

Titech-IGES Joint Briefing Paper 1

**Current Outlook on the Sustainable
Development Goals (SDGs): A Brief
Analysis of Country Positions**

January 2013

**Tokyo Institute of Technology
Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES)**



1. Current Outlook on the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)¹

While the international community is accelerating its efforts to achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) by 2015, the discussion on the Post-2015 Development Framework and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) is beginning to gather momentum. Existing literature on the MDGs points out that countries' achievement of the goals varies significantly, given the general "one size fits all" nature of the MDGs (Vandermoortele 2011). Others also point out that MDGs lack overall objectives and perspectives on what needs to happen *after* the MDGs are achieved – namely, concrete plans and indicators for developing countries to leapfrog towards sustainability are missing.

Taking this critique into account, the following three points have great importance for the post-2015 MDGs framework: (1) set global benchmarks as well as bottom-up goals in line with national circumstances that are practical and clear, (2) set universal goals for both developing and developed countries, including issues such as climate change, human rights and human security, and governance, along with strengthening cooperation among stakeholders, and (3) set intermediate goals and identify criteria for achievement of the goals (Poku et al. 2011; Moss 2010; Vandermoortele 2011; Guardian 2010; Koehler et al, 2012).

Recently, there has been growing discussions supporting a convergence of development and environmental agendas in the Post-2015 Development Agenda. Particularly, the discussion on the so-called Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) which was set in motion through the outcome (The Future We Want) of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20) held in Rio de Janeiro, June 2012. In the outcome, governments agreed on the necessity of balancing economic, environmental, and social dimensions to achieve sustainable development. Secondly, the United Nations High Level Panel of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda (HLPEP), which was created by a General Assembly resolution in 2010, has promoted a discourse favouring the complementarity of the SDGs and Post-2015 Development Agenda.

Furthermore, the Rio+20 outcome decided to establish an Open Working Group on SDGs (OWG) consisting of 30 member states by the 67th United Nations General Assembly in 2012, and to submit its report by the 68th UNGA in 2013. The OWG, which was finally formed in December 2012, takes a regional representation approach, and the Asia and Pacific region has 7 seats. Twenty one countries in the region will be divided into a cluster group which consists of 3 countries (Japan is in the same group with Iran and Nepal), and then a cluster group will select one country and rotate participation among its members.

While most of the countries agree to unify SDGs in the post-2015 process, it is still unclear how to integrate the two processes. Against this background, this paper considers the future discussions on the SDGs by analyzing a questionnaire on SDGs issued by the Secretariat for the SDG process, the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA) between

¹ This report is a part of research funded by the Ministry of the Environment, Japan.

October and November 2012.² Furthermore, it also explores the implications on the future discussion points to be considered in future working meetings of the OWG.

2. Country Positions on the SDGs

This part summarizes countries' response to the UNDESA's questionnaire in the 7 discussion points, as follows (i) The vision and characteristics of SDGs, (ii) universality of SDGs and differentiation, (iii) frameworks for SDGs and Post-2013 Development Agenda, (iv) assessment of SDGs process, (v) participation of the civil society actors, (vi) governing principles, and (vii) global partnership for development.³

On the **vision and characteristics of the SDGs**, many countries expressed that integrating the three dimensions of sustainable development is of overriding importance. Many countries reason that such vision is necessary to address the cross-sectoral, and interlinked integrated nature of development challenges. On the other hand, some countries suggested expanding MDG 7 on environmental sustainability (into MDG 7 +). Interestingly, Nepal expressed that two sets of goals would be confusing and that after 2015 the MDGs should gradually merge with SDGs to become 'SMDGs'. However, Colombia claimed that "MDG7+ would be an admission of defeat before we have even started" and that there is a need for a more structural and systemic approach to development post 2015.

On the **universality of the SDGs and differentiation**, most countries agreed that although SDGs should global in nature, targets and indicators can be differentiated according to particular national circumstances, capacities, priorities and level of development. This point is supported by disagreement with the 'one size fits all' characteristics of MDGs. However, to ease comparison of progress, targets and indicators should be consistent between countries where practicable. For target and indicator setting, Japan proposed expert groups to establish benchmarks for target figures - also taking into account differentiated national circumstances and development levels. Colombia proposed that SDGs could be multilevel: i.e. consist of 1) an internationally-defined dashboard of indicators; 2) country or region-specific indicators; and 3) suites of indicators to guide national processes addressing prevailing inequalities or internal differences and challenges.

On the **relations between the SDGs and the Post-2015 Development Agenda**, most countries agree on the integration of the two. However, whether to merge SDG and MDG processes, several countries argued for one unified process. Botswana for example did not deny the possibility of having separate SDGs and MDGs, but also pointed out for the need for interlinkages between the two. The EU supported the need to avoid two different outcomes (i.e. one on development and another on environment), although remaining open to further negotiations. Cyprus pointed out that it

² In this questionnaire, 63 member states including EU responded. United Nations General Assembly and Secretary-General's Initial Input to the Open Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals (A/67/--), Advance Unedited Copy, 12 December 2012. <http://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/1494sgreportsdgs.pdf>

³ Detailed country positions are summarized in the appendix.

will be critical for the OWG on the SDGs to present an initial report as early as possible and in time to be considered both by the first High Level Political Forum (HLPF) and by the Special Event on the Review of MDGs in September 2013, in order to achieve coherence and integration between SDGs and post-2015 processes.

On the **assessment of the SDGs**, developing countries expressed the need for a transparent and open assessment process. Botswana proposed a Universal Periodic Review (UPR)-type regular reporting on the implementation of the SDGs with an embedded peer-review mechanism to ensure involvement by multiple stakeholders. Mongolia pointed to the option of commissioning annual Secretary General (SG) progress reports and recommended it to become a core function of the future High Level Political Forum (HLPF) and the UNGA. Cyprus supported a sound monitoring system, at country- and at HLPF-levels, arguing that it would be essential to ensure effective implementation. Australia and Switzerland emphasized both the importance of using existing official statistics and initiate further data collection for future assessments of progress. On the contrary, Croatia argued that qualitative indicators are critical for monitoring and should include information on prevailing inequalities and sustainability aspects.

Linked to above, **the participation of the civil society actors** is also important for transparency and accountability of the SDGs. Switzerland for example thought that SDGs/Post-2015 Development Agenda preparatory meetings should take place not only in New York and that consultations should be organized to allow developing country stakeholders to provide input. Japan also highlighted the importance of private sector engagement as necessary to mobilize financing for implementation and stressed the importance of building partnerships with new donors such as emerging economies and the private sector.

In terms of **governing principles**, the reaffirmation of the Rio Principles, Agenda 21 and JPoI, along with human rights and gender equality were recurring in country statements. Interestingly and importantly, Columbia argued for the need to revise our understanding of prosperity, as the emphasis on consumption as a proxy for prosperity is not sustainable and an insufficient indicator for human wellbeing.

On **global partnerships for development**, Korea and Switzerland recommended using existing modalities including the Busan Global Partnership rather than establishing new mechanisms. As for the financial aid, some countries such as Peru and Pakistan stressed that a new financing strategy should be a central piece in the global partnership for implementation of the SDGs. Algeria argued for the necessity of bolstering UN funding for sustainable development. Montenegro found that a global partnership for development should go beyond Overseas Development Assistance (ODA) and focus on developing mechanisms for better access to and transfer of knowledge, skills, and technologies.

3. The way forward: possible scenarios for creating a development space within planetary well-being

To help the discussion going forward, it is now time to consider the possible matrix of goals, targets and indicators that could become a part of the Post-2015 Development Agenda. The following tables show three different scenarios and examples for developing integrated goals and targets. Scenario 1 adds sustainability issues, such as biodiversity and energy, into the current MDG 7 (environmental sustainability). Scenario 2 focuses on development goals, and has sustainability incorporated into each goal. Scenario 3 attempts to capture universality and planetary well-being and takes a differentiated approach depending on varying international and sub-national development levels.

	<i>How?</i>	<i>Examples</i>
Scenario 1 (MDGs plus type)	Expand MDG Goal 7 (environmental sustainability)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporate environmental issues such as biodiversity, energy, and climate change, which are addressed in current MDG 7.
Scenario 2 (Post-MDGs type)	Expand the current list of MDGs with more consideration of sustainability in each goal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Educational goals will have one target on education for sustainable development Employment related goals will have one target on green jobs etc.
Scenario 3 (SDGs type)	Incorporate the essence of the current MDGs into SDGs	*See Table below.

**Examples of focus issues and goals in Scenario 3 (SDGs type) between/within countries*

<i>Focus Issues</i>	<i>Access to basic services</i>	<i>Increase efficiency</i>	<i>Lifestyle changes</i>
	<i>The poorer</i>		<i>The richer</i>
Climate change /Energy	Access to electricity	Energy efficiency improvement in production	% of renewable energy use in daily life
Water	Access to safe drinking water	Efficiency improvement of water use in agriculture	Reduction of freshwater use in daily life (including reuse of gray water)
Disaster risk reduction & resilience	% of population with access to safe places/areas	% of population living with strengthened physical infrastructure	% of population with resilient infrastructure systems (decentralised and redundant)
Sustainable Cities	Access to proper housing	Efficiency improvement in essential urban services	Reduction of energy use in houses and offices
Others

We believe that Scenario 3 best addresses both human and planetary well-being. It is clear that each country has a different set of development priorities and common but differentiated responsibilities (CBDR) exist in our efforts to achieve sustainable development. For many

developing countries, ‘**basic access**’ to essential natural resources (such as clean water) could be an important social concern and priority. For middle income countries who have already achieved access, ‘**efficiency**’ in utilising natural resources (such as energy efficiency) would then be the most important economic challenge and a driving force for innovation. For developed countries, ‘**lifestyle change**’ could become the central challenge in order to reverse environmental degradation. For example, a set of three goals on basic access to electricity, improved efficiency in electricity generation, and increasing use of renewable energy as a lifestyle change could be universal in scope to address climate change, yet could offer meaningful goals for each category of countries according to their level of development. Scenario 2 tends to overlook the overall goal for environmental sustainability⁴, and many governments stressed in the questionnaire for SDGs that Scenario 1 would be insufficient to ensure the integration of economic, social, and environmental dimensions, which in essence should be the aim of the future SDGs.⁵

The SDGs OWG has now been officially formed. The OWG and the coming HLP meetings in Monrovia (early February 2013) and Bali (March 2013) could focus further on these options for deciding visions, priority areas and the forms of the new goals to be incorporated into the HLPEP’s final report, which will be announced in May 2013.

(End)

References

- Guardian (2010), ‘After 2015, we need a new set of millennium development goals that apply to all counties’. Available
 HTTP: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/global-development/poverty-matters/2010/nov/03/millennium-development-goals-inequality>
- Koehler, G. Gasper, D. Jolly, R. and Simane, M. (2012) 'Human Security and the Next Generation of Comprehensive Human Development Goals', Brighton: IDS
- Langford, M (2010), ‘A poverty of rights: six ways to fix the MDGs’, IDS Bulletin, 41(1), 2010, pp 83–91.
- Moss, T. (2010), What Next for the Millennium Development Goals? Global Policy Volume 1 . Issue 2.
- Poku, N.K. and Jin Whitman (2011), ‘The Millennium Development Goals and Development after 2015’, *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 32, No. 1, pp.181–198.
- Sixty-seventh United Nations General Assembly Second Committee. *Comprehensive approach of Monterrey Consensus, Doha Declaration still most effective addressing financing for development, Second Committee told*. October 2012. New York.
- Sixty-seventh United Nations General Assembly. “Secretary-General’s Initial Input to the Open Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals (A/67/....).” *Advance Unedited Copy*. 12 December 2012.
- UN Non-Governmental Liaison Service. *Consultation Report for the High-Level Panel of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda*. November 2012.
- Vandemoortele, J. (2011), ‘If not the Millennium Development Goals, then what?’. *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 32, No. 1, pp 9–25.

⁴ United Nations General Assembly, Secretary-General’s Initial Input to the Open Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals (A/67/....), Advance Unedited Copy, 12 December 2012.

⁵ UN Non-Governmental Liaison Service, Consultation Report for the High-Level Panel of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda, November 2012.

APPENDIX – selected responses to the SDGs questionnaire –

Characteristics of SDGs/ Visions

- Most countries expressed the integration of three dimensions of sustainable development (economic, social, and environmental).
 - Colombia argues it should not be termed as ‘pillars’, but should be termed as ‘dimension’. This is because ‘pillars’ are somewhat perpetuates an erroneous understanding that these elements are somehow separate. Countries such as Australia and Brunei, as well as the EU also use ‘dimensions’.
 - Panama thinks that it is yet too early to say whether SDGs subsume MDGs or vice versa. They stress that the Bretton Woods Institutions (BWIs) and the International Financial Institutions (IFIs) should have mid-term targets responding to the SDGs to which their activities shall be evaluated.
 - The EU sees the Post-2015 Development Agenda with 3 dimensions while focusing on poverty eradication.
 - Nepal thinks that overall SDGs should be just 4: poverty eradication; environmental sustainability, and sustainable consumption and production, and equitable development and then subsequent targets can be constructed from thereon.
 - Slovakia (separate submission to EU) thinks that the green economy is a cornerstone of development initiatives both in the EU and globally.
 - Switzerland states that a good example for SDG creation can be gained from the “Sustainable Energy for All” initiative: It has different targets in all three dimensions: targets on access to energy (social and development dimension); sustainable energy production targets (ecological dimension); and efficiency targets (economic dimension). A similar approach could be envisaged for a water food, nutrition, agriculture, resource use etc.
 - Due to the risks for resource related conflicts in the future, Switzerland welcomes a comprehensive approach, which also addresses the peace and security dimension in the Post-2015 Development Agenda. There is a need to integrate the various key international agencies, in function with their particular mandate, into the process and for consultation (particularly UNESCO, FAO, FIDA, WPF, biodiversity).
- Some countries recognizes the importance to integrate the MDGs, suitably modified/updated for post-2015, into a larger sustainable development framework (such as Brunei, Colombia, Cyprus, Fiji, Mongolia)
 - Colombia argues that while the main components of the MDGs will remain relevant beyond 2015, there is a need to integrate them into a framework that provides a more

structural and systemic approach.

- Cyprus stresses the contents of SDGs should also give high consideration to the content of MDGs, taking into account the outcome of the 2013 MDG Special Event.
- Nepal thinks that two sets of goals would be confusing and that the MDGs should gradually become SMDGs
- Moldova shares that the main purpose of SDGs is very similar to the MDGs (that it should guide development cooperation). Moreover they think that targets should be defined by each country, and remind that the MDGs taught us that very specific goals can cause gaps at national levels (issues that are not addressed).
- The United Arab Emirates seem to not be final in their decision to support the SDGs, but that they may want to have SDGs alongside MDGs.
- Numbers of countries, such as Australia, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei, Fiji, Haiti, and Iraq mentions to expand MDG7 into a number of goals with a natural/environmental resources dimension (water, food, energy etc.), though they stress that these issues should be approached holistically and not in isolation from the each other.
 - Colombia claims that “MDG7+ would be an admission of defeat before we have even started”. This is because: 1) the theoretical option of only expanding on MDG7, would translate into a missed opportunity of historic proportions to truly incentivize and promote the integration of the three dimensions. 2) The MDGs are criticized for their limited scope and the fact that they address only ends and outcomes and not means and processes.
- Hungary stresses that the SDGs should be Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic, Timely = SMART.
- Lebanon thinks that, beyond purely traditional development and sustainability aspects, the SDGs focus should be on regional equity, peace, development and citizenship, crisis management, and security.
- Montenegro state that SDGs should be integrated and crosscutting rather than sectoral and focus on horizontal issues (at least for half of its goals) and propose SDG measuring to go beyond GDP and measure development rather than just growth.

From Global to National and from Universal to Differentiated SDGs

- Most of the countries agree that although SDGs should global in nature, targets and indicators can be differentiated according to particular national circumstances, capacities, priorities and level of development - some strongly disagree with ‘one size fits all’ characteristics of MDGs
 - Linking SDGs to national agendas, such as linking SDGs with National Development Plans and District Development Plans (Botswana)
 - Bhutan thinks that the MDG type of approach worked well.

- Fiji reminds us that there is no “One Size Fits All” since countries are at different levels of development.
- Global targets associated with SDGs should be based on CBDR (Botswana, Cyprus, Fiji, Haiti, Israel, Guyana and Iraq)
- Lebanon thinks that SDGs should be common to all countries.
- For Mongolia, the SDGs should be common but differentiated depending on country characteristics and level of development;
- Turkey thinks that the link between global and national goals needs to be identified clearly. Also diversification of countries as “developed” and “developing” countries might be reviewed and a new, more equitable and dynamic country classification system might be generated.
- Montenegro thinks that if SDGs are built on universally accepted values and principles then universality can be achieved.
- Nepal sees the principle of CBDR not just for defining commitments between developed and developing nations but sees greater commitments necessary for countries that (i) develop fast; and (ii) have great amounts of resources.
- Australia stresses that differentiation could occur at the target or indicator levels to allow for differences in national circumstances, capacities and priorities. Targets and indicators should be consistent where practicable.
- Columbia argues the degree of specificity and differentiation would be reflected through indicators in multi-level context: 1) Firstly, there would be a dashboard of indicators which could be defined internationally. 2) Secondly, countries or regions could define their own indicators which could be country or region specific, and which might be of interest to other countries and other regions. 3) Thirdly, countries may decide to develop suites of indicators to guide national processes that focus on addressing prevailing inequalities or internal differences, or that reflect ethnic considerations that are relevant to specific indigenous communities.
- Haiti argues that targets must be defined quantitatively in proportion to the level of development of each country on a purchasing power parity (PPP) basis.
- Japan argues that SDGs could be common to all countries, but target figures and indicators could be different according to country's characteristics and the development levels. In doing so, expert groups could establish several benchmarks according to development levels.

SDGs and post-2015 Agenda: The Framework

- SDGs with existing IFSD – most countries agrees on the integration of multilateral agreements with SDGs and the Post-2015 Development Agenda.
 - The SDG development process should not become a parallel negotiation for goal setting

where goals have been or are being set through other mandated processes. Existing negotiating mandates, such as for climate change or trade rules, should be respected (Australia).

- The Republic of Korea thinks that after the SG's Post-2015 report and the SDGs Working Group's report are submitted to the 68th General Assembly, the two tracks should be integrated into a unified intergovernmental process led by UN member states.
- Norway thinks that to ensure the best possible coherence with the broader process on the UN development agenda beyond 2015, the SDG Open Working Group should aim at submitting a (preliminary, if necessary) report in time for the MDG review summit in 2013. They also strongly endorse the UN Task Team (UNTT) report's findings.
- The formulation of SDGs should be coherent with existing intentionally agreed goals and targets, such as biodiversity, climate change, social inclusion and social protection floors and others. (Cyprus)
- Institutional Framework for Sustainable Development, there is a need to minimise bureaucracy and streamline processes for greater access to finance and technological/knowledge transfer (Fiji).
- Montenegro thinks that inclusiveness of processes is crucial for combining SDG and Post-2015 Development Agenda.
- Singapore states that the OWG should be mandated to take into account the MDG review at GA 68 - this would create a natural point of convergence between Post-2015 Development Agenda and SDGs.
- Post-2015 Process
 - On the one hand, Australia, Colombia, Cyprus, Hungary and Japan argues that the post-2015 development agenda should contain a single set of goals. In particular, Australia argues "the SDG and post-2015 processes should be considered **as one process with one outcome**. To ensure this, the Open Working Group must link with other UN post-2015 consultative and advisory processes, such as the Secretary-General's High Level Panel. Efforts should be made to ensure that Working Groups' outcomes and recommendations align with the post-2015 development agenda".
 - The EU emphasize that it is important to avoid two different agendas for post-2015: one on development and one on SD. But they stress that they remain open to negotiations.
 - On the other hand, Botswana argues that "the development of SDGs should be linked with the evolution of the post-2015 development agenda to ensure that the **two processes inform each other**. Thus continuous feedback between SDGs and the post-2015 process is requiring as both process evolve. The two tracks need to be aligned to achieve truly SD-based SDGs".

- Cyprus points out that it will be critical for the OWG on SDGs to present a first report as early as possible and in time to be considered both by the first High Level Political Forum-HLPF (that should be the body to follow-up on SDGs) and by the Special Event on the Review of MDGs, which will both take place in September 2013.

Assessment of Progress

- “Fundamentally, collecting relevant data is important & also link with the MDG framework, the OECD’s Global Project on Measuring the Progress of Societies, and the Human Development Index” (Australia).
- “All countries should agree to a Universal Periodic Review (UPR)-type regular reporting on the implementation of the SDGs with an embedded peer-reviewed mechanism” (Botswana).
- Peru states that monitoring and evaluation of implementation will be key for the SDGs and establishing adequate mechanisms is a priority.
- In terms of assessing progress, Mongolia point to the option of commissioning annual SG reports on the progress towards SDGs and recommend it to become a core consideration at the future High Level Political Forum (HLPF) and the UNGA. Moreover they believe the achievement of the SDGs should be one of the priorities for new Global Partnership for Development (GPD);
- So too Cyprus, which supports “a sound monitoring system, at country- and at HLPF-levels, is essential to ensure effective implementation. It is also important to secure common standards for methodology that will be used for monitoring progress so as to ensure accountability, meaningful assessments, fruitful interactions between countries and commitment to progress”.
- “The question is accurately formulated as it will be key to measure progress towards achievement of defined goals taking into account the very different baselines and starting points not only of countries, but also within countries, rather than absolute numbers” (Columbia).
- “Performance can be measured by targets that should be set in a way to measure the prevailing inequalities and sustainability aspects, which together with qualitative indicators and more available data would be critical to monitor both the degree to which development progress is inclusive and sustainable” (Croatia).
- “Civil society and other interest groups can provide the monitoring oversight for full accountability and transparency”.(Fiji)
- “The Open Working Group to be constituted involving member states and major groups must as a first step meet to decide the parameters for assessment of progress”.(Ghana)
- Switzerland shares that the SDG framework should be measurable with existing official statistics and adaptable in function of need and possibilities of countries. They also prefer

absolute over relative targets, because the latter are much more difficult to measure and interpret.

Partnerships and Participation with non-state actors

- Korea shares that there is a need for guaranteeing the participation and the right to submit opinions of the non-WG-member-states in WG meetings, not only of CSOs.
- The enabling environment for civil society and citizen engagement can be defined as a set of interrelated conditions (legal, fiscal, institutional, informational, political, cultural, etc.) that cultivates the growth of civil society and strengthens its capacity to participate in public policy shaping and implementation (Croatia).
- Civil society, local community, especially human rights, youth and women organizations, workers and farmers unions, and all relevant stakeholders should be engaged at every step of the process at the national and local level (Haiti).
- Japan stresses the need to enhance partnerships with emerging donors such as emerging economies and private sectors.
- Slovakia emphasizes the importance of participating in knowledge sharing from the period of transformation and integration and onwards.
- Nepal share that each member country should ensure to involve stakeholders from A to Z step of a project. Just involving in assessment will only yield criticism and accusation.
- The Swiss think that the SDG/P-2015 Development Agenda meetings should take place not only in New York and consultation should be organized in a way that stakeholders, especially from developing countries, can give input.

Governing Principles

- Human rights and gender equity are emphasized.
- Reaffirmation of the Rio Principles on Sustainable Development is a prerequisite for any formulation of new objectives on sustainable development after 2015 (Algeria, Ghana).
- The MDGs, Agenda 21 and JPoI principles combined should form the basis of SDG principles (Fiji).
- Principles should work to integrate the three dimensions of sustainable development, complement any existing goals or targets internationally; incorporate a level of flexibility to recognize different approaches to implementation (Australia).
- Inclusive, people-centered growth; ethical and equitable development, reducing poverty and unemployment; promoting and protecting human rights, dignity and security while respecting cultural diversity; including the economic value of natural resources and ecosystem jointly owned by society at large; targets should go beyond minimum level of existence; subject to

monitoring at the lowest level of society; empowering to the most disadvantaged groups; developing the human capital; gender equality; supporting development diversity models for different contexts; resilient and responsive to emerging global shocks (climate, economic, wars etc.) (Botswana).

- New understanding of prosperity - emphasis on consumption as a proxy for prosperity, is not sustainable and does not ultimately deliver wellbeing. (Columbia)

Global Partnership for Development

- Montenegro finds that a global partnership for development should go beyond ODA and focus on developing mechanisms for better access to and transfer of knowledge, skills, and technologies for SD;
- Peru states that the new Financing Strategy for SD must become a central piece in the global partnership for SD implementation (former MDG 8).
- A variety of partnerships for development should be pursued based on the principles of a) lesson learning; b) sharing of best practices; d) enabling the LDCs to 'leap-frog' in their development efforts and e) based on the commitment to the overarching sustainable development goals
- Global partnership should be established for monitoring, knowledge exchange and lessons learnt (Republic of Moldova)
- Korea recommends to use modalities from the Busan Global Partnership rather than establish a new one;
- Switzerland emphasizes that a Global Partnership for Development is crucial for SDG/Post-2015 Development Agenda and it must:
 - - encompass all forms of partnerships and all actors, including science community
 - - focus on the effects on vulnerable groups and countries (e.g. LDCs, SIDS)
 - - address key areas for global collective action (including health, migration, knowledge access, development and transfer of technologies, trade or financial regulation and other issues)
 - - base on the Busan Principles for Effective Development Cooperation, including the New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States
 - - have a clear framework of (mutual) accountability and transparency.
- Pakistan see the New Financing Strategy for SD as a central piece in the global partnership and reminds that for the strengthening of environmental sustainability there is a need for enhancing the provision of resources for UNEP;
- Algeria: The new global partnership for development must include a reference to the commitments made by developed countries under various international conventions (climate

change, biodiversity and desertification) and contribute to the strengthening of UN funds and existing in sustainable development.

- Australia is committed to seeing a strengthened multilateral system that will more effectively govern sustainable development and is working with member states and other parties to achieve agreement on the best possible solutions for strengthening the current institutional framework.
- Botswana: The New Global Partnership for Development (GPS) should assume the responsibility to guide and support the implementation of the SDGs as well as putting in place mechanisms for accountability towards their attainment at global and national levels.
- Colombia: A sound starting point is to assess why MDG8 has not delivered. However, beyond this, we also need to appreciate that implementation of the SDGs will be far more complex than that for the MDGs. The SDGs speak to structural and systemic changes, to articulating linkages, to supporting difficult decisions around trade-offs. The SDGs are truly about a global partnership that involves all – governments, IGOs, NGOs, private sector from three dimensions that – to date- have operated in largely in isolation: economic (i.e. WTO and WIPO), social (i.e. ILO and WHO), and environmental (i.e. UNEP and IOC). Therefore this new partnership will also need to be closely aligned with efforts to achieve greater global coherence.
- Cyprus: must reflect new global and national realities, while accommodating for the continuing special needs particularly of poor and fragile countries, i.e. LDCs, LLDCs and SIDS.
- Hungary: A new Global Partnership for Development must be adjusted to the nature of the SDGs as adopted at the Rio+20 Conference, and address all three dimensions of the sustainable development in a balanced manner. New forms of cooperation and mobilisation of new partners (e.g. emerging economies, private sector, donor countries, private donors and NGOs) are necessary in order to move from the MDG related classical forms of donor-recipient model. We should not forget that countries themselves have an important responsibility for their own development.
- Japan: enhance partnerships with emerging donors such as emerging economies and private sector.

© 2012 Tokyo Institute of Technology and Institute for Global Environmental Strategies.

Authors:

Masahiko Iguchi, Researcher, Department of Value and Decision Science (VALDES), Graduate School of Decision Science and Technology, Tokyo Institute of Technology

Simon Hoiberg Olsen, Policy Researcher, Governance and Capacity Group, IGES

Ikuho Miyazawa, Associate Researcher, Programme Management Office, IGES / Researcher, Department of Value and Decision Science (VALDES), Graduate School of Decision Science and Technology, Tokyo Institute of Technology

Department of Value and Decision Science (VALDES),
Graduate School of Decision Science and Technology,
Tokyo Institute of Technology
2-12-1-W9-43, Ookayama, Meguro-ku, Tokyo, 152-8552 Japan
Tel/Fax: 03-5734-2189

Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES)
2108-11 Kamiyamaguchi, Hayama, Kanagawa, 240-0115 Japan
Tel: 046-855-3700 Fax: 046855-3709
E-mail: iges@iges.or.jp
URL: <http://www.iges.or.jp>

The contents of this paper are the opinions of the authors and do not reflect the views of Tokyo Institute of Technology and IGES.

