

# GLOBAL SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT REPORT

2016 EDITION



# CONCLUSION

This concluding chapter highlights insights from the report that could contribute to strengthening the science-policy interface for sustainable development. The reader is referred to individual chapters and to the executive summary for a more comprehensive overview.

A message comes across strongly from chapters 1, 2, 3 and 4, even though their topics are very different and the scientific communities involved around each of them are distinct: if no one is to be left behind in 2030, the notion of inclusiveness cannot be treated as an afterthought or even mainstreamed in other areas. Rather, it should be an integral part of institution design and functioning, of research and development, and of infrastructure planning and development, to mention only topics covered in this report.

*Improving our understanding of the effectiveness of development strategies in leaving no one behind*

Ensuring that no one is left behind is a fundamental guiding principle for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Science can inform decision-making on three broad questions. First, who are those being or at risk of being left behind? Second, how can strategies and policies reach them in practice? And third, what types of strategies and policies would be appropriate in order to leave no one behind?

This report makes clear that many criteria are used in practice to identify those left behind, whether within a country or between countries. In practice, those “left behind” with respect to a particular dimension of the Agenda may be different groups in different societies. It is important to take into account the dynamic nature of deprivation and inequality; in this respect, preventive policies are critical to ensure that new people or group do not fall behind at the same time as others escape poverty and deprivation.

In many areas, inclusive development strategies are the commonly accepted paradigm. However, whether strategies succeed in reaching those left behind depend on many factors, from country-specific circumstances to their design, targeting methods and practical implementation. Available evaluations from different SDG areas all suggest that there are significant practical challenges in effectively reaching those left behind. Targeting, in and by itself, is not sufficient in order to leave no one behind –development interventions, even if properly targeted, can result in at best partial solutions to deprivations and, as a result, only address part of the problem.

Examples of interventions reviewed for the report that aim to reach the furthest behind first include: nutrition, where the core target of interventions in developing countries is those suffering the most from stunting; area-based interventions targeting the poorest locations; and strategies to provide shelter for homeless people.

Based on the limited evidence reviewed in the report, in many areas of the new Agenda, factoring in the imperative to leave no one behind in sustainable development interventions may not present insurmountable difficulties. Undertaking to systematically reach the furthest behind first may represent a much greater challenge and may in some cases imply a more significant departure from present strategies.

Going forward, it will be important to systematically collect further scientific evidence on how existing development strategies do indeed reach the furthest behind. A first step could be an inventory of existing meta-studies that attempt to review the effectiveness of development interventions in different SDG areas in reaching those left behind. While evaluations do exist for specific SDG areas, they use different criteria for defining and measuring those left behind or furthest behind and for assessing the effectiveness of interventions in reaching them. It could be worth assessing the costs and benefits of investing in more comparable frameworks for evaluating development interventions in different SDG areas. This would likely be a significant undertaking in terms of methodology and costs.

*Adopting an integrated approach to sustainable development: the infrastructure-inequality-resilience nexus*

This year's report examines interlinkages between infrastructure, inequality and resilience. Extensive bodies of literature have focused on each of these areas. For example, infrastructure has received significant attention in development circles, due to its perceived critical role in spurring economic growth and development. Yet, scientists focusing on each of those fields typically hail from different communities, making links between the three areas less commonly studied than any of the three areas taken in

isolation. Among the possible interlinkages in the nexus, an extensive amount of scientific research was found on the links between infrastructure and inequality, as well as on how people's resilience is affected separately by infrastructure resilience and by inequality. Links from resilience to inequality and from resilience to infrastructure seem to have received less attention. Further research in this area may be needed to uncover important synergies and trade-offs.

As in any nexus, harnessing synergies and addressing trade-offs is critical for policy-making. In this regard, the chapter illustrates the importance of adopting an integrated approach towards sustainable development. The research reviewed here emphasizes that a focus on both efficiency and equity is needed to harness the synergies between infrastructure, inequality and resilience. In this regard, contributing experts have noted that reducing inequalities in any of its dimensions also contributes to better infrastructure provision and increased resilience by, for example, increasing the likelihood of infrastructure investments that benefit vulnerable groups. An important policy component is geographic equity in the provision of basic infrastructure.

The report provides examples of policies that have been found to address synergies in the nexus. For example, labour-based programs in infrastructure projects can expand job opportunities and reduce inequalities, while at the same time improving resilience to natural disasters. Participatory processes that involve local communities and their various segments can be useful ways to ensure that considerations related to economic, social and environmental dimensions are taken into account when planning for infrastructure investment. Regulation and incentive mechanisms also need to be in place to integrate disaster risk reduction into all phases of the infrastructure life cycle, and to ensure the resilience of critical infrastructure to natural disasters. Contributing experts noted the need to further disaggregate the analysis between rural and urban contexts to be able to provide more specific policy recommendations.

Further cross-disciplinary collaboration and engagement between researchers, practitioners, decision makers and other stakeholders could be a way of achieving the mutual learning and transfer of information that would enable scientific knowledge to be transformed into practical strategies to harness the synergies and address the trade-offs between the three areas of the nexus.

*Mobilizing technology for the SDGs: scientists' perspectives*

The report presents a range of perspectives of scientists on the role of technology for the achievement of the SDGs. Technology is essential for achieving the SDGs and reaping the benefits of synergies among them, as well as for minimizing trade-offs among goals. Technology, society and

institutions co-evolve. Hence, technology progress requires institutional adaptations and may be constrained by social issues. Policy actions to achieve the SDGs and ensure that no one is left behind need to consider these interlinkages.

Many scientists point to a need for making simultaneous progress on equity issues (especially technology access), on overall technology system performance, and on supporting institutional change - strategies focusing only on one of these components have proven ineffective in the long-run. Innovation systems, understood as the network of institutions in the public and private sectors whose activities and interactions initiate, import, modify and diffuse new technologies, perform sub-optimally if only one or the other of these elements is supported. Policy actions must support both research and development to spur technology performance at the technology frontier, as well as promote the diffusion and adaptation of existing technologies in developing countries and among marginalized groups in all countries – one supports the other and vice versa.

Scientists emphasized a need for national and international technology roadmaps. Promising technological trajectories and new industries can be identified by each country. Scientists suggested the importance of investing at the same time in new and old technologies; in increased performance of advanced technologies and technology adaptations for underserved communities; in large-scale infrastructures and small-scale technologies with large numbers of units. They also suggested that science roadmaps should include measures relating to affordability and inclusion, which should be built into R&D processes from the outset.

Other notable key actions or policy elements suggested by scientists include: effective national science-policy interfaces; foresight and scenarios; facilitation of learning across communities, including underserved communities; and cluster analysis. The latter analyses networks of firms linked to each other (through production chains, or geographically concentrated and making use of related buyers, suppliers, infrastructure and workforce, or of similar nature), with a view to addressing systemic imperfections of innovation systems.

#### *Inclusive institutions for sustainable development*

There is clear awareness that the understanding of institutions is important for delivering on the imperative to leave no one behind. Institutions can trigger behaviours and trends that can have positive or negative impacts for development outcomes, and in particular for inclusiveness. Inclusive institutions bestow equal rights and entitlements and enable equal opportunities, voice and access to resources and services. On the other hand, power holders can shape institutions for the benefit of some rather than all groups of society.

Achieving any particular target related to inclusion (e.g. gender equality) will require a combination of factors, including: legal, regulatory components; multiple institutions intervening at various levels; and potentially broader societal changes, e.g. in social norms, which themselves can be spurred by changes in institutions. Conversely, individual institutions, especially those with broad mandates, can contribute to inclusiveness in many different areas as well as society-wide.

It is important to assess both how inclusive institutions are, and whether and how they foster inclusiveness through their actions. In this vein, the report explores two specific types of institutions: national councils for sustainable development (NCSDs) and national parliaments. More in-depth assessment of research is needed on other types of institutions and how they contribute to inclusiveness in the context of the new Agenda, and this should be a critical component of future GSDRs.

Research reviewed for the report suggests that, if provided with adequate resources, NCSDs can be effective mechanisms for stakeholder participation and engagement across the whole policy cycle, to: (1) inform and educate the public at large on sustainable development related topics; (2) stimulate informed public debates; (3) engage key stakeholders in formulating policy recommendations; and (4) involve stakeholders in various parts of implementation and progress reviews. In practice, governments' attitude regarding stakeholder involvement influences the functioning of NCSDs and the resources provided to them.

As legislative bodies, parliaments are very important for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda and SDGs. Their role in fostering inclusiveness can be examined at two different levels: first, how parliaments themselves are inclusive in their representation of all segments of society, including of marginalized groups; and second, how, when adopting legislation, they take into account the needs of these groups. The report focuses on the inclusion of four specific groups: women, indigenous peoples, persons with disabilities, and children and youth. Research reviewed for the report suggests that progress has been made with respect to the representation of these groups in national parliaments. However, gaps still exist. Similarly, while progress has been made in terms of codifying the rights of marginalized groups, there is still a long way to go in this respect, and parliaments will have a key role to play in ensuring that no one is left behind.

#### *Identifying emerging issues for the HLPF*

The identification of new and emerging issues warranting policy makers' attention is a critical function of the science-policy interface. Policymakers are exposed to a broad range of analyses, rankings, and advice concerning emerging issues. In addition, the sheer breadth of the sustainable

development agenda requires the consideration of issues from different sources and processes. Yet, intergovernmental processes such as the HLPF can only consider a limited numbers of issues, and by their mandate and place in overall governance frameworks can only address some issues.

There is scope for enhanced dialogue between scientists and policy-makers in considering both the processes by which emerging issues are identified, selected and brought to the attention of the HLPF, as well as the substantive character of issues that could usefully be considered by the forum.

The chapter demonstrates that a wide range of sources – document analysis, crowdsourcing, and expert meetings – can usefully be drawn on when identifying emerging issues in the context of sustainable development. The report introduces “scanning” as a major approach for finding emerging issues. The process of scanning can be usefully guided by criteria, which help to make explicit assumptions about what counts towards designing issues as emerging. Such criteria include impact and probability of occurrence, persistence, irreversibility, ubiquity, novelty, and potential for mobilization. Priority, a criterion that is meant to capture an issue's importance in terms of social and cultural norms or impact on already vulnerable and marginalized groups, can accommodate principles such as ‘ensuring that no one is left behind’.

The report provides a simple framework for categorizing emerging issues, as well as criteria that the HLPF could consider using to filter emerging issues in order to identify a limited number of those that are most relevant. It is suggested that the following criteria could serve as starting points: (a) the extent to which the issue in question related closely to the SDGs; (b) whether the issue is a potential threat or opportunity of global or at least international relevance; (c) whether management of the risk or harnessing of the opportunity depends on international action and cooperation; and (d) whether the issue is expected to persist (non-transient) and whether or not a clear increasing trend can be established.

The report also reflects efforts made to test the approach proposed for the identification and filtering of emerging issues, which involved an expert assessment of emerging issues. Experts pointed to the interdependence among emerging issues. The expert assessment made clear that such interdependence is best perceived by replacing emerging issues in a broader framework, which clarifies the values that are to be sustained, potential threats and opportunities, causal mechanisms at play, possible responses and actions, and key emerging features.

The involvement of experts from multiple disciplines brings critical added value to this process, including for prioritizing

emerging issues and provide multi-dimensional analyses of the issues and their inter-connectedness. The regular scanning and multidisciplinary analyses of emerging issues from different levels and perspectives is important and should be maintained as a necessary and useful early warning system for the science-policy interface.

#### *Taking stock from three editions of the Global Sustainable Development Report*

Since UN Member States foresaw a Global Sustainable Development Report as an instrument to strengthen the science policy interface for sustainable development at Rio+20, three yearly editions of the report have been published by UNDESA in 2014, 2015 and 2016. Taken together, these reports have contributed to the science-policy interface in three main ways.

Firstly, since 2014, the Global Sustainable Development has become a platform and process for engaging scientists and experts in the UN deliberations on sustainable development. It has been open for participation to all interested UN entities, organized science institutions and programmes, and individual scientists – the only requirement being that contributions needed to be grounded in science. The process for the preparation of the reports sought to engage key players in organised science. In particular, the International Council for Science (ICSU) – the official organisation representing the scientific and technological community at the UN - has played a crucial role in encouraging scientific contributions. To date, 35 UN entities and more than one thousand scientists have contributed to the Report. The open call for science-policy briefs alone resulted in 589 scientists from all parts of the world submitting 264 briefs.

The approach followed for the three reports started from the premise that anybody interested in the GSDR should be able to provide inputs. For this reason, multiple channels for outreach and inputs were developed, from the most conventional such as relying on organized science to more innovative ones, such as open calls for science briefs in multiple languages. Through these channels, an effort was made to reach scientific communities (e.g., young scientists) that usually have limited access and input to large assessment processes. Multi-lingual crowdsourcing inputs and calls for papers have also sought to address the traditional bias of large assessment reports that rely on English language, peer reviewed science, leaving aside large bodies of literature in other languages that may be highly relevant to specific contexts, including regional experiences.

All editions of the GSDR benefited from advice and guidance from many senior scientists and experts of the science-policy interface, some of which had been involved in major efforts to devise sustainable development assessments in the past, including: reports from the US National

Academy of Science; the Global Environment Outlook; the Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services; and others.

Secondly, the reports have provided specific suggestions on how the HLPF could operationalize the science-policy interface in practice in years to come. Chapter 1 of the 2015 edition suggested a range of ways for the HLPF to enable constructive interactions between science and policy-making at the UN. Actions that the HLPF might consider spanned the space between science and policy, from the provision of policy-relevant data, analysis and information, to actions that the HLPF could take to support enhanced dialogue between science and policy, to the translation of the results of science-policy dialogue into policy-making. Ultimately, it will be up to UN Member States to decide how they want the HLPF to strengthen the science-policy interface, and which of these actions they want to undertake, if any.

Among ideas considered by experts, providing improved access to the findings of existing assessments, highlighting synergies and trade-offs and tools to address them, and helping transpose the outcomes of global science-policy debates into regionally and nationally relevant frameworks for action were the most consensual. Many practitioners who provided inputs for this chapter emphasized the importance for the HLPF to consider a combination of

actions, rather than any single action, recognizing potential synergies among them.

All three editions devoted space to the identification of new and emerging issues, from their identification by all areas of science to how existing scanning processes may be combined to provide the HLPF with a usable list of topics for addressing in that forum.

Thirdly, the reports have explored different perspectives on the SDGs as an integrated and indivisible set of goals, and translated those in chapters that adopted a diversity of focuses and approaches. The chapters of the three editions of the report can all be clustered into a simple list of generic chapters, which are all relevant to an assessment of assessment approach covering the science-policy interface for sustainable development. This is illustrated in table 6.1. Such a structure emphasizes an integrated approach that focuses on the interrelationships among areas of the SDGs seen as an indivisible system, and a balanced consideration of the three dimensions of sustainable development.

For example, the 2014 edition provided templates for looking at progress made on sustainable development over the long term, as well as for synthesizing insights from sustainable development scenarios undertaken by leading institutions covering a wide range of thematic areas. The reports also included the examination of four clusters

**Table 6-1: Generic chapters of past Global Sustainable Development Reports**

Chapters	Generic description	GSDR 2014	GSDR 2015	GSDR 2016
Science-policy interface, including assessments	Describes the landscape of existing assessments; assesses the science-policy interface in various contexts	Ch.2	Ch. 1, Ch. 2	Ch. 1
Trends and review of progress	Reviews sustainable development trends in a comprehensive way for the whole set of SDGs seen as an indivisible system	Ch.3		
Sustainable development scenarios	Documents sustainable development scenarios and long-term modelling exercises published by diverse institutions in a uniform way	Ch.4		
New and emerging issues	Takes stock on existing processes to identify emerging issues and compares their outcomes. Provides science digests on issues of concern emerging in the scientific literature	Ch. 7	Ch. 7	Ch. 5
Featured clusters or nexuses	Takes an in-depth look at interlinkages, synergies and trade-offs among a subset of SDG areas, and examines the status of scientific knowledge on the various interlinkages	Ch. 6	Ch.3, Ch.5	Ch. 2
Cross-cutting issues	Takes an in-depth look at interlinkages between a cross-cutting issue (e.g. disaster risk reduction, institutions, technology, inclusiveness) and all the SDGs, and examines the status of scientific knowledge on the various interlinkages	Ch. 6	Ch. 2, Ch.4	Ch. 4, Ch. 3
Countries in special situation	Focus on overall progress, thematic or cross-cutting issues for one or several categories of countries in special situations (LDCs, LLLDCs, SIDS, Africa, and MICs)		Ch. 6	
Data and measurement (measuring progress)	Takes stock of initiatives aiming at measuring progress in different ways; highlights innovative data approaches on specific themes or in specific regions	Ch.5	Ch. 8	

Source: Authors' elaboration.

of issues (climate, land, energy and water; oceans and livelihoods; industrialization and sustainable consumption and production; and infrastructure, inequality and resilience), as well as cross-cutting issues (disaster risk reduction, innovative data and measurement approaches, technology). These contributions provide illustrations of how policy-relevant conclusions can be gleaned from existing scientific assessments.

As the Global Sustainable Development Report moves to a new phase after the HLPF 2016, the lessons learned in attempts to mobilize a broad range of scientific communities, and the collaborations initiated for this purpose, can provide an interesting base on which to build an ambitious yet actionable multi-year report for the benefit of the HLPF. Ultimately, the GSDR could become a science engagement platform for science-policy interface.

# Acknowledgements and Disclaimer

The terms 'country' and 'economy' as used in this Report refer, as appropriate, to territories or areas; the designations employed and the presentation of the material do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. In addition, the designations of country groups are intended solely for statistical or analytical convenience and do not necessarily express a judgement about the stage of development reached by a particular country or area in the development process. Major country groupings referred to in this report are informed by the classification of the United Nations Statistical Division. Reference to companies and their activities should not be construed as an endorsement by the United Nations of those companies or their activities. The boundaries and names shown and designations used on the maps presented in this publication do not imply official endorsement of acceptance by the United Nations.

The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the United Nations or its senior management, or of the experts whose contributions are acknowledged. The valuable comments provided by the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs Editorial Board are gratefully acknowledged.

The Report benefitted from additional resources provided by the General Assembly through the Revised estimates resulting from the decisions contained in the Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development and the outcome document of the United Nations summit for the adoption of the post-2015 development agenda, entitled "Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (A/70/589)". It also benefitted from the Expert Group Meeting that was organised by the Division for Sustainable Development on the report and was held in New York from 5 to 6 April 2016.

## Authors

This Report was prepared by a team of United Nations staff based on inputs from expert contributors. The team comprised David Le Blanc, Richard Roehrl, Clovis Freire, Friedrich Soltau, Riina Jussila, Tonya Vaturi, Meng Li and Kebebush Welkema (UN Division for Sustainable Development), Vito Intini (United Nations Capital Development Fund, on chapter 2) and Ingeborg Niestroy (IISD Associate, on chapter 4). Research assistance and contributions was provided by Anastasia Kefalidou, Esther Lho, Crispin Maconick, Nelya Rakhimova and Lina Roeschel.

The coordinators for the chapters were David Le Blanc (Chapter 1, conclusion), Clovis Freire (Chapter 2), Richard Roehrl (Chapter 3), Irena Zubcevic (Chapter 4), and Friedrich Soltau (Chapter 5).

## Contributing Organizations

Danish Institute for Human Rights, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), Health Poverty Action, International Council for Science (ICSU), Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU), International Trade Centre (ITC), International Telecommunication Union (ITU), International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC), Minority Rights Group International, Overseas Development Institute (ODI), Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (UNOHCHR), Office of the Special Representative of the UN Secretary General on Violence against Children, International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), International Labour Organization (ILO), United Nations Capital Development Fund (UNCDF), United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (Division for Policy Analysis and Development, Division for Public Administration and Development Management, Division for Social Policy and Development, Statistics Division, Financing for Development Office, Population Division), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), United Nations Industrial Development Organisation (UNIDO), United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR), United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), UN Women, World Bank Group (WB), UN-Water, the UNESCO World Water Assessment Programme (WWAP), WHO / UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme on water and sanitation.

## Individual contributors by chapter:

### Chapter 1

Marcia Tavares (UNDESA), Abdelkader Bensada (UNEP), Ana Persic (UNESCO), Anna Rappazzo (FAO), Babatunde Omilola (UNDP), Astrid Hurley (UNDESA), Chantal line Carpentier (UNCTAD), Chris Garroway (UNCTAD), Claire Thomas (Minority Rights Group International), Clare Stark (UNESCO), Clarice Wilson (UNEP), Devika Iyer (UNDP), Doris Schmitz-Meiners (Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights), Edoardo Zandri (UNEP), Elena Proden (UNITAR), Fackson Banda (UNESCO), Fanny Demassieux (UNEP), Halka Otto (FAO), Ines Abdelrazek (UNEP), Irmgarda Kasinskaite (UNESCO), Isabel Garza (UNCTAD), Isabell Kempf (UNEP), Jacqueline McGlade (UNEP), Jason Gluck (UNDP), Jean-Yves Le Saux (UNESCO),

Jillian Campbell (UNEP), Joerg Mayer (UNCTAD), Katrin Fernekess (ITC), Kathryn Leslie (Office SRSG on Violence against Children), Kirsten Isensee (UNESCO), Konstantinos Tararas (UNESCO), Lucas Tavares (FAO), Ludgarde Coppens (UNECP), Lulia Nechifor (UNESCO), Mara Murillo (UNEP), Maria Martinho (UNDESA), Mariann Kovacs (FAO), Marie-Ange Theobald (UNESCO), Marion Jansen (ITC), Marta Pedrajas (UNDP), Matthias Eck (UNESCO), Michael Clark (FAO), Michael Stanley-Jones (UNEP), Monika Macdevette (UNEP), Natalia Linou (UNDP), Natalie Sharples (Health Poverty Action), Nicholas Bian (WB), Nina Atwal (Minority Rights Group International), Patrick Keuleers (UNDP), Pedro Conceicao (UNDP), Pedro Manuel Monreal Gonzalez (UNESCO), Piedad Martín (UNEP), Ranwa Safadi (UNESCO), Renato Opertti (UNESCO), Renata Rubian (UNDP), Salvatore Arico (UNESCO), Solene Ledoze (UNDP), Sylvia Hordosch (UN Women), Tim Scott (UNDP), Tina Farmer (FAO), Trang Nguyen (UNEP), Verania Chao (UNDP), Vinícius Carvalho Pinheiro (ILO).

The chapter was peer reviewed by Lucilla Spini, Head of Science Programmes, International Council for Science (ICSU).

## Chapter 2

Ana Paula Barcellos (State University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil), Ana Persic (UNESCO), Ananthanarayan Sainarayan (ICAO), Andrew Fyfe (UNCDF), Antonio A. R. Ioris (University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom), Chantal line Carpentier (UNCTAD), Chris Garroway (UNCTAD), Clare Stark (UNESCO), Daniel Albalade (Universitat de Barcelona, Spain), David Seekell (Umeå University, Sweden), Dominic Stead (Delft University of Technology, the Netherlands), Edsel E. Sajor (Asian Institute of Technology, Thailand), Epo Boniface Ngah (University of Yaoundé II, Cameroon), Florence Bonnet (ILO), Gail Ridley (University of Tasmania, Australia), Geraldo Mendoza (ECLAC), Gwen DiPietro (Carnegie Mellon University, United States), Holger Schlör (Institute of Energy and Climate Research, Germany), Isabel Garza (UNCTAD), Jean-Yves Le Saux (UNESCO), Jimena Blumenkron (ICAO), Joerg Mayer (UNCTAD), Julie-Maude Normandin (École nationale d'administration publique, Canada), Kash A. Barker (University of Oklahoma, United States), Kristen Isensee (UNESCO), Kristen MacAskill (University of Cambridge, United Kingdom), Lulia Nechifor (UNESCO), Mara Keller (ICAO), Maria Ortiz (ECLAC), Marie-Ange Theobald (UNESCO), Marie-Christine Therrien (École nationale d'administration publique, Canada), Michael Rütimann (Biovision Foundation for Ecological Development, Switzerland), Miguel Esteban (The University of Tokyo, Japan), Mike Muller (University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa), Nikki Funke (The Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, South Africa), Nicholas Bian (WB), Paolo Bocchini (Lehigh University, United States), Ranwa Safadi (UNESCO), Remi Lang (UNCTAD), Romain

Zivy (ECLAC), Samuel Choritz (UNCDF), Silvana Croope (Delaware Department of Transportation, United States), Simona Santoro (UNCDF), Sophie Browne (UN Women), Stig Ole Johnsen (SINTEF, Norway), Sylvia Hordosch (UN Women), Thomas Poder (Université de Sherbrooke and CIUSSS de l'Estrie - CHUS, Canada), Thomas Ummerhofer (Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Germany), Tim Zinke (Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Germany), Tirusew Asefa (Tampa Bay Water, United States), Valérie Ongolo Zogo (Ministry of Transport, Cameroon), Vinícius Carvalho Pinheiro (ILO), Wang Xiaojun (Nanjing Hydraulic Research Institute, China).

## Chapter 3

Bert de Vries (Utrecht University, The Netherlands); Thomas Reuter (University of Melbourne, Australia); Birama Diarra (Agence Nationale de la Météorologie, Mali); Erick R. Bandala (Division of Hydrologic Sciences, Desert Research Institute, Las Vegas, USA); E. William Colglazier (Center for Science Diplomacy, American Association for the Advancement of Science, USA); R.B. Singh (Delhi School of Economics, University of Delhi, India); Bartłomiej Kolodziejczyk (Department of Mechanical Engineering, Carnegie Mellon University, USA); V.N. Attri (IORA, University of Mauritius, Mauritius); Muhammad Saidam (Royal Scientific Society, Amman, Jordan, and International Council for Science, ICSU); H-Holger Rogner and Nebojsa Nakicenovic (IIASA, Austria); Nicholas Robinson (Pace University, New York USA); Franz W. Gatzweiler (ICSU-IAMP-UNU Urban Health and Wellbeing Programme, and Institute of Urban Environment, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Xiamen, China); Muhammad Yimer (Department of Civic and Ethical Studies, Arba Minch University, Ethiopia); Moshe C Kinn (The University of Salford, Manchester, UK); Oliver Mutanga (Bloemfontein, South Africa); Robert Brinkmann (Director of Sustainability Studies, Hofstra University, USA); Pan Jiahua (Institute for Urban & Environmental Studies, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, China); Matteo Pedercini and Steve Arquitt (Millennium Institute, USA); Adriaan Kamp (Energy for One World, Oslo, Norway); Akiko Okabe (The University of Tokyo, Japan); Alice C. Hughes (Xishuangbanna Tropical Botanical Garden, Chinese Academy of Sciences, China); Qinqi Dai and Yu Yang (School of Humanities, Southeast University, Nanjing, China); Sigrid Kusch (ScEnSers Independent Expertise, Germany); Emmanuel Letouzé and Anna Swenson (Data Pop Alliance, Harvard Humanitarian Initiative, MIT Media Lab and Overseas Development Institute, USA); Antje Bruns and Rossella Alba (Governance and Sustainability Lab, Trier University, Germany); Zachary Donnenfeld (Institute of Security Studies, Pretoria, South Africa); Vania Aparecida dos Santos (Forest Institute - IF / SMA / SP, Brazil); Patrick Paul Walsh, Caroline O'Connor and Purity Mwendwa (University College Dublin, Ireland); Mahua Mukherjee (Department of Architecture and Planning, Indian Institute of Technology Roorkee, India);

Claudio Huepe Minoletti (Centro de Energía y Desarrollo Sustentable, Universidad Diego Portales, Chile); Anita Shankar (Johns Hopkins University, Bloomberg School of Public Health, Maryland, USA); Lucilla Spini (International Council for Science, France); Laura Diaz Anadon, William C. Clark and Alicia Harley (Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, USA); Gabriel Chan, (Humphrey School of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota, USA); Kira Matus (Department of Science, Technology, Engineering and Public Policy, University College London, UK); Suerie Moon (Harvard Kennedy School of Government and Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Harvard University, USA); Sharmila L. Murthy (Suffolk University Law School, Suffolk University, USA); Keigo Akimoto (Research Institute of Innovative Technology for the Earth, Kyoto, Japan); Ambuj Sagar (Indian Institute of Technology Delhi, India); Chijioke Josiah Evoh (UNDP and Economic & Urban Policy Analysts, Yonkers, USA); Deepak Sharma (Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology, University of Technology, Sydney, Australia); Melika Edquist (Sustainable Development Solutions Network, USA); Richard Watson, Alex Ayad, Chris Haley and Keeren Flora (Imperial College London, UK); Lawrence Whiteley (Wond.co.uk); Dušan Jasovský (ReAct - Action on Antibiotic Resistance, Uppsala University, Sweden); Magdalena Muir (Arctic Institute of North America, University of Calgary, Canada); Jill Jaeger (Vienna, Austria); Manuel Montes (The South Centre); Prof. Xiaolan Fu (Technology & Management for Development Centre, University of Oxford, UK); Steve Sparks (School of Earth Sciences, University of Bristol, UK); Javier Garcia Martinez (University of Alicante, Spain); Stewart Lockie (The Cairns Institute, Australia), Dong Wu (UNCTAD), Claudia Contreras (UNCTAD), Bob Bell (UNCTAD), and Arun Jacob (UNCTAD).

In addition, the following 97 individuals provided science-policy briefs on technology issues which were also considered:

Manish Anand, Shailly Kedia (TERI, India); Erick R. Bandala (DRI, USA); Ashantha Gooetilleke (QUT, Australia); Lindy Weilgart (Dalhousie University, Canada); Ashish Jha, Nicholas Zimmermann (Harvard University, USA); Ilona Kickbusch (Graduate Institute, Switzerland); Peter Taylor (IDRC, Canada); Kamran Abbasi (The BMJ, UK); Friedrich Soltau (UN-DESA); Bartłomiej Kolodziejczyk (IUCN CEM, Switzerland); Raymond Saner (CSEND, Switzerland); Steven A. Moore (University of Texas, USA); Carole-Anne Sénit, Henri Waisman (IDDRI, France); Ademola A. Adenle (UNU); Klaus Ammann (University of Bern, Switzerland); Zeenat Niazi, Anshul S. Bhamra (Development Alternatives, India); Ivana Gadjanski (BioIRC, Serbia); Ying Qin, Elizabeth Curmi, Zenaida Mourao, Dennis Konadu, Keith S. Richards (University of Cambridge, UK); Thematic Group on Sustainable Agriculture and Food Systems; Carl Mas, Emmanuel Guerin (UN-SDSN); Timothy O.

Williams, Javier Mateo-Sagasta, Pay Drechsel, Nicole de Haan, Fraser Sugden (IWMI, Sri Lanka); Karumuna Kaijage, Pamela Flattau (PsySiP, USA); Karl Aiginger, Michael Boeheim (AIER, USA); James Ehrlich, Sanjay Basu (Stanford University, USA); David Acuna Mora, Arvid de Rijck, Daphne van Dam, Mirle van Huet, Stan Willems, Carmen Chan, Guilia Bongiorno, Janne Kuhn, Hein Gevers (Wageningen University, Netherlands); Hyosun Bae, Zoraida Velasco, William Daley, Rajiv Nair, Elizabeth A. Peyton, Margeret McKenzie (Tufts University, USA); Lucy Fagan (Global Health Next Generation Network, UK); Adrian Paul Jaravata Rabe, Sharon Lo, Luca Ragazzoni, Frederick M. Burkle; Ali J Addie (Center of Advanced Materials, USA); Moa M. Herrgard (UN Major Group for Children & Youth); Charles Ebikeme, Heide Hackmann, Anne-Sophie Stevance, Lucilla Spini (International Council for Science, ICSU); Simon Hodson, Geoffrey Boulton (ICSD CODATA); Jari Lyytinen (Finnish Environment Institute, Finland); Alessandro Galli, David Lin, Mathis Wackernagel, Michel Gressot, Sebastian Winkler (Global Footprint Network, USA); Ibrahim Game, Richaela Primus, Darci Pauser, Kaira Fuente, Mamadou Djerma, Aaron Vlasak, Brian Jacobson, Ashley Lin (SUNY-ESF, USA); Normann Warthmann (The Australian University, Australia); Claudio Chiarolla (PSIA, France); Coli Ndzabandzaba (Rhodes University, South Africa); Alexander Gloss, Lori Foster (SIOP, USA); Davide Rasella, Romulo Paes Souza (UNDP), Daniel Villela (PROCC, Brazil), Delia Boccia (London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, UK), Ana Wiczorek Torrens, Draulio Barreira (Brazilian National Tuberculosis Control Program, Brazil), Mauro Sanchez (University of Brasilia, Brazil); Pedro Piqueras, Ashley Vizenor (CE-CERT, USA); and V.N. Attri (IORA, Republic of Mauritius).

The chapter was peer reviewed by Dr. William E. Kelly (Committee on Sustainability, American Society of Civil Engineers, USA) and Prof. Dr. Gueladio Cisse, Head of the Ecosystem Health Sciences Unit, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, Swiss Tropical and Public Health Institute, Switzerland.

#### Chapter 4

Simen Gudevold and Elie Hobeika, Division for Public Administration and Management, DESA.

The chapter was peer reviewed by Raymond Saner, Professor, Basle University, Sciences Po (Paris), University of Applied Sciences and Arts Northwestern Switzerland (FHNW)

#### Chapter 5

Gueladio Cisse (Swiss TPH and ICSU); William Colgazier (AAAS); Carl Dahlmann (OECD Development Centre);

Roberta D'Allesandro (Leiden University and ICSU); Zachary Donnenfeld (ISS); Gerlis Fugmann (APECS); Claudio Alberto Huepe Minoletti (Universidad Diego Portales); Stewart Lockie (James Cook University and ICSU); Cheikh Mbow (ICRAF); Manual Montes (Senior Advisor on Finance and Development South Centre); MantaDevi Nowbuth (University of Mauritius); Muhammad Saidam (Royal Scientific Society, Jordan, and ICSU); Anita Shankar (Johns Hopkins University); Oyewale Tomori (Nigerian Academy of Science and ICSU); Patrick Paul Walsh (University College Dublin); Robert Lindner (UNU-IAS); Nicholas Robinson (Pace University Law School); Chantal Line Carpentier (UNCTAD); Lud Coppens (UNEP); Ana Persic (UNESCO); Dino Corell (ILO); Liisa Haapanen, Petri Tapio (University of Turku); Luca Sabini (Newcastle University Business School); V.N. Attri (IORA); Donovan Guttieres, Gusti Ayu Fransiska Sri Rahajeng Kusuma Dewi (UN Major Group for Children and Youth); Shikha Ranjha (DLGS-IOER-TU Dresden); Simon Hodson, Geoffrey Boulton, (ICSU-CODATA); Charles Ebikeme, Heide Hackmann, Lucilla Spini (ICSU); Ivonne Lobos Alva, Jes Weigelt (IASS); Sigrid Kusch (ScEnSers); Hung Vo (UN Major Group for Children and Youth); Nicola Martinelli (Technical University of Bari), Gabrielle Calvano, Angelo Tursi (Bari University), Giovanna Mangialardi (University of Salento); M.B. Wehbe, M.P. Juarez, I.E. Tarasconi, J.M. Quiroga (Rio Cuarto National University, Argentina); Pranab J. Patar (WCPA), Ms. Surbhi (Earthwatch Institute India); Qinqi Dai, Yu Yang (Southeast University, China); Florian Koch, Kerstin Krellenberg, Sigrun Kabisch (Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research); Bolysov, Sergey, Nekhodtsev, Vladimir (Moscow State University); Shikha Ranjha (DLGS-IOER-TU Dresden); Erick R. Bandala (Desert Research Institute), Ashantha Goonetilleke (Queensland University of Technology); Pedro Piqueras, Ashley Vizenor (University of California, CE-CERT); Saul Billingsly (FIA Foundation); Chijioke J. Evoh, Owen Shumba

(UNDP); Moa M. Herrgard (UN Major Group for Children and Youth), Adrian Paul Jaravata Rabe, Sharon Lo, Luca Ragazzoni, Frederick M. Burkley; Lucy Fagan (Global Health Next Generation Network); Davide Rasella, Romulo Paes Souza (UNDP), Daniel Villela (PROCC), Delia Boccia (London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine), Ana Wiczorek Torrens, Draulio Barreira (Brazilian National Tuberculosis Control Program), Mauro Sanchez (University of Brasilia), Sanjay Basu (Stanford University); Karlee Johnson, Darin Wahl, Frank Thomalla (Stockholm Environment Institute); Annisa Triyanti, Eric Chu (University of Amsterdam); Sara Al-Nassir (DLGS-IOER-TU Dresden); Hamidul Huq, Shafiqul Islam, Khalid Bahaiddin (University of Liberal Arts Bangladesh); Nitya Rao (University of East Anglia), Daniel Morchain (OXFAM); Houria Djoudi (CIFOR); Anne M. Larson, Therese Dokken, Amy E. Duchelle (CIFOR); Pham Thu Thuy, Maria Brockhaus (CIFOR); Yong long Lu (Chinese Academy of Sciences), Nebosja Nakicenovic (IIASA), Martin Visbeck (GEOMAR Helmholtz Centre for ocean Research), Anne-Sophie Stevance (International Council for Science); Matteo Pedercini, Gunda Zulich, Kaveh Dianati (The Millennium Institute); H. Suenaga, D.K.Y. Tan, P.M. Brock (University of Sydney); Manish Anand, Shailly Kedia (TERI, New Delhi); Ali J. Addie (Center of Advanced Materials); Bartlomiej Kolodziejczyk (IUCN CEM); Lindy Weilgart (Dalhousi University); Saeko Kajima (UN DESA); Salvatore Arico (UNESCO); Assem Barakat (Alexandria University and ICSU); Tom Beer (ICSU); David Black (ICSU); Lucien Chabason (IDDRI); Chad Gaffield (University of Ottawa and ICSU); Gisbert Glaser (ICSU); Fumiko Kasuga (Future Earth and ICSU); Jinghai Li (Chinese Academy of Science and ICSU); Johannes Mengel (ICSU); Julia Nechifor (UNESCO); Zitouni Ould-Dada (UNEP); Katsia Paulavets (ICSU); Emmanuelle Quillerou (Independent Consultant); Claire Weill (Université Pierre et Marie Curie); Denise Young (ICSU).