3.6. Coordination on SCP

Indicator title, level and general definition

3.6. Coordination on SCP - # inter-sectoral or multi-stakeholder mechanisms for coordination on SCP and # of participating governments and other organisations.

Goals and Targets addressed

10YFP Objectives

Objective 3 (outcome level): Accelerate the shift towards SCP, supporting regional and national policies and initiatives

Main associated SDG indicators

17.14.1 # of countries with mechanisms in place to enhance policy coherence of sustainable development (Tier III UNEP)
17.16.1 # Number of countries reporting progress in multi-stakeholder development effectiveness monitoring frameworks that support the achievement of the sustainable development goals (Tier II, UNDP, OECD)
17.17.1 # Amount of United States dollars committed to public-private and civil society partnerships (Tier III, World Bank to confirm)

Definition and method of computation

Definition and concepts

This indicator allows for the quantification (#) of inter-sectoral or multi-stakeholder mechanisms for coordination on SCP established by governments and other organisations under the influence of the 10YFP and, to the extent that is possible, beyond. It also tracks the number of participating organisations.

An inter-sectoral and/or multi-stakeholder mechanism for coordination on SCP can be defined as an assembly composed of governmental and/or non-governmental entities with various mandates and sectors of interventions, interacting on a regular basis, established with the objective of coordinating action on SCP in a coherent and sustained manner. These mechanisms can be established at various scales, e.g. regional, national or sub-national, at cross-cutting or sectoral level. For instance, in the governmental context, those mechanisms can take the form of inter-ministerial committees on SCP or national multi-stakeholder roundtables. At the regional level, existing Regional Roundtables on SCP could also count as such mechanisms.

This indicator focuses on coordination mechanisms which are either multi-stakeholder or inter-sectoral or both.

The notion of coordination is very broad and could be measured through activities of diverse degrees of integration, from regular dialogues / information sharing sessions to shared plans of action or common policies resulting directly from the action of the mechanism. Hence, monitoring the effectiveness of those mechanisms implies to not only quantify those mechanisms or the entities involved, but also to collect information on their operating conditions (e.g. dedicated budget) as well as on their activities and impacts.

The effectiveness of those coordination mechanisms could be measured through several elements, including:

1) Diversity of participating entities (types, sectors of intervention);
2) Level of representation in the mechanism (e.g. high-level, technical) or level of influence of the mechanism (e.g. what is the audience of the mechanism – e.g. ministerial, executive, technical, financial, public);
3) Prerogatives of the mechanism (e.g. informative, consultative, decision-making, implementing, monitoring);
4) Operating budget
5) Regularity
6) Shared planning and monitoring instruments
7) Types of outputs: meetings / dialogues, information sharing, technical reports/tools, specific inter-sectoral or transversal agreements / policies.

Method of computation

Each coordination mechanism should be reported separately together with its associated annual budget if available, and number of participating organisations.
Stand alone outreach or communication meetings do not fall under the definition of a coordination mechanism and cannot be reported under this indicator. They can be reported under indicator 2.2. on communication and outreach activities. There are also differences between a coordination mechanism, a monitoring and reporting scheme (3.2.) and a policy (3.1.) as per their respective definition.

This indicator is calculated at relevant aggregation levels based on the information collected from the different reporting streams. Secretariat, programmes and other users of this framework should be mindful of double counting one same mechanism when aggregating reporting across different reporting streams or different reporting years.

Rational and interpretation

Because of its holistic and systemic nature, SCP requires a multi-disciplinary approach and the participation of all stakeholders. In this context, inter-sectoral and multi-stakeholder mechanisms are essential to creating the conditions for an integrated, coordinated and coherent approach to SCP.

This indicator helps to monitor the establishment and improvement of SCP coordination mechanisms, including those supported by the 10YFP. It also supports monitoring of the number of participating organisations, as well as this of actual participants and associated gender balance.

Progress on coordination on SCP can be the result of elements captured under other outputs and outcomes indicator of this framework such as SCP network (2.2.), SCP in policy instruments (3.1.), etc. and can in turn lead to achievements relevant to some of these indicators, e.g. improved monitoring and reporting on SCP (3.2.).

Disaggregation

# of inter-sectoral or multi-stakeholder mechanisms for coordination on SCP and indication of associated budget expenditure (in US$) if available, disaggregated by:
- Title of coordination mechanism
- Status of coordination mechanism: Initiated; on-going; closing
- Years active:
- Date of last meeting
- Functions of coordination mechanism: Communicating to the general public on SCP; Coordinated policy implementation; Design of overarching or sectoral policies with SCP objectives; Identification of ad hoc opportunities for synergies and cooperation; Information and knowledge sharing on SCP; Monitoring and evaluation of policies relevant to SCP; Reporting on progress at national and/or international level; Stakeholders consultations and transparency
- Cross-cutting disaggregation categories outlined in Annex 2a.

Note: programmes and other reporting streams are encouraged to report as many outputs, outcomes and impacts of their activities and beyond as possible. The disaggregation categories above are indicative and some can be left empty when reporting on measures for which such data elements are not available.

Baseline(s) and target(s)

Proposed parameters for baselines and targets are defined in Annex 2a.

For SCP coordination mechanism: There is to date no global baseline available for inter-sectoral or multi-stakeholder mechanism for SCP coordination. The first Global Report on National SCP Policies and Initiatives, currently under development, will include a review of existing inter-ministerial and multi-stakeholder coordination mechanism at government level, based on the results of the 10YFP Global Survey on National SCP Policies and Initiatives (about 50 countries). Scoping studies have also been conducted at regional and national levels (e.g. SWITCH projects in Asia / Pacific; EEA survey on resource efficiency policies).

Sources and data collection

Data collection will be done in accordance with the 10 YFP M&E Process as described in section on “The reporting and monitoring Process: requirements, roles and timelines” of this framework.

Comments and limitations
The indicator does not provide any information on the usefulness and quality of the mechanism and whether they were effective in enabling an integrated approach to SCP. These aspects will have to be looked at through narrative reports / qualitative analysis.

Establishing baselines and targets can be time and resource intensive and depends on the willingness of partners and actors – including the 10YFP National Focal Points - to communicate necessary information.

Main issues regarding precision, reliability, attribution and double counting are addressed above. If you come across additional issues, please inform the Secretariat.

References
- Methodological note and questionnaire of the 10YFP Global Survey on National SCP Policies and Initiatives
- See general references in “indicator methodology introduction” section.

Examples of sub indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STP</th>
<th>SPP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of functioning models for improved participatory coordination, cooperation and joint action on sustainable tourism and SCP at national and local level</td>
<td># of [...] with inter-sectoral and multi-stakeholder mechanisms supporting the shift to SPP or SP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>