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Starting point
What should the goals be like?
目標はどうあるべきか？

• Action oriented
• Concise and easy to communicate
• Limited in number
• Aspirational
• Incorporate in a balanced way all three dimensions of SD and their interlinkages
• Global in nature, universally applicable to all countries
• Taking into account different national realities, capacities and levels of development
• Respecting national policies and priorities
• Progress to be assessed by targets and indicators
• Consistent with international law, past commitments, outcomes of all major summits (Agenda 21, all Rio principles, JPOI)

Taken from the lessons of successful global goals such as MDGs
How can we narrow these areas down to around 10 aspirational universal goals?

Chapter V. A. Thematic areas and cross-sectoral issues

| 1. Poverty eradication |
| 2. Food security and nutrition and sustainable agriculture |
| 3. Water and sanitation |
| 4. Energy |
| 5. Sustainable tourism |
| 6. Sustainable transport |
| 7. Sustainable cities and human settlements |
| 8. Health and population |
| 9. Promoting full and productive employment, decent work for all and social protection |
| 10. Oceans and seas |
| 11. Small island developing States |
| 12. Least developed countries |
| 13. Landlocked least developed countries |
| 14. Africa |
| 15. Regional efforts |
| 16. Disaster risk reduction |
| 17. Climate change |
| 18. Forests |
| 19. Biodiversity |
| 20. Desertification, land degradation and drought |
| 21. Mountains |
| 22. Chemicals and waste |
| 23. Sustainable consumption and production |
| 24. Mining |
| 25. Education |
| 26. Gender equality and the empowerment of women |

9 planetary boundaries

- Suggest physical environmental limitations
- Very useful concept/indicators for humanity to achieve sustainability
- Scientific data not certain and reliable in every sector — precautionary approach (Rio principle 15)
- Technical in nature and hard to mobilize general public (e.g. phosphorus cycle)
- How to apportion the burden down to each country?

### PLANETARY BOUNDARIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Earth-system process</th>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Proposed boundary</th>
<th>Current status</th>
<th>Pre-industrial value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change</td>
<td>(i) Anomalously high CO₂ concentration (parts per million by volume)</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Increase in radiative forcing (watts per meter squared)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of biodiversity loss</td>
<td>Extinction rate (number of species per million species per year)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&gt;100</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen cycle (part of a boundary with the phosphorus cycle)</td>
<td>Amount of N₂ removed from the atmosphere for human use (millions of tonnes per year)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phosphorus cycle (part of a boundary with the nitrogencycle)</td>
<td>Quantity of P flowing into the oceans (millions of tonnes per year)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.5-9.5</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratospheric ozone depletion</td>
<td>Concentration of ozone ( Dobson unit)</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean acidification</td>
<td>Global mean saturation state of aragonite in surface seawater</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global freshwater use</td>
<td>Consumption of freshwater by humans (cm³ per year)</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in land use</td>
<td>Percentage of global land cover converted to cropland</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Atmospheric aerosol loading

- Overall particulate concentration in the atmosphere, on a regional basis

Chemical pollution

- For example, amount emitted to, or concentration of persistent organic pollutants, plastics, endocrine disrupters, heavy metals and nuclear waste, the global environment, or the effects on ecosystem and functioning of Earth system (thrust)
Oxfam’s doughnut planetary boundaries + ‘social foundation’

- Introduced social foundation within planetary boundaries
- It is innovative in combining the two concepts in one and helps demonstrate the relationship between MDGs and SDGs
- Need to come up with the goals/targets which guide our activities and ways of living to keep their consequences within the green ring

Source: Oxfam

Conceptual framework for integrated SDGs

- MDGs unachieved by 2015 and new post-MDGs can help ensure the social foundation
- This framework can help the processes and stakeholders of the two groups (MDGs focused development crowd and SDGs focused environment crowd) to complement rather than compete with each other
- How to ensure a balance between ensuring social foundation and remaining within planetary boundaries
- MDGs were focused on developing countries but SDGs would be universal
Goal formulation

Other considerations

目標形成 その他の考慮事項

• Relationship with the existing targets such as climate change targets and biodiversity targets
  – need to repackage them to be simpler, positive and action oriented (e.g. renewable energy target or % of GDP spending for CC mitigation rather than percentage reduction target)?

The strength of non-legally binding goals:

MDGs had the force of inspiration and changed behaviour and motivated communities, governments, NGOs, companies and the broad public to take action whereas the 3 Rio treaties became hostage to technical insider negotiations – Jeffrey Sachs

• Human rights were not included in MDGs as they have internationally established legal scheme.

• Further research may be necessary to make scientifically supported targets to achieve the desired results (e.g. the co-relation between the global percentage of renewable energy based electricity and global CO2 emission reduction)

Goal formulation

Other considerations (continued)

目標形成 その他の考慮事項 (継続)

• What about many other existing indicators/targets? How should we make use of them?
  – CSD indicators (UN), MDGs indicators (UN), SEEA (UN), Human Development Index (UNDP), Your Better Life Index (OECD), Green Growth Strategy (OECD), Ecological Footprint (British Columbia), Environmental Performance Index (Yale) etc.

• Should the international community prescribe national and local targets?

• Goals/targets need to be adjusted according to ‘the different national realities, capacities and levels of development’.
  – CBDR? – stalemate?

• The same numerical targets cannot be used for different countries. The use of relative targets ( % increase compared to the base year) as opposed to absolute targets?
Are we reinventing the wheel?

CSD indicators

The Division for Sustainable Development and the Statistics Division of UNDESA, in collaboration with experts from international organisations and UN member states, developed a set of sustainable development indicators.

The set now has 96 sustainable indicators including 50 core indicators.

The CSD Indicators of Sustainable Development serve as reference for countries to develop or revise national indicators of sustainable development.

They have been intensively tested and applied by many countries around the world.

Lessons from MDGs

MDGs の教訓

Numerical and time-bound targets have mobilized many actors to strive to overcome human poverty.

The focus on ends, not means. Donors shouldn’t be patronizing.

The definitions of ‘slum dwellers’, ‘access’, and ‘safe water’ etc. are not clear therefore not measurable. The world is on or off track depending on the definitions.

The statistics on global poverty is not based on direct observations but on complex calculations with assumptions.

Targets should be clearly defined, use solid indicators for which reliable data exist.

Some people question if this is really the case.

Some goals are on the track to be met by 2015:
- Target 1.A: Halve the proportion of people whose income is less than one dollar a day.
- Target 7.C: Halve the proportion of the population without sustainable access to safe drinking water.

Some goals are NOT on the track therefore are bound to stay:
- Target 4.A: Reduce by two thirds, between 1990 and 2015, the under-five mortality rate.
- Target 5.A: Reduce by three quarters the maternal mortality ratio.
- Target 6.A: Have halted by 2015 and begun to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS.
• No political will, no sustainable development despite excellent goals and indicators
• SDGs formulation should be based on the thorough review of the merits and shortcomings of MDGs
• The stalemate of inter-governmental negotiations seen in Rio should not be repeated for the SDGs formulation process
• Financing for SD was a big cause of the stalemate. Setting up ‘SDGs fund’ could be a solution.
  — Maybe using an innovative finance mechanism based on personal wealth (capacity to pay) not on countries’ wealth e.g. financial transaction tax, solidarity air levy
• How we can mobilize stakeholders ranging from the governments to corporations to citizens with the SDGs would be key
• Implementation can be monitored by peer reviews and/or third party monitoring by reliable NGOs rather than superficial state reporting
• Visible examples by model country, model city, model company, community etc. should be encouraged

Thank you!!
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