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Engagements of the Mongolian CSOs Network for SDGs

Engagements for the 1\textsuperscript{st} VNR

- **Brief introduction:** Mongolian CSOs’ Network on SDGs established in 2016. It unites more than 500 CSOs, CBOs, their coalitions and networks and individuals working on human rights, protection of environment and public, social service issues.

- 2017: reminding and demanding conduct of the 1\textsuperscript{st} VNR

- 2018-2019: Drafting the 1\textsuperscript{st} CSOs Joint Report on the SDGs and active engagements with the WG and the experts’ team on drafting of the 1\textsuperscript{st} VNR report.

- Active participation in final reviews of the draft national SDGs targets and indicators after the 1\textsuperscript{st} VNR
Engagements of the Mongolian CSOs Network for SDGs

Engagements for the 2nd VNR

• Scoring assessment of the SDGs
• Engagements with multistakeholders
  - National consultation
  - The government Launch meeting of the 2nd VNR
• Scoring assessment of the SDGs with Multistakeholders
Scoring assessment of the SDGs

• Methodology developed by Action for Sustainable Development (A4SD) global civil society network

• Methodology designed to assess the structural and procedural effectiveness of SDG Implementation by 10 key areas.

• This methodology has been used by CSOs of different countries of Asia, Africa, Latin America when they face VNRs in their countries with financial and technical supports from A4SD

• Our Network had a chance to be one of them.

• We started the scoring from April 2022. The purpose was to make contribution for the 2\textsuperscript{nd} VNR.
10 key areas of assessing the SDG implementation process

**State policy parameters:**
1. National development strategy, action plan, budget;
2. State policy, legal regulations;

**Institutional capacity:**
3. **Institutional support** – to have special agency, who is responsible for implementation, the scope of rights and responsibilities, institutional capacity, and the level of integration of the work of government institutions working on each SDG;

4. **Implementation at the national level** – General understanding of the implementation of the state policy at the national level and evaluation of implementation criteria;

5. **Implementation at the local level** - General understanding of the implementation of the state policy at local level and evaluation of implementation criteria;

6. **Monitoring, evaluation and reporting** – Review the quality of the state policies, the national criteria for the SDGs and the level of inclusive actions;

7. **Transparency and Accountability** – Transparency of government information, monitoring of the SDG implementation, and the level of transparency of accountability;

8. **Public awareness, understanding and capacity building** – Public awareness and understanding of the SDGs;

9. **Inclusive/Participatory Multi-stakeholder Partnerships** – Quality, level of the participation, equality/inequality of participants, and scope of multi-stakeholder partnerships established to implement the SDGs;

10. **Participation of civil society** – the level of participation of CSOs, trade unions, local communities and individuals in the development of the state policies, priority setting, implementation, monitoring, evaluation and revision of the state policies;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDGs</th>
<th>Responsible organizations</th>
<th>Number of organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Global Meridian NGO</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>“For Food Sovereignty” CSOs Coalition (Food Coalition)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Psychological Responsiveness Centre NGO</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>“All for Education” National Coalition</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Liberal Women’s Brain Pool, MONFEMNET</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Global Meridian NGO, Food Coalition, Mongolian Environmental CSOs Council (MECC)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mongolian Remote Censor Association</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Expert team</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Human Rights Centre for Assisting Citizens NGO</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Expert team</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Human Rights Centre for Assisting Citizens NGO</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Consumer Foundation NGO, MECC</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Step Without Border NGO</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Step Without Border NGO</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Step Without Border NGO</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Expert team</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Expert team</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Score value to assess SDG implementation process

The effectiveness of SDG implementation process is assessed by scores of -5 to +5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Immense regress</th>
<th>High regress</th>
<th>Moderate regress</th>
<th>Low regress</th>
<th>Very low regress</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Very low progress</th>
<th>Low progress</th>
<th>Moderate progress</th>
<th>High progress</th>
<th>Immense progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
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Overall scores per SDGs

- Scores show a small progress only in case of SDG-4
- In case of other SDGs scores show mostly regress.

Main reasons for negative scores:
- National SDG targets and indicators have not still been adopted and introduced;
- Not mainstreamed in plans, no reports on implementation monitoring and evaluation on SDGs is publicly available;
- No localization of SDGs taken place except the establishments of SDG subcommittees in 10 provinces;
- No statistics available to show trends in achieving SDGs
Overall scores by 10 key areas

- Scores show small progress only in two key areas which are “National action plan, SDG strategy and budget” and “Policy and legal framework available”;

- In case of other key areas scores show regress. The most regress is shown in key areas of “Monitoring, evaluation and reporting” and “Public awareness and Capacity building”, and “Transparency and accountability”.

- **Main reasons for positive scores:**
  - Methodology to connect budget planning with SDGs developed, training organized and starting this year 5 ministries start implementation;
  - The Law about Development Policy, Planning and Management was revised, and a new Ministry of Economy and Development was established in 2022 which will play direct role for implementation of SDGs;
  - MSH Council was set up under the Parliament Subcommittee on SDGs;
  - National Development Finance Strategy is drafted and in the process approval
Main assessment results

• Scoring assessment shows that only SDG-4 is on track to achieve its targets by 2030, the implementation of all other SDGs is regressing or stagnating. The government needs to undertake urgent measures to stop the regress and to accelerate the implementation.

• Overall scores of SDGs by 10 key areas show that a very small progress for the SDGs made only in 2 key areas: “Policy and legal framework” and “National action plan, strategy and budget” as well as significant regress is in 3 key areas of “Public awareness and Capacity building”, “Monitoring, evaluation and reporting”, and “Transparency and accountability”.

• Regress in key areas of “Transparency and accountability”, “Multi-stakeholder partnership” and “Citizens’ participation and CSO engagement” will hinder institutional supports for policy coordination and coherence and implementation of the SDGs at the national and local levels.
Engagement with Multi-stakeholders for the SDGs

• National consultation on the results of the Scoring assessment of SDGs, August 30, 2022;
• Presentation of the scoring assessment results on the 2nd VNR launch meeting, 22 November 2022;
• Multi-stakeholders (MSH) scoring of the SDGs, 4 January 2023;
• Sharing the MSH scoring results with the drafting team members of the 2nd VNR report;
• Some results of the CSOs and MSHs scoring results were reflected in the 2nd VNR report.
Scoring assessment of the SDGs with Multi-stakeholders: Comparison of CSOs and MSHs scoring

- Differences in scores for SDGs 1, 2, 3, and 6 given by CSOs and MSHs
- The scores given for SDGs 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 15, and 17 are almost similar
Engagement with Multi-stakeholders for SDGs: Comparison of CSOs and MSHs scoring by key areas

- The scores given by CSOs and MSHs have similar tendency of progress in case of most of key areas, although the extent is different.

- In case of “Institutional support” and “Multistakeholders’ partnership” the scores given by CSOs and MSHs have different tendencies. MSHs assessed positively, but CSOs scores were negative.
Engagement with Multi-stakeholders for SDGs: Conclusion and Recommendation

- Mongolia may not achieve the SDGs by 2030 if not to undertake urgent actions to improve the 5 key areas of Inclusive governance.

- Expectation: CSOs’ engagements with MSHs may have progress after scoring exercises. The representation of CSOs in different committees, councils, working groups on SDGs may expand.

- These committees or councils need to change ad-hoc character and function effectively through building their capacities for regular functions.

- MSH Partnerships for SDGs with equal participation of CSOs need to be established at national, sub-national and sector levels to accelerate SDGs.

- Most urgent actions needed for implementation of SDG 17.16 and SDG 17.17 targets to achieve policy coherence (SDG 17.14) to avoid frequent “conflicts” to balance economic growth interest with public interests to protect the environment and livelihood of people.
Thank you for your attention!