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This report presents the discussions and findings of the Expert Group Meeting on Governance, Public Administration and Information and Communication Technology for Post-2015 Development organized by the Division for Public Administration and Development Management (DPADM) of the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA), in partnership with the Centre for Electronic Governance at the United Nations University (UNU-IIST). The EGM was held during the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) High-Level Segment Meetings in Geneva, from 1 to 4 July 2013.

The goal of the EGM was to further the thinking of the United Nations on governance as an enabler for post-2015 development by exploring and identifying issues and challenges facing both governments and citizens in their quest for sustainable development.

The meeting gathered together eminent experts, both academicians and practitioners, representatives of governments, private sector, international and regional development organisations to discuss governance and public administration issues and challenges. It served to identify key issues in public governance and post-2015 development; provide a better understanding of structural and process challenges associated with the elaboration of a governance approach for post-2015; enhance the knowledge of UN staff and partner organizations on these important issues; and enrich the discussion in the area of public governance for post-2015.

This report attempts to capture the rich debate that took place. It presents the underpinnings of the various conceptual and methodological approaches introduced; the issues and challenges raised; and recommendations on where greater focus should be placed. It comprises the salient features of the experts’ presentations and discussions to outline some of the issues which the international community and the various stakeholders will have to address for inclusion of governance in the development agenda.

It is hoped that the report of the meeting will be a useful contribution to the ongoing discussions as we, collectively, move towards a framework of governance for the post-2015 development in the near future.

John-Mary Kauzya
Chief, Public Administration Capacity Branch (PACB), and Officer-in-Charge
Division for Public Administration and Development Management
Department for Economic and Social Affairs
New York, November 2013
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Executive Summary

Public governance is an evolving and complex concept. It has moved from a mainly administrative and bureaucracy-centred paradigm to one based today more on new approaches to public management that show increasing flexibility and greater focus on strengthening public institutions and capacities, especially with a view to enhancing transparency and accountability. Public governance, which is a function of effective institutional development and capacity, is grounded in national development contexts and remains crucial in achieving coherence between the three pillars of sustainable development, i.e. economic, social and environmental sustainability, at the national level. At the nexus of governance, institutional development and capacity building, is information and communication technology (ICT), considered a key governance enabler in contributing to the various dimensions of governance including public sector accountability and transparency.

As the world moves towards a post-2015 Development Agenda, the unmet targets of social and economic development are being revisited within the ambit of sustainable development. The overall challenge associated with sustainability is to deliver improvements in the standards of living in such a manner that development today does not compromise development tomorrow.

The main challenge for the post-2015 Development Agenda is how to structure a holistic governance approach which would be agreeable to all countries despite the complexity and diversity of governance institutions and operations around the world. The need for an integrated governance conceptual framework, with sustainability at its core, is increasingly being recognised in the consultations on the post-2015 Development Agenda, with a view that such framework should also provide the basis for a realistic and meaningful measurement, and monitoring, of the contributions of governance to sustainable development at the national and subnational levels.

The United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA), in partnership with the Center for Electronic Governance at the United Nations University IIST (UNU), organized an Expert Group Meeting (EGM) on Governance, Public Administration and Information and Communication Technology for the Post-2015 Development during the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) High-Level Segment Meetings in Geneva, from 1 to 5 July 2013. The goal of the EGM was to further the thinking of the United Nations on governance for post-2015 development by exploring and identifying issues and challenges facing both governments and citizens in their quest towards sustainable development. This report captures the substance of the discussions at the Expert Group Meeting.

i. Public governance for post-2015 development

Governance is an evolving and complex concept. It has moved from a mainly administrative and bureaucracy-centred paradigm to one based today more on new approaches to public management, showing increasing flexibility and with greater focus on strengthening public institutions and capacities, especially with regards to enhancing transparency and accountability. Institutional development and capacity building are important in achieving coherence between the three pillars of sustainable development at the national level, i.e. economic, social and environmental sustainability, at the national level. In this context, technology-enabled governance, which cuts across government entities and improves efficiency, effectiveness and collaboration, is key in contributing to better development outcomes.

Public governance issues were not specifically included in the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) framework, but lessons of experience suggest that governance deficits have hampered the
achievement of MDGs at the national level. Governance has emerged as a key area to address in the post-2015 development agenda, as recognized by the various milestone reports on post-2015 development including the UN Task Team Report, the Rio +20 Outcome document and the recent Secretary General’s High-Level Panel Report. Effective public governance, as the core of human well-being, is critical for the sustainable development of the future.

The experts discussed a number of important issues concerning public governance for post-2015 development. With lessons learnt from Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) highlighting the necessity of good governance, the timeliness of the discussions on governance at the EGM was deemed significant as the global community moves towards the post-2015 development phase with several of these issues yet to be resolved.

The experts also maintained that public governance was a key enabler for sustainable development and, as such, there was a need to determine how this role could be integrated in the post-2015 Development Agenda. First, a clear strategic vision of what quality governance consisted of must precede the assessment of governance itself. In this context, there is a critical need to develop a new paradigm and a common approach to governance that all countries could agree to and which could also be employed across all countries to articulate goals, targets and indicators for measurement. Second, good governance models will vary in practice depending on the local context, which highlights the need to recognise that a set of diverse approaches may be required. Lessons from wider analyses in the literature point to the clear conclusion that it is the indigenous mix of policy and program approaches springing from a country’s unique level of development, in addition to socio-economic context and history, which are the precursor to good governance. Integrated approaches are also associated with a dialogue or feedback mechanism with relevant stakeholders who are targets of government policy and contribute to sustainable development outcomes. Third, there is a rationale to recognize technology-enabled governance as a cross-cutting enabler in this context. Since it can support internal government operations, decision making, public services, network management, public information and services, ICT in the service of governance – or technology-enabled governance – is fundamental to policy and development outcomes in the post-2015 Agenda.

In terms of indicators, the importance of both, outcome and process indicators, was pointed out including the need to review the components of the process; how to set goals and targets; who would collect the data; how it would be used, and by whom. Overall, the experts agreed that a sound, feasible, and doable governance framework was required to provide a clear strategic vision of good governance, at both global and national level, alongside the pathways by which it may be measured.

ii. Governance architecture for post-2015 development

In developing a governance architecture framework for the post-2015 development agenda, the experts were of the opinion that the challenge of conceptualizing and modeling governance indicated that it was difficult to arrive at a final consensus on the architecture of governance across all Member States given the variety of national contexts.

There was a need to discuss what elements and dimensions of governance should be included in such a framework, including the issue of whether governance can be seen as value-neutral. Even in terms of a definition there was a range of implications. To some, governance is the manner in which government engages with its public, but on the ground, it is the manner in which a community of interdependent actors is organized, and it often has less to do with formal structures and more with relationships.
An institutional analysis to understand development over time will help in this task, for example, through grouping institutions by characteristics and manifestations in order to develop flexible as well as robust and usable typologies. In this context, the experts discussed whether or not to include cognitive and behavioral institutions as institutions in their own right or treat them as ‘culture’, especially as they are even more difficult to measure than the more formal and rule-bound institutions. However, they agreed it is important to represent institutional diversity and the multi-level nature of institutions in the broad governance context. It is also important to acknowledge the context-specificity of governance concepts, for example, as well as how to contextualize governance properly through context-specific policy guidelines reflecting this rather than through generic maturity models.

A ‘meta-governance’ approach with smart mixing of three basic governance styles based on context and the type of problem confronted was cited. The three styles could be adapted according to the prevailing cultural and political roles that government has, as well as to the nature of problems to be addressed and the way these are framed.

The experts maintained that there are three overriding issues to consider. First, the overall design and architecture of a governance framework requires a definition of ‘governance,’ which is context-specific to the post-2015 development agenda. This definition should be mindful of the inter-linkages between the level of national institutional development and capacity, to achieving coherence between the three pillars of sustainable development at the national level, i.e. economic, social and environmental sustainability.

The experts also agreed that a ‘narrow’ concept of governance comprising only the key elements is desirable, since a governance framework that includes everything will be impossible to agree and will not be actionable. A proposed working definition might be: public governance encompasses the processes and formal and informal arrangements by which the government, the private sector, civil society organizations and the citizens interact to decide on public decisions affecting collective society goals from the perspective of maintaining a country’s values.

Second, that it was important to acknowledge that while governance is generally understood as the manner in which government engages with its public, at its root, governance is about how the community of interdependent actors is organized, and its relationships, rather than formal structures.

In this context, the experts agreed upon eight dimensions of good governance for the post-2015 development framework that capture the essence of good governance. A rational set of four which can help support the achievement of post-2015 development goals (efficiency, effectiveness, equity and transparency in public administration and public service delivery), and another four which can promote collective public policy and decision making as well as lead to more sustainable development outcomes (accountability, responsiveness, participation and inclusion). The proposed eight governance dimensions provide a comprehensive chapeau to assess the role of governance in a way that can strengthen better development outcomes at the national level and therefore can be considered the conduits for measurement in the post-2015 Agenda.

Additional dimensions of good governance were noted. Among these were political stability, democratization, domestic revenue mobilization, the rule of law, data privacy, the right to know, state capacity, and policy performance. It was acknowledged that to be truly representative across the 193 UN Member States, governance dimensions in the post-2015 Development Agenda need to be politically acceptable, value neutral and feasible.
Third, governance is the interplay of complex political, economic and social changes; hence it requires successful management of institutional change in order to develop sound governance architecture. It was especially challenging to change institutions and the underlying governance architectures, given that institutions by their nature tend to be ingrained, relatively permanent and slow to reflect innovation and change. The experts noted that government needed to involve non-state actors, especially at the local levels, in managing stakeholder engagement as part of this process. Lessons of experience from the African context also highlighted that one of the important governance issues often left out is the global financial architecture, including trade and overseas development assistance (ODA) as well as illicit financial flows, each of which profoundly impacts governance performance at the national level, especially in developing countries.

*The experts at the EGM were therefore of the opinion that work should continue to develop the contours of a comprehensive architectural framework for governing the key development challenges.*

### iii. Governance measurement framework for post-2015 sustainable development

The experts discussed whether governance issue should be addressed as a cross-cutting issue or a stand-alone goal within the post-2015 Development Agenda. Transparency was suggested as a good fit for any stand-alone goal in post-2015, as were also several indicators developed within the context of sustainable development governance. Although there were sound arguments for stand-alone goal approach, such as the need to highlight the importance of governance and the desirability of ensuring it becomes a major feature of the post-2015 Development Agenda, a stand-alone goal has the danger that it may not capture the multivariate aspects of governance or turn out to be politically infeasible. It was noted that governance as a cross-cutting enabler may offer some possibilities if it could be woven into the design and implementation of all other goals.

The experts discussed the various governance assessment methodologies that could be brought to bear on future governance monitoring in the post-2015 framework. Among those discussed were the existing objective and subjective assessment approaches in literature along with their advantages and disadvantages. Experts were concerned about the technical challenges in governance measurement. They noted that while all socio-economic measurements were less than perfect, there was a need to be cautious about governance measurement since many of the existing governance indicators represented researcher bias and/or perceptions. Combining the best of both within the context of post-2015 seemed to be the best approach. Notwithstanding, it should be noted that borrowing from existing disaggregated measures of governance may prove to be difficult when comparing across time and space, since existing governance indicators lacked spatial and/or broad country coverage. Furthermore, existing methodologies suffered from the lacuna that if these indicators were combined in composite (catch-all) indices, it may also lead to an inflexible measure of comparison falling short of adequately capturing the diversity in governance models across all 193 UN Member States. Extant data sources also varied with shortcomings in terms of the dimensions covered, country coverage, the method of data collection and comparability over time.

The experts concluded that context-specific measurement was preferable to a one-size-fits-all approach, requiring knowledge of the local context which itself may need a qualitative approach to measurement with the right entry points. When selecting and operationalizing goals, targets and indicators, governance measurement needs to be grounded in understandable, fact-based rather than perception-based indicators and fully accessible at a disaggregated level. Indicators and data sources should be published online in an accessible and understandable manner. At the same time, it was also important to consider the extent of burden the measurement assessment and data collection would carry for the national institutions. In this context, the Sustainable Governance Indicator (SGI)
project, which provides an indicator-based, cross-national comparison of all countries from the Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD) and the European Union (EU), may point the way for a governance measurement approach for the post-2015 development.

Designing a robust measurement framework system to operationalize the governance framework should weigh the translation of each dimension into goals, targets and indicators to operationalize the various aspects of governance. In this case, the resulting indicators should be politically acceptable, actionable, action-worthy, transparent and replicable, with a focus on de-facto and not just de-jure indicators, and feasible in terms of cost of measurement.

The experts considered three alternative governance measurement models for post-2015 development presented by DESA:

Model 1: Governance as a stand-alone goal, which would encapsulate governance assessment under one goal such as the rule of law, democratic governance and/or human rights. The experts felt that the challenge here may be that a limited set of indicators may not be able to adequately capture all dimensions of governance. The experts at the EGM also noted that since commonality of terms such as democratic governance was not at all assured across all Member States, political feasibility of such approach may become difficult.

Model 2: Embedded governance goals in each of the post-2015 Development Agenda. Though ideal in displaying the attributes of governance as a cross-cutting enabler, the challenge may be the sheer intricacy of defining contributions and mapping of each governance dimension to the desired outcomes.

Model 3: Governance principles framework, by elaborating ‘good governance’ into a set of principles accompanying the post-2015 Development Agenda using a three-step approach:

- **Step 1**: good government is articulated as set of limited and value-neutral, but common, good governance principles for all Member States;
- **Step 2**: a set of Voluntary Governance Goals (VGG), which are universal (i.e. do not just apply to developing countries), value-neutral and politically feasible, where adherence would be voluntary (i.e. countries will opt to be assessed) through a wide ranging menu of suggested governance goals from which countries can pick and choose a few;
- **Step 3**: each country could establish its own national self-monitoring good governance framework consisting of both common (shared with other Member States) and voluntary (chosen or devised by it) goals for the post-2015 Agenda. The experts anticipated that this would shed light on national governance deficit areas and would measure performance against a country’s own objectives and criteria in key governance areas, as well as provide basic regional and global comparisons around the commonly developed goals.

The experts agreed that work was needed to sift through all governance indices, measures and their source data to ascertain actual availability, usefulness, and relevance of governance measures for an effective monitoring framework.

iv. Technology-enabled governance for post-2015 development

State capacity for effective public administration and good governance are key factors in a country’s national development and underpin its efforts towards the successful achievement of the MDGs. It is the role of technology as an enabler, rather than as a stand-alone sector, that impacts development outcomes by increasing the added value in the provision of public services, efficient functioning of institutions, and participatory governance.
Overall, the experts noted three main issues relating to governance, public administration and ICT for post-2015 development. First, the role of ICT as enabler of post-2015 development was both a challenge as well as an opportunity, and it was important to institutionalize ICT in the post-2015 Agenda.

Second, the experts pointed out that technology advancements will continue to impact how public governance is shaped in the years to come. Some of the trends to watch for were the growth of the mobile market; social media and networks replacing other forms of web interaction; cloud computing and the advantages it could bring in terms of agility, scalability, cost-effectiveness and security; big data, which has the potential for smarter governance; and innovations in cyber security technology. Many of these ICT advancements will increasingly have significant impacts on governance and government operations, some of which are not yet clearly seen.

Third, integrating technology-enabled governance in post-2015 for all Member States may be a challenge since the contribution of technology to development presupposes a certain level of access for all. Improved access and connectivity is critical, particularly for mobile and broadband services, which are becoming the ‘oxygen’ of the digital economy.

Exploiting ICT for governance will also require appropriate incentives to local innovators for adjustment of their business and financial models. Deploying technology enabled governance may require a reformation of the legal and regulatory systems to better leverage local innovations in many countries. Looking at how technologies are likely to impact the post-2015 development era, one aspect noted by the experts was creating environments for better business models, for example, to permit indigenous businesses, especially in developing countries, greater local market formation and competition. The main technology drivers of the future propelling such development are cloud computing and Service-Oriented Architecture (SOA), which were identified as offering the potential to fulfill innovative governance opportunities for post-2015 development.

Experts at the EGM agreed that, despite challenges, ICT is a significant opportunity to access, create, share and manipulate knowledge, as well as for empowering people with information to hold institutions to account. In terms of the post-2015 development, ICT is key enabler for inclusive social and economic development as well as for environmental sustainability.

v. Institutional and capacity building as key to the development of the future

Governance is dependent on effective human and institutional development and, therefore, inextricably linked to leadership. Strengthening institutions and good leadership is a pre-requisite for institutionalizing mechanisms of accountability and transparency, efficiency and effectiveness, which are all desirable dimensions of good governance.

Successful leadership requires professionalism, accountability, integrity and ethics. It also involves emphasizing sustainability by taking account of the needs of future generations. Leaders who can work with citizens to look beyond immediate concerns invariably achieve success in the longer term. Thus, success is not only about today, but about tomorrow as well, so there is a need to plan ahead with a clear vision.

Discussions centred on how to build human and institutional capacity, supported by ICT, for governing post-2015 development. In addressing these challenges, the experts explored what were the linkages between given levels of human and institutional development capacity in a country and the post-2015 development pathways; and how to fill this gap by extending capacity and reforming
existing institutions through technology and related innovation, as well as proposing how this new capacity can empower government institutions and staff, and give rise to new institutional arrangements for supporting post-2015 development.

Experts indicated that other issues and challenges, including the role of technology, enabled governance in terms of whether ‘e’ needs to be part of ‘inclusion’, the lack of policy coherence, difficulties in policy monitoring, and the link between access, equity and quality that need to be taken into account. Building institutional governance for post-2015 development will also require ‘Government Information Leadership (GIL)’ capability. To ensure that ICT meets this potential, a GIL function should be set up with three important interrelated activities to assess readiness, build human and institutional capacity, and develop ‘support’ to engage leaders to facilitate cross-agency coordination and international collaboration.

The experts agreed that capacity building was a requisite in entrepreneurial, operative and administrative leadership, supported by the rule of law. To assess further gaps in capacity building in the context of post-2015 development, the need for reliable data was also recognized.

Discussions on capacity building reviewed some country case studies. The perspective from India on ICT-enabled education services was that there are three interrelated components to build capacity in education and to deliver public value, which is ultimately what matters. First, access in terms of physical, academic and co-curricular access, for example the use of subsidies and scholarships for basic health education. Second, equity in terms of gender parity, social equity including for children with special needs (CWSN) and geographical equity is needed. Third, the quality of capacity building in terms of the development of capabilities to teach, learn, acquire skills and make contributions is important.

The African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) as an example of a mutually agreed, self-monitoring governance mechanism, which is helping to transform governance, was cited for consideration. With emphasis on accountability and transparency, the APRM is a good example of how governance issues can support the post-2015 Development Agenda, particularly in a developing country context.

The experts maintained that it was important to acknowledge the context-specificity of institutional and capacity building models when discussing post-2015 development framework for the 193 UN Member States. As such, there was a need to further refine the institutional framework and capacity needs at the national level for better mapping of the governance institutional structures onto post-2015 development agenda.
Introduction

As the world moves towards a Post-2015 Development Agenda, the unmet targets of social and economic development are being revisited within the ambit of sustainable development. The overall challenge associated with sustainability is to deliver improvements in the standards of living in such a manner that development today does not compromise development tomorrow. The United Nations Rio+20 Summit affirmed that to achieve sustainable development we need institutions at all levels of public governance* that are effective, transparent, accountable and democratic. With the need for a set of ‘development enablers’ to guide policy coherence, there is increasing recognition that efforts at a holistic approach to sustainable development require an inherent governance framework at the core of strategic national development planning to ensure efficacy, transparency and inclusion in the delivery of public services and in the implementation of public policies.

An important component of the global consultation is, therefore, how to incorporate governance issues in the post-2015 Development Agenda within the context of sustainable development. Embedded in the concept of sustainability is the viability of national and sub-national governance systems and the associated institutional linkages, which affect development outcomes.

The role of governance as an enabler of sustainable development is complex and faces multiple challenges associated with defining, conceptualizing and measuring its various dimensions. There is a need to determine how this role would be integrated into the development agenda of the future. The onus lies collectively on all stakeholders of the post-2015 process, including the national governments, private sector, civil society, international organizations, and the donor community, to agree acceptable parameters of governance to ensure equal opportunity for all in the future beyond 2015.

Discussions at the UN and around the world have emphasized some elements of governance in terms of human rights, accountability and the rule of law, amongst other things. At the same time, incorporating an integrated economic and social governance approach into the post-2015 framework requires more thinking. Part of this is to rethink the concepts and relationships between governance, public administration and Information and Communication Technology (ICT).

ICT is also seen as a cross-sectoral enabler that can make institutions and systems function more efficiently. As such there is a need to recognise that technology-enabled governance can support innovation, capacity building and institutional development in order to achieve greater efficiency, effectiveness and inclusion in development processes and thereby improve public accountability and development outcomes in the post-2015 era.

The Expert Group Meeting on Governance, Public Administration and Information and Communication Technology for Post-2015 Development organized by the Division for Public Administration and Development Management (DPADM) of the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA), in partnership with the Center for Electronic Governance at the United Nations University IIST (UNU), brought together a number of experts and practitioners to address these questions.

The experts reviewed governance and public administration paradigms, and assessed conceptual and methodological approaches to better understand the key dimensions of governance to support sustainable development during the post-2015 era. The experts explored state-of-the-art approaches

* The discussion of governance in this Report refers to public or national governance. In the interest of brevity, the word governance is used interchangeably to mean both.
to governance and public administration which, if underpinned by effective, transparent, accountable and responsive institutions, can contribute to the integrated governance framework for pursuing sustainable development by the world community. In their deliberations, the experts also focused on how technology-enabled governance can be leveraged by the public sector to add value to the functioning of institutions for the achievement of the post-2015 Development Agenda. This report highlights the many issues for consideration, as well as specific experiences and lessons learned to date from the experts’ presentations and discussions during the meeting.
Chapter I. Public Governance for post-2015 development

As the world moves forward, a new public governance framework needs to reflect and pay attention to issues of sustainability – not only in terms of public policies, public service organizations and public services themselves, but also in terms of the impact of these elements upon broader issues of societal and environmental sustainability. This is especially relevant in the context of the post-2015 Development Agenda that will have sustainability at its core and will need to be driven by a more calibrated development process that places major emphasis on respect for human rights, access to jobs and prosperity, justice and rule of law, and prudent management of a nation's wealth and natural resource endowments.

1.1 The Global Setting for post-2015 Agenda

Over the past decade, there have been phenomenal advancements in the area of governance. Emerging evidence has confirmed that political and democratic governance is a prerequisite for development and that citizens value good governance given its broad range of benefits that extend from recognition of basic rights to effective services delivery. Accordingly, the architecture for governance has undergone significant enhancements regarding its mainstreaming both in public policy and in governing and regulating the private sector. The main challenge that has emerged is how to structure a holistic approach to governance so that it can effectively promote public interest while getting the best out of the private sector.

It has been recognized that the 1970's traditional approach to public policy that relied exclusively on a public administration regime, focusing primarily on a bureaucracy that administers rules and guidelines, has been replaced by an emphasis on nurturing new and modern public management, with the ultimate goal of strengthening institutions. This has involved a shift from a simple standard application of public administration reforms to a focus on enhanced transparency and accountability, through the application of performance-based budget and service standards and public disclosure of accounts to allow for scrutiny.

The new public management framework has sought to bring market incentives into the public sector through ensuring appointments of managers based on fit and proper criteria, inducing competition, adjustment of wage scales and better methods of monitoring and accountability. It has been noted that application of these standards has been problematic in the developing countries' context given the presence of weak institutions, weak capacities and resistance of vested interest both within governments and within businesses.

In today’s increasingly integrated world, the post-2015 development agenda must be conceived as a truly global agenda with shared responsibilities for all countries. A renewed global partnership must enhance government capacity to efficiently and effectively mobilize public and private domestic resources. As the implementation of a post-2015 development agenda will take place at the country level, strengthening national mutual accountability mechanisms must be at the centrepiece of any effort to promote it.

† Shamshad Akhtar, Assistant Secretary-General for Economic Development and Senior Advisor on Economic Development and Finance, Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA), New York, USA.
1.2 MDGs and lessons learnt for post-2015†

In September 2000, world leaders adopted the United Nations Millennium Declaration¹, committing their nations to a new global partnership to reduce extreme poverty and setting out a series of targets known as the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

In the last 10 years the world has seen increasing national and international efforts around the eight MDGs leading to positive outcomes. Whereas impressive gains were achieved in reduction of extreme poverty, access to safe drinking water, gender parity in primary enrolment, and improvement in lives for at least 100 million slum dwellers, targets were only partially met for goals such as access to improved drinking water sources, deaths on account of tuberculosis and maternal mortality. Further, hunger remains a global challenge, illiteracy still holds back more than 120 million young people, the progress on primary school enrolment has slowed and one in five children under age five in the developing world is still underweight. The timeline of 15 years for these eight MDGs – which ranged from halving extreme poverty rates to halting the spread of HIV/AIDS and providing universal primary education – culminates in 2015.

*Millennium Development Goals*

Notwithstanding the uneven progress, MDGs provided an integrated agenda that gave priority and operational meaning to various dimensions of human development. They were simple, transparent and easy to communicate and as such they influenced the national policy agenda, improved policy coordination and allowed governments to take concrete actions to improve human development. However, undue emphasis on outcomes resulting from a mechanical association between economic growth and poverty reduction often failed to take into account the complexities of development processes. In particular, inadequate attention to institutional building and structural transformations led to a lack of focus on strengthening the processes. Though governance issues were not addressed directly in the MDG goalposts, lessons learnt now indicate governance deficits and weak institutions remained among the main challenges to optimal development outcomes.

† Seema Hafeez, Senior Governance Officer and Focal Point on UN Secretary-General’s Task Team on Post-2015 Development, Division for Public Administration and Development Management (DPADM), United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA), New York, USA.
As the end date approaches, the United Nations is engaged in wide global consultations on the framework for a post-2015 sustainable development agenda. In the last year, initial discussions among stakeholders on a framework for post-2015 development have highlighted deficits of development which impinge on sustainable development in many countries around the world. But most importantly, various assessments of the MDGs have repeatedly cited public governance and accountability as a key constraining positive outcomes of development and increasingly highlighted the need for a core set of ‘governance enablers’ to guide the future agenda.

The UN Task Team Report, the Rio +20 Outcome and the Secretary-General’s High-Level Panel Report have all identified the need for good governance and institution building. Member States have acknowledged in the Rio+20 Summit Outcome that “…effective governance at local, sub-national, national, regional and global levels representing the voices and interests of all is critical for advancing sustainable development,” while the High-Level Panel Report has gone beyond and called “for a fundamental shift to recognize peace and good governance as a core element of wellbeing, not an optional extra.”

1.3 UN post-2015 Development Agenda: governance framework

The experts maintained that there is increasing recognition that efforts at a holistic approach to sustainable development require an inherent governance framework at the core of strategic national development planning to ensure efficacy, transparency and inclusion in the delivery of public services and in the implementation of public policies. The experts pointed out that the Rio+20 Summit stated that to achieve sustainable development, effective, transparent, accountable and democratic institutions were needed at all levels of governance. Additionally, and in line with the theme of the Expert Group Meeting, there was a need to revisit the important role ICTs could play in transforming governance systems. Technology-enabled governance can support innovation, capacity building and institutional development in order to achieve greater efficiency, effectiveness and inclusion of the Post-2015 development.

For the post-2015, the world was confronted with many challenges. Sluggish economic growth, growing inequalities, knowledge challenges, shifting demographics, an increasing environmental footprint, more pressing peace and security issues and, most important of all, governance and accountability deficits at all policy levels, among other, all impinge upon the necessity to integrate into the future development agenda.

The experts were of the view that contours of the guiding framework for governance in post-2015 require identification of the linkages between governance and the three pillars of sustainable development and substantiation of the pathways which enhance effective, responsive and accountable public governance in the service of the goals and targets which will frame the post-2015 Development Agenda.

As a first step, a common understanding of a governance typology is needed to determine the move towards efficacy of institutional structures, effectiveness of outcomes, the value of transparency and accountability, and the importance of participation and inclusion which will be key to post-2015 sustainable developmental outcomes. In determining such a pathway, it would be important to also

---

§ Seema Hafeez, Senior Governance Officer and Focal Point on UN Secretary General’s Task Team on Post 2015 Development, Division for Public Administration and Development Management (DPADM), Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA), New York, USA
ascertain what aspects of institutional development and capacity building would be important in achieving the coherence between the three pillars of economic, social and environmental sustainability at the national level.

The experts maintained that governance is a critical enabler of sustainable development and as such there was a need to determine how this role could be integrated in the post-2015 Agenda. A clear strategic vision of what quality governance consists of must precede the assessment of governance itself. A proposed working definition might be: public governance encompasses the processes and formal and informal arrangements by which the government, the private sector, civil society organizations and the citizens interact to decide on public decisions affecting collective society goals from the perspective of maintaining a country’s values.

The experts acknowledged that the United Nations global consultations for a post-2015 Development Agenda have made efforts to make the global process truly representative and to incorporate the often diverse needs of a multitude of stakeholders to ensure participation. It was notable that as of mid-June 2013, in the online global survey ‘My World’, more than 620,000 people from 194 countries voted for “Honest and responsive government” as one of their top priority to be addressed in the post-2015 Development Agenda. The experts noted with approval the ongoing multivariate efforts at arriving at commonality of interest, cohesion in concepts and terminology, and consistency in approach which is likely to lead to a more inclusive agenda for the future.

1.4 Public Governance for the post-2015 Agenda **

Tracing the history of global goals and governance, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) in 1948\(^2\) set many ideal norms with the supposition that national laws and policies would adhere to international norms and agreements. While the Millennium Declaration in 2000 had no specific governance goals, Section II of the Declaration was concerned with peace and security, and Section V with human rights, democracy and good governance. While in pursuit of MDGs many countries attempted to adhere to the spirit and letter of the international agreements competing development objectives, lack of resources and often inconsistencies in poverty, growth and sustainable development strategies downgraded efforts at achievement of development goals.

**David Hulme, CEO, Effective States and Inclusive Development Research Centre (ESID), School of Environment and Development, The University of Manchester, Manchester, United Kingdom.
Among lessons learnt from such experiences on the ground was whether there is a unilinear path for sustainable development and governance that all countries follow, or whether each country has its own national trajectories. Further in such cases, governance – and its ambit – became elusive, ambiguous and contested. One of the most recent definitions of governance comes from Francis Fukuyama: “A government’s ability to make and enforce rules and to deliver services, regardless of whether that government is democratic or not.” The World Bank in 1992 steered clear of democracy and human rights putting greater emphasis on a pro-business and pro-growth perspective when defining governance as “the manner in which power is exercised in the management of a country’s economic and social resources for development.” Other alternatives encompass a range of elements, including the 19th Century Weberian bureaucratic approach, the 1990s liberal democratic tradition of ‘good governance’, and more recent human rights approaches based on the UNHCR. There have been, however, many criticisms that the main definitions embed Euro- or Western-centric values and favor stability whilst ignoring progressive struggles. For example, is the current impasse in certain Middle East country simply bad governance, or does it demonstrate the actual often painful processes of democracy? Is there such a thing as ‘good governance’, or should we focus instead on ‘good enough governance’ as part of a process of change?

The experts at the EGM maintained that whereas the recent Secretary-General’s High-Level Panel focused on “good governance and effective institutions” emphasizing free and universal legal identity, freedom of speech giving ‘voice’, public participation, information and data transparency, and accountability to reduce bribery and corruption, there was a need to determine whether governance goals should be set as means to achieve other goals or as ends in themselves since considering governance as both ends and means may ignore the trade-offs between them.

The experts said that, apart from these conceptual concerns, there were also significant technical issues to be addressed in the post-2015 Development Agenda, such as the huge amounts of data required, its reliability, and the technical capacity to use it. There was also the issue of timing: when to start, what is the baseline, how often to measure, whether to use discrete or rolling averages, etc. Further technical issues include determining the MDG protocol of goals, targets and indicators, the use of observed or subjective measures, as well as the many options concerning absolute, percentage, universal, national, among other measures. Related to this is also who will collect, calculate and manipulate the data, whether this should be expert-led or legitimacy-led, whether by international organizations like the UN or World Bank, or by third parties, experts or even civil groups. Ideally, measurement professionals (such as national statistical offices) should be involved within a framework of global standards and procedures, perhaps with peer review. A good example might be how the UN worked with national offices to develop a standardized way of collecting health statistics.

1.5 An overarching perspective on the nature of academic theory and its relation to policy

The experts at the EGM discussed the need to take an overarching perspective that attempts to link academic theory to policy and concrete action in order to understand the parameters of governance but also to ground the discussion in practicality. Instructive in this context are two quotes from the mid-20th Century economist, John Maynard Keynes. First, “policy and politicians are slaves of long-dead social scientists,” which underlines the long-standing role of theory and reminds us that...
the main approaches to the concept of governance have been dominated by formal theories derived from economics and sociology. Second, “we’re all dead in the long run,” which stresses that social science thinking is often too formalistic to play a full role in policy making and needs instead to become more involved in concrete human activity.

Three important lessons arise from this. First, it is the mix that matters; any given system of governance will have varying effects depending on its context, so the need for diverse inputs is paramount while acknowledging that, and institutions are not a panacea for all. Second, participation and dialogue need to be given much greater priority in a governance approach, i.e., even when experts are setting policy, dialogue needs to take place with all stakeholders who are the targets of the policy. Participation is not just a normative goal but is also a means to greater efficiency and better outcomes, and will help to overcome overly simplistic and normative thinking. Third, developing the parameters of governance is often limited by formalized approaches; in reality, social terms and categories (like elections, class, democracy) are inherently ‘fuzzy’ without natural boundaries, and this makes measurement with certainty, simplicity and prediction difficult. Experts at the EGM contended that attempting to measure the social sciences is useful but does not have the same meaning as measuring a liter of water, for example. The attempt can, however, be misguided if it is used simplistically to ascertain causal links. It is often preferable to use descriptive data, for example as a prompt to action. Thus, it is important to be more creative in devising indicators and to constantly rethink the indicators developed.

Public governance usually refers to one or both of two related topics: state institutions and service delivery. Since “governance” became a policy agenda, the main approaches to it have been dominated by formal theories derived from economics and sociology: (a) economic theories generally focus on micro-level and suggest markets are efficient ways of securing equilibrium; and (b) sociological theories generally stress mid-level contexts, describe new times, and promote networks and partnerships as responses to those times.

Today, sociological approaches to governance dominate policy agendas concerned with both state institutions (for example, of the use of governance, in the literature on development, to signal the embedded nature of markets) and service delivery (for example, of the rise of joined-up and whole-of-government agendas and the changing role of embassies in development). The danger, however, is that much of the discourse has become overly descriptive as well as too keen to see cause and effect relationships. It is important to beware of so-called ‘causes’ as these are often in direct conflict with concrete human activity and experience. For example, the sociological theories that currently dominate scholarly work on governance sometimes encourage essentialist views of organizations, markets and networks, for example that networks are always innovative and that markets are always efficient. Such posits may not always hold as they are only contingent generalizations at best, as well as being over simplistic and often lull policy makers into thinking in terms of certainties of outcomes that are far from guaranteed. Concepts like markets and networks are only heuristic ideal types, not found in reality in pure form. Instead, the new governance paradigm should recognize the importance of ‘concrete human activity’.

The experts saw a clear need to see governance as a broad chapeau that can be deployed across policy and programming in the post-2015 Development Agenda. They pointed out that in addition to looking at concrete targets, it is important to examine overarching issues and longer term processes related to public governance. Since good governance is inter alia what actually implements good policies, and not the policies themselves, it was important to be mindful of the divergence between policy and its implementation which, in many instances, may cause sound policies to be negated in their impact due to a lack of effective implementation.
Chapter II. Governance architecture for post-2015 development

The substantive focus of the thematic discussion on governance architecture was ‘what would constitute a viable public governance framework for post-2015 development’. Consideration was given to the issue of how to capture the linkages between the various aspects of governance and other development goals; discussing issues and challenges associated with articulating stand-alone governance goals in light of the current post-2015 discussion and the experience with MDGs; and exploring governance as a cross-cutting concern with key dimensions of governance built into sustainable development goals such as inequality, poverty, education, health and others, likely to be included in the post-2015 Development Agenda.

2.1 Innovation, governance of economic development, and institutions

In order to understand the trajectory of economic development, it is necessary to understand the institutions that govern economic activity. Ultimately, economic development is driven by innovation which itself needs to be seen as a context-specific concept, and highly dependent on locale. To understand innovation and economic development through time, there is a need to understand the institutions which organize economic activity and around – and through which – economic activity is organized. This leads to the need to understand governance.

Governance, and particularly good governance, like innovation, consists of many elements and is often context specific. Varying definitions of governance would likely include elements of one or more of: upholding the rule of law; providing stability; being inclusive and supporting the most vulnerable in society; efficacy and efficiency; representativeness, accountability, participation and transparency. At base, governance is the manner in which government engages with its public through administrative rationalism, democratic pragmatism and/or economic rationalism.

Governance is exercised through institutions. Like innovation and governance, institutions also carry the baggage of numerous definitions, many of which are context specific. However, most definitions incorporate the notion of some prevalence or permanence of the conventions of action embedded in the customs or habits of people. Depending on the source, this can include social habits, codes of conduct, social practices and norms, mental constructs, and established or prescribed/proscribed behavior patterns. They can also cover collective action by organizations such as the family, trade unions, corporations or the state; sets of rules; formal organizations; constitutional rule systems; as well as rules that regulate the relations among individuals or groups. This plethora of approaches is difficult to make sense of, so a typology of institutions is proposed which ranges from intangible and social characteristics at one end to tangible and societal characteristics at the other.

In discussing the institutional structures through which governance operates, experts observed that, despite globalization, it is often the case that national problems, policies, and politics emerge and traverse through varying modes of locally evolved governance mechanisms characterized by a range of clearly discernible formal and informal institutions. Efforts to operationalize supra-national or global policies or visions such as the MDGs continue to be simultaneously supported and curtailed at the local/national scale by the institutions that characterize any given mode of governance. A framework for conducting governance-oriented and institutionally informed policy analysis in politically and socio-economically heterogeneous environments was presented focusing on the institutions which organize economic activity and around, and through which economic

‡‡ Saeed Parto, Director of Research, Afghanistan Public Policy Research Organization, Kabul, Afghanistan, and Lecturer, Maastricht University, The Netherlands.
activity is organized.

**Typology of institutions**

- Behavioral institutions: standardized (recognizable) social habits – ingrained as routines.
- Cognitive institutions: mental models and constructs or definitions, based on values and embedded in ‘culture’.
- Associative institutions: mechanisms facilitating prescribed or privileged interaction among different private and public interests.
- Regulative institutions: prescriptions and proscriptions as immediate boundaries of action.
- Constitutive institutions: prescriptions and proscriptions as ultimate boundaries of action.

According to Robert Reich⁵, public policy is not only to discover what people want and then to implement policies to implement this, but also to provide a set of alternative visions about what is possible and to stimulate deliberation about them. Again, this requires an understanding of the local context. It also requires institutional analysis which views institutions as ‘structuring phenomena’ through qualitative research over time, relying on a combination of intuition as well as hard data, and requiring entry points for intervention. At present, working definitions are the best we can do, given this sensitivity of context. Thus, governance is the manner in which a community of interdependent actors is organized, or organizes itself. Institutions are formal/informal structures through which a community of interdependent actors is governed (is organized, or organizes itself). Moreover, governance is less to do with formal structures and more to do with relationships.

In conclusion, institutions have by definition a high degree of permanency and are slow to catch up with, and adjust to, innovation or change. We are beginning to see structures in institutions through which economic and political activity has been traditionally governed. The question is seldom whether to intervene through policy, but rather how to do so effectively and with the least negative impact.

### 2.2 Between worlds and levels: findings and observations on governance for sustainable development §§

---

Governance for sustainable development is highly complex both because it covers a myriad of fields and issues, but also because it needs to link the global with the local. Research in Europe and in the context of the Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM) has adopted a comparative approach between national and global levels with iterative clustering using an inductive methodology. This work has identified four analytical dimensions of the governance of sustainable development. First, leadership, which is performed at one end versus ownership which is fostered at the other. Second, top-down versus bottom-up. Third, firmness and monitoring versus flexibility. Fourth, framework document versus action focus.

These four dimensions have also been found in a number of other theories, especially the ‘meta-governance’ approach based on the so-called ‘smart mix’ of three basic governance styles: hierarchy, market and network. There are clear differences between these styles which can be recognized in many parts of the world in a variety of cultural and political roles and the types of problems they are best suited to tackle, as well as in their historical developments over time:

- **Hierarchical governance:**
  - roles: top-down, government rules society and authoritarian
  - problems addressed: crises and instability
  - history: at least since Weber in the 19th Century

- **Market-driven governance:**
  - roles: government delivers services, efficiency but also instability
  - problems addressed: routine and non-sensitive issues
  - history: since the late 1990s and New Public Management (NPM)

- **Network governance:**
  - roles: bottom-up, government is partner, based on trust and consensus
  - problems addressed: complex, unstructured and ‘wicked’ problems
  - history: since the late 1990s, the internet and the ‘networked society’

A ‘meta-governance’ approach seems to have been successful in some countries, i.e. the smart mixing of three basic governance styles based on context and the type of problem confronted: hierarchy, market and network. For example, crisis and disaster management are best addressed by top-down hierarchical governance, ‘wicked’ problems by network governance, and more routine questions and issues by market governance. These three styles can be varied according to the prevailing cultural and political roles which government has, as well as by the nature of the problems to be addressed and the way these are framed.

**The three governance styles**

![Diagram of the three governance styles](image)

This approach sees governance as about the ‘how’ of decisions and problem-solving which combines polity (i.e. institutional rules and frameworks) with politics (i.e. the processes of decision-making). It also sees governance as about ‘what’, i.e. policies to be pursued, their substance, the choices involved and the results obtained. From this, we might derive some broad definitions of governance. Governance is a collection of normative insights (‘how should…’) about the organization of influence, steering, power, checks the balances in societies. Also, governance is the totality of interactions in which governments, other public organizations, private companies, and civil society participate in order to (1) solve public challenges and (2) create new opportunities.

Competition and tension can be seen between the three styles of meta-governance, each of which has weaknesses and strengths. Meta-governance is situational requiring the use of knowledge about the functioning of societies (trans-governance), and tools to analyze the specific governance environment (stakeholders etc.). Case studies have shown that successful public managers use several strategies, including combining governance styles and managing linkages, switching to another style, and maintaining governance style mixtures. Balancing between the styles and these strategies seems to depend on five frameworks conditions: politico-administrative culture, tradition and history; personal conviction of the political leader; societal expectations; organizational characteristics (including the type of education); as well as the type of problem (and the way it is framed).

2.3 Governance Architectural Issues in post-2015 Development Agenda: the Asian context

From the developing country perspective, the governance architectural issues in the post-2015 development agenda are complex and challenging. In view of the complexities, a broader approach to development is required in these countries for the post-2015 period with a right balance between investments in social sectors with development strategies that seek to combine economic growth with employment creation and participatory and inclusive development. This is not only about reformulating policies, but also about rethinking the development paradigm in these countries.

The experience in Asia and elsewhere shows that even when good policies are adopted, the issue as to whether policies or structural factors are the dominant determinants of growth and development is a subject of controversy. It is also not clear which policies are more important, and evidence of any dramatic improvement in the policy framework is rather uncommon. Historically, policy changes have been slow and policies remain more constant than needed due to the inherent inertia in the nature of institutions and the underlying governance architecture. In this context, a key element which did not make it to the forefront of the MDGs framework is the need for good, effective, efficient, accountable and responsive governance that can support and promote a dynamic policy approach, one that builds on local knowledge and uses decentralized governance structure to tailor public policy and its implementation.

At present, the priority in Asia is to accelerate on the MDGs which are lagging and to sustain progress on those targets that have been met. Furthermore, Asian economies need to develop more comprehensive frameworks for governing the key development challenges, such as poverty, social protection, food insecurity, poor education, environmental vulnerability, etc.

*** Mustafa K. Mujeri, Director General, Bangladesh Institute of Development Studies, Dacca, Bangladesh.
Examining the post-2015 development agenda in the Asian context is important as Asia still accounts for about 60 per cent of the world’s poor and suffers from significant development gaps across all development dimensions. Some of these countries need to focus more on building productive capacities; undertaking strategic diversification; creating and strengthened the policy framework; and taking measures to benefit from supportive global partnerships, increased market access, aid for trade and more effective regional cooperation. Climate change is also an important issue as it has extreme impacts in Asia.

To be successful, multiple stakeholders need to be involved in the process. In this context, Asia must tackle a two-fold challenge to its development. First, address the issues of human rights, justice and social inclusion; and second, bring together and ensure the right balance among the three broad pillars of sustainable development—economic prosperity, social equity, and environmental sensitivity—to generate longer term sustained benefits. Policy development in Asia has been slow on these issues, mainly because it is difficult to change institutions and underlying governance architectures. There is, thus, a need for good, effective, efficient, transparent, accountable and responsive governance that builds on local knowledge. Without this, the post-2015 Development Agenda will be difficult to carry out successfully.

Good governance can only be ensured if there are good and performing institutions. In the absence of good governance, the policies and strategies necessary to implement the post-2015 Agenda is unlikely to be carried out properly and sustained progress towards achieving the targets will be underpinned by the absence good governance. Thus, governance architectural issues deserve serious consideration for explicit inclusion in the post-2015 Agenda.

The experience across most countries shows that sub-national governments are critical to development as these institutions serve as interface between locals and the national government. For example, in the case of Bangladesh, some of the success factors identified include the independent management by local government institutions of the available financial resources and their consultations with local communities on budget allocations and planning decisions.

In conclusion, governance is a key cross-cutting issue in Asia that should be considered as a stand-alone goal for the post-2015 Development Agenda. The experts at the EGM agreed that the proposed governance framework should be flexible enough to accommodate country characteristics which determine the linkages between relevant aspects of governance, economic governance in particular, as well as other development goals. Experts also agreed that due recognition should be given to the role of local and regional governments. To exploit this potential, it is important to enable people at local levels to participate in decision-making.

2.4 Global governance architecture and the post-2015 Agenda: the African context

The global financial architecture is beset by a number of priority issues, including the monitoring of financial innovations and addressing gaps in financial supervision. In this context, lessons learnt from the consultations at the UN Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA) was that the role of enablers, many of which are cross-cutting and apply to most (if not all) countries, was lacking in the...
MDGs framework. The challenge for the post-2015 development therefore is to determine which of these enablers can be agreed upon by all countries.

In the context of governance and management of financial innovations, such as hedge funds, which were not monitored, there is a need to examine what systems to put in place to ensure that the crises such as that of 2008 do not re-occur. As far as the gaps in financial supervision are concerned, there is a need for better monitoring of rating agencies, and to question the multi-layered regulatory system where some activities fall outside of the regulatory system while others do not.

In the African context, one problem is the low share of trade of the African developing countries, which is today less than half (at 3 per cent) of what it was after 1945. Import tariffs erected by the developed countries are characterized by both tariff peaks on sensitive products like sugar, as well as tariff escalation when African countries attempt to retain more of the value chain, for example, when they process their raw materials before export. This makes Africa’s raw materials very sensitive to overall price fluctuations. Coupled with this are the often high export subsidies imposed by the developed economies on exports to Africa, which further erodes local market formation. This needs addressing as part of global governance architecture.

Overseas Development Aid (ODA) should also be part of the governance debate, even though there has been a real decline in ODA recently, especially since the financial crisis. Most ODA focuses mainly on the social sector (schools, hospitals, etc.) rather than on the economic sector, such as small and medium enterprises (SMEs) and entrepreneurship. Greater alignment with national priorities is needed to ensure a better balance across, and linking between, these sectors. This would also help to ensure a more equitable regional and national distribution of aid and reduce the number of ‘aid orphans’. Another priority is to reduce the huge administrative, transaction and other costs of aid, given that only 49 per cent is actually spent on development projects.

According to the African Development Bank, illicit financial flows (IFF) are another big drain on Africa’s resources, estimated at $1.4 trillion between 1980 and 2009, and at $50 billion annually from 2000 to 2008. This meant that in 2009, IFF out of Africa were over three times the amount of the ODA received. Much of this IFF is concentrated in the raw material from countries, especially those with extractive industries. IFF is also linked to ODA, trade issues, as well as foreign direct investment (FDI), for example, as curtailing IFF would reduce reliance on ODA.

**IFF estimates from Africa $billion**

For a variety of reasons, climate change impacts developing countries in Africa harder than most. There is an increasing need to finance adaptation measures estimated at $20-30 billion in the next decades, compared to the just $132 million received in 2011 for this purpose mainly in bilateral ODA. One danger is that as more funding is sucked into adaptation, this will be at the expense of traditional ODA, so close monitoring is necessary. Climate change is by nature a transboundary, global issue, but there are very few international agreements, and there is already an increase in the incidence of conflicts over transboundary water management. The risk to Africa is high as the continent has more transboundary river basins than it has countries making this a global governance issue.

Experts at the EGM maintained that, in terms of measuring financial governance, there is, in addition to other governance issues, a need both for outcome as well as process indicators. For example, in the case of water, the number of transboundary agreements put in place would be an outcome indicator, whilst process indicators are also needed to check how effective these agreements are and how they are enforced.

The experts agreed that governance in the post-2015 context must reflect a shared global development agenda. Building on the Rio +20 outcomes and the Secretary-General’s High-Level Panel Report, there needs to be a new global partnership to mobilise public and private domestic resources. A new concept of public governance, which also promotes good corporate governance and strengthens national accountability measures, is required. Issues such as tax systems, subsidization, illegal capital flight and mutual accountability affect all countries and must be tackled. Effective governance at all levels is critical for sustainable development, so a key issue is how to measure and improve it especially in the context of the post-2015 Development Agenda. It is also important to place these discussions within the context of overall institutional development and capacity building to support coherence between the three pillars of sustainable development, i.e. economic, social and environmental sustainability, at the national level.
Chapter III. Governance measurement framework for post-2015 development

A comprehensive approach to governance measurement for post-2015 is a complex task with multiple challenges associated with defining, conceptualizing, and measuring the various dimensions of governance. As observed in post-2015 consultations around the world, building a common understanding of what is meant by governance down to basic definitions and concepts is not at all assured. Various reports released by the UN and around the world have emphasized differing elements of governance for the post-2015 Agenda, be it human rights, accountability, civic participation or the rule of law.

Governance indicators can allow better monitoring of both process and outcomes at national and sub-national levels, but devising tangible parameters of effective, equitable, responsive and accountable public governance into monitorable guideposts within the post-2015 development framework is challenging. While coverage of certain aspects of governance in terms of accountability, transparency and rule of law are fairly well established, indicators for linkages of governance with development effectiveness, economic and social inclusion and environmental management are needed.

To improve governance measures and increase accountability towards a shared development agenda, a two-dimensional framework using capacity and autonomy as measures of executive branch quality could be further explored. Such a framework was suggested in a recent paper by Francis Fukuyama. In this view, the quality of government is the result of the interaction between capacity and autonomy. Accordingly, in a country with low capacity, one would want to limit discretion and subject all processes to clear rules. On the other hand, if capacity was to be outstanding, one would not just feel safer granting considerable autonomy, but would actually want to reduce rule-boundedness in hopes of encouraging innovative behaviour. Importantly, this is consistent with the need for different approaches among countries within a universal agenda.

Experts reflected on how governance and technology-enabled governance could be reflected in the post-2015 development goals to ensure effective accountability and monitoring of the progress and the process. Discussions touched upon the feasibility of stand-alone governance goals in the post-2015 monitoring framework compared to deployment of governance dimensions ‘within’ each of the other sectoral goals with a view to enhancing the viability of measurement frameworks and their articulation in a way that can strengthen better development outcomes at the national level.

3.1 Measuring ‘good governance’ for development

When measuring ‘good governance’ for development, the most appropriate approach is to see governance as the ‘means’ and development as the ‘ends’. Governance should primarily be seen as a means rather than an end in itself, for example, because people do not pay taxes just to build

---
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government institutions. They do so that institutions can help deliver what they really want in terms of public services and facilities, peace and security, etc. However, there are divergent views on what the ‘means’ are, for example amongst economists some of whom see governance as the ‘means’ to make markets work whilst others see policy as the ‘means’.

A number of measurement approaches are used by econometricians, where the choice is often about whether indicators should be partial, by focusing on particular aspects of governance, or composite indicators as ‘averages’ about governance as a whole. Most resort to partial indicators where the choice is often pragmatic and based on available datasets. This has the danger that governance and institutions become reduced and simplified to individual indicators serving as proxies for an entire concept. There is also a choice between objective or subjective data, where the latter are often used as they are easiest to obtain. For example, although the relationship between development and government effectiveness is hard to measure, a strong correlation of +0.88 can be found when using GDP per capita as a surrogate for the former and measures of government effectiveness as a surrogate for the latter.

However, when the development surrogate is changed to growth in GDP per capita, the correlation disappears. It may be that better governance correlations can be found with growth, for example by weighting the six dimensions of the World Governance Indicators into a composite governance indicator. However, because each of the six has highly divergent correlations, the composite is again without significance.

This raises two questions. First, does ‘good governance’ lead to development, or does development lead to ‘good governance’? (Do we know what ‘good governance for development (growth) is?) Second, what do country histories tell us about governance for development? Some evidence can be gleaned from country cases on the ‘developmental state’, such as the role of industrial and science, technology and innovation (STI) policy for development in successful states. The evidence seems to be particularly strong with catch-up growth policies, such as in South-East Asia where STI policy is typically embedded in a strategic vision of development, but in other global regions industrial policy often seems to fail.

**Correlation between government effectiveness and GDP per capita**

![Correlation Graph](image)

The experts agreed that there are implications for indicators in these observations highlighting the need for additional indicators that measure the ‘developmental state’ notion, as well as to ascertain why it worked so as to be able to determine between broad and composite indicators or precisely targeted indicators. Some of the proposed dimensions could be: how well is the state able to formulate and pursue development goals?; does the state have an active strategic goal with regard to development, and to what extent does it rely on markets versus intervention?; industrial and STI policy: how important is this, and how much of the resources should go into it?; and finally, how are relations between government, firms and labor organized?

The experts noted that it is hard to get objective evidence on this, although attempts are underway at United Nations University (NYU)-MERIT, so it may be easier to rely on subjective evidence and to use a targeted rather than broad approach. The experts also noted that the High-Level Panel proposed governance indicators, though reasonable in terms of availability may still not allow a successful measurement of ‘governance’ as a means for development.

3.2 Evidence on governance: measurement and the governance dimension of the sustainable development goals

Taking a long term view of governance for sustainable development within the post-2015 framework needs to ensure the transition from conventional (unsustainable) scenarios to sustainable scenarios. However, to do this governance must operate within a narrow space of constraints defined as “the safe and just space for humanity” which balances the need for development with the concomitant need for sustainability. This necessitates a better understanding of what governance is, how it works and how it can be measured.

**Balancing development with sustainability**


---
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A systematic approach for this long term view would be a hierarchically structured measurement system which moves from a broad perspective and context to a sharper focus and increasing specificity: i) values, ii) issues, iii) goals and sub-goals, iv) indicators (what to measure), and v) targets (where to aim). This needs to be embedded in a principles-based approach for sustainability, assessment and measurement and could include the guiding vision, essential considerations, adequate scope, framework and indicators, transparency, effective communication, broad participation and continuity and capacity.

Hierarchical measurement system

The experts were of the opinion that measuring governance should start with goals first and then develop metrics, but this posed a number of challenges. First, goals should not be driven by data availability. It should be a policy imperative to make data available for the key issues of sustainable development even though it is acknowledged that this of itself may be challenging if proxy measures are all that are available. Second, due consideration should be given to making key issues measurable, which is a challenge. Third, given that even if something is measurable, measurement still needs to be performed, and investment is needed for that. Fourth, an interpretation challenge, in that interpreting and analyzing data is not straightforward. Fifth, an implementation challenge is how to act on the results.

In this context, it was noted that:

- Sustainable development goal indicators (SDGIs) and underlying data are needed for goal and target setting and strong SDG accountability, but goal setting cannot be data driven;
- Developing the SDGIs could be best done in a parallel, but distinct and value neutral process;
- The development of the SDGIs for all themes, including governance, should follow a principles-based approach;
- The development of SDGIs represents a major opportunity for mainstreaming beyond GDP thinking into policy;
- Clarity on the precise meaning of goals, sub-goals, indicators and targets is needed; and
- Governance indicators require primary data collection capacity on governance (structures, processes, results etc.) that often does not yet exist yet and will require investment.
An important issue to recognize is that governance as an enabler, despite its clear significance, is not the only ‘means’ to achieve the sustainable development ‘ends’. Other ‘means’ are likely to include natural capital (such as the availability of natural resources), built capital (e.g. factories, tools, infrastructures), and human capital (e.g. labor, skills and competences). Governance is just one means to manipulate these in producing sustainable development.

In this context, a number of evaluation criteria and possible measures were noted by the experts:

- Leadership: the existence and legitimacy of ‘vision’.
- Participation: processes and participants.
- Planning: processes and structures.
- Implementation and coordination: capacity.
- Monitoring and analysis: observation, data collection and assessment capacity.
- Adjustment: agility and ability to learn and adjust.
- Sustainability outcomes: progress towards targets individually and collectively.

### 3.3 Sustainable governance indicators measurement framework and the post-2015 process

The Sustainable Governance Indicator (SGI) project is an indicator-based, cross-national comparison of all OECD and EU countries which may point the way for a governance measurement approach for the post-2015 development. Under the project, 150 qualitative and quantitative indicators are employed by an international expert network to draw up detailed country reports. The SGI project is based on three guiding questions. First, how successful are the sample countries in achieving sustainable policy outcomes? Second, how well developed are the governance capacities of these countries in terms of long-term-oriented political steering capacities? Third, what is the quality of their democratic order?

A number of indices have been developed to address these questions. These include ‘sustainable policy performance’ measured along three dimensions: economic sustainability, social sustainability and environmental sustainability. Each is composed of a number of sub-categories and, in turn, a number of indicators. For example, a sub-category of social sustainability is “tackling global social inequalities,” one of the indicators of which is “to what extent does the government demonstrate an active and coherent commitment to promoting equal socio-economic opportunities in developing countries?” Another index is ‘quality of democracy’ measured along four dimensions: the electoral process, access to information, the rule of law, civil rights and political liberties.

The ‘governance index’ is measured along two dimensions of which the first is an ‘executive capacity’ consisting of the sub-categories of steering capability, political implementation and institutional learning. The second is ‘executive accountability’ consisting of sub-categories relating to citizens, the legislature and intermediary organizations. Executives need to have a long-term view and take governance seriously. For each of these indices, specific indicators are used that include the roles of key actors. Overall, this approach is in line with the UN Task Team Report *Realizing the Future We Want for All* and the High-Level Panel Report *A New Global Partnership: Eradicate Poverty and Transform Economies Through Sustainable Development*. Finally, the rule of law index is also seen as a fundamental framework condition, one of the sub-categories of which is judicial review, with an indicator exemplifying “to what extent do
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independent courts control whether government and administration act in conformity with the law?" Other sub-categories include improving legal certainty, ensuring independent judicial review, ensuring people have equal access to justice, and fighting corruption. Measurement of the rule of law index shows a strong positive correlation with the sustainable policy performance index. Other issues which might be addressed include empowering civil society actors, building up long-term political steering capacities, and ensuring policy coherence.

**Rule of law and sustainable policy performance**

![Graph showing correlation between rule of law and sustainable policy performance](image)


The experts at the EGM agreed that there is a need to measure the contribution of governance to global public goods in the context of the post-2015 Development Agenda. Clear and measurable targets are needed, however difficult this may be, in order to facilitate cross-national comparisons perhaps reinforced by reliable expert assessments. It is also important to refrain from imposing a one-size-fits-all approach with too many indicators, and it is crucial to undertake monitoring through evidence-based instruments. Finally, positive mutual learning processes need to be promoted, which highlight good examples and frontrunners.

### 3.4 Governance as a development goal: borrowing from existing measures

Incorporating governance within the post-2015 development framework is associated with the important challenges of how to measure it, what kind of data can be obtained, and what methodologies can be used. Though no firm consensus has yet emerged, the few aspects of existing governance assessments considered important are:
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- **Bureaucracy and administration**: how capable is the administration, is there lack of corruption, etc.
- **Legal issues**: legal quality, judicial quality, the rule of law, etc.
- **Accountability**: do governments do what they say, and do they make information available for others to track this.

A methodology for measuring governance for post-2015 needs to be developed, which takes account of what can and cannot be measured as well as of the quality of data. There are two broad types of measurement approaches which could be applied to governance measurement; however, both have some advantages and disadvantages. First, objective measures, which include ‘proxies’ of hard data and ‘de jure rules’ of government, i.e. rules existing in law which can be used as measurement yardsticks. The advantages of such objective measures are that they are not affected by observer bias and can be used to isolate the specific governance dimensions covered by the ‘de jure’ rules. The disadvantages, on the other hand, are that they can only express outcomes of governance and do not capture processes or the function of informal mechanisms.

### Classification and properties of governance measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of measure based on:</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Subjective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proxies from hard data</td>
<td><strong>De jure</strong> rules</td>
<td><strong>De facto</strong> rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advantages</td>
<td>Not affected by observer’s bias</td>
<td>Not affected by observer’s bias; isolates specific governance dimensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations</td>
<td>At best express outcomes of governance; do not address specific governance aspects</td>
<td>May not capture the functioning of informal mechanisms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The second measurement approach is of subjective measures based on ‘de facto rules’, i.e. what actually happens, as compared to what the law says should happen. The advantages of subjective measures are that they tend to capture both formal and informal rules, whilst the disadvantages are observer bias which is unlikely to be isolated. The trade-off between objective and subjective measures indicates the complexity inasmuch as that there is unlikely to be perfect governance measurement. This highlights the need for caution in devising governance assessments at the global level across 193 countries.

In order to monitor governance, it is also possible to borrow from measurements undertaken by the private sector and the industry, although again, with imperfect measures, and subjective and limited country coverage.

Further, in devising effective governance measurement there may also be a need to choose between a composite index and disaggregated measures. The former does not allow sufficient flexibility or the context-specificity often necessary when measuring governance issues. Additionally, in order to be valid, such approaches require the full disclosure of index components and the methodology used, which is not always the case. Though currently widely used composite indices have their shortcomings. Examples of these include the International Country Risk Guide, with indicators such as the rule of law, bureaucratic quality, and corruption, which primarily captures the view of
the business community; the Fraser Institute\textsuperscript{14}, which employs indicators like legal structure and security of property rights, but only covers 140 countries; and the World Bank\textsuperscript{15}, which though covering all UN Member States with indicators like the rule of law, regulatory policy, government effectiveness, voice and accountability, is nevertheless not comparable over time. In conclusion, it is important to include governance as a stand-alone post-2015 goal, but that measuring and monitoring governance presents political as well as methodological challenges.

3.5 Measuring governance: the challenge of transparency\textsuperscript{\textsection\textsection\textsection}\textsuperscript{\textsection}

There is currently some uncertainty and even arbitrariness as to which governance dimensions would be ideally suited to measure governance for the post-2015 Development Agenda. Leading governance dimensions include effectiveness, efficiency, equity, transparency, accountability, responsiveness and inclusion. However, there are a number of other possibilities, including political stability (e.g. measured by the amount of political violence); democratization (e.g. the growth in ‘democracy’); efficiency (size) of government (e.g. measured by central civilian government wages as a percentage of GDP, the role and size of the state, private investment as a percentage of GDP); e-government (e.g. using the UNDESA, UN E-Government Survey data\textsuperscript{16}, social media penetration); anticorruption measures (e.g. perception of corruption from Transparency International’s\textsuperscript{17} anticorruption measures taken); and the density of civil society networks.

The dimension of governance to be assessed should satisfy the following criteria:

- **Political acceptability**: a dimension must be acceptable to all UN Member States.
- **Actionable**: governments need to know what to do to improve rankings – given that composite indicators are non-actionable, they do not provide guidance as to what to do.
- **Action-worthy**: the aspect of governance should be important and legitimate.
- **Transparent and replicable**: governance indices and indicators need to be transparent. If an index is a black box, it unlikely it will be actionable.
- **Low ‘isomorphic mimicry’**: should focus on de-facto and not just de-jure indicators, therefore need to measure actual implementation and compliance on the ground, not just what laws, regulations or plans say should be achieved.
- **Easy collection of data**, i.e. the feasibility and cost of measurement.

Keeping these in mind, the current World Bank thinking purports transparency as a key dimension of governance, as a stand-alone goal, for post-2015 development since transparency seems to satisfy most of the criteria stated above. Moreover, other proposed dimensions may well be included under the rubric of other goals or remain difficult to measure (like efficiency, equity, accountability, etc.).

Transparency has both a normative and intrinsic value, e.g. transparency is enshrined in values and conventions like the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, regional conventions, etc.; it has empirical justification inasmuch as there is strong positive correlation between open government and government effectiveness. Transparency as a stand-alone goal for post-2015 development also has historical timelines and relevance evidenced from the right to information legislation which has grown dramatically since the 1990s. It also has the capability of being monitored independently, e.g. by organizations like Transparency International. Transparency is also linked to broader objectives like ‘open government’ which appears to have a strong positive correlation with government effectiveness. It has historical timelines and relevance, e.g. the right to information
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legislation has grown dramatically since the 1990s, and it has the capability of being monitored independently. Other methods to measure transparency, such as surveys of citizens, businesses and civil servants that could more accurately capture different transparency measures and arrangements are implemented at the country and agency levels.

**Government effectiveness and open government**

![Figure 1: Government Effectiveness and Open Government, 2011](image)


The experts at the EGM noted that focusing on transparency will, however, also involve significant additional work, such as conceptual work to unpick its dimensions, as well as more empirical investigation. There will also be a need for a greater focus on smart transparency, i.e. where will developing countries receive the greatest payoff for their marginal transparency investment. Another governance dimension which was considered was domestic revenue mobilization, given the financing requirements of the future agenda.

### 3.6 Thoughts on the measurement framework for governance in the post-2015 Agenda****

The discussion on governance indicators for post-2015 highlighted that there is a need for cross-country comparative metrics. Context-specificity was important but that is a challenge in making cross-country comparisons for which national-level indicators are relied upon. In this context, there are three key messages.
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First, if governance is only treated as an enabler, it may not have much impact and might disappear altogether, hence stand-alone governance indicators may be considered.

Second, less is more, so there is a need to focus on a ‘narrow’ concept of governance comprising only the key elements. A governance framework that includes everything will be impossible to agree and will not be actionable. Similarly, composite indicators are not actionable, so there is a need for individual disaggregated indicators. To support this, there should be a focus on incentives and measurability.

Third, the experts at the EGM agreed that it is important to have set criteria for selecting goals, targets and indicators. In this context, the following points were noted:

- The incentives that an indicator gives to a government, i.e. what will the indicator incentivize that government to do? There is a danger of perverse incentives which have negative side effects on other issues. A better indicator would be one which people will accept as stemming from a universal value and which is agreeable across governments.
- The importance of comparability over time, which puts a lot of demands on the data collection and methodology.
- The data needs to be fully accessible at disaggregated level; it should be understandable by non-econometrists and not too technical.
- The need for fact-based rather than perception-based indicators, tailored to the real experience of people.
- The indicator should send clear and unambiguous message.
- The desirability of focusing on formal requirements, which are likely to be clearer, more visible and easier to measure.
- The importance of publishing data online in an understandable manner for which evidence is also provided.

Finally, in addition to transparency as key governance dimension as proposed by the World Bank, the rule of law (as also proposed in the High-Level Panel’s Report\(^{18}\)), access to information, data privacy, and the right to know should also be considered. These are all relatively easy to measure, for example through the existence of legislation and formal practices, etc.

### 3.7 Governance measurement framework for post-2015 development – some thoughts on what and how

There are three main measurement trends across most social and economic activities including governance. First, up the value chain, measurement is increasingly focusing on measures which are higher up the value chain. Historically, measurement of government activity has encompassed only inputs and outputs on the supply side, such as the resources used by government or the number and sophistication of services put online, regardless of whether the latter were used or not. Many measures are now focusing more and more on outcomes and impacts. On the supply side, these include back-office process re-engineering, as well as productivity and efficiency measures, such as the number of cases dealt with. On the demand side, they include e-service take-up, the user experience, life events, user satisfaction, as well as impacts like job creation, economic growth, competitiveness, inclusion and cohesion.

\(^{18}\) Jeremy Millard, Danish Technological Institute, Denmark.
Three main measurement trends

Second, down the government hierarchy, the policy focus is shifting down the government hierarchy to regional and local governments, to front line staff and even to stakeholders. Earlier measurement frameworks have often neglected to address and capture developments at the local level and at the user interface where the design, standards and outcomes of government activity might be difficult to capture. Thus, rather than relying solely on surveys of central government administrators, measures should also examine feasible ways to include assessments of local administrations, staff and beneficiaries (family, community, civil organizations). The development of user-centric measures across, for example, the main areas of service provision at local level will be needed, for example in care, housing, education, crime, transport, environment and health. For the transformation potential of innovative government to become noticeable to users, frequency of use, local context and the specificity of service to everyday life situations all matter.

Third, out of the government institutions: the third main measurement trend is moving beyond solely government-owned measures with a host of other actors at different levels becoming increasingly involved in measuring government and governance. Thus, an attempt should be made to take account of these different stakeholder groups in designing and implementing any measurement survey. This might necessitate using new diverse sources of data, many of which are likely to emanate from these groups themselves, and other knowledge and resource inputs. For example, how to capture local and especially location-specific services used frequently, maybe even every day, in addition to the more familiar national, centralized administrative services which are used just once or twice a year. Both are important, but to date only the latter have been captured.

Rethinking measurement also needs to consider whether the money spent on measurement is commensurate with the benefits of measurement, given that there can be trade-offs. Overall, we need to move towards a robust but also very flexible measurement framework much of which is also at least partially ‘owned’ by the governments themselves as well as by other legitimate stakeholders. Such a framework should consist of two main elements. First, a core or common set of goals, targets and indicators across all countries, i.e. internationally comparable ‘good governance’ indicators supporting the four goals of inclusive social development, inclusive economic development, environmentally sustainable development, and peace and security. These core elements can be collected through multiple sources but should also be subject to robust quality
checks. Second, optional add-on goals, targets and indicators selected and/or devised by countries or authorities themselves to reflect national, regional or city policies, as well as their own needs and stage of development.

These two types of elements would enable countries to undertake, at least partially and if the country chooses to do so, an integrated as well as a selective and self-managed approach to measurement. This would include self–assessment and peer review, which, in turn, allows countries to personalize their measurement. It also permits the possibility of follow-up initiatives, i.e. so countries or others can directly act on and/or respond to the measurement results in a way which benefits their development goals. Overall, this enhances the possibility of a clear focus on policy performance and impact.

To achieve this, certain criteria need to be adhered to. Goals, targets and indicators must be easy to use and to personalize. They must be open and testable by all ‘legitimate’ actors. Countries/localities should also be able to use own add-on tools as well as data. This will allow countries to select what is best for them and make relevant comparisons against other countries because of similarity, shared goals, desired development path, etc. Furthermore, results and analyses could be visualized on a measurement platform (dashboard), to which other data and content can be added by the countries themselves.

### 3.8 Governance measurement and monitoring models for post-2015 development framework

Governance goals for post-2015 should be oriented towards the development outcome with the monitoring and evaluation criteria mindful of causal linkages between the policies adopted and the results obtained within the triumvirate of the political, economic and social sustainability.

In setting the contours of governance measurement for post-2015 development, the UN Task Team Statistics and indicators for the post-2015 Development Agenda identified the need for a set of agreed-upon values or dimensions of good governance to guide the definition of targets and indicators for the post-2015 Development Agenda. While data series and coverage of certain aspects of governance in terms of accountability, transparency, and rule of law is fairly well established, indicators for linkages of governance with economic effectiveness and social inclusion are needed.

The approach to a governance assessment framework for post-2015 also needs to ensure that governance indicators can assess and compare the quality of government institutions, assist citizens in making informed choices, allow for better understanding of public policy decision making, and enable stakeholders to assess the performance of government and of government institutions. In this context, four principles needed to be kept in mind:

- while goals themselves may be aspirational, numerical targets should balance ambition with realism
- the number of indicators for global monitoring should be kept strictly limited
- targets should be results-oriented in terms of wellbeing and sustainability
- be capable of aggregation to represent global and regional trends

---
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be politically value-neutral, feasible and do-able

Towards the post-2015 development goals and targets

The report also recommends that indicators should be mainly ‘outcome-based’ in order to focus on long-term results, clearly linked to targets, measureable over time, collected in a cost-effective and practical manner, and relevant for informing policy. They should be applicable to all 193 UN Member States and be able to account for wide disparities in context.

The experts also suggested that a clear strategic vision of what good governance consists of must precede the assessment of governance itself. A set of agreed-upon values or dimensions of good governance is needed to guide the definition of targets and indicators for the post-2015 development agenda. An initial proposal for such a set of dimensions of good governance comprises the following eight:

- Effectiveness
- Efficiency
- Equity
- Transparency
- Accountability
- Responsiveness
- Participation
- Inclusion
The experts indicated that there is a clear rationale for these eight dimensions. By increasing efficiency, effectiveness, equity and transparency in public administration and public service delivery, governments can help support the achievement of post-2015 development goals. Also, by promoting accountability, responsiveness, participation and inclusion, collective public policy decision making can lead to more sustainable development outcomes.

Given this background, three proposed models of governance monitoring can be considered, as follows:

Model 1: Governance as a stand-alone goal, for example focused on the rule of law, democratic governance and/or human rights. The challenge here is that none of these can adequately capture all dimensions of governance in such a limited manner. The experts at the EGM also noted the political infeasibility of incorporating ‘democratic governance’ dimensions such as freedom of speech, the public’s right to information or reductions in bribery and corruption.

Model 2: Embedded governance goals in each of the post-2015 goals. Governance considered primarily as a cross-cutting enabler with assessment and measurement of key dimensions (such as efficiency, transparency, etc.) built into each of the post-2015 development sectoral goals. The experts noted that a challenge in this approach would be how to isolate /measure the contribution of each governance dimension to desired outcomes.

Model 3: Governance principles framework: elaborating ‘good governance’ into a set of principles accompanying the post-2015 Development Agenda. The principles framework would be:
• universal (i.e. do not just apply to developing countries)
• voluntary adherence (i.e. countries will opt to be assessed)
• a wide ranging menu of suggested governance goals from which countries can pick and choose a few
• will allow countries to devise their own indicators for reporting
• be value-neutral and politically feasible

The Principles framework would be accompanied by a national self-monitoring framework for a set of Voluntary Governance Goals (VGG) in the post-2015.

The primary purpose of the VGG would be to shed spotlight on national governance deficit areas for adoption of appropriate laws, policies, standards and practices, and serve as a self-monitoring framework to measure performance against a country’s own objectives, standards, criteria and indicators in key areas of governance in order to support better development outcomes. This would also include opting for expert or outside assessment and/or self-assessment employing a phased in three-step approach and not necessarily a linear stage-type sequence.
Chapter IV. Technology-enabled governance for post-2015 development

The current framework of the MDGs falls short of an effective measurement of the contribution of new technologies to sustainable development. The focus on access to technology is not only narrow but is also overtaken by development solutions in the last decade. Meaningful access to ICT has gone beyond connectivity issues to embrace human, economic and social resources, institutional structures and governance networks, which are key to developmental outcomes, including those for the MDGs.

The emerging imperative today is to rethink the scope of e-government in order to understand how the opportunity offered by new technologies affects sustainable development both in terms of their sectoral contribution and as an enabler of development. There is a need to assess ‘how’ and ‘to what extent’ the governments of the world can deploy technology-enabled governance frameworks towards economic, social and environmental sustainability. In this context, it is crucial to redefine the space for assessing the role of ICT and their governance dimension in the post-2015 Agenda.

It is generally accepted worldwide that ICT is a catalyst for development. Through its 24/7 ubiquitous nature and its ability to reach remote areas, it has shown to contribute to: a) greater transparency and accountability; b) cost reduction; and c) inclusiveness and engagement. All of these are good governance goals. Further, national governments have moved beyond connectivity parameters to employ ICT and e-government for service delivery, which can easily be tracked. A revision and broadening of the scope of ICT in post-2015 Development Agenda is required to capture both new concepts and innovative technology solutions to development and monitor the contributions of new technologies towards development outcomes.

4.1 ‘E’ and the challenges of government *

Since the 1980s, globalisation has been posing profound challenges to government. Everything, including the movement of money and people, production, consumption and technology, is becoming globalized, except for politics which remains bound to territory. This challenges governance in four ways: structural financial problems, legitimation problems (e.g. EU or national level), the competitiveness of geographical entities (also states as well as regions are now in direct competition, for example for foreign direct investment, FDI), and the instrumentalization of the state (e.g. many multinational companies are more powerful than countries).

Since the 2000s, the information society has been a significant change maker, driven by a combination of ICT and other technological revolutions, together with the profound transformations taking place in the economy, in demographics and in social and cultural landscapes. This is reinforcing the challenges of globalization and is starting to force the state to adapt to the needs of its citizens. For example, the introduction of New Public Management (NPM) in the 1990s has been strengthened by ICT, which means that today governments are increasingly being judged in terms of serving their citizens’ needs.

ICT has three main impacts on government functions. First, in the provision of services, especially e-services, by transforming the way all services are delivered. Second, on policy making which is
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now starting to adopt aspects of e-democracy. Third, on regulation, where there is a huge untapped potential for e-regulation which is not yet realized.

\textit{The consequences of ICT for government functions}

Experts at the EGM noted that, to date, the impact of ICT on government still has a long way to go, for example in relation to four important challenges:

- Financial pressures, where e-services can ease financial pressures on governments by reducing their costs.
- Legitimation problems, where e-policymaking can increase legitimacy through more (online) participation and consultation (e.g. through the social web), and where e-services can make services cheaper, more accessible and more targeted and thereby more useful and legitimate.
- Competitiveness, which can be addressed by e-regulation, whilst e-services for example for businesses can increase their competitiveness.
- Instrumentalization, which can be eased by e-regulation, for example by making governments smarter as well as better at both collaborating and competing.

4.2 Socio-technical dynamics of governance

In understanding the socio-technical dynamics of governance, the experts at the EGM stressed the importance of context, to take account of available resources and competences, and depart from wishful thinking. One size does not fit all, and policy should go hand-in-hand with process. To appreciate this, it may be useful to identify a path of linear development through three levels: 1) basic infrastructure, 2) good standards of living, and 3) enhanced quality of life. However, a linear approach is may be overly simplistic, but we can add a cumulative development perspective by building the levels sequentially so the earlier influence the later. More appropriate is to look at a

---

\textsuperscript{†}Sharon Dawes, Senior Fellow, Center for Technology in Government, University at Albany, New York, USA.
mixed and continuous development approach in which governments work on several aspects of governance at the same time with variable policies, processes and resources.

*Mixed and continuous development*


In this context, we can define the role and the purpose of government as:

- distribution and exercise of power and responsibility including accountability, transparency, and stewardship;
- legal frameworks within and across nation-states;
- capabilities of the civil service;
- efficiency and effectiveness of processes and practices, and diversity of governmental organizations;
- influences and roles of actors outside government models and methods for assessing performance, integration and public value.

There is a huge variety of potential themes related to governance, ranging from privacy, personal identity and trust to mission oriented goals and performance, as well to cyber-infrastructures for e-government. There are also societal and economic challenges, human elements, in addition to ICT and other technology changes. Each theme interacts with each other and produces high complexity, which can be best addressed through complex model building and the identification of theme clusters and their variables.

One such model approach leads to the identification of six clusters: the purpose and role of government; societal trends; changing technologies; and human elements; all of which contribute to the interaction and complexity. A descriptive model that combines all these variables provides a relatively robust perspective on governance itself. The government’s role is to process and manage these different features and their interactions within and with open, complex and dynamic systems. This will provide a better perspective on the interaction between social and technical factors which is shaping governance systems in both expected and unexpected ways. The experts agreed that no one model is ‘best’ or ‘ideal’, or even feasible in all contexts. Instead, we should focus on monitoring the dynamics and learning something useful rather than benchmarking, including asking ‘how’, ‘why’ and ‘under what conditions’, in addition to ‘what’ and ‘how many?’.
4.3 Innovation and technology for the post-2015 development agenda

Experts pointed out that a major new phenomenon on the development stage in the last decade since the MDGs were articulated is the increasing impact of new technologies on the way the world conducts business. ICT is both a challenge, as it can widen inequality, but also a significant opportunity by enabling development in areas like health, energy, agriculture, entrepreneurship, building local economies and small companies, etc. Its impact on development sectors is not only due to the rapid advancements in technology but also due to an ever increasing access to global knowledge and information, enabling knowledge sharing and empowerment.

ICT can be seen as a new general purpose technology, like electricity, inasmuch as it has proven to be a driver inducing change in the way people communicate, organize, learn and participate; reducing the costs and barriers to public services; and inducing streamlined governance transactions, among other. In some venues, ICT is already being talked about as a human right.

ICT clearly has a role in three of the four development goals mentioned above, i.e. inclusive social development, inclusive economic development and environmental sustainability.

The role of technology in post-2015 development

Notwithstanding, ICT is not fully explored in terms of its concrete role in the post-2015 Agenda till now; rather, it is considered implicit alongside other technologies in support of knowledge and innovation despite the fact that achievement of all post-2015 goals – be it in poverty reduction, education health or any other - will likely rely to some extent on the use of technology.

‡ Tomasz Janowski, Head, Center for E-governance, United Nations University, UNU-IIST Macau, People’s Republic of China.
The experts discussed the role of ICT and reiterated that it was important to institutionalize ICT and ICT-led governance in the post-2015 Agenda and to widely disseminate understanding of the potential opportunities it brings, including in the context of public governance.

### 4.4 Policy-Driven Electronic Governance for Post-2015 Development

Information and Communication Technology (ICT) in public sector for post-2015 should be viewed in the context of Policy-Driven Electronic Governance (PDEGOV), which can support some key premises of the post-2015 Agenda as long as a number of challenges are addressed. These premises include the need to recognize the diversity of contexts within and among countries, which necessitates leaving space for national policy design and adaptation to local settings, to ensure policy coherence at global, national and sub-national levels. It is also important to rely on development enablers within and across dimensions, inclusion of all relevant stakeholders, such as the civil society, academia and the private sector, as well as facilitating transformative changes in the mechanisms of governance.

The goals of technology-enabled governance have evolved over time from mainly technological to organizational and more recently socio-economic goals. This process has broadened the scope and focus of public sector ICT to a multi-tiered level policy making.

- Stages 1-3: from technology in government, to electronic government and then to electronic governance, which includes goals that are more policy-driven.
- Stage 4: Policy-Driven Electronic Governance (PDEGOV), where ICT is seen as strengthening the mechanisms of governance, such as public service delivery, policy formulation and implementation, and the maintenance of social order and security. PDEGOV is also concerned with supporting locally-relevant policy and development goals in particular sectors, such as health, education, the economy, environmental sustainability, public sector reform, etc.

As such, PDEGOV, as an enabler, supports the post-2015 Agenda because it fulfills a number of key premises. A good example of PDEGOV is Electronic Governance for Sustainable Development (EGOV4SD). E-governance can transform the workings of government and its interactions with citizens, businesses, civil society and other arms of government through technology. In this model, five dimensions of EGOV can be recognized:

- government in terms of mission, roles, operations, institutions, etc.;
- technology in terms of infrastructure, equipment, data, social media, services and applications; interaction through channels, interoperability, partnerships, etc.;
- customers, i.e. their needs and roles; and
- society: societal conditions and needs.

Similarly, four dimensions of Sustainable Development (SD) can be recognized: i) social in terms of inequality, poverty, gender, etc.; ii) economic in terms of growth, jobs, energy, transport, etc.; iii) environmental issues like climate change, water scarcity, etc.; and iv) transitional changes such as green accounting, renewal energy, voice and empowerment, policy integration, etc.

---

*Tomasz Janowski, Head, Center for E-governance, United Nations University, UNU-IIST Macau, People’s Republic of China.*
The five EGOV dimensions can be mapped against the four SD dimensions to produce an EGOV4SD value framework in order to highlight the areas where EGOV can support SD. For example, the EGOV technology dimension can support the SD social dimension through access for all and reducing poverty and inequality. Such mapping will vary from country to country providing a useful link between global concepts, comparisons and learning, on the one hand, with national and local settings on the other. EGOV4SD itself can be seen to be the result of the policy cycle from planning, through design and implementation to operations.

The operationalization of EGOV4SD can be undertaken by developing an overall governance model consisting of a system of state and non-state actors (government, citizens and businesses), as well as the networks between them in which value is jointly produced. These actors and networks together engage in six governance functions, i.e. internal government operations, decision making, public services, network management, public information and services, and creating opportunities for self-development (‘government as a platform’). This in turn produces value in the overall system: internationally, nationally, and sub-nationally.

The basic EGOV4SD model


The experts at the EGM considered this overall approach useful as it links EGOV to SD in the context of the post-2015 Agenda, as well as providing a framework for accommodating both the local and the global. There are, however, challenges and issues to be addressed. There is a need for better understanding of how to contextualize EGOV properly, for example by developing context-specific policy guidelines in addition to generic maturity models. It also points to a need for policy-relevant indicators, knowledge of local conditions and the awareness of local customs of objective setting. Thus, capacity building at local level and of non-state actors is essential, propelled in part by a public-private partnership especially in terms of resources. The transition from EGOV to
PDEGOV is an incremental process and depends upon learning from both theory and practice in the local and cultural contexts.

4.5 ICT & governance: challenges and opportunities in development**

Making definitions clear is necessary when examining the impact of ICT on governance. Governance itself can be defined as the process of decision-making by which decisions are implemented (or not implemented). Good Governance has eight major characteristics: participatory, consensus oriented, accountable, transparent, responsive, effective and efficient, equitable and inclusive, and follows the rule of law. It ensures that corruption is minimized, the views of minorities are taken into account and that the voices of the most vulnerable in society are heard in decision-making. It is also responsive to the present and future needs of society.

In the context of ICT, e-Governance can be defined as an administration that applies and integrates information, communication, and operational technologies to address the challenge of planning and managing operations across multiple domains, and is fast becoming a key architectural component in most government operation models. Of relevance in this context is the so-called ‘FAST Government’, an approach suggested by the World Economic Forum for creating new public value and effectively meeting citizens’ needs so that leading governments are transforming themselves into flatter, agile, streamlined and tech-enabled (F.A.S.T.) organizations.

There are five major technology trends impacting governance. First is the rapid adoption of mobile technology, which indicates that by 2015, 1.3 billion people, 37 per cent of the global workforce, will be using smart phones and tablets. Second, its impact on the social media, where smart technology is already being deployed by 65 per cent of companies and is replacing other forms of web interaction. Third, cloud computing, which is already being used or investigated by 70 per cent of organizations. Fourth, advances in big data, which indicates that digital content will grow to 8ZB by 2015 and, if wisely used, can lead to smarter governance. Lastly, the need for cyber security in response to threats to electronic identity as well as from malware and cybercrime attacks.

Taking cloud computing as an example shows that its growth is supported by mega data centers located in the US and Europe. Cloud computing can have a very positive environmental impact because of the huge increases in efficiency it enables, thereby reducing energy consumption. There are different types of clouds: private (agile, cost effective and scalable), public (more secure and customizable giving greater control but also more overhead), and private-public hybrids (which combine the benefits of both as agile, scalable, cost effective and more secure). Cloud computing also enables Data as a Service (DaaS) and dominates job creation in the IT sector.

** Frank Mckosker, General Manager, International Organizations, Microsoft Corporation.
Notwithstanding, these exciting new technologies, innovations of the future will depend upon broadband access as the ‘oxygen’ of the digital economy, digital inclusion and affordable access. Since cloud and broadband together drive innovation and national competitiveness, it is important to lower the barriers to their roll-out and use, as has happened in a few countries of the world. For example, the use of TV white spaces, i.e. the unused spectrum between TV channels which was originally left open to prevent interference and which today can be exploited for broadband transmission. Similarly, using power grids to deliver broadband is increasingly becoming an option, as it is happening in some parts of Kenya, where both can be provided to customers for under $2 per month.

The experts were of the opinion that there are a number of impact areas that the technology community should focus on over the next 15–20 years. It should be noted that ICT provides positive feedback loops, so that potentially both ‘good’ and ‘bad’ effects are amplified in areas like privacy, security, new jobs, innovations, etc. This means there needs to be a focus on equality to reduce the gap between more and less developed countries.

4.6 Building IT infrastructure for post-2015 e-Governance development: cloud computing and service-oriented architecture

Information and communication technology can positively impact both governance and society through several pathways such as improved e-services and better quality of life. Improved e-services stem from direct e-government services as well as from e-economy and e-business services. The necessary condition which can realize the benefit of ICT, first, includes access to the Internet, then availability of useful ICT tools, and finally the e-skills of users.

†† Wojciech Cellary, Professor and Head of the Department, Department of Information Technology, Poznan University of Economics, Poland.
The experts highlighted that two key technologies of the future likely to affect the post-2015 development are cloud computing and service-oriented architecture. Cloud computing is a model for enabling convenient, on-demand network access to a shared pool of configurable computing resources (e.g. networks, servers, storage, applications, and services) that can be rapidly provisioned and released with minimal management effort or service provider interaction. It is often seen as providing three important benefits.

First, ‘infrastructure as a service’ (IaaS), where users do not need to invest in their own infrastructure but can pay just for using it when and where they need to with scalable use. There is more efficient use of fixed infrastructural investments and a reduction in the overall risk, as costs for users become operational rather than tied up in investment. IaaS can also overcome bottlenecks related to scarce ICT maintenance staff which is often a barrier in many developing countries.

The second benefit is ‘platform as a service’ (PaaS), which in a similar way lowers the costs of, and barriers to, software development, and thereby increases competition in e-services.

Third, ‘software as a service’ (SaaS) provides users with access to application software and databases on demand. Before SaaS in the public sector, each entity provided its own services tailored to local conditions. Although there are some localization advantages in this, there are also costs such as duplication and fragmentation of services and large quality differences between services. With SaaS, a single common ICT infrastructure can be provided as a public sector cloud, which can also be kept secure to meet privacy and surveillance concerns, thus ensuring no software duplication, improved software consistency, and reductions in local barriers related to infrastructural costs and staff. It reduces unnecessary competition between public administration agencies, a legal separation between decision making and services provision making, and reduces the gap between less and more advanced regions.

The second technology likely to impact the Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) is a software design and software architecture design pattern based on structured collections of discrete software modules, known as ‘services’, that collectively provide the complete functionality of a large software application. SOA permits the mutual interaction of those who have capabilities with those who have needs. It is a process-oriented approach which is independent of ICT systems implementation and ownership. This improves efficiency and enables the dynamic composition of services from both private and public sectors. SOA can be a lever of the e-economy also by the public sector which itself cannot go beyond service boundaries so has to create web services that can be freely integrated by businesses as compound e-services. Thus, SOA in the public sector can boost innovation and contribute to job creation in the wider economy.
Financial models

In developing countries, where household incomes are often low and where subsidies from the public sector can only be used in initial phases, micro-payment systems could be a useful solution to kick-start local e-businesses. There is the added danger in developing countries that inventions in an open innovation system, which are readily copyrighted in the developed economies and by large companies, often do not become protected due to this asymmetry in funding models. Experts at the EGM considered that support for new business models which allow local innovators to earn money from their innovations could be a way to reduce this disadvantage.

The experts maintained that post-2015 development of public governance should rely on cloud computing because this will improve public sector efficiency and reduce its costs, while provide equal access to public e-services for all: citizens living and working in richer and better developed regions of a country, and those living in poorer and less developed regions. This will also contribute to speeding-up development in poorer regions so that they can catch-up with richer regions. SOA can provide improvements in achieving citizen and business goals due to the process-oriented approach to mixed e-governance and e-economy.

4.7 Technology-Enabled Governance for Post-2015 Development‡‡

Highlighting the evolutionary nature of ICT, the experts explained that many technologies available today were non-existent when the MDGs were first envisioned, but advancements in ICT subsequently contributed to the achievement of the MDGs. The private sector had achieved great advances in the power of ICT tools, and contributed to the MDGs effort, for instance, in the one laptop per child initiative. Similarly, they reminded, that ICT solutions that do not exist today may be available in the future for the post-2015 development which will offer innovative opportunities to address governance issues of the future. In this context, however, the key challenge for the developing world will arise in terms of providing access to new technologies and smart tools.

‡‡ Oliver Bell, Chief Technology Officer, Microsoft Corporation, Washington DC, United States of America.
One such potential advancement could be the use of the so-called ‘big data’ for pursuing development goals like disaster prevention and recovery; interoperability as a mechanism enabling the instantaneous translation and usage of data for immediate problem solving; social computing opening new pathways for governments to interact with citizens; and open government data facilitating in monitoring and enhancing the transparency of civil service functions.

ICT is already omnipresent in the governance of the corporate world, as shown for example through many new initiatives. These include various iterations of a code of corporate governance in South Africa presented in the so-called King Reports and cited as "the most effective summary of the best international practices in corporate governance." There are also various other instances with best practices in governance, but it should be noted that the real opportunity stems from recognizing the merit of governance and not ICT per se which remains only a tool.

Scenarios of ICT impact

![Scenarios of ICT impact](image)


Today, the corporate world continues to be transformed by ICT enabling mobility, cloud computing, social media and big data. A number of common trends were driving ICT, typically with Moore’s Law at their base. For example, natural interaction, leading to more intuitive and ubiquitous control interfaces in computers; social computing, such as new ways of interacting with citizens as businesses; ecosystem of computers based on the web and the internet of things – if people could interact and trade non-physically, opportunities would grow; pervasive displays enabling information to be taken to new places; ubiquitous connectivity, so people and things are potentially online whenever and wherever they are and in all situations; and cloud computing, which reduces costs, scalability and agility.

To ascertain how future ICT innovations could impact governance, it was necessary to be mindful of the potential of the following:

- Big data: there are already many examples of practice where this is used for development goals (such as in natural disasters), and new uses that were unimaginable until recently are now possible. However, uncurated data are a challenge, but if its potential can be unlocked, more uses become possible.
- Data interoperability: the instantaneous transfer and translation of data can lead to immediate problem-solving.
• Administration and finance: business productivity, cost containment and financial management can all be dramatically improved.
• Business intelligence: business reporting can be improved leading to the rapid identification of, and immediate response to, mission- and business-critical situations.
• Open government: for example, open data to facilitate governance, the monitoring and transparency of civil service functions, as well as use for global benchmarking and international comparisons.

4.8 Public governance dependence on ICT for post-2015 development§§

Placing the discussion in the context of the post-2015 development, experts discussed several challenges to public governance, ranging from excessive debt, through the depletion of natural resources and climate change to high unemployment and civil unrest. In thinking about how ICT could address them, two points were of key importance: take what we have and build what we need, and one size does not fit all.

To do this, there was a need to better understand the government’s increasing reliance on ICT – key among which was information sharing between government with citizens and businesses. In this approach, it was also important to be mindful of the concept of ‘world governance’, which would be realistic and acceptable by all countries with a context-sensitive definition of governance. Since governance is not only about information exchange and use, but also how the governance system operates, including the respective roles and power structures of the stakeholder, one may consider a broader concept of ICT as information and operational communication technology (IOCT).

In such a model, variations of governance would be applied to different contexts, depending on the political system and the phase of transition. Eventually, one may conceive of universal ‘target’ governance that countries could converge towards leading to a World Governance Index (WGI), ranging from a very open and loose government, which is really no government at all, to a closed government which, in reality, provides no governance. An optimal WGI position would be between these two extremes. In moving towards a universal ‘target’ of governance, different paths need to be conceived depending on needs, priorities and a starting position, which would necessitate a piecemeal approach as the concept of public governance with identifiable steps. For example: Stage 1 - primitive governance, where governance is defined as a development goal; Stage 2 - more governance as planned for; and Stage 3 - complete governance, defined as a development goal.

§§ Saleem Zoughbi, United Nations University, UNU-IIST Center for E-governance, Macau, People’s Republic of China.
Three stages of controlled technology implementation

Each stage has its own raison d’être and provides a controlled plan for successful implementation. Such a pattern is flexible and can be tailored by each country according to its own needs, and enables the feasible implementation of new public governance for developing countries. It can also take account of the broad evolutionary pattern of government from e-government in 2000 to connected government in 2005, to open government in 2010, and as a continuous process towards smart government by 2015. The latter incorporates elements of sustainability, agility, the empowerment of not only citizens but also of government (civil servants), sustainability not only through new technologies, but also through new ways of doing business, as well as blending information, operation and communication in IOCT.

Another way to conceive this is to imagine governance as a planet where we can unpeel the layers. The inner core would consist of the business processes, the office and bureaucratic structures; the outer core would be the interface between governance and citizens, and ways of providing governance continuity; the mantle would be citizen-enabled governance; and the crust would be smart living, smart economy, smart services, etc.

During the discussion, the experts agreed that new ICT is having a profound impact on these layers and functions, including mobile, data centers, the cloud, shared services, broadband and operational technologies. All these should be used to increase well-being and human development through flexible combinations suited to individual countries. This enables governance implementation step by step and thereby more successful economic and social development on both national and regional levels.

In summing up, the experts concluded that recent advances in technology provided huge opportunities for greater public accountability and improved development outcomes. ICT can cut across governance institutions and enhance their efficiency, effectiveness and transparency. Especially when coupled with an entrepreneurial culture, ICT can significantly encourage thinking outside the box and improve capabilities for solving everyday and real world problems, often at lower cost.
Chapter V. Institutions and capacity building as key to development of the future

Underpinning governance for post-2015 is the role of national leadership in redefining what the State does and how governance institutions, mechanisms and processes are governed within the local and cultural context. This, in turn, is a requisite of institutional coordination mechanisms which promote greater accountability and transparency, efficiency and effectiveness – all desirable dimensions of good governance. Participatory and inclusive institutional governance begins with strengthening the civil service; reforming and regulating to promote multi-stakeholder partnerships; and a proclivity to citizen-orientation.

The various reports related to the post-2015 development agenda, including the UN Task Team Report, the Rio +20 Outcome and the Secretary-General’s High-Level Panel Report have identified the need for good governance and institution building. Member States have acknowledged in the Rio+20 Summit Outcome that “to achieve sustainable development we need institutions at all levels that are effective, transparent, accountable and democratic.” However, clear challenges remain in identifying the pathways in which public administration will shape the governance debate in post-2015 so that leadership and institutional development that encouraged creativity and innovation in the pursuit of inclusive, equitable and sustainable growth can be managed.

5.1 Governance, Public Administration and Leadership Capacity Building for post-2015 Agenda

Public Administration (PA) is at the core of public governance and, in turn, the core of PA is politics and public policy which impinge on development. The importance of public administration can be gauged by the evidence on the underachievement of the MDGs in many countries, which highlighted deficiencies in public administration and the national human and institutional capacity.

Past development patterns indicate that in this context leadership is a key issue for two reasons. First, it matters who is leading a country, since how a country fares in its development is crucially dependent upon its leaders. Leadership is about aligning local development plans with national, regional and global development strategies. In the context of the post-2015 development agenda, there is a need to focus on leadership for development, which is also concerned with engaging all actors and securing appropriate and relevant support, energies and resources.

Successful leadership requires professionalism, accountability, integrity and ethics. It also involves emphasizing sustainability by taking account of the needs of future generations. Leaders who can work with citizens to look beyond immediate concerns invariably achieve success in the longer term. Thus, success is not only about today, but about tomorrow as well, so there is a need to plan ahead with a clear vision.

*** John-Mary Kauzya, Chief, Public Administration and Capacity Building Branch (PACB), Division for Public Administration and Development Management (DPADM), United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA), New York, USA.
In relation to development for all, leaders face many challenges. The increasing disparity between the rich and the poor calls for a large scale transformation and vision as moving in small steps is not sufficient. The challenge for leaders is not to succumb to the daily pressures of their constituency if this means sacrificing the long-term dream. Leaders also need to be able to resolve conflict peacefully; if countries are in conflict, it is difficult to focus on a long-term development agenda.

Leadership needs to be imbued with several skills and capacities including what is called an ‘integrated leadership’ capacity in order to cohere policies at a country level; ‘entrepreneurial leadership’, which means scanning the environment and looking ahead in order to finding solutions to actual problems before they arise; ‘administrative leadership’, focusing on the rule of law, and the ‘administrative leadership’ to achieve change management. Finally, ‘operative leadership’ is needed so that plans can be acted upon. Above all, leaders need a multi-competency approach where these skills can be flexibly deployed, which necessitates a holistic approach to building these characteristics. Such an approach should include responsiveness to people’s and communities’ needs, self-reliance and collaboration, self-examination, the ability to exploit ICT, applied research and scholarship, and being able to harness diversity.
Diversity is a resource, not a problem to be solved, and trying to deal with it as a problem causes conflict, for example between regions and ethnicities. Above all, experts at the EGM pointed out that leadership should be seen as the trinity of professionalism, integrity and ethics. These are like the branches of a tree resting on the trunk of institutions, structures, systems, rules, laws and regulation, which in turn are ultimately dependent on societal norms and values. Recognition of these interrelationships and such dependencies is the mark of a good leader.

**Focus areas for developing Professionalism capacity**
5.2 Building capacity for governing post-2015 development

The transformation of the mechanisms of governance, as required by post-2015 development, requires capabilities for government information leadership and a tangible approach to building such capabilities within institutions and the civil service. A transformative change towards an inclusive, people-centered sustainable development needs to impact production and consumption, the management of national resources and governance systems. A number of institutional capabilities are needed to achieve this, including developing multi-dimensional and holistic approaches for evidence-based policy-making; managing organizational changes; promoting citizen participation and engagement; ensuring accountability and transparency; and developing partnerships at the local, national, regional and international levels. There is also a need for reliable data and monitoring. Other required capabilities include leadership to enable the transformative changes needed to achieve public value, as well as communicating effectively with stakeholders and the public at large.

In this context, experts at the EGM agreed that ICT is a significant opportunity to access, create, share and manipulate knowledge, as well as for empowering people with information to hold institutions to account. In terms of the post-2015 development architecture, ICT is key enabler for inclusive social and economic development as well as for environmental sustainability. To ensure that ICT meets this potential, a Government Information Leadership (GIL) function should be set up with three important interrelated activities. First, ‘establish’ to assess readiness and provide necessary foundations. Second, ‘operations’ to build human and institutional capacity. Third, ‘support’ to engage leaders and facilitate cross-agency coordination and international collaboration.

Three activities of a Government Information Leadership (GIL) function

One framework for designing and implementing the GIL function, consisting of seven synergistic activities, was considered by the experts. It highlighted, first, the need for conducting a readiness assessment to determine the preparedness of a capacity building framework for post-2015 development to local context. Second, establishing a legal and regulatory framework which would help with customization and contextualization. Third, organizational development and support for the leadership role and for implementation, by creating positions supporting infrastructure, defining responsibilities and defining competences. Fourth, human capacity building, including for developing skilled leaders. Lessons of experience indicate that in a developing country context, governments seldom have the necessary knowledge and skills for this, so there is a need to establish partnerships and institutionalize training centers. Fifth, international collaboration in order to learn from others, for example through regional collaboration and partnerships with other institutions.

††† Elsa Estevez, Academic Officer, United Nations University, UNU-IIST Center for E-governance, Macau, People’s Republic of China.
Sixth, cross-agency collaboration to provide mechanisms for the execution of cross-agency projects, for example by establishing a central coordination unit with defined policies and financial mechanisms. Seventh, collaboration and engagement by building community support, promoting collaboration and engagement, as well as sharing and anchoring experiences.

5.3 ICT enabled education services

The experts discussed capacity building for ICT-based governance in the context of education as a critical goal of the current as well as likely future development agenda. Increasingly, ICT is seen as a tool for both efficient and effective service delivery across the education sector, so that capacity building strategies must take account of the important role that private sector actors supplying ICT services and expertise will need to play. This ranges from directly taking on roles for the delivery of such services to supporting government in its own capacity to deliver. Thus, a holistic perspective and approach to the delivery of ‘value’ in education, as in other sectors is essential, when considering any capacity building exercise.

The experts highlighted the need for partnered interventions in three areas. First, decision-support systems in which data collection, collation and updating are required for effective management information systems at all levels of decision making in the education sector. Global experience shows that this is generally an outsourced task, where although government may formally own the systems, the de facto partner is often a private sector ICT actor. Second, teaching and learning support systems where the government typically defines standards, including curriculum design, syllabi, class/level learning standards and outcomes. Here, content creation is an activity in which both government and non-government actors can participate, resulting for example in open education resource platforms. Third, governance support systems used for monitoring data on, for example, school dropouts, gender variation by location, social class/caste behavior, etc. ICT-based initiatives, such as child tracking, identity databases and GIS mapping of schools and institutions, are indicative of a paradigm shift in the way government undertakes many of its core tasks.

These examples illustrate the need to look at capacity gaps and development with both public and technology partners working together to align the technology with the priorities of governance. Government should reform its institutional frames and processes, re-skill its staff and revisit institutional mechanisms to enable professional service providers to function in the government domain. In turn, non-government actors need to review their structure and processes to operate in a mandated regulatory framework different from their traditional market perspective. In this context, there is a case for developing a Global Capacity Assessment Framework for a country to be able to conceptualize, customize and assess its current status with reference to its inherent institutional capacities across all its activities.

Radha Chauhan, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India, Delhi, India.
An area where ICT as a tool could help is through an ‘inclusive’ policy approach for each of the components above in terms of equal access by all groups to good quality education. ICT is a key enabler for education and capacity building in a large number of areas, including the delivery and monitoring of teaching, student performance assessment, collaborative platforms for content, enrollment and admissions, examination management and certification and teacher services. However, ICT is not a silver bullet, and it can, in some circumstances, make lives more difficult rather than easy, for example when people do not have the appropriate skills or when there is low community acceptance of new technology.

Another area where ICT can be utilized is that of capacity assessments of the three main stakeholders: individual students, IT related service providers and the educational institutions. In this context, the experts at the EGM agreed that capacity frameworks need to be developed, which can address the need to (self) assess capacity and identify gaps and provide options for resolution. It is also important to standardize tools which can factually peg a ‘where am I now’ query to ‘where should I go’ and ‘how’; to twin ICT with non-ICT, i.e. develop blended education and learning; and to provide indicators for each of these capacity components which can be globally identified and benchmarked.

### 5.4 The example of the African Peer Review Mechanism

The African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) was considered as an example to draw upon for governance in post-2015. The APRM is a mutually agreed instrument voluntarily acceded to by the Member States of the African Union (AU) as a self-monitoring mechanism, founded in 2003. The mandate of the APRM is to encourage conformity in regard to political, economic and corporate governance values, codes and standards among African countries, and the objectives of socio-economic development within the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD).

---

**Roseline Achieng, Head, Governance and Africa Peer Review Program (APRM) South African Institute of International Affairs, Johannesburg, South Africa.**
With its emphasis on two aspects of governance i.e. accountability and transparency, the APRM offers a practical example of how governance issues can be incorporated in the post-2015 Development Agenda, particularly in a developing country context. Exploring further, the experts highlighted the need to understand how accountability and transparency could be managed in a cross-country governance perspective. The social sciences not only focus on cause and effect, but also provide the concept of embeddedness, i.e. how an understanding of governance issues needs to be embedded in each country’s context, despite the many similarities and areas of overlap which they share.

After ten years operation of the APRM, there are achievements; however, there is also a need for a critical review. This will provide better understanding of the challenges and lessons for the post-2015 Agenda in general, as well for capacity building and institutional reform in particular.

In response to how the post-2015 development effort can learn from the experience of the APRM, the experts were of the opinion that lessons include the need to both initiate a governance agenda that is transformative, and to pay more attention to the coherence of policies across different areas. It is also clear that better linkages need to be established between governance processes and the institutions which structure them. Above all, good leadership is critical, which can enter a ‘social contract’ and continuously cultivate the ability to bring people together so that they can act towards a common goal.
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Backed by in-depth knowledge in governance, public administration and management, and strategic planning, he has proven successful practical experience in management and administration, management training and consultancy, and strategic planning. The consultancies he has carried out have been in the field of writing programmes and advising governments on good governance, local governments strategic planning, organizational auditing, evaluation and restructuring, corporate planning, training needs assessment and other areas in African countries.

He holds a Ph.D. in law (Public Administration and Management) from Sorbonne University, and a Master’s degree in Public Administration from the University of Liverpool. He has attended several universities and higher Institutions of learning and research. His areas of specialization include governance capacity assessment and programme design, human resource management, training programmes design, delivery and evaluation, organizational auditing and restructuring, institutional development, civil service reform, decentralization, policy analysis and planning, general management and administration, strategic corporate planning.

McCosker, Franck

Mr. Frank McCosker is Managing Director of Global Strategic Accounts for Microsoft with responsibility for Microsoft’s engagement with multilateral organizations, including the international financial institutions, intergovernmental organizations and the bilateral providers of Official Development Assistance (ODA). Frank McCosker joined Microsoft’s East European headquarters in 1997, and during his 14 years with the company he successfully guided Microsoft in carrying out key public sector-related development projects. His successes in helping Bulgaria to transform and realize their full potential have been very much appreciated by the Bulgarian government, partners, and communities.

Mr. McCosker was named Director and later General Manager of Microsoft’s East European Headquarters in Munich, Germany in 2000. Frank McCosker also spent his time on various strategic public sector projects, helping the new EU Member States to meet the EU accession criteria. In addition, he chairs a working group within Microsoft aimed at company transformation, focusing on new strategies to further socio-economic development in least developing countries (LDCs) and emerging markets. In 2004, he was promoted into his current role of Managing Director, Global Strategic Accounts, International Organizations.

Throughout his career, Frank McCosker has combined a distinguished career of business, philanthropic, and humanitarian leadership with a personal life of public service. Both his career and his voluntary activities have reflected a commitment to improving the lives of others with a special interest in young people at risk and giving something back to international community.
Millard, Jeremy

Dr. Jeremy Millard is Senior Consultant with the Danish Technological Institute, and Associate Research Fellow at Brunel University, UK. He has 40 years’ experience working with new technology and society in Europe and globally. He has worked with many governments, regional and international development agencies all over the world in providing consultancies particularly in the areas of eGovernment, eBusiness and eInclusion.

Recent assignments include leading an impact assessment of the European eGovernment 2010 Action Plan and a comprehensive study on European eParticipation. He also participates in the European eGovernance 2020 Vision Study and eGovernment benchmarking for the EU.

He has supported the inclusive eGovernment Expert Group of EU Member States, and undertaken an impact assessment of EU supported eGovernment research. Much of this work has focused on open, innovative and inclusive eServices. His recent work with the UN, the OECD and the Council of Europe has also focused on this area.

Mujeri, Mustafa

Dr. Mustafa Mujeri is the Director General of the Bangladesh Institute of Development Studies (BIDS) and Coordinator of the South Asia Network of Economic Research Institutes (SANEI), the South Asian regional arm of the Global Development Network (GDN). Dr. Mujeri obtained his Ph.D. in Economics from McMaster University in Canada.

Before joining BIDS, he served as the Chief Economist of the Bangladesh Bank (country’s central bank) and UNDP Advisor in Cambodia. Earlier, he served as Research Director at the Centre on Integrated Rural Development for Asia and the Pacific (CIRDAP), a regional inter-governmental organization; national expert in the Bangladesh Planning Commission; and Professor of Economics at the University of Rajshahi.

Dr. Mujeri has extensive research experience in different areas of economics especially in development economics, poverty and macro policy analysis, and application of modeling and quantitative techniques in development issues. He has to his credit a large number of publications in reputed journals at home and abroad.

Niestroy, Ingeborg

Dr. Ingeborg Niestroy studied (physical) geography, worked as planner for transport projects, and has ever since been interested in governance questions of environmental integration and sustainable development, firstly culminating in her Ph.D. thesis on Strategic Environmental Assessment. She was Secretary-General of the European network of advisory councils for environmental policy and sustainable development (EEAC), and has around 15 years’ experience in European policy-making and multi-stakeholder relations. She conducted a comparative study on governance for SD in nine EU members states (2005), as well as on different models of environmental and SD councils (2007, with follow-ups).

Since 2013, she is a research associate at the Policy Assessment Group of the Environmental Policy Research Centre, Free University of Berlin, Germany. Previously, she conducted research studies at the German University of Administrative Sciences, Speyer and University of California at Berkeley about
environmental planning, public law administration and environmental law.

Ingeborg took part in the preparations of the Rio+20 process (2010-2012), collaborated in a comparative study of the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF) on governance for SD at regional, national and sub-national levels, and will continue to contribute in the post-Rio agenda. She is Board member & Secretary of the Club of Rome – EU chapter, delegate to the Consultative Committee for Industrial Change (CCMI) of the European Economic and Social Committee (EESC) and is affiliated with the Network of Excellence LIAISE (Linking Impact Assessment Instruments and Sustainability Expertise).

Parto, Saeed

Dr. Saeed Parto is currently Director of Research at the Afghanistan Public Policy Research Organization (www.APPRO.org.af) based in Kabul, Afghanistan, and responsible for research programmes on Aid Effectiveness, Rights and Development, Natural Resource and Environmental Management, Governance, and Political Economy. He is also Lecturer at the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Maastricht University.

His work focuses on different modes of governance and the formal and informal institutions through which governance is exercised, emphasizing the links between governance and policymaking at different jurisdictional and territorial scales and in different contexts. He has written, lectured, and consulted in a wide array of areas including capacity building through development aid programmes (Afghanistan, Ghana, India, Nigeria, and Vietnam), industrial clustering (South Africa, Egypt, and Afghanistan), regional integration (Turkey and the European Union), environmental policy (Canada, the Netherlands, United Kingdom, and Afghanistan), technological transitions (Europe and Japan), and industrial greening (Canada).

Pintér, László

Dr. László Pintér is currently Professor in the Department of Environmental Sciences and Policy at the Central European University in Budapest, Hungary, and Senior Fellow and Associate at the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) in Winnipeg, Canada. Prior to joining CEU in 2010, he had worked full time with the IISD since 1994, serving as director of its Measurement and Assessment Program between 2003 and 2010.

Professor Pintér is an internationally renowned author, speaker and practitioner on sustainable development, with a background in analysing strategically important sustainable development policy issues at the global and sub-global levels.

His main interest is the integration of science, policy and politics in transition processes with a focus on progress towards sustainability. More specifically, his work focuses on how the sustainability governance of coupled socio-ecological systems is informed by knowledge and management tools and processes, such as indicators, models, strategies, and alternative scenarios in various geographic and sector contexts.

He also maintains an interest in adaptation to global change and how adaptive management can contribute to strengthening resilience. He works worldwide with governments, companies, research centers, multilateral organizations and communities that seek to translate sustainability from theory into practice.
Savoia, Antonio

Dr. Antonio Savoia is an economist focusing on the political economy of development. Taking a cross-national approach and using quantitative methods, his research has looked at the determinants of governance and institutional performance and how they impinge on development outcomes and policies.

Before joining the University of Manchester, Antonio has worked at the University of Exeter, the University of Reading and at the University of Bath.

His most publication has looked at the role of institutional development on income distribution in Developing Economies. Ongoing research includes an empirical article on the dynamics of institutional change, a case study on growth and human development in Bangladesh, and a survey article on the determinants and consequences of State Capacity.

Schraad-Tischler, Daniel

Daniel Schraad-Tischler is a Senior Project Manager at the Bertelsmann Stiftung in Gütersloh, Germany. He heads the Stiftung’s Sustainable Governance Indicators (SGI) project, a cross-national comparison of policy performance and governance capacities in the OECD.

Daniel Schraad-Tischler holds a Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of Cologne (Faculty of Management, Economics, and Social Sciences) as well as a master’s in Political Science, History and German Literature (Cologne).

His main areas of research are good governance, sustainable development, and EU politics, as well as cross-national comparisons of social justice and equality of opportunity. Before joining the Bertelsmann Stiftung, he worked as a research associate at the Jean Monnet Chair for Political Science and European Affairs at the University of Cologne. Daniel Schraad-Tischler also gained project management experience at the European Parliament and at Bayer AG.

Verspagen, Bart

Professor Bart Verspagen is Director of UNU-MERIT and Director-Dean of the Maastricht Graduate School of Governance (MGSoG) at Maastricht University. He is an economist specialized in the economics of technological change. He did his undergraduate studies at the University of Limburg (now called Maastricht University) in Maastricht, the Netherlands, from 1984 to 1988. After that, he obtained a Ph.D. degree from the same university in 1992. During the five years after that, he held a scholarship from the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW). His workplace is the Economics Department of Maastricht University, as well as the research institute UNU-Merit in Maastricht. At the university, he holds the chair of International Economics.

Professor Verspagen's research interests are fairly broad. The Centre area is the process of economic growth, and its relation to technological change. This also brings him into areas such as international trade theory, industrial dynamics, economic and technology history, and applied econometrics, statistics and mathematical modeling. With regard to the latter, he has mainly been applying evolutionary theory to economics. This includes simulation modeling of international economies.
Dr. Zoughbi worked in several career environments. After he completed his graduate studies in computer engineering, he taught at the Computer Institute of Canada, Concordia University, Montreal, then moved to Alquds (Jerusalem) University and Bethlehem University in the Palestinian Territories. As an associate professor, he was involved in research and several development projects in ICT for development. He authored research part and books in part and in full.

He was involved in the in founding the Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics (the IT section), and worked as senior adviser in ICT to the Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation of the Palestinian Authority. With support from UNDP, he helped design the National Information Centre at the Ministry. He participated in several advisory, assessment and evaluation of projects and undertook many studies and reports with the UNDP, and represented Palestine in the technical groups of the EU in the information society.

He joined the United Nations ESCWA in Beirut as a regional adviser for Information and Communication Technology (ICT), Dr. Saleem Zoughbi provides technical assistance and advisory services to member governments. This includes special technical advice in different applications such as the evaluation of national policies and strategies, evaluation of IT departments within a CIO approach that includes business and process re-engineering, planning and evaluation in e-government and e-governance, databases, data centers and others. Currently, he supports the Centre of e-Governance at UNU–IIST for smart city governance.
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