic along with other global challenges, such as climate change, suggests that policy coherence issues will be more complex, requiring convergence between policy agendas. Political leadership at the highest level is essential to sustain the complex political, social and economic balance of adopting cross sectoral recovery measures while ensuring the fulfilment of domestic priorities and international commitments, in particular the 2030 Agenda.

Overview of trends

The vast majority of Adherents to the PCSD Recommendation have made an explicit commitment to PCSD either as part of their SDG implementation plans or their development co-operation policy (OECD, 2019^[2]). Translating these commitments into action requires them being backed by strategies, action plans, policies and legislation, as well as incentives to take action across levels of government.

Clear government commitment to the SDGs and to policy coherence, and effective communication of these commitments, can also contribute to steering integrated policies for a recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic. In terms of designing recovery strategies, the processes for prioritising action to “build forward” better and improve resilience through stimulus packages can build on existing leadership structures established for SDG implementation in many countries (OECD, 2020^[3]).

At the international level, adhering to the PCSD Recommendation signals important commitment to policy coherence and the Recommendation is open to adherence by non-OECD Members. Four provisions in particular seek to guide Adherents to build political commitment and leadership at the highest political level to foster whole-of-government action for PCSD (Box 2.1 **Error! Reference source not found.**).

Box 2.1. Principle 1

Building a strong, inclusive political commitment and leadership at the highest political level to foster whole-of-government action for PCSD.

- a) Enhance whole-of-government approaches to PCSD by defining priority areas, time-bound action plans and key performance indicators for making progress on PCSD and communicating results to the public;
- b) Systematically apply a poverty, gender and human rights perspective to PCSD frameworks in line with the 2030 Agenda ambition of ending poverty in all its forms everywhere, empowering all women and girls and achieving gender equality;
- c) Introduce measures to promote PCSD within government structures so that commitment to PCSD outlives electoral cycles and changes in government, cabinet compositions or government programmes, including identifying a lead institution, responsible for promoting, overseeing and implementing PCSD;

d) Build leadership capacity in the public service to consistently formulate, implement, and monitor policies coherent with sustainable development in across sectors.

Source: PCSD Recommendation available at <https://legalinstruments.oecd.org/en/instruments/OECD-LEGAL-0381>

Actions to consider

a) Define priority areas, time-bound action plans and key performance indicators

- Include an explicit commitment to PCSD in national sustainable development strategies and/or development co-operation strategies, and reiterate this commitment as well as the commitment to integrate sustainable development in a range of other policy documents with different target audiences.
- Identify policies that target priorities and enable progress across as many SDGs as possible.
- Prepare an action plan for enhancing PCSD over a defined period, compatible with available resources.
- Use project selection and prioritisation and the budget process to set priorities and ensure that available resources achieve maximum impact.
- Make use of parliamentary oversight when developing legislation, the budget and other policy documents.
- Engage with Supreme Audit Institutions (SAIs), or – as in some countries (e.g. Argentina) – Internal Audit Institutions, to ensure monitoring and reporting that goes beyond electoral cycles and that public finances are managed appropriately.
- Clearly define the roles and responsibilities of operational institutions.

Good practice examples

Box 2.2. Explicit commitment to PCSD in national strategic documents

The majority of OECD countries have made an explicit commitment to PCSD either as part of their SDG implementation plans or their development co-operation policy.

In **Mexico**, for example, the National Strategy for the Implementation of the 2030 Agenda, launched in November 2018, underscores PCSD as a national target for SDG implementation, and emphasises the need to promote the necessary legislative initiatives with a view to create the enabling environment to enhance PCSD (Mexico, 2018^[4]).

In **Poland**, the principle of policy coherence was incorporated in the Multiannual Development Cooperation Programme 2021-2030 adopted by the Council of Ministers with an explicit link to support SDG implementation and ensure consistency with the global goals.

The **German** National Sustainable Development Strategy contains the Federal Government's concrete ambition to use the 2030 Agenda as an opportunity to increase its efforts for policy coherence, with particular reference to SDG 17.14. Various policy areas are bundled to achieve greater coherence in light of the large number of systemic interdependencies. Ministry Coordinators for Sustainable Development have been appointed in all Ministries. This approach has been confirmed in the new Sustainable Development Strategy of March 2021 (which builds on the version approved in January

2017 and its subsequent update from November 2018). The implementation of the Strategy is fostered through the use of different existing or updated instruments to enhance PCSD in practice: Sustainability Impact Assessment (since 2009), further developed in the online Electronic Sustainability Assessment (eNAP); finance and Federal Budget as levers for Sustainable Development; Sustainability training for the Federal Administration (since 2020).

Sweden's new bill on the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, submitted by the Government to the Swedish Riksdag on 17 June 2020, sets an overall goal that anchors and clarifies Sweden's commitment to implement the 2030 Agenda for a sustainable development in its three dimensions - the economic, social and the environmental - by pursuing a coherent policy nationally and internationally. The proposed goal also includes Sweden's policy for policy coherence on sustainable development and the agenda's principle to 'leave no one behind'. The bill emphasizes that the 2030 Agenda must be integrated into ordinary processes. The proposed goal should be followed up and reported to the Swedish Riksdag in a separate appendix to the Budget Bill at least once every four years. The bill emphasizes the need for collaboration within the EU and internationally and coordination and collaboration with actors at all levels of government, as well as with non-government stakeholders.

In February 2021, the government of **Canada** released Canada's 2030 Agenda National Strategy: Moving Forward Together, setting out an approach to accelerate progress towards achieving the SDGs, both domestically and abroad through an encompassing whole-of-society vision. The Strategy takes up the 30 federal actions to advance progress towards the SDGs outlined in the 2019 Towards Canada's 2030 Agenda National Strategy and updates the action-tracker that monitors the status of each action. Based on this progress, the government will release a new Federal Implementation Plan, based on five core objectives for engagement and action. Among these, the first objective is fostering leadership, governance and policy coherence. According to the tracker, 23 out of 30 federal actions are on track, whereas the others require further attention. This includes the need to "align federal reporting mechanisms and support the integration of the SDGs into new and existing strategies, policies and programs across federal departments and agencies to increase policy coherence". In fact, the government recognises the importance of enhancing policy coherence across departments and agencies and it is working to integrate the SDGs into federal strategies, policies and programmes. At the same time, it acknowledges that this process requires time and support from various actors.

Box 2.3. Political commitment to consider the impacts of policies on developing countries

Governments need to frame political commitments in a way to encourage all stakeholders to reflect the transboundary dimension of policy coherence for sustainable development, in particular the effects of domestic policies on developing countries.

Many Adherents to this Recommendation have an explicit commitment at highest policy level to ensure the coherence of their policies with sustainable development in developing countries. The different options, which are not mutually exclusive, include:

- In the case of the European Union (EU), this commitment is set out in its founding Treaty on European Union.
- A number of OECD Members have included a commitment in their national legislation on development co-operation.
- A number of OECD Members include a commitment in the national sustainable development plan.

- Many OECD Members include a commitment in their development co-operation strategies, some also in foreign policy strategies.

In these countries, stakeholders regularly use high-level commitments to advocate for more coherent policies, build coalitions and ensure accountability. The EU commitment at highest level has translated into efforts to ensure coherent policies in the interest of developing countries and ensuring that such an approach is part and parcel of policy coherence for sustainable development. For example, the revised EU trade policy '**An Open, Sustainable and Assertive Trade Policy**' integrates responsible business conduct (RBC) as a key feature of enhancing supply chain resilience and sustainability.

Reiterating a commitment in a range of policy documents is useful, as different policies have different target audiences. National sustainable development plans in particular speak to wide domestic audiences and are thus an important complement to development co-operation strategies.

As an example, **Costa Rica** uses its national medium-term development strategy (Plan Nacional de Desarrollo e Inversiones Públicas), the National Policy of International Cooperation and other policy documents to promote this political commitment. Cooperation projects are analysed to verify alignment with these instruments. Regarding Costa Rica's role as international cooperation recipient, the alignment of projects with the SDGs is provided for and monitored by the local cooperation management software. An annual report of the International Cooperation for Development (ICD) includes the amounts of development assistance per year; which SDGs the projects contribute to; and their outcome. As a donor, Costa Rica also seeks to ensure that all the projects and technical cooperation catalogues are aligned with its cooperation policy. In this way, the country verifies compliance with sustainability through its cooperation projects.

Box 2.4. Action plans for policies that take into account developing countries

Translating a political commitment into practice requires defining specific objectives and actions. This is particularly important where the commitment requires a change of approach, as is often the case for policies that are more coherent with sustainable development in developing countries.

The **Netherlands** and **Sweden** have a general action plan that identifies priorities, objectives and actions for adjusting policies to enhance their positive impact and avoid negative impact on developing countries (Government of the Netherlands, 2018^[5]) (Government of Sweden, 2017^[6]).

OECD Members have also adopted numerous issue-based action plans, often within specific multilateral frameworks, and take measures to implement action plans and publicly report on progress. Public reporting is important to spark debate on the level and direction of implementation with all stakeholders.

France's G7 Presidency in 2019 created an OECD and UNDP joint action plan to define a common framework and recommendations for aligning finance with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The OECD-UNDP Framework for SDG Aligned Finance promotes financing actions plans to build sustainability (i.e. do no harm across the goals) and to promote equality (i.e. leave no one behind).¹

¹ <https://www.oecd.org/development/financing-sustainable-development/Framework-for-SDG-Aligned-Finance-OECD-UNDP.pdf>.

Box 2.5. Promoting political commitments at international level

Transboundary issues often concern more than just two states. Agreeing to a policy coherence commitment at national level therefore often depends on establishing and adjusting commitments at international level. Creating multilateral frameworks can help establish a level playing field, i.e. ensuring that competitors from other countries abide by the same development-friendly rules. Once adopted, multilateral frameworks lead to monitoring and follow-up, increasing the likelihood for effective implementation.

OECD DAC members actively contribute to the creation of new and the adjustment of existing international commitments that promote better coherence with sustainable development in developing countries. They champion causes of relevance to developing countries; support developing country stakeholders to voice their views; co-facilitate international agreements; and build decisive coalitions, including with developing countries.

International commitments often lead to national commitments and action plans. Some examples are:

- Action plans for climate objectives under the Paris agreement.
- National action plans on business and human rights and/or responsible business conduct to implement the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (NAPs). By providing an overarching policy framework for responsible business conduct, NAPs may strengthen coordination and coherence within the government among all relevant policies that can promote and incentivise responsible business practices (including investment, procurement, export credits, among others) (See also Box 16 below).
- Action plans to implement the UN Arms Trade Treaty.
- Action plans to reduce the cost of sending remittances, following an international commitment by G20 members within the work of the Global Partnership for Financial Inclusion.
- Commitments made by members of the Inclusive Framework on Base Erosion and Profit Shifting (BEPS) and the Global Forum on Transparency and Exchange of Information for Tax Purposes to refrain from harmful tax practices and provide for exchange of information to enable effective taxation of cross-border activities.

Costa Rica's foreign affairs with Panama have been governed by the Agreement on Border Development and Cooperation since 3 May, 1992. Both this Agreement and the Central American Strategy for Rural Development share common strategic actions for binational development. The coincidence of objectives promotes the wellbeing of the border inhabitants and shares a geographic scope for implementation. The power of an international commitment depends on the extent of its implementation by individual states. It is therefore important that as many States as possible adhere to the commitment, participate in follow-up processes and ideally lead by example in the implementation.

b) Apply a poverty, gender and human rights perspective

- Promote an intersectional governance approach to socially disadvantaged groups (due to e.g. gender, religion, minority, region), while addressing economic, social, political and environmental aspects of inequalities at the global, national and local levels.
- Introduce equality and inclusion provisions in strategies, action plans and reporting requirements for PCSD.
- Map the interactions between equality and inclusion and other goals to promote synergies and limit trade-offs when designing and implementing policies.

- Apply an equality and inclusion lens to SDG interactions analysis more broadly to understand if/how these interactions impact socially disadvantaged groups differently.
- Identify and address the effects of domestic policies on broader international policies and equality and inclusion objectives.
- Consider the long-term effects of joint action on sustainability and equality and inclusion.
- Assess national youth strategies against the specific needs of socially disadvantaged groups from diverse backgrounds to ensure inclusive policy outcomes and intergenerational justice.
- Mainstream equality and inclusion into public awareness-raising campaigns for PCSD.

Good practice examples

Box 2.6. Integrating national gender equality strategies into SDG agendas

As part of its Policy for Global Development, **Sweden** has made gender equality a core priority of its national strategy, identifying gender equality budgeting as a strategic tool to meet Goal 5 and thus ensure the implementation of the 2030 Agenda. In **Mexico**, gender mainstreaming has been incorporated as a transversal requirement in the realisation of the National Development Plan.

In the context of its Gender and LGBTI Equality Policy Plan 2018-2021, the **Netherlands** is currently working on implementing SDG 5 through the introduction of a quality requirement 'Effects on gender equality'. Part of the government-wide Integral Assessment Framework (IAK), this requirement intends to map out the nature and scope of the consequences of intended policy and regulations for gender equality in the Netherlands. The elaboration of the quality requirement 'Effects on gender equality' is available online since January 2019.

The **United Kingdom** also promotes an intersectional governance approach to gender, and has mainstreamed gender equality through the Equality Act 2010, which states the need for public authorities to reduce discrimination and advance equality of opportunity with regard to sex and other relevant protected characteristics (Section 149, Public Sector Equality Duty).

Similar initiatives also take place outside of OECD countries. **Paraguay** targeted gender mainstreaming in SDG implementation through establishing gender equality as a crosscutting priority in its National Development Plan Paraguay 2030 (PND 2030). **Kenya** identified gender mainstreaming as a central strategy for development policies. As a result, Kenya made progress in developing and enhancing methodologies for measuring different forms of gender-based discrimination, including on unpaid care work, notably through time-use surveys.

Source: (OECD, 2019^[7]).

c) Introduce measures to ensure commitment beyond electoral cycles

- Incorporate, as appropriate, the SDGs into the budget process to help maintain continuity of policy objectives beyond electoral cycles. Coherent budgeting decisions will also allow administrations to have greater coherence in relation to key national priorities regardless of election results (OECD, 2019^[7]).
- Promote an overlap rather than matching of electoral cycles in the bodies supporting the implementation and follow up of the SDGs, such as the national commissions for sustainable development.

- Use more proactively existing tools such as strategic foresight and visioning to engage in scenario planning consistent with the time horizon of different goals to involve different stakeholders. This contributes to achieving a level of endorsement and legitimacy by society that could facilitate political commitments' continuity beyond electoral cycles.

Good practice examples

Box 2.7. Finland: National Commission on Sustainable Development

In Finland, the term of the National Commission on Sustainable Development has been changed explicitly to overlap rather than follow the four-year electoral cycle. The purpose is to ensure that the Commission's tasks are not excessively tied to Government programmes and that it can consider key long-term sustainable development issues.

Source: (OECD, 2017^[8]).

d) Build leadership capacity in the public sector

- Apply the principles enshrined in the OECD Recommendation of the Council on Public Service Leadership and Capability [<https://legalinstruments.oecd.org/en/instruments/OECD-LEGAL-0445>].
- Empower political leaders to lead the civil service on the 2030 Agenda and policy coherence and create an enabling environment that allows for interaction among a diversity of stakeholders throughout society in a constructive and results-oriented manner.
- Clarify the expectations incumbent upon senior-level public servants to be politically impartial leaders of public organisations, trusted to deliver on the priorities of the government and internationally agreed goals, such as the SDGs.
- Ensure senior-level public servants have the mandate, competencies, and conditions necessary to provide impartial advice based on research and evidence on SDG governance and policy coherence.
- Develop leadership styles that encourage collaboration across ministries and agencies to meet the integrated challenges posed by the SDGs.
- Use performance management methods for incentivising, acknowledging and rewarding contributions to collective and cross-sectoral goals (OECD, 2019^[7]).

Links with the global methodology for SDG indicator 17.14.1

SDG 17 focuses on partnerships and means of implementation to achieve all the SDGs. In this respect, mechanisms for policy coherence are identified as an important aspect of means of implementation with Indicator 17.14.1 measuring the “number of countries with mechanisms in place to enhance policy coherence of sustainable development”.

The commitment to enhance policy coherence is a sub-indicator of SDG 17.14.1, which is captured as follows: “The country has institutionalized its commitment towards policy coherence for sustainable development at the highest political central/federal level.”

Government contributions towards enhancing PCSD are monitored on the basis of political commitment towards PCSD expressed by the highest level of the central/federal government at national level applying to the whole government, reinforced by:

- Set timelines for the achievement of policy coherence objectives;
- A dedicated budget for PCSD;
- Defined roles and responsibilities;
- A requirement for a regular reporting mechanism on policy coherence for sustainable development;
- Explicit consideration of international commitments and/or transboundary effects;
- Other nationally relevant mechanisms.

Principle 2. Define, implement and communicate a strategic long-term vision that supports policy coherence

Why is this important?

Successfully achieving the SDGs demands a long-term perspective on the consequences of today's activities, as well as planning for the future to support present needs and those of future generations. It entails acknowledging that the well-being of future generations depends on the stock of assets left behind by the previous generations, including economic capital (physical, knowledge, financial), natural capital (energy and mineral resources, land and ecosystems, water, air quality and climate), human capital (labour, education, and health) and social capital (trust and institutions). Long-term vision and planning horizons are also essential to ensure that efforts on SDG implementation go beyond electoral cycles, government programmes or cabinet compositions. PCSD provides an important link between the SDGs and the protection of global public goods.

Ensuring a sustainable recovery from the COVID-19 crisis demands a long-term strategic vision to support today's needs and those of future generations in a balanced manner. Governments could reap greater benefits by aiming for recovery measures that achieve “double dividends” and help ensure that longer-term policy objectives, such as the SDGs, are not sacrificed for short term economic stimulus. As such, there is an opportunity for governments to build back better, find ways to update and adapt – not undermine – their strategic plans for SDG implementation, so that these take into account emerging and new challenges facing countries in a post-COVID-19 world.

Overview of trends

However, governments often struggle to balance the long-term and transformative nature of the SDGs with more pressing short-term priorities. This recognition also led to the elaboration and adoption of the OECD Green Growth Declaration in 2009, following the financial economic crisis.

The COVID-19 pandemic and global transformations such as population ageing, digitalisation, climate change and rising inequalities have created uncertainties about the future young people and unborn generations face (Governance for Youth, Trust and Intergenerational Justice, OECD, 2020). Moreover, commitments to intergenerational justice tend to be scattered across various policy documents and strategies (e.g. youth/elderly strategies, SDG strategies, etc.), which risks impeding policy coherence and coordinated action across government.

OECD analysis also shows that environmental pressures and material consumption remain high and the material footprint is rising: the amount of materials extracted globally doubled between 1980 and 2010, and is projected to double again by 2060 (OECD, 2020^[9]). Stronger and more predictable policies could help countries to effectively decouple environmental pressures from economic growth and establish a resource efficient and circular economy, including when it comes to activity in global supply chains. The performance of OECD countries regarding human and economic capital is mixed and sometimes widening disparities exist between countries (OECD, 2020^[10]).

Two provisions in the PCSD Recommendation aim at supporting governments to define, implement and communicate a strategic long-term vision

Box 2.8. Principle 2

Defining, implementing and communicating a strategic long-term vision that supports policy coherence and orients the government and stakeholders towards common sustainable development goals.

- a) Develop a strategic long-term vision that defines desired sustainable development outcomes, scenarios and actions to enhance coherence across sectors and government levels, and between external and domestic policies in areas that are likely to affect developing countries;
- b) Use existing tools such as strategic foresight, scenario development and systems thinking approaches in the formulation and implementation of policies, to identify, prevent and mitigate actual and potential adverse impacts on the wellbeing and sustainable development prospects of future generations.

Source: OECD Council Recommendation on PCSD: <https://legalinstruments.oecd.org/en/instruments/OECD-LEGAL-0381>

Actions to consider

a) Develop a strategic long-term vision that defines sustainable development outcomes

- Adopt long-term timeframes and include inter-generational principles and indicators.
- Integrate a well-being perspective into broader sustainable development frameworks and strategies, including when it comes to considering business impacts on well-being and related policies.
- Apply good governance principles for intergenerational justice, e.g. formulate and invest in the quality of integrated youth strategies, at the appropriate level(s) of government, to ensure they are evidence-based, participatory and cross-sectoral, supported by political commitment, adequate resources, and effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms.
- Systematically gather age-disaggregated data, and apply regulatory and budgetary impact assessments to address inequalities within and across different age cohorts, including as it relates to socially disadvantaged groups.
- Use government-established oversight institutions to monitor the implementation of intergenerational justice commitments.
- Ensure a communication strategy and initiatives across multiple channels to keep both citizens and the whole government informed and aligned with the government's strategic view on implementing the SDGs and expected outcomes of a policy area.
- Use digital tools for implementing and communicating a strategic long-term vision.
- Include references to the National Sustainable Development Strategy (NSDS) in the National Digital Government Strategy (NDGS).
- Use formal co-ordination mechanisms (e.g. steering groups, regular reporting on implementation and results), cross-cutting projects and goals between sustainable development and digital government policy to set a long-term strategic vision malleable to new contexts and governments' priorities, which are embedded throughout the whole government's policy agenda, and make them viable for the long-run.

Box 2.9. Long-term timeframes

A number of OECD countries have adopted a long-term perspective in developing strategies and implementation plans for SDGs. Some countries such as **Slovenia**, **Finland** and **Belgium** have developed long-term visions with a timeline up to 2050 through inclusive processes and used them as a basis for designing their national sustainable development strategies. For example, the **Finland** we want by 2050 - Society's Commitment to Sustainable Development, provide a long-term framework for sustainability. The plan defines several key actions, such as more closely aligning foresight activities with SDG implementation, developing competence among government officials, and creating conditions for long-term work. In **Germany**, the first Management Rule of the German Sustainable Development Strategy emphasises that "Each generation is required to solve the challenges facing it and must not unload them onto future generations. It must also make provisions for foreseeable future problems." Long-term effects of particular regulations are explicitly considered in the Sustainable Impact Assessment.

Finland also introduced a long-term National Child Strategy in early 2021 that is foreseen to span the duration of several parliamentary terms up to 2041 and deliver on the country's 2040 Vision of a Child and Family Friendly Society. The goal is a society that respects the right of children, including their right to a future. Key areas for action include inclusion, parenting support, and exercise and healthy lifestyle as well as areas or sectors where changes promoted by the Strategy are envisioned take effect, for example, in the family and the local community, transport sector, and the digital environment. The strategy aims to improve cross-administrative coordination and policy implementation, better integrate policy and resource processes, and strengthen joint government communications. The pilot included children and young people in bill drafting, and implementation will involve a wide range of stakeholders from civil society representing a variety of different groups and ages (<https://stm.fi/en/child-strategy>).

The **United Kingdom's** government has moved to address the long-term protection of prosperity and biodiversity through its commission of the Dasgupta review (2019). An independent review, it sets out fundamental changes in the way in which nature should be accounted for in economics and decision-making.

Austria's Youth Strategy provides a framework for long-term planning and aims at strengthening and developing youth policy across all sectors. The Strategy is intended as an ongoing process and is subject to a continuous development, while also being anchored in the current government programme 2020-2024. The operating unit of the Strategy is the Youth Competence Centre within the Federal Chancellery, whose goal is to develop a network between different youth policy stakeholders and to better coordinate inter-ministerial measures. The Strategy is linked to the European Youth Goals, which also covers many SDGs. According to the Strategy, each ministry adopts one or more youth objectives related to its area of competence and the specific measures for their implementation, while a cross-sectoral working group was created to foster dialogue and exchanges. By resolution of the Federal government of September 2020, the Austrian Youth Goals were adopted by all ministries. Each goal is assigned to one out of four fields of Action of the national Youth Strategy: learning and employment, participation and initiative, quality of life and a spirit of co-operation, media and information.

In **Wales**, the Well-being of Future Generations Act (2015) requires public bodies to consider the long-term impact of their decisions, to work better with people, communities and each other, and to prevent persistent problems such as poverty, health inequalities and climate change. The Act's measures for future-oriented decision making include requiring ministers to publish a 'Future Trends Report', as well as establishing Public Service Boards for each local authority in Wales, which are responsible for

publishing a Local Well-being Assessment and Plan. Furthermore, the Act establishes a statutory Future Generations Commissioner for Wales, with a mandate to ensure that political decisions taken today do not compromise the interests of Welsh citizens tomorrow. Although an advisory role, the Commissioner has played an instrumental role in designing Wales planning policy and helped to ensure that a proposed GBP 1.1 billion relief road around Newport is a balanced investment in terms of future costs and benefits (<https://www.futuregenerations.wales/>).

Source: (OECD, 2018^[11]); (OECD, 2017^[8]).

b) Use existing tools to identify, prevent and mitigate adverse impacts

- Combine strategic foresight efforts at both the broad contextual and sector-specific levels to interlink and reinforce each other as part of an ongoing system of integrating futures thinking into policy-making.
- Adapt existing tools, such as Regulatory Impact Assessments, to take into account broader sustainability aspects across all policy areas.
- Build on experience and innovate and develop new tools as appropriate, to respond to emerging trends and to meet citizen's evolving expectations.

Good practice examples

Box 2.10. Strategic foresight for the engagement with developing countries

Designing policies that promote sustainable development domestically in OECD countries and internationally in developing countries requires having a sense of the trajectories developing countries could take in the longer term. This enables anticipating and preparing for changes, identifying innovations and assessing to what extent the current engagement strategies with developing countries are reflective of future scenarios.

In a number of countries, Ministries of Foreign Affairs and development co-operation agencies undertake foresight research for different aspects of their engagement with developing countries, e.g.:

- **France's** AFD has taken a 10-15 year lens to reflect which adaptations possible futures might require from development co-operation agencies. It is also leading efforts to promote collaboration of public development banks on strategic foresight.
- **Germany's** BMZ studies the future of European-African relations with a view to inform policy making.
- USAID missions develop scenarios to test their development assumptions in partner countries.
- **Finland's** Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Development Co-operation contributes significantly to regular foresight exercises for critical challenges the Finnish government has identified.

Results of these efforts include e.g.:

- **USAID** uses foresight to inform decision-making, such as the focus of interventions and budgetary allocations in partner countries.
- **Finland's** Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Development Co-operation has used foresight to inform its engagement on multilateral co-operation and civic space.
- Some lessons learned are:

- Operational constraints (planning horizons, staff rotation, training etc.) limit decision-makers' capacity to think beyond a medium-term horizon. Dedicated resources or spaces for strategic foresight can enable them to take a step back and assess possible longer-term developments.
- The “Now what?” needs to be clear to link insights from foresight research to decision-making.
- Foresight analysis will also be useful for cooperation recipients – such as **Costa Rica** – in order to improve the predictability of development cooperation and promote coherence with national policies. Foresight analysis should be tailor-made for each country, considering that aggregated analysis can hide some key findings. Middle-income countries with short fiscal space face the challenge of increasing access to refundable finances, but with less capacity to use them as an incentive for development. Financing decisions should be agreed by both donors and recipients to promote common objectives and clear rules for both sides. The COVID-19 pandemic also showed the urgency of this kind of foresight analysis, so that policy making and strategies can be future-proofed in the face of rapidly evolving circumstances.

Source: OECD Policy Responses to Coronavirus (COVID-19), Strategic foresight for the COVID-19 crisis and beyond: Using futures thinking to design better public policies, 10 June 2020.

Links with the global methodology for SDG indicator 17.14.1

The long-term perspective is considered by the global indicator 17.14.1. It is captured as follows: “The country has mechanisms in place to ensure that long-term considerations are integrated in policies, plans, programmes and projects, decision-making, policy development and planning.”

Government contributions towards enhancing PCSD are monitored on the basis of the existence of long-term objectives going beyond the current electoral cycle, and the interests of future generations embedded in the national sustainable development strategy or policy framework, reinforced by:

- A commissioner, council, fund or ombudsperson for future generations;
- Other mechanisms of scrutiny or oversight over the possible effects on future generations of policies or legislation (e.g. auditing mechanisms);
- Mechanisms for regular appraisal of policies to ensure that unanticipated effects are integrated over time;
- Impact assessment mechanisms that take into account intergenerational effects of major infrastructural developments (not limited to an environmental perspective);
- Other nationally relevant mechanisms.

Principle 3. Improve policy integration to capitalise on synergies across economic, social and environmental policy areas

Why is this important?

A coherent implementation of the SDGs requires specific institutional mechanisms to steer policy integration. It requires specific initiatives by government to better integrate economic, environmental and social goals within the mandate of each existing institution. It demands sustained efforts to improve the integration of sectoral - and often fragmented - policies, to enhance policy integration across levels of government, and to foster consistency in the choices made by the various stakeholders. The OECD Policy Framework on Sound Public Governance provides guidance to this end (OECD, 2020_[12]). Policy integration is central to balancing the dimensions of sustainable development, to maximising synergies

and managing trade-offs at all stages of policy-making, and to ensuring that national and sub-national goals are aligned to achieve the SDGs.

The COVID-19 crisis has confirmed some well-known SDG interlinkages, triggering a need for new regulatory or institutional mechanisms to address them in an integrated and balanced manner. The COVID-19, as a zoonotic disease, has illustrated how the interaction between environmental and habitat changes induced by human activity (agricultural activity, deforestation, wildlife trade, and climate change) can lead to shifts in ecosystems, which in turn may intensify communicable disease transmission. Governments have a range of strategic tools that could be used in an integrated manner and more proactively to advance a sustainable and coherent recovery in alignment with SDGs, such as budgets, laws, regulatory policies and public procurement systems.

Overview of trends

Countries have put or are putting in place mechanisms to incorporate sustainable development into the work of national institutions and to align sectoral objectives with the multi-dimensional SDGs. In a majority of countries, an overarching national strategy or action plan for 2030 Agenda implementation serves as a common framework for integrating the SDGs into sectoral programmes. Governments also have at their disposal a number of strategic tools that can serve to integrate the SDGs into the policy making process more systematically, including project selection and prioritisation, budgets, laws, international tax policy, regulatory policies and public procurement systems.

Indeed, an emerging practice in many countries is to use the budget as a mechanism for policy integration and coherence. The integrated nature of the SDGs and the fact that they call for a medium-term vision means that incorporating the SDGs into the budget process can promote policy coherence across various policy goals and ensure the continuity of policy objectives beyond electoral cycles.

Some countries are using procurement as a strategic lever for achieving broader policy objectives and outcomes, from environmental protection to SME development and innovation, while the interlinked challenges caused by the COVID-19 measures have triggered a need for new institutional mechanisms to support policy integration (OECD Policy Responses to Coronavirus (COVID-19), Building a coherent response for a sustainable post-COVID-19 recovery, 23 November 2020).

Improved policy integration and coordination are also being fostered through foreign direct investment (FDI). In the framework of the second phase of the FDI Qualities initiative, a mapping of institutions and policies is being conducted in ten pilot countries, which focuses on the coordination mechanisms between the various institutions across different areas of sustainable development².

Four provisions in the PCSD Recommendation aim at supporting governments and stakeholders improving policy integration.

² The 2019 FDI Qualities Indicators, together with the forthcoming Policy Toolkit, will provide guidance to OECD and partner countries on how to attract investment that boosts innovation, quality jobs and skills, gender equality, and the low-carbon transition. The Policy Toolkit is planned as a deliverable for the OECD Ministerial Council Meeting 2022 and is a strategic component of OECD's efforts to support the 2030 Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals.

Box 2.11. Principle 3

Improving Policy Integration to better incorporate sustainable development into policy and finance, and in that respect capitalise on synergies and benefits across economic, social and environmental policy areas as well as between domestic and internationally-recognised Sustainable Development Goals.

- a) Make strategic use of policy planning mechanisms and tools, including the budget process and public procurement, to manage synergies and trade-offs and integrate sustainable development into sectoral policies;
- b) Incorporate a PCSD lens, as appropriate, into national development plans, sustainable development strategies, and financing plans and develop supporting tools, such as guidelines or regulations, as well as coordination mechanisms for ministries and government agencies to align their mandates, policies and sectoral objectives with broader sustainable development goals;
- c) Integrate regional and territorial development into sectoral policies to achieve greater synergies with long-term strategic planning for the implementation of the SDGs;
- d) Take a whole-of-government approach to development policy and finance to diversify the resources and linkages beyond official development assistance that support sustainable development impact, including domestic resources, private investment, remittances and philanthropic flows as well as non-financial drivers of sustainable development such as trade and corporate business models.

Source: OECD Council Recommendation on PCSD: <https://legalinstruments.oecd.org/en/instruments/OECD-LEGAL-0381>

Actions to consider

a) Make strategic use of policy mechanisms and tools to integrate sustainable development into sectoral policies

- Strengthen the link between planning, budgeting and outcomes to foster sustainable development. For example, 'SDGs policy tagging' reveals current sectoral priorities of the government, as well as linkages between budgetary programmes with the SDGs and targets.
- Maintain a balance between accountability, central steering capacity, local autonomy and integration.
- Develop policy mechanisms in an evidence-based, data-driven manner.
- Apply SDG budgeting (i.e. tagging budget measures, etc.) to support a prudent assessment of costs and benefits of capital investments in terms of sustainability, affordability, relative priority among various projects, and the impact on future generations.
- Inform public investment decision-making on value for money and affordability of new investment projects for the public budget and users, and minimising sustainability risks by measuring, disclosing and taking into account the total cost over the entire asset life cycle³ including promoting responsible business conduct risk-based due diligence for private sector participants.

³ OECD Recommendation on the Governance of Infrastructure (2020)

- Adopt rigorous project appraisal and selection processes to assess capital investments' economic, social, fiscal, environmental and climate-related costs and benefits, project costing, time planning, risk management and governance⁴, and the impact on future generations.
- Apply a holistic view of government purchasing to ensure that public spending supports sustainability and target public procurement as a strategic function beyond the mere administrative process. Use the public sector's buying power to promote responsible production and consumption.
- Apply innovation-enhancing public procurement to catalyse ideas needed for the transition to a more sustainable economy, address the culture of risk aversion and learn how to manage risks, improve the skills of public buyers, enhance data collection and monitor sustainable procurement practices and achievement of sustainable targets, try out new forms of partnerships and require transparency and responsible behaviour throughout the entire public supply chain.
- Make use of digital government policy levers, such as business cases, agile project management and digital procurement approaches to integrate planning, budgeting and implementation to advance PCSD. Business cases are the first step of justifying the need and value of a project. Agile project management covers the management methodology and the agile and innovative practices in the design and implementation process. Digital procurement approaches enable the last mile of the project delivery by integrating the research, policy design, business cases and acquisition of the necessary resources based on the policy goals. This requires a design thinking process that is centred on policy integration.

Good practice examples

Box 2.12. Finland: State budget planning as a tool for policy integration

In September 2018, the Finnish Ministry of Finance presented a proposal for the 2019 State Budget to the Parliament with a comprehensive consideration of sustainable development. The budget focused in particular on carbon-neutrality, sustainable resource consumption and production. The proposal took the budgetary impacts on climate action, bio-economy, circular economy, clean-tech innovations and sustainable public procurement into account, and bore international environmental agreements, development cooperation policy and climate investments in mind. This was an important step in mainstreaming sustainable development into all sectoral policies and financial instruments. In addition, the government launched work on a phenomenon-based approach to budgeting that will allow for more tailored solutions that consider cross-sectoral, transboundary and intergenerational policy impacts.

Source: (PMO Finland, 2020^[13]).

⁴ OECD Recommendation on the Governance of Infrastructure (2020)

Box 2.13. Sweden: Public procurement

Sustainable public procurement. The public procurement legislation provides good opportunities to consider different sustainability aspects and states that contracting authorities, under certain circumstances, should pay attention to environmental, social and labour law aspects. A national government procurement strategy has been adopted with seven directional goals that contribute to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda. In addition to economic sustainability, these encompass environmentally responsible public procurement and a public procurement that contributes to a socially sustainable society. The National Agency for Public Procurement is an authority that has been established to support and strengthen the work of public procurement. This includes to work for a public procurement that is in compliance with the rule of law, efficient and socially and environmentally sustainable. It also has the task to increase the knowledge of how public procurement can be used as a tool to contribute to the global sustainability goals that are linked to the 2030 Agenda.

Employment criteria in public procurement. The National Agency for Public Procurement supports and promotes socially sustainable procurement. Within an EU-funded project – Employment through Procurement – a national model for employment criteria has been developed together with partners from Finland. The aim has been to create a uniform method that shows what is required to be able to carry out a successful procurement with employment criteria. The model describes each step in the process and provides practical support to the stakeholders involved, including contracting authorities and entities, matching agencies and suppliers, but also decision-makers. The agency has established a web-based knowledge bank with information and materials in the form of questions and answers about employment criteria, legal framework, a calculation model for socio-economic effects, success factors for employment criteria and best practice from Sweden and other EU countries.

Source: Input provided by Sweden to this note.

Box 2.14. Assessing public procurement systems' readiness for delivering on SDGs

Methodology for Assessing Procurement Systems (MAPS), and its Supplementary Module on Sustainable Public Procurement

Evaluating and assessing the quality and effectiveness of public procurement systems helps governments to understand whether their systems properly support the implementation of SDGs. The Methodology for Assessing Procurement Systems (MAPS), and especially its Supplementary Module on Sustainable Public Procurement, can serve as an international standard to evaluate any public procurement system (regardless of income level or development status) and thus support evidence-based policy work. The module on SPP is intended to provide an assessment tool that integrates sustainable public procurement in general procurement assessments and reforms and helps transforming public procurement systems into more sustainable ones. It aims to:

- Enable a country to assess its legal and institutional framework, operations and market practices, and the accountability, integrity and transparency of SPP
- Identify strengths and weaknesses of SPP
- Facilitate the implementation of reforms to advance SPP › Complement the MAPS core methodology

- Integrate the existing tools related to SPP
- Support the implementation and reporting of SDG 12.7 and related goals.

Sustainable Public Procurement in Norway – testing the MAPS SPP module

OECD, in collaboration with the Norwegian Agency for Public Management and eGovernment (Direktoratet for forvaltning og ikt, Difi), has recently tested the Sustainable Public Procurement Module of the MAPS in Norway. The module has been used in its draft form for the first time to test its robustness and the indicator framework. Norway was the first country to be assessed using the supplementary module on sustainable public procurement. Lessons from the application were used to improve and finalise the module.

This assessment followed the core MAPS assessment, which Norway undertook in 2018. The primary objective of the assessment was to conduct a thorough, external assessment of the way sustainability features in the Norwegian public procurement system, highlighting strengths and weaknesses, and benchmarking the Norwegian system with international good practices and standards. The findings of the assessment feed into Norway's strategy for green public procurement. The assessment included the analysis of 28 sample procurement procedures, which were selected by the OECD and Difi to cover a range of sectors and contracting authorities relevant for sustainable public procurement.

Source: <http://www.mapsinitiative.org/> ; <https://www.oecd.org/gov/public-procurement/country-projects/sustainable-public-procurement-in-norway/>

Box 2.15. Sweden: Integration of 2030 Agenda goals as targets for state-owned enterprises

The State Ownership Policy of the Swedish government lays down that the work of state-owned enterprises on sustainable business has to be guided by international guidelines, the 2030 Agenda and the global Sustainable Development Goals. State-owned enterprises have to analyse the Sustainable Development Goals to identify which targets the enterprises have an impact on and can contribute to through their operations.

The Government views sustainable business as an important issue of short and long-term business strategy. The Policy thus expects the enterprises to identify business opportunities that contribute to achieving these and are to be guided by care for the future position of the enterprise in a sustainable world.

The board of directors is responsible for integrating sustainable business into their enterprise's business strategy. This means that the enterprise has to start from its business and, where applicable, its specifically adopted public policy assignment when setting targets and strategies to attain these targets. The boards of directors are responsible for tracking of strategic targets for sustainable value creation that they set for themselves.

The Government has supported integration of sustainability goals by organising a series of workshops on the theme of the 2030 Agenda attended by enterprise representatives so as to increase the joint exchange of knowledge. Further work done by the enterprises will be tracked as part of the ongoing owner dialogues between owner representatives and the enterprises.

Source: Government of Sweden (2020), Annual report for state-owned enterprises 2019

<https://www.government.se/4a841c/contentassets/30d932bb500642b6a2dfcf40e7457071/annual-report-for-state-owned-enterprises-2019-complete.pdf>

Box 2.16. Enhancing policy coherence through responsible business conduct

Implementation of responsible business conduct (RBC) principles and standards can help companies to 'operationalise' the SDGs and to enhance PCSD. RBC means that all companies – regardless of their legal status, size, ownership or sector – should (i) make a positive contribution to the economic, environmental and social progress of the countries in which they operate and (ii) avoid and address negative impacts of their activities, including in the supply chain and throughout business relationships.

Guidance issued on RBC can help to ensure stakeholders comply with standards and follow coherent approaches to risks and synergies. Food security is an area that demands such an approach, for example where agricultural practices such as the growing of cash crops can themselves have a negative impact on food access for local communities. The [OECD-FAO Guidance for Responsible Agricultural Supply Chains](#) provides a global standard for addressing risk and development in the agricultural sector, with a focus on implementing due diligence. Pilot projects testing the application of this guidance have shown promising results, such as greater collaboration with suppliers to tackle deforestation and the use of impact assessments by companies before launching projects on unused land. ([How responsible business boosts the agriculture sector | FAO Stories | Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations](#)).

Promoting the implementation of RBC principles and standards, such as the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises (MNE Guidelines) [[OECD/LEGAL/0144](#)], can also provide a framework for ensuring a balanced approach to COVID-19 recovery efforts, by avoiding conflicting requirements and promoting a level playing field globally.

National Contact Points for Responsible Business Conduct (NCPs) – government-established agencies – play an active role in promoting RBC across government agencies and seeking policy coherence. NCPs can also promote policy coherence on RBC within government through their remedy role, by informing other government agencies of the findings from their statements when relevant to these agencies policies and programmes, as encouraged by the MNE Guidelines.

Source: <https://mneguidelines.oecd.org/RBC-and-the-sustainable-development-goals.pdf>.

b) Incorporate a PCSD lens into national plans and strategies and develop supporting tools and co-ordination mechanisms

- Link the sustainable development strategy to other national strategies (for instance, by referring to green growth strategies, digital government agendas, public investment and infrastructure, etc. in the sustainable development strategy, and vice-versa). This approach frames the sustainable development policies as part of the government's broader agenda.

c) Integrate regional and territorial development into sectoral policies

- Use the SDGs to promote synergies and manage trade-offs across levels of government in order to overcome fragmentation, linking social, economic and environmental dimensions either at the goal or target level.
- Allocate financial resources based on the identified place-based policy priorities and key local challenges, and use the SDGs framework as a means to foster integrated multi-sectoral programmes and priorities.

*Good practice examples***Box 2.17. Japan: supporting the localisation of the SDGs**

Japan has expanded its SDGs Action Plan 2018 to increase national support to local governments. The second pillar of the Action Plan on “regional revitalisation” focuses mainly on the localisation of the SDGs through its Future Cities initiative comprising 29 local governments, 10 of which have been selected as SDG Model Cities and are receiving financial support by the national government to implement their SDG strategies. The initiative also promotes the establishment of SDG local governance structures following the national “SDGs Promotion Headquarters” headed by the Prime Minister within the Cabinet Office.

Source: (OECD, 2020^[14]).

d) Take a whole-of-government approach to development policy and finance

- Ensure complementarity and promote SDG alignment across existing sources of finance. Recognize that the qualitative dimensions of financing flows have become increasingly important, and seek to maximise the SDG impact of each dollar flowing to developing countries.
- Increase the efficiency of financing frameworks, while recognising the full cost of environmental, social and economic factors in financing sustainable development.
- Pursue efforts to contain and mitigate the impact of the investment volatility in partner countries, and reinforce the development cooperation-investment-trade nexus to build the resilience of financing and ODA efforts. Further use and leverage ODA to increase the qualities of other sources of financing, including trade, investment and infrastructure.

*Good practice examples***Box 2.18. Mobilising and aligning private finance for sustainable development in developing countries**

The issue: Large amounts of capital for financial investments are available, but do not target developing countries, often for reasons of risk, or promote sustainable development, often due to poor incentives or regulations. Mobilising additional capital for investments and aligning existing resources in developing countries is critical to complement domestic resources and official development assistance and leverage sufficient resources for sustainable development.

Good practices: OECD DAC members engage in several ways to promote more and better private sector investment for sustainable development:

- They enable blended finance, i.e. use public resources to leverage private funding, by sharing the risk with private investors (e.g. through guarantees to cover first loss tranches) or decreasing investment costs (e.g. through lending at low rates) so that private investors consider engaging in challenging contexts. Funding is conditional on respect for sustainability criteria and demonstrating a development impact. The role of blended finance is particularly important, as the use of development finance to mobilise private capital flows to emerging markets may result

in positive results for both investors and communities, thus supporting progress towards the SDGs.

- They encourage private sector actors to engage in developing countries, providing technical assistance and advisory services to companies and development co-operation to improve the business environment in developing countries.
- They support partnerships with the local private sector that maximise results for those most in need, for example by encouraging investments in micro-, small and medium-sized enterprises, businesses and entrepreneurs in the informal sector and collaboration with trade unions.
- They support inclusive and institutionalised consultations with developing country governments and other actors at country level, including through social and public-private dialogue to strengthen trust, raise awareness of investment opportunities and help ensure investments are in line with (sub-) national plans and policies.
- They push for greater reflection of ecological, social and governance criteria in private investments.
- They utilise ODA to effectively create enabling conditions for private sector-led financing (i.e. the development co-operation-investment nexus) that remains sustainable and inclusive and does not result in socio-economic setbacks.
- They seek to better identify and leverage the comparative advantages of the different actors in developing countries at different stages of transition, including bilateral and multilateral institutions and in coordination with the private sector.

Results:

- Private investments in developing countries continue to grow, but the exodus of private capital after the COVID-19 crisis has illustrated the fragility of investments.
- Private investment funds increasingly include ecological, social and governance criteria in their investment assessments.
- ODA represents a declining share of total available resources in developing countries in volume terms, but it remains the highest quality resource both in terms of targeting development aims and providing highly concessional terms and conditions of financing.

Lessons learned:

- Private investors prefer investments in lower risk contexts and sectors, therefore concentrating on middle-income countries and the energy sector. Additional work is needed to encourage greater investments in challenging contexts and notably least developed countries.
- A focus on the development impact of private investments is necessary to justify the use of public resources and should be geared towards targeting those locations, markets, value chains and investor types that are most likely to have a positive impact on those furthest behind.
- Integrating a transition finance approach/principles requires financing strategies that weigh the trade-offs between portfolio management (notably risk mitigation) and development impact (notably country-led financing strategies).

Note <https://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-development/blended-finance-principles/>.
<https://www.effectivecooperation.org/landing-page/action-area-21-private-sector-engagement-pse>

Source: OECD, Transition Finance Compendium.

Box 2.19. Applying taxation principles

The developmental impact of private sector activity is significantly reduced if companies are not paying tax, especially where tax is avoided through funds being shifted offshore, and out of the local economy. To counter this phenomenon, on 1 July 2021 131 member jurisdictions of the G20/OECD Inclusive Framework on BEPS (Inclusive Framework), representing more than 90% of global GDP, joined an agreement for a two-pillar solution to address the tax challenges arising from the digitalisation of the economy. The two-pillar solution helps to ensure that large multinational companies pay their fair share everywhere and brings much needed tax certainty and stability to the international tax system.

In addition, many development finance institutions have established principles around the tax behaviour they follow, and expect of investment partners and investee companies.

For example Swedfund's principles on tax

(https://www.swedfund.se/media/1861/swedfund_tax_policy.pdf) explain that Swedfund:

- evaluates financing structures to assess potentially harmful tax risks,
- expects company structures they invest in to follow both the letter and spirit of the law, and requires investee companies to be able to demonstrate their tax situation to Swedfund
- encourages investee companies to make tax and item on the board agenda
- will not invest through intermediary jurisdictions that have been assessed as non or partially compliant by the Global Forum
- uses income tax levied on portfolio companies as an indicator for measuring impact on society.

3 Effective and inclusive institutional and governance mechanisms to address policy interactions

Principle 4. Ensure whole-of-government coordination to promote mutually supporting actions across sectors

Why is this important?

The cross-cutting nature of the SDGs poses co-ordination challenges at each level and stage of the policy-making process. It requires governments to strengthen existing institutional and governance mechanisms for horizontal co-ordination (between entities of a particular tier) and vertical co-ordination (between international, national and subnational levels). Having in place efficient mechanisms and processes at appropriate levels for inter-ministerial co-ordination to resolve policy divergences and trade-offs between different sectors is essential to ensure an integrated implementation of the 2030 Agenda and the SDGs.

Whole-of-government co-ordination is a relevant governance mechanism to identify and address policy divergences and conflicts between measures for recovery and achievement of the SDGs. Most OECD countries have established co-ordination mechanisms for SDG implementation that can play a key role for ensuring a sustainable recovery for the SDGs.

Overview of trends

There is no one-size-fits-all approach for ensuring efficient high-level co-ordination conducive to improving policy coherence. Countries are using various mechanisms and processes to address specific national and local contexts and respond to existing cultural, institutional and political conditions (OECD, 2019^[2]).

In recent years, an increasing number of countries have strengthened the institutional and financial capacity of their Centres of Government (CoG) – the body or group of bodies that report directly to the Head of Government and the Council of Ministries – to support SDG implementation (OECD, 2016^[15]). In other countries, the co-ordination responsibility is often assigned to line ministries with cross-cutting influence (e.g. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Finance). A number of countries have also established informal working groups or networks that meet on a regular or ad hoc basis to discuss pressing issues.

More than five years into the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, it is clear that each approach has its pros and cons. For example, having the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as the co-ordinating body helps to ensure that developing country interests are taken into account and adverse transboundary impacts limited, but also risks leading to a separation between the domestic and external dimension of SDG implementation. The Ministry of Environment is likely to put sustainability aspects first, but must also ensure that the SDGs do not simply become an extension of the Rio process but rather reflect the multi-

dimensional nature of the SDGs. Creating a new body allows for an administration that is specifically aligned with the SDGs, but the question is if it adds value or just another layer of bureaucracy.

With the outbreak of COVID-19, the value of whole-of-government co-ordination has become even more evident and in some cases countries have relied on their SDG co-ordination mechanisms to manage the economic, social and environmental consequences of the crisis. This is a strong testament to these structures' importance and usefulness for addressing global challenges. Specifically, the Recommendation outlines four provisions that aim at helping countries to ensure whole-of-government co-ordination.

Box 3.1. Principle 4.

Ensuring whole-of-government coordination to identify and mitigate divergences between sectoral priorities and policies, including external and domestic policies, and promote mutually supporting actions across sectors and institutions.

- a) Use high-level co-ordinating mechanisms, whether located within the Centre of Government or a lead line ministry as appropriate, to promote PCSD and the integration of sustainable development across central agencies, line ministries and other public institutions;
- b) Establish clear mandates, capacities and mobilise adequate resources, as appropriate, for PCSD to identify policy divergences and conflicts related to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda;
- c) Encourage formal governance arrangements and informal working methods that support effective communication between ministries and departments, and between ministries and other public sector bodies under their aegis;
- d) Build capacity in public administrations for PCSD, and align training strategies and programmes for public actors with the principles and integrated nature of the SDGs

Source: OECD Council Recommendation on PCSD: <https://legalinstruments.oecd.org/en/instruments/OECD-LEGAL-0381> .

Actions to consider

a) Use of high-level co-ordinating mechanisms

- Align existing coordinating structures and inter-ministerial mechanisms with the principles enshrined in the PCSD Recommendation to enhance policy coherence for sustainable development.
- Ensure the involvement of the Government Office/Centre of Government in efforts to promote policy coherence across line ministries and other public institutions
- Ensure neutrality and convening power of the body responsible for co-ordination functions throughout the administration.

Good practice examples

Box 3.2. Central co-ordination mechanisms at the highest level

Finland - Co-ordination for national implementation of the SDGs is led by the Prime Minister's Office (PMO). The co-ordinating secretariat of the Commission on Sustainable Development was transferred from the Ministry of the Environment to the PMO in 2016, along with responsibility for planning, preparing, co-ordinating and ensuring implementation. An Inter-ministerial Coordination Network consisting of sustainable development focal points from each line ministry supports the PMO.

Germany - Chaired by the Head of the Federal Chancellery, the State Secretaries' Committee serves as the central co-ordinator for the Sustainable Development Strategy. Its role is to ensure that the Strategy is applied to all policy areas. All ministries retain primary responsibility for contributions to the SDGs and 2030 Agenda in their respective policy areas. A directors' working group for sustainable development (UAL-AG) with representatives from all ministries, and led by the Federal Chancellery, deals with all questions of sustainable development relevant to the ministries. Germany also demonstrates a serious engagement on coordination on transboundary impacts (Principle 7). A number of measures contribute towards this. Germany is already committed to cross-sector coordination on their Sustainable Development Strategy. This is achieved through a permanent Inter-ministerial Working Group for Sustainable Development as well as through the appointment of coordinators in each ministry with the mandate to mainstream relevant initiatives internally and across departments. There is also coordination in international bodies, typically through a co-lead by the Ministry for Environment and the Ministry for Development Cooperation, to ensure coherence between domestic and international aspects.

Japan - In 2016 Japan created a new cabinet body, "SDGs Promotion Headquarters", headed by the Prime Minister and comprising all ministries to lead co-operation among ministries and government agencies in implementing the SDGs.

Mexico - The President established the National Council for the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development as a bonding mechanism between the Federal and local governments, civil society, the private sector and academia. It is chaired by the President and composed of state secretaries. The National Council is tasked with co-ordinating actions for the design, implementation and evaluation of policies to comply with the 2030 Agenda. The work of the Council is supported by an Executive Secretary located within the Office of the President.

Sweden - All government ministers are responsible for the implementation of the global goals and the 2030 Agenda for sustainable development within their respective areas of responsibility. Two ministers have a coordinating responsibility for the 2030 Agenda; the Minister for Environment and Climate at the Ministry of the Environment for the national implementation and the Minister for International Development Cooperation at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs for international implementation. The Ministry of the Environment has the coordinating responsibility for the 2030 Agenda at the EU-level and the Ministry for Foreign Affairs has the coordinating responsibility for the EU-external 2030 Agenda activities. There is also a State Secretary group for the 2030 Agenda convened and led by the Ministry of the Environment. State Secretaries from several ministries meet every four months to discuss and coordinate the 2030 Agenda issues at the political level. There is also a 2030 Agenda coordination group that consists of civil servants from all ministries. The civil servants are national and international coordinators in their respective ministries for issues related to the global goals and the 2030 Agenda for sustainable development.

Source: (OECD, 2018^[11]), inputs to this note.

Box 3.3. Mandates and co-ordination across government on the effects in developing countries

The issue: Understanding and addressing effects of policies on developing countries requires technical expertise on both the issue and on developing countries. Within governments, this means that foreign ministries, development co-operation agencies and other ministries need to work together to mobilise their respective expertise and stakeholder networks. Embassies can also contribute to foster coherence with national policies and use them as a guideline for directing their resources.

Good practices: An analysis of DAC members' co-ordination mechanisms identifies a number of good practices, e.g.:

- **Making all ministries responsible for the effects of their policies on developing countries.** For instance, **Sweden** is requiring all ministries to develop action plans on how they contribute to the SDGs globally. Poland has established a network of focal points in ministries. The EU and the Netherlands oblige ministries to undertake regulatory impact assessments that cover effects on developing countries.
- **Providing necessary resources and strengthening capacity.** A number of DAC members have dedicated staff in foreign ministries to support work across government on the coherence of policies with developing countries' development. To strengthen the understanding of effects on developing countries, the United Kingdom's newly created Foreign, Commonwealth, and Development Office seeks to integrate diplomacy and development to achieve greater impact and address the links between climate change and extreme poverty (referencing the Integrated Review). The UK government has also published an Integrated Review of Security, Defence, Development and Foreign Policy (2021). Similarly, **Portugal** provided training on policy coherence with a perspective on developing countries. The EU draws on its delegations in developing countries to provide insights into coherence issues.
- **Establishing government co-ordination mechanisms to discuss and arbitrate effects on developing countries.** At working level, many DAC members have thematic ministerial working groups, e.g. on climate change or migration, and ministries co-ordinate the preparation of new strategies or action plans. The EU Inter-Service Consultation draws in expertise across the Commission, building on regulatory impact assessments that also cover effects on developing countries. Some DAC members have dedicated ministerial committees to discuss policies' effects on developing countries, such as **Italy** or **Luxembourg**. Some DAC members' top development co-operation officials have cabinet rank, allowing them to flag coherence issues at highest political level.
- **Results:** Numerous DAC member initiatives for greater policy coherence build on effective co-ordination elsewhere across the government. A typical example are action plans on business and human rights that involve ministries of foreign affairs, economy and labour.
- **Insights and lessons learned:** Evaluations have underlined that the existence of mechanisms does not guarantee their use. Political will at high level, mandates, awareness and resources are all required to enable effective government co-ordination. Early co-ordination at government level is often more effective in promoting policy adjustments, since it avoids considering adjustments at a stage where policies are well advanced.

Further information: OECD-DAC Peer Reviews assess efforts for policy coherence for sustainable development with regard to developing countries.

b) Establishment of clear mandates, capacities and mobilisation of adequate resources

- Provide the co-ordination mechanism with a clear mandate to anticipate and resolve policy divergences and tensions arising from diverging priorities and different sectoral interests related to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda.
- Ensure that the co-ordination mechanism goes beyond information sharing. Even if the political mandate is clear in government resolutions, it does not necessarily translate into the ability to shepherd the issues across ministerial lines and silos and arbitrate solutions in the case of disagreement.
- Communicate the existing mandate of the co-ordination body to all actors.
- Couple the mandate to co-ordinate with the financial and human resources needed to do so effectively. Government bodies often have only a marginal interest in issues that go beyond traditional electoral cycles and likely less willing to engage time and resources into them.

c) Encouragement of formal governance arrangements and informal working methods

- Combine formal governance arrangements and clear mandates for coherent SDG implementation with informal working methods to bringing about positive cultural change in public administrations. Meetings and conversations that are not dictated by formalities, seniority or protocol stimulate a more open exchange of ideas and innovative thinking that can be conducive for addressing cross-cutting policy objectives and develop integrated solutions

Good practice examples

Box 3.4. Switzerland: '2030 Agenda Steering Committee' and coordination mechanisms at different levels

In 2018, a new committee at the level of senior management composed of representatives of the government offices that are most relevant for the 2030 Agenda, from all seven ministries, has been set up by the Federal Council ('2030 Agenda Steering Committee'). It coordinates and provides strategic support for overall matters relating to the 2030 Agenda at federal/national level. The committee is specifically responsible for identifying conflicting goals at a broad level.

While the coordination with the sub-national level is taking place via the Network of Cantonal Sustainability Offices, effective cooperation with non-state actors is ensured through an Advisory Group comprising representatives from central coordinating bodies of different sectors of society (academia, civil society, business, and youth).

Further general mechanisms include:

- The Federal Administration has various other bodies, which are made up of different members of various government offices depending on the topic in question, that ensure coherence in a specific policy area as far as possible (e.g. international cooperation, climate).
- All decisions within the Federal Administration are consulted between all the federal offices concerned.
- In addition, for new laws and ordinances, there is a consultation procedure (ger: "Vernehmlassungsverfahren" / fre: "procédure de consultation") in which all the players concerned (political parties, civil society, cantons, associations, etc.) can express their views on the content of a planned legislative package.

- At the sub-national level, the cantons coordinate in thematic conferences and thus establish sub-national coherence where necessary.

At the international level, Switzerland also coordinates with other countries in order to reinforce policy coherence within the framework of multilateral institutions and weighs up conflicting objectives together with international partners.

d) Building of capacity in public administrations for PCSD

- As part of government SDG strategies, adjust management practices to an increasingly complex economic, social and environmental reality and deploy human resources and capabilities in the most effective way.
- Build capacity and skills that take civil servants beyond their traditional operating environment and challenge them to think and act in new, cross-disciplinary ways.
- Promote the application of new tools and methods in systems thinking and experimental policy design.
- Develop competency frameworks, which identify and strengthen the right skills of public servants, to make civil servants fit to deliver on national objectives such as the SDGs (OECD, 2017^[16]).
- Encourage digital skills to strategically shape public governance outcomes beyond using them simply to improve government processes or reducing costs in the public sector. They could be essential, for example, for taking to a new level engagement with citizens and other stakeholders, which is at the heart of achieving the SDGs (OECD, 2019^[7]). In developing countries, the lack of inter-agency bodies is common and the remaining institutional practices do not foster innovation towards a systemic approach. Technological tools can help improve this integration, but they should be tested before implementation to assess whether they can actually help reduce the institutional inflexibility in achieving the SDGs.
- Engage the National Schools of Public Administration (NPAs) to infuse the SDGs into the civil service more systematically.

Good practice examples

Box 3.5. Poland: Building civil service skills for the SDGs

In September 2020, Poland embarked on a 16-month long project to develop and test a 'Capacity Building Programme for Public Administration to support the implementation and carrying out of actions for SDGs and sustainable development'. Specifically, the project aims to improve staff competences and strengthen governance frameworks for a holistic, cross-sectoral approach to SDG implementation. The programme, which targets mid-level and senior civil servants at national (central) level, consists of different thematic modules and is currently being by a limited number of government officials. The results and feedback from the pilot phase will serve to improve the programme before it is being rolled-out across the government. The programme, which can be easily adapted and replicated in other countries, could also be complemented with targeted training for civil servants at sub-national levels of government.

Box 3.6. Engagement of National Schools of Public Administration

Ireland's Institute of Public Administration is investing heavily on project management as a skill central to SDG implementation. Many other schools too have programmes or courses about the SDGs and/or on sustainability management, e.g.; the **Netherlands** School of Public Administration, **Dubai's** Mohammed Bin Rashid School of Government, and **Bahrain's** Institute of Public Administration are all including the SDGs in their education curriculum. However, as highlighted at recent meetings of the OECD Global Network of Schools of Government, the challenge is not only to provide appropriate development opportunities for the SDGs, but to also convince governments to prioritise this training for their civil servants. Many suggested that their governments were not yet approaching the SDGs as a domestic policy challenge.

Links with the global methodology for SDG indicator 17.14.1

The principle of whole-of-government co-ordination is captured by the global indicator 17.14.1 as follows: “The country has an institutional mechanism in place that periodically brings together relevant ministries and governmental entities to enhance policy coherence for sustainable development.”

Government contributions towards enhancing PCSD are monitored on the basis of:

- A mechanism for regular coordination established at the national level and bringing together ministries (and other governmental entities) to facilitate information sharing and consultation among different ministries/sectors most relevant to sustainable development, reinforced by:
- A mandate to make decisions regarding trade-offs and other unintended negative impacts;
- Convened by a centralised government body such as the Office of the Prime Minister or President or other central national governmental entity (ex. Ministry of Planning);
- Representation and coordination at both political/strategic level and technical level, to ensure political commitment as well as its translation into action and alignment between the two levels;
- Explicit mandate to consider transboundary issues and enhance coherence of internal and external policies including through the involvement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (or equivalent bodies);
- Other nationally relevant mechanisms.

Principle 5. Engage appropriately sub-national levels of government to promote coordinated actions

Why is this important?

An integrated implementation of the SDGs requires high degrees of policy coherence across different levels of governments to identify and address potential trade-offs between international commitments, national priorities and local needs. It is estimated that 65% of the 169 targets underlying the 17 SDGs will not be reached without proper engagement of, and co-ordination with, local and subnational governments (SDSN, 2016). Vertical coherence aims to link local-to-national levels and national-to-global levels in delivering on the SDGs. Countries need to strike a reasonable balance between local autonomy and central steering capacities when implementing the SDGs.

Subnational governments are at the frontline of the COVID-19 response. Regional and local authorities are responsible for delivering critical short-term containment measures and more long-term recovery activity – from health and social care to economic development and public investment. They need to work

together actively as well as in close collaboration with the national government. Subnational responses to the COVID-19 pandemic will also have important implications for the overall achievement of the 2030 Agenda.

Overview of trends

Many cities and communities have already taken steps to implement the SDGs. Notably, an increasing number of local and regional governments are producing SDG Voluntary Local Reviews (VLRs). Similar to VNRs, these reviews provide a tool for local and regional governments to periodically follow-up and review their progress in SDG implementation. While the VLRs hold no official status, the process of preparing them is often as important as the final report, and also reinforces vertical coherence and complements SDG implementation at the national level. So far, 29 sub-national governments (SNGs) have conducted their own VLR. In many cases, the findings suggest two key aspects that require further consideration: (i) the inadequacy of many targets to be tackled at the local level; and (ii) the lack of a guiding framework for subnational levels of government (IGES, 2020). As an example, Costa Rica is working on the development of an SDG guiding framework for local governments, while also trying to align efforts from different government levels.

The OECD Programme on a Territorial Approach to the SDGs specifically focus on supporting SNGs to implement the SDGs. The Programme recently developed an OECD localised indicator framework for the SDGs, which measures the distance towards the SDGs for more than 600 regions and more than 600 cities in OECD and partner countries, comparing them to their national averages and their peers. With its 135 indicators available up to now, the OECD localised indicator framework already covers all the 17 goals, both at regional and city level (OECD, 2020^[14]).

The data collected thus far show that cities and regions in OECD countries are far from achieving the SDGs: at least 80% of OECD regions have not achieved the end values proposed by the OECD for 2030 in any of the 17 SDGs, and at least 70% of cities have not achieved the suggested objectives for 15 out of the 17 SDGs. The goals where most of the regions and cities are lagging behind are SDG 13 on “Climate action” and SDG 5 on “Gender equality”. On the other hand, the goal where most regions and cities are performing relatively well is SDG 16 about “Peace and institutions” (OECD Urban Policy Reviews: A Territorial Approach to the Sustainable Development Goals, OECD 2020).

A recent survey conducted by the OECD and the European Committee of Regions (CoR) in European countries show that most cities and regions work with the SDGs because they consider them a valuable tool to strengthen regional and local development. The most common actions put in place to implement the SDGs are awareness-raising campaigns (62% of respondents), establishing a dedicated body (57%) and – at a more advanced stage of implementation – having a dedicated strategy/action plan (44%); and establishing indicators (34%). The survey results also indicate a higher level of co-operation for SDG implementation between different national levels (60%) than between the local and national level (only 23% have joint projects with the national level to implement the SDGs). (<https://cor.europa.eu/en/events/Documents/ECON/CoR-OECD-SDGs-Survey-Results-Note.pdf>)

Two provisions in the PCSD Recommendation focus on the engagement of sub-national levels of government to promote coordinated and coherent action for SDG implementation (Box 3.7).

Box 3.7. Principle 5

Engaging appropriately sub-national levels of government in areas where they have a role in policy coordination to promote coordinated actions and enhance coherence across levels of governments for sustainable development.

- a) Promote PCSD at different levels of government and work with key stakeholders to develop tools that support local regional governments in applying PCSD in their legal frameworks, plans and actions for localising the SDGs.
- b) Promote synergies among national, regional and local policies to better align with and contribute to relevant economic, social and environmental goals, including international commitments and international development co-operation objectives, within the scope of their responsibilities and in a balanced manner.

Source: OECD Council Recommendation on PCSD: <https://legalinstruments.oecd.org/en/instruments/OECD-LEGAL-0381>

Actions to consider

a) Promote PCSD at different levels of government

- Develop capacity-building programmes across government levels on policy coherence for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda and SDGs.
- Use the SDGs as a framework to align policy priorities, incentives, objectives across national, regional and local governments.
- Facilitate multi-level dialogue around success stories and persistent challenges, and encourage the SDG monitoring at the subnational level to unpack regional disparities and go beyond national average.
- Work with sub-national levels of government to leverage public procurement for the SDGs. According to Government at a Glance (OECD, 2020), sub-central governments make up 63% of overall public procurement spending in OECD countries, with substantial variations reflecting the institutional set-up of each country.

Good practice examples

Box 3.8. Luxembourg – Taking inventory of local initiative to foster vertical coherence

In Luxembourg, many parliamentarians exchange regularly with the country's mayors. Local concerns can be raised in parliament, and mutual exchange of knowledge between the local and national level is a common occurrence. Furthermore, local communities have an opportunity to influence legislation via regular consultation processes. To foster vertical coherence, the Government has taken inventory of SDG-related local initiatives to ensure that priorities and policies are well aligned. It has provided a reference guide for local communities based on ISO 37120:2018 on 'Sustainable cities and communities: Indicators for city services and quality of life' and the Reporting Standards of the Global Reporting Initiative.

Source: (OECD, 2019^[2]).

b) Promote synergies among national, regional and local policies

- Use the SDGs as a framework to align policy priorities, incentives, objectives across national, regional and local governments.
- Ensure effective processes for engaging appropriately sub-national levels of government and promoting coordinated sub-national, national and international actions for achieving the SDGs.

- Mainstream the SDGs in the design and implementation of international co-operation activities, including decentralised development co-operation programmes.

Good practice examples

Box 3.9. Decentralised development co-operation

The issue: Almost 60% of SDG targets can only be achieved by subnational governments providing essential public services. Cities and regions in OECD DAC countries are well placed to provide assistance to their peers in developing countries. However, the potential for decentralised development co-operation between subnational entities is still largely untapped.

Good practices: DAC member governments subnational entities take a range of action to promote subnational engagement for sustainable development in developing countries

Providing stable funding: In **France**, a law enabled municipalities to use 1% of their water and sanitation budget for international co-operation in the sector.

Mobilising the full range of expertise at subnational level: The **Italian** region of Tuscany mobilises public and private sector actors from Tuscany on the basis of their specific competences and expertise, with networks in Tuscany and partner countries.

Dedicated institutional arrangements: The **Belgian** region of Flanders has made development co-operation a policy priority, with a long-term focus on select countries and sectors. Most Flemish municipalities have a councillor, budget and advisory board for development co-operation activities.

Institutional support: **Germany** has a national agency that provides advisory services and networks for subnational entities engaging in development co-operation. The European Union has set up a portal to facilitate match-making between subnational entities.

Results: The financial volume of decentralised development co-operation is growing, but still at low levels. Decentralised development co-operation is moving towards more systematic reciprocity, partnership and mutual learning, away from traditional donor-driven and project-based approaches.

Lessons learned: Multi-level and multi-stakeholder partnerships can connect actors and help exchange best practices. This is important since decentralised development co-operation is often small scale, increasing risks of comparatively high costs and fragmentation. Support should be well matched to demand and local context.

Transparency and more comprehensive reporting on decentralised development co-operation remain a challenge.

Targeting should avoid that only more competitive cities and regions benefit, as this could exacerbate inequalities in developing countries.

Source: (OECD, 2019^[17]), Decentralised development co-operation: Unlocking the potential of cities and regions, <https://doi.org/10.1787/e9703003-en>. (OECD, 2018^[18]), Reshaping Decentralised Development Co-operation: The Key Role of Cities and Regions for the 2030 Agenda, <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264302914-en>

Links with the global methodology for SDG indicator 17.14.1

Vertical coherence is included in the global indicator 17.14.1 as follows: “The country has mechanisms in place for aligning priorities, policies and plans between various levels of government.” Government contributions towards enhancing PCSD are monitored on the basis of:

- Consultation and coordination mechanisms to systematically collect the inputs of sub-national government entities and the consideration of their priorities in national policy, strategy formulation and planning processes and to integrate national priorities into the subnational policies, plans and programmes;
- Contractual or other institutional arrangements for regular formal exchange between central government and subnational levels of government for systematic consultation, collaboration, and alignment of efforts;
- Tools to enhance substantive coherence such as policy or planning and budgeting templates or checklists that require demonstration of alignment between sub-national and national level policies before validation and budget allocation;
- Planning cycle timeframes that facilitate the alignment of national and sub-national plans, or systems that allow for the regular review of plans, policies, regulations and programmes to facilitate such alignment.

Principle 6. Engage stakeholders effectively to sustain broader support for policy coherence

Why is this important?

Major barriers to policy coherence are strongly rooted in differing perceptions of stakeholders on the priorities and challenges in advancing sustainable development. A coherent implementation of the SDGs requires mechanisms for dialogue and engagement whereby governments and key stakeholders can come together to identify challenges, set priorities, contribute to the development of laws and regulations, align policies and actions, and mobilise resources for sustainable development.

Engaging proactively with stakeholders in all phases of the policy cycle, including through the exchange of knowledge and expertise, helps to ensure a holistic perspective on sustainable development issues, give voice to diverse interests, identify potential trade-offs, raise public awareness and create ownership.

Making different voices in society heard will be critical for ensuring an inclusive and sustainable recovery from the COVID-19 crisis. This is particularly relevant in a context where the COVID-19 crisis puts the ability of governments to act effectively under the public spotlight and where trade-offs have to be made to balance public health and economic priorities and to allocate large-scale stimulus packages across different sectors and beneficiaries.

Overview of trends

Most OECD countries have involved multiple stakeholders in the process of identifying national priorities, preparing VNRs and developing strategies or action plans for SDG implementation. Two provisions in the PCSD Recommendation encourages Adherents to work towards more effective stakeholder engagement (Box 3.10).

Box 3.10. Principle 6

Engaging stakeholders effectively to sustain broader support for PCSD and its implementation

- a) Engage proactively with stakeholders in different phases of the policy cycle, including through the exchange of knowledge and expertise, to develop and prioritise initiatives for enhancing PCSD, making specific efforts to reach out to the marginalised and vulnerable groups in society and to advance inclusive social and economic development, in line with the aspirations of the SDGs.
- b) Work with stakeholders to raise public awareness and mobilise support on sustainable development and government commitments supporting PCSD, through campaigns, policy dialogue, capacity building and information sharing.

Source: OECD Council Recommendation on PCSD: <https://legalinstruments.oecd.org/en/instruments/OECD-LEGAL-0381> .

Actions to consider

a) Engage proactively with stakeholders in different phases of the policy cycle

- Ensure that stakeholder engagement is purposeful (e.g. by clearly defining what the desired outcomes of the engagement are); inclusive (e.g. by mapping and analysing stakeholders); transformative (e.g. by choosing methods that build collaboration across different groups of society); and proactive (e.g. by building engagement planning into implementation).
- Engage with stakeholders from different age groups. For example, a strong relationship between public institutions and youth can help to mobilise support for structural reforms with long-term implications, as highlighted in the updated Youth Action Plan.
- Promote co-production, whereby citizens engage in partnerships with the government in the design and delivery of a public service, to ensure stakeholder engagement that goes beyond information sharing and consultation.
- Engage in citizen participation to strengthen monitoring, evaluation and reporting quality to allow governments to understand the extent to which their policies were successful and helping them improve the design of new policies.
- Link open government principles (e.g. the OECD Recommendation on Open Government [OECD/LEGAL/0438]) with SDG implementation. The two agendas are mutually reinforcing.

*Good practice examples***Box 3.11. Norway - Establishing a Policy Coherence Forum for broad stakeholder participation**

The Norwegian Policy Coherence Forum develops recommendations for enhancing policy coherence and plays a central role in preparing the annual report on Policy Coherence to Parliament. The Forum is comprised of representatives from civil society, academia, the private sector and trade- and employers' unions and chaired by the state secretary for international cooperation at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in cooperation with the Ministry of Finance and other line ministries. The Norwegian Forum for Development and Environment, a second important forum for national dialogue on SDG implementation that brings together more than 50 civil society organisations, provides analytical and strategic input on sustainable development in the form of reports and road maps.

Source: (OECD, 2019^[2]).

Box 3.12. Norway: Inclusive and consultative service delivery to vulnerable populations

Also in Norway, the Asker Welfare Lab is working to provide service delivery centred solely on the citizen, in which all relevant municipal services, together with external partners, invest together in a person's welfare. Treating citizens as co-investors, the aim is to raise the living standards of vulnerable individuals under the motto: "No decision about me shall be taken without me". The pilot phase showed improvements in living conditions and quality of life, and demonstrated that common planning saves time and gives municipal employees greater access to resources and the ability to make earlier investments. The project has been recognised as a National Learning Project in Norway and was one of three projects to receive the annual National Innovation Award from the Ministry of Local Government and Modernisation. It has also been awarded a Best Practice Certificate from the European Public Sector Awards 2017.

Box 3.13. Australia – mobilising stakeholders for sustainable development

In Australia, the government has partnered with the Global Compact Network Australia (GCNA) to develop the Australian SDG website. The website includes an online platform to centralise and showcase action being taken across government, business, civil society and academia to advance the SDGs in the Australian context. Organisations are invited to submit case studies on projects which deliver on the SDGs to the platform's data base. These case studies detail the goals being delivered on, the key steps involved, and quantitative data on the project's impact. The website also provides resources such as tools for incorporating the SDGs into business practice. The overall objective is to disseminate good practices, inspire new projects, and to avoid the duplication of efforts.

Box 3.14. Consulting stakeholders with development expertise

The issue: Domestic stakeholders are independent actors for sustainable development, implementing partners, and advocates in public debate. Their advice and participation is therefore critical to increase the likelihood of successful policy shifts.

Good practices: OECD DAC member have established diverse institutional mechanisms that allow a broad range of stakeholders to discuss transboundary effects of national policies. Development NGOs and research institutions are represented in many of these. Diaspora organisations and business associations with a focus on developing countries are also important stakeholders. Specific examples include:

- **Specific policy coherence mechanisms:** A number of DAC members have given multi-stakeholder committees a mandate to advise on the effects of national policies on developing countries or associate stakeholders in these debates. In France, the committee also includes foreign experts, in Italy representatives of the diaspora from developing countries.
- **Associating stakeholders with developing country expertise in policy-making:** For instance, Ireland regularly organises an SDG stakeholder forum, where civil society organisations that engage in development co-operation also participate.
- **Building stakeholder coalitions:** Prime examples relate to responsible business conduct with initiatives such as Beyond Chocolate in Belgium or the Partnership for Sustainable Textiles in Germany.

Results: Suggestions to improve the coherence of national policies with sustainable development in developing countries become part of political debate.

Stakeholder coalitions have increased buy-in and engagement in implementation, as all partners bear responsibility for the outcome of the initiative.

Lessons learned: It is important to clarify when stakeholders will be consulted and which follow-up will be given to suggestions or recommendations proposed by stakeholders (e.g. management response, debate in Parliament...). Where possible, consultation with stakeholders from developing countries should also take place.

Box 3.15. Consulting with governments and key stakeholders in developing countries

The issue: Developing countries have limited capacity to voice concerns as part of OECD country policy-making. Proactively discussing policy coherence issues with governments and other stakeholders from developing countries can therefore enhance the understanding of the issue and contribute to more coherent policy design. Bilateral dialogue on policy coherence for development is particularly important where the issue at hand can be addressed through bilateral agreement (e.g. migration, tax or trade agreements) and where it has a major impact on the country (e.g. trade policies of a top trading partner).

Good practices: OECD DAC members discuss policy coherence issues with developing countries through:

- Embassy reporting: The **European Union** requires its delegations to regularly report on policy coherence issues, which in turn requires embassies to enter into dialogue with local stakeholders.
- Regulatory impact assessments: The **Netherlands** encourage the consultation of stakeholders in developing countries as part of the regulatory impact assessment.
- Issues-based dialogue: **Switzerland** discussed the return of illicitly acquired assets to Nigeria, Ireland the challenges and opportunities from health worker migration to Ireland with Pakistan and Sudan, and Korea dialogued with Cambodia to enhance trade opportunities for Cambodia. The European Union's Cotonou Agreement with 79 African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) States obliges the EU to inform ACP countries of measures that might affect their interests. It also allows ACP countries to request a consultation before a final decision, although the mechanism has been rarely used.

Results: Dialogue has enabled finding development-friendly agreements:

- **Switzerland** signed a Memorandum of Understanding with Nigeria that enabled the development-friendly return of USD 321 million.
- **Ireland** put in place specific partnership programmes with Pakistan and Sudan to increase the mutual benefits from health worker migration.
- **Korea** and Cambodia signed a memorandum of understanding for a plan to support export of Cambodian mangoes to Korea in 2016, and actual exports started in 2020.

Lessons learned: In order to raise concerns and make a convincing case, developing countries need access to quality data and research. Dedicated support, for instance by building statistical capacity and commissioning targeted studies, can provide a better basis for dialogue.

Transparency in negotiations can help all stakeholders to assess whether concerns are addressed.

Box 3.16. Finland: Reporting on the 2030 Agenda creates a framework for structured dialogue between the Government, Parliament and stakeholders

In Finland, the national implementation plan for the 2030 Agenda is updated by each Government, and submitted to the Parliament as Government Report. These Reports form a solid base for dialogue between the Government and the Parliament on the national implementation of the 2030 Agenda. The Government prepared the first national implementation plan in 2017, and the current Government submitted its updated plan to the Parliament in October 2020.

The Finnish Parliament's Committee for the Future acts as the parliamentary committee responsible for the 2030 Agenda. The Committee for the Future prepares a parliamentary response to the Government. Other parliamentary committees issue their statements to the Committee for the Future for its consideration. During the drafting process, all committees consult with experts and can also arrange public consultations allowing wider participation by stakeholders. The Government is obliged to report to the Parliament annually on what measures it has taken to respond to the issues identified in the Parliamentary response.

Source: Link to Government Report on the Implementation of the 2030 Agenda: <http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-952-383-085-1>.

Box 3.17. Including stakeholders in government bodies that foster sustainable development: the case of National Contact Points for Responsible Business Conduct

Responsible Business Conduct contributes to enhanced policy coherence for sustainable development (see Principle 3). National Contact Points for Responsible Business Conduct (NCPs) closely liaise with business, workers and civil society stakeholders to promote RBC (see also box 16 above). One of the requirements that the Guidelines place on NCPs is that they maintain relations with stakeholders and gain their confidence. This is why three quarters of NCPs include stakeholders directly in their structure, in several ways:

- Ten NCPs have a multi-stakeholder structure, meaning that representatives from business, trade unions and civil society are full members of the NCP;
- Four NCPs have an expert-based structure, whereby the NCP is composed of independent experts nominated by stakeholder groups;
- Twenty-two NCPs are government-based and are supported by an advisory body composed of stakeholder representatives.

Such stakeholder inclusion allows NCPs to disseminate RBC more broadly and convincingly, and to be perceived as an honest and impartial broker by the parties in the resolution of cases, thereby being more effective in fostering the SDGs.

Source: OECD (2020) National Contact Points for Responsible Business Conduct - Providing access to remedy: 20 years and the road ahead. <http://mneguidelines.oecd.org/NCPs-for-RBC-providing-access-to-remedy-20-years-and-the-road-ahead.pdf>.

b) Raise public awareness and mobilise support on sustainable development

- Incentivise stakeholder participation via digital challenge platforms to re-use open government data and generate innovative solutions that can assist in achieving the SDGs. The combination of purpose-oriented challenges and easily accessible government data creates a strong environment for new innovative solutions to be created by citizens and businesses and assist governments in their policies supporting sustainable development.
- Promote and facilitate stakeholder access to relevant online learning material, such as the UNSSC-OECD online course on Policy Coherence for Sustainable Development.
- Use practical ways for designing specific campaigns, and promoting policy dialogue, capacity building and information sharing to build consensus on priorities for enhancing policy coherence for sustainable development.

Good practice examples

Box 3.18. Engaging the public to become development-aware citizens

The issue: Ultimately, taking policy decisions that constitute a significant departure from the status quo require public support. When the reason for such an adjustment stems from the effects in developing countries, it is critical that the public is sufficiently sensitive to such effects although they feature less in domestic debate. Public support for such policies builds on acknowledging the underlying rationale of shared prosperity that underpins the 2030 Agenda, combining self-interest and solidarity.

Good practices:

- Investing in future generations of development-aware citizens, OECD members such as Portugal and Korea integrate global citizenship and “development” into school curricula. In addition, Portuguese NGOs such as DECOJovem develop awareness campaigns as extracurricular activities in schools to raise awareness of issues such as sustainable consumption and development.
- Ireland’s approach to development education, which has been commended by Global Education Network Europe, notably builds on strong partnerships. Key stakeholders include civil society, community organisations such as the National Youth Council and local authorities.
- Development co-operation actors boast numerous good practices and insights in communicating effectively with their publics. To raise awareness of the SDGs, the Italian multi-stakeholder alliance ASviS runs an annual sustainable development festival, while Japanese character Hello Kitty partners with the United Nations.
- Many development co-operation agencies such as the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) have a strategy for information and communication activities, including through civil society organisations.

Results: Results from the Global Competence segment of the 2018 PISA exercise can highlight where schools are particularly successful in Global Citizenship education.

Surveys across DAC members show high levels of support for development co-operation, but less and more mixed readiness to engage as an individual for sustainable development in developing countries, through donations, volunteering or consumer behaviour.

Links with the global methodology for SDG indicator 17.14.1

Stakeholder engagement is captured by the global indicator 17.14.1 as follows: “The country has mechanisms in place to ensure that laws, policies, plans, programmes and major development projects at different levels of government are developed through participatory processes that engage relevant stakeholders in a comprehensive manner.” Government contributions towards enhancing PCSD are monitored on the basis of:

- A requirement that relevant stakeholders are consulted at the early stages of development of laws, policies, plans, programmes and major development projects at different levels of government, accompanied with the requirement for a reasonable timeframe for information and participation of relevant stakeholders and other procedural standards to make participation effective, reinforced by:
 - Consultations mandated to take place in a comprehensive manner at various stages of the policy cycle, i.e. not only during policy development but also at implementation, evaluation, and revision stages;
 - Institutions are required to disclose the rationale for taking or not taking into account inputs from consultations;
 - An accountability mechanism that allows public intervention by citizens such as petitioning and subsequent review of policies.

4 Responsive and adaptive tools to anticipate, assess and address domestic, transboundary and long-term impacts of policies

Principle 7. Analyse and assess policy and financing impacts to avoid negative impacts, in particular on developing countries.

Why is this important?

Many of the challenges facing countries at the domestic level are increasingly transboundary, if not global, in nature. Governments need to strengthen their competencies to be up to these challenges and effectively address policy and financing impacts at the global level.

Taking effective and informed decisions on the policies needed to achieve the SDGs in an integrated and balanced manner requires evidence on potential interactions (synergies and trade-offs) and impacts (here and now, elsewhere and tomorrow). For example: governments have to give more careful consideration to the cumulative and inter-related impacts of policies and regulatory regimes; they need to analyse the role and impact of both public and private investments; and they must strive to limit adverse policy impacts not only at home but also on other countries.

Monitoring and impact assessments are an integral part of the governance process, ensuring that public value and intended outcomes are achieved according to initial goals and objectives. Negative policy impacts are felt more by smaller, unorganised, hard-to-reach, less informed or marginalised constituents in society. The OECD Best Practice Principles on Regulatory Impact Assessment therefore recommend that governments assess impacts of draft regulatory interventions to foster inclusive growth and sustainable development

In today's global and interconnected world, the transmission channels for transboundary impacts are numerous and include e.g. financial flows (and taxation of such flows), imports and exports of goods and services, migration or knowledge transfers, and activity in global supply chains. OECD analysis finds that as many as 97 SDG targets can be described as having transboundary elements (57% of all 169 targets); 50 of these are "means of implementation" targets, most of which relate to financing and supporting developing countries in achieving the SDGs. Transboundary targets are heavily concentrated in the Planet

goals, where they account for 76% of the total, and in the Implementation goal (95%) (Measuring Distance to the SDG Targets, OECD 2019).⁵

Moreover, since the onset of COVID-19, disruptions of global supply chains and limited movement of people across borders have triggered a host of negative transboundary impacts, in particular on countries that are heavily dependent on tourism, such as small island developing states (SIDS); inflows of remittances; or official development assistance, with a risk of reversing these countries' progress in implementing the SDGs. Hence, with regard to SIDS, supporting new and emerging ocean-economy opportunities in ways that foster significant linkages and multiplier effects across multiple economic and social areas will be critical for the recovery.

Overview of trends

A number of OECD countries are working towards adopting broader forms of impact assessment to ensure the sustainability of policies. Some countries have taken steps to ensure an effective interface between the domestic and international dimensions of sustainable development as part of their SDG implementation process. Working towards adopting measures to systematically assess impacts can help enhance policy coherence for sustainable development. The PCSD Recommendation includes two provisions to this end (Box 4.1).

Box 4.1. Principle 7

Analysing and assessing policy and financing impacts to inform decision-making, increase positive impacts and avoid potential negative impacts on the sustainable development prospects of other countries, in particular on developing countries.

- a) Introduce, where possible, regular assessments to identify and assess potential positive and negative impacts on sustainable development, building on any existing tools such as Regulatory, Environmental, Gender, Human Rights, and Social Impact and Strategic Assessments.
- b) Adopt ex-ante and ex-post impact assessment practices that take into account transboundary impacts, paying particular attention to economic, social, gender and environmental impacts on developing countries as well as the promotion and protection of human rights.

Source: OECD Council Recommendation on PCSD: <https://legalinstruments.oecd.org/en/instruments/OECD-LEGAL-0381>

Actions to consider

a) Introduce, where possible, regular assessments to identify and assess potential positive and negative impacts on sustainable development

- Use available data to measure outputs, outcomes and impact; auditing of the decision process and monitoring of performance, in order to make informed decisions on resource allocation, performance improvement, incentive changes and cost reductions: this leads to an important feedback loop for the policy design and delivery phases.

⁵ A forthcoming OECD working paper on “Measuring transboundary impacts in the 2030 Agenda – Conceptual approach and operationalisation” will also provide a typology of transboundary impacts, operationalised through illustrative proxy indicators on transboundary flows. It presents evidence from a qualitative survey of experts about the potential impact of these five flows on each of the 17 Goals and 169 targets of the 2030 Agenda.

- Work with national statistical institutes (NSIs) to identify those population groups most at risk of being left behind, as well as the negative policy impacts that these groups are more exposed to.
- Draw on years of lessons learned from using Regulatory Impact Assessments (RIAs), Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) and Gender Impact Assessments (GIAs) to develop a new generation of impact assessments (ex-ante and ex-post), to allow for a screening of the impacts (both positive and negative, intended and unintended) on all the SDGs for each new policy initiative. RIA can be used to also promote intergenerational justice as highlighted in the updated OECD Youth Action Plan.
- Build technical capacity and methodological skills to facilitate the use of “new generation” impact assessment tools.
- Make use of existing methodologies for mapping out critical interactions (synergies and trade-offs) across policies in the implementation of the SDGs. Promote the analysis of unintended impacts (positive or negative) of policies not expressly intended to promote the SDGs.
- In the area of performance management, use real-time data to provide feedback on the policy design features and delivery process – whether the benchmarks and KPIs are attained or there are gaps to improve.
- Consider the impacts on sustainability of foreign direct investment policies (FDI). Realising the potential benefits of FDI is not a given: among countries receiving FDI, some have benefited more than others and, within countries, some segments of the population have lagged behind. While, in principle, FDI has the potential to support sustainable development, home and host country policies require careful consideration.

Good practice examples

Box 4.2. Sustainability Impact Assessments

- In March 2018, **Germany** launched an “electronic sustainability impact assessment” (eNAP), which is now being used for sustainability impact assessments in the ministries. The new programme is intended to help improve the quality of the sustainability impact assessment while making it easier to perform. The user is systematically guided through the content of the Sustainable Development Strategy relevant to the assessment. All indicators, goals and management rules are queried, which means that no area is overlooked. Other connections to the individual SDGs are also assessed. The application is freely available to all societal stakeholders at www.enap.bund.de. Moreover, in order to build technical capacity and methodological skills to facilitate the use of “new generation” impact assessment tools, the Sustainability Education Office was established in January 2020 at the Federal Academy of Public Administration (BAköV), which is the central advanced training institution for German Federal administration. This office supports managers and employees of the federal authorities with need-based trainings, good examples from home and abroad and methodological knowledge in order to train them in managing the transformation towards sustainable development. Online lectures series include trainings on electronic sustainability assessment (eNAP), sustainable procurement, EMAS Regulation, climate-neutral administration by 2030 etc. The Sustainability Education Office relies not only on well-established formats for specialized trainings (workshops, coaching sessions, conferences), but also on online formats. As also mentioned by the 2021 National Sustainable Development Strategy, the Office uses synergies with institutional partners such as the Federal Chancellery, the Federal Ministry for the Environment and the Federal Environmental Agency as well as with universities, civil society and firms.

- The IAK (Integraal Afwegingskader) has been used in the **Netherlands** since 2011 for every new policy, legislation and regulation proposal submitted to Parliament. The procedure is formed by three phases and seven questions that need to be answered: phase 1) Problem Analysis; phase 2) Instrument Selection; phase 3) Impact Assessment. Moreover, 20 mandatory “quality requirements” (or estimated impacts) are expected to be assessed by ministries during the process. Examples of these requirements include: Business Impact Assessment; Impact on Citizens; Impact on Developing Countries; and Impact on Gender Equality. The instrument is coordinated by the Ministry of Justice and Security, but policy officers are responsible for its implementation. The IAK is conducted at an early stage of the policy-making process. After the pressure of the Parliament, the SDGs were integrated in the process and the tool now contains a SDG-test, which contributes to enhance policy coherence early on in the policy process allowing for an ex ante assessment of whether new proposals are in line with the SDGs.
- In **Luxembourg**, The Sustainability Check (Nachhaltigkeitscheck) is being developed in order to address two policy issues: first, whole-of-government coordination. The implementation of PCSD requires a unified effort across ministries. In recognition of this, Luxembourg has weekly inter-ministerial pré-conseil meetings, designed to maximise synergies and minimise trade-offs between the work of each ministry. Accessible and up-to-date quantitative data on the linkages and potential trade-offs between sectoral policies and transboundary impacts in line with the PNDD (Plan National pour un Développement Durable) would further enhance the effectiveness of these meetings. Second, it is important to ensure monitoring and systematic evaluation for the PNDD. The use of quantitative indicators would again inform these efforts and provide a clear picture on progress made on the SDGs and PCSD. Luxembourg is building a Sustainability Check as a tool for assessing legislative acts in relation to their impact on sustainable development. Its use will be mandatory for new laws and encouraged for other policies. The Sustainability Check will therefore embed the intentional integration of SDG objectives at the conception of all new legislation. The Sustainability Check is built on a list of 118 potential indicators selected by a body of national experts to measure the evolution of each of the 124 targets of the Agenda 2030 selected by Luxembourg government. The tool will provide early-stage feedback on bills before they are presented to Parliament. Finally, the tool is designed to be digital and aims at extracting data to have post-policy-based evidence reports and impact studies.

b) Take into account transboundary impacts, in particular on developing countries

- Develop approaches for identifying and assessing transboundary impacts (environmental, social and economic), including also cumulative and cross-sectional impacts.
- To the extent possible, integrate the transboundary dimension into existing ex ante and ex post impact assessment.
- Complement domestic-level indicators used in nationally-based approaches to sustainable development with measures of economic, social and environmental externalities imposed beyond national borders.

Good practice examples

Box 4.3. Impact assessments of effects in developing countries

The issue: Transboundary policy coherence issues often involve complex causalities and interlinkages that affect multiple groups of stakeholders both at home and in many, diverse developing countries.

Assessments of regulation projects can therefore help OECD DAC members to better understand the potential impact of a policy on developing countries and consider appropriate adjustments.

Good practices: A growing number of OECD members are integrating a development-dimension in their regulatory impact assessments. Specific guidance helps undertake the assessments. The EU's better regulation toolbox #34 provides an overview of key links between EU policies and developing countries, a typology of possible effects, and examples that illustrate how to conduct assessments and design mitigating measures.

Guidance in the **Netherlands** also suggests focusing on the effects on the most vulnerable and recommends consulting civil society in the Netherlands and in developing countries.

Results: Quality assessments have translated into more development-friendly EU policies.

Lessons learned: Given the complexity of issues, drafting assessments is challenging and requires resources.

Assessing the alignment with international standards and recommendations can be a pragmatic approach for less relevant issues, while reserving resources for more in-depth assessments for issues of high political relevance.

Box 4.4. Access to medicine in developing countries

Policy issue: Intellectual property rights on pharmaceutical products delay the development and marketing of generic products in developing countries, increasing the cost of access to medication. Trade policies can be adjusted to facilitate access to medication in developing countries.

Good practices: The **Netherlands** has advocated within the EU for granting least developed countries exemptions under the Trade-related intellectual property rights (TRIPS) agreement, and for not applying provisions that go beyond this framework (so-called TRIPS+, in particular longer patent duration and test data exclusivity) in its agreements with Indonesia, the Philippines, the MERCOSUR and Mexico. The Netherlands are also advocating for fair pricing of medication in the World Health Assembly and the UN Secretary-General's High Level Panel on Access to Medicines. Finally, together with other DAC members and partners, including from developing countries, the Netherlands supports product development partnerships, where pricing and patents are discussed upfront to enable access also in developing countries. It also supports the Access to Medicine Foundation on Antimicrobial Resistance.

Results:

- The EU agreed in the WTO Council to renewing the exemption for least developed countries to respect pharmaceutical patents until 2033.
- The EU-Mercosur agreement confirms TRIPS standards, while the agreement with Mexico and EU proposals for Philippines and Indonesia include TRIPS+ provisions
- Product development partnerships resulted in a new drug for childhood tuberculosis, a malaria medicine for pregnant women, and a vaginal ring to prevent HIV infection.
- An Antimicrobial Resistance Benchmark assesses the engagement of pharmaceutical companies in research and development of new drugs.

Insights and lessons learnt: The Netherlands found that other EU member states were not always supportive of its position to not include TRIPS+ provisions in its trade agreements. This could warrant further reflection how to build awareness and political will.

Box 4.5. Sweden – Antimicrobial resistance

Antimicrobial resistance (AMR) is a global threat for human, animal and environmental health and has implications for food safety, food security as well as economic well-being of millions of people. In addition, AMR is a global cross-border challenge that requires collaborations between countries and sectors. The current COVID-19 pandemic further highlights AMR as it risks driving the use of antibiotics, which in turn drives the emergence of resistance. Furthermore, the pandemic reminds us of a reality where effective treatments are lacking.

AMR has long been a priority for the Swedish government, which early developed a strategy for achieving set goals. The strategy is cross-sectoral signed by five Ministers/Ministries and coordinated in the Parliament to ensure sustained work. The strategy is the roadmap and forms basis for practical activities which are governed by 25 national authorities in an Inter-sectoral coordinating mechanism, an ICM, chaired jointly by the animal and human health authorities, respectively. Activities are demand driven and set out in action plans which are updated regularly.

Sweden's working model is based on coordination and collaboration against a cross-cutting issue and has taken a decade or more to develop. However, it facilitates our proactive work within the EU and internationally as initiatives and positions are agreed upon within the ministries or the ICM platform. A lesson learned is that a dedicated budget together with a close collaboration with the private sector and academia are key components for success. As for the SDGs, Sweden introduced 'antibiotic use' in food-producing animals as well as in humans as national indicators for monitoring of sustainability goals 2, 3 and 12. These actions complement the 2020 introduction of a global indicator for AMR by the IAEG, which measures the SDG target 3.d on "the capacity of countries, for early warning, risk reduction and management of national and global health risks". Similar direct/explicit indicators had been lacking among the global indicators, although 40 % of the global indicators are reported to be relevant for AMR. These indicators are found across 12 SDGs, with 6 SDGs being of particular relevance (SDG 2, 3, 6, 9, 12 and 17).

Box 4.6. Switzerland: Return of illegal assets to developing countries

The issue: To fight global corruption, Switzerland is taking action to return stolen assets from developing countries deposited in financial centres such as Switzerland. The challenge is to ensure that confiscated assets support sustainable development.

Good practices: Switzerland returns stolen assets based on the 2016 Foreign Illicit Assets Act. The requesting country of origin and Switzerland lead a dialogue to identify the best way forward on the use of assets and control measures. Based on a binding agreement, returned funds need to benefit the local population or strengthen the rule of law. Where possible, the approach seeks to include NGOs. Control systems ensure that funds are used as intended. As part of its global engagement, Switzerland

helped formulate voluntary Guidelines for the Efficient Recovery of Stolen Assets, together with partners.

Results: Switzerland successfully applied this approach in a number of return cases. For instance, in 2017, Switzerland, Nigeria and the World Bank signed an agreement to return illicitly acquired assets worth USD 321 million. Importantly, the approach enabled finding a solution that matched expectations by Nigeria, Switzerland and Nigerian civil society by contributing to a World Bank supported programme for social security for the poorest. The agreement also set out control measures to prevent and respond to misuse of funds. In 2020, Switzerland signed further asset return agreements with Turkmenistan and Peru, following similar approaches. Switzerland's approach has been met with interest abroad.

Lessons learned: A case-by-case approach is required, but the [GFAR Principles](#) provide key references. Early dialogue and shared responsibility between both states as well as the involvement of international organisations and non-governmental stakeholders can be success factors.

Source: Federal Department of Foreign Affairs: Illicitly acquired assets of politically exposed persons, <https://www.eda.admin.ch/eda/en/fdfa/foreign-policy/financial-centre-economy/illicit-assets-pep.html>

Box 4.7. Germany – transboundary impacts in SDG reporting

The German government recognises transboundary impacts in reporting on progress in the SDGs. In the most recent reports related to the SDGs, reference is made to the following levels: Impacts in Germany, Impacts on other countries and on global public goods (spillovers or externalities); supporting other countries. Transboundary impacts are therefore included in reporting and indicators where possible. This approach applies to sustainable development impact assessments as well. Finally, explicit details on initiatives regarding externalities are made in Germany's 2015 VNR for each SDG.

Box 4.8. European Union: Trade facilitation

The issue: Trade barriers and agricultural subsidies can create negative spillovers for developing countries, by affecting market access and competitiveness of products from developing countries.

Good practices: In 2012, the EU revised its Generalized Scheme of Preferences (GSP) to reduce duties on 66% of all EU tariff lines for imports from low income and lower-middle income countries, with zero tariffs on these imports from countries that implement core human rights, labour rights and other sustainable development conventions (GSP+). Since 2001, the already EU applies the Everything But Arms (EBA) scheme, that enables duty-free import for products from least development countries on all products with the exception of armament.

The EU signed nine economic partnership agreements with 50 African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries that offer provisions to help developing countries trade with EU member states, including: long transition periods or exclusions from market opening while EU markets are opened up; special safeguards for the development of infant industry and on food security; and voluntary EU restraint on World Trade Organization safeguards and the use of dispute settlement.

In 2015, the EU agreed to remove all agricultural export subsidies. It reformed the Common Agricultural Policy to reduce market-distorting effects by removing production constraints and ending export subsidies.

Results: An independent mid-term evaluation of the GSP schemes found overall positive results in terms of export growth and diversification, and social and human rights, with significant differences among countries. The environmental impact are difficult to determine.

The share of LDC imports in the EU was 2.2% in 2018, compared to 0.98% in world imports in 2017.

The trade and production distortions of support to agriculture have been reduced. However, many EU member states continue to pay significant levels of so-called voluntary coupled support (VCS) to their farmers, which has been shown to distort markets and may worsen environmental outcomes.

Lessons learned: Frequent political debate and sustained criticism regarding the development impacts of EU trade and agricultural policies has helped build political will to further adapt these policies.

The EU mid-term evaluation recommended, amongst others, greater transparency of the governance monitoring under GSP+, raising awareness of the schemes, strengthening coherence between schemes, and considering the inclusion of trade in services.

Box 4.9. Ireland: Tax Treaties

Tax treaties provide a legal framework to clarify the taxing rights on cross-border activities between signatory countries, reducing the risks of double taxation (where the same income/transaction is taxed twice by separate countries). As tax treaties involve signatories forfeiting some of their taxing rights, they require a balancing of costs and benefits, and careful negotiation. There are concerns that developing countries can find designing and implementing a tax treaty negotiation position challenging, with a risk of agreeing to a treaty with negative impacts.

Given these risks there are clear benefits for the treaty partners to consider PCSD in their approach to tax treaties with developing countries. To this end Ireland undertook a spillover analysis of Ireland's tax treaties with developing countries, published in 2015

(http://www.budget.gov.ie/budgets/2016/documents/ibfd_irish_spillover_analysis_report_pub.pdf).

More recently in 2021 announced it will be developing a Policy Statement on tax treaties, which 'will have a particular emphasis on tax treaties with developing countries, having regard to Ireland's development commitments and in consultation with the Department of Foreign Affairs and Irish Aid', in addition Ireland included questions on if/how it should adjust its policy on tax treaties with developing countries as part of the policy consultation held April-May 2021

(<https://assets.gov.ie/130908/ca770784-31a1-45a1-91c5-6dd510029c7e.pdf>).

Links with the global methodology for SDG indicator 17.14.1

The assessment of policy effects is captured by the global indicator 17.14.1 as follows: "The country has mechanisms in place that allow relevant public institutions systematically assess the policy effects and cross-sectoral linkages throughout the policy and planning processes in the spirit of the integrated approach of the SDGs." Government contributions towards enhancing PCSD are monitored on the basis of:

- A mechanism for assessing cross-sectoral effects and policy linkages of a policy (new or existing), including transboundary elements, reinforced by:
 - The application of the above mechanisms at all levels of government (i.e. national and subnational);
 - An indicator framework for tracking policy effectiveness towards sustainable development;
 - A cost-benefit analysis of policy impacts across all sectors;
 - The identification of measures to mitigate potentially negative effects and to optimize synergies as part of policy and planning;
 - The specific consideration of international spill-overs, such as cross-border and international impacts in the basic component of this sub-indicator.
 - Other nationally relevant mechanisms.

Principle 8. Strengthen monitoring, reporting and evaluation systems to collect evidence on the impact of policies and report progress on policy coherence.

Why is this important?

The use of data underpins the digital transformation of our societies and economies. Notably, data offers opportunities to better anticipate, forecast and plan for potential futures; monitor and respond to unexpected effects of designed policies; and to evaluate and draw insights from previous actions. Official statistics are an important starting point, but the need for data to support evidence-informed decision-making and ultimately the implementation of the SDGs goes far beyond conventional national statistics. National statistical institutes (NSIs) have a key role to play in achieving these data requirements.

Governments generate, collect and store massive volumes of digital data, including administrative records, and are also increasingly experimenting with the use of external data sources to fill critical data gaps. The 2019 OECD report on “The Path to Becoming a Data-Driven Public Sector” notes that the insights harvested from data and information can inform policy makers to design smarter, more agile, responsive and strategic policies that can hedge against unforeseen changes in the long-run.

Just as new regulatory proposals need to be assessed to ensure they are fit for purpose and are in line with the 2030 Agenda, so, too, do existing regulations, which tend to greatly outnumber new ones and which were often introduced under different circumstances. The OECD 2012 Recommendation on Regulatory Policy and Governance states that member countries should “conduct systematic reviews to ensure that regulations remain effective and consistent, and deliver the intended policy objectives” (OECD, 2020^[19]).

Governments need now more than ever robust monitoring, reporting and evaluation systems to inform the design of coherent and sustainable recovery strategies. In an unprecedented context where the effects of the COVID-19 crisis affect different sectors and groups of people differently, governments need to strengthen their mechanisms and capacities to track the progress of their policies, and adjust them as needed in light of evidence on potential negative or unintended effects.

Overview of trends

Most OECD countries are aligning their monitoring and reporting systems with the 2030 Agenda and the SDGs, and expanding their monitoring and reporting systems to consider the international and transboundary dimension of sustainable development. Four provisions in the PCSD Recommendation encourage countries to work towards strengthening monitoring, reporting and evaluation systems and report on PCSD (Box 4.10).

Box 4.10. Principle 8

Strengthening monitoring, reporting and evaluation systems to collect qualitative and quantitative evidence on the impact of policies and financing, and report progress on PCSD.

- a) Monitor and report back on policy and financing impacts drawing on national, regional and local sources, where available, and publish regular reports about progress on PCSD outlining progress made on addressing impacts on sustainable development at home and abroad.
- b) Identify existing reliable and timely data, indicators and information, disaggregated by sex and geographically and territorial level as well as other aspects such as income, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other characteristics relevant that can help better capture economic, social and environmental externalities imposed beyond national borders (transboundary impacts); and understand the country's contribution towards global efforts for implementing Agenda 2030.
- c) Report regularly on PCSD and, where needed, build capacity and skills to strengthen data collection, management, storage, and reporting processes.
- d) Embed a policy coherence dimension in evaluation systems to inform decision-making regarding the linkages and potential trade-offs between sectoral policies as well as transboundary impacts.

Source: OECD Council Recommendation on PCSD: <https://legalinstruments.oecd.org/en/instruments/OECD-LEGAL-0381>

Actions to consider

a) Monitor and report back on policy and financing impacts

- Make use of national statistical institutes (NSIs) and official statistics as a starting point for evidence-informed decision making.
- Establish a specific action plan or framework for policy coherence to make progress on relevant areas of sustainable development.
- Consider regular independent reviews of policy performance on high priority issues with a substantial impact on sustainable development.
- Conduct systematic reviews to ensure that regulations remain effective and consistent, and deliver the intended policy objectives (e.g. sustainable development).

b) Identify existing data, indicators and information to capture transboundary impacts

Good practice examples

Box 4.11. Strengthening capacity for data production and use

The issue: Developing countries, especially low-income countries and countries affected by state fragility, often lack foundational statistical systems and data use in policy debates often remains limited. Better data and capacity to use data would allow developing countries to engage in international policy debates on PCSD more actively. DAC members actively support their partner countries in developing statistical capacity, some with the explicit objective to ensure openness, transparency and participation in debates in relation to the 2030 Agenda (e.g. Sweden).

Good practices:

- Enabling actors in partner countries to implement, follow-up and participate in global dialogue on the 2030 Agenda. Key data on development, on everything from vital statistics to economic data, are lacking in developing countries or of poor quality, preventing these countries from implementing better policies and from participating in global debates. Working towards openness and transparency in relation to the 2030 Agenda, for instance, **Swedish** development co-operation explicitly aims to help improve countries' own statistical systems, putting partners into a position to strengthen their ability to actively contribute to policy debates. Furthermore, Sweden has created a network of approximately 70 government agencies and ministries, under the leadership of Statistics Sweden, was established in 2017 to support the coordination of the follow-up of the implementation of the 2030 Agenda in Sweden.
- Understanding cross-border financial flows. Remittances from DAC member countries represent a significant portion of GDP in some countries, often surpassing official development assistance and helping families in recipient countries to pay for essential goods and services, especially in time of need. Global Affairs Canada, in co-operation with Statistics Canada, administered a survey to people who send remittances from **Canada** to developing countries to better understand these important financial lifelines.
- Helping partner countries to reap the benefits of technology. New technologies give rise to large economies of scale in monitoring the environmental impacts of climate change. In 2018, **Australian** agencies, including the Department for Foreign Affairs and Trade, the Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research and Geoscience Australia, have been partnering with others for the Digital Earth (DE) Africa initiative, contributing technical and operational expertise in using satellite data to address sustainable development challenges. DE Africa aims to provide a routine, reliable and operational service, using Earth observations to deliver decision-ready products enabling policy makers, scientists, the private sector and civil society to address social, environmental and economic changes on the continent.
- Helping developing countries to build statistical capacity. The **UK** has embedded statisticians in a number of countries and runs a successful mentoring program for national statistical agencies (NSIs) through the ONS/FCDO data science hub.

Results:

- The Canadian study indicates that despite technological innovation in financial services, many remitters still use traditional channels which tend to be more costly.
- The use of satellite data produced by the DE Africa initiative in Zanzibar has, for instance, helped identify areas that are prone to disasters such as flooding or have experienced overexploitation of mangrove resources as a result of salt production and wood for fires and housing.
- Lessons learned: Helping partner countries to develop data, statistics and statistical capacity faces many challenges. The benefits of data and statistics cannot easily be measured; there is

an increasing number of providers, often with incompatible priorities; and the political economy of data and statistics can be challenging. To ensure that statistical capacity becomes sustainable, alignment to partner countries' priorities and better co-ordination between providers is paramount.

Source: (Lange, 2020^[20]), Key trends in development co-operation for national data and statistical systems, <https://doi.org/10.1787/1ce044d2-en>.

c) Report regularly on PCSD

- Publish regular reports for the parliament and the wider public about progress on PCSD outlining progress made on the achievement of policy priorities and on how policies are being implemented regarding sustainable developmental issues. Information on progress can also be included in VNRs and in reporting on development co-operation activities.

Good practice examples

Box 4.12. Monitoring and reporting on action and effects in developing countries

The issue: Monitoring allows OECD DAC members to verify if their actions towards more coherent policies are successful, while public reporting is critical for accountability and engaging stakeholders on policy coherence.

Good practices: At national level, a number of DAC members provide dedicated PCD reports on both actions and results to their parliaments and the public (Netherlands, Sweden, Norway, EU).

Germany and Sweden have used their voluntary national reviews (VNRs) to illustrate their action on PCD. Germany's VNR distinguished domestic action, global responsibility (PCD) and third-country support (ODA). Sweden provided a detailed discussion of two challenges in the coherence of domestic policies.

Results: Monitoring has allowed public debate of progress.

Lessons learned:

- **Sweden:** Generating stakeholder support and advancing coherent policies does not lend itself easily to results-based management. A Swedish study therefore suggested: "The reporting could be seen more as an instrument to produce a common understanding of what is necessary for coherence with development objectives in different fields; assessing precise outcomes in a precise moment is less relevant."
- **Norway:** Highlighting divergent opinions within government cannot necessarily be expected in public reports.
- **Switzerland:** Reporting against status indicators only does not enable strategic decision-making, since it is not clear which actions have been implemented and successful.

Discussions in Parliament do not directly lead to reform, but are only part of a long-term process of shifting political views.

d) *Embed a policy coherence dimension in evaluation systems*

Good practice examples

Box 4.13. Evaluation of actions that have effects in developing countries

Evaluation is the systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, programme or policy, its design, implementation and results. Evaluations aim to determine the relevance and fulfilment of objectives, coherence, development efficiency, effectiveness, impact sustainability. Consequently, evaluations serve an accountability and learning function, providing (publicly available) information on success, lessons learned and recommendations for future adjustment.

Good practices:

- The EU, Norway and Sweden have recently evaluated their overall approach to policy coherence for development. In addition, an independent study assessed the implementation of Sweden's Policy for Global Development in 2016 (Felleson and Román, 2016[19]). The EU has also evaluated its system of trade preferences, and the Netherlands its international responsible business conduct policy. Moreover, in light of the increasing collaboration with the private sector, the evaluation department of the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD) has conducted a policy coherence evaluation to assess to what extent human rights are considered in the Norwegian development cooperation which includes the private sector.
- The United Kingdom undertook an [Integrated Review](#) of its Security, Defence, Development and Foreign Policy in 2021, following a wide consultation process.
- Some DAC members already use the new DAC evaluation criterion of "coherence" to discuss how other policies interact with development co-operation objectives, for instance in country strategy or thematic evaluations.

Results: The European Union, Norway and Sweden have considered the findings of their respective evaluations and taken action to implement some of the recommendations.

Lessons learned:

Conducting evaluations in the area of policy coherence is challenging when theories of change, objectives, indicators and targets have not been clearly defined. It is therefore important to think of evaluability at the design of an intervention already when actions for greater policy coherence are defined.

Source: <https://www.norad.no/en/toolspublications/publications/2018/ungp-human-rights-and-norwegian-development-cooperation-involving-business/>

Links with the global methodology for SDG indicator 17.14.1

Monitoring, evaluation and reporting are considered in the global indicator 17.14.1 as follows: "The country has mechanisms in place to systematically monitor and evaluate the effects of policies on the various dimensions of sustainable development and cross-sectoral impacts, and to report and inform adaptive action." Government contributions towards enhancing PCSD are monitored on the basis of:

- An institutional or regulatory framework ensuring that the effects of policies on the various dimensions of sustainable development and cross-sectoral impacts are monitored and evaluated

on a regular basis using specific indicators and that the findings are used to inform adaptive action to ensure that such action is coherent;

- Requirement that aspects of policy coherence for sustainable development are integrated into reporting of government entities;
- Existence and usage of tools and information management systems that facilitate availability, accessibility and comparability of centralized and harmonized data on sustainable development.

References

- Government of Sweden (2017), *Policy for global development in the implementation of the 2030 Agenda*, <https://www.government.se/legal-documents/2018/03/policy-for-global-development-in-the-implementation-of-the-2030-agenda/> (accessed on 6 June 2020). [6]
- Government of the Netherlands (2018), *Revised action plan and annual progress review on policy coherence for development*, Government of the Netherlands, <https://www.government.nl/documents/parliamentary-documents/2018/07/13/revised-action-plan-and-annual-progress-review-on-policy-coherence-for-development> (accessed on 6 June 2020). [5]
- Lange, S. (2020), “Key trends in development co-operation for national data and statistical systems”, *OECD Development Policy Papers*, No. 31, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/1ce044d2-en>. [20]
- Mexico, P. (2018), *Mexico: Estrategia Nacional para la Puesta en Marcha de la Agenda 2030*, Mexico Agenda 2030, Mexico, https://www.gob.mx/cms/uploads/attachment/file/412433/Estrategia_Nacional_Implementacion_Agenda_2030.pdf (accessed on 9 January 2019). [4]
- OECD (2020), “Building a coherent response for a sustainable post-COVID-19 recovery”, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/d67eab68-en>. (accessed on 20 July 2021). [3]
- OECD (2020), *Environment at a Glance 2020*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/4ea7d35f-en>. [9]
- OECD (2020), *How's Life? 2020: Measuring Well-being*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9870c393-en>. [10]
- OECD (2020), *Policy Framework on Sound Public Governance: Baseline Features of Governments that Work Well*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/c03e01b3-en>. [12]
- OECD (2020), *Reviewing the Stock of Regulation*, OECD Best Practice Principles for Regulatory Policy, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/1a8f33bc-en>. [19]
- OECD (2019), *Action Plan to Strengthen National Contact Points for Responsible Business Conduct 2019-2021*, <http://mneguidelines.oecd.org/Action-Plan-to-Strengthen-National-Contact-Points-for-Responsible-Business-Conduct-2019-2021.pdf>. [22]
- OECD (2019), *Annual Report on the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises 2018*, <http://mneguidelines.oecd.org/2018-Annual-Report-MNE-Guidelines-EN.pdf>. [23]

- OECD (2019), “Decentralised development co-operation: Unlocking the potential of cities and regions”, *OECD Development Policy Papers*, No. 22, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/e9703003-en>. [17]
- OECD (2019), *Governance as an SDG Accelerator : Country Experiences and Tools*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/0666b085-en>. [7]
- OECD (2019), *Policy Coherence for Sustainable Development 2019: Empowering People and Ensuring Inclusiveness and Equality*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/a90f851f-en>. [2]
- OECD (2018), *Policy Coherence for Sustainable Development 2018: Towards Sustainable and Resilient Societies*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264301061-en>. [11]
- OECD (2018), *Reshaping Decentralised Development Co-operation: The Key Role of Cities and Regions for the 2030 Agenda*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264302914-en>. [18]
- OECD (2017), *Policy Coherence for Sustainable Development 2017: Eradicating Poverty and Promoting Prosperity*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264272576-en>. [8]
- OECD (2017), *Public Governance Reviews: Skills for a High Performing Civil Service*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264280724-en>. [16]
- OECD (2016), *OECD Survey on Planning and Co-ordinating the Implementation of the SDGs: First results and key issues*, <https://www.oecd.org/gov/cob-sdg-survey-overview-of-results.pdf> (accessed on 14 December 2018). [15]
- OECD (2011), *OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises, 2011 Edition*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264115415-en>. [21]
- OECD Publishing (ed.) (2020), *A Territorial Approach to the Sustainable Development Goals: Synthesis report*, https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/urban-rural-and-regional-development/a-territorial-approach-to-the-sustainable-development-goals_e86fa715-en (accessed on 23 November 2020). [14]
- PMO Finland (2020), *Finland Report on the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. [13]
- United Nations (2021), *The Sustainable Development Goals Report 2021*, <https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/report/2021/>. [1]