Training Toolkit on Effective National to Local Public Governance for SDG Implementation
Institutional Arrangements

Module 2.2
Learning Outcomes

- Understanding the importance of institutional arrangements for SDGs implementation
- Understanding how institutional arrangements can be strengthened
- Learn about different types of institutional arrangements
- Identify approaches horizontal and vertical coordination
- Increased understanding of cross-sectoral coordination
I. Institutional Arrangements for the Implementation of the 2030 Agenda

“Institutional arrangements are the policies, systems, and processes that organizations use to legislate, plan and manage their activities efficiently and to effectively coordinate with others in order to fulfill their mandate.”

UNDP, 2009

Institutional arrangements for implementing the SDGs refers to:

- Integrating the SDGs into national government
- Mobilizing civil society and the private sector
- Engaging local authorities
- Monitoring and review
- Public service and public administration
I. Institutional Arrangements for the Implementation of the 2030 Agenda (Cont.)

Institutional arrangements are key for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda because...........

Calls for rethinking governmental strategies and for applying different approaches to governance

Requires strong collaboration among all parts of government, along with institutions, the business sector and the CSOs

Require a special focus on budgeting and financing to ensure an effective implementation of the SDGs

Integration and coordination among different levels of Government and institutions remain cumbersome

Leaving no one behind (LNOB) necessitates a whole of government and a whole of society approach
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- Emphasis on coherence, integration, coordination and multi-sectoral involvement
- High-level political support to mobilize and coordinate public institutions and policies
- Involvement of key line ministries with sufficient political power
- Critical role of Parliament in SDG implementation through their oversight
- Solid collaboration, and coordination across sectors and institutions
- Fostering integration promotes strong cooperation among institutions at all levels and engagement of non-state stakeholders in the decision making

Important features of institutional arrangements:

- Integrated policymaking necessitates establishing vertical and horizontal coherence
I. Institutional Arrangements for the Implementation of the 2030 Agenda (Cont.)

Challenges

Insufficient synergy, communication and coordination between the different ministries, agencies and other sectors that deal with sustainable development

Fragmentation of mandates and responsibilities for implementation, including subnational and local government action

Accommodating new institutional arrangements will imply additional costs and human resources on the government

What are the challenges related to institutional arrangement in your country?
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**Institutional and Coordination Modalities**

01. There is no single model

02. Establishing new institutional mechanisms and coordination structures for SDG implementation

03. Adapting existing institutional frameworks for SDG implementation

04. Establishment of entities within the office of the Head of State or Government

05. Engagement of local authorities in SDG implementation

06. Parliamentary engagement around the SDGs
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National institutional arrangements to coordinate and lead SDG implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type 1</th>
<th>Inter-ministerial entity with Head of State or Government leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tanzania (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type 2</th>
<th>Inter-ministerial entity with ministry leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Azerbaijan, Croatia, Iceland, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Mauritania, Mongolia, Oman, Republic of Congo, South Africa, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Timor Leste (12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type 3</th>
<th>Head of State or Government Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vanuatu (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cambodia, Cameroon, Indonesia, Côte d’Ivoire, Eswatini, Guyana, Liechtenstein, Mauritius, New Zealand, UK, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Philippines (13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type 4</th>
<th>Specific Ministry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turkey, Tonga (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UN DESA, 2019
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Institutional and Coordination Modalities

Case of Sierra Leone

National strategies

National institutional arrangements

Local authorities

Parliament

Civil society and the private sector

Engaging supreme audit institutions
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Country case in establishing new institutional mechanisms for SDG implementation

Institutional structure for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda in Colombia

Source: UNDP, 2017
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Short Discussion

Is there a key institution/body officially designated to oversee the implementation of the SDGs?

Is the institution/body strongly supported by the highest levels of government (office of the president or prime minister)? Is this commitment effectively communicated throughout the government machinery?

Does the key institution/body responsible have a clear mandate to oversee and coordinate SDG implementation?

Does the key institution/body responsible have a sustainable development roadmap or strategy in place with clearly defined roles and targets?
II. Horizontal Coordination Mechanisms for Institutional Arrangements

- Fragmentation and narrow perspectives caused by organizational silos in government
- Challenges arise from disincentives to policy integration from the perspective of sectoral actors
- Without effective horizontal coordination, the integrated approach of the Goals cannot be taken

The following institutional arrangements among central authorities at the national level may be considered:

- A management committee could be established at the level of executive head of the Government
- For real coordination at the working level, a second committee should be established among the sectoral bodies
- Horizontal coordination will additionally require cross sectoral project management
- Horizontal coordination must be supported by budgetary inducements
II. Horizontal Coordination Mechanisms for Institutional Arrangements (Cont.)

Important Tools for Coordination

- Budget
- Coordinating organization
- Performance review
- Personnel management
- Task allocation
- Digital technologies and online platform
- Legislation
- Stakeholder engagement
- Communicating Strategy/Progress
- Implementing and monitoring to check the progress
III. Vertical Coordination & its Mechanisms

Vertical coordination arrangements should be in place to allow for policy integration among national, regional and local governments.

- Even highly developed horizontal integration mechanisms at the national level will not be enough to ensure awareness and coherence on their own.

- Subnational levels of government are closer to citizens and often have a better understanding of their needs and particularities.

Vertical coordination institutional arrangements for the SDGs should:

- Promote local ownership, community involvement, local leadership and joint decision making at the local level.
- Use local resources and skills and maximize opportunities for development.
- Involve local, national and international partnerships between communities, businesses and government to solve problems.
- Rely on flexible approaches to respond to changing circumstances at the local, national and international levels.
- Empower disadvantaged people and marginalized communities and geographical regions to enable them to participate fully in the economic life of the country.
III. Vertical Coordination & its Mechanisms (Cont.)

Linkages between national and sub-national levels for SDG implementation

Source: World Public Sector Report, 2018
III. Vertical Coordination & its Mechanisms (Cont.)

- Engagement of local government head in the national policy making from the starting phase
- Coordination mechanisms
- Swift feedback
- Monitoring of the results
- Budget allocation
- Digital tools to support the coordination, implementation and monitoring
III. Vertical Coordination & its Mechanisms (Cont.)

Tools for Vertical Integration in SDG Implementation

Five essential steps of policy making

- 01 Leadership
- 02 Laws and regulations
- 03 Planning
- 04 Implementation
- 05 Monitoring

Three broad categories

- 01 National Level
- 02 Sub-national level
- 03 Multi-level

Source: World Public Sector Report, 2018
Examples of Vertical Coordination

Australia has taken the opportunity offered by the voluntary national review to encourage the participation and engagement of subnational level of Governments.

Bhutan’s 12th Five Year Plan (FYP) emphasizes the importance of coordination, consolidation, and cooperation (Triple C) among different stakeholders and levels of governance. Local Governments are involved in the formulation of the 12th FYP programmes to ensure integration of the Sustainable Development Goals into the Agency and Local Government Key Result Areas.

The national Government of Lao PDR is working towards strengthening collaboration with local administrations to assess progress against the National Socio-Economic Development Plan (NSEDP) and the Sustainable Development Goals, focusing on public service improvement, participation, rule of law and sound financial management.

In Viet Nam, Ministry of Planning and Investment as the leading agency for the Sustainable Development Goals, also engages with multiple layers of governance, through the assigned focal points for the 2030 Agenda at the planning and financing departments of other ministries and related agencies, and the Provincial Departments of Planning and Investment (DPI).
To facilitate integration and coherence for SDG implementation, the government has established SDG Support Units at the federal and provincial levels with UN assistance and has created the SDG Secretariat within Parliament.

At the provincial level specifically, the government has begun integrating SDGs, including establishing approaches for the analysis of annual development plans to identify gaps in progress and financial allocations.
Multi-tier institutional coordination mechanism

- Indonesia – SDGs National Coordination Team, comprising the Steering Committee, Implementing Team, Technical Working Group, and Expert Team.
- The National Coordination Team is chaired by the President.
- Minister of National Development Planning is the Coordinator of SDGs tasked with coordinating planning, implementation, monitoring, evaluation, reporting at the national and regional level, as well as funding sources from the government and other legal and non-binding sources.


Establishing Institutional Mechanism

Organizational structure for SDG coordination in Indonesia

Source: Source: Appendix to the Presidential Decree No. 59 (2017).
Examples of Horizontal & Vertical Coordination - Jamaica – Alignment of Planning Mechanisms
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Short Discussion on Horizontal and Vertical Coordination

Does the institution/body have a coordination mechanism in place to foster horizontal coordination across sectors?

Does the institution/body have a coordination mechanism in place to foster vertical coordination across government levels?

Is there participation of the local level in national processes, policies, strategies, reporting and planning?

Is there a clear framework for assigning and delegating responsibilities and commensurate resources from the national level to the local level and from the local level to the provincial level and for establishing participatory monitoring systems for resource use?

Does the local government have adequate skills and capacity to support active community involvement in planning, decision-making and service delivery?

Does the local government have adequate capacity for data collection and analysis to enhance monitoring, reporting and decision-making? In this regard, is there a system to inform national government analysis and decision-making?

Is there adequate capacity to undertake participatory and integrated planning?

Is there strong institutional commitment within each of the sectors?
### IV. Multi-stakeholder Approaches

Successful implementation of the SDGs requires the engagement of many stakeholders, encompassing government and non-government actors. A more sophisticated alternative to basic consultation is the institutionalization of multi-stakeholder bodies in which key stakeholders are represented.

- **Ensuring public involvement through institutional arrangements can strengthen the position of the political leadership** vis-à-vis influential sectoral interests.
- Another option entails a network-like structure with a lesser degree of institutionalization.
- Several ways of promoting dialogue between multi-stakeholders such as conducting stakeholder consultations.
- Beneficial to institutionalize partnerships with individual stakeholders or groups of stakeholders who can make key contributions to the achievement of the Goals.
### IV. Multi-stakeholder Approaches (Cont.)

#### Challenges and opportunities in working with government actors and non-government actors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actors</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head of State’s Office</td>
<td>• Has numerous priorities to deal with</td>
<td>• Turn this actor into an SDG champion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• May face conflicting interests</td>
<td>• Have it take a leading role in coordinating the implementation of the SDGs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliament</td>
<td>• Often not involved in all stages of national development planning</td>
<td>• Leverage its legislative role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• May have limited awareness of SDGs</td>
<td>• Foster its advocacy role, especially for budgeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• May face conflicting interests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial system</td>
<td>• May have limited awareness of SDGs</td>
<td>• Develop synergies with laws related to good governance as well as those necessary for the achievement of the SDGs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enforcement of laws may be lacking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• May face conflicting interests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and planning bodies</td>
<td>• Linkages with sector ministries and subnational bodies may be weak</td>
<td>• Turn these bodies into SDG champions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Addressing all three dimensions of SD may not be seen as a priority</td>
<td>• Have them play a key role in coordinating SDG implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop synergies with revenue collection measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector ministries &amp;</td>
<td>• May have weak capacities</td>
<td>• Support them in fulfilling their roles in DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subnational bodies</td>
<td>• Lack of funding</td>
<td>• Encourage them to integrate SD objectives into plans/budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some sector ministries are not well-connected DP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### IV. Multi-stakeholder Approaches (Cont.)

#### Challenges and opportunities in working with government actors and non-government actors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actors</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **National statistics office**  | • Data collection and management often weak  
                                  • Data not generally captured by regular surveys  
                                  • Capacity to produce policy-relevant information may be weak                | • Increase investments in data and national statistical systems  
                                  • Build statistical capacity to monitor the SDGs                              |
| **CSOs**                        | • Capacities may be weak, especially with respect to engagement in national development planning  
                                  • Often not involved in all stages of development planning                   | • Engage them as SDG Champions  
                                  • Involve them in all stages of DP  
                                  • Encourage them in their watchdog role  
                                  • Foster their role in information collection                                |
| **Business and industry**       | • May perceive SD as a barrier to their activities  
                                  • Often not involved in development planning                                  | • Mitigate the effect of their activities  
                                  • Provide effective and innovative solutions  
                                  • Make use of this major source for financing the SDGs                        |
| **Academic and research institutions** | • May be disconnected from the DP process  
                                      • Capacity to produce policy-relevant information may be weak                  | • Leverage their innovative ideas  
                                      • Work with them to enhance the science policy link to find sustainable solutions to development problems |
| **Media**                       | • May lack knowledge of and attention to sustainable development issues  
                                  • May lack freedom of expression                                               | • Make use of their role in shaping the opinions of decision-makers and the general public  
                                  • Work with them to encourage public involvement                              |
## V. Institutional Principles of SDG 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Dimension</th>
<th>Access to information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Inputs and processes** | • Adoption of access to information laws and creation of related institutions  
• Adaptation of organizations to meet the requirement of access to information laws, including resources and capacity building |
| **Outputs** | • Number of requests made to public institutions  
• Outcomes of the requests for information  
• Measures of compliance with the law for different institutions |
| **Outcomes** | • Volume of information disclosed  
• Use of information made by requesters  
• Changes in public officials’ and public agencies’ behaviors |
| **Impacts** | • Do citizens feel empowered to request information from the government?  
• Has information contributed to improved public debate?  
• Has information contributed to enhanced public sector accountability?  
• Has information contributed to better public services, enhanced the effectiveness of public institutions? |
## V. Institutional Principles of SDG 16 (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Dimension</th>
<th>Transparency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Inputs and processes** | • National OGD initiatives  
• Adoption of legal framework mandating or encouraging disclosure (targeted or not) |
| **Outputs** | • Information produced and published by government agencies  
• Measures of compliance with the law |
| **Outcomes** | • What type of information is more (less) available than in the past?  
• Changes in perceptions of transparency |
| **Impacts** | • Is the information published through OGD initiatives and mandated disclosure relevant and useful to citizens, NGOs and firms?  
• Has disclosure contributed to improved public services?  
• Has information disclosure contributed to better government accountability? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Dimension</th>
<th>Inclusive and participatory decision-making</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Inputs and processes** | • Changes in legal framework with respect to participation  
                         • Creation of participatory channels and mechanisms  
                         • Organizational change to accommodate and manage participatory mechanisms in public institutions |
| **Outputs**              | • Number of participatory events and channels created  
                         • Number of people from different social groups who engage in participatory mechanisms |
| **Outcomes**             | • How has participation impacted decision-making and resource allocation?  
                         • Has participation contributed to more responsive and higher quality public services?  
                         • Have public officials’ behavior changed in the way they interface with citizens?  
                         • Changes in citizen’s perceptions of participation, empowerment |
| **Impacts**              | • How significant is the civic space for participatory processes?  
                         • How are participatory processes changing social dynamics, including civic engagement?  
                         • How are power relations affected by participatory processes?  
                         • Have participatory processes contributed to enhance trust in government? |
### V. Institutional Principles of SDG 16 (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Dimension</th>
<th>Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Inputs and processes** | • Constitutional or legal provisions for government accountability  
                             • Charters for civil service  
                             • Organizational processes for accountability (e.g. performance processes) |
| **Outputs**             | • Compliance with formal processes for government reporting and oversight  
                             • Implementation of civil service accountability related measures |
| **Outcomes**            | • Outcomes of formal oversight processes, including possible sanctions  
                             • Outcomes of internal accountability mechanisms in public agencies |
| **Impacts**             | • Are institutional checks and balances more robust?  
                             • How have work ethics and motivation changed in the public service?  
                             • Are civil servants more responsive to the public? |
### V. Institutional Principles of SDG 16 (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Dimension</th>
<th>Anti-corruption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Inputs and processes** | • Adoption of anticorruption laws and creation of related institutions  
                          • Training and capacity building in public institutions |
| **Outputs**              | • Number of corruption cases brought to justice, to public knowledge  
                          • Financial amount exposed or recovered |
| **Outcomes**             | • Sanctions taken against corrupt officials  
                          • Amounts of public funds recovered  
                          • Changes in administrative processes  
                          • Changes in perception of corruption |
| **Impacts**              | • How have channels and mechanisms of corruption morphed in reaction to legal and institutional changes?  
                          • Have different actors (public officials, firms, citizens) changed their behaviors? |
### V. Institutional Principles of SDG 16 (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Dimension</th>
<th>Non-discrimination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Inputs and processes** | • Adoption of antidiscrimination laws and regulations and related institutions  
                       • Universal civil registration  
                       • Training and capacity building in public institutions |
| **Outputs**             | • Number of cases brought to justice or public administration  
                       • Outcomes of legal cases  
                       • Measures of compliance with the law |
| **Outcomes**            | • How have outcomes changed for groups that are often discriminated against?  
                       • How has the jurisprudence evolved overtime? |
| **Impacts**             | • Are traditionally discriminated groups empowered?  
                       • How are tolerance and sectional divides changing in society as a whole overtime? |
## VI. Institutional and Coordination Mechanisms for Monitoring SDG Progress

### Challenges in Monitoring and Reporting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lack of communication and coordination</th>
<th>Lack coordination among national data producers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>within National Statistical Systems (NSS) in many countries, and between the NSS and international agencies, complicates reliable data availability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommendations to improve coordination for monitoring and reporting

- Coordinating bodies on SDG indicators be established or reinforced
- Foster broad, multi-stakeholder participation in national monitoring and reporting
- Governments must be committed to the improvement of their NSSs
- Periodic monitoring is vital.
- Inclusive and participatory consultations, although challenging, should be undertaken
- Securing high-level political ownership to ensure collaboration between data-producing government institutions is important
VII. Digital Government in Institutional Arrangements

Failures of governments to make the transition to the new digital environment can have important consequences.

Strategies for effective digital government need to reflect public expectations.

Digital government institutional framework has become a public sector innovation driver and accelerator.
VII. Digital Government in Institutional Arrangements (Cont.)

Dimensions of Digital Government

- Government as a platform
- Digital by design
- Open by default
- User driven
- Data-driven public sector
- Proactive

Source: OECD 2019 Open useful reusable data (ourdata) index © OECD 2020
**Promoting Digital Transformation in Public-sector Institutions: Costa Rica**

**Initiative:** The Single Digital Health File (EDUS)

**Institution:** Caja Costarricense de Seguro Social (CCSS), Costa Rica

**Problem:** Medical records of the Costa Ricans were not easily accessible or transferable between different offices and regions, impeding the quality of healthcare patients received.

**Solution:** The Single Digital Health File (EDUS) consists of a set of applications and services that allows the automation of health processes. Using the EDUS, health professionals of the CCSS can review patients’ health record from any medical establishment and throughout its network of services. It facilitates better clinical decision making and quality control. The access to clinical information available in real time and the implementation of clinical protocols for the medical care guarantee the standardization of the processes. The system also employs mobile messaging features to directly communicate with people using EDUS.

**Impact:** The initiative is used in 1,047 Basic Teams of Integral Health Care (Primary Care Establishments) of the Costa Rican Social Security Fund in the 7 provinces.

### Group Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is there a mechanism within the institutional framework to include the CSO and private sectors?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the institutional mechanism ensure that women and men have equal access to decision-making processes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are particular groups (women, youth, people with disabilities, indigenous peoples, minorities, etc.) legally or practically excluded from decision-making processes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which 3 actions could your organization take as a priority to improve institutional arrangements for SDG implementation in your country context? Please think from the perspective of horizontal and vertical institutional arrangements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VIII. Key Takeaways

**Sound and Resilient Institutional Foundations**
- A government that is resource-efficient with sound public financial management
- A government that is representative, builds consensus and is participatory and inclusive
- A civil service that is effective and capable
- Institutions grounded in the rule of law

**Mechanisms for National Ownership and Multi-Stakeholder Engagement**
- Formal national multi-stakeholder council or advisory body, e.g., a National Council for Sustainable Development, National Advisory Group, etc., including a dedicated Secretariat or support unit within the planning department

**Mechanisms for Institutional Coordination and Implementation**
- A multi-tiered governance structure
- Interministerial Planning Commission/Committee and Other Institutional Mechanisms

**Mechanisms for Monitoring and Review**
- An agreed development strategy
- A capable and well-resourced National Statistical Office
- National Sustainable Development Indicator Framework and Information System
- National Sustainable Development Reports
- Review mechanism
- Authoritative, independent body for reporting and review
To learn more about Institutional Arrangements, please access the following toolkit.
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