

List of Abbreviations and Acronyms

LDN	Land Degradation Neutrality
MEAs	Multilateral Environmental Agreements
NBSAPs	National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans
NDCs	Nationally Determined Contributions
OECD	the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PCSD	Policy Coherence for Sustainable Development
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SDG Indicator 17.14.1 questionnaire	UNEP/OECD Questionnaire on the mechanisms in place to enhance policy coherence of sustainable development
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNSD	United Nations Statistics Division

Contents

List of Abbreviations and Acronyms.....	2
Introduction	4
1 About SDG indicator 17.14.1	5
2 Definitions	6
3 Methodology.....	6
4 Structure of the Indicator Framework.....	7
5 Scoring System	9
6 Indicator Themes	11
Theme 1: Political Commitment	11
Theme 2: Long-term Vision.....	13
Theme 3: The Integration of Sustainable Development into Policy and Finance.....	16
Theme 4: Whole-of-government Coordination.....	18
Theme 5: Sub-national Engagement	20
Theme 6: Stakeholder-engagement	23
Theme 7: Impact Assessment.....	26
Theme 8: Monitoring, Evaluation, and Reporting.....	29

Introduction

This Handbook provides methodological guidance for the use of the **Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) Indicator 17.14.1**, measuring progress towards policy coherence for sustainable development (PCSD). The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) are the co-custodian agencies of indicator 17.14.1.

The indicator is measured through a structured questionnaire ([UNEP/OECD Questionnaire on the mechanisms in place to enhance policy coherence of sustainable development](#)) completed by countries, assessing the existence and strength of eight themes of policy coherence mechanisms. The purpose of this Handbook is to serve as a user-friendly companion to the official questionnaire.

This Handbook:

- Explains each theme of policy coherence;
- Provides guiding questions in plain language;
- Clarifies scoring guidance;
- Suggests examples and offers tips for evidence and documentation.

The aim of this work is not to “rank” countries but to help them assess where they stand, set baselines, and strengthen their institutional frameworks for policy coherence in line with the 2030 Agenda and beyond.

This Handbook should be considered as a living document that evolves in response to country experiences in establishing and assessing mechanisms for policy coherence. The data gathered by UNEP and the OECD on these experiences, including related challenges, lessons learned and emerging solutions, will continue to inform and strengthen the methodology over time. UNEP and the OECD aim to disseminate this Handbook not only as a tool to enable effective reporting, but also as a resource to support countries in enhancing policy coherence.

1 About SDG indicator 17.14.1

In September 2015, the United Nations Sustainable Development Summit adopted a new framework to guide development efforts between 2015 and 2030, entitled "[Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for sustainable development](#)". The 2030 Agenda contains 17 SDGs, divided into 169 targets, which are informed by 244 Indicators. Sustainable Development Goal 17 covers partnerships and means of implementation to achieve the goals. In this respect, mechanisms for policy coherence are identified as an important aspect of means of implementation with **SDG Indicator 17.14.1** measuring the **"number of countries with mechanisms in place to enhance policy coherence of sustainable development"**.

The increasingly complex and interconnected nature of the three planetary environmental crises of climate change, biodiversity loss, including desertification, land degradation and drought, and pollution and waste, requires domestic institutional settings, legislative frameworks and governance systems that are equipped to address cross-sectoral and transboundary challenges in an effective and coherent manner. In this context, policy coherence has emerged in recent years as a cornerstone principle of effective and inclusive governance for sustainable development – one that can help advance more integrated policymaking for more systemic impacts, while identifying opportunities for building synergies and minimizing trade-offs across the domestic and international policy landscape.

SDG indicator 17.14.1 on Policy Coherence for Sustainable Development (PCSD) can provide a blueprint for decision-makers to advance mutually reinforcing policy action across sectors and levels of government that delivers on the SDGs and other international commitments, including those under the multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs), in a synergetic manner.

Promoting policy coherence as an enabling approach for effective and inclusive sustainable development can generate significant benefits for national decision-makers:

- 1. Help formulate national policies that balance domestic policy objectives across sectors and institutional frameworks** through a coherent strategic and long-term vision, driven by a 'whole of government' approach.
- 2. Create clearer legal and regulatory frameworks that reduce policy contradictions, strengthen long-term planning and stability in environmental governance**, increasing public trust and accountability in national institutions.
- 3. Promote the mutually supportive implementation of the SDGs and other internationally agreed instruments and frameworks, including MEAs** at the national level, while reducing administrative and financial burdens on national institutions and enhancing efficiencies.
- 4. Address structural barriers to multi-stakeholder engagement**, promoting participatory mechanisms across the policy cycle that respond to rights-based approaches and promote a 'whole of society' engagement in national policy making.
- 5. Create the evidence base to help consolidate monitoring and assessment of policy effectiveness**, to inform decision-making and adjust policies in light of potential negative effects.

This document presents the international methodology for SDG Indicator 17.14.1, under the co-custodianship of UNEP and the OECD. The methodology is composed of 8 themes forming a 'checklist' that covers a wide range of institutional and organizational mechanisms that can support governance reforms aimed at enhancing policy coherence. As the indicator measures the existence of such mechanisms, whether policy coherence is ultimately achieved will depend on each country's specific policy context.

The UNEP-OECD methodology and its questionnaire are designed to be adapted to different national realities and sectors. It should be used to guide decision-makers in the design, implementation and

monitoring of key sectoral policies where enhanced coherence can make a substantial difference, taking into account country-specific priorities and capacities.

The methodology is accompanied by a [self-assessment questionnaire](#) (*UNEP/OECD Questionnaire on the mechanisms in place to enhance policy coherence of sustainable development*) that national focal points can use to assess the existence and level of implementation of mechanisms in their countries to advance policy coherence. This allows countries to assess and report on their progress towards SDG Indicator 17.14.1, and at the same time identify areas for improvement to further enhance policy coherence for sustainable development in their national contexts.

UNEP and the OECD jointly use the data collected through this methodology for global SDG reporting, for tracking national and international trends in policy coherence for sustainable development, and for informing capacity-building and supporting country activities.

2 Definitions

Note: *The definitions have been integrated by UNEP and the OECD in the standardized questionnaire on the mechanisms in place to enhance policy coherence of sustainable development, to support reporting on the SDG Indicator 17.14.1 and the data collection process.*

Policy Coherence for Sustainable Development (PCSD): An approach to integrate the dimensions of sustainable development throughout domestic, international and systemic policy-making. Its objectives in the context of the 2030 Agenda are to advance the integrated implementation of the 2030 Agenda by:

- (i) Fostering synergies and maximizing benefits across economic, social and environmental policy areas and institutional frameworks;
- (ii) Balancing domestic policy objectives and institutional frameworks with internationally recognized sustainable development goals and other international agreements/frameworks; and
- (iii) Addressing the transboundary and long-term impacts of policies, including those likely to affect developing countries.

Institutional Mechanisms: Structures, systems, processes and working methods applied by the government across all branches and levels of government as well as by key stakeholders.

Stakeholder: Any interested and/or affected party, including: individuals and national, regional, or international institutions and organizations, whether governmental or non-governmental, and from civil society, foundations, academia, the media or the private sector and others.

Transboundary Impacts: Any effect – intended or not – originated in one country that crosses national borders through flows of capital, goods, human and natural resources, and that is able to affect positively or negatively the sustainable development prospects of another country.

3 Methodology

The harmonized methodology and questionnaire for measuring SDG Indicator 17.14.1 are designed to assess the institutional and organizational mechanisms in place to enhance coherence between policies addressing the various dimensions of sustainable development.

The questionnaire functions as a self-assessment tool, comprising eight themes and twenty-four guiding questions. The eight themes set out mutually supportive principles for enhancing policy coherence, ranging from political commitment to monitoring and evaluation. Organized under these themes, each guiding question assesses a specific institutional or organizational mechanism which

international best practice shows to be conducive to higher degrees of policy coherence.¹ The resulting score represents the overall existence and level of implementation of these mechanisms within the responding country. The periodic repetition of the self-assessment exercise enables the monitoring of progress over time.

By setting out best practice for enhancing policy coherence, completion of the questionnaire can assist policymakers and stakeholders with the identification or strengthening of national enabling conditions for the synergetic design and implementation of policies, national plans and strategies across sectors and governance levels. This in turn can support the effective implementation of MEAs and the alignment between Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs), National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs), Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) Strategies, pollution strategies and plans.

4 Structure of the Indicator Framework

SDG 17.14.1 Indicator considers institutional and organizational mechanisms that can support efforts in enhancing policy coherence across eight themes.

Table 1. Composite SDG Indicator 17.14.1: index of themes and guiding questions

Theme	Guiding question
1. Political Commitment	1.1. Is there a clear political statement at the highest level of government demonstrating commitment to PCSD?
	1.2. Has the government defined clear national priority areas for advancing PCSD?
	1.3. Has the government defined clear institutional roles and responsibilities for promoting, overseeing, and implementing PCSD?
2. Long-term Vision	2.1. Has the government developed a strategic long-term vision for sustainable development to enhance policy coherence?
	2.2. Does the government use long-term strategic planning tools to enhance policy coherence?
	2.3. Has the government established dedicated institutional arrangements or mechanisms to support a long-term vision for PCSD?
3. The Integration of Sustainable Development into Policy and Finance	3.1. Does the government have a budgetary process that integrates sustainable development into sectoral policies, and to address synergies and trade-offs across economic, social and environmental policy areas?
	3.2. Does the government have dedicated mechanisms or tools to integrate sustainable development into the sectoral or financing plans of line ministries?

¹ OECD (2024), *Unleashing Policy Coherence to Achieve the SDGs: An Assessment of Governance Mechanisms*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/a1c8dbf8-en>.

	3.3. Does the government have established mechanisms or measures to promote the mobilisation of public, private, domestic, and international resources for sustainable development?
4. Whole-of-government Coordination	4.1. Has the government established high-level coordinating mechanisms with clear mandates to ensure whole-of-government coordination for PCSD, including at sectoral level?
	4.2. Are there formal governance structures or informal channels in place to support communication between sectoral ministries and departments for enhancing PCSD?
	4.3. Are there specific capacity-building programs or other resources in place for public servants, government officials, or staff to enhance policy coherence for sustainable development?
5. Sub-national Engagement	5.1. Are there provisions or mechanisms in place to align national and sub-national plans, policies, budgets, or regulatory frameworks for sustainable development?
	5.2. Are there formal governance structures or informal channels in place to support communication between national and sub-national levels of government for enhancing PCSD?
	5.3. Are there mechanisms or processes in place to ensure coordinated action between national and subnational agencies on international initiatives or development co-operation for sustainable development?
6. Stakeholder-engagement	6.1. Are there participatory mechanisms in place to ensure stakeholders are informed and engaged proactively in different phases of the policy cycle for sustainable development, or in the development of PCSD initiatives through a whole-of-society approach?
	6.2. Are there mechanisms in place to reach out to marginalized and vulnerable groups in society and advocate for their needs and participation in decision-making to advance inclusive sustainable development?
	6.3. Has the government put mechanisms in place to promote stakeholder engagement in policy coherence for sustainable development at various levels of governance, to advance best practice and encourage peer learning?
7. Impact Assessment	7.1. Does the government have any mechanisms or tools in place to conduct regular policy impact assessments to identify any positive and negative impacts on sustainable development?
	7.2. Has the government established ex-ante and ex-post policy impact assessments that consider transboundary impacts?

	7.3. Does the government have any mechanisms in place to build capacity in the public service to collect and analyze evidence on how different policies, laws or regulations impact sustainable development?
8. Monitoring, Evaluation, and Reporting	8.1. Does the government have any information management systems or similar mechanisms in place to coherently identify and centralize data, indicators and (or) other information for monitoring progress on sustainable development?
	8.2. Does the government have mechanisms in place to provide regular and transparent reporting to relevant national bodies (e.g. Parliament, ministerial or other bodies) on progress on PCSD?
	8.3. Does the government have mechanisms in place to ensure that findings on PCSD are regularly evaluated and used to take adaptive action, including with regards to synergies and potential trade-offs between sectoral policies?

5 Scoring System

Each of the 8 themes includes three questions, scored on a scale from 0 to 4, indicating the level of implementation of the mechanism specified in the question. A general description of the level of implementation and scoring is provided below.

Table 2. General description of the level of implementation and scoring

Level of implementation	General statement	Score
Not in place	The mechanism does not exist, and there are no plans or actions to develop it.	0
Under development	The mechanism does not exist yet; however, there are formal plans to develop it, or it is currently under development.	1
In place, not implemented	The mechanism exists but has not yet been implemented. For example, it may be inactive or activities are of very low relevance to contribute to meaningful progress.	2
In place, partially implemented	The mechanism is in place but only partially implemented. Some components may be missing, which are necessary to ensure the mechanism supports efforts to enhance policy coherence. There might be several reasons for this, including insufficient funding, capacity constraints, lack of specific mandates, normative gaps, regulatory burdens, bureaucratic lengthy processes, etc.	3
Fully implemented	The mechanism is in place and fully implemented. The mechanism under assessment is complete and relevant in all aspects.	4

In total, each of the 8 themes, and related guiding questions, is scored on a scale from 0 to 12, where 0 means none of the requested mechanisms are implemented, 12 means all the requested mechanisms are in place and fully implemented. Across all 8 themes, the maximum score achievable is 96. The score out of 96 is converted to a percentage for the purpose of reporting under SDG Indicator 17.14.1.

The data will be validated by UNEP and the OECD and submitted to the United Nations Statistics Division (UNSD) for publication in the [SDG Global Database](#). UNEP and the OECD will also use the data to track national and sub-national policy coherence both quantitatively and qualitatively and to inform any capacity building or support activities that may take place in the responding countries.

6 Indicator Themes

The following section introduces each of the 8 themes and related guiding questions. It also provides scoring guidance examples. The language in the example tables is taken directly from the SDG Indicator 17.14.1 questionnaire, intended to provide an example of the assessment criteria and rationale that stakeholders will use to determine success towards each indicator theme.

Theme 1: Political Commitment

- There is a clear political statement at the highest level of government demonstrating commitment to PCSD, implemented in all relevant aspects of governance.
- The government has defined clear national priority areas for advancing PCSD, and these are implemented covering all relevant aspects of governance.
- The government has developed a strategic long-term vision for sustainable development to enhance policy coherence, which is implemented in all relevant aspects of governance.

Rationale: The first theme assesses whether a country has institutionalized its commitment to PCSD at the highest political level. The institutionalization of such political commitment constitutes a national governance foundation for prioritizing policy coherence as a guiding element in the formulation of national policies, across all levels of government. Embedding policy coherence at the national level can trigger the establishment, or enhancement, of existing mechanisms for policy coherence and drive more integrated and impact-driven national responses, informed by a whole-of-government approach.

Source/means of verification: For example, an explicit commitment to policy coherence in national strategic documents, policies or legislation including at sectoral level; a national policy, strategy, law or action plan identifies priority areas for addressing issues where trade-offs need to be managed or potential transboundary impacts need to be addressed; a law or administrative directive has established a central unit, ministry, or inter-ministerial committee that has the mandate to promote, oversee or implement policy coherence.

Table 3. Scoring Guidance for Theme 1 “Political Commitment”, including examples

Question	Not in place (0)	Under development (1)	In place, not implemented (2)	In place, partially implemented (3)	In place, fully implemented (4)
1.1 Is there a clear political statement at the highest level of government demonstrating commitment to PCSD?	There is no clear political statement in place, and there are no plans or actions to	There is no clear political statement in place; however , there are formal plans to develop one and include it in national strategic documents, policies or legislation, including at sectoral	There is a clear political statement at the highest level of government demonstrating commitment to PCSD, but it is not implemented.	There is a clear political statement at the highest level of government demonstrating commitment to PCSD, but the level of implementation is incomplete.	There is a clear political statement at the highest level of government demonstrating commitment to PCSD, implemented in all relevant aspects of governance.

<p><i>For example, an explicit commitment to PCSD in national strategic documents, policies or legislation, including at sectoral level.</i></p>	<p>include it in national strategic documents, policies or legislation.</p>	<p>level, or it is currently under development.</p> <p><i>(e.g. An upcoming new or updated national strategic document, policy or law with an explicit commitment to PCSD.)</i></p>	<p><i>(e.g. The commitment to PCSD is reflected in sectoral strategies, policies or laws but there are no action plans, priority areas, institutional roles and responsibilities to support it. Any activities do not effectively translate the commitment to PCSD into action.)</i></p>	<p><i>(e.g. Some elements may be missing, preventing full implementation of the commitment to PCSD. This could be due to unclear oversight mandates, roles and responsibilities, insufficient funding, capacities or data, regulatory burdens, normative gaps, or lengthy bureaucratic processes.)</i></p>	<p><i>(e.g. The government has made a clear political statement at the highest level, demonstrating commitment to PCSD. The political leadership actively promotes PCSD and supports sustainable development goals, ensuring that policies, laws and institutional arrangements align with these goals, including at sectoral level, as applicable. This commitment is translated into concrete mechanisms and actions across all relevant sectors and policies. This includes integrating PCSD into relevant frameworks, strategic planning, and operational activities, fostering a culture of sustainability throughout the government. Stakeholders are engaged, public support is mobilised, and robust monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are in place to track progress and ensure accountability.)</i></p>
<p>1.2 Has the government defined clear national priority areas for advancing PCSD?</p> <p><i>For example, clear priority areas for addressing issues where trade-offs need to be managed or potential transboundary impacts need to be addressed, defined within a national policy, strategy, law or action plan for advancing sustainable development.</i></p>	<p>There are no clear national priority areas in place, and there are no plans or actions to define them.</p>	<p>There are no clear national priority areas in place; however, there are formal plans to define them, or they are currently under development.</p> <p><i>(e.g. An upcoming new or updated national strategic document, policy or law with an explicit commitment to PCSD.)</i></p>	<p>The government has defined clear national priority areas for advancing PCSD, but specific actions to address these priority areas have not been implemented.</p> <p><i>(e.g. No concrete actions have been taken to address the priority areas for advancing PCSD in sectoral strategies, policies, or regulations. Alternatively, the actions taken have not effectively addressed these priority areas.)</i></p>	<p>The government has defined clear national priority areas for advancing PCSD, but the level of implementation is incomplete.</p> <p><i>(e.g. Some factors may be preventing full implementation. These could include insufficient funding, capacity, data, siloed institutional approaches, normative or regulatory gaps, including at sectoral level, or lengthy bureaucratic processes.)</i></p>	<p>The government has defined clear national priority areas for advancing PCSD, and these are implemented covering all relevant aspects of governance.</p> <p><i>(e.g. The defined priorities are integrated into sectoral policies, strategies, and time-bound action plans, guiding efforts to achieve sustainable development goals, capitalising on synergies across sectors and considering potential transboundary impacts of policies. There is active</i></p>

					<i>coordination across sectors to align initiatives with these priorities, fostering an integrated approach throughout the government.)</i>
<p>1.3 Has the government defined clear institutional roles and responsibilities for promoting, overseeing, and implementing PCSD?</p> <p><i>For example, a law or administrative directive has established a central unit, ministry, or inter-ministerial committee that has the mandate to promote, oversee or implement PCSD.</i></p>	<p>There are no clear institutional roles and responsibilities in place, and there are no plans or actions to define them.</p>	<p>There are no clear institutional roles and responsibilities in place; however, there are formal plans to define them, or they are currently under development.</p> <p><i>(e.g. Upcoming changes in the government structures; new mandates for existing bodies or institutional structures defining clear PCSD role or the creation of new bodies or institutions explicitly mandated to enhance PCSD across the government.)</i></p>	<p>The government has defined clear institutional roles and responsibilities for promoting, overseeing, and implementing PCSD, but these roles have not yet been implemented.</p> <p><i>(e.g. Factors that may hinder implementation include: insufficient funding, capacity constraints, regulatory burdens, normative gaps, lack of specific mandates, inadequate political will, coordination issues, insufficient stakeholder engagement, weak inter-ministerial communication, etc.)</i></p>	<p>The government has defined clear institutional roles and responsibilities for promoting, overseeing, and implementing PCSD. However, these roles have only been partially implemented.</p> <p><i>(Several challenges could be causing the partial implementation, including limited financial, human, or technical resources, resistance from existing institutional practices, lack of inter-ministerial collaboration, normative or regulatory gaps and insufficient capacity-building for staff involved in PCSD.)</i></p>	<p>The government has defined clear institutional roles and responsibilities for promoting, overseeing, and implementing PCSD. In practice, these roles are comprehensively implemented in all relevant aspects of governance.</p> <p><i>(e.g. A lead institution has been established with clear mandates to promote and oversee the implementation of PCSD across the government. The mandates and role of this institution are well known throughout the government in different sectors and at different levels.)</i></p>

Theme 2: Long-term Vision

- The government has developed a strategic long-term vision for sustainable development to enhance policy coherence, which is implemented in all relevant aspects of governance.
- The government uses long-term strategic planning tools to enhance policy coherence, and these are implemented covering all relevant aspects of governance.
- The government has established dedicated institutional arrangements or mechanisms to support a long-term vision for PCSD. Their tasks are comprehensively implemented, covering all relevant aspects of governance.

Rationale: The second theme assesses whether, once political commitment to PCSD has been embedded at the national level, a country has established mechanisms to ensure its long-term operationalization. Advancing PCSD requires forward-looking planning, strategic foresight and integrated budgetary processes that support coherent regulatory frameworks, reduce policy inconsistencies, strengthen environmental governance and increase public trust and accountability in national institutions. Long-term planning enables cross-sectoral policy formulation and mitigates the potential adverse impacts on the wellbeing and sustainable development of future generations.

Source/means of verification: For example, a national vision statement, policy, strategy or action plan that sets objectives to identify, prevent and mitigate actual and potential adverse impacts of decision-making on the wellbeing and sustainable development of future generations; the use of tools such as impact assessments, strategic foresight, scenario development, integrated modelling tools or systems-thinking approaches in the formulation and implementation of strategies and policies to identify, prevent, and mitigate potential adverse impacts on the wellbeing and sustainable development of future generations; the creation of independent bodies, a commissioner, council, or ombudsperson for future generations that can promote long-term vision for policy coherence that outlives electoral cycles or government terms.

Table 4. Scoring Guidance for Theme 2 “Long-term Vision”, including examples

Question	Not in place (0)	Under development (1)	In place, not implemented (2)	In place, partially implemented (3)	In place, fully implemented (4)
<p>2.1 Has the government developed a strategic long-term vision for sustainable development to enhance policy coherence?</p> <p><i>For example, a national vision statement, policy, strategy or action plan that sets objectives to identify, prevent, and mitigate actual and potential adverse impacts of decision-making on the wellbeing and sustainable development of future generations.</i></p>	There is no strategic long-term vision for sustainable development in place, and there are no plans or actions to develop it.	There is no strategic long-term vision for sustainable development in place; however , there are formal plans to develop it, or it is currently under development. <i>(e.g. An upcoming new or updated national long-term vision statement, policy or strategy to identify, prevent, and mitigate actual and potential adverse impacts of decision-making on the wellbeing and sustainable development of future generations.)</i>	The government has developed and formally adopted a strategic long-term vision for sustainable development to enhance policy coherence, but it is not implemented yet. <i>(e.g. Sectoral strategies and policies do not include the key elements of the long-term vision. They lack clear objectives to identify, prevent, or reduce potential negative impacts of decision-making on the wellbeing and sustainable development of future generations.)</i>	The government has developed a strategic long-term vision for sustainable development to enhance policy coherence, but the level of implementation is incomplete. <i>(e.g. Several challenges could be hindering the full implementation. These could include poor integration into sectoral policies, undefined objectives, limited stakeholder engagement, inadequate monitoring, capacity constraints, normative gaps, and low public awareness.)</i>	The government has developed a strategic long-term vision for sustainable development to enhance policy coherence, which is implemented in all relevant aspects of governance. <i>(e.g. A long-term vision or strategy is in place establishing long-term goals and targets for sustainable development and guiding short-term decision-making to consider the wellbeing and sustainable development of future generations. This strategic vision is integrated into all relevant sectoral strategies and policies and translated into concrete actions to identify, prevent, and mitigate potential adverse impacts on future generations. This process involves engaging stakeholders, securing legislative and public support, and developing robust monitoring and evaluation frameworks.)</i>
<p>2.2 Does the government use long-term strategic</p>	There are no long-term strategic planning tools in	There are no long-term strategic planning tools in place; however , there are formal plans to develop	The government has developed long-term strategic planning tools to enhance policy coherence, but these tools have	The government uses long-term strategic planning tools to enhance coherence. However , these tools have only been	The government uses long-term strategic planning tools to enhance policy coherence, and these are implemented covering

<p>planning tools to enhance policy coherence?</p> <p><i>For example, the use of tools such as impact assessments, strategic foresight, scenario development, integrated modelling tools or systems-thinking approaches in the formulation and implementation of strategies and policies to identify, prevent, and mitigate potential adverse impacts on the wellbeing and sustainable development of future generations.</i></p>	<p>place, and there are no plans or actions to develop them.</p>	<p>them, or they are currently under development.</p> <p><i>(e.g. The upcoming creation of dedicated strategic foresight units at the center of government or ministries, changes to existing impact assessment tools, and the development of new training programs related to long-term planning tools and systems-thinking approaches.)</i></p>	<p>not been implemented yet.</p> <p><i>(e.g. Resource constraints, lack of political will, institutional resistance, insufficient training, complexity of using tools, normative gaps and inadequate engagement might be factors that hinder implementation.)</i></p>	<p>partially implemented.</p> <p><i>(e.g. Several challenges could be hindering the full implementation. These could include: resource constraints, insufficient political will, institutional resistance, normative gaps insufficient training, etc.)</i></p>	<p>all relevant aspects of governance.</p> <p><i>(e.g. The government commonly uses long-term strategic planning tools (e.g. impact assessments, strategic foresight, scenario development, integrated modeling tools, or systems-thinking approaches) in formulating and implementing strategies and policies. These tools help identify, prevent, and mitigate potential adverse impacts on the wellbeing and sustainable development of future generations. These tools are proactively used to inform policy- and decision-making.)</i></p>
<p>2.3 Has the government established dedicated institutional arrangements or mechanisms to support a long-term vision for PCSD?</p> <p><i>For example, independent bodies, a commissioner, council, or ombudsperson for future generations, can promote long-term vision for PCSD that outlives electoral cycles or government terms.</i></p>	<p>There are no institutional arrangements or mechanisms in place, and there are no plans or actions to establish them.</p>	<p>There are no institutional arrangements or mechanisms in place; however, there are formal plans to establish them, or they are currently under development.</p> <p><i>(e.g. The upcoming creation of a dedicated or independent body, such as the National Commissions for Sustainable Development, independent bodies, a commissioner, council, or ombudsperson for future generations with a specific mandate to enhance PCSD that spans government terms and electoral cycles, ensuring continuity of PCSD efforts across different administrations.)</i></p>	<p>The government has established dedicated institutional arrangements or mechanisms to support a long-term vision for PCSD. However, their tasks have not been implemented yet.</p> <p><i>(e.g. Several factors can hinder implementation including unclear mandates, resource constraints, insufficient political will, institutional resistance, inadequate stakeholder engagement, normative gaps, and low public awareness and support.)</i></p>	<p>The government has established dedicated institutional arrangements or mechanisms to support a long-term vision for PCSD. However, their tasks have only been partially implemented.</p> <p><i>(e.g. The full implementation of government measures can be hindered by political interference, insufficient resources, bureaucratic resistance, poor coordination among ministries or departments, public opposition, complex legal frameworks, normative gaps or other gaps in monitoring and evaluation.)</i></p>	<p>The government has established dedicated institutional arrangements or mechanisms to support a long-term vision for PCSD Their tasks are comprehensively implemented covering all relevant aspects of governance.</p> <p><i>(e.g. The government has established a dedicated body with clear mandates and resources to ensure its commitment to PCSD extends beyond electoral cycles and government terms. This body has clear objectives, adequate resources, and supports effective communication, strong leadership, stakeholder engagement, and coordination across Ministries or departments. It also has robust monitoring and evaluation systems and the flexibility to adapt to changing circumstances.)</i></p>

Theme 3: The Integration of Sustainable Development into Policy and Finance

- The government has developed a budgetary process to integrate sustainable development into sectoral policies, and to address synergies and trade-offs across economic, social and environmental policy areas. Sustainability considerations are integrated in all phases of the budgetary process.
- The government has developed dedicated mechanisms and tools to integrate sustainable development into the sectoral and financing plans of line ministries. These mechanisms have been comprehensively implemented, covering all relevant aspects of governance.
- The government has established mechanisms and implemented measures to promote the mobilization of financial resources to support PCSD. These have been comprehensively applied, covering all relevant aspects of governance.

Rationale: The third theme assesses the extent to which countries have established mechanisms to link and allocate expenditures to the implementation of sustainable development and its dimensions with sectoral policies. This includes the integration of PCSD objectives into national budgeting processes and financing frameworks, while ensuring coordination across sectoral ministries, so that these commitments are reflected in financial planning and resource allocation. Additionally, this theme assesses whether national stakeholders have adopted strategies to mobilize and diversify financial from public, private, domestic and international sources.

Source/means of verification: For example, SDG budgeting or checklists; strategies, guidelines, regulations, provisions or coordination mechanisms for ministries and government agencies to align their mandates, policies and sectoral objectives with sustainable development priorities; or specific programmes or policies informed by policy coherence to enhance the contribution of domestic resources to sustainable development and incentives or frameworks to attract private investment for sustainable development projects.

Table 5. Scoring Guidance for Theme 3 “The Integration of Sustainable Development into Policy and Finance”, including examples

Question	Not in place (0)	Under development (1)	In place, not implemented (2)	In place, partially implemented (3)	In place, fully implemented (4)
<p>3.1 Does the government have a budgetary process that integrates sustainable development into sectoral policies, and to address synergies and trade-offs across economic, social and environmental policy areas?</p> <p><i>For example, through the use of SDG budgeting (i.e. tagging budget measures, etc.) or checklists.</i></p>	<p>There is no budgetary process in place, and there are no formal plans or actions to develop it.</p>	<p>There is no budgetary process in place; however, there are formal plans to develop it, or it is currently under development.</p> <p><i>(e.g. The upcoming introduction of new directives for preparing the annual budget with the aim of integrating sustainable development into sectoral policies, or</i></p>	<p>The government has developed a budgetary process to integrate sustainable development into sectoral policies, and to address synergies and trade-offs across economic, social and environmental policy areas, but it has not been implemented yet.</p> <p><i>(e.g. Several factors can hinder implementation, including the complexity of integrating</i></p>	<p>The government has developed a budgetary process to integrate sustainable development into sectoral policies, and to address synergies and trade-offs across economic, social and environmental policy areas, but its implementation remains partial.</p> <p><i>(e.g. Several challenges could be hindering full implementation, including the</i></p>	<p>The government has developed a budgetary process to integrate sustainable development into sectoral policies, and to address synergies and trade-offs across economic, social and environmental policy areas. Sustainability considerations are integrated in all phases of the budgetary process.</p> <p><i>(e.g. Sustainable development is effectively integrated into sectoral policies through budgetary process</i></p>

		<i>adopting new practices such as SDG coding and tagging, SDG-aligned results-based budgeting, and linking the strategic budgeting process to the SDGs.)</i>	<i>sustainability into existing frameworks, balancing resource allocation across competing goals, the need for capacity building within institutions, the necessity of strong political will and commitment, normative gaps, and financial constraints.)</i>	<i>complexity of integrating sustainable development priorities into existing frameworks, difficulties in data collection, balancing resource allocation across competing goals, weak institutional capacity, insufficient political will and commitment, normative gaps, and financial constraints.)</i>	<i>(e.g. budget formulation, approval, execution, oversight), promoting synergies across policy sectors, strategically balancing resource allocations for economic, social and environmental goals, and fostering collaboration and coordination between government departments and agencies).</i>
<p>3.2 Does the government have dedicated mechanisms or tools to integrate sustainable development into the sectoral or financing plans of line ministries?</p> <p><i>(For example, strategies, guidelines, regulations, provisions or coordination mechanisms for ministries and government agencies to align their mandates, policies and sectoral objectives with sustainable development priorities.)</i></p>	There are no mechanisms or tools in place, and there are no plans or actions to develop them.	There are no mechanisms or tools in place; however , there are formal plans to develop them, or they are currently under development.	<p>The government has developed dedicated mechanisms and tools to integrate sustainable development into the sectoral and financing plans of line ministries. However, these mechanisms have not yet been implemented.</p> <p><i>(e.g. Several challenges might hinder implementation, including limited funding, capacity constraints, limited data and information, coordination issues, insufficient political will, and normative gaps.)</i></p>	<p>The government has developed dedicated mechanisms and tools to integrate sustainable development into the sectoral and financing plans of line ministries. However, these mechanisms have only been partially implemented.</p> <p><i>(e.g. Several factors might contribute to the partial implementation. These could include insufficient funding, capacity constraints, bureaucratic burdens, coordination issues, data unavailability normative gaps, etc.)</i></p>	<p>The government has developed dedicated mechanisms and tools to integrate sustainable development into the sectoral and financing plans of line ministries. These mechanisms have been comprehensively implemented, covering all relevant aspects of governance.</p> <p><i>(e.g. Established mechanisms and tools have ensured that sustainable development priorities are integrated into every sector and financial plan, contributing to effective progress towards sustainable development goals. These mechanisms and tools also foster a culture of sustainability across all levels and sectors of government, driving continuous improvement and innovation in sustainable development practices.)</i></p>
<p>3.3 Does the government have established mechanisms or measures to promote the mobilisation of public, private, domestic, and international resources for sustainable development?</p>	There are no mechanisms or measures in place, and there are no plans or actions to develop them.	There are no mechanisms or measures in place; however , there are formal plans to develop them, or they are currently under development.	<p>The government has established mechanisms or measures to promote the mobilisation of financial resources to support PCSD. However, these mechanisms have not yet been implemented.</p>	<p>The government has established mechanisms or measures to promote the mobilisation of financial resources to support PCSD. However, these mechanisms have only been partially implemented.</p>	<p>The government has established mechanisms and implemented measures to promote the mobilisation of financial resources to support PCSD. These have been comprehensively applied, covering all relevant aspects of governance.</p> <p><i>(e.g. The established mechanisms</i></p>

<p><i>(For example, specific programmes or policies informed by policy coherence to enhance the contribution of domestic resources to sustainable development; incentives or frameworks to attract private investment for sustainable development projects; partnerships between the government and private sector to finance sustainable development initiatives, etc.)</i></p>	<p><i>(e.g. Several challenges might hinder implementation, including insufficient funding, capacity, coordination, or insufficient stakeholder engagement.)</i></p>	<p><i>(e.g. Some factors may be preventing full implementation. These could include insufficient funding, capacity, coordination, or insufficient stakeholder engagement.)</i></p>	<p><i>and implemented measures have resulted in specific programs or policies that enhance the contribution of domestic resources to sustainable development, or have created incentives to attract private investments for sustainable development or fostered public-private partnerships that support the mobilisation of financial resources to advance sustainable development.)</i></p>
--	--	--	---

Theme 4: Whole-of-government Coordination

- The government has established high-level coordinating mechanisms with clear mandates to ensure whole-of-government coordination for PCSD, including at sectoral level. These mechanisms have been fully implemented, covering all relevant aspects of governance.
- The government has established formal governance structures or informal channels to support communication between sectoral ministries and departments for enhancing PCSD. These mechanisms have been fully implemented, covering all relevant aspects of governance.
- The government has developed capacity-building programs or other resources for public servants, government officials, or staff to enhance policy coherence for sustainable development. These programmes have been fully implemented, covering all relevant aspects of governance.

Rationale: The fourth theme assesses whether mechanisms to advance and support whole-of-government coordination have been established and operationalized. A whole-of-government approach is a critical enabler of PCSD, as it supports policymakers in designing and implementing cross-sectoral policies that move beyond siloed approaches. By strengthening interinstitutional and interministerial coordination, whole-of-government creates the conditions for more effective coordination mechanisms and enables governments to create a framework for aligning national policies with international commitments and action plans. It also facilitates the anticipation and mitigation of trade-offs and enhances information sharing across ministers and actors. Establishing the foundations for this level of coordination serves as a catalytic factor for sustained, long-term improvements in the implementation of PCSD, supported by targeted training and the continuous professional development of civil servants to strengthen cross-disciplinary knowledge and skills.

Source/means of verification: For example, a high-level coordinating mechanism or body, whether located within the center of government or a lead line ministry as appropriate, with a clear mandate, resources and capacities to anticipate and resolve policy divergences, including on potential negative impacts of policies, and tensions arising from diverging priorities and different sectoral interests; inter-ministerial committees that stimulate open exchange of ideas and innovative thinking to address cross-cutting policy objectives and develop integrated solutions; capacity building programmes to improve civil servants’ skills beyond their traditional operating environment and challenge them to think and act in new, cross-disciplinary ways to foster coherence in policymaking.

Table 6. Scoring Guidance for Theme 4 “Whole-of-government Coordination”, including examples

Question	Not in place (0)	Under development (1)	In place, not implemented (2)	In place, partially implemented (3)	In place, fully implemented (4)
<p>4.1 Has the government established high-level coordinating mechanisms with clear mandates to ensure whole-of-government coordination for PCSD, including at sectoral level?</p> <p><i>(For example, a high-level coordinating mechanism or body whether located within the Centre of Government or a lead line ministry as appropriate, with a clear mandate, resources and capacities to anticipate and resolve policy divergences, including on potential negative impacts of policies, and tensions arising from diverging priorities and different sectoral interests.)</i></p>	<p>There are no high-level coordinating mechanisms in place, and there are no plans or actions to establish them.</p>	<p>There are no high-level coordinating mechanisms in place; however, there are formal plans to develop them, or they are currently under development.</p>	<p>The government established high-level coordinating mechanisms with clear mandates to ensure whole-of-government coordination for PCSD, including at sectoral level. However, these mechanisms have not yet been implemented.</p> <p><i>(e.g. Several factors can hinder implementation, including insufficient political will, bureaucratic inefficiencies, information asymmetries, stakeholder resistance, vested interests, complexity of coordination, normative gaps and lack of accountability.)</i></p>	<p>The government has established high-level coordinating mechanisms with clear mandates to ensure whole-of-government coordination for PCSD, including at sectoral level. However, these mechanisms have only been partially implemented.</p> <p><i>(e.g. Several challenges can lead to the partial implementation, including shifts in political leadership and priorities, insufficient technical resources, normative gaps, bureaucratic and stakeholder resistance; etc.)</i></p>	<p>The government has established high-level coordinating mechanisms with clear mandates to ensure whole-of-government coordination for PCSD, including at sectoral level. These mechanisms have been fully implemented, covering all relevant aspects of governance.</p> <p><i>(e.g. A high-level coordinating mechanism operates regularly to support whole-of-government coordination for Policy Coherence for Sustainable Development (PCSD). This mechanism has a clear mandate, adequate resources, and the capacity to anticipate and resolve policy divergences, including potential negative impacts of policies and tensions arising from diverging priorities and different sectoral interests.)</i></p>
<p>4.2 Are there formal governance structures or informal channels in place to support communication between sectoral ministries and departments for enhancing PCSD?</p> <p><i>For example, inter-ministerial committees that stimulate open exchange of ideas and innovative thinking to address cross-cutting policy objectives</i></p>	<p>The formal governance structures or informal channels do not exist, and there are no plans or actions to develop them.</p>	<p>The formal governance structures or informal channels do not exist yet; however, there are formal plans to develop them, or they are currently under development.</p>	<p>The government has established formal governance structures or informal channels to support communication between sectoral ministries and departments for enhancing PCSD. However, these mechanisms have not yet been implemented.</p> <p><i>(e.g. Several factors might hinder implementation, such as resistance to change, lack of alignment with organisational</i></p>	<p>The government has established formal governance structures or informal channels to support communication between sectoral ministries and departments for enhancing PCSD. However, these mechanisms have only been partially implemented.</p> <p><i>(e.g. Full implementation may be hindered by bureaucratic rigidities, inflexibility, resource constraints, poor communication,</i></p>	<p>The government has established formal governance structures or informal channels to support communication between sectoral ministries and departments for enhancing PCSD. These mechanisms have been fully implemented, covering all relevant aspects of governance.</p> <p><i>(e.g. The establishment of these structures and channels has led to improved collaboration,</i></p>

<p>and develop integrated solutions.</p>			<p>culture, vested interests, inadequate resources, poor communication normative gaps, and unfavorable external conditions like political instability or changes in government.)</p>	<p>resistance to change, normative gaps, and external factors like political instability or economic downturns.)</p>	<p>coordination, and information sharing across all sectors of government. This has strengthened the alignment of policies with the Sustainable Development Goals and fostered a culture of continuous improvement and innovation in public administration.)</p>
<p>4.3 Are there specific capacity-building programs or other resources in place for public servants, government officials, or staff to enhance policy coherence for sustainable development? <i>For example, to improve skills that take civil servants beyond their traditional operating environment and challenge them to think and act in new, cross-disciplinary ways to foster coherence in policymaking.</i></p>	<p>There are no capacity-building programmes or other resources in place, and there are no plans or actions to develop them.</p>	<p>There are no capacity-building programmes or other resources in place; however, there are formal plans to develop them, or they are currently under development.</p>	<p>The government has developed capacity-building programs or other resources for public servants, government officials, or staff to enhance policy coherence for sustainable development. However, these programmes have not yet been implemented. <i>(e.g. Several challenges might hinder implementation. These could include insufficient funding, capacity constraints, bureaucratic burdens, coordination issues, data unavailability normative gaps, etc.)</i></p>	<p>The government has developed capacity-building programs or other resources for public servants, government officials, or staff to enhance policy coherence for sustainable development. However, these programmes have only been partially implemented. <i>(e.g. Several factors might contribute to the partial implementation. These could include insufficient funding, capacity constraints, bureaucratic burdens, coordination issues, insufficient engagement, etc.)</i></p>	<p>The government has developed capacity-building programs or other resources for public servants, government officials, or staff to enhance policy coherence for sustainable development. These programmes have been fully implemented, covering all relevant aspects of governance. <i>(e.g. Competency frameworks have been designed to target cross-disciplinary knowledge and skills to foster coherence in policymaking. Training has been developed to strengthen these skills, and rolled out to all relevant civil servants.</i></p>

Theme 5: Sub-national Engagement

- The provisions or mechanisms are in place to align national and sub-national plans, policies, budgets, and regulatory frameworks for sustainable development. These mechanisms have been fully implemented, covering all relevant aspects of governance.
- The government has established formal governance structures or informal channels to support communication between national and sub-national levels of government. These mechanisms have been fully implemented, covering all relevant aspects of governance.
- The government has established mechanisms or processes to coordinate national and sub-national action on international initiatives or development cooperation for sustainable development. These mechanisms have been fully implemented, covering all relevant aspects of governance.

Rationale: The fifth theme assesses whether governments establish provisions, structures, and processes to engage and exchange across government levels, promoting sub-national engagement for advancing PCSD. Effective alignment and communication mechanisms between national and sub-national levels ensure that priorities are consistent, mutually reinforcing, and adapted to local contexts. In the absence of such alignment, key aspects of national strategies or plans may not be adequately implemented at the sub-national or local levels. Equally, the absence of such alignment may not take into account the reality and priorities at a lower governmental level. By integrating sub-national perspectives and capacities, governments can foster more inclusive, responsive, and coherent sustainable development policies.

Source/means of verification: For example, National Sustainable Development Strategies or other strategies outline relevant action and mandate sub-national engagement, including data exchanges; interterritorial commissions, the participation of local governments in National Councils for the 2030 Agenda, and focal points for the implementation of SDGs at the regional and local level; or the establishment of national agencies providing advisory services, networks, or matchmaking for sub-national entities engaging in international initiatives or development cooperation.

Table 7. Scoring Guidance for Theme 5 “Sub-national Engagement”, including examples

Question	Not in place (0)	Under development (1)	In place, not implemented (2)	In place, partially implemented (3)	In place, fully implemented (4)
<p>5.1 Are there provisions or mechanisms in place to align national and sub-national plans, policies, budgets, or regulatory frameworks for sustainable development?</p> <p><i>For example, National Sustainable Development Strategies outline relevant action and mandate sub-national engagement; or data exchanges and other engagements between government levels are institutionalised in other ways.</i></p>	<p>There are no provisions or mechanisms in place, and there are no formal plans or actions to develop them.</p>	<p>There are no provisions or mechanisms in place; however, there are formal plans to develop them, or they are currently under development.</p>	<p>The provisions or mechanisms are in place to align national and sub-national plans, policies, budgets, or regulatory frameworks for sustainable development, but are not implemented.</p> <p><i>(e.g. National Sustainable Development Strategies outline relevant action at the sub-national level, but are not implemented through tools or action plans, or complemented by local monitoring on sustainable development objectives. This may be due to challenges such as resource constraints, lack of political will, institutional resistance, insufficient training, complex legal or political frameworks, normative gaps and inadequate engagement.)</i></p>	<p>The provisions or mechanisms are in place to align national and sub-national plans, policies, budgets, and regulatory frameworks for sustainable development, but are only partially implemented.</p> <p><i>(The full implementation of government mechanisms can be hindered by challenges including resource constraints, lack of political will, institutional resistance, insufficient training, complex legal or political frameworks, normative gaps and inadequate engagement.)</i></p>	<p>The provisions or mechanisms are in place to align national and sub-national plans, policies, budgets, and regulatory frameworks for sustainable development. These mechanisms have been fully implemented, covering all relevant aspects of governance.</p> <p><i>(e.g. National Sustainable Development Strategies are territorialised at the sub-national level and complemented by local indicators and monitoring systems on sustainable development objectives. Best practices and common challenges are documented, shared and incorporated across government levels, promoting continuous improvement. These mechanisms are effectively used to engage sub-national</i></p>

					<i>levels of government in PCSD and to promote coordinated action on relevant economic, social and environmental goals.)</i>
<p>5.2 Are there formal governance structures or informal channels in place to support communication between national and sub-national levels of government for enhancing PCSD?</p> <p><i>For example, interterritorial commissions, the participation of local governments in National Councils for the 2030 Agenda, and focal points for the implementation of SDGs at the regional and local level.</i></p>	<p>There are no formal governance structures or informal channels in place, and there are no formal plans or actions to develop them.</p>	<p>There are no formal governance structures or informal channels in place; however, there are formal plans to develop them, or they are currently under development.</p>	<p>The government has established formal governance structures or informal channels to support communication between national and sub-national levels of government, but are not implemented.</p> <p><i>(e.g. Platforms for communication have been established, but are not active. This may be caused by a lack of political will, insufficient resources, bureaucratic resistance, poor coordination, normative gaps or inadequate engagement.)</i></p>	<p>The government has established formal governance structures or informal channels to support communication between national and sub-national levels of government, but are only partially implemented.</p> <p><i>(e.g. The full implementation of government mechanisms can be hindered by a lack of political will, insufficient resources, bureaucratic resistance, poor coordination, normative gaps or inadequate engagement.)</i></p>	<p>The government has established formal governance structures or informal channels to support communication between national and sub-national levels of government. These mechanisms have been fully implemented, covering all relevant aspects of governance.</p> <p><i>(e.g. Platforms such as interterritorial commissions are in place to collect inputs from subnational entities and initiate formal exchanges between government levels. These mechanisms are active and stimulate open exchange of ideas and innovative thinking to address cross-cutting policy objectives and facilitate multi-level dialogue around success stories and persistent challenges.)</i></p>
<p>5.3 Are there mechanisms or processes in place to ensure coordinated action between national and subnational agencies on international initiatives or development co-operation for sustainable development?</p>	<p>There are no mechanisms or processes in place, and there are no formal plans or actions to develop them.</p>	<p>There are no mechanisms or processes in place; however, there are formal plans to develop them, or they are currently under development.</p>	<p>The government has established mechanisms or processes to coordinate national and sub-national action on international initiatives or development cooperation for sustainable development, but these are not implemented.</p> <p><i>(e.g. Advisory services, networks, or guidance are in place, but are not active or</i></p>	<p>The government has established mechanisms or processes to coordinate national and sub-national action on international initiatives or development cooperation for sustainable development, but these are only partially implemented.</p> <p><i>(e.g. The full implementation of government mechanisms can be hindered by insufficient</i></p>	<p>The government has established mechanisms or processes to coordinate national and sub-national action on international initiatives or development cooperation for sustainable development. These mechanisms have been fully implemented, covering all relevant aspects of governance.</p>

<p><i>For example, national agencies provide advisory services, networks, or matchmaking for sub-national entities engaging in international initiatives or development cooperation.</i></p>	<p><i>engaged with by sub-national entities.)</i></p>	<p><i>resources, bureaucratic resistance, poor coordination among ministries or departments, inadequate engagement, or complex legal frameworks.)</i></p>	<p><i>(e.g. For example, national agencies provide advisory services, networks, or matchmaking for sub-national entities engaging in international initiatives or development cooperation. Multi-level and multi-stakeholder partnerships connect actors and help exchange best practices, and support is well matched to demand and local context.)</i></p>
--	---	---	--

Theme 6: Stakeholder-engagement

- The participatory mechanisms are in place for stakeholder engagement in sustainable development policy-making through a whole-of-society approach, and in the development of PCSD initiatives, and these mechanisms are fully implemented through participatory approaches.
- The government has established mechanisms to reach out to marginalized and vulnerable groups in society and advocate for their participation in decision-making, to advance inclusive sustainable development. These mechanisms have been fully implemented, covering all relevant aspects of governance.
- The government has worked with various stakeholders on initiatives to raise public awareness, mobilize support, and advocate for policy coherence for sustainable development at various levels of governance. These mechanisms have been fully implemented, covering all relevant aspects of governance.

Rationale: The sixth theme assesses whether mechanisms to advance and support multi-stakeholder engagement and promote participatory mechanisms throughout the policy cycle have been institutionalized at the national level. A whole-of-society approach is a critical enabler of PCSD, as cross-sectoral policies have far-reaching impacts across all segments of civil society, including youth, women, Indigenous Peoples and local communities, people of African descent, as well as academia, business and the private sector. Meaningful and sustained multi-stakeholder participation is essential to reduce barriers to the implementation of rights-based approaches, promote and respect environmental and human rights, and ensure inclusive, accountable and effective policy implementation in the interest of present and future generations. The establishment of structured platforms for collaboration, consultation and peer-learning throughout policy design and implementation can further strengthen whole-of-society engagement and enhance governance mechanisms for advancing PCSD in an innovative, inclusive, transparent and resilient manner.

Source/means of verification: For example, dedicated laws, public consultations, advisory committees, focus groups, online platforms, regular meetings or other means enable engagement and participation in decision-making making, to gather feedback, address coherence issues, and collaborate on solutions involving different levels of society; consultations or engagements for different groups as co-designers on action plans that mainstream, in an integrated

manner, the principle of leaving no one behind in public policies and reform measures to promote human rights, gender equality and social inclusion; or engagement through global or national campaigns, policy dialogues, intergovernmental processes, capacity building initiatives, and societal mobilization.

Table 8. Scoring Guidance for Theme 6 “Stakeholder-engagement”, including examples

Question	Not in place (0)	Under development (1)	In place, not implemented (2)	In place, partially implemented (3)	In place, fully implemented (4)
<p>6.1 Are there participatory mechanisms in place to ensure stakeholders are informed and engaged proactively in different phases of the policy cycle for sustainable development, or in the development of PCSD initiatives through a whole-of-society approach?</p> <p><i>For example, dedicated laws, public consultations, advisory committees, focus groups, online platforms, regular meetings or other means enable engagement and participation in decision-making making, to gather feedback, address coherence issues, and collaborate on solutions involving different levels of society.</i></p>	<p>There are no mechanisms in place, and there are no formal plans or actions to develop them.</p>	<p>There are no mechanisms in place; however, there are formal plans to develop them, or they are currently under development.</p>	<p>The participatory mechanisms are in place for stakeholder engagement in sustainable development policy-making through a whole-of-society approach, but these are not implemented.</p> <p><i>(e.g. These mechanisms have not been established as a regular part of the policy cycle, or inputs are not systematically fed into decision making for policy coherence or sustainable development; or normative gaps persist.)</i></p>	<p>The participatory mechanisms are in place for stakeholder engagement in sustainable development policy-making through a whole-of-society approach, but these are partially implemented.</p> <p><i>(e.g. Several factors can limit implementation. These could such as insufficient political will, inadequate stakeholder engagement, normative gaps or a lack of resources or capacity.)</i></p>	<p>The participatory mechanisms are in place for stakeholder engagement in sustainable development policy-making through a whole-of-society approach, and in the development of PCSD initiatives, and these mechanisms are fully implemented through participatory approaches.</p> <p><i>(e.g. Dedicated forums and opportunities are in place to develop recommendations for enhancing policy coherence and to provide analytical and strategic input on sustainable development, supported by dedicated normative provisions. Engagement concerns relevant representatives from civil society, academia, the private sector and trade- and employers’ unions, in coordination with government Ministries. Consultations are mandated to take place in a comprehensive manner at various stages of the policy cycle. Preparatory information and feedback on the outcomes of the process is provided to involved stakeholders.)</i></p>

<p>6.2 Are there mechanisms in place to reach out to marginalised and vulnerable groups in society and advocate for their needs and participation in decision-making to advance inclusive sustainable development?</p> <p><i>For example, to consult or engage different groups as co-designers on action plans that mainstream, in an integrated manner, the principle of leaving no one behind in public policies and reform measures, placing emphasis on targeted measures which support those who are furthest behind and promote human rights, gender equality and social inclusion.</i></p>	<p>There are no mechanisms in place, and there are no formal plans or actions to develop them.</p>	<p>There are no mechanisms in place; however, there are formal plans to develop them, or they are currently under development.</p>	<p>The government has established mechanisms to reach out to marginalised and vulnerable groups in society and advocate for their participation in decision-making, to advance inclusive sustainable development, but these are not implemented.</p> <p><i>(e.g. These initiatives have not been rolled out to the public, or their results have not been fed into strategies for inclusive social and economic development; or normative gaps persist.)</i></p>	<p>The government has established mechanisms to reach out to marginalised and vulnerable groups in society and advocate for their participation in decision-making, to advance inclusive sustainable development, but these are only partially implemented.</p> <p><i>(e.g. Several factors can limit implementation. These could include insufficient political will, inadequate stakeholder engagement, normative gaps or a lack of resources or capacity.)</i></p>	<p>The government has established mechanisms to reach out to marginalised and vulnerable groups in society and advocate for their participation in decision-making, to advance inclusive sustainable development. These mechanisms have been fully implemented, covering all relevant aspects of governance.</p> <p><i>(e.g. These initiatives have been rolled out to key marginalised and vulnerable groups. Findings have been fed back into strategies designed to advance inclusive social and economic development, such as action plans that mainstream, in an integrated manner, the principle of leaving no one behind in public policies and reform measures, placing emphasis on targeted measures which support those who are furthest behind and promote human rights, gender equality and social inclusion.)</i></p>
<p>6.3 Has the government put mechanisms in place to promote stakeholder engagement in policy coherence for sustainable development at various levels of governance, to advance best practice and encourage peer learning?</p> <p><i>For example, engagement through global or national campaigns, policy</i></p>	<p>There are no mechanisms in place, and there are no formal plans or actions to develop them.</p>	<p>There are no mechanisms in place; however, there are formal plans to develop them, or they are currently under development.</p>	<p>The government has in place mechanisms for collaboration with various stakeholders on initiatives to raise public awareness, mobilise support, and advocate for policy coherence for sustainable development at various levels of governance, but these have not been implemented.</p> <p><i>(e.g. These initiatives have not been rolled out to the public due to factors such as a lack of</i></p>	<p>The government has in place mechanisms for collaboration with various stakeholders on initiatives to raise public awareness, mobilise support, and advocate for policy coherence for sustainable development at various levels of governance, but these have only been partially implemented.</p> <p><i>(e.g. Several factors can limit implementation. These could</i></p>	<p>The government has worked with various stakeholders on initiatives to raise public awareness, mobilise support, and advocate for policy coherence for sustainable development at various levels of governance. These mechanisms have been fully implemented, covering all relevant aspects of governance.</p> <p><i>(e.g. The government has worked with stakeholders to</i></p>

<p><i>dialogues, intergovernmental processes, capacity building initiatives, and societal mobilisation.</i></p>	<p><i>political will, insufficient resources, normative gaps and inadequate engagement.)</i></p>	<p><i>such as insufficient political will, normative gaps and inadequate stakeholder engagement.)</i></p>	<p><i>support their engagement in a wide range of initiatives on sustainable development issues. Specific campaigns have been designed and delivered to build consensus on priorities for enhancing policy coherence for sustainable development and they have been promoted in international settings to advance best practice and encourage peer learning.)</i></p>
---	--	---	---

Theme 7: Impact Assessment

- The government has developed mechanisms or tools to conduct regular policy impact assessments to identify any positive and negative impacts on sustainable development. These mechanisms have been fully implemented, covering all relevant aspects of governance.
- The government has established ex-ante and ex-post policy impact assessments that consider transboundary impacts. These mechanisms have been fully implemented, covering all relevant aspects of governance.
- The government has mechanisms in place to provide capacity building for the public service to collect and analyze evidence on how different policies, laws or regulations impact sustainable development, and these initiatives have been fully implemented and rolled out to civil servants.

Rationale: The seventh theme assesses whether governments employ mechanisms and tools to systematically assess the impacts of policies in advancing sustainable development, both ex-ante and ex-post. The processes of policy making and advancing PCSD are inherently dynamic. The introduction of regular impact assessments is vital to systematically evaluate the full policy cycle and identify potential positive and negative effects across sectors and the dimensions of sustainable development. Considerations of international spillovers and other transboundary effects is a key element of such assessments. In advancing PCSD, it is necessary to assess and mitigate negative social, gender and environmental impacts, while promoting and protecting human rights. Strengthening analytical capacity within the public service ensures that decision-making processes are evidence-based, enhancing accountability, and creating positive feedback loops for policy design and implementation.

Source/means of verification: For example, established tools such as cost-benefit analysis, indicator frameworks for tracking policy effectiveness, transboundary impact assessments, multistakeholder consultations, indicator frameworks or other tools such as Regulatory, Environmental, Gender and Social Impact, and Strategic Assessments are regularly used across government sectors to evaluate and align policies with sustainable development objectives, including their transboundary impacts; or trainings designed to allow civil servants to strategically address positive and negative impacts of policies, laws or regulations on sustainable development.

Table 9. Scoring Guidance for Theme 7 “Impact Assessment”, including examples

Question	Not in place (0)	Under development (1)	In place, not implemented (2)	In place, partially implemented (3)	In place, fully implemented (4)
<p>7.1 Does the government have any mechanisms or tools in place to conduct regular policy impact assessments to identify any positive and negative impacts on sustainable development?</p> <p><i>For example, established tools such as cost-benefit analysis, indicator frameworks for tracking policy effectiveness, or other tools such as Regulatory, Environmental, Gender and Social Impact, and Strategic Assessments are regularly used across government sectors to evaluate and align policies with sustainable development objectives.</i></p>	<p>There are no mechanisms or tools in place, and there are no formal plans or actions to develop them.</p>	<p>There are no mechanisms or tools in place; however, there are formal plans to develop them, or they are currently under development.</p>	<p>The government has developed mechanisms or tools to conduct regular policy impact assessments to identify any positive and negative impacts on sustainable development, but these are not implemented.</p> <p><i>(e.g. These mechanisms or tools are not used to inform decision-making in the policy and planning process due to limited capacity, resources, or training, normative gaps.)</i></p>	<p>The government has developed mechanisms or tools to conduct regular policy impact assessments to identify any positive and negative impacts on sustainable development, but these are only partially implemented.</p> <p><i>(Several challenges could be hindering the full implementation. These could include limited capacity, resources, or training, normative gaps.)</i></p>	<p>The government has developed mechanisms or tools to conduct regular policy impact assessments to identify any positive and negative impacts on sustainable development. These mechanisms have been fully implemented, covering all relevant aspects of governance.</p> <p><i>(e.g. The government has integrated principles of sustainable development into Regulatory Impact Assessments, and made these mandatory for legislative proposal by ministries. Available data is used to measure impact and 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. Sufficient technical capacity and methodological skills have been built to facilitate the use of these impact assessment tools.</i></p>
<p>7.2 Has the government established ex-ante and ex-post policy impact assessments that consider transboundary impacts?</p>	<p>There are no ex-ante and ex-post policy impact assessments in place, and there are no</p>	<p>There are no ex-ante and ex-post policy impact assessments in place; however, there are formal plans to develop them, or they are currently under development.</p>	<p>The government has established ex-ante and ex-post policy impact assessments that consider transboundary impacts, but these are not implemented.</p>	<p>The government has established ex-ante and ex-post policy impact assessments that consider transboundary impacts, but these are only partially implemented.</p>	<p>The government has established ex-ante and ex-post policy impact assessments that consider transboundary impacts. These mechanisms have been fully implemented, covering all relevant aspects of</p>

<p><i>For example, established tools such as cost-benefit analysis, transboundary impact assessments, multistakeholder consultations, indicator frameworks or other tools are regularly used across government sectors to evaluate the transboundary impacts of policies on sustainable development.</i></p>	<p>formal plans or actions to develop them.</p>		<p><i>(e.g. These mechanisms or tools are not used to inform decision-making in the policy and planning process due to limited capacity, resources, or training or normative gaps.)</i></p>	<p><i>(e.g. Several challenges could be hindering the full implementation. These could include limited capacity, resources, or training or normative gaps.)</i></p>	<p>governance.</p> <p><i>(e.g. Established tools such as transboundary impact assessments, spillover analysis frameworks, or multi-stakeholder consultations are used to regularly assess international implications of government policies. There is effective use of these mechanisms to facilitate informed decision-making in the policy and planning process.)</i></p>
<p>7.3 Does the government have any mechanisms in place to build capacity in the public service to collect and analyse evidence on how different policies, laws or regulations impact sustainable development?</p> <p><i>For example, training designed to allow civil servants to strategically address positive and negative impacts of policies, laws or regulations on sustainable development.</i></p>	<p>There are no mechanisms in place, and there are no formal plans or actions to develop them.</p>	<p>There are no mechanisms in place; however, there are formal plans to develop them, or they are currently under development.</p>	<p>The government has mechanisms in place to provide capacity building for the public service to collect and analyse evidence on how different policies, laws or regulations impact sustainable development, but these mechanisms have not been implemented and rolled out to civil servants.</p> <p><i>(e.g. These initiatives have not been rolled out due to factors such as a lack of political will, insufficient resources, normative gaps and inadequate engagement.)</i></p>	<p>The government has mechanisms in place to provide capacity building for the public service to collect and analyse evidence on how different policies, laws or regulations impact sustainable development, but these mechanisms have only been partially implemented and rolled out to civil servants.</p> <p><i>(e.g. Several challenges could be hindering the full implementation. These could include resource constraints or insufficient political will.)</i></p>	<p>The government has mechanisms in place to provide capacity building for the public service to collect and analyse evidence on how different policies, laws or regulations impact sustainable development, and these initiatives have been fully implemented and rolled out to civil servants.</p> <p><i>(e.g. Training designed to allow civil servants to strategically address positive and negative impacts of policies on sustainable development, rolled out to all relevant staff. Competency frameworks have been developed to identify and strengthen the right skills of public servants, to make civil servants fit to deliver on national objectives on sustainable development.)</i></p>

Theme 8: Monitoring, Evaluation, and Reporting

- The information management systems or similar mechanisms exist, and the government has identified data, indicators and (or) other information to monitor transboundary impacts. These mechanisms have been fully implemented, covering all relevant aspects of governance.
- The mechanisms for regular and transparent reporting to relevant national bodies are in place. These mechanisms have been fully implemented, covering all relevant aspects of governance.
- The mechanisms are in place for the evaluation of PCSD, including synergies and potential trade-offs between sectoral policies and they are fully implemented to ensure that findings are used to inform decision making and adaptive action is taken.

Rationale: The eighth theme assesses whether countries have mechanisms in place to systematically monitor, evaluate and report on cross-sectoral policies and their impacts to advance sustainable development across all its dimensions. Monitoring, evaluation, and reporting systems are essential for tracking progress on PCSD and ensuring accountability. Centralized information management systems support governments with gathering reliable and comparable data, including on transboundary impacts, and make such information accessible to decision-makers and public stakeholders across whole-of-society. Regular reporting to parliaments, ministries, and other oversight bodies fosters transparency and strengthens trust in government action. Systematic evaluation of findings and their integration into the policy cycle allow governments to adapt strategies, address shortcomings, and scale up good practices. Robust mechanisms in this theme establish an evidence-based feedback system that supports continuous improvement in designing policies for the implementation of the SDGs, through policy coherence.

Source/means of verification: For example, Systems for centralizing existing reliable data, indicators, and information to monitor economic, social, and environmental externalities imposed beyond national borders (transboundary impacts); regular reports to the parliament, ministerial or other bodies about progress on policy coherence, including through Voluntary National Reviews (VNRs); or evaluation systems that systematically assess the coherence of policies with different sectoral priorities and policies, providing actionable insights for policymakers.

Table 10. Scoring Guidance for Theme 8 “Monitoring, Evaluation, and Reporting”, including examples

Question	Not in place (0)	Under development (1)	In place, not implemented (2)	In place, partially implemented (3)	In place, fully implemented (4)
8.1 Does the government have any information management systems or similar mechanisms in place to coherently identify and centralise data, indicators and (or) other information	There are no information management systems or similar mechanisms in place, and there are no formal	There are no information management systems or similar mechanisms in place; however , there are formal plans to develop them, or they are currently under development.	The information management systems or similar mechanisms exist, and the government has identified and centralised data, indicators and (or) other information to monitor progress on sustainable development, but has not yet fully implemented	The information management systems or similar mechanisms exist, and the government has identified and centralised data, indicators and (or) other information to monitor progress on sustainable development, but has only partially implemented	The information management systems or similar mechanisms exist, and the government has identified data, indicators and (or) other information to monitor transboundary impacts. These mechanisms have been fully implemented, covering all

<p>for monitoring progress on sustainable development?</p> <p><i>For example, centralising existing reliable data, indicators, and information to monitor economic, social, and environmental externalities imposed beyond national borders (transboundary impacts).</i></p>	<p>plans or actions to develop them.</p>	<p>these.</p> <p><i>(e.g. The indicators have not yet been populated with up-to-date data, or have not been made widely available to civil servants; normative gaps persists; or the systems or mechanisms are not yet operational.)</i></p>	<p>these.</p> <p><i>(e.g. Some factors may be preventing full implementation. These could include a lack of data or indicators, or a lack of awareness of or training to allow civil servants to access the system, normative gaps persists; or the systems or mechanisms are not yet fully operational.)</i></p>	<p>relevant aspects of governance.</p> <p><i>(e.g. The government has identified reliable and timely data and indicators to effectively monitor progress on sustainable development. Information management systems or their mechanisms are in place and they facilitate the public availability, accessibility and comparability of centralised and harmonised data on sustainable development. This may include indicators used to monitor trends in based on income and resources flows that impact the well-being of people in other countries. For example, on trade and aid (Official Development Assistance, remittances, imports of goods) and environment and resources (fossil fuel imports, imports of metals, greenhouse gas footprints).)</i></p>	
<p>8.2 Does the government have mechanisms in place to provide regular and transparent reporting to relevant national bodies (e.g. Parliament, ministerial or other bodies) on progress on PCSD?</p> <p><i>For example, regular reports to the parliament, ministerial or other bodies about progress on PCSD. Information on progress can also be included in VNRs and</i></p>	<p>There are no mechanisms in place, and there are no formal plans or actions to develop them.</p>	<p>There are no mechanisms in place; however, there are formal plans to develop them, or there are currently under development.</p>	<p>The mechanisms for regular and transparent reporting to relevant national bodies are in place, but are not implemented.</p> <p><i>(e.g. Information is not reported due to lengthy bureaucratic processes or a lack of sufficient data collection, normative gaps.)</i></p>	<p>The mechanisms for regular and transparent reporting to relevant national bodies are in place, but are only partially implemented.</p> <p><i>(Several challenges could be hindering the full implementation. These could include the administrative burden or a lack of regular data collection, normative gaps.)</i></p>	<p>The mechanisms for regular and transparent reporting to relevant national bodies are in place. These mechanisms have been fully implemented, covering all relevant aspects of governance.</p> <p><i>(e.g. Reports for parliament, ministerial or other bodies and the wider public about progress on PCSD are regularly published, outlining progress made on the achievement of policy priorities and on how policies are being implemented regarding sustainable development</i></p>

<i>in reporting on development co-operation activities.</i>						<i>issues.)</i>
<p>8.3 Does the government have mechanisms in place to ensure that findings on PCSD are regularly evaluated and used to take adaptive action, including with regards to synergies and potential trade-offs between sectoral policies?</p> <p><i>For example, evaluation systems systematically assess the coherence of policies with different sectoral priorities and policies, providing actionable insights for policymakers.</i></p>	There are no mechanisms in place, and there are no formal plans or actions to develop them.	There are no mechanisms in place; however , there are formal plans to develop them, or they are currently under development.	<p>The mechanisms are in place for the evaluation of PCSD, including synergies and potential trade-offs between sectoral policies, but they are not implemented and used to inform decision making.</p> <p><i>(e.g. These evaluation systems are not applied due to their administrative burden, a lack of data, or their findings are not reported to decision-makers, normative gaps persist, or the mechanisms are not yet used to take adaptive action.)</i></p>	<p>The mechanisms are in place for the evaluation of PCSD, including synergies and potential trade-offs between sectoral policies, but they are only partially implemented and used to inform decision making and ensure that adaptive action is taken.</p> <p><i>(Several challenges could be hindering the full implementation. These could include the administrative burden, limited technical capacity or a lack of data, normative gaps persist, or the mechanisms are not yet fully used to take adaptive action</i></p>	<p>The mechanisms are in place for the evaluation of PCSD, including synergies and potential trade-offs between sectoral policies and they are fully implemented to ensure that findings are used to inform decision making and adaptive action is taken.</p> <p><i>(e.g. These evaluation systems are used systematically to inform decision makers, as a fixed part of the policy cycle supported by sufficient data and capacity and normative provisions.)</i></p>	