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• Initiated at Rio+20 in 2012, core partnership 11 leading international research institutes & think tanks (6 ”South”, 5 ”North”)

• Aim to build support for a universal, integrated and transformative post-2015 development agenda with sustainability and equity at the center

• Strategic engagement with key stakeholders and decision makers

• Provision of practical, evidence-based analysis and guidance
REVIEW OF TARGETS FOR THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS: THE SCIENCE PERSPECTIVE
ICSU report on the issue of coherence and interactions

• Clear integration of social-env-economic dimensions / access-efficiency-sustainability across goal areas

• Lack of clarity how goals interact – i.e. a multidimensional concept of development and its core drivers and elements

• Lack of articulation of joint / nexus targets eg through “modular approach”

• Vague attempt at formulating essential elements unlikely to enhance coherence.
Policy Coherence for Sustainable Development in the Post-2015 Context

From MDGs to SDGs
From ODA agenda to a universal agenda
From PCD to PCSD

Figure 4. Five complementary levels of coherence for implementing the Post-2015 Agenda

1. Coherence among international agendas and processes
   MDGs; Rio+20 SDGs; Climate Change Agenda, G20
   Coherence between economic; social and environmental policies
   For more integrated approaches to sustainability

2. Coherence between global goals and national contexts
   Universal Agenda

3. Coherence between different sources of finance
   Public, private, international and domestic

4. Coherence between diverse actions of multiple actors and stakeholders
   Governments, international and regional organisations, CSOs; private sector

5. PCSD

Policies for Sustainable Development

- Foster synergies across economic, social and environmental policy areas
- Identify trade-offs and reconcile domestic policy objectives with internationally agreed objectives
- Address the spillovers of domestic policies

SEI Stockholm Environment Institute
Vertical and horizontal coherence
PCSD is addressing coherence across governance systems

6. Coherence across public interventions ??
Capacity building, institutions, policy instruments
Different interactions on a coherence scale

• Interdependence
  – A target is only viable if another is achieved
• Reinforcement / synergy
  – Achieving one target helps achieve another
• Consistency
  – There is no critical positive or negative interaction but it is compatible
• Conditionality
  – A target impose conditions or constraints on how another can be reached
• Inconsistency / trade off
  – Achieving one target will work against another target
Mapping interactions between targets

Formulating nexus targets
A simplified coherence assessment process

1. Policy inventory
   • Policy objectives
   • Policy Instruments
   • Implementation practices

2. Screening matrix
   • Interaction type
   • Evidence base
   • Conditionality

3. Summary assessment & Follow up
   • Scoring and reporting
   • Opportunities for synergy
   • Mitigation options
## A coherence assessment matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Energy security policy</th>
<th>Climate mitigation policy</th>
<th>EU-ETS</th>
<th>Increasing renewables</th>
<th>Improving energy efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversification of energy suppliers and supply routes</td>
<td>Neighbourhood policy, new gas infrastructure (pipelines and LNG terminals)</td>
<td>coherent</td>
<td>inconsistent</td>
<td>consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency stocks</td>
<td>Oil and petroleum products strategic reserves</td>
<td>inconsistent</td>
<td>consistent</td>
<td>consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive energy markets</td>
<td>Market integration for power and gas</td>
<td>coherent</td>
<td>consistent</td>
<td>consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure redundancies and resilient design</td>
<td>New power infrastructure (notably interconnections),</td>
<td>consistent</td>
<td>coherent</td>
<td>coherent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Strambo, C; Nilsson M; and Månsson, A. 2015, *Are EU energy security and climate change policies coherent? A rapid assessment of policy interactions, in press*
Table 3. Illustrative screening matrix for cohesion policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
<th>C4</th>
<th>N1</th>
<th>N2</th>
<th>N3</th>
<th>N4</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>R3</th>
<th>R4</th>
<th>H1</th>
<th>H2</th>
<th>H3</th>
<th>H4</th>
<th>H5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2/+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1/+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1/0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2/+1</td>
<td>-2/+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2/+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2/+2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2/+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1/1</td>
<td>+1/+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>0/+1</td>
<td>-1/+1</td>
<td>0/+1</td>
<td>-1/+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>0/+1</td>
<td>0/+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0/+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1/+2</td>
<td>-1/+2</td>
<td>-1/+2</td>
<td>-1/+2</td>
<td>-1/+2</td>
<td>-1/+2</td>
<td>-1/+2</td>
<td>-1/+2</td>
<td>-1/+2</td>
<td>-1/+2</td>
<td>-1/+2</td>
<td>-1/+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1/+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1/+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Attractive places in which to invest and work
2. Expand and improve transport infrastructure
3. Strengthen synergies between environmental protection and growth
4. Address Europe’s intensive use of energy
5. Knowledge and innovation for growth
6. More and better jobs
7. Attract and retain more people in employment; modernize social protection
8. Adaptability of workers and enterprises; flexibility of labour markets
9. Increase investment in human capital
10. Improve capacity of administrations and services
11. Maintain a healthy labour force
12. Territorial dimension
13. Ensure the contribution of cities to growth and jobs
14. Support diversification of rural areas, fisheries, and areas with natural handicaps
15. Promote cross-border and interregional cooperation
## Enhancing coherence in the governance system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vertical coherence</th>
<th>Developing societal capacities</th>
<th>Building institutional frameworks</th>
<th>Public policy interventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>↑ Global</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>← Horizontal coherence ← Horizontal coherence →</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Gupta and Nilsson, 2015, Toward a multi-level SDG action framework: principles and mechanisms
Why invest in coherence assessments?

• Identify hotspots
• Identify where adjacent policy measures will be the most effective (mitigation or enhancement)
• Improve coordination and policy-oriented learning across government
Key messages

• Moving from PCD to PCSD is mirroring the Post-2015 move from MDGs to SDGs
• There are more types of relevant interactions than “synergy” and “trade off”
• Nature of interaction emerge at the level of instruments and implementation
• Cross-cutting principles can enlighten PCSD – eg “access – efficiency – sustainability”
• Still “holy grail”: linking human prosperity to global systems
Possibility for coherent policy design?

Figure 4. SDG framework for energy: eight target areas in three tiers.