Morning SDG Cluster Group Reporting

We would like you to report on...

1. SDG Cluster Integrative Policy Statements

2. List of peers, lead agency for 17 SDG profiling (hotspots, brightspots, emerging issues, target status indicators and data): drafting team for each SDG.

3. Reflections on institutional set up for development of indicator framework (ref worksheet of Gerel)

4. Interactive Scoring Examples and Policy Leverage level

Session 5: Systems Mapping: Leveraging Policies for Elicited Themes of Cross-Sectoral Intervention

4 Sector Analysis
Mining, Agriculture, Tourism, Water
In relation to SDGs and SDV 2030
Session 5.1 Group Forming

1. We will have 4 Thematic Sector Groups
2. SDG Cluster Groups should separate and divide themselves between the 4 Thematic Sector Maps.
3. Bring your SDG Cluster analysis lens / perspective to the Thematic Sector Causal System Map
S5.2: Sectors Systems Mapping Analysis Tasks

1. Revise the drafts and improve sector system Maps
2. Identification of Potential Policy Leverage Points
3. Impact Scoring of Potential Policy Leverage Points
4. Leverage Point Policy Scaffolding

Note: Record your comments and revisions directly on the Sector System Maps using the Posit-it Notes provided and directly on the Maps themselves.

Also fill in the worksheets.
Water Management Sector
Agriculture (Livestock)
Part 1. Sector System Map Revisions – Elements and Links

Instructions:

• Consider your Goals Statements for Cross Sector intervention and take time (approximately 15 minutes) to study the system map elements and causal linkages between elements for the “draft’ sector system map.

• Record directly on the Sector System Map Poster the following information:
  ✓ Any missing elements not currently included in the system map that should be included (identify where it should be added and how).
  ✓ Any of the elements that you would like to rename
  ✓ Any elements that you think should be deleted (that are not necessary or are incorrect for the Mongolia sector system story).
  ✓ Any causal links that you would either deleted, change or add.
  ✓ Identify Possible Policy Leverage Points and mark with symbol ▲
Part 2: High Impact Policy Leverage Point Scoring

Instructions

• Discuss and identify all the “intuitive” leverage points (intervention points) you can think of for your respective system that can be entry points for policy intervention to transform the system towards a sustainable state.

• List out all of your agreed on system Leverage Points on the worksheet 6.2

• For each of your Leverage Points conduct a simple ‘Leverage Point Impact Analysis’, answering the questions and giving a score for each of the 4 analysis questions;

Total possible is 6 points.
# Leverage Point Impact Analysis Scoring Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Analysis Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Levels.</strong> Identify in the adapted Meadow’s 4 leverage point framework, which level your chosen leverage point would fall within (i.e. Physical, Informational, Social, Mental Model) leverage point framework? If the leverage point falls within the Physical level give a score of 1 point. If the leverage point falls within the Informational level, then give a score of 2 points. And if the leverage point element falls within the Social or Mental Model level, then give a score of 3 points. Refer to the previous leverage point handouts from Session 3.1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Levers.</strong> Does the Leverage Point element affect many other system elements, yet is only affected by a few? If one element affects many other elements downstream (say 5 or more other elements) but is itself only affected by 1-2 other elements, it can be considered a high impact leverage point. Not so if it is itself directly influenced by 4 or more other elements - meaning you’ll likely have to shift many or all of those other things to get that lever to move. Give 1 point if it is a high impact leverage point, and 0 score if not.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Loops.</strong> Is the factor part of a reinforcing loop that if properly primed, would take off and continue positive changes on its own (i.e. self-sustaining reinforcing feedback)? Secondly, do you actually think there is enough capacity and political support for initiating action in the reinforcing loop? If the answer to these two questions is yes in both cases, then give this leverage point 1 point. Give it a 0 point score if the answer is no.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Trends.</strong> Is the leverage point element trending favorably towards your chosen goal (i.e. is it a bright spot)? Ask: “How has this element been changing over time relative to our overall goal?” If the leverage point element has been moving steadily in a positive direction (whether it is up, down or flat) then give it 1 point. If the leverage point element is currently trending in the opposite direction (i.e. a hotspot or emerging issue) to where you would like it, then give it 0 point score.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scoring framework adapted from work of Scott Span: http://innatestrategies.com/about/scott.html
Leverage Point Scoring – Levers (Score 1 - 3)

• **Levels.** Identify in the adapted Meadow’s 4 leverage point framework, which level your chosen leverage point would fall within (i.e. Physical, Informational, Social, Mental Model) leverage point framework?

• If the leverage point falls within the Physical level give a score of 1 point. If the leverage point falls within the Informational level, then give a score of 2 points.

• And if the leverage point element falls within the Social or Mental Model level, then give a score of 3 point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leverage Level</th>
<th>Leverage Point Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental Model Level</td>
<td>• The mindset or paradigm out of which the system — its goals, structure, rules, delays, parameters — arises and is created from (related to a person’s worldview).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Level</td>
<td>• The goals of the system in question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The power to add, change, evolve, or self-organize system structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The rules of the system (such as incentives, punishments, constraints).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational Level</td>
<td>• The structure of information flows (who does and does not have access to information).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The gain around driving reinforcing feedback loops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The strength of balancing feedback loops, relative to the impacts they are trying to correct against.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The lengths of delays, relative to the rate of system change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Level</td>
<td>• The structure of material stocks and flows (such as transport networks, population age structures).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The sizes of buffers and other stabilizing stocks, relative to their inflows and outflows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Constants, parameters, numbers (such as subsidies, emissions or consumption levels, taxes, compliance standards, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= 3 points

= 2 points

= 1 point
Leverage Point Scoring – Levers (Score 0 or 1)

- **Lever**: Does the Leverage Point element affect many other system elements, yet is only affected by a few? If one element affects many other elements downstream (say 5 or more other elements) but is itself only affected by 1-2 other elements, it can be considered a high impact leverage point.

- Not so if it is itself directly influenced by 4 or more other elements - meaning you'll likely have to shift many or all of those other things to get that lever to move. Give 1 point if it is a high impact leverage point, and 0 score if not.
Leverage Point Scoring – Loops (Score 0 or 1)

- **Loops.** Is the element part of a reinforcing loop that if properly primed, would take off and continue positive changes on its own (i.e. self-sustaining reinforcing feedback)?
- Secondly, do you actually think there is enough capacity and political support for initiating action in the reinforcing loop?
- If the answer to these two questions is yes in both cases, then give this leverage point 1 point. Give it a 0 point score if the answer is no.

Good Loop = 1 point
Leverage Point Scoring – Trend (Score 0 or 1)

• **Trends.** Is the leverage point element trending favorably towards your chosen goal (i.e. is it a bright spot)? Ask "How has this element been changing over time relative to our overall goal?" If the leverage point element has been moving steadily in a positive direction (whether it is up, down or flat) then give it 1 point.

• If the leverage point element is currently trending in the opposite direction (i.e. a hotspot or emerging issue) to where you would like it, then give it 0 point score.

Example: In Agriculture... Community Collective Herder Councils on Paster / Rangeland Management

What is the trend for this policy option? (increasing in acceptance and application regionally, nationally? Or One-off or ‘ad hoc’

Remember... Total Score possible if perfect = 6 points
Use Worksheet 5.1
Part 3: Policy Leverage Point Scaffolding

Instructions

1. Discuss and agree on your most important or key “high” impact policy leverage point.

2. Next, discuss the types of policy interventions that could be introduced here. Agree on one that seems to have most support from the group (which can be a combination of different original ideas). Record your top policy intervention on the worksheet.

3. What are the important ‘driver’s for this policy intervention to be implemented and to create the type of change you would like to see? Record these. (e.g. think of impact investment schemes)

4. Identify key stakeholder (i.e. ministries, organisations, individuals) that have a role to play in this policy intervention. Record these.

5. What are some important assumptions that people in your group are making? Identify key
Good Luck – you have 90 minutes