



Initiatives of Change
Switzerland.

CROSSING PATHS

A Guide to The Pillars for Human Security
and the 2030 Global Goals

**Just Governance
for Human Security**

Creating a world where the Six Pillars of Just Governance Human Security are actively practiced- bringing together all sectors of society



CAUX FORUM

Developing Human Potential
for Global Change

FORWARD

On September 25th, 2015 countries adopted a set of goals to end poverty, protect the planet, and ensure prosperity for all. This United Nations initiative is part of a fifteen year agenda focused on the Sustainable Development Goals. The SDGs build on the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and their success. The new goals call for action from all countries to address ending poverty through building sustainable economic growth and addressing social needs without losing focus on climate change and environmental conservation.

For these goals to be reached, the UN seeks to have everyone play a role, whether government, civic, or private sector. Caux Forum: Just Governance for Human Security heard this call and is building its 2018 programme to align with the Global Goals. Established in 1946, Initiatives of Change Switzerland continues its vision of a just, peaceful, and sustainable world in which people act from a sense of global interdependence and responsibility. As part of IoC's summer Caux Forum Season, Just Governance for Human Security seeks to bring together individuals to advance human security and to get inspired to take action. As part of this initiative JGHS has created an Ebook to be used in conjunction with our forum season and beyond to our global community as a resource for projects in their communities.

Within the pages of this document, JGHS aligns its Six Pillars of Human Security with specific SDGs. The Pillars (Good Governance, Sustainability, Social Inclusion, Inclusive Economics, Food Security, Healing Memory) are used as a base for identifying how the SDGs work together to create a holistic approach towards change. Rather than focusing individual issues and isolated solutions, this Ebook and JGHS addresses how each of the UN SDGs links to another to create a whole solution ensuring inclusion and representation from all members of a community. The success of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals is dependent on a holistic approach, this demands individuals in all areas of society and from every country, communicate and work together to create change.

We hope you find the information within these pages inspiring, resourceful and motivating in your own work to create change in your community. The Global Goals and SDGs are a global community movement for change, in this spirit, this eBook was created through the dedicated work of a volunteer team of writers and editors from the United Nations Volunteers Platform and with leadership and overview from the JGHS Team.

EBOOK CONTRIBUTING TEAM

JGHS Leadership, Editing and Content Writing Support, and Overview Team:

Elizabeth Hall, Salma Moustafa Khalil, Shontaye Abegaz and executive committee

United Nations Volunteers Writers: Amy Child, Atifa Hasham, Madison

Kennewell, Alison Reiszadeh

United Nations Volunteers Editors: Helen Bradford, Madhu Tuli, Christina Dendy,

Sujata Balaram



SOCIAL INCLUSION INTRODUCTION

As of 2017, Just Governance for Human Security has officially renamed one of its Human Security Pillars from Care for Refugees to Social Inclusion. According to the UN, Social Inclusion is the process of improving an individual's ability to fully participate, contribute to, and realize their potential in society at a local, national, or global level. It is a multidimensional concept that goes beyond economic or material needs and falls across political, social, cultural, and environmental spheres. In essence, all persons should be able to enjoy the benefits of prosperity and the minimum standards of well-being (UNESCO, 2017; United Nations, 2016; Dugarova & Lavers, 2014). In the context of Just Governance for Human Security's forum, social inclusion can be better understood by examining its opposite, social exclusion. Social exclusion hinders an individual from accessing society, as well as the process leading to and sustaining unequal power relationships (United Nations, 2016). The inability to change discriminatory behaviours without any material or social consequence places individuals in an incredibly vulnerable position. Without the same access to opportunities, resources, protection, respect, and dignity, an individual or group's human security can drastically decrease. Social inclusion policies can, therefore, lead to a profound transformation on every aspect of society. It can support economic activity, increase human capital, reduce inequalities, and ensure social responsibilities are equally shared (Dugarova & Lavers, 2014). It is important to note that implementing such policies must be completed in a spatial context. The normative framework, historical and cultural social structures, and the physical environment all have an effect on the degree and type of mechanisms needed (Silver, 2015). Globally, the world has been more accepting of social inclusion policies and programmes; however, trends such as climate change, urbanization, an ageing population, and international migration are spurring nationalistic and exclusionary sentiments. By changing its name from Care for Refugees to Social Inclusion, Just Governance for Human Security commits to including the diverse voices and perspectives of refugees, whose numbers have been rising as a result of world conflict. The SDGs assert to leave "no one behind" and have used inclusionary language in their targets and indicators, thereby confirming the cross-cutting nature of this pillar of human security. Social inclusion connects to nine SDGs: (1) SDG 1: No Poverty; (2) SDG 3: Good Health and Well-being; (3) SDG 4: Quality Education; (4) SDG 5: Gender Equality; (5) SDG 8: Decent Work and Economic Growth; (6) SDG 10: Reduced Inequalities; (7) SDG 11: Sustainable Cities and Communities; (8) SDG 13: Climate Action; (9) SDG 16: Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions.

SOCIAL INCLUSION AND NO POVERTY SDG 1

SUMMARY

Though the poverty rate has halved since 2000, it has not been completely eradicated. While the economic growth of both India and China has created a financially robust middle class, it has also disproportionately decreased the global poverty levels. Amidst this changing scenario, the definition of poverty has changed as well. It has been observed that economic growth alone is not sufficient to reduce poverty. Poverty is now best seen and understood as a multidimensional concept, with social inclusion forming a key component of this new understanding.

Evidence shows that countries with dramatically improved poverty rates have taken a structural approach when tackling poverty—combining economic development objectives with social policy.

Though SDG 1 aims to reduce poverty in all its forms, it emphasizes the need for national and international policies to be pro-poor and gender-sensitive. The unemployed, the disabled, the elderly, LGBTQ+ communities, migrants, and women make up some of the poorest and most vulnerable populations of society. These groups struggle to secure decent and stable livelihoods and may face stigma from the rest of the community. In addition, they often find themselves denied of their political and civil rights, ultimately being excluded societal and policy decision-making processes.

In these circumstances, social protection systems can have an influential role to play. They are not only viewed as the primary means of providing a safety net for vulnerable groups at a national level, but also as a critical social inclusion policy initiative at the international level.

IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS

SDG 1 aims to reduce poverty in all its forms. This not only includes wages and rising above the poverty line, but also non-traditional forms of investment such as land ownership, inheritances, natural resources, technology, and financial services.

Since 2000, the poverty rate has halved with the most significant progress seen in Eastern and South-eastern Asia and the least in Sub-Saharan Africa (UNDESA, 2018). This is considered a major accomplishment for the UN and is often used as an example of how the MDGs were an achievable set of goals. While the dramatic reduction of the poverty rate is certainly admirable and counters the idealized notion of the MDGs, this particular outcome is often decontextualized. During this twenty-year period, the global landscape has changed. The economic growth of both India and China has led them to become two major emerging economies that have challenged the West. As citizens of both these countries inevitably rose out of poverty, creating a robust middle class, global poverty levels decreased disproportionately. The poverty rate is, therefore, better understood in regional terms. Currently 1 in 5 people in developing regions (in which the overwhelming majority lives in Sub-Saharan Africa and Southern Asia) still live on less than \$1.90 per day—with many at risk of slipping back into poverty (UN, 2018).

As a response to the MDGs, the SDGs have expanded the definition of poverty. Now understood as a multidimensional concept, SDG 1 builds on the theory of sustainable economic growth by addressing the political and social implications of poverty. Poverty often affects marginalized communities living on the fringes of society, whether due to age, gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity, or religion. Such vulnerable populations not only experience greater hunger, malnutrition, and unemployment, but also have limited access to social services, such as education and healthcare, and the political system (UN, 2018). Social inclusion, therefore, constitutes a key component of how we understand poverty today, particularly in a global capitalist economy. The idea that individuals or communities who are poor deserve to be poor because they are either lazy or do not work hard enough is a pervasive one. It contributes to the stigma against those living under the poverty line, which only leads to greater social discrimination and exclusion from society. In this respect, there is a classist undertone when addressing poverty; however, in reality there are more likely many structural issues working against these groups.

The SDG 1 targets demonstrate the need for economic growth to be inclusive and in doing so invalidates the assumption that economic growth automatically translates to poverty reduction (Dugarova, 2015). It emphasizes vulnerable populations' equal right to goods, services, and resources and aims to build their resiliency against social and climate-related shocks. Social protection systems are viewed as the primary way to provide vulnerable groups with a social safety net and have increasingly gained traction as a critical social inclusion policy initiative at the international level. Many countries, however, still fail to implement comprehensive social protection programs within their national frameworks. It is estimated that approximately 73 percent of the global population has no access to adequate social services scheme that would allow them to attain decent and productive livelihoods (Dugarova, 2015). As of 2016, the UN approximates that only 28 percent of people with severe disabilities, 22 percent of unemployed

individuals, and 41 percent of mothers received benefits (UN, 2018). Although targeted-income social policies are an effective method for poverty alleviation, international and national schemes need to move away from a cautious social development strategy consisting of remedial actions to a broader, coherent, and multi-sectoral strategy. Evidence has shown that countries with dramatically improved poverty rates have taken a structural approach, combining the economic development objectives with social policy. Indeed, the complex nature of social protection policies illustrates that poverty itself is shaped by nuanced relationships between ideas, institutions, policies, and practices in the social, economic, cultural, and political sphere (Dugarova, 2015).

Social protection systems can profoundly influence economic, social, political, cultural, and environmental sectors, contributing to a more socially inclusive society (Dugarova & Lavers, 2014; Dugarova, 2015). SDG 1 specifically aims for national and international policies to be both pro-poor and gender-sensitive. The latter acknowledges that women are more likely to be poorer than men. Gender inequality in the economic sector, as well as societal gender norms, affect the type of employment women can access. More often than not, women find work in the informal sector, which is devoid of contracts, pensions, a livable wage, and social protections. In addition, women are usually the primary caregivers of the household and complete the majority of physical and emotional labour. The current economic model is, therefore, not only exclusive in and of itself, but also excludes women from achieving a quality of life that is comparable to a man (Oxfam, 2017).

While there are other poor vulnerable populations, such as disabled populations, the elderly, and LGBTQ+ communities, the current migration crisis has scaled to such an extent that it is now a global concern that has not been adequately addressed. Since 2006, the world has seen the highest number of people forcibly displaced from their homes (USA for UNHCR, 2018). Of the 65.6 million, 22.5 million are refugees, 40.3 million IDPs, and 2.8 million asylum seekers. Syria holds the largest population of displaced persons and is followed by the crisis in South Sudan where approximately 1.9 million remain internally displaced and 1.4 million having fled the country (USA for UNHCR, 2018).

The refugee crisis has been generally framed as an issue of migration. On the surface, it does indeed involve the movement from one place to another; however, a deeper analysis of migration has become increasingly relevant. Why is migration an issue in the first place? Why do hundreds and thousands of people feel the need to leave their home country? In the past decade, there is no doubt that one of the obvious answers is intense political instability and violent conflict caused by the exclusion of certain groups from society and the lack of infrastructure to deliver basic services. When arriving to their host country, refugees often find themselves in the same place: vulnerable, displaced, and poor (Verme et al., 2016). Accordingly, there is a need to not only acknowledge the migratory element of the refugee crisis, but also frame it as a development and poverty concern especially given its scope and breadth (Dalrymple, 2016).

The Rohingya population in Myanmar, for instance, is a classic case of Us vs. Them. This religious minority group is not recognized as an official ethnic group of Myanmar. The prejudice against the Rohingya ironically stems from the early migration of Indian and Bengali workers in the late nineteenth century and has now been institutionalized. The Rohingya has experienced decades of discrimination, violence, and persecution by state, with as many as 671,000 thousand people having fled to Bangladesh to live in makeshift refugee camps (USA for UNHCR, 2018). The Bangladesh government, however, has attempted to prevent the Rohingya from crossing into their borders and have not provided adequate aid (Al Jazeera, 2018).

It is important to note that there is a significant lack of data available on the levels of poverty refugees may experience. This is due to the difficulty of accessing refugee populations within host countries, counting non-registered refugees, and populations who have been repeatedly displaced (Dalrymple, 2016). Moreover, data collection has historically been completed by humanitarian agencies, which has removed the onus of states to include refugees in national poverty surveys. As a result, there is no current data that has measured the degree of poverty experienced and/or tracked progress out of poverty, ultimately rendering refugees invisible to the social system (Dalrymple, 2016).

SDG 3: SOCIAL INCLUSION – GOOD HEALTH AND WELL-BEING

SUMMARY

SDG 3 focuses on the achievement of global health and well-being, especially among vulnerable populations. Among these are women subject to a maternal mortality ratio of 216 maternal deaths per 100,000 live births; children under age 5 subject to a mortality rate of 43 deaths per live births; individuals subject to the spread of infectious diseases and to premature death as a result of non-communicable diseases; individuals with physical and mental disabilities and disorders; and those suffering from the effects of tobacco and alcohol addiction and environmental pollutants. This SDG emphasizes the spread of information, education and services to prevent and treat complications contributing to high mortality rates, the spread of infectious disease, substance abuse, and contributing factors to non-communicable disease. In particular, the goal aims to provide universal healthcare access, including to sexual and reproductive healthcare services as well as essential vaccines and medicines. Through these measures, UNESCO hopes to encourage greater social inclusions among physically isolated and socially disparaged populations; expanded social inclusions, in turn, will promote positive returns in good health and well-being.

IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS

The United Nations' third sustainable development goal (SDG 3) aims to ensure healthful lives and general well-being for people at all ages, and to promote concerted efforts to achieve this goal for the most vulnerable populations, particularly children. There is a clear and thoroughly documented interdependence between good health and well-being and broader issues of social inclusion. Individual health and well-being underpins social acceptance and participation while social inclusion, in turn, promotes optimal mental and physical health. Groups at a higher risk of social exclusion or isolation face worse health and well-being outcomes than socially included groups. Well-being is conceptualized by Sen (1993) and Vernon (2008) as the holistic importance of agency and ability to live or to be well, with specific indicators unique to different communities. Such unique communities can include individuals with disabilities, mobility issues and health conditions; people from a refugee background; and rural community members. This in part, is due to understanding of a role that an individual occupies within a community which provides behavioral expectations, and a sense of purpose which has positive effects on health habits and well-being (Berkman, et al., 2000; Brissette, et al., 2000). This positively affects self-esteem, which lowers symptoms of anxiety, depression and isolationism, and increases life satisfaction (Baumeister, et al., 2003; Taylor and Stanton, 2007).

Substantial evidence documents that social ties and social support—and therefore social inclusion—are positively correlated to physical and mental health (Berkman, 1995; Cohen and Janicki-Deverts, 2009; Cohen and Wills, 1985). Research shows that social support also buffers the harmful physical and mental health impacts of stress exposure (Cassel, 1976; Cobb, 1976; Cohen and Wills, 1985).

Transportation Across the world, access to a sufficient transportation system within one's community is a major contributing factor to social isolation. This is because of the critical role that transportation plays in physically enabling individuals to participate in an active community life, thereby improving their health and wellbeing. An inadequate system of transportation restricts the ability of residents to access community resources, such as healthcare and food (through access to grocery stores, food programs, or food subsidies), and physically isolates individuals who require but lack a caregiver (Ryan & Bower, 1989; Davies, 1984; McIntosh, Shifflett, & Picou, 1989; McIntosh & Schiflett, 1984). For the elderly, rural residents and individuals with mobility issues, functional impairments can reduce, restrict and remove the capacity for social activity. This makes the availability of sufficient transportation systems crucial to their the ability to access necessary health and well-being services. Those without cars need more time, expend greater effort and pay higher cost to reach the same destinations as people with cars (DETR, 2000, p. 18). A socially inclusive community with significant ties can work around structural barriers to health and well-being, while itself serving as a source of health and well-being. Rabin and Barry (1995) estimated that 70% of the care that community-dwelling older adults receive is provided for by relatives, friends, and neighbors.

The Impact of Social Isolation Physically isolated individuals, including the elderly, the poor and frail, residents from “unsafe” neighborhoods, and rural individuals, experience poorer health outcomes. Communities with increased social support, such as where religious groups maintain high levels of social activity, are positively associated with better dietary behavior and dietary adequacy (McIntosh & Schifflett, 1984). In contrast, the lack of an adequate social network, or being socially isolated, are risk factors for poor nutritional intake (Frongillo, et al, 1992; Ryan & Bower, 1989). For residents from “unsafe” neighborhoods, especially women and the elderly, social isolation may be a conscious choice because of fears of victimization (Clemente & Kleiman, 1977; Gordon & Riger, 1991). This self-isolation can restrict some individuals from accessing resources available within a community, including healthcare, social support and other positive influences on well-being.

Accessibility, having access to optimal healthcare is an essential part of successful social inclusion. People with disabilities, chronic conditions and short-term health needs may face significant barriers to accessing appropriate health services (Lennox, et al, 2007; Mojtahedi, et al, 2008). People with intellectual disabilities live with higher rates of illness and unmet needs (Balogh, Ouellette-Kuntz, Bourne, Lunsy & Colantonio, 2008), and encounter significant barriers to healthcare access and health promotion interventions for preventable and secondary health conditions, such as diabetes, pneumonia and depression (McDonald, Farnworth & Hand, 2012). These conditions interfere with an individual's ability to participate in family and community life. Social inclusion, therefore, depends on accessibility of health care, aids and equipment, including mobility aids, environmental control, and personal care supports, that enable people with healthcare needs to have the same opportunities for participation as other members of the community.

Displaced Populations, within a refugee context, well-being is framed by Ahearn as “the ability, independence, and freedom to act and the possession of the requisite goods and services to be psychologically content” (Ahearn, 2000, p. 4). Within this definition is the more specific context of how open and socially inclusive a host community is. Social networks and social support provide important foundations for the achievement of health and well-being (Berkman & Glass, 2000), and that social support is particularly important to displaced communities (Portes, 1998; Loizos, 2000). A study from Australia (Ziersch, Due, Walsh & Arthurson, 2017) reported that 22% of people from a refugee background reported discrimination because of ethnicity, religion or skin colour within their communities. Self-reported discrimination, including racism, has been directly linked to negative health outcomes (Krieger, Smith, Naishadsham & Barbeau, 2005). Williams (2000) has documented the relationship between racism and discrimination as well as the effects on health based on socioeconomic opportunities and mobility restriction. This type of social barrier directly connects with the establishment of a sense of belonging in the early resettlement period vital for well-being among youth with refugee backgrounds (Correa-Velez, Gifford & Barnett, 2010). Establishment within a host society and the extent of social inclusion is a key indicator of well-being (Brough, Gorman, Ramirez, & Westoby, 2003; O'Sullivan & Olliff, 2006).

Research and observation has shown that social inclusion has a positively correlated effect on health and well-being. The factors that influence social inclusion and social isolation are specific to populations and communities, but range from physical, social and economic factors. For individuals in socially isolating communities, these factors can have negative impacts on their health and well-being. In contrast, individuals in socially inclusive communities can have better health outcomes.

SDG 4: SOCIAL INCLUSION– QUALITY EDUCATION

SUMMARY

SDG 4 aims to achieve equitable access to and inclusion in quality education opportunities for all people, without regards to age, gender or sex, disability, social and economic status, race and ethnicity, or refugee status. The achievement of equity in education is crucial to the attainment of other levels of social inclusion, particularly in the economic and political spheres. This goal makes clear the close interdependence of social, economic and political status, which is also tied, in turn, to cultural factors. Often, like access to food and healthcare, mitigating factors of exclusion—or vulnerability to exclusion—are beyond individuals' control. Rather, they are systemic issues tied to broader challenges in the community, nation and region, and must be addressed as part of a broader examination and solution set.

IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS

The United Nations' fourth sustainable development goal (SDG 4) seeks to ensure inclusive and equitable quality education, and promotes lifelong learning opportunities for all. Access to high-quality education better enables individuals to realize their potential, to build the capacity to participate in social, economic, political and cultural life. However, according to the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA), factors beyond individuals' control often limit their access to educational opportunities. In turn, limited access to education restricts individuals' access to resources and participation in society. Factors beyond an individual's control include ethnicity, age, disability, place of residence, and gender. Unlike skill level, discipline, and effort, these types of factors are determined by the larger society, culture or body politic, rather than by the individual. For this reason, the effects of such characteristics are not uniform across countries; much depends on the norms, institutions and policies in place in each nation (UNDESA, 2016). Inclusiveness and shared prosperity are core aspirations of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The following section will focus on issues of access and inclusiveness regarding quality education.

Education has been recognized as a basic human right under the 1989 Convention on the Rights of the Child and the 1951 Refugee Convention (UNHCR, 2016). However, according to the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS, 2018) three years after the adoption of SDG 4, little to no progress has been made in reducing the global number of out-of-school children, adolescents, and youth. The UNESCO Institute for Statistics 2018 fact sheet, highlights trends in education at global and regional levels. According to the UIS, the number of children (age 6-11), adolescents (age 12-14), and youth (age 15-17) excluded from education fell steadily in the decade following 2000. Then, that progress stopped. After an initial decline in the years after 2000, the primary out-of-school rate has barely moved from around 9% since 2008 and the lower secondary out-of-school rate has been at 16% since 2012. The upper secondary out-of-school rate, has fallen more steadily since 2000, however this trend has slowed down with the most recent estimate at 36% (UIS, 2018a). In 2016, 263 million children, adolescents and youth were out of school, representing nearly one-fifth of the global population of this age group (UIS, 2018a).

Excluded Groups: Persons with Disabilities Historically, persons with a disability, young women and girls, and refugees count among the population groups most likely to suffer exclusion from education. The UIS examines educational disparities linked to disability based on data from 49 countries and territories for five education indicators. A disability can be identified as the presence of difficulties in one of the six core functional domains: seeing, hearing, walking, cognition, self-care, and communication (Washington Group, 2018). In 2018, the UIS concluded that persons with disabilities between the ages of 15 to 29 are less likely to have attended school than those without in nearly all of the 37 countries surveyed. The largest gaps are found in Viet Nam (44% vs. 97%), Egypt (43% vs. 89%) and Indonesia (53% vs. 98%). Additionally, the UIS calculated the number of completed years of formal education at a primary level or higher for the population 25 years and older in 22 countries. In these countries, disabled persons spend a lower average number of years in formal education than their counterparts without a disability.

On average, across the 22 countries and territories with data, persons without disabilities aged 25 years and older have 7.0 years of schooling while those with disabilities have just 4.8 years. The largest gaps in education were observed in Mexico, Panama, and Ecuador (UIS, 2018b).

Excluded Groups: Young Women and Girls Despite the significant progress made in the past 20 years, girls are still more likely than boys to never set foot in a classroom (UNDESA, 2016). Girls represent two-thirds of the total number of children out of school (UNESCO, 2017). In countries where gender disparities in educational attainment are present, they usually intersect with other disparities in education, such as those based on wealth, place of residence, and race or ethnicity (UNDESA, 2016). Data from the World Inequality Database on Education show that gender gaps in attainment generally are found among the poorest families, in rural areas, and among indigenous or ethnic minority groups. Thus the United Nations has focused on ensuring the SDG 4 targets address these disparities. For example, Target 4.5 seeks to eliminate gender disparities in education and ensure equal access to all levels of education and vocational training for the vulnerable, including persons with disabilities, indigenous peoples and children in vulnerable situations by 2030 (UNDESA, 2017).

Excluded Groups: Refugees Currently, 17.2 million refugees fall under the mandate of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR); half of these refugees are under the age of 18. For millions of young people around the world, the years in which they should be exploring the wonders of the world around them instead are spent in fear and uncertainty, as people move from place to place, searching for stability in home, sustenance, and personal security. The time spent in school learning to read, write, draw, debate, create, and calculate; making discoveries; socializing; and figuring out future economic opportunities are key to individuals' personal development. Education—when available—gives refugee children, adolescents and youth a place of safety amid the uncertainty of displacement (UNHCR, 2016). However, compared to other children and youth around the world, the gap in opportunity for the 6.4-million school-age refugees under UNHCR's mandate is growing ever wider. Globally, 91 percent of children attend primary school. For refugees, that figure is just 61 percent; in low-income countries, it is less than 50 percent. As refugee children age, the barriers to accessing education increase. Only 23 percent of refugee adolescents are enrolled in secondary school, compared to 84 percent globally (UNHCR, 2016).

Access vs. Inclusion The goal of achieving equitable and inclusive access to education refers not only to initial enrollment but also to regular attendance, retention, attainment, and achievement. An individual's abilities to access, to participate in, and to succeed in school each represent distinct degrees of social inclusion (UNESCO, 2017). UNESCO suggests that inclusive education has a simple central message: "Every learner matters and matters equally." (UNESCO, 2017). Government policies should enable education systems to support the diverse needs of their students. The role of education should be used as an effective vehicle for overcoming marginalization and enhancing inclusion instead of as a means of perpetuating disparities (UNESCO, 2017). Integrating the principles of equity and inclusion into education policy means the following:

"Building a common understanding that more inclusive and equitable education systems have the potential to promote gender equality, reduce inequalities, develop teacher and system capabilities, and encourage supportive learning environments. These various efforts will, in turn, contribute to overall improvements in educational quality" (UNESCO, 2017).

However, instituting equitable and inclusive education policy is not a simple task. It requires engaging other sectors, such as health, social welfare and child protection services, to ensure a common administrative and legislative framework for inclusive and equitable education. Thus, under Target 4.C, The United Nations aims to improve the capabilities of schools by substantially increasing the supply of qualified teachers, including through international cooperation for teacher training in developing countries, especially least developed countries and small island developing States by 2030 (UNDESA, 2017). The achievement of SDG 4 calls for a comprehensive analysis of the education system as well as of other public service sectors to ensure all children, adolescents, and youth have an equal opportunity to learn and successfully transition into the workforce.

SOCIAL INCLUSION AND GENDER EQUALITY SDG 5

SUMMARY

SDG 5 seeks to achieve gender equality and the empowerment of all women. This is an important target as far as the social inclusion process is concerned. Women, in spite of making up half of the human population, have been and continue to be marginalized by their families, communities, and governments. This marginalization has led to lack of access to quality education, healthcare, and financial resources. The rippling effect of this has been a rise in cases of discrimination and sexual violence against women, as well as the underrepresentation of this gender in the workplace and the political arena.

The current state of affairs, particularly in regards to women, does not bode well for society as a whole. It creates an imbalanced society where the views of fifty percent of the population are suppressed. Women are ultimately being excluded from making decisions that concern them and the society in which they live.

SDG 5 recognizes the need to inclusion women in all aspects of society. While several initiatives have promoted the prevention of discrimination and protection of women's rights on a global level, targeted initiatives are still needed to pull gender into mainstream dialogue.

Gender mainstreaming will ensure that women are included in international development efforts. Social inclusion efforts to bring about gender equality will further be strengthened when gender-responsiveness and intersectionality are taken into consideration.

IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS

SDG 5 seeks to achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls. It aims to end all forms of discrimination, violence in both the public and private spheres, and harmful practices, such as child marriages and female genital mutilation. This goal also ensures that proper policy and law strengthen women and girls' economic, political, sexual, and reproductive rights.

Women constitute half of the human population, and have historically been marginalized due to the patriarchal nature of many societies around the world. For decades, women have not been able to access quality education, healthcare, and financial services, or have their voices heard politically and culturally. The investment in women and girls is critical to advancing a healthy society and has proved to have a positive effect on their own, their families', and their communities' well-being and quality of life (UN, 2018).

Since the completion of the MDGs, specifically MDG 3 (the promotion of gender equality and women's empowerment) there has been significant improvement in the education and health sector. More than half of developing countries have achieved gender parity in primary education and progress has been made to support sexual and reproductive rights resulting in fewer maternal deaths worldwide (UNDESA, 2018). However, gender-based violence is still largely prevalent, with a third of women having experienced physical or sexual violence by a partner or a non-partner in their lifetime (WHO, 2017). When it comes to child marriages, although they have declined, the progression has been very slow. Furthermore, in almost every region of the world a disproportionate burden is placed on women to do the majority of unpaid domestic work and caregiving. This leaves women and girls with less time to pursue other activities and goals. Women are also grossly underrepresented in managerial positions and have seen slow progress in participation in politics (UNDESA, 2018).

The lack of concrete policy commitment from nation-states to advance and protect women's rights remains a persistent issue, ultimately undermining the sustainable development of a country. It is, therefore, not surprising for gender equality to be conceived as a cross-cutting issue and for women to be specifically targeted as a vulnerable group in many of the SDGs.

The idea of inclusion is particularly resonant in SDG 5, as it recognizes that women continue to face political, economic, and cultural discrimination, as well as extreme levels of violence. Social inclusion is very ostensibly being championed through SDG 5, as it attempts to answer how women become socially vulnerable and what is being done about it.

The protection of women's rights has been enshrined in international human rights law since the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was adopted in 1948. It has been further articulated in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (UN, 2014). In 1979, the UN General Assembly adopted the widely known Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination (CEDAW), detailing women's specific rights to equality and non-discrimination and the actions that must be taken to achieve this equality. Most importantly, CEDAW recognizes that discrimination is more often than not rooted in culture, tradition, and family, which can create harmful gender stereotypes (UN, 2014; UN Women, 2018A).

As a way to realize and enforce commitments to gender equality, the 1995 Fourth World Conference on Women endorsed gender mainstreaming as a key strategic approach. A gender mainstreaming approach attempts to ensure that when designing, implementing, and monitoring and evaluating policy, programs, research, and/or legislation, gender implications are taken into consideration (UN Women, 2018B). It aims to make the gender perspective an integral aspect of all activities and can involve asking questions such as, what are the specific roles of women and men in the community; in what ways are the needs of women and men different; and/or how do women's and men's experiences differ (OSAGI, n.d.). As now a globally accepted strategy, gender mainstreaming is the leading method of including women in international development efforts. This, however, does not mean that women-specific activities have become unnecessary. On the contrary, targeted initiatives are still needed to reduce disparities and to pull gender into mainstream dialogue. These activities also create an empowering space for women and girls to employ their own ideas and can be used for initiatives to engage men and boys as allies (OSAGI, n.d.).

As the world moves from the MDGs to the SDGs, the shift in language from gender mainstreaming to gender-responsive implementation should be noted. This is not to say there has been a sudden and fundamental shift in approaches. The shift rather indicates the move away from solely identifying gender issues with an emphasis on planning how gender dynamics in any given context will affect a policy, program, or research intervention (End Violence Against Women & Girls, UN Women, 2012).

Both gender mainstreaming and gender-responsiveness can be complemented by the concept of intersectionality—understanding that women and girls face different barriers to inclusion based on their ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, age, race, social status, or level of income. For instance, female migrants or refugees may have a harder time accessing reproductive care; however in a particularly culturally homogenous nation, a female refugee with disabilities and of a different culture or ethnicity may find it even harder. It is, therefore, important to note that women's experiences will differ depending on their background and the context in which they are living. Unfortunately, a huge lack in data undermines efforts to include women who are more vulnerable than most in sustainable development projects (UNSDN, 2017).

SOCIAL INCLUSION AND SDG 8, DECENT WORK AND ECONOMIC GROWTH

SUMMARY

SDG 8 covers the area of decent work and economic growth with specific consideration for women, youth and the disabled. It includes protection of migrant workers. This goal, therefore, recognises vulnerable groups and aims to protect their labour rights and strives to ensure that such groups are provided with safe and secure working environments. However, the goal fails to identify refugees and asylum seekers who are also in vulnerable positions and should be given the same protection as the groups mentioned above. The risk in aiming to protect the rights of all, without specifying the distinct challenges faced by unique vulnerable groups (such as refugees), is a uniform response that will not address the specific needs of such groups.

Refugees, asylum seekers and migrant workers face higher risks of forced labour, poor working conditions, discrimination, harassment, sexual exploitation, trafficking, violence and persecution.

These vulnerable groups have a lot to offer, in terms of skills and services. Their exploitation may create a domino effect across labour markets and undermine the protection of all workers.

Refugees, asylum seekers and migrant workers face unique challenges which must be addressed in order to adequately achieve SDG 8. The goal should also consider the fact that women, youth, and disabled groups also fall into the category of migrant and refugee workers, creating layered vulnerable groups. Such groups need to be provided with labour rights and safe and secure work environments. This will result in work attainment, thereby reducing career gaps and hence providing families with resources (which can circulate in communities and increase the demand for local businesses, stimulating local economies) and financial and social security. This will then impact on the bigger picture, where governments will have a reduced need to provide financial support for such communities. Furthermore, the ability to comfortably work can support self-esteem, prevent depression and create a supportive community for refugees that have experienced trauma.

IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS

Sustainable Development Goal 8 (SDG 8), decent work and economic growth, take into consideration women, youth and people with disabilities. These three groups reflect large populations which are vulnerable to discrimination in the workplace. It prescribes the immediate and effective eradication of forced labour, an end to modern slavery and human trafficking, and the elimination of child labour, including recruitment and use of child soldiers.

The indicators include protection of labour rights, and safe and secure working environments for all workers, including migrant workers. This is an important endeavour as migrant workers frequently experience various forms of exploitation and abuse, and so need dedicated attention to their protection. The goal, however, does not address refugees, or the economic challenges facing displaced populations. The risk in aiming for the rights of all, without specifying the distinct challenges faced by uniquely vulnerable groups, is that a uniform response will not address those specific needs. The International Labour Organisation (ILO) notes that a lack of protection for migrant workers and refugees can lead to exploitation, which may have a domino effect more widely across labour markets and undermine protections of all workers (International Labour Organisation, 2016). Refugees and migrant workers face higher risks of forced labour and trafficking, so are directly affected by this SDG, even if refugees are not specified. Currently, approximately 60 million people are displaced due to conflict, violence, and persecution. Of those, nearly 20 million are refugees outside their own countries and 86% are hosted by developing countries, with Turkey being the biggest host (Amnesty International, 2016a).

Most asylum seekers and refugees work in the informal sector where they are at risk of unfair and exploitative working conditions, discrimination and harassment. When this occurs, workers have few means to address the issues, and may not be protected by authorities. For example in Turkey, a group of 11 men working in a factory had not been paid for three months, when they complained to the police they were threatened with deportation, rather than the exploitation being addressed. (Amnesty International, 2016a). Child labour is common among Syrian refugees in Turkey and is a common reason that they are unable to attend school. Instead, children engage in work at stores and factories (Amnesty International, 2016a). Nearly one in three children disappeared when the refugee camp in Calaise, France, was demolished in 2016 and were vulnerable to experiencing human trafficking (Agerholm, 2016). By guaranteeing the right to work and specifically protecting the rights of refugees, countries can have a direct impact on trafficking and forced labour by providing a protective environment.

Trafficking and forced labour are risks facing economic migrants as well as asylum seekers and refugees. The ILO reports that labour recruiters can be deceptive about the nature and conditions of work on offer, may retain passports and other identity documents, collect fees for work placement and put people in indebted servitude for repayment (International Labour Organisation, 2016). Migrant women face increased risks of sexual exploitation and harassment, and represent 70% of migrants employed as domestic workers, often without clear terms of employment, and excluded from labour protections in some countries (International Labour Organisation, 2016). These conditions were found in the development of the World Cup Stadium

in Qatar by Amnesty International. Migrant workers makeup 90% of Qatar's workforce and are mainly from South Asia (Amnesty International, 2016b). Migrant abuse in Qatar is widespread as employers hold unreasonable power over employees through the sponsor system (ibid.). This law requires all migrants to have a sponsor that is also their employer. They cannot change jobs or leave the country without the employer's permission (ibid.). It is not lawful for passports to be confiscated, but this is a common practice. Amnesty International found that workers had incurred debt to travel to Qatar and pay the recruitment fees, were being paid less than the recruiters had promised, and that in some cases wages had been withheld for months (ibid.). Employees who complained were threatened with deportation or told they had to work or they would not receive the wages that were owed, or that they would not be allowed to leave (ibid.) Employees were forced to live in squalid, overcrowded conditions with few facilities. In one case flooding resulted from inadequate drainage and smelled of raw sewage (ibid.).

Refugees have useful skills. Many are educated and have professional or trade backgrounds, such as academics and artisans, so can contribute to the society they are staying in, though many struggle with finding employment opportunities (Correa-Velez et al., 2013, Macchiavello, 2003). Getting work quickly can reduce career gaps, provide resources to families and create security, both financial and social. Working can support self-esteem, prevent depression and create a supportive community for refugees that have experienced trauma (Beiser, 2009). It reduces the need for government to financially support these communities. It also gives them resources which they can circulate in their communities, increasing demand for local businesses and stimulating local economies (Zetter, 2012).

The right to work for asylum seekers and refugees varies between countries. In Turkey between 2012 and 2016, only 7,500 Syrian refugees had received work permits, while the country hosted over 2.7 million Syrians by 2016. (Amnesty International, 2016a). In the UK refugees are entitled to work, but must reapply every five years (Equality and Human Rights Commission). However, in 2015 just 45% of asylum seeker applications were granted in the UK and the applicants allowed to stay as refugees (Red Cross, 2018), which means 55% of applicants, whose status was not yet determined, could not work. In Canada, refugees and asylum seekers don't have an automatic right to work, but can apply for a work permit (Government of Canada, 2018). The inability of asylum seekers to work, the insecurity during this period, and the various policies on refugees' rights to work mean that significant numbers of refugees and asylum seekers are being denied access to work.

Anti-refugee and anti-migrant sentiments have been on the rise, in conjunction with a rise in Islamophobia, in Western countries, posing further difficulties for these vulnerable groups to find decent work in the West. Rapid influxes of new populations can cause tension in any country, and contribute to discrimination, such as on the island of Nauru where refugees previously held in Australian detention have been settled (Edwards, 2015). Despite these sentiments, research shows that migrant communities, including refugees, bring economic benefits to their host countries (OECD, 2014). Migrants contribute more in taxes and social contributions than they receive in benefits, and employment is the single biggest determinant of migrants' net fiscal contributions (ibid.). Remittance flows from migrant communities to home countries are also an important development tool. In 2015 migrants sent US\$601 billion in remittances, although this is a conservative figure as more may have been sent through informal channels (International Labour Organisation, 2016).

Refugees and asylum seekers face unique challenges which must be addressed in attempts to adequately achieve SDG 8. The commitment under SDG 8 to protect migrants needs to be extended specifically to cover these vulnerable groups. Following the intersectional model used throughout this booklet, we must consider how multiple identities when combined can increase a person's vulnerability. A migrant may actually be a refugee, they may be a woman and/or a youth. Each of these factors compounds the other and increases the vulnerability of the demographic. As such, SDG 8 does address several vulnerable populations but needs to be approached in a nuanced way to see the hidden vulnerabilities of these groups, and organisations need to identify and specifically target these groups for intervention to be effective. The provision of decent work acts as security, reducing the risk of exploitation and providing a foundation. The assurance of decent work and protection of these groups also protects the wider working population from competing against these unfair conditions, a race to the bottom. Without exclusion, everyone in society can work together towards inclusive economic growth.

SOCIAL INCLUSION AND REDUCED INEQUALITIES SDG 10

SUMMARY

Widening levels of inequality harm a country's efforts to bring the returns of economic growth to all segments of society. It also hampers its efforts to reduce poverty. SDG 10 seeks to reduce inequality within and among countries by empowering and promoting economic, political, and social inclusion of all.

A good place to begin addressing issues of inequality is with the examination of the groups that are being excluded and the measures needed to close the gap between the richest and the poorest members of society.

Today, more than 75 percent of the population in the developing world live in societies where there is an unequal distribution of wealth. SDG 10 focuses on ensuring adequate representation of developing nations in global decision-making institutions, such as the IMF and the World Bank. It also encourages official development assistance (ODA) and financial flows to balance out trade imbalances.

Women and migrant workers frequently face discrimination that leads to income inequality. To address this issue, SDG 10 aims to adopt fiscal, wage, and social protection policies. The social protection schemes emphasize income security for all women, as well as quality access to maternal and child healthcare.

Migrant workers experience social and economic discrimination. They make up a large portion of low-skilled jobs in the informal economy. Moreover, they are usually excluded from social security coverage due to a lack of legislation and enforcement from the state.

IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS

SDG 10 seeks to reduce social, economic, and political inequality within and among countries.

Historically, an economic approach has primarily been used to address widening inequalities and has been understood by measuring income disparities between individuals, groups, and states. While certainly economic growth remains a factor in addressing levels of inequality, it is no longer sufficient to solely use an economic lens. In actuality, widening levels of inequality are found to harm economic growth and poverty reduction efforts. The underlying social, political, and cultural biases, therefore, greatly contribute to how inequality is distributed globally and within a country. In other words, it is through examining who is being excluded within a society that inequality can be addressed in a holistic and sustainable manner.

SDG 10's central approach for resolving current inequalities is to empower and promote economic, political, and social inclusion of all. It enumerates a number of targets, providing a framework in which to pursue social inclusionary policies. The economic perspective is not ignored within this goal, but rather has been well integrated in conjunction with social needs and implications. This allows a country to pursue an inclusive development process that promotes both social inclusion policies, as well as implements measures to reduce income inequality (UN, 2016).

The developing world, or the Global South, has consistently been at a disadvantage with the developed world, the Global North. The legacy of colonial rule in much of the world has resulted in slower and even negative economic growth for many countries. Despite the increasing trend of globalization, many colonized countries still maintain ties with its former colonizer and experience the effects of modern imperialism. These countries not only have limited access to the global market, but also cannot access high quality education and health services. In developing countries, income inequality has increased by 11 percent globally. More than 75 percent of the population in the developing world are living in societies where income is more unequally distributed than in 1990s. Additionally, there is evidence that children in the poorest 20 percent of population are three times more likely to die before their fifth birthday in comparison to children in the richest quintiles (UN, 2018).

While SDG 10 aims to achieve and sustain income growth for the bottom 40 percent of the population, it also focuses on ensuring developing nations are adequately represented in global decision-making institutions such as the IMF and the World Bank. Despite a quota reform increase in the IMF from 33 percent of the vote in 2010 to 37 percent, developing countries' vote falls short of the 74 percent they represent in membership. The World Bank has done even less, as reforms made in 2010 are still being implemented. For instance, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development has still not changed developing countries' 38 percent share of voting rights since 2000 (UNDESA, 2018A).

In addition to changes in representation, SDG 10 encourages official development assistance (ODA) and financial flows, including foreign direct investment, as a way to further balance out trade imbalances. ODA, however, has a notorious reputation of operating from a top-down hierarchy that imposes a number of conditionalities on its recipients. This does not necessarily indicate an increase in inclusion to the

global market, but rather greater dependence on other countries for aid. Similarly, foreign direct investment comes with the risk of corporations abusing their powers to the detriment of low-income countries. Given the lack of demand in corporate investment in low-income countries, foreign companies can very easily exploit the labour force and break environmental and social protections. Countries also often provide tax cuts, which limits the amount of capital going back into the local economy.

Within countries, income inequality is solidified by social inequality, where one group views another as inferior to themselves. The creation of an Us vs. Them paradigm dehumanizes this group and allows for biases and prejudices to be translated into discriminatory policies. In such cases, there is often a concentration of political influence among the higher income group. This imbalance not only allows for such policies to be passed, but also maintains unequal economic and social opportunities and uneven access to public services (UN, 2016).

Since the lack of social and political voice in a society can only increase social tensions, and therefore, economic inequality, it is important for civic society to hold the state accountable and ensure that social protections are in place (UNDESA, 2018B).

As a way of improving social cohesion and the inclusion of marginalized groups, one of SDG 10's target goals is to adopt fiscal, wage, and social protection policies. Social protection is a group of policies and programmes designed to target vulnerable and excluded populations by guaranteeing a basic level of income security and access to social services. It is considered a key aspect of promoting human development, political stability, and inclusive growth, and is currently at the forefront of many national development strategies (ILO, 2013).

While there are many excluded groups that benefit from social protection policies, this analysis will focus on two groups—women and migrants.

Gender equality is a major indicator of social inclusion, as men have historically been better positioned in the political, social, and economic hierarchy. More often than not, women live within a patriarchal society which undervalues them, and in some cases, views them as property. Women's agency has been greatly hindered over the years, resulting in unequal access to economic goods, services, and opportunities. Without access to a steady stream of income, women lose bargaining power in their household over the allocation of goods and services. Moreover, it contributes and reinforces stereotypes of women where they are viewed as being less capable and less intelligent than their male counterparts. As a result of their low status, structural barriers (such as the underinvestment in education and training) and the function of gender norms and roles within a society, women frequently experience explicit discrimination. This has led to job segregation within certain sectors, which effectively excludes women from well-paid and stable parts of the economy.

While gender gaps in income have narrowed over the past decade, women still earn less than men and are unable to find stable employment, subsequently looking to the informal economic sector for opportunities (UNDP, 2013). It is not surprising for social protection schemes to heavily emphasize income security for older women and women of working age, as well as maternity coverage protection to ensure quality access to maternal and child healthcare (ILO, 2017).

The current migrant crisis in North and Northeast Africa and the Middle East has triggered an outpouring of refugees and Internationally Displaced Persons (IDP) into neighbouring countries. The civil war in Syria has produced millions of refugees, with approximately 1.5 million people seeking refuge in Jordan and Lebanon (ILO, 2017). In this context, international migrants, refugees, and IDPs experience a profound sense of vulnerability when they leave their home country, as they are forced to disconnect from their home, family, friends, employment, and culture (UN, 2016). Upon arrival to their host country, international migrants face a significant disadvantage compared to its citizens. Citizens often feel migrants are taking away economic opportunities from locals and are overburdening their social services. These anti-immigrant sentiments have paved the way for international migrants to experience social and economic discrimination, as they are pushed to the margins of society.

Economic migrants make up a large portion of low-skilled jobs in the informal economy and are usually excluded from social security coverage due to a lack of legislation and enforcement from the state. Refugees and IDPs are also unable to participate in social protection programmes of their host country, instead falling under the protection of humanitarian agencies (ILO, 2017). As more and more refugees and IDPs seek asylum in other countries, host countries have responded with stricter policies to immigration and an increase in barriers to migrants' entry. While these policies are intended to act as a deterrent for the increase in migration, it has led to further marginalization and social exclusion of migrants and has ultimately undermined their socioeconomic stability (UN, 2016).

There is a definitive need for appropriate policies to be implemented by host countries and for a cultural shift in the way migrants are perceived. Currently, the ILO is exploring ways for long-term refugees to be fully integrated into its host society, as well as to increase access to social protection programmes with financial support from the international community (ILO, 2017). The political instability crises affects the entire globe, and as such, multilateral institutions should also underline the need for national policies that represent our new reality.

SDG 11: SOCIAL INCLUSION – SUSTAINABLE CITIES

SUMMARY

SDG 11 focuses on the connection between sustainable development practices and social inclusion of otherwise marginalized persons, particularly the urban poor but also ethnic and racial minorities, migrant workers, persons with disabilities, and displaced persons. As industrialization spreads across the globe, it has spurred rapid and not entirely well-planned urbanization. Cities—and today, the vast megacities and metropolitan areas that surround city cores—have brought together people and their social and economic institutions in revolutionary ways. Today, most of the world's population are urban dwellers, and cities serve as the loci of government, commerce, and culture. People move to cities, swelling the urban populations, precisely because they hope to find jobs, housing and services there. Unfortunately, cities and their infrastructures have had a hard time keeping up with the swell. More people generates more demand and puts greater pressure on land, water, and other urban resources. As urban planners look for sustainable solutions to mounting environmental and economic challenges, they must take into account the inclusivity of their solutions. Historically, the failure to do so has resulted in the spread of impoverished conditions within cities that have contributed to health, sanitation, security, and food crises.

IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS

The United Nations' eleventh sustainable development goal (SDG) aims to make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable. The central message of the sustainable development goals is to leave no one behind. To realize this philosophy of inclusion, we must understand who is at risk of being excluded from development (UNDESA, 2016). This section focuses on the vulnerable members of society that are being left behind in urban cityscapes. Ambassador Korosi, Co-Chair of the Open Working Group on sustainable development goals, stated, "The world is rapidly urbanizing, and so, cities are where the battle for sustainable development will be won or lost (UNSDN, 2014)." Currently, more than half the world's population lives in cities. By 2030, it is projected that 6 out of 10 people will be urban dwellers (UNDESA, 2017). According to the World Bank (2015), urban trends are making the push for inclusion more important than ever. Cities are growing at historic rates, with 90 percent of urban growth taking place in Asia and Africa. While urbanization has the potential to lift people out of poverty and to increase prosperity, rising inequality and exclusion threaten to derail progress (World Bank, 2015).

Migration: Push and Pull Factors Decisions to migrate from rural to urban areas are not made by isolated individuals but by larger units of related people—typically families and households (Massey, 1993, p.436). In many circumstances, migration is a risk sharing-behaviour in which households or family groups may decide that one or more of their members should migrate to diversify income sources and minimize income risks (Castles, 2014, p.38). In developing countries, institutional mechanisms for managing risk are imperfect, absent, or inaccessible to poor families giving them incentives to diversify risks through migration. This absence incentivizes them to diversify risks by migrating (Massey, 1993, p.436). Additionally, factors within household decision-making—known as "push factors"—also influence a family's decision to move. Push factors are those that drive people to migrate from a place of origin. Such factors include climate change, drought, violence or persecution, lack of food security, conflict and other sources of regional instability, and poor economic activity or prospects. In contrast, "pull factors" attract people to migrate to new locations. The promise of jobs, higher wages, and other economic opportunities, religious or political freedom, and a more stable environment in which to settle constitute pull factors.

Urbanization, Urban Sprawl and Slums As more of the world's population migrates into city centers in search of job security and higher incomes, a phenomenon known as "urban sprawl" results. Urban sprawl refers to the uncontrolled expansion of urban areas. Urban sprawl has been occurring on an ever-increasing scale since the rise of industrialization in Europe and the United States in the 1800s. As industrialization has spread, so, too, has urbanization and its antecedent, sprawl. This massive expansion of the urban landscape strains urban infrastructure and services and leads to the tandem growth of informal settlements called slums. Today, one quarter of the world's city dwellers live in slums (Totaro, 2016).

UN-Habitat (2016) defines a slum household as a group of individuals living under the same roof in an urban area who lack one or more of the following characteristics:

- durable housing of a permanent nature that protects against extreme climate conditions;
 - sufficient living space, which means not more than three people sharing the same room;
 - easy access to safe water in sufficient amounts at an affordable price;
 - access to adequate sanitation in the form of a private or public toilet shared by a reasonable number of people;
 - and/or security of tenure that prevents forced evictions.
- (UN-Habitat, 2016)

Around the world, one in eight people live in slums, and about one billion people live in slum-like conditions. Slums are emerging as a dominant and distinct type of spontaneous settlement in the cities of the developing world. Since 2000, the global slum population on average grew by six million a year, an increase of 16,500 person's daily. Rapid population growth and rural-to-urban migration in these regions means that these slums are here to stay (UN-Habitat, 2016). Considering these informal settlements grow at very rapid rates, it creates a variety of challenges for the residents living in them. For example, space and privacy are viewed as unachievable luxuries. A sample survey conducted in 2012 by the Participatory Slum Upgrading Programme's implementing countries shows that the average room occupancy (number of persons per room) among slum households is four people, one more person than the recommended maximum of three when considering typical slum rooms of nine square meters (UN-Habitat, 2016). Furthermore, the existence of slum conditions and inadequate urban housing build barriers to social inclusion as well as societal, economic, and civic participation. The simple fact is that living in a slum can be life threatening.

Slums generally arise in the most hazardous urban landscapes, such as along riverbanks; on sandy and degraded soils; near industry and dump sites; in swamps and other wetlands; in flood-prone zones; and on steep slopes. Thus, due to the geography of these settlements slum dwellers often experience inadequate recognition by governance frameworks and are not included in the urban policy process (UN-Habitat, 2016). As stated by Murray (2009), the lack of government assistance for informal settlements is characterized by the fragmentation of urban landscapes:

"There is a tendency both in scholarly and popular commentary to treat the cosmopolitan sites of luxurious spectacle at the urban core and the depleted sites of degraded living at the exurban fringe as spatially distinct locations and therefore analytically separate places, more isolated and disconnected from each other than bound in a common history and a mutual dependence." (Murray, 2009)

Furthermore, the fifth characteristic of a slum, the lack of secure tenure, greatly affects individuals that do not have legal citizenship status or legal rights to their land. Living without secure tenure means living under constant threat of eviction. In 2003, the United Nations estimated that 924 million city dwellers did not have a title to their homes or land. In Africa, more than half the urban population—or 62 percent of people—live in shanty towns, and 90 percent of rural land is undocumented (Totaro, 2016). Today, several organizations around the world advocate for the legal rights of urban dwellers. For example, the Society for the Promotion of Area Resource Centers (SPARC) is one of the largest Indian NGOs working on housing and infrastructure issues for the urban poor. Since 1986, SPARC has been working in partnership with two community-based organizations, the National Slum Dwellers Federation (NSDF) and Mahila Milan. Together, they are known as the Alliance (SPARC, 2014).

The Alliance The Story of NSDF began when residents of a slum called the Janata Colony started to mobilize in the 1960s against an eviction notice from the city government. This occupied area was earmarked for housing and recreation for 3,000 workers of the nearby Bhabha Atomic Research Center. The government ordered the 70,000 residents to disperse and leave. However, the people of the Janata Colony organized themselves, bringing court challenges, and resisting court challenges for several years (Dwyer, 2011). Together, with leaders of other communities facing removal, they formed the Bombay Slum Dwellers Federation in 1969, and the National Slum Dwellers Federation five years later. This movement allowed for the creation of the Indian Alliance. The Alliance is now made up of five interlocking organizations based in 70 towns and cities across India. The federations joined forces with the Society for the Promotion of Area Resource Center (SPARC) in 1986.

This move brought together an activist group and an NGO, which facilitated a platform for both groups to share ideas about how to solve problems of urban deprivation and how to empower the poor (Dwyer, 2011). Sheela Patel is the founder and director of SPARC. In her interview with One World TV, Patel comments on the fragmentation of the urban landscape in India: “For a very long time, slums have been able to coexist with the city; however, because real-estate is becoming more of a commodity, the value of land is becoming the basis of reformulating cities. Getting urban areas onto the global map where everyone wants shining new cities, results in slums being pushed out. Social services never reach the poor.” (Patel, 2012)

International human rights law recognizes everyone’s right to an adequate standard of living, including adequate housing. Adequate housing was recognized as part of first in the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights and then in the 1966 International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (UN-Habitat, 2009). In order to create inclusive societies, house builders and urban planners must recognize housing as a process rather than as a product. Habitat for Humanity (2017) puts forth that housing should be addressed holistically, as both an integral and integrating element of sound urban development practice and urban policies. Societies should incorporate the seven elements of the “Right to Adequate Housing”: security of tenure, availability of services, affordability, habitability, accessibility, location, and cultural adequacy.

Cities are amazing. Perhaps one of our best inventions, they generate wealth and improve living standards while providing the density, interaction, and networks that make people more creative and productive. Cities serve as the key social and economic organizing units of our time, bringing together people, jobs, and all the inputs required for economic growth (Florida, 2011). However, we need to make sure everyone reaps the benefits of urbanization. In order to ensure no one gets left behind in the process of urbanization, governments must work towards making cities inclusive. Everyone is entitled to a safe and affordable place to live. The day-to-day lives of the urban poor must be included in urban policy planning and discourse. There is a need to understand the nature of the urban challenge in order to make the world’s cities places where all people can live healthy, productive and secure lives (UN-Habitat, 2016).

SOCIAL INCLUSION AND SDG 13 – CLIMATE ACTION

SUMMARY

SDG 13 focuses on combating climate change and its impacts. Climate change creates the biggest impact on vulnerable groups and developing countries; therefore, there is a need for social inclusion for survival and security. This is of importance at local, national and international levels.

Vulnerable groups include poor communities, women, children, the elderly, and the disabled. Such groups need to be represented when solutions to the climate change crisis are being sought as their exclusion can exacerbate the impact of the crisis for them. When inequality is high between men and women, women face higher mortality rates during and following natural disasters. Such inequalities relate to the issues of healthcare, food distribution, violence and disproportionate family responsibility. Furthermore, different socioeconomic groups also face challenges and risks. The poor are affected the most due to the lack of housing, the high probability of them having to live in flood prone areas and the lack of access to financial resources to prepare for and overcome impacts.

Developing countries are on the forefront of experiencing the negative impacts of climate change, in particular, small island developing states. Developing countries have contributed the least to causing climate change, and yet are facing the highest costs, including material deprivation, displacement, and the threat of their countries being uninhabitable. This results in great injustice therefore, developing countries are rallying together in order to protect their interests during international climate forums – where developed countries tend to protect their own interests. Developing countries have a right to develop and to seek better standards of living for their people, just as developed countries have done. Therefore, their voices need to be heard and there needs to be a recognition of the vast disparity between developed and developing countries in the contribution to climate change and the experience of its impacts, in order to see the fulfilment of SDG 13.

IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS

Sustainable development goal 13 (SDG 13) is focussed on taking urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts. Climate change disproportionately impacts vulnerable groups and developing countries. As such, the significance of social inclusion to survival and security is important at local, national and international levels. It is a global crisis that requires global action and global input. The great injustice of the impacts of climate change is that the people and countries who have contributed the most to creating this crisis, are the least likely to be severely negatively impacted, while those who have contributed the least are facing not only material deprivation as a result, but are becoming displaced, and in some instances, facing the threat of elimination of their countries. Mitigating and adapting to the threat requires the inclusion of the most affected groups in policy and decision making at both the national and international levels, to be successful.

Every year since 1995 there is held a Conference of Parties (COP) to discuss climate change and its impacts. In 2015, at COP21 the parties met in Paris and signed the Paris Agreement on Climate Change, which dealt with greenhouse gas emissions, mitigation, adaptation, and financing. As of 2017, a total of 197 countries are party to the Agreement, with 175 having ratified it (UNFCCC, 2018). The United States is the sole outlier with President Trump withdrawing from the Agreement, which was signed by President Obama (Dennis, 2017). Despite having the option to participate in the yearly COPs, there is a vast capacity disparity between developed and developing countries. Developed countries can send larger teams, and teams with dedicated training on single issues. Developing countries often send fewer representatives, and have single people covering multiple issues. In the face of this disparity, it is common for developing countries interests to become subsumed and not be adequately reflected in the outcomes of negotiations (Richards, 2001).

These disadvantages have highlighted the need for developing countries to work together, to have their needs addressed. Prior to the 2015 COP21, Fiji held a meeting of the Pacific Island Development Forum (PIDF) with representatives from Pacific countries to develop the Suva Declaration on Climate Change. This document set out to assert a united Pacific voice at the COP21 and covered the inclusion of all stakeholders in climate change talks, including indigenous people, people living with disabilities, women, and youth (Pacific Island Development Forum Secretariat, 2015). It called for setting the ceiling for increasing warming to 1.5 degrees above pre-industrial levels and advocated for strong loss and damage provisions (Ibid.). This document allowed Pacific voices to go to the COP21 prepared to amplify each other and maintain a clear, common, message. The Marshall Islands led the “coalition of high ambition” and was joined by 79 other African Caribbean and Pacific countries (as well as developed countries such as Australia, the US, Canada, and EU member states). The number of countries added up to more than 100 nations who were able to negotiate with an agreed common interest. This group was hailed as a key factor in the end agreement (Harvey, 2015, Mathiesen and Harvey, 2015).

Countries in the Pacific are on the front lines of Climate Change. These small islands developing states (SIDS) have been experiencing increasingly powerful cyclones, such as Tropical Cyclone (TC) Pam (which ravaged Vanuatu in 2015), TC Winston (which did significant damage and claimed 44 lives in Fiji in 2016), and TC Gita which hit Tonga in 2018 (Armbruster, 2017). These storms caused extensive material damage (TC Winston caused more than Aus\$2.5 billion (Ibid.)), which can only be conservatively estimated as many people affected do not have insurance for their property. They have a negative effect on the economy as business is interrupted, and recovery can be slow. In 2018, some children in Fiji continue to attend school in tents while they await classrooms being built (Nasiko, 2018).

TC Winston passed through the centre of Fiji from East to West, affecting all four divisions, about 40% of the population were adversely affected. The storm destroyed up to 100% of buildings on some islands, and 100% of crops in the worst affected areas. The cyclone passed through the “sugar belt” flattening sugar farms, and the houses of sugar farmers, many of whom live on low incomes (Pacific Beat, 2016, UNOCHA, 2016a, UNOCHA, 2016b).

Throughout the Pacific, coastal communities are facing rising seas swallowing their land and are being faced with forced displacement, contamination of groundwater with saltwater, and salt encroachment threatening their subsistence crops. Several countries, such as Kiribati and Tuvalu are facing their entire countries being submerged. Despite displacement, as land is claimed by the sea and security of food and water is diminished, those displaced are not considered refugees. However, even if refugee status could be achieved, the dispersion of these populations across other countries would mean the loss of a home, the loss of governance as a people, the loss of rights to self-determination, the loss of sovereignty, the loss of culture, the loss of identity (Smith and McNamara, 2014). These concerns have led to the majority of Pacific Island states demanding preventative action from developed countries to mitigate climate change, and limited acknowledgment of the prospect of migration should mitigation fail (Ibid.). Kiribati is an outlier to this position by including planned migration as part of their climate strategy (Ibid.). Other countries are concerned that this position may reduce developed countries’ perceived urgency to act and mitigate climate change. Kiribati has bought a large section of land in Fiji, though the official position is that this space is for food security for Kiribati rather than migration (Ibid.).

Climate activism in the Pacific has been strong because the impacts are already being suffered and because of the severity of the ongoing threat. The refrains “we are not drowning, we are fighting” and “1.5 to stay alive” can be heard around the Pacific and reflect that climate change is more than material risk. It is rather an existential threat, which should not be taken lightly. These Pacific communities, such as those in Kiribati and Fiji, are fighting for their voice to be included in the global discourse and are inspiring their leaders to fight on their behalf (350.org, 2018). Exclusion on this issue means a threat to human rights, material needs, the maintenance of cultural groups and threats to the environment (Smith and McNamara, 2014). Exclusion is a death sentence.

Not only does climate change disproportionately impact developing countries, it also poses unique challenges to women. Women bear disproportionate responsibility for caring for others when disasters strike, often putting others safety, such as children’s, elderly and persons with disabilities, ahead of their own (Neumayer and Plümper, 2008). Women are often responsible for feeding their families, in developing countries they are responsible for 60-80% of food production, and this burden doesn’t disappear during climate induced food scarcity, or following natural disasters (United Nations, 2009). Women are often not prioritised when food is distributed at the household level following disasters (Neumayer and Plümper, 2008). Reports of violence against women rise following natural disasters (UNDP, 2010). Women may be pregnant or lactating and require specific medical treatment and nutrition (United Nations, 2009). Females also have different hygiene needs to males and require the provision of sanitary items, as well as a greater level of privacy due to the risk of sexual violence. When inequality is high between men and women, women face higher mortality rates during and following natural disasters (Neumayer and Plümper, 2008). Due to these reasons, women’s voices need to be included in conversations of preparing for natural disasters but are often excluded. This is in part due to limited representation of women in politics but also a lack of effort on the part of researchers to engage women when making recommendations for planning and policy (United Nations, 2009). Similarly, other groups, such as people with disabilities and the elderly, need to be included to ensure that distinct needs are being met. Different socioeconomic groups also face different challenges and risks; poor families are less likely to have housing able to withstand disasters, are more likely to live in flood prone areas, and have less access to financial resources to overcome impacts (Neumayer and Plümper, 2008). The intersectional nature of the challenges needs to be recognised.

Developed countries have gained significant benefits through the exploitation of carbon for industrialisation. The amount of carbon that can be emitted before irreversible catastrophic climate change impacts occur is known as the carbon budget. While all countries are working to curb emissions and mitigate climate change, development continues to be tied to these processes. Developing countries have a right to develop and to seek better standards of living for their people, just as developed countries have done. As such, they should have a designated portion of the carbon budget to support development. In the Pacific, 70% of emissions come from transport – with sea transport being a significant, and in some cases, the majority emitter (Newell et al., 2015). Fossil fuel is often the single largest operating cost for sea transport operators. These boats provide access to goods and materials but are also key for transport for access to services (Ibid.). Despite this, the Pacific is only responsible for producing 0.03% of global CO₂ emissions (McCarthy et al., 2001).

Efforts to mitigate and adapt to climate change, in accordance with SDG 13 can only be effective when considering the needs and distinct circumstances of vulnerable groups, and actively engaging them at grassroots level. This is necessary locally, when planning for disaster relief, and internationally, when agreeing to global efforts to mitigate climate change. We need to recognise the individual insecurities climate change poses to indigenous populations (who face the loss of their homes and countries), the youth (who are looking forward to a future better than that of the present), women (who are responsible for others), as well as people with disabilities and the elderly. We need to recognise the unique threats posed on people living on islands and in remote regions that may be cut off from aid during severe weather events and to people living in less secured housing unable to withstand the threat of storms. Finally, we need to recognise the vast disparity between developed and developing countries in the contribution to climate change and the experience of its impacts.

SOCIAL INCLUSION AND PEACE, JUSTICE, AND STRONG INSTITUTIONS

SDG 16

SUMMARY

Peace, justice, and strong institutions are the prerequisites for the sustainable development of nations and are the key aspects of SDG 16. For institutions to be strong, effective, and accountable, they need to be inclusive. The types of policies institutions design and implement can be instrumental in either maintaining exclusive behaviours or promoting inclusion. Governments, too, have an important role to play, here: they can help to create the conditions necessary to change exclusionary attitudes.

Social inclusion policies are seen as a form of justice by the marginalized sections of society who have faced political, economic, social, and cultural exclusion. The implementation of these policies can also represent the beginning of a peace process for these communities.

IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS

SDG 16 aims to promote peace and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all, and build effective, accountable, and inclusive institutions. This includes promoting the rule of law nationally and internationally, enforcing non-discriminatory laws and policies, reducing bribery and corruption, providing legal identity for all, and strengthening relevant institutions for building capacity.

The endorsement of SDG 16 by the United Nations is a significant decision in international development history. Prior to the adoption of the SDGs, the international community has often been at odds when agreeing to the role of institutions in creating a sustainable and just world. Now with an agreed upon agenda, SDG 16 represents the nexus between politics and institutions and provides a set of guidelines underlying the importance of the effective and accountable management of power (Whaites, 2016). It also signifies a shift in perspective from the focus on development outcomes to understanding the factors that are integral to the development process, acknowledging in particular the role of violence and conflict in impeding meaningful and transformative change (Institute for Economics and Peace, 2017).

The rationale and theoretical underpinnings of SDG 16 make a clear case for the relevancy of JGHS' most recent Human Security Pillar, Social Inclusion. Terms, such as "inclusive", "participatory", and "representative", are utilized as part of its formal language and the concept of inclusivity is included as part of SDG 16's major targets and indicators.

Institutions provide the framework for how and to what degree social exclusion is present in a society and they are key to creating an inclusive society. The type of policies institutions may design and implement influences how social interaction is structured which can either maintain exclusive behaviours or promote inclusion. As a means of holding society accountable in supporting marginalized individuals and communities, strong institutions have the clout to establish social precedents needed to reduce poverty and inequality (UN, 2016).

Unfortunately, marginalized communities can be largely unaware of the rights they have as citizens of a state, and services may be costly in terms of both finances and time. Also, corruption (which can become normalized within an institution, or multiple institutions) can tilt the benefit of available resources to the dominant group. A limited understanding of rights, its cost, and institutionalized discrimination make it extremely difficult for excluded communities to access the system and have it translated into meaningful action. With this in mind, inclusivity within institutions also means challenging discriminatory and exclusionary social norms, attitudes, behaviours, and cultural beliefs that sustain structural injustice. Indeed, this is deeply affected by history and culture, and should be approached in a context-sensitive manner. By fostering acceptance of diversity within a community, institutions can ensure there is a respect for equality.

In this regard, the government has a particular role to play as they can help to create the conditions necessary to change exclusionary attitudes. For instance, the state can promote decent labour initiatives or make sustainable investments for the long-term well-being of a society. Since they are in control of the mandate and possess the resources to provide services and infrastructure at a larger scale, the government is in the best position to remove institutional barriers and prevent the concentration of power (UN, 2016).

A strong institution requires strong internal formal mechanisms, as well as external campaigns that increase legal literacy and programmes to reduce the costs of services. Civil systems that register and provide legal documentation, for instance, can be a powerful tool for individuals rendered invisible to institutions, such as ethnic minorities, persons with disabilities, and homeless persons. With a legitimate legal identity, excluded individuals and communities are able to access institutions that exist to protect their rights (UN, 2016).

This issue can especially affect refugees, asylum seekers, and displaced persons who may not possess identification documentation for a variety of reasons. For instance, it is easy for identification to be lost or destroyed when fleeing a conflict zone or not to have been provided in the first place. It is the host country's responsibility to handle identification documents, and if needed, give assistance from UNHCR. However, given the recent migration crisis, human rights violations have become a common response to foreigners who are coming to these host countries to restart their lives (UNHCR, 2002). The rise in xenophobic, islamophobic, and racist sentiments across the globe have manifested in harassment and/or have become a part of state legislature. Human Rights Watch has reported that U.S. border agents routinely detain families in very cold cells and illegally separate families during this process (HRW, 2018A). Similarly, more than 600 asylum seekers and refugees in Calais, France have not only been subject to extreme weather conditions, but also are faced with routine police brutality and frequent violence (HRW, 2018B). Hungary has taken a different approach, proposing three bills that would penalize any groups working on refugee and migration issues (HRW, 2018C).

While SDG 16 addresses the need for legal identification of all, the question of migration and the inclusion of refugees, asylum seekers, and displaced persons in a host country have not been represented at all. As an SDG that outlines targets on the prevention of conflict, this constitutes a major oversight regarding issues relating to migration. There is a clear need for the UN to provide a guideline within the SDGs for tackling humanitarian crises, not only to demonstrate a vested commitment in the refugee crisis, but also to promote evidence-based practices that will assist state institutions in ensuring this vulnerable group is protected. SDG 16 appears to provide the best context to do this, as institutional capacity is vital in providing necessary documentation and to challenge exclusionary belief systems.

While it is more intuitive to see a link between strong institutions and social inclusion, Peace and Justice also play a role in ensuring marginalized individuals are included within a society. All three aspects of SDG16 are contingent on how individuals or groups feel society is treating them. The more excluded they feel, the greater likelihood of conflict between the dominant group and those who are marginalized. Whether by social norms and mores or institutionalized discrimination, the justice system will ultimately determine how exclusion is manifested. It is, therefore, critical for individuals from any socio-economic background to be able to express their concerns and participate in legal processes. The lines of communication between public institutions and its citizens should be open, transparent, and equal (UN, 2016).

Social inclusion policies, therefore, can be seen as a form of justice to those who have politically, economically, socially, and/or culturally excluded. From a social perspective, the implementation of appropriate policies that target vulnerable communities can, at the very least, represent the beginning of a peace process. In the long term, however, institutions must be aligned with the underlying principle of social inclusion, and indeed of the SDGs' of leaving no one behind.



SUSTAINABILITY INTRODUCTION

Just Governance acknowledges sustainable living as one of six pillars of human security. Sustainable living means striking a balance between advancing human needs and protecting the environment. There are many challenges to achieving this balance: climate change, land degradation, environmental pollution and rising sea levels. New energy sources are needed to provide us with a model that prioritises sustainable living in the production and usage of energy.

Sustainable living concerns are not new. In Sri Lanka, under King Devanampiyatissa's reign (circa 307 BC), nature reserves were established to promote harmonious living with nature (Mackee et al, 2001). Worldwide, today's societies are highlighting that land custodianship must be aligned with the needs of future generations. Australia's traditional custodians see the land as a place of learning, with enormous cultural and spiritual connections that must be maintained and cared for, for future generations. Likewise, the often-quoted words of a Nigerian tribal chief describe his community as consisting of 'many dead, few living and countless others unborn' (Ike, 1984).

In 1983 the United Nations installed former Norwegian prime minister, Gro Harlem Brundtland, to run the World Commission on Environment and Development. At that time, and despite decades of industrialisation and efforts to raise living standards, many countries were still dealing with extreme poverty and the ramifications of large-scale industrialisation such as high levels of pollution and resource consumption. It had become evident that prosperity and ecology needed to be in harmony to maintain ecological health, achieve social equality and ensure that industrialisation benefited humankind, instead of creating major hazards (UN Documents, 1972). The hazards causing greatest concern were nuclear weapons and other means of mass destruction that have the capacity to irrevocably annihilate sustainable living.

The World Commission on Environment and Development's final report, 'Our Common Future', famously defined sustainable development as 'development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs' (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987). This led to the policy concept that development needs to be considered within the limitations of fertile arable land, clean drinking water, and other natural resources imposed by nature. This concept has since been reimagined by reinterpreting and segmenting information through the concept of social, economic and environmental sustainability 'Our Common Future' highlights that development and the environment are concerns that need to be reconciled.

They are not directly opposed: on the contrary, they can be mutually supportive goals. One example is China's Rain to Green project that has converted over nine million hectares of cropland into forest while incentivising farmers to participate by providing grain and cash subsidies (State Forestry Administration of China, 2014). This permanent land-retirement project has reduced soil erosion and restored biodiversity on an immense scale (Liu et al, 2008). Rain to Green targets large industrial operations that can be readily regulated, while incentivising smallholder farmers to change production practices by providing subsidies that don't compromise their livelihoods (Ruhl, 2000).

Agriculture is the most dominant use of land but it poses significant challenges to the natural environment. Crop and livestock production displace biodiversity, carbon storage, and water purification, which threaten access to clean water and sanitation, impact on climate change, and harm biodiversity on land and below water. Crops can necessitate extensive deforestation, excessive water usage or natural waterway diversion, while livestock excrement can pollute waterways. Agricultural impacts on sustainable living are a major concern given the need to feed a global population that is projected to rise to around 10 billion by 2050 (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2017).

Sustainable living is guided by the belief that humans should live within the limits of current resources in ways that allow living systems to thrive in perpetuity. Today's use of non-renewable natural resources is projected to come at the expense of future generations but, in the process, it may generate capital — like knowledge — that improves future wellbeing. Therefore sustainable living connects with the six of the United Nations' SDGs: SDG 6 — clean water and sanitation, SDG 11 — sustainable cities and communities, SDG 12 — responsible consumption and production, SDG 13 — climate action, SDG 14 — life below water and SDG 15 — life on land.

SOCIAL INCLUSION AND NO POVERTY SDG 1

SUMMARY

SDG 6 focuses on improving the availability and sustainable management of clean water and sanitation.

Water is essential for existence and for multiple functions of modern life. The rate of water consumption is growing and by 2030 the demand for water is predicted to be 40 percent more than current supplies from sustainable sources. Recurring water shortages are likely to become an increasing problem worldwide with detrimental consequences on ecosystems, agriculture, food production and human settlements, all of which may lead to political uprising and conflict.

Water must be managed better in future to reduce stress on the resource. A failure to do this will significantly impact on food production as agriculture consumes the majority of all water supplies. Improvements in water and sanitation management are also needed to reduce the spread of infectious diarrhoea and non-diarrhoeal diseases.

With global water needs increasing, good management of water resources and sanitation systems are becoming even more necessary to eradicate poverty (SDG 1) and hunger (SDG 2).

IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS

All living matter in all ecosystems needs water to survive. Humans need a minimum of 7.5L every day—for drinking, preparing food and personal hygiene—and up to 50L for all personal hygiene, domestic cleaning and laundry needs (Howard & Bartram, 2003). Humans also depend on water for multiple biological, economic, social, cultural and environmental functions such as agriculture, energy generation, medicine and healthcare and industry.

Water is the backbone for all material products needed for life. Yet water can have a destructive effect through floods, droughts, acting as a sink for pollutants and a breeding ground for disease. These can have significant economic, health and human wellbeing impacts that, along with water shortages, are exacerbated by socioeconomic factors.

Since the 1980s, the rate of global freshwater use has grown about one percent each year (United Nations World Water Assessment Programme, 2014). Agriculture accounts for approximately 71 percent of global water withdrawals today, and may increase to 4,500 billion m³ by 2030 (2030 Water Resources Group, 2009). Most of this growth is attributed to developing countries. The increasing global population, and its demand for water for domestic, agriculture and industry purposes, is expected to result in water use increasing to 6,900 billion m³ by 2030. This is 40 percent more than the current supply from sustainable, reliable and accessible sources (Alexandratos & Bruinsma, 2012).

2.1 billion people have gained access to cleaner water and improved sanitation since 1990 (World Health Organization & the United Nations Children's Fund, 2017). However, water scarcity still affects more than 40 percent of people worldwide (United Nations Development Programme, 2017) and is a particular problem in sub-Saharan Africa, where the majority of the world's poor live (Jaglin, 2002). An increasing dependence on unsustainable water resources is a problem affecting every continent. By 2050, 25 percent of the world is projected to face a recurring water shortage (Mekonnen, 2016). 41 countries are experiencing water instability of which 10 are close to depleting their renewable freshwater supply and becoming reliant on sourcing water by alternative methods (FAO, 2014) such as storm-water harvesting, sewer mining, desalination plants or recycling.

The effects of climate change and global population growth (forecast to rise to nine billion people by 2050 (Rockström et al, 2014)), will overtax renewable sources of water, potentially leading to their total depletion and collapse. This would devastate local ecosystems, agriculture, and human settlements. Water scarcity can cause political uprising and internal conflict such as in Yemen where 19 of the country's 21 main aquifers are no longer being replenished (Eurasia Group, 2008) resulting in 16 million Yemeni without safe water and sanitation (ReliefWeb, 2017).

Water for human development and wellbeing must be effectively managed to reduce significant stressors (Rockström et al, 2014). For example, agricultural water demand is forecast to increase by 45 percent to 4,500 billion m³ by 2030 if efficiency is not improved. This will massively impact on food production (that consumes 70 percent of all water resources) and on work being done to build sustainable living. For example, in Yemen's Sa'ada basin, a lack of water caused small farmers to abandon their farms, causing further food shortages in an already deprived region (Ward, 2014).

Water and sanitation mismanagement can also cause severe health issues including acute infectious diarrhoea, and non-diarrhoeal diseases. The most noteworthy example of a non-diarrhoeal disease arising from inadequate water quality management, is the arsenic crisis in Bangladesh that is causing skin cancer and gangrene (Smith et al, 2000; Saha, 2003). Poor water governance also led to an epidemic of meningococcal epidemic in a Sudanese refugee camp: the disease spread along the routes that people used to collect their water (Santaniello-Newton & Hunter, 2000).

To improve access to water, the right policies, economic investments, infrastructure development and institutional arrangements must be enacted (Jaglin, 2002). Universal access to safe, affordable and sustainable drinking water also requires us to protect and restore water-related ecosystems such as forests, mountains, wetlands, rivers and underground water supplies. International support for water treatment technologies and water reclamation projects would also help mitigate the projected water scarcity crisis (UN-Water, 2016). Water and sanitation governance is necessary to eradicate poverty and hunger, the first two SDGs. With growing global water needs, it is increasingly becoming a topic for discussion.

SUSTAINABILITY AND SDG 12: RESPONSIBLE CONSUMPTION AND PRODUCTION

SUMMARY

SDG 12 focuses on ensuring sustainable consumption and production patterns. A growing middle-class population is increasing the demand for goods produced from the world's natural resources. Achieving a balance between meeting consumer needs, maintaining economic growth and sustaining world ecology is an increasing problem.

Increased consumption raises a number of concerns: environmental and health risks from natural resources and fossil fuels used to produce goods; and the high volumes of general waste and food waste generated. Sustainable living can be reconciled with economic growth by more effectively managing natural resources, using better methods of waste management (prevention, reduction, recycling and reuse), phasing out fossil fuels in favour of renewable energy sources, and reducing food losses and waste at all stages of the production and supply chains.

IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS

The middle-class population is projected to increase from 1.8 billion in 2009 to 4.9 billion by 2030 (Kharas, 2010). While transition into the middle class brings individual prosperity it also brings an increased demand for goods that are produced from already overburdened natural resources. Responsible production and consumption of goods, and finding a balance between meeting consumer needs and sustaining world ecology, is becoming an increasing global concern.

The effective management of natural resources, especially non-renewable resources, is one concern that arises from increased consumption. Chemicals, pollutant byproducts and toxic waste must be managed in line with agreed international frameworks throughout their lifecycles to manage environmental risks. Effective management reduces the release of toxins into air, water and soil systems, and minimises any adverse impacts on human health, the broader environment and fauna.

The volume of waste generated is a second concern. The preferred methods of managing waste are prevention, reduction, recycling and reuse. Policies that encourage the creation of recyclable matter and the recycling process, will benefit the physical health of communities as they reduce pollution. Children are particularly susceptible to adverse environmental conditions (Sly & Flack, 2008), and as recycling decreases so does the consumption of primary resources which causes pollutants (Bartl, 2014).

Improperly-managed waste often generates higher downstream costs than well-managed waste (Hornweg & Bhada-Tata, 2012.) Recycling is estimated to halve the cost of waste management (through significant savings in salaries, goods and services, and sales) compared with waste relegated to landfills (Integrated Waste Management Board, 2005).

There are some health and safety concerns with informal recycling, which is often small-scale, labour-intensive, unregulated and unregistered, low-technology and involves vulnerable individuals such as women, children and the elderly (Wilson, Whiteman & Tormin, 2001; Medina, 2000). Good governance and regulation of recycling are necessary to reap the benefits while also protecting human health.

The use of fossil fuels is another concern arising from increased consumption. Fossil fuel combustion is the leading contributor to global warming, air and water pollution (Hoel & Kverndokk, 1996) and may have significant health impacts. 92 percent of the global population live in areas that have an air quality level in excess of WHO's Ambient Air quality guidelines, and air pollution is estimated to claim one in nine lives (World Health Organisation, 2016). Fossil fuels must be phased out in favour of renewable energy sources, in line with national circumstances.

A further cause of concern is the volume of food waste. This is estimated to be approximately 1.3 billion tonnes each year, equivalent to one third of the annual quantity of food produced for human consumption. This waste causes economic losses of USD \$750 billion and significant environmental damage: approximately 1.4 billion hectares of land (28 percent of the world's agricultural land), is used to produce this wasted food, which releases 3.3 billion tonnes of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere (The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, 2013). Reducing global food waste—at the retail and consumer levels—and reducing food losses—at the production, post-harvest and supply chain levels—would improve quality and life expectancy for a significant part of the population.

The responsible production and consumption of goods involves reducing the global ecological footprint while maintaining economic growth and sustainable development. Sustainable living can be reconciled with economic growth by regaining the economic benefits of reduction and recycling.

SUSTAINABILITY AND SDG 13: CLIMATE ACTION

SUMMARY

SDG 13 focuses on taking action to combat climate change and its impacts. Climate action is one of the most relevant SDGs to Just Governance's sustainable living pillar.

The world's surface temperature is increasing, causing ice to melt and sea levels to rise. Rising sea levels result in soil erosion and salinization that reduces the area of habitable land and affects agriculture and food production. These effects are particularly harmful to small island developing states and pose a real threat to the continued existence of some low-lying Pacific islands. Rising sea levels and coastal erosion affect their ability to maintain territorial integrity, water and food security, public services and infrastructure: their efforts to build sustainable nations are undermined.

There will be an estimated 200 million climate refugees by 2050, including over 50 million people living in small island development states. Kiribati is one of the first countries likely to disappear. Its ability to continue growing food and accessing clean drinking water will render Kiribati's atolls uninhabitable before they are completely inundated by the sea. In the meantime, population growth and internal migration are putting pressure on the densely populated capital's already inadequate housing and sanitation infrastructure, and making the people of Kiribati even more vulnerable to natural disasters and climate change.

Developing countries cannot achieve sustainable living while climate change erodes their habitable land, increases their population density and puts pressure on land needed for agriculture and food production. Climate action is needed for sustainable living to be possible.

IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS

Between 1906 and 2005, the world's average surface temperature increased by 0.6°C to 0.9°C, melting mountain glaciers and ice sheets and causing sea levels to rise. In 2007, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change reported that the annual average extent of sea ice in the Arctic has shrunk by 2.7 percent per decade, with shrinkage of 7.4 percent per decade experienced in summer (Pachauri & Reisinger, 2007). The National Climatic Data Center and World Meteorological Organization report that annual summer ice loss now totals 60,421 square kilometers (National Snow and Ice Data Center, 2006).

Research has linked sea level changes in 293 cities to specific regions of melting land ice in southern Greenland and the Antarctic peninsula (Larour, Ivins & Adhikari, 2017). The specific location of Antarctic melting is important for areas south of the equator (South America, Africa, South Asia and the Pacific Islands), while Greenland's ice loss is relevant to North America and Europe. Sea levels are expected to rise between 18cm and 59cm by the end of this century due to the thermal expansion of the world's oceans (Levermann et al, 2014).

Rising sea levels cause soil erosion, degradation and salinisation: effects that are particularly harmful to small island developing states (SIDS). Climate change impacts economies: urban population density increases as habitable land shrinks, population growth is unsustainable, food demands are unmet, and infrastructure is threatened through more natural disasters. Hallmarks of sustainable living—social protection, health care and education investment, sociopolitical and economic stability—are all threatened by climate change. Regional differences in water temperature, salinity and depth mean that sea level rises will be greater in the tropical Pacific than any other area of the world (Durack, Wijffels & Gleckler, 2014). This has ramifications for SIDS that face significant concerns over their ongoing existence.

The United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs lists 57 SIDS (including 37 member states) (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2015), with a combined population of over 65 million people, which are at substantial risk of displacement due to rising sea levels. These territories share fragile tourism-based economies, infrastructure development challenges, inadequate protection against natural disasters and dependence on international trade to sustain their communities. As rising sea levels and coastal erosion affect their ability to maintain territorial integrity, water and food security, public services and infrastructure, so their ability to build sustainable nations is threatened (UN-OHRLS, 2015).

The Republic of Kiribati is a good illustration of the interconnectedness of environmental, economic and social factors in sustainable development. Kiribati is a string of 33 ring-shaped coral reefs (atolls) spread over 7.8 million km², with an average altitude of three metres. These features mean Kiribati is one of the most likely countries in the world to disappear within the next 50 years, displacing its population of 110,000 I-Kiribati (Kiribati's inhabitants) (Barnett & Adger, 2003; Gheuens, 2017).

Kiribati's arable land and underground fresh water are at risk of salt water contamination due to rising sea levels. An inability to grow food, and a lack of clean drinking water, would render the atolls uninhabitable long before they are

completely inundated by the sea (United Nations Sustainable Development, 2009). There are no long-term plans to halt rising sea waters inundating Kiribati. Seawalls and models for 'floating islands' have been proposed but they would cost USD1 billion to USD2 billion dollars (Marks, 2011) and would not allow the population to stay indefinitely. The current, locally affordable solution is to create sandbags harvested from the atoll's beaches. However, while this buys survival time for houses and infrastructure, it speeds up soil erosion and degradation (McDonald, 2015).

One of the areas of Kiribati most vulnerable to rising sea levels is Betio—an islet of South Tarawa with a higher population density than Hong Kong but without the high-rise buildings. This area already has high pollution and poor sanitation—a lack of sewerage systems, septic tanks that seep into the ground water supply, and tank infrastructure that cannot keep up with population growth. Kiribati's ability to cope with ongoing crisis is further hampered by the economic damage from climate change, which represents 17–34 percent of gross domestic product due to its tourism-heavy economy (Wyett, 2014).

Kiribati's population is expected to increase by a third by 2022 (Kiribati National Statistics Office, 2007). As rising sea waters inundate more land, population density increases, worsening conditions across the atolls (McAdam, 2011). A sudden increase to the density of human living creates significant challenges—such as slums emerging without basic services and safe infrastructure—that make people even more vulnerable to natural disasters and climate change.

The island likely to survive the longest is South Tarawa, which currently houses half of the nation's population. A recent study found that more than 70 percent of households in Kiribati and neighbouring nation Tuvalu would consider leaving their homes if droughts, rising sea levels or floods got worse. Most I-Kiribati most would move to the capital (Tarawa), which could result in the population growing by 72 percent (United Nations ESCAP & UNU-EHS, 2015). The impact on the already high population density would destroy any chance of building a sustainable community.

Opportunities to migrate out of Kiribati are limited. New Zealand's Pacific Access Category scheme allows for only 75 I-Kiribati migrants each year, and migration numbers outside this scheme are negligible. A reported 3,000 applications are received annually for these 75 positions (Voigt-Graf, 2016).

Rising sea levels threaten national sovereignty and cultural identity (Fedor, 2012). Research has shown that when Pacific Islanders are relocated they often find themselves in a state of discontent as the very strong relationship between communities and their land is disrupted (Campbell, 2010; O'Collins, 1990).

By 2050 there will be an estimated 200 million climate refugees (Myers & Kent, 1995). However, as yet there is no binding international treaty that recognises migration for climate change reasons. Climate refugees are therefore invisible in the international system: no institution exists to track their numbers or provide them with basic services. So far no countries have been willing to unilaterally accept climate refugees, so they 'fall through the cracks of international refugee and immigration policy' (International Organization for Migration, 2008).

Sustainable living cannot be achieved while climate change is eroding habitable land, causing population density to rise, increasing pressure on land and threatening local agriculture and food production. While no nations have so far been inundated due to anthropogenic climate change, this is a reality many Pacific Islands face in future. Climate action is necessary for sustainable living to be both possible and feasible within the context of current climate situations.

On 20 April 2017, 143 parties ratified the Paris Agreement. This agreement recommends that, by 2020, developed nations are committing USD100 billion each year to the climate-related needs of developing countries, and that they continue that level of support until 2025. The agreement specifically notes that the countries and populations most vulnerable to climate change and its effects are the least developed countries and SIDS. Of the parties that ratified the agreement, 137 (136 countries and the European Commission) have United Nations Volunteer-sealed their first nationally-determined contributions to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change secretariat.

SUSTAINABILITY AND SDG 14: LIFE BELOW WATER

SUMMARY

SDG 14 focuses on conserving and sustainably using the oceans, seas and marine resources. The marine environment is threatened by climate change, industrialisation, overfishing and marine pollution by plastics, fertilizers and farm waste. The impacts these have on human health, economies and marine fauna are often felt most by communities already vulnerable through their socio-economic situation or propensity to disasters.

Achieving sustainability within the marine environment relies on sustainable living practices above the water. Similarly, without sustainably using marine resources we will be unable to achieve sustainable living in other areas.

IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS

The most familiar form of marine pollution is plastics. Plastics are harmful as their buoyancy and durability results in their widespread distribution across the oceans, and because they absorb toxicants while traveling through the environment (Teuten et al, 2007). Through photodegradation and other weathering processes, plastics fragment to form microplastics that disperse in the ocean and converge in ocean gyres, closed bays, gulfs, and seas surrounded by densely populated coastlines (Law et al, 2010; Collignon et al, 2012).

These plastics enter the food chain as they are ingested by marine fauna. Cases of plastic being found in seabirds' and marine reptiles' stomachs are well documented, while microplastics have been found in zooplankton and cetaceans (Gregory, 2009). Plastic fragments that are distributed across oceans can also transport microbial communities, algae, fish and invertebrates to non-native regions, which can act as a biohazard (Barnes, 2002; Carson et al, 2013; Goldstein et al, 2014).

Plastic fragments off the Belgian coast have been found to contain human pathogenic bacteria that is different to that found in the surrounding water and sediment. This indicates that plastic debris can act as a distinct habitat and vector for pathogens (McCormick et al, 2014; Van der Meulen, 2014). Due to its shape and absorbent qualities, plastic debris can hold stagnant water on land and create a habitat for mosquito larvae that transmit diseases — such as Zika, malaria, chikungunya and dengue fever (Moss et al, 2017) — or it can provide suitable conditions for parasite-bearing, freshwater snails (Vethaak & Leslie, 2016).

These characteristics mean that plastic debris has a greater impact on communities with poor sanitation facilities and underdeveloped waste management systems, on areas affected by disasters (especially floods), and on people living in or near landfill, waste processing and illegal dumping regions. Plastic debris is an emerging health issue that may have repercussions on the lowest socio-economic bracket (Vethaak & Leslie, 2016; Van der Meulen et al, 2014).

Oceans are projected to be 30 percent more acidic than they were before the industrial revolution in the 1750s. (Orr et al, 2005). Ocean acidification is driven by carbon dioxide — the same driver of climate change. Future changes are expected to occur rapidly: researchers project that by 2050 the ocean could be more acidic than at any point over the last 20 million years (Turley & Findlay, 2009).

Ocean acidification has widespread effects. In some marine species it can alter or halt vital biological and physiological processes such as reproduction (Havenhand et al, 2008), growth (Orr et al, 2005), calcification (Gooding et al, 2009), behaviour (Munday et al, 2009), phenology (Polovina et al, 2008) and migration patterns (Orr et al, 2005). Oysters are an example of a high value marine resource (Cooley & Doney, 2009) that is directly threatened by ocean acidification at both larval and adult stages. Increased acidity and decreased availability of carbonate ions provide oysters fewer resources to build their shells (Gazeau et al, 2007). Acidification, along with fertilizer and farming waste draining into aquatic systems, has affected the water concentrations of metals and lowered pH, which can also reduce oyster survival and growth rates (Dove & Sammut, 2007).

Phosphorus and nitrogen from fertilizers and farm waste flow through aquatic systems, directly impacting the marine environment by causing algal blooms. High levels of these nutrients in water cause algae to grow faster than ecosystems can handle, with harmful consequences for human health, aquatic ecosystems and coastal ecosystem services like fisheries and tourism (Yang et al, 2008; Berdalet et al, 2015).

Specific algal blooms (such as blue-green algae or cyanobacteria) are an ongoing public health issue. They can pollute seafood chains creating economic disaster and public health impacts in coastal areas. Paralytic Shellfish Poisoning (PSP), Neurotoxic Shellfish Poisoning (NSP) and Ciguatera Fish Poisoning (CFP) can be carried by virtually all edible shellfish in affected bodies of water (Azanza, 1999) and cause damage to different systems of the human body (Christian & Luckas, 2008). Toxic algal species can force fish and shellfish farms to close and cause coastal tourist activities to decline (Mazzeo, 2016). Rising global temperatures and eutrophication of aquatic systems may increase the occurrence and severity of algal bloom (Paerl, 2008). This damage by algae, to economies, townships and human health, undermines the goal of achieving sustainable living practices.

Unsustainable fishing practices also threaten marine health. The most extreme example of overfishing and overharvesting is found in Australia where extensive oyster reefs once thrived along the southern coastline (Zu Ermgassen et al, 2012; Beck et al, 2011). These reefs were shellfish ecosystems formed by *O. angasi* and *S. glomerata*. Once common and extensive marine ecosystems, today less than 1 percent of *O. angasi* and 8 percent of *S. glomerata* reef systems remain. This collapse is directly linked to overexploitation through dredging harvesting in the 19th century. The decline in the ecosystem is possibly due to invasive animals, new diseases and is symptomatic of declining water quality and disturbance (Ogburn et al, 2007).

SUSTAINABILITY AND SDG 15: LIFE ON LAND

SUMMARY

SDG 15 focuses on sustainably managing forests, combating desertification, halting and reversing land degradation and halting biodiversity loss.

The world's population is growing, which is increasing the demand for food and fuel produced from the land. In response, more land is being converted to agriculture, more water is being used for irrigation, and traditional crops and agricultural methods are being substituted by large-scale monoculture. These changes are altering natural habitats that protect biodiversity, keep soil and watersheds healthy and protect against flooding. The consequences of these changes are far reaching.

Achieving a sustainable balance between ecological health and increasing the amount of nutritious food produced, needs existing agricultural land to be transformed rather than significantly expanded, and transformative changes to be made to how food is produced, stored, processed, distributed and accessed.

IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS

The global demand for food, fuel and livestock feed is growing fast: the demand for meat and agricultural commodities is expected to have doubled by 2050 (FAO, 2006). As the world's population gets more than 99.7 percent of its calories from the land, and less than 0.3 percent from the oceans and aquatic ecosystems (FAO, 2004), sustaining agricultural processes is becoming increasingly important.

As the world's agricultural land base, from which to produce food, is shrinking, the increased demand is driving land clearance (Braithwaite, 1996). In the developing world, urban expansion is causing approximately 1–2 million hectares of cropland to be converted to prime agricultural real estate every year (Döös, 2002). As much as 50 percent of the earth's ice-free land has already been altered by people (Vitousek et al, 1997) and 40 percent of available land is now used for agriculture (including pasture and coadapted grassland). Irrigation for agricultural purposes accounts for 85 percent of the world's water use (Foley et al, 2005) and is the foremost cause of nitrogen emissions (Galloway et al, 2003).

Land is being affected by climate change and pollution (Chameides et al, 1994; Law & Stohl, 2007), which in turn impacts on crop viability (Auffhammer et al, 2006). Soil is also being lost from agricultural areas 10 to 40 times faster than new soil is being formed (Pimentel & Burgess, 2013). Obtaining a higher yield from existing land is essential to be able to increase food production, and any decrease in output may lead to food insecurity (Godfray et al, 2010; Hubert et al, 2010).

To meet the global demand for food, agriculture is having to expand into natural ecosystems. However this expansion brings significant losses to natural habitats that are needed to maintain biodiversity, mitigate floods, protect soil and watersheds and store carbon. These losses can cause land degradation, desertification and deforestation (Lambin & Meyfroidt, 2011; Foley et al, 2005; Gibbs, 2012). During the 1980s and 1990s, more than half of the expanded agricultural areas in the tropics came at the expense of closed forests, and an additional third came at the expense of disturbed forests (Gibbs et al, 2010).

Small-scale agricultural plants are often displaced by more profitable commercial crops. In East Africa, colonisation caused the systematic upheaval of indigenous and traditional food habits. Traditional foods that once sustained populations through drought and famine are now on the verge of extinction (Asfaw & Tadesse, 2001). Monocultures displaced traditional food crops that were grown using cultivation techniques, such as 'shifting cultivation' and 'intercropping', which had evolved to adapt to local agricultural conditions (Gura, 1986; Shiva, 2000). These traditional techniques protected the soil and provided communities with a variety of crops, which reduced the risks of crop failure, pests and diseases, and minimised weeds: benefits that monoculture cropping does not have (Gura, 1986). The loss of indigenous crops has severely reduced biodiversity, caused ecological damage and negatively affected nutritional and caloric intake in East Africa and the rest of the world (Okigbo, 1986; Platt, 1962; Tudge, 2003). The situation in East Africa clearly demonstrates how threats to biodiversity directly impact sustainable living.

A common approach to reconciling agricultural expansion with forest conservation, is to focus agricultural expansion in degraded, underutilized or marginal areas (Fargione et al, 2008). The problem with this approach is that the demand for land-intensive commodities, such as beef, cotton and wheat, tend to cause the agricultural potential of this type of land to be overstated (Lambin et al, 2013; Young, 1999; Lewis & Kelly, 2014). The term 'degraded land' is also used to describe a variety of different land condition problems including desertification, salinisation, erosion, compaction, encroachment of invasive species, waterlogging, or a soil imbalance (such as an overabundance of clay or sand). Critically, 'degraded land' doesn't differentiate between naturally occurring problems that affect land productivity (such as naturally saline soil) and man made ones (such as areas that are periodically burned to prepare them for agriculture (Fagúndez, 2013; Maiangwa et al, 2007).

Irrigating agricultural land can also cause it to become degraded as excess nutrient uptake can result in contaminated waterways, salinity, water resource collapse and groundwater drainage (Hillel et al, 2008). Between the 1960's and 2005 large-scale agricultural irrigation triggered the collapse of the Aral Sea and its fishing industry (Gaybullae, Chen & Gaybullae 2012). By 1997 the Aral Sea had declined to 10% of its original size and by 2014 the eastern basin of the Aral Sea had completely dried up and is now known as the Aralkum Desert (Liston 2014). The dry sea beds also resulted in wind-dispersed salinification of agricultural land and nearby rivers (Bos, 2001).

The clearance of vegetation that accompanies agricultural expansion is the biggest driver of plant and animal species' population decline and extinction, as their natural habitats are destroyed (Gibbs et al, 2010; Bradshaw et al, 2009). Naturally between one and five species would become extinct each year, but human activity has increased this rate by 1,000–10,000 times to the point where dozens of species are becoming extinct every day (Chivian & Bernstein, 2008), and 30–50 percent of all species could be nearing extinction by 2050 (Thomas et al, 2004). Amphibians face the biggest threat: a third of the 6,300 known species of amphibians are at risk of extinction (Wake & Vredenburg, 2008) due to their sensitivity to pollution, climate change, ultraviolet light, disease and introduced species. It is this sensitivity that means amphibians are often a litmus test for subtle ecosystem changes (Hopkins, 2007).

Achieving a sustainable balance, between increasing the amount of nutritious food produced and ecological health, needs existing agricultural land to be transformed rather than significantly expanded. This requires changes to the way that food is produced, stored, processed, distributed and accessed: changes that are as transformative and radical as the food shifts that occurred during the 18th century agricultural revolution, the 19th century industrial revolution and the 20th century green revolution (Conway, 1997). It is only by sustainably managing environments that this balance will be achieved and further land degradation and biodiversity loss will be avoided. Economies, food and resource sources and sustainability are directly dependent on effective land management (Vrije Universiteit te Amsterdam Centre for Development Cooperation Services, 1992; Pinstrup-Andersen & Pandhya-Lorch, 1994).



INTRODUCTION TO FOOD SECURITY

Just Governance identifies food security as one of the six pillars of human security. Food insecurity exists across the world. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) estimates the global number of individuals classified as undernourished at more than 800 million (FAO, 2017). The concept of food security has evolved over the past forty years to reflect changes in official policy thinking. The term originated in 1974, when the World Food Conference defined food security in terms of food supply. Food security became equated with a sufficient food supply at the national or global level (FAO, 2006). However, over the years, as certain groups were observed to experience inadequate food intake despite there being an overall adequate food supply, the term food security began to be applied at a community, local, household, and individual level (Clapp, 2014).

In 1983, the FAO focused on food access in an effort to balance the demand and supply sides of the food security equation. The FAO concluded that hunger is deeply dependent on a person's ability to access food. A country's ability to produce enough food to feed a population within its borders does not guarantee that everyone will be well fed. "Ensuring that all people at all times have both physical and economic access to the basic food that they need" became a defining characteristic of food security (FAO, 1983). Food security was moved out of the realm of agricultural productivity, and examined in a broader context associated with problems of continuing or structural poverty and low incomes. In 1986, an influential World Bank report, *Poverty and Hunger*, provided a definition that focused on the temporal dynamics of food insecurity. Food insecurity can be categorized as either chronic or transitory. Chronic food insecurity refers to a continuously inadequate diet caused by the inability to acquire food. Transitory food insecurity describes a temporary decline in a household's ability to access food because of unstable prices, production or household incomes. These temporal qualifiers reflect the revised definition of food security as the "access of all people at all times to enough food for an active, healthy life" (World Bank, 1986, p.1).

In the next decade, the nutritional dimensions and quality of food were incorporated under the conditions in which hunger occurs. The 1996 World Food Summit expanded the definition of food security, and remains the most widely used and authoritative definition of the concept today: "Food security exists when all people, at all times, have physical, social and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food that meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life (FAO, 1996)."

The widely accepted 1996 definition reinforces the multidimensional nature of food security by describing what are known as the “four pillars” of food security: accessibility, availability, utilization and stability.

Food availability means the availability of sufficient quantities of food of appropriate quality, supplied through domestic production or imports, including food aid. Food access refers to individuals' access to adequate resources (entitlements) for acquiring foods appropriate to a nutritious diet (FAO, 2006). The idea of entitlements to food highlights that starvation is the characteristic of some people not having enough food to eat. It is not the characteristic of there not being enough food to eat (Sen A, 1981). Personal entitlements to food access are defined by one's ability to obtain resources to produce, trade, or purchase food (Sen A, 1981). The third pillar of food security is the utilization of food through adequate diet, clean water, sanitation and health care to reach a state of nutritional well-being where all physiological needs are met. Lastly, the concept of food stability requires that a population, household, or individual have access to an adequate quality and quantity of food at all times. People should not risk losing access to food because of sudden shocks (e.g., an economic or climatic crisis) or cyclical events (e.g., seasonal food insecurity) (FAO, 2006). Food security as a theoretical framework provides an outline and standard for achieving access to sufficient, safe, and nutritious food.

More recently, the increasing concentration of hunger and under-nutrition in countries affected by conflict has made it imperative to develop a clearer understanding of the relationship among hunger, conflict and peace. Thus, the ethical and human rights dimensions of food security have come into focus (FAO, 2017). The Right to Food was first recognized in the UN Declaration of Human Rights in 1948; it pointed the way towards the possibility of a rights-based approach to food security. This is important, as the United Nations has made a strong effort to focus on the nexus between conflict, food security, and nutrition (FAO, 2017).

The definition of food security has evolved over the years to become a more comprehensive and inclusive concept. As a result, it connects with the following six Sustainable Development Goals of the United Nations: SDG 1–No Poverty, SDG 2–No Hunger, SDG 12–Responsible Production and Consumption, SDG 13–Climate Action, SDG 14–Life Below Water, and SDG 15–Life on Land.

FOOD SECURITY – NO POVERTY SDG 1

SUMMARY

SDG 1 ends to eliminate global poverty, a key predictor of food insecurity. Studies have shown close ties between poverty and the hunger traps that compromise food security. Low productive resources, low wages, low entrepreneurial investment, and unsustainable practices all contribute to extreme poverty levels and limit food availability, food access, food utilization and food stability. As a result, the FAO aims to boost incomes, provide better social safety nets, increase rural investment in communities, businesses and transportation infrastructure, and improve education in sustainable practices to address the two-pronged threat of poverty and hunger. By alleviating poverty, the United Nations hopes to help more people achieve food security.

IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS

The United Nation's first Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) aims to end poverty in all its forms everywhere. Currently, poverty is measured as people living on less than USD 1.25 a day. Higher levels of poverty are linked with a higher prevalence of undernourishment, suggesting a clear link between hunger traps and poverty conditions. Poverty and hunger are interconnected and mutually reinforcing; hunger is not only a cause but also a consequence of poverty (WFP, 2009, p.19). For example, as economist Ragnar Nurkse explains:

“A poor man may not have enough to eat; being underfed, his health may be weak; being physically weak, his working capacity is low, which means that he is poor, which in turn means he will not have enough to eat; and so on” (Nurkse, 1953, p.4).

Hunger and poverty drive each other in a vicious cycle, generating a hunger-poverty trap (WFP, 2009). Poverty plays an important role in the access dimension of food security (FAO, 2013). Food access is defined by a “household's ability to acquire adequate amounts of food, through one or a combination of own home production and stocks, purchases, barter, gifts, borrowing and food aid” (WFP, 2009, p.23). Although there is not a one-to-one correlation between hunger and extreme poverty, their general interdependence makes it necessary to explore the ways in which poverty impacts food security.

One of the primary priority actions on poverty eradication is “improving access to sustainable livelihoods, entrepreneurial opportunities and productive resources” (UNDESA, 2017). Nearly 800 million people around the world, or 78% of the world's poor, live in rural areas. These individuals rely on farming, livestock, aquaculture and other forms of agricultural work to access food and earn a living (World Bank, 2014). The agricultural industry in developing countries accounts for 11.5% of their GDP; in poorer agriculture-based developing countries, agriculture accounts for a much higher proportion of GDP, often more than 25%, and 50% or higher for some, such as Sierra Leone or Guinea-Bissau (Clapp, 2012). As a result, barriers to food production, such as a lack of natural resources, inadequate infrastructure, and reduced subsidies, hinder the employment sector of affected local economies and negatively impact their local food security.

In 2013, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) conducted a report on the state of food security in the world. The report confirmed that hunger tends to be widespread in countries with high poverty levels, and that food is one of the most income-responsive of basic necessities. These findings support the conclusion that boosting incomes and providing social safety nets reduce hunger (FAO, 2013, p.28). Juergen Voegelé, Senior Director of the World Bank's Agriculture Global Practice, states:

“Agriculture must become part of the solution to many of the world's most pressing development problems. It is important for developing countries because of its potential positive impact on everything from job creation and food security, to fighting climate change. When done sustainably, agriculture not only grows economies, but also improves the daily lives of the world's poorest people.” (World Bank, 2014)

Furthermore, investments in sustainable agricultural production are important in order to improve overall food availability. However, abundant food supplies do not necessarily translate into improved access or utilization of food. Structural barriers to food access, such as a lack of investments in rural transportation and infrastructure, further exacerbates food-poverty in rural areas by isolating rural farmers from needed inputs and profitable markets (Omotayo, 2018).

Moreover, the United Nations aims to strengthen the resilience of the poor and those in vulnerable situations and to reduce their exposure and vulnerability to climate-related extreme events and other economic, social and environmental shocks and disasters (UNDESA, 2017). It is important to recognize that poverty is generally associated with deprivation of health, education, food, knowledge, and influence over one's environment. However, vulnerability is another universal aspect of poverty that makes it incredibly challenging for one to escape the food-poverty trap. Individuals that have a low socioeconomic status are more vulnerable than any other group to economic downturns (Philip, 2004). Specifically within the context of food security, access to food has largely become a market transaction; this means that threats to an individual's place in the economy also endanger their food security (Clapp, 2012).

For example, during the global food price crisis of 2007–2008, prices of the main commodities—such as wheat, maize, and rice—significantly increased on global markets. The food price index rose by nearly 40%, compared to 9% in 2006 (De Schutter, 2013). These price increases strongly impacted poorer households, who are largely net food buyers, because they dedicate the largest proportion of their household budget to the purchase of food (De Schutter, 2013). Furthermore, international price increases most severely affect food-deficit countries, which are more dependent on imports to feed their populations. During 2007–2008, 115 million people joined the ranks of “the urgently hungry” (WFP, 2009). Avoiding and managing risk is a prerequisite for poor rural households to move out of poverty, and it is central to their livelihood strategies (IFAD, 2011). Thus, increasing food access through decent rural employment and securing wages through the promotion of sustainable agriculture is imperative to providing food security for all.

SDG 2: FOOD SECURITY– NO HUNGER

SUMMARY

The United Nations' second Sustainable Development Goal (SDG 2) aims to end global hunger through the institution of reforms and processes that will ensure food security. This includes measures improving the nutritional quality of foods consumed and implementing sustainable farming and livestock practices.

The four pillars of food security are availability, access, utilization, and stability. Food availability refers to the physical presence of consumable food. Food access refers to a household's ability to acquire, or get, sufficient quantities of food. Food utilization refers to the consumption of healthful food, or food with appropriate nutritional content to meet one's dietary needs. Food stability refers to secure and consistent access to and availability of food resources. This means that food resources must be available and accessible to households at all times, and not subject to compromise by fluctuations in income, conflict, climate conditions and other factors. Studies show that an estimated 815 million people were deemed undernourished in 2016, and that number continues to rise. To address this global threat and achieve SDG 2, the four pillars of food security must be met.

IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS

The United Nations' second Sustainable Development Goal (SDG 2) aims to end all forms of hunger, achieve food security, improve nutrition, and promote sustainable agriculture by 2030. The goal also commits to ensuring universal access to safe, nutritious, and sufficient food at all times. In 2015, the number of undernourished people in the world was an estimated 777 million; in 2016, the number of undernourished people increased to an estimated 815 million. The prevalence of undernourishment is projected to have increased to an estimated 11 percent in 2016. Although this is a considerable increase in the number of people that are undernourished, it is still below the levels during the early 2000s. Nonetheless, the recent increase is cause for great concern, and poses a significant challenge for international commitments to end hunger by 2030. (FAO, 2017) To implement appropriate policies to ensure food security, it is important first to understand how an individual, community, and nation becomes hungry, or undernourished. While the connection between achieving food security and reducing hunger may seem straightforward, it is imperative to break down the concept of food security into its four pillars, and to examine how achieving each pillar will help make SDG 2 a reality.

The 1996 World Food Summit defines food security as follows: "Food security exists when all people, at all times, have physical, social and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food that meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life." This definition will be used as a standard against which to examine the four pillars of food security—availability, access, utilization, and stability—as they relate to the reduction of hunger.

Food Availability The World Food Programme defines food availability as "the physical presence of food in the area of concern through all forms of domestic production, commercial imports, and food aid" (WFP, 2009, p.23). Food availability is determined by

- Production, or food produced in the area
- Trade, or food brought into the area through market mechanisms
- Stocks, or food held by traders and in government reserves
- Transfers, or food supplied by the government and/or aid agencies (WFP, 2009, p.23).

To achieve food availability, the United Nations aims to increase the productive capacity of agriculture through encouraging increased investment from both public and private sectors in rural infrastructure, agricultural research and extension services, technology development, and plant and livestock gene banks. The United Nations also seeks to correct trade distortions in world agricultural markets through the elimination of all forms of agricultural export subsidies in accordance with the mandate of the Doha Development Round. (ECOSOC, 2017)

Food Access According to the World Food Summits definition, food access comprises three elements: physical, economic/financial and socio-cultural. It "concerns a household's ability to acquire adequate amounts of food, through one or a combination of own home production and stocks, purchases, barter, gifts, borrowing and food aid (WFP, 2009, p.23)." The physical component of food access refers to the geographic context in which food is produced and distributed. An example of a physical challenge to food access might be when food produced in one region is unable to be delivered to an area experiencing a food shortage because of inefficient or non-existent transport infrastructure (Muro, 2011).

The economic/financial aspect of food access refers to the ability of people to purchase food. Any shock that would affect a person's income (unemployment/decreased wages), or a drastic sudden change in the price of food, would ultimately restrict their ability to purchase food.

The socio-cultural dimension refers to conditional access to food based on factors such as gender, race, ethnicity, religion, and other social classifications. This factor is significant as it reflects situations in which food might be physically available but potential consumers with the resources to purchase the food are prevented from doing so because of perceived social and cultural characteristics (Napoli, 2011). Additionally, social conflict and civil unrest can have significant implications on production strategies, and threaten the food access of vulnerable households (Riely, et al., 1999, p.14). Therefore, food may be available but not accessible to certain households; because of structural inequalities, these households cannot acquire a sufficient quantity or diversity of food. For this reason, the United Nations has prioritized increasing agricultural productivity and incomes among small-scale food producers, especially women, indigenous peoples, family farmers, pastoralists and fishers, as well as ensuring secure and equal access to land, other productive resources and inputs, knowledge, financial services, markets and opportunities for value addition and non-farm employment (ECOSOC, 2016).

Food Utilization The third pillar of food security, food utilization, refers to the consumption of food resources in healthful ways. Food availability and access to food is not enough; people must have "safe and nutritious food which meets their dietary needs." Since 1974, the prevalence of undernourishment (PoU) has been the internationally recognized indicator measuring hunger and food insecurity. As of 2016, Sub-Saharan Africa remained the region with the highest PoU, affecting 22.7 percent of the population (FAO, 2017). The lack of nutritious food in a person's diet can lead to a variety of negative health implications. The World Health Organization has identified four broad sub-forms of undernutrition: wasting, stunting, underweight, and vitamin and mineral deficiencies. Wasting refers to low weight-for-height. It indicates a recent and severe weight loss because of insufficient food or infectious disease (e.g., diarrhea). Stunting means low height-for-age. Resulting from chronic or recurrent undernutrition, stunting prevents children from reaching their physical and cognitive potential. Low weight-for-age indicates that a child is underweight, and may be stunted or wasted or both (WHO, 2017).

Finally, vitamin and mineral deficiencies refers to a lack of sufficiently nutritious foods. Specifically, in terms of global public health, iodine, vitamin A, and iron are of extreme importance, since their deficiency represents a major threat to the health and development of populations worldwide; particularly children and pregnant women in low-income countries. Their deficiency represents a major threat to the health and development of populations worldwide, particularly children and pregnant women in low-income countries (WHO, 2017). Food utilization also includes factors such as safe drinking water, sanitary storage facilities, and the proper preparation and handling of food. Hygienic food helps maintain a healthy body, and access to clean water is crucial to preparation of clean, healthy food as well as to maintenance of a healthy body (FAO, 2013). To reduce hunger, one must have access to nutritious food that can be prepared and stored safely with minimal risk of contamination by harmful microbes/microbial pathogens.

Food Stability The fourth pillar of food security is food stability, or the availability of and access to nutritious food at all times. Vulnerable households often face instability in income, food production, and market structure, which can inhibit their ability to acquire food. If households are unable to sufficiently cope with such threats, their basic food access becomes unstable (Riely, et al., 1999). To reduce household risks and achieve stability, the United Nations aims to promote sustainable food production systems and to implement resilient agricultural practices that increase productivity and production; that help maintain ecosystems; that strengthen capacity for adaptation to climate change, extreme weather, drought, flooding and other disasters; and that progressively improve land and soil quality (ECOSOC, 2016). Encouraging resilient agricultural practices will contribute to the long-term sustainability and stability of the food supply. For example, increasing crop diversity reduces the risk of soil desertification, which causes crop failure. Additionally, the United Nations seeks to reduce the risks associated with unstable markets by ensuring the proper functioning of food commodity markets and their derivatives; by facilitating timely access to market information, including on food reserves; and by helping to limit extreme food price volatility (ECOSOC, 2017). The combined achievement of these four pillars of food security will enable the attainment of SDG 2.

SDG 5: FOOD SECURITY – GENDER EQUALITY

SUMMARY

SDG 5 aims to achieve global food security through implementing systemic changes to promote gender equality, especially among the most vulnerable—and food insecure—populations. Studies have shown the women and girls disproportionately rank among the most food-secure in communities while also being disproportionately responsible for food production and food preparation. To increase food availability and food access, efforts must be made to ensure gender equality in distribution of labor and resources. Social norms that provide more productive resources, including land, to men, while placing the burden of labor on women reduce food productivity—and thereby availability—overall. These same norms also limit wage-earning and other means by which women and their households might access food. Equalizing gender roles will also help improve the nutritional quality of foods consumed as women not only are the initial food providers (through lactation) and must themselves consume healthful foods but also are more likely to select, raise and purchase foods for their dietary benefits than are male providers. In this regard, women also tend toward food choices that promote food stability as opposed to cash crops and ventures less likely to ensure a regular and lasting food supply.

IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS

The United Nations' fifth sustainable development goal (SDG 5) seeks to empower all women and girls through gender equality. How does the empowerment of women foster food security? This section explores the relationship between gender equality and the four dimensions of food security: availability, access, stability, and utilization. As of 2017, women and girls are overrepresented among those considered food-insecure. Often the victims of hunger themselves, women have a crucial role to play in ending hunger as mothers, farmers, teachers, entrepreneurs, activists and community leaders. In these domestic and public capacities, women and girls prove vital to the sustainability of rural households and communities, to the improvement of rural livelihoods, and to overall wellbeing. Globally, women comprise about 43 percent of the agricultural labour force and two-thirds of the 600 million livestock keepers; as such, they hold the key to building a future free of malnutrition (De Schutter, 2013).

Gender Roles In developing countries, rural women and men generally play different roles in guaranteeing food security for their households and communities. Time-use surveys conducted by the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) in 2013 present the precise breakdown of time use by men and women per farming activity, and show that women often undertake more strenuous activities, primarily weeding, followed by harvesting, and fertilizer application (SOFA, 2011, p.11). These tasks are undertaken in addition to their primary roles as housekeepers and homemakers (Satyavathi, 2010). The relevant data from the studies confirm that women overwhelmingly provide the greatest proportion of household time spent on food processing and preparation. If the distribution of labour is considered accurately within the food preparation process, women's labour share would well exceed 60 percent in many African countries and would approach 60 percent in many Asian countries (SOFA, 2011, p.11). Overall, the labour burden of rural women exceeds that of men, and includes a higher proportion of unpaid household responsibilities related to preparing food and collecting fuel and water. The under-reporting of women's activity in agriculture creates a significant obstacle when trying to address the unequal share of work within the agricultural sector.

Although, on average, women contribute a significant amount of their labour to the agricultural sector, rural women are rarely considered the primary clients of agricultural research and development programs, or the primary users of improved technology. Technical training and extension programs almost exclusively target men, thus excluding women and denying them an opportunity to improve their skills and access new channels of communication and state-sponsored support services (Satyavathi, 2010, p.444). Women—whether self-employed or wage workers, whether working on-farm or off-farm—are systematically discriminated against as economic actors. Such discrimination diminishes their economic autonomy, and contributes to their weak bargaining position within the household (De Schutter, 2013). Even when women produce food, the intra-household allocation of food may well disfavour them because of beliefs about the value of females relative to males. For example, in many regions of South Asia, family food distribution of food as well as of housework and childcare responsibilities tends to be quite unequal. In some circumstances, girls, valued less than boys, may receive less food and less nutritious food. Consequently, gender role internalization produces the expectation that women eat the least, eat leftovers, and eat after all others in the family have eaten, thus making women more vulnerable to food insecurity (Mukherjee, 2009).

Women and Food Availability To improve the food security of women, as well as entire communities, it is important to explore how gender discrimination impacts the four pillars of food security. The World Food Programme defines food availability as “the physical presence of food in the area of concern through all forms of domestic production, commercial imports, and food aid” (WFP, 2009b, p.23). To improve domestic production and ensure a greater supply of appropriate food, producers must have access to productive resources such as land, credit, modern inputs, technology, education and financial services. However, female farmers continually face discrimination in their pursuit of such productive resources and services (FAO, 2010). Women are less likely than men to own land or livestock, to adopt new technologies, to use credit and other financial services, and to receive education and extension advice. In some cases, women do not even control the use of their own time. Access to credit and financial services is crucial for the survival of small-scale farm production, and is largely dependent on security of land tenure. The FAO notes that while all smallholders face constraints in their access to financial resources, “in most countries the share of female smallholders who can access credit is 5–10 percentage points lower than for male smallholders” (FAO, 2010, p. 38). Additionally, researchers of the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) reviewed existing microeconomic empirical literature on use of fertilizer, seed varieties, tools, and pesticides, and found that 79% of the studies concluded that men have higher mean access to these inputs (Peterman, 2010, p.11).

Social norms systematically limit the options available to women and reduce the agricultural productivity of women, resulting in broader economic and social costs (FAO, 2010, p.23). The FAO concluded that if women had the same access to productive resources as men, they could increase yields on their farms by 20–30 percent. This could raise total agricultural output in developing countries by 2.5–4 percent, which could in turn reduce the number of hungry people in the world by 12–17 percent (FAO, 2010, p. 40). Target 5.A of SDG 5 outlines how the United Nations plans to address gender discrimination in access to productive resources: The United Nations will undertake reforms to give women equal rights to economic resources as well as access to ownership and control over land and other forms of property, financial services, inheritance and natural resources, in accordance with national laws (UNDESA, 2017). The success of such reforms will be measured by indicator 5.A1: (a) proportion of total agricultural population with ownership or secure rights over agricultural land, by sex; and (b) share of women among owners or rights-bearers of agricultural land, by type of tenure, as well as by indicator 5.A2: proportion of countries where the legal framework (including customary law) guarantees women’s equal rights to land ownership and/or control (UNDESA, 2017).

Women and Food Access The barriers women face in accessing land has repercussions not only on their ability to improve their productivity as farmers but also on their ability to access other livelihood options. Food access is largely determined by one’s ability to purchase food. Thus, the FAO proposes that decent rural employment and social protection are key priorities in ensuring food access (De Schutter, 2013). Furthermore, to be food secure, access to food must be stable, meaning that a population, household or individual must have access to adequate nutritious food at all times. People should not be at risk of losing access to food as a consequence of sudden shocks such as unanticipated increases in the price of staple food items (FAO, 2006). In 2007–2008, the world experienced a severe shock to food access because of the global food price crisis. Price increases were significant for wheat, maize, and rice. During that period, the price of maize almost tripled, and the price of wheat quadrupled. Meanwhile, from January to April 2008, the price of rice also quadrupled (De Schutter, 2013). It is important to examine the gender dimension of food price shocks as women and girls typically comprise the primary group to experience the effects of these crises. The inherent gender vulnerabilities they face are exacerbated in times of crisis. For example, female-headed households are disproportionately represented among the poorest households and among households with a high dependency ratio. Unfortunately this vulnerability creates an inability to overcome shocks (De Schutter, 2013).

Women and Food Utilization The utilization pillar of food security by the United Nations has been placed at the center of international food security strategies in recent years. Improvements in gender equality, both within and outside the household, are crucial to ensure better nutritional outcomes in general, and to reduce child malnutrition in particular (Meinzen-Dick, et al., 2011). Food security and nutrition programs must prioritize the adequate nutrition of pregnant and lactating women. It is also important to recognize that the ability of women to provide adequate care depends on the support they receive, and on their ability to make choices within the household. The gender dimension of the links between agricultural production, adequacy of diets, and health and nutritional outcomes is also relevant. Women who benefit from the increased opportunities and incomes that productivity gains allow are more likely than men to use the incomes they control for the health, education, and nutrition of children (De Schutter, 2013, p.71).

Women and Food Stability Finally, where rural women control assets and decide what to produce, they tend to favour the production of food crops that ensure food security for the family. Men more frequently show a preference for cash crops sold on markets (FAO, IFAD, and ILO, 2010, p. 13). Overall, the evidence makes clear that gender discrimination has significant impacts on food security, as stated by Phumzile Mlambo-Ngcuka, UN Under-Secretary-General and Executive Director of UN Women: “Only once these inequalities are purposefully levelled, will both women and girls, whether rural or urban, be able to take their place at the heart of the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals, and the growth of a better future for us all” (2017).

SDG 12: FOOD SECURITY–RESPONSIBLE PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION

SUMMARY

SDG 12 aims to achieve responsible production and consumption of food patterns that meet basic needs, improve quality of life, and use sustainable practices that conserve resources and limit pollutants and waste. The attainment of this goal requires intensive cooperation and planning on the part of national governments to support efforts at the local and household level. The major obstacle to this goal derives from the commodification of food in recent decades by which production and consumption are determined by economic value rather than to further food security. A major consequence of this commodification is increasing rates of food waste. Reducing food wastage means examining productive and consumption practices from three perspectives—economic, environmental, and social.

IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS

The United Nations' twelfth sustainable development goal (SDG 12) promotes responsible production and consumption patterns. The 1994 Oslo Symposium defines sustainable consumption and production (SCP) as "the use of services and related products, which respond to basic needs and bring a better quality of life while minimizing the use of natural resources and toxic materials, as well as the emissions of waste and pollutants over the life cycle of the service or product so as not to jeopardize the needs of further generations" (UNDESA, 2017). According to the United Nations, achieving SDG 12 requires a strong national framework for sustainable consumption and production that is integrated into national and sectoral plans, sustainable business practices, and consumer behavior (UNDESA, 2017). Agricultural products are deemed the most essential resource for improving quality of life, making it imperative to critically analyze how food is being produced for global consumption. As the global food economy has expanded over the past century, food has become increasingly commodified. There has been a shift away from viewing food as a source of nourishment and a cultural element of society towards regarding it as any other tradable commodity—a product that firms can produce, sell, and trade. Distance between the production of food and the consumption of food is increased by its commodification within the global economy (Clapp, 2012, p.17). The commercialization and commodification of food poses very real threats to food security, as it encourages unsustainable consumption and production patterns.

Food Loss and Food Waste One of the most significant and detrimental such patterns is food waste. Target 12.3 aims to halve per capita global food waste at the retail and consumer levels, and to reduce food losses along production and supply chains, including post-harvest losses, by 2030; these goals will be measured by the Global Food Loss Index (ECOSOC, 2016). The current production and consumption patterns that result in food waste create significant challenges for global food security. Hunger poses one of the most serious obstacles to achieving sustainable development; the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) puts the global number of individuals classified as undernourished at more than 800 million (FAO, 2017). To meet the demands of the growing world population, the global production of food must increase by more than 50 percent. Paradoxically, there is enough food being produced to feed everyone in the world; however, more than one-third of current food production is lost or wasted. Food loss refers to the decrease in edible food mass at the production, post-harvest, and processing stages of the food chain. This loss might result from problems in harvesting, storage, packing, transport, infrastructure, or market/price mechanisms, as well as from institutional and legal frameworks. Food waste means the discard of edible foods at the retail and consumer levels. This waste might result from rigid or misunderstood date-marking rules, and improper storage, buying or cooking practices (FAO, 2013).

Food is lost or wasted throughout the food supply chain—from agricultural production, to post-harvest handling and storage, to processing and distribution, to household consumption (FAO, 2013). To put the volume of global food waste in perspective, the FAO categorized the quantity of food thrown out within each commodity group per year. Globally, 263 million tonnes of meat is produced, and more than 20 percent is lost or wasted; this amount equates to 75 million cows. Additionally, in industrialized countries, consumers throw away 286 million cereal products, or 763 billion boxes of pasta. Lastly, along with roots and tubers, fruit and vegetables have the highest wastage rates of any food products; almost half of all the fruit and vegetables produced are wasted, the equivalent of throwing away 3.7 trillion apples every year (FAO, 2015). The relationship between food wastage and food security can be determined by examining between economic, environmental and social perspectives (Tielens, 2014).

Economic Perspective Food waste generates a substantial financial cost that amounts to USD 1 trillion a year (FAO, 2018). Additionally, food loss and waste can have significant impacts on overall food availability in the market. A decrease in food may in turn increase food prices, and reduce the capacity of low-income consumers to access food. The livelihood of farmers and producers may also be adversely affected if the quality of food is such that food must be sold at a lower price or even discarded (Rezaei, 2017). Therefore, decreasing food waste will ultimately lead to a reduction in wasted investments by farmers and businesses, which will help keep food prices stable and affordable for consumers of a lower socioeconomic status.

Environmental Perspective Environment effects of food waste are assessed through four model components: (1) Carbon footprint: The resources used to produce food eventually lost or wasted account for approximately 4.4 gigatonnes of greenhouse gas emissions (CO₂ equivalent) annually. This makes food loss and waste the world's third largest carbon emitter, after only China and the United States (Rezaei, 2017). (2) Water footprint: The water footprint is a measure of humanity's appropriation of fresh water in volumes of water consumed and/or polluted. Globally, the blue water footprint for the agricultural production of total food wastage is about 250 km³, which is more than 38 times the blue water footprint of USA households. In terms of volume, it represents the annual flow rate of the Volga River, an amount that could cover all the world's household water needs. (3) Land occupation/degradation impact: The equivalent of 28% of the world's agricultural land, an area the size of China, Kazakhstan, and Mongolia, grows crops that are wasted. (4) Potential biodiversity impact: Biodiversity comprises the diversity of life on earth, across genes, species and ecosystems. As agriculture and fisheries expand into wild areas and over exploit natural resources, forest and marine habitats are lost along with their biodiversity. (FAO, 2013) Reduction of food waste will help ensure a more effective and efficient use of land, water, and energy inputs while decreasing greenhouse gas emissions. Using natural resources responsibly is imperative to achieving a sustainable global food system, to increasing food production. Efforts to reduce food waste will help secure an increased global food supply to meet future demands for food (Tielens, 2014).

Social Perspective Ethically, it is important to share knowledge on how to reduce food waste, and to ensure food security to people in need of food. The social perspective of food wastage and food security focuses on the practical applications of research, education, extension and training. For example, in developing countries, the Rockefeller-financed Global Knowledge Initiative (GKI) works to identify opportunities, stakeholders and approaches to reducing food loss in Africa. Additionally, the African Postharvest Losses Information System (APHLIS) brings together a network of cereal grain experts in East and Southern Africa to estimate annual post-harvest loss for cereal grains in the region (Tielens, 2014). Providing food producers with improved knowledge of best practises and preventions methods of postharvest losses should strengthen food security, as it will help to ensure an overall reduction in the loss of food at the post harvest stage of the food cycle.

To develop efficient solutions to reduce food loss and food waste, we must investigate and understand the interconnectedness of different stages of the food supply chain (Rezaei, 2017). On both the production and consumption side of the food chain, food is wasted because of unrealistic standards of food aesthetics, not because of inedibility. Part of the solution to sustainability requires raising public awareness and shifting the paradigm away from viewing food as a commodity rather than as a life source. The achievement of global sustainable development requires the responsible production and consumption of agricultural products.

SDG 13: FOOD SECURITY-CLIMATE CHANGE

SUMMARY

SDG 13 addresses the lasting impact of climate change—specifically, global warming—on food security. Studies conducted by the IPCC support conclusions that the growth of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, largely as a result of human activity, have contributed to global warming. This phenomenon poses a number of serious and potentially devastating consequences for human life and the plant and animal life on which humans depend. A rise in global temperatures contributes to an accelerated melting of polar ice caps and glaciers, which in turn, raises sea levels. The UN estimates that about 40% of the world's population lives along coastal areas, and in many regions, the most productive agricultural areas lie along coastal plains, river deltas, and in fresh-water areas upstream. Climate change also adversely affects weather patterns, generating instability in traditional seasonal patterns in temperature and precipitation. Additionally, it increases the frequency and intensity of weather events like cyclones that can damage food resources and other infrastructure necessary to food production and distribution. For this reason, and others, we must look to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and roll back global warming and its effects as part of a comprehensive approach to securing food availability, access, utilization and stability.

IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS

The United Nations' thirteenth sustainable development goal (SDG 13) calls for urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts. The United Nations Environmental Programme and the World Meteorological Organization established the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) in 1988. The IPCC assesses the scientific, technical and socio-economic information relevant for the understanding of human-induced climate change, its potential impacts, and options for mitigation and adaptation (IPCC, 2014). The IPCC's fifth assessment report explains that climate change occurs when long-term weather patterns are altered. This transforms the planet's ecosystems and threatens the well-being of current and future generations. The growth of greenhouse gas emissions is raising the Earth's temperature. This, in turn, generates more extreme weather events and causes long-lasting changes in all components of the climate system, increasing the likelihood of severe, pervasive and irreversible impacts for people and ecosystems (IPCC, 2014). The accelerated pace of climate change, combined with global population growth, threatens food security everywhere. Climate change negatively impacts all four dimensions of food security: availability, access, stability and utilization.

Food Availability: Agriculture is extremely vulnerable to climate change; increasing temperatures eventually reduce the yields of desirable crops while encouraging weed and pest proliferation. Furthermore, climate change directly impacts water availability for irrigated crops even as higher temperatures increase the water requirements of crops. Changes in precipitation patterns also increase the likelihood of short-run crop failures and long-run production declines. (Nelson, 2009) Populations in the developing world currently considered vulnerable and food insecure are most likely to be affected by climate change and related phenomena. Empirical evidence suggests that increases in temperature in the period from 1980 to 2008 have already resulted in average global maize and wheat yield reductions of 3.8 percent and 5.5 percent respectively, as compared to a non-climate scenario (Krishnamurthy, 2014). The negative effects of climate change on crop production are especially pronounced in Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia. For example, in South Asia, by 2050, the climate scenario results in a 14-percent decline in rice production, a 44- to 49-percent decline in wheat production, and a 9- to 19-percent fall in maize production relative to a no-climate-change scenario. In Sub-Saharan Africa, the predicted decline of the rice, wheat, and maize yield with climate change are 15 percent, 34 percent, and 10 percent, respectively. (Nelson, 2009, p.6).

Food Access: Although the effects of climate change will vary across crops and regions, sharp price increases for all major crops are expected to result from anticipated climate changes accompanied by population growth, shifting diets, and rising demand for biofuels (De Schutter, 2013). The effects of climate change on food access are different for people living in rural vs. urban areas. Today, four billion people, or 54 percent of the global population, live in urban areas. By 2050, this number will increase to more than 6.3 billion people, representing 66 percent of the world's population (UN Environment, 2016). Climate change can have serious implications for urban food systems. For example, frequent and intense heat waves caused by climate change can lead to food spoilage, increasing waste and speeding the spread of diseases. Furthermore, urban areas only produce a small portion of the food that is consumed in those areas. Consequently, extreme weather events such as floods and hurricanes seriously damage transportation infrastructure, like bridges and roads. This can interrupt food supply to a city and lead to sudden food shortages (UN Environment, 2016).

Extreme weather events and other climate events that impact food supply can cause a rise in food prices. Sudden price hikes can have serious consequences for poorer disadvantaged populations, who represent a quarter of the world's urban population and are already nutritionally vulnerable (UN Environment, 2016).

Currently, 800 million people, or 78 percent of the world's poor, live in rural areas. These individuals rely on farming, livestock, aquaculture and other forms of agricultural work to access food and earn a living. In the developing world, it is estimated that 500 million smallholder farms support the livelihoods of almost two billion people. These smallholder farms are responsible for approximately 80 percent of the food produced in Sub-Saharan Africa and parts of Asia (IFAD, 2017). This is concerning as smallholder farmers and the rural poor face the brunt of climate change and the depletion of natural resources. Extreme weather events, such as droughts, storms and floods, put pressure on the ecosystems on which farmers depend (IFAD, 2017). Therefore, any climate-related shocks affecting the natural environment have direct consequences for farmers' incomes and their ability to purchase or grow food. For example, in Fiji, 70 percent of the working population is employed in agriculture, and is highly vulnerable to severe weather and natural disasters. In February 2016, the worst cyclone on record hit, destroying 30,000 homes and farms (Astralaga, 2017). In order to provide smallholder farmers with the best chance to adapt to the rapidly changing weather conditions, governments need to increase their investments in small-scale sustainable agriculture. Helping smallholders to better withstand the impact of changing weather patterns can increase security for their livelihoods and their food supplies (Astralaga, 2017).

Food Stability: Globally, extreme weather events and internal conflicts are exacerbating hunger and food insecurity (Climate Action, 2018). Climate change will only increase the juxtaposition of conflict and climate-related natural disasters and compound their effects. Climate change not only threatens communities with food insecurity and malnutrition but also increases the likelihood of conflict, prolonged crisis, and continued fragility (FAO, 2017). Severe food insecurity and malnutrition tend to be magnified where natural hazards such as droughts and floods compound the consequence of conflicts. On average, 56 percent of the population in countries affected by conflict live in rural areas, where agriculture is central to many people's livelihoods. Conflict negatively affects almost every aspect of agriculture and food systems, from production, harvesting, processing and transport to input supply, financing and marketing (FAO, 2017). In many countries affected by conflict, subsistence agriculture is central to food security for much of the population. Currently, 37 countries rely on foreign help to meet their food needs. Of these, 16 countries have been impacted by civil wars and conflict that continue to displace millions of people. This displacement prevents agricultural activities and results in high hunger rates among the populace (Climate Action, 2018).

Food Utilization: The life source of the food sector is an ecosystem's ability to provide resources, including biodiversity, nutrient-rich soils, and clean water. Climate change puts additional pressure on food systems as well as on the ability of farmers to produce nutritious, plentiful, affordable food (Bradbear, 2013). Climate-related risks affect calorie intake. Reduced calorie intake because of lower food availability can affect nutrition outcomes. Inadequate care practices can also be exacerbated because of difficulties accessing clean drinking water. Potential increases in food prices because of climate change could reduce dietary diversity; this would reduce the nutritional value of the diet, which degrades one's nutritional status (Krishnamurthy, 2014). Furthermore, changing climate conditions could also create a vicious cycle of disease and hunger (Krishnamurthy, 2014). For example, certain illnesses and infections, such as tuberculosis, measles, and diarrhea, are directly linked to acute malnutrition. A combination of disease and malnutrition weakens the metabolism, leading to infection and undernourishment, which cycles back to an increased vulnerability to illness (Action Against Hunger, 2017).

Environmental Impact: It is worthwhile to explore how current agricultural production patterns contribute to global environmental issues. Specifically, the livestock sector plays an important role in climate change. Total emissions from global livestock are 7.1 Gigatonnes of Co₂-equiv per year, representing 14.5 percent of all anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions (Gerber, 2013). In recent decades, industrial agriculture has increasingly separated animals from the land. More and more meat production is occurring in concentrated operations commonly called "factory farms." The manure output from these factory farms overwhelms the capacity of local croplands to absorb it. By concentrating thousands of animals into a small area, industrial animal production produces threats to the environment and to human health (Horrigan, 2002).

To address these unsustainable agricultural practices, which contribute to climate change, the World Health Organization (WHO) and UN Environment have agreed to a new, wide-ranging collaboration to accelerate action to curb environmental health risks. Mr. Erik Solheim, head of UN Environment, and Dr. Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus, Director-General of WHO, signed an agreement to step up joint actions to combat major global development issues, including air pollution, climate change, water quality, food and nutrition (UN Environment, 2018). Regarding the necessity for action, Dr. Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus, the WHO Director-General, stated: "Our health is directly related to the health of the environment we live in. Together, air, water and chemical hazards kill some 12.6 million people a year. This cannot and must not continue." (UN Environment, 2018)

SDG 14: FOOD SECURITY – LIFE BELOW WATER

SUMMARY

SDG 13 addresses the lasting impact of climate change. SDG 14 addresses the paramount importance of marine life to global food security. Today, more than 3 billion people globally depend on oceans, seas and other waterways as sources of food and nutrition. Many people, especially in least developed countries, also depend on the cultivation and harvesting of aquatic organisms for their livelihoods, which further impacts their ability to access a sufficient quantity of healthful food. The condition of Earth's waterways is integrally connected to food security. However, human economic development and unsustainable practices like overfishing pose serious threats to global marine resources. To ensure the four pillars of food security worldwide—availability, access, utilization and stability—we must be sure to target policies harmful to the world's oceans and other water systems and to promote sustainable practices that boost marine life and foster equitable access across populations.

IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS

The United Nations fourteenth sustainable development goal (SDG) seeks to conserve and sustainably use oceans, seas, and marine resources. We live on a blue planet; oceans cover 70 percent of the world's surface and play a central role in supporting life on earth. However, the adverse effects of climate change, ocean acidification, overfishing, and marine pollution pose a serious threat to this global resource (UNDESA, 2017). Fisheries and aquaculture remain important sources of food and nutrition for hundreds of millions of people. More than 3 billion people depend on the oceans as their primary source of protein, making it the world's largest source of protein (UN, 2017). Overall, the growth in fish consumption has enhanced people's diets around the world. Fish supply high-quality proteins containing all essential amino acids. Additionally, fish provide essential fats (e.g., long chain omega-3 fatty acids), vitamins (D, A and B) and minerals (including calcium, iodine, zinc, iron and selenium), particularly if eaten whole. Even small quantities of fish can have a significant positive nutritional impact on plant-based diets, as in many low-income food deficit countries and least-developed countries (FAO, 2016).

Impact of Aquaculture Aquaculture is the fastest growing food sector in the world. Globally, the market value of marine and coastal resources and industries is estimated at \$3 trillion per year, or about 5% of global GDP (UNEP, 2017). Global fish production is expected to increase from 158 million tons in 2012 to 195 million tons by 2022 (FAO, 2011). In recent decades, there has been a substantial increase in the proportion of fishery products used for direct human consumption. For example, in 2014, 87%—or 146 million tons—of global fish production was used for human consumption. The remaining 23%—or 21 million tons—was destined to non-food products, especially fishmeal and fish oil (FAO, 2016). The role of fish in diets in many Asian and the Pacific countries is rising rapidly. For example, from 1961 to 2009, annual per capita fish consumption in East Asia increased from 10.6 kg to 34.5 kg and in Southeast Asia from 12.8 kg to 32.0 kg (De Schutter, 2013). Moreover, coastal fisheries supported by coral reefs contribute to the food security of hundreds of millions of coastal dwellers, providing 70% of the dietary protein of Pacific islanders (UN Environment, 2018). Fisheries and aquaculture support the livelihoods of nearly half a billion people across the world (IFAD, 2017). Around 90% of inland fish is caught in developing countries and 65% is caught in low-income, food-deficit countries (FAO, 2011). Life below water plays a large role in ensuring food security and livelihood strategies for millions of people around the world. The following section will identify some of the current obstacles threatening life below water and how it ultimately impacts food security.

Pollution and Overfishing The sustainability of fisheries production is crucial to the food security, nutrition, and livelihoods of billions of people (FAO, 2016). Unsustainable practices such as overfishing reduces food production; it impairs the functioning of ecosystems and reduces biodiversity. The proportion of world marine fish stocks within biologically sustainable levels has declined from 90% in 1974 to 68.6% in 2013 (UNDESA, 2017). The United Nations aims to address overfishing in targets 14.4 and 14.6. Target 14.4 seeks to effectively regulate harvesting and end overfishing; illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing; and destructive fishing practices. This target also will implement science-based management plans to restore fish stocks in the shortest time possible, with the minimal goal of restoring levels that can produce maximum sustainable yield as determined by their biological characteristics.

Target 14.6 aims to prohibit certain forms of fisheries' subsidies that contribute to overcapacity and overfishing as well as to eliminate subsidies that contribute to illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing. In addition, this target bars the introduction of any new subsidies of this type. This target asserts that appropriate and effective special and differential treatment for developing and least developed countries should be an integral part of the World Trade Organization fisheries subsidies negotiation (UNDESA, 2017).

Dead Zones In addition to overfishing, the increasing number of dead zones pose an alarmingly spreading threat to life below water. Ocean dead zones are coastal areas where water closer to the seafloor is depleted of oxygen. Water with very low levels of oxygen is called hypoxic; when no oxygen can be detected, it is called anoxic. Oxygen is fundamental to life, including marine life. It is essential for the survival of individual organisms, and regulates global cycles of major nutrients and carbon. In hypoxic zones, the lack of oxygen creates an environment unsuitable for fish and invertebrate survival (Tirado, 2008). For this reason, the term "dead zone" refers to the fact that no living fish, crab, or other animals can be found in these areas (Tirado, 2008). In addition, nutrient overloading and eutrophication create algal blooms: a rapid and massive growth of minute plants (phytoplankton) that float in waterways and deplete oxygen from the water as they grow. These algal blooms result in dead zones and have become a recurrent and growing hazard in every ocean and on every continent (Tirado, 2008).

Ocean dead zones with zero oxygen have quadrupled in size since 1950, and the number of very low oxygen sites near coasts has multiplied tenfold (Carrington, 2018). There are now 199 documented dead zones related to human-caused eutrophication, the main sources of which include fertilizer runoff from industrial agriculture, domestic sewage, and industry as well as the burning of fossil fuels (Tirado, 2008). Given that the vast majority of sea creatures cannot survive in dead zones, current trends would lead to mass extinction of these animals, creating implications for the ecosystem at large. Furthermore, 500 dead zones have now been reported near coasts, up from fewer than 50 in 1950. A lack of monitoring in many regions means the true number might be much higher. This creates serious implications regarding the food security for hundreds of millions of people who depend on the sea for food and nutrition (Carrington, 2018). Unless measures are put in place to control fertilizer usage, losses to biodiversity will continue to intensify—to the detriment of coastal and inland fisheries.

Plastic Waste and Microplastics Another impending threat to life below water is the irreparable damage caused by the rising tide of plastic waste in our oceans and seas. Every year, an estimated 8 million tons of plastic waste end up in the world's oceans (UN, Environment, 2018). In freshwater and marine environments, small plastic particles known as microplastics, commonly defined as being 5 mm, have been found in beaches, shelf and deep water sediments, and in surface and subsurface waters. Additionally, ingestion of microplastics has been observed in many species of aquatic organisms, including commercially valuable fish and invertebrates (Lusher, 2017). Fish might ingest microplastics for several reasons: some confuse microplastics with prey while others ingest them during filter-feeding (Lusher, 2017). Consumption of fish and aquaculture products have well-established health benefits because of their unique nutritional composition. However, with increasing levels of ocean pollution, fish can accumulate significant levels of contaminants that can make fish products potentially harmful if consumed. Thus, to maximize the nutrition of those who depend on marine life for food, policy must focus on food security strategies that maximize the positive consequences of seafood consumption while minimizing the concurrent negative consequences.

Furthermore, a recent study in the Asia-Pacific region conducted by the United Nations Environment Program found that coral reefs are contaminated by 11 billion pieces of plastic. This contamination compromises coral reef ecosystems by leading to coral disease. Coral reef ecosystems provide society with resources and services worth \$375 billion per year and house 25% of all marine life, feeding hundreds of millions of people. Current estimates suggest that at least one-fifth of the world's coral reefs are lost, with some estimates placing the loss of live coral as high as 50% (UN, Environment, 2018). Gabriel Grimsditch of UN Environment's Marine and Coastal Ecosystems Branch stated, "If greater action is not taken today, the planet could lose its live coral reefs and with them a large number of the world's marine species by 2050 (UN, Environment, 2018)." The correlation between food security, nutrition, and life below water must be addressed to fulfill the United Nations 2030 Agenda, which envisions a fairer, more prosperous, and more peaceful and sustainable world—one in which no one is left behind.

SDG 15: FOOD SECURITY - LIFE ON LAND

SUMMARY

SDG 15 focuses on the sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems to support long-term food security. Human economic development and environmental conditions are synergistic. What people do to produce food affects the landscape and lifeforms around them; in turn, the environment influences what people can do to survive. For this reason, any consideration of food security must take into account human economic practices—and other activities. Over the past century, industrial agricultural and livestock practices have increased the supply of food globally, but not equitably, and have compromised the natural resources that make possible food production. Large-scale industrial food production consumes not only ever-increasing amounts of land but also other resources. Such activities pollute land, water and air as well as lead to deforestation, desertification, soil depletion and other forms of land degradation. These phenomena reduce the ability of the environment to support farming and other human development and negatively impact plant and animal life in the region. For this reason, a model for food security must include plans for restoration, conservation and sustainable land use.

IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS

The United Nations' fifteenth sustainable development goal aims to protect, restore and promote the use of terrestrial ecosystems in a manner that averts long-term or permanent damage. This includes sustainably managing forests, combating desertification, halting and reversing land degradation, and halting biodiversity loss. Ecological fragility has become a key side effect of the current world food economy. The industrial agricultural model comprising hybrid seeds, monoculture planting, irrigation, mechanization and chemical inputs has spread over the past 50 to 100 years. The adoption of this model was integral for the globalization of the world food economy (Clapp, 2012). However, such methods have resulted in a variety of negative environmental consequences, which in turn have adversely affected the achievement of global food security.

One recent trend in the industrial agricultural model is the industrial production of livestock to meet rising demands in meat production and consumption. Currently, the livestock sector is growing faster than the rest of the agricultural sector in nearly all countries. For example, in 1961, cattle accounted for almost two-fifths of world meat production by volume, followed by pig (35 percent), poultry (13 percent), and sheep and goats (8 percent). In the subsequent half of the 20th century, the human population grew by 120 percent. Meanwhile, the annual volume of pig meat produced more than quadrupled and the volume of poultry meat grew more than 10-fold (Weis, 2013, p. 69). It is estimated that world meat production will increase to 52 kg per person, amounting to 480 million tons, by 2050, versus 293 million tons produced in 2010 (Weis, 2013). This ever-rising production also demands ever-larger amounts of world resources, particularly arable land.

A report conducted by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) confirmed that, “the livestock sector is by far the single largest anthropogenic user of land” (Steinfeld, 2006). Livestock production accounts for 70 percent of all agricultural land, with 33 percent of the total arable land dedicated to animal feed-crop production (Steinfeld, 2006). As the agricultural industry continues to expand, it consumes more of the world's arable land. The clearing of land for feed crop production and expansion of pastures for livestock production has been one of the driving forces behind deforestation. Around 20 percent of the world's pastures and rangelands, with more than 70 percent of the rangelands in dry areas, have been degraded to some extent—mostly through overgrazing, compaction and erosion caused by livestock farming. Dry lands, where livestock are often the only source of livelihood for the people living there, suffer the greatest damage from these trends (FAO, 2013).

Land degradation and desertification, largely resulting from deforestation and unsustainable land use, rank among the most pressing problems facing the world today. These challenges pose significant implications for agro-economic productivity and the environment as well as endanger food security and quality of life (Eswaran, 2001). The FAO has broadened the definition of land degradation to include not only soil erosion or loss of soil fertility but also the deterioration of a balanced ecosystem and the loss of the services provided by that ecosystem (FAO, 2011). Agricultural land degradation is particularly concerning as it reduces the productive capacity of the land.

Lower productivity leads to further incursion of agricultural land into natural habitats, putting a number of key food production systems around the globe at risk. This poses a profound challenge to food security for a world population expected to reach 9 billion by 2050 (FAO, 2011). For example, the primary cause of soil degradation in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) is the expansion and intensification of agriculture in efforts to feed its growing population. Furthermore, yield reduction in Africa caused by past soil erosion may have reduced yields by 2 percent to 40 percent, with a mean loss of 8.2 percent for the continent. If accelerated erosion continues unabated, then yield reductions may reach 16.5 percent by 2020 (Eswaran, 2001). This means that the reduction in productivity of land may affect food security in some areas by decreasing food availability through losses in aggregate production, leading to increased food prices for consumers (Hamdy, 2015).

An extreme example of land degradation is desertification, a process by which once fertile land turns into desert because of drought, deforestation, or unsustainable agricultural practices. Desertification reduces the amount of available land to produce food. Almost 20 million square kilometers, or 15 percent of the world's total land surface, may already be experiencing some degree of desertification (Horrigan, 2002). This phenomenon affects food security in the short and long term. A scarcity of nutrient-rich land to produce food will significantly affect the potential livelihoods and income of farmers. Across the world, land degradation is forcing people to flee their homes and homelands. Worldwide over the next few decades, close to 135 million people are at risk of being permanently displaced (UNEP, 2017). Already, more than 500 million hectares of farmland, an area more than half the size of China, has been abandoned due to drought, desertification and land mismanagement (UNEP, 2017). To address this challenge, the UN's SDG Indicator 15.3 aims to combat desertification, and restore degraded land and soil, including land affected by desertification, drought and floods. Accordingly, SDG 15 strives to achieve a land degradation-neutral world (ECOSOC, 2017).

Other troubling trends in the agricultural industrial model include the industrial-sized growing of a single plant, or "monoculture," repeated toxic chemical infusions through the use of pesticides, and the application of synthetic fertilizers. These practices pose a significant threat to life on land, including humans and the farming ecosystems on which they depend, and to achievement of food security. While monoculture offers definite advantages, it also has significant disadvantages that must be considered. By cultivating the same plant species, the farmer can optimize his or her farming practices given that growing requirements, planting, maintenance and harvesting will be the same across the farmed land. This helps to produce a greater yield at a lower cost. Essentially it is argued that mono cropping helps to increase the efficiency of the farming process. Agriculture depends on biodiversity for its existence but threatens that biodiversity through its methods and tools of implementation (Horrigan, 2002). One way that agriculture depends on biodiversity is through developing new varieties of plants to keep pace with ever-evolving plant diseases. When farmers want to find a resistance gene to improve a domestic seed variety, cross-breeding the variety with a wild relative offers an effective strategy. However, economic pressures to bring a product to market quickly often lead farmers to search for a single gene conferring resistance (Horrigan, 2002). The problematic nature of this practice is explained by Cary Fowler and Pat Mooney in *Shattering: Food, Politics, and the Loss of Genetic Diversity*:

"Frequently, resistance in a traditional landrace [wild variety] is not nearly so simple [as one gene]. Resistance may be the product of a complex of genes, literally hundreds of genes working together. . . . By utilizing one-gene resistance . . . the plant breeder gives the pest or disease an easy target. It has only to overcome or find a way around that one line of defense. . . . The use of one gene for resistance, one gene which is routinely overcome by pest or disease, results in that gene being 'used up.' It no longer provides resistance." (Fowler, 1990)

It may take thousands of years for a wild plant to develop resistance genes, but modern plant breeding methods are chipping away at this natural resource, one resistance gene at a time, and at a rate beyond nature's ability to replenish it (Horrigan, 2002). Industrial agriculture erodes biodiversity not only because it favors monocultures but also because those monocultures replace diverse habitats.

The industrial agriculture system not only degrades and develops arable land at alarming rates but also consumes fossil fuel, water, and nutrient rich soil at unsustainable rates. Modern intensive agriculture relies on the use of fossil fuels for tillage, transportation and grain drying, and for the manufacturing of fertilizers and pesticides. It contributes to numerous forms of environmental degradation, including air and water pollution, soil depletion, diminishing biodiversity, and fish die-offs. Ultimately, this model poses a significant obstacle for the attainment of SDG 15—and the achievement of global food security.



HEALING MEMORY INTRODUCTION

One of the Six Pillars of Human Security, and perhaps the most distinctive, is Healing Memory. This pillar calls for the act of healing through storytelling and serves as one of JGHS's primary approaches to reconciliation. While Healing Memory is present in all of Initiatives of Change's programming, the Just Governance for Human Security forum uses this particular pillar to frame its discussions and plenary sessions. The Forum focuses on themes of restorative justice as an alternate pathway for healing that can subsequently lead towards a sustainable and secure future.

Ambassador Mohamed Sahnoun presents four basic principles to guide the process of Healing Memory: (1) openness; (2) responsibility; (3) repentance; and (4) forgiveness (Sahnoun, 2010).

Oftentimes, unresolved violent conflicts fuel a cycle of hate and resentment. When crimes remain unacknowledged and histories hidden away, traumas are sustained and passed from generation to generation. It is necessary for a community to not only acknowledge the pain and grief of its victims (Sahnoun, 2010), but to also examine its past from different perspectives so as to construct multiple and diverse histories that can all contain truth in some form or the other. In this respect, perhaps the fundamental and guiding principle of Healing Memory is to ensure all the voices that have previously gone unheard are brought to the surface. Indeed, the idea of truth as a concept will always be subjective and dependent upon the storyteller in question. This is not to say that objective facts should be dismissed or ignored during this process, but rather to take context and frame of reference into consideration in addition to hard facts.

It is a challenging and risky undertaking to produce a version of history that does not agitate either party. Moral binaries of right and wrong, or good or bad, are easy to fall into and can foster a sense of mistrust, especially if representatives of the conflict are not ready to confront the source of trauma. Open and safe spaces for meaningful dialogue between involved parties, therefore, vital in building relationships based on mutual respect and to eventually construct this new story (McAllister, 2010; Komesaroff, 2010). In doing so, victims have the opportunity to move from a passive to an active role in their own stories and begin the process of reconciliation, healing, and forgiveness.

Healing Memory lays the foundation for individuals and communities to develop peacefully, and as such, it can be linked to three Sustainable Development Goals: (1) Reduced inequalities (SDG 10); (2) Sustainable Cities and Communities; and (3) Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions.

HEALING MEMORY AND REDUCED INEQUALITIES SDG 10

SUMMARY

An increase in the per capita income of the poorest 40 percent (UN) and access to exports for developing countries (IMF) has not been sufficient to reduce income inequality. It is well documented that the poorest 10 percent of the global population earns between 2 and 7 percent of global income versus 40 percent earned by the same percentage of the richest (UN-DESA, 2018). SDG 10 aims to address this rise in income inequality by promoting the economic, social, and political inclusion of all by 2030.

Exclusion of individuals and groups is the underlying cause of income inequality. Such groups are often denied access to opportunities and face discriminatory behaviour, which in some cases can be systemic and institutionalized. The inequality stemming from this behaviour can create an “othering” effect, dividing communities into dominant and oppressed groups.

Healing Memory provides an avenue to cultivate connections between opposing groups. It can help to shift an individual, community, and/or a government's perspective from hate to compassion. The Healing Memory process, however, faces significant challenges when addressing the exclusion caused by widening inequalities. Firstly, it is context driven and cannot be used as a one-size fits all model. Secondly, the process can be long and unpredictable as injustices of the past and the present need to be honestly, openly, and frankly acknowledged and redressed for any positive healing to occur. Thirdly, the inequality that proceeds from institutionalized and systemic discrimination is rooted in a culture of impunity, thus making it harder to address.

A democratic culture—one where every voice is heard and every story considered—can generate a space for constructive working relationships. Such a culture is essential for building understanding, trust, and respect, which in turn will help reduce inequalities caused due to exclusionary behaviours, norms, and laws.

IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS

SDG 10 aims to sustain the income growth of the bottom 40 percent at a rate higher than the national average, within and among countries, as well as to promote economic, social, and political inclusion of all by 2030. This includes ensuring equal opportunities through appropriate legislations and policies, particularly those that allow for greater equality in wage, fiscal, and social protection (UN-DESA, 2018).

Currently, the United Nations has measured that the per capita income (average income per person) of the poorest 40 percent has improved more rapidly than the national average in about 50 countries, accounting for approximately three-quarters of the world population. A recent quota change at the International Monetary Fund has seen an increase in the share of voting rights for developing countries and an expansion of duty-free treatment and access to exports. However, between 1990 and 2010, income inequality increased by 11 percent in developing countries. It has been well documented that the poorest 10 percent of the global population earn between 2 percent and 7 percent of the total global income, whereas the richest 10 percent earn approximately 40 percent of the total global income (UN-DESA, 2018). It has also been found that after a certain level of inequality, poverty reduction becomes more challenging. This, in turn, can have an adverse effect on an individual's self-worth and fulfilment. This outcome threatens long-term economic and social sustainability, resulting in greater environmental degradation, disease, and crime (UN, 2017A).

Income inequality cannot be tackled unless its underlying causes are addressed, mainly the exclusion of individuals and groups from socially, politically, and economically engaging in society (UN, 2017B; UN-DESA, 2018). Excluded groups are often denied access to opportunities as a result of horizontal inequalities (language, religion, ethnicity, class, gender, and/or age) which can manifest as part of the cultural makeup of a society (UNESCO, 2018). In some cases, discriminatory norms and behaviours can be institutionalized to maintain psychological, social, and material advantages, thereby solidifying the position of the dominant group over the oppressed group (The Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues et al., 2015). Systemic and institutionalized inequality can also create an “othering” effect in which the dominant group conceives the oppressed group as different and inferior to themselves (Khan, 2012). This is a consistent pattern of behaviour that can be seen throughout history. From the systematic extermination of the Jewish community in World War II to apartheid in South Africa, inequalities based on culture can exclude marginalized communities in extreme ways.

It is easy to understand how discrimination can be transmitted across generations and the reasons for which ethnic and racial discrimination continues to be a source of global inequality and conflict (OHCHR, n.d.). Deconstructing inequalities, therefore, requires communities to understand existing and pre-existing conflicts and the consequences of discriminatory policies and practices on the oppressed communities' lives and psyche. Healing Memory provides an avenue to cultivate connections between historically opposing groups and can help pave the way towards a contextually relevant healing processes (The Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues et al., 2015). It allows both the perpetrator and the victim to humanize one another so as to change their perspective from hate to compassion. For instance, Christian Piccolini, founder of Life After Hate and former white supremacist, has engaged in the Healing

Memory process to counter racism and intolerance in the United States. His organization works to help radicalized individuals disengage from extremist movements by trying to understand why they joined in the first place. They look for what Piccolini calls “potholes” in someone’s life, such as unemployment, poverty, trauma, abuse or addiction that may have lead them to join these groups. Instead of arguing with these individuals on an ideological basis, Life After Hate approaches them with compassion and empathy. They hope these individuals will one day be able to view the people they are against as fellow human beings and to ultimately change their personal belief system (Just Governance for Human Security, 2017).

It is not easy to destroy an idea, especially if it has been festering for generations. Narratives, therefore, become powerful tools for addressing exclusion through Healing Memory. Since there will inevitably be differences in historical narratives, there is a need for productive and respectful dialogue. As society works to reduce inequalities, it is important that Healing Memory follows a long-term democratic process. A democratic culture, both from a moral and a pragmatic standpoint, can generate a space necessary for positive and constructive working relationships between society’s differing constituencies (International IDEA, 2003). It is imperative that every voice is heard and every story is considered in a manner that accounts for the hurt and distrust of both parties, particularly if past relations were violent. In order for groups to fully cooperate when seeking the truth of the past and restorative justice for the victims, there needs to be a basic level of trust and respect. Democracy can ensure that the issues of a conflict are fairly addressed; it can also begin a process of reconciliation wherein individuals and groups can move from a divisive past to a future of peaceful co-existence. This process is by no means easy to implement as it requires a profound shift in perspective for a society. It can be very painful and may even take decades of intergenerational healing. In this respect, it is important to remember that reconciliation through Healing Memory is not a quick fix and should be considered a long-term process from the beginning (International IDEA, 2003).

Challenges of Healing Memory and Reduced Inequalities

There are many challenges when using Healing Memory to work towards achieving SDG 10.

Healing Memory is a complex and delicate issue that cannot be applied as a one-size fits all model. It is extremely dependent on the local context and does not necessarily follow a linear progression. It can be long and unpredictable, requiring many stages towards healing of past injustices caused by inequality. As a result of the many components involved in reconciliation, people may want to move on quickly or believe that it can be delayed as other issues take precedence. There is a belief - particularly in the political realm - that looking back into the past, that is, to what had previously divided the community, will only undermine the current political and economic structures (International IDEA, 2003). Indeed, it may initially seem rational to focus on a community’s similarities instead of their differences; however, it is impossible to forget the past if it is not dealt with in a meaningful way.

Institutionalized and systemic discrimination makes it harder to challenge inequality, especially if the dominant group has no intention of relinquishing their position in the hierarchy. They can even deny the existence of such injustices and may firmly believe that racism and/or discrimination do not exist in their society. It becomes more problematic if a society’s prejudices become entrenched in norms and behaviours as a result of an Us vs. Them paradigm. In this case, the othering of the oppressed group is not only rationalized, but scapegoating the victims becomes normalized in the eyes of society. It is, therefore, extremely difficult to even begin the process of Healing Memory if a society refuses to take accountability for their actions or vastly underestimates the consequences on its victims. A culture of impunity can further these beliefs, resulting in a lack of guilt or shame (International IDEA, 2003).

On the other hand, victims of long-standing discrimination may feel wary of a reconciliation process. If they have no reason to believe that the status quo has changed, they may feel as if their suffering is being belittled or ignored or it could also be seen as a shortcut to the process of truth, justice, and punishment, and they may doubt the sincerity of any apologies (International IDEA, 2003).

Existing economic, social, and political inequalities can undermine Healing Memory and set the tone of the process. The victims of past crimes do not get any closer to justice, remaining in the same place more angry, hurt, resentful, and hopeless than before.

HEALING MEMORY AND SDG 11 SUSTAINABLE CITIES AND COMMUNITIES

SUMMARY

Urbanization is happening at a rapid pace. Today, a large number of people live in cities, and this number is only expected to increase in the future. It is estimated that about five billion will be living in cities by 2030.

The rapid pace of urbanization has brought many challenges in its wake. Extreme poverty, inadequate access to basic services, increased air and water pollution, and informal housing issues are some of the issues caused due to urbanization. It is vital to address these issues, as they can threaten a community's stability, thus contributing to the overall fragility of a city.

Sustainable urban development is the need of the hour. SDG 11 aims to make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient, and sustainable, as well as to provide a decent quality of life for every citizen. A fragile city can undermine this very aim. Ineffective urban planning and management can further issues of inclusion, exclusion, and identity. Physical spaces can see communities being segregated, which can foster feelings of injustice and fuel resentment.

The Healing Memory process can mitigate these conflicts by involving marginalized groups in the urban planning process. By preserving a community's urban cultural heritage and integrity, it can protect the identity of a people and thereby create a participatory city.

An inclusive city provides a safe space for different narratives to be discussed. Including all communities in urban planning can go a long way in not only removing class divisions in a physical space, but also promoting sustainable urbanization.

IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS

SDG 11 aims to make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient, and sustainable.

As of 2015, four billion people, approximately half of the world's population, live in cities and this number is expected to increase to five billion in 2030. The rapid pace of urbanization experienced in the past few decades has brought on a number of challenges, such as extreme poverty, inadequate access to basic services, increased air and water pollution, and informal housing issues (particularly as migrants enter cities from rural areas or other parts of the world). Urban sprawl is also a growing issue, outpacing the growth of urban populations, and can be seen in many parts of the world (UN DESA). Today, approximately one billion people live in slums, with women, youth, and the poor being the most affected. By 2050, it is projected that 56 percent of the population in fragile and conflict-affected states will be living in cities (Altpeter, 2016).

It is clear that effective, inclusive, and sustainable urban management is needed to ensure that each citizen of the world is able to live a decent quality of life (UN DESA, 2017). Soon after the announcement of the Sustainable Development Goals, the Habitat III conference adopted a new framework linking urbanization to sustainable development for governments, civil society organizations, and the private sector. Now known as the New Urban Agenda, it serves as an extension of SDG 11 (UN Habitat, 2016). While there is a distinctive lack in literature, there is a wide commitment from universities, think tanks, and civil society groups to provide evidence-based policy and programs towards SDG 11. However, apart from the New Urban Agenda, most disciplines are still situated in their own academic niche, which makes it difficult and less intuitive to conceive SDG 11 as a cohesive whole.

In order to determine how sustainable a city or community may be, it is useful to understand the concept of fragility. While fragility has traditionally been used to describe the deterioration of a state's authority and the vulnerability of its society, it is now increasingly being used as an indicator in the development of cities. The degree of fragility, however, allows for a holistic approach and can be conceptualized by a number of factors and the ability of a city to mitigate them. In a working paper by the United Nations University, the authors identify seven specific fragility factors: (1) economic and social inequality; (2) concentrated poverty; (3) unemployment; (4) real or perceived insecurity; (5) natural hazard exposure; (6) rapid urbanization; and (7) policy and justice deficits (de Boer, Muggah, & Patel, 2016). The way in which these factors may combine, however, is context-specific, as they also interact with local attitudes, behaviours, and norms (Altpeter, 2016). In the case of SDG 11, rapid urbanization can easily lead to unregulated urbanization, thereby undermining a city or community's stability.

Ultimately, the urban question revolves around issues of inclusion, exclusion, and identity, all of which can be addressed by Healing Memory. The lines of inequality, whether economic, social, or cultural, often manifest in a physical space wherein marginalized communities have minimal access to city infrastructure and services. Decades of urban projects have contributed to a physical reinforcement of inequality and segregation, forcing marginalized populations into a space that lowers the standard of living (Burdett, 2016). This literal divide within a community can serve as a stark reminder of the inequalities that still exist, and can only fuel resentment and anger from its victims.

The historical and racial background of a city or community must also be taken into consideration if a healing process is to occur. The intergenerational effects of delineating physical spaces according to class, status, and race can especially be observed in the United States of America where race relations are at an all time high. In Flint, Michigan, for example, the water crisis has disproportionately affected poorer communities of colours primarily due to mismanagement and systemic neglect. Whereas other white communities continued to get clean water from the state, the city of Flint had been a dumping ground for toxic waste by Buick City, a GM automotive factory, from 1904 to 1999, and is still reeling from the resulting health effects (Craven & Tynes, 2016)

A city is more than a collection of people, where the social and the spatial are inextricably linked (Burdett, 2016). It is a complex melange of identities, needs, and history that can represent how a community is built. Healing Memory, therefore, acts as a stepping-stone to creating an equal environment and assists in mitigating any further injustices that may require reconciliation.

Promoting the re-development of urban areas through a cultural lens can especially help to increase the liveability of certain spaces that were previously neglected or uninhabitable (UNESCO, n.d.). Culture preserves both the social fabric of a city's urban identity and the natural environment. In this respect, the Healing Memory process could involve using cultural preservation as a means to create an inclusive and participatory city.

The destruction of a city or community's cultural heritage has historically been used as a deliberate and systematic tool to destroy the image and identity of a people (Banadarin, 2013). For example, in Syria, six UNESCO World Heritage sites have been severely damaged and other cultural sites have been deliberately raided (Henderson, 2016). This can have intergenerational damaging repercussions, as a loss of culture can cause feelings of bitterness, resentment, and ultimately hopelessness. However, as stated by musician, composer, and UNESCO Goodwill Ambassador Jean-Michel Jarre, "even when there is nothing, imagination and culture are the last pillars, the last cement of civilization" (Jarre, 2013). Since the self and community can be destroyed along with culture, rehabilitating a victim's culture within a city is extremely important in allowing reconciliation efforts to be sustained. It enables individuals to have a safe space for different narratives to be discussed (Bombande, n.d.). Cultural infrastructure, therefore, can be used as public spaces for such dialogue and the promotion of social inclusion, which can help to reduce violence and foster a culture of peace (UNESCO, n.d.).

If a city or community wishes to redress issues of the past, and even present inequities, it is no longer sufficient to solely rely on economic growth as an approach to remove class lines in a physical space (Campbell, 2013). As a starting point to reconciliation, urban planners require meaningful participation from marginalized groups to improve access to infrastructure, utilities, services, and standards. By allowing these groups to engage in the planning process, it not only creates an inclusive space, but also gives communities that have been excluded in their own city or community a sense of ownership. While these initial steps may be delicate and tenuous, acting upon them would demonstrate a commitment by urban planners to redress a community's concerns. Moreover, it would build the foundation of a relationship based on trust, which can go a long way in the healing process.

HEALING MEMORY AND PEACE, JUSTICE, AND STRONG INSTITUTIONS SDG 16

SUMMARY

According to UN DESA, SDG 16 is a core tenant of sustainable development. But implementing this goal remains a challenge. Weak bureaucracies, autocratic regimes, lack of accountable and inclusive institutions make it difficult to promote peace and justice. These systems breed an atmosphere that fuels existing grievances and can lead to citizens' distrust in state or national authorities.

Healing Memory can pave the way forward towards building peace in unstable regions. In order for this process to gain any sort of traction, strong and transparent institutions need to facilitate an agreed upon history amongst all stakeholders and provide justice to the victims of past crimes. Reconciliation is a long-term process. As such, it is important to understand that while the process may not follow logical or sequential stages, it should nonetheless be framed in clear terms.

Local community representatives, states, and civil society can create and maintain programmes that build trust between conflicting parties. As a way to cultivate an atmosphere of co-existence, understanding, and empathy, these bodies could administer the Healing Memory process, initiate dialogue, document an accurate version of history, and provide compensations. The education system and truth commissions can play an active role in the process as well. The former may engage in post-conflict education, while the latter could provide a formalized platform for the victims to tell their stories.

Even with the involvement of public and private institutions, the Healing Memory process can very easily be stalled. The barriers towards reconciliation can range from who should take the lead in reconciliation matters, what approach should be taken, and what the Healing Memory sequence should even look like. It is also important to keep in mind that Healing Memory's long and past-focussed process could have undesired effects. It could be manipulated to reinforce a negative and destructive narrative, and too much focus on the past could come at the expense of present issues.

It is, therefore, important to look at the approaches adopted by different countries to promote the Healing Memory process within their own context.

IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS

SDG 16 (Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions) seeks to promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all, as well as build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels (UN-DESA, 2018).

It is extremely difficult to reduce poverty (?) and sustain economic growth while a country experiences insecurity and violence (Paul, 2016). During the SDG negotiations, a large gap in Millennium Development Goals (MDG) performance was found between countries experiencing high levels of violence and those that were not (Attree & Möller-Loswick, 2015). While in recent years there has been a decline in homicides and greater access to justice, levels of violent conflict are on the rise. As the world becomes increasingly divided, SDG 16 has been recognized as a core tenant of sustainable development (UN-DESA, 2018).

The promotion of peace and justice and accountable and inclusive institutions is still uneven across and within many regions. There have been efforts to make national and international institutions more effective, inclusive, and transparent, as well as to ensure states deliver on their human rights obligations through monitoring by independent or national human rights institutions. Several areas have seen an increase in security and sustained levels of peace; however, progress of rule of law and access to justice is mixed, as there appears to be a significant gap in citizens' access to and trust in authorities (UN-DESA, 2018).

The implementation of SDG 16 remains a huge challenge, especially in countries with autocratic regimes or weak bureaucracies (Paul, 2016). Insecurity and lack of inclusive institutions resulting from violent conflict can cause long-standing grievances that can last generations. As a means to finding lasting solutions to insecurity, Healing Memory can be a method of forwarding the peace process in unstable regions. But Healing Memory requires strong institutions to ensure that reconciliation is a long-term process, rather than a short-term one.

Reconciliation can occur at a number of levels. It can manifest between individuals, groups, and/or nations, and varies in degree according to the social context (Smith, McCandless, Paulson & Wheaton, 2011). Accordingly, the state, local community representatives, and civil society have a role in facilitating the Healing Memory process. Each group has the ability to maintain or create programmes that build trust between victims and perpetrators. As potential symbolic representatives of opposing forces, they can initiate dialogue when either party is not ready to speak directly to one other (International IDEA, 2003).

On a national level, the state has a specific role to play: to document an accurate version of history and to ensure that the country does not relapse into conflict due to weaknesses in its constitution, lack of appropriate legislation, and/or an exclusive political system.

A state has the power to compensate for past abuses with reparations, which can be perceived as physical evidence of regret and can validate the wrongdoing that occurred to a harmed group. In doing so, it emphasizes a government's commitment to accountability and transparency, while concurrently building trust amongst its citizens. Ideally a state should be able to implement these high-level tasks; however, they can often lack the political will or capacity to do so. Under these circumstances, civil society organizations should fill the gap where needed (Sánchez & Rognvik, 2012). In cases where religion is the cause of conflict, religious institutions can facilitate the peace process, such as in Northern Ireland where Protestant clergy spoke with the Catholic paramilitary and political leaders. Religious institutions are therefore in a unique position to promote interfaith dialogue and bring a spiritual component to the healing process. They can also provide a safe space for individuals to discuss grievances and assist in reintegrating offenders back into the community (International IDEA, 2003).

There is a need for institutions, such as the government, civil society, advocacy groups, and the media to cultivate an atmosphere of co-existence, understanding, and empathy. It is key for Healing Memory to be clearly interpreted as a long-term process, as well as to ensure that it is not framed in ambiguous terms. In essence, the hurts of the past must be spoken of publicly and by institutions that claim to represent community members (International IDEA, 2003).

The education system can also make a significant contribution to the peace building process, and therefore, the Healing Memory process. The provision of post-conflict education addresses what are known as "legacies of conflict" (Smith, McCandless, Paulson & Wheaton, 2011, p. 22), which can be mainstreamed into school curriculums. Educational institutions, whether formal or informal, or civil society organizations can promote the understanding of the causes, consequences, and resolutions of conflict at a personal, social, institutional, and global level. Conflict resolution can be expanded to include concepts of restorative justice as an effective approach to healing past wounds and to develop the social skills needed to rebuild relationships. For example, debates concerning forgiveness can be held and the importance of expressions of apology and regret can be explored (Smith, McCandless, Paulson & Wheaton, 2011).

A school or a school-like setting can, therefore, offer a safe space to discuss ethnic, religious, or political differences, as well as offer a relatively objective account of a community's common history. Segregated educational systems have historically furthered existing tensions between groups. A dominant group's narrative is advanced at the expense of the oppressed, fuelling resentment and hate across generations. By developing the concept of pluralism, the education system can help to break the cycle of conflict and allow for coexistence to be based on respect, dignity, and equality (International IDEA, 2003). Revised education strategies that include reconciliation and healing can act as a long-term solution towards conflict prevention, while also tackling acute psychological and emotional impacts on victims and offenders (Smith, McCandless, Paulson & Wheaton, 2011).

Truth commissions are a typical institutional mechanism used to pursue an investigation of a specifically defined time in history as a means to produce historical justice. They are generally a temporary body that is independent, but sanctioned by the state, and created for political transitions. Although they have gone by different names, 25 official truth commissions have been established since 1974 and used in countries such as, Argentina, Uganda, South Africa, Guatemala, and Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

As its name suggests, truth commissions aim to establish the truth about the past and hold perpetrators accountable for their actions. They provide a formalized platform for victims to actively be a part of the reconciliation process and have their stories told. If necessary, truth commissions further victim-centred healing by building a case for reparations, as well as recommending legal and institutional reforms. Where a political transition is not relevant, historical commissions are often established to inquire about past state abuses. They differ from truth commissions in that they seek to clarify historical truths out of respect for unrecognized victims or their descendants. Additionally, they focus on specific practices that affected particular ethnic, racial, or other groups. Less formal truth seeking mechanisms also exist; however, they are more tied to political process and produce a less nuanced, diverse, and inclusive account of the past as they are more limited in its scope (International IDEA, 2003).

It is difficult to discuss reconciliation as a set of concrete steps that an institution should take. Theoretically, a country or community's Healing Memory process may not follow logical or sequential stages (International IDEA, 2003). The practice of Healing Memory will always differ from theory, so it is important to understand what other countries are doing and how different reconciliation processes are being implemented concurrently around the world.

The following are case studies of how different countries' have conceived Healing Memory in their own context—what has worked, and what still needs to be done to fully engage its victims.

Tulsa, USA: Tulsa Race Riots

Tulsa, Oklahoma, is home to one of the United States of America's most deadly cases of domestic terrorism and has been represented at the Just Governance for Human Security forum since 2016.

In the early 1830s, the American Indian Removal Act forced a number of tribes to relocate to what is now Oklahoma. African Americans followed in the early 20th century, as Tulsa became the centre of oil and petroleum. When the region experienced a massive economic boom, American Indians and African Americans became incredibly wealthy. They established the Greenwood Districts, often dubbed "Black Wall Street." This caused huge resentment among white Americans living in the area, ultimately igniting a spark that burned the whole city down. From May 31 to June 1, 1921, over thirty-five blocks of black businesses and residences were burned down by a white mob.

Over the next three days, martial law was declared and over 6,000 black residents were detained. This event became known as the 1921 Tulsa Race Riots (also known as the Tulsa Genocide or Tulsa massacre) and was only officially acknowledged by the Mayor of Tulsa, Susan Savage, in 1997 and again in 2013 by the police force. There have since been a number of initiatives to preserve the history of Greenwood and to bring awareness of this serious act of racial violence to the rest of the Tulsa community. In 1995, the Greenwood Cultural Centre was built to support African American cultural history, particularly of the business pioneers of Greenwood, and a number of parks and monuments stand in tribute of the Tulsa Race Riots. The Tulsa Race Riot Commemorative Commission was also established to conduct an educational campaign to bring its history into state-led curriculum. They have also placed additional signage and kiosks in the town itself.

While there have been significant efforts to bring Tulsa's hidden history to light and the acknowledgment of the crime by the city's government, there is still a lot more work to be done. As of yet, there has not been an official apology by either the state or the federal government. The City of Tulsa and the State of Oklahoma are also legally liable to pay USD 30 million in damages to the survivors of the riot and/or descendants of victims. These reparations have not been paid to the African American community, nor have reparations been discussed for American Indians forced upon the land (Just Governance for Human Security, 2017).

Canada: Indian Residential Schools

Similar to Tulsa, Oklahoma, the Canadian government issued an apology to former living students, the families, and communities of Indian Residential Schools in 2008. In the 1870s, the Government of Canada took on a policy of assimilation, forcing 150,000 First Nation, Métis, and Inuit children to attend schools far from their families and communities. Most schools operated as part of joint ventures with Anglican, Catholic, Presbyterian, or United Churches, in which indigenous culture and language were prohibited. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada established in 2010 confirmed that the children were often physically, emotionally, and sexually abused and that as many as 6,000 children died during this time (Government of Canada, 2008). There was also irreparable damage done to Indigenous cultural and spiritual traditions. This historical trauma has had multi-generational effects and is attributed to high rates of suicide, addiction, and incarceration in indigenous communities (Hanson, 2015). In October 2017, almost ten years later, the Government of Canada issued CAD 800 million in reparations in response to an eight-year long Ontario Superior Court case, which found the Canadian Government in breach of its duty of care to the children, as well as its damaging effects (Tasker, 2017)

Despite these reparations, Canadian policies continue to be contradictory regarding its reconciliation process to rebuild a sustainable future with the Indigenous nations of Canada. Many indigenous communities still live in chronic poverty, face inadequate housing and education services, and do not have clean drinking water, all of which has resulted in a youth suicide epidemic (Act Now, 2017). Land and territory disputes continue to be a major issue, particularly as a number of government approved oil pipeline projects have received significant backlash from communities that reside on the land these pipelines will pass through (Kinder Morgan, 2017). The National Inquiry of Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women, an electoral promise by the Trudeau government, has also not received the urgent attention it requires due to bureaucratic barriers. Information on participation in this process has not been publicly or widely shared with the affected families and there is a general lack of faith whether the Commission will complete its work in two years. While the Commission itself has asked for an additional two-year extension, indigenous communities wish to see the process re-set to make it less paternalistic, and more-participatory (Support Growing, 2017).

Armenia and Turkey: The Armenian Genocide

Unlike Tulsa and the Government Canada, there has been no official apology from the Turkish Government for the atrocities committed against the Armenian population from 1915 to 1918. In what is now recognized as the first genocide of the 20th century, Armenians were forcibly removed from their homes in Armenia and Anatolia to Syria, and systematically massacred throughout the Ottoman Empire (Armenian National Institute, 2017). By the 1920s, it is approximated that almost 1.5 million Armenians had died.

Despite intense social pressure from Armenians and the international community, the Turkish government has since denied that any massacre took place. Officially, the government states that both Turks and Armenians had lost their lives in the context of the Great War, resisting in particular the descriptor of “genocide” (Arango, 2017). A year prior to the centennial anniversary of the Armenian Genocide, the soon-to-be elected and now current President of Turkey, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, expressed his sympathy for the inhumane historic event and offered his condolences to the grandchildren of those who had lost their lives. While Erdoğan’s statement was a political stratagem to smooth over any condemnation over the upcoming anniversary of the genocide, it is nevertheless regarded as an important step in reconciliation between the two states and its peoples. Experts are calling this ease in tensions a “thaw” that appears to be unofficially sanctioned by both governments. It has seen Turkish society revisiting its history, including the darker parts of it. In 2008, a group of Turkish intellectuals began an online “I apologize” petition, which has now been signed by 32,000 Turks. Remaining and neglected Armenian churches are being restored and a few have reopened for services. In addition, a Christian Church was built in Istanbul in 2015 and has now been retrofitted into a library. Some properties taken by the Turkish Government are also being returned to their legal owners or alternative means of compensation is being provided (Hill, Kirişci & Moffat, 2015).

Given the current political crackdown, as well as the recent Turkish coup, it seems unlikely that Erdoğan would broker any additional efforts to acknowledge the Armenian Genocide, politically or symbolically. It is rather posited that the road to reconciliation lies in a normalization policy that would open up diplomatic channels between the two states (Hill, Kirişci & Moffat, 2015). There have been attempts to ratify the 2009 Armenia-Turkey Protocol, which would open borders and establish formal diplomatic relations; however, as of 2017, Armenia and Turkey still remain at a stalemate. Although political channels appear to have failed, a Consortium of eight civil society organizations from Armenia and Turkey established the Armenia-Turkey Normalisation Process in 2014. The Consortium aims to contribute to regional peace and stability by engaging in economic, educational, and cultural activities, as well as increasing the flow of information and communication between the two countries. It has brought together over 2000 participants and beneficiaries and reached more than 10,000 people through activities and meetings, thereby increasing people-to-people contact and awareness (Armenia-Turkey Normalisation Process, 2016A).

The idea of opening up other economic, cultural, and technological channels between two countries with long-standing grievances runs contrary to the mainstream approach of reconciliation, and indeed the Healing Memory Process. Theoretically, we need to approach the wounds of the past openly and with the intention of providing a semblance of justice for its victims. In this particular case, however, we have one party staunchly refusing to do so. This path towards reconciliation should, therefore, be viewed as one of the many approaches that can be used for reconciliation and should not be so easily dismissed.

Sri Lanka: 25 Years of Conflict

After 25 years of armed conflict, the ethnic tensions that fuelled the Sri Lankan Civil War were declared over in 2009. The Sri Lankan government and the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (also known as the Tamil Tigers) had been entrenched in a violent war over the self-determination of the Tamil population in Sri Lanka.

As in many other countries, Sri Lanka experienced huge disparities in income, access to services, and infrastructure dating back to pre-colonial times, particularly in areas inhabited by the minority Hindu Tamils. The lack of a participatory government confined Tamils to the fringes of the overly centralized government, which only served to exacerbate ethnic tensions. Two insurrections occurred in early 1970s and late 1980s, but were brutally put down by the government. Although the conflict was mainly contained in the north and east of the country, Tamil separatists carried out a number of attacks against civilians across the country. During the final stages of the conflict, approximately 300,000 Tamils were internally displaced and there have been serious allegations of human rights violations from both sides (UNPBF, 2016).

From 2009 to 2014, the Government of Sri Lanka attempted to implement a variety of measures to support reconciliation efforts between conflict-affected ethnic groups. For many, however, the government fell short of building a sustainable peace-building agenda, and preferred a policy of economic recovery. This ultimately undermined and ignored the root causes of the conflict, mainly structural discrimination and grievances of the victims. After the 2015 political election, there was an unprecedented change in mandate to advance peace, governance, and reconciliation reforms by the federal government. Two of the largest political parties united to form the National Unity Government, which maintained a positive working relationship with the main Tamil party and opened up a space to candidly discuss the need for Healing Memory. The country’s leadership pledged to ensure constitutional reforms to uphold ethnic unity and the rights of the minorities. The Minister of Foreign Affairs went on to promise the UN that their government would establish independent processes for transitional justice. They have proposed to form a Commission for Truth, an Office for Missing Persons, an Office for Reparations, and judicial mechanisms to investigate human rights violations. Additionally, the government has committed to strengthen their national human rights commission and to support legislative reforms that mitigate discriminatory actions and policies (UNPBF, 2016). It has been understood that the Government of Sri Lanka has been given a window of opportunity to push for reconciliatory reforms, which if it does not take advantage of, will only close as time goes on.

Significant progress has been made in opening up civil society as spaces for dialogue and activism, and the police and judiciary appear to be functioning more independently. The government quickly passed the 19th Amendment to the Constitution and the Right to Information legislation, which re-imposes a two-term limit on the Presidency and strengthens eleven oversight bodies (UNPBF, 2016).

As of 2017, however, there has been a serious loss in momentum to push for reconciliation policies and institutions. No mechanisms for transitional justice have currently been established and the government has yet to craft a policy addressing reconciliation. There has been increased secrecy when drafting legislations and policies, which appear to have harmful implications on rights protection and due process. The Offices of Missing Persons was not established, and other initiatives, such as land restoration, have stalled. Citizens continue to be left out of the policy reform process, and the recent surge in demonstrations shows there is a perception among Sri Lankans that this new coalition government is no different from previous administrations (Centre for Policy Alternatives, 2017).

Challenges

Although it is clear that public and private institutions play a crucial role in administering the Healing Memory process, it remains unclear who should take the lead on reconciliation. It is still debated on whether a bottom-up or top-down approach is best suited to the healing process. It has been even more difficult to formulate a way to pursue both avenues in a complementary way. Moreover, what should the Healing Memory sequence look like? Should an apology precede transitional justice or governance reforms?

The context-specific nature of these questions underlines the idea that while Healing Memory is recognized as a non-linear process, it is also not a one-size fits all solution. Indeed, as previously discussed, it is important to hear other people's stories so as to gain insight to one's own situation, but it is not realistic for it to be fully replicated.

In theory, institutions provide a means of ensuring Healing Memory is a long-term process; however, they can also reinforce the negative and destructive narrative that has been historically used to oppress marginalized groups. This can manifest as outright ignoring the past or skewing history in favour of the victorious' side. In this respect, memory is selective and can easily be manipulated, especially as time goes on (International IDEA, 2003). Civil society organizations can act as an accountability mechanism for governments, but disproportionate focus on the past can dominate the present and hinder the peace process. Memory should therefore be considered to be a powerful tool that must be delicately balanced in order to address past traumas and grievances.

Truth commissions are not a universal solution for reconciliation. A federally sanctioned investigative committee may not be a viable option for a country or community, especially if they are entrenched in violent conflict where it is extremely difficult to retain an objective viewpoint. It requires political will, government capacity, and resources, which may not be available after a conflict. There may also be preferred local alternate conflict resolution mechanisms that can act as a better response for long-term healing. Truth commissions may be helpful to resolve national or political conflicts, but not necessarily individual ones (International IDEA, 2003). The latter entails a more complex process because of how personal healing can be. In fact, national or political conflicts can be understood as an amalgamation of individual conflicts which - as stated beforehand - are complex, nuanced, and deeply personal. The question that arises is if truth commissions should be used for reconciliation purposes or if there is a need for extensive reform so as to adequately address the subjectivity inherent in the Healing Memory process. Culture, memory, and trauma are interwoven in this respect, hence the long-term nature of the Healing Memory process. Truth should therefore be considered as one of the many elements of the reconciliation process, and not its panacea.

As with any conflict resolution mechanism, a truth commission does have its own set of risks. Commission members may not be as impartial as they should, and thereby prevent the construction of an objective perspective of the past. At a political level, truth commissions may be established for political gains or as a means for the government to relegate this process, which can be difficult, long, and complex. It can also be used as a vehicle to fend off criticisms from victims, so as to not fully acknowledge grievances of the past (International IDEA, 2003). The motives and expectations of a truth commission, therefore, need to be clearly articulated, otherwise it can foster unrealistic hope for victims that can further their resentment and set back the healing process.



INCLUSIVE ECONOMICS INTRODUCTION

Vast inequalities in wealth cause resentment. Social cohesion depends on economies that seek to meet everyone's basic needs and share wealth equitably. The predominant approaches to economics over the last few decades under neoliberalism have focused on growth and monetary indicators, such as incomes and GDP. Inclusive economics is a nuanced approach to ensuring that the benefits gained within a society are equitably experienced by its members.

The UNDP defines the basis of inclusive economic growth as, “the equality of opportunity and participation in growth by all with a special focus on the working poor and the unemployed” (Duran, 2015). UNDP's Chief Economist, Thangavel Palanivel, uses a poor-focused definition stating that, “growth is inclusive when it takes place in the sectors in which the poor work; occurs in places where the poor live; uses the factors of production that the poor possess; and reduces the prices of consumption items that the poor consume” (Duran, 2015). However inclusive economics should not be focused solely on growth, but also on the equitable distribution of existing resources, and existing opportunities. The focus on growth has failed to alleviate poverty, unemployment and inequality. Taking a poor focused definition also risks treating economic equality as a form of charity rather than the rights of all members of society; the outcomes for the poor should be the result of equitable economics, rather than an additional consideration. Only equitable processes will lead to equitable outcomes.

Inclusive economics has to be just that, inclusive. This means it must involve all members of society in a participatory manner. Participation allows people a voice in determining their needs and how those needs are to be met in society. It allows choices to be made, making members of society agents in their futures. Women, children and other vulnerable and marginalised groups will only find justice and inclusion through participation.

Inclusive economies must be equitable. It is not enough to have a wealthy society if that wealth is controlled by only a few. Without equitable distribution of resources, economies stagnate because opportunities are lost.

Inclusive economies must be predictable. There needs to be stability so that people have confidence in their choices and are empowered to act. Instability impacts more severely on those already in precarious positions, and disproportionately disadvantages them. Stability is, therefore, a means of including all people, linking to the idea of inclusiveness discussed above.

The processes and outcomes of an inclusive economy must be sustainable. They must be replicable so as to be used over time. A paradigm shift is needed so that the way we approach organising societies is inherently inclusive and that the goals of inclusive economics are not just short-term projects.

Only with participatory, equitable, stable and sustainable approaches to organising our societies will we succeed in creating inclusive economies that benefit everyone in society (Benner and Pastor, 2016).

Inclusive economics is relevant to several of the Sustainable Development Goals including SDG 5 – Gender Equality, SDG 8 – Decent Work, and Economic Growth and SDG 10 – Reduced Inequalities. Each of these will be discussed below.

INCLUSIVE ECONOMICS AND SDG 5 – GENDER EQUALITY

SUMMARY

Women and girls are half of the world's population but are not well represented in many aspects of society. For this reason, economies cannot be inclusive without paying particular attention to females. Stereotypes, imbalances in remuneration and education, harassment in all its forms, healthcare and poverty need to be addressed on a national and an international platform in order for females to be included in economics.

Education plays an important role in granting the opportunity for females to enter the workforce and poor access to it, in many developing countries, can hinder their chances. Social stereotypes have compartmentalized the type of jobs women can do thereby undervaluing their contribution to the workforce. Inadequate pay and poor labour laws also pose as problems for women.

The Gender Inequality Index (GII) developed by the United Nations Development Programme measures women's access to reproductive health, empowerment and labour market participation. The measures indicate the loss of achievement that women experience as a result of inequality. The index links these factors, recognising that poor outcomes in one area are likely to impact other areas, and also prevent a good outcome in one area from over-compensating for poor performance in another. In this chapter the GI is highlighted as being an accurate tool for the measurement of development in developing and developed countries.

This chapter examines STEM sectors and observes that there is a lack of ethnic diversity among women, which is seen as another factor to overcome by affording women equal opportunities in research and development in STEM fields.

Active inclusion of women in decision making processes is one of the key actions that need to be implemented so that their interests are seen to, thereby, ensuring that the overall economic picture is balanced, after having sought solutions for non-economic issues.

IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS

Sustainable Development Goal Five (SDG5) seeks to achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls.

Women and girls are half the population and yet, are not well represented in many aspects of society. For this reason, economies cannot be inclusive without paying particular attention to women and girls. This section will be about the necessity of including a gender perspective in the inclusive economics framework; that inclusive economies aim to be equitable, predictable, sustainable and stable. After all, gender equality has been recognised as a key element for successful development outcomes (Robinson et al., 2015).

Women cannot experience economic inclusion in society without factors that may not normally be considered to be economic. For instance, girls' access to education has a direct impact on their ability to participate in the workforce when they become women; in Brazil 60% of women with a secondary education are in work, whereas only 37% of women with less than primary education are (UNESCO, 2013). Education also impacts earnings, in Pakistan women with a secondary education earn 70% what men earn, but those with only a primary education earn 51% (Ibid.). Their limited freedom of movement in public spaces limits work and educational opportunities, and hinders economic empowerment (UN Women, 2017). Social stereotypes about women's roles, typically reflecting the care and menial work of the private sphere can limit employment opportunities, confining them to low paid labour markets, and undervaluing women's work in traditionally male occupations leading to lower wages (UN Women, 2015).

Women disproportionately perform unpaid work and childcare, which, despite their status, is integral to the operation of the economy; people cannot work without their basic needs met, and society cannot reproduce workers without children being cared for. Women also disproportionately work in the informal sector, sometimes called the "grey economy"; up to 95% of women's employment is informal in developing regions (UN Women, 2015). The informal sector can include any kind of employment that is not recognised as formal employment, for example, street vendors. In South Asia, over 80 per cent of women in non-agricultural jobs are in informal employment; in sub-Saharan Africa, 74 per cent; and in Latin America and the Caribbean, 54 per cent (Ibid.). This type of work often does not have the protections of the formal sector, such as labour laws (minimum wage, sick leave, maternity leave) and social benefits. Benefits such as retirement schemes which build up over the course of employment are thus less likely to be held by women, contributing to the poverty that women disproportionately face in old age (Ibid.). These sectors also lack the regulation of the formal sector leading to unsafe conditions (Ibid.).

The Gender Inequality Index (GII) developed by the United Nations Development Programme measures women's access to reproductive health, empowerment and labour market participation. These three measures indicate the loss of achievement that women experience as a result of inequality. The index links these factors, recognising that

poor outcomes in one area are likely to impact other areas, and also preventing a good outcome in one area from over-compensating for poor performance in another. For example, adolescent fertility can lead to under-achievement in education which then impacts on labour force participation (UNDP, 2010). The GII is an important measurement tool as it allows for assessment of the disadvantages that women uniquely face that may otherwise be invisible. It makes it practical to challenge and address underlying factors that reinforce gender inequality and poverty. The GII also improves on previous attempts to measure gender inequality. By measuring things that are not specific to the level of development of the country, the GII gives a more accurate reflection of gender inequality within a country, separate from the country's overall level of development. Which means developing countries can score well in gender equality, and developed countries can score poorly. This allows for more nuanced analysis (Ibid.)

The GII measures reproductive health using two indicators; the maternal mortality rate and adolescent fertility rates. Both these indicators reflect women's access to reproductive healthcare and reflect the value of women in society. Furthermore, the wealth of the country is irrelevant as similarly wealthy countries have vast differences in these measures, for example, Indonesia's per capita income is slightly higher than Mongolia's, but its maternal mortality rate is nine times higher (UNDP, 2010). The ways to prevent maternal mortality are inexpensive, largely involving education, nutrition, antenatal health services and skilled birth attendants. Hence, the lack of these things reflects a lack of prioritisation of women's wellbeing, during what can be a very dangerous time. In 2014, 83% of pregnant women in developing countries received at least one antenatal care visit, but only 52% had the recommended four (United Nations 2015). Contraception, education and access to reproductive healthcare are important for a woman's ability to prevent unwanted pregnancy. An inclusive economy that is equitable must provide basic healthcare that meets the specific needs of women in order for them to fully participate in society. Without accessible and reliable access to these services, women's futures are unpredictable, and their education and employment can be interrupted against their intention or will. Disruptions at family level, such as the consequences of an unplanned pregnancy, can have profound impacts on the ability of families to battle poverty, and particularly on girls who may be expected to assist with childcare at the expense of their own education and development (Greene and Merrick, 2005).

Adolescent pregnancy also reflects a lack of available education and contraception. Early pregnancies often prevent young women from completing their education, stymieing future employment opportunities (UNDP, 2010). Adolescent pregnancy rates can also reflect the level of power held by young women in relationships, such as those who have experienced child marriage (United Nations, 2015), and don't have the ability to reject sexual activity, enforce contraceptive use, or plan their fertility. These girls in particular face reduced opportunities for social participation. While the rates of child marriage are decreasing globally, there are worrying trends facing girls escaping conflict (UNFPA, 2017). Adolescent pregnancies carry higher risks to the mother, including a higher maternal mortality rate (Graczyk, 2007). Unplanned fertility also contributes to exponential population growth, which can create societies with large numbers of dependent children, reducing overall health and education outcomes due to overburdened infrastructure, limited resources and services (Fotso et al., 2011). This leads to further social and economic challenges which isolate the already vulnerable, such as women and girls. These are some of the consequences of unstable and unpredictable economies for women and girls and must be directly addressed for women to be safe and empowered.

The second GII measurement, empowerment, is measured using two indicators; educational attainment at secondary level and above, and parliamentary representation. Women's ability to attain higher education directly impacts their ability to gain higher paid employment, improving women's representation in the public sphere, such as in business and government (UNDP, 2010). Women's historical representation in these areas has been low but is improving (UNDP, 2010, United Nations, 2015). Within parliament women's representation is often limited to lower levels, with few women holding leadership positions. Other than education women face other barriers to these positions, such as gender norms and stereotypes. However, increasing female representation in parliament, and especially in leadership positions, allows women to be directly involved in ensuring that legislation takes gender considerations into account (Aldana, 2018).

Women's access to higher education is predicated on their access to primary education, an indicator that has been improving globally (United Nations, 2015). However, in areas where there are gender disparities to access, such disparities are stark against girls (Ibid.). Wherever suitable ablution facilities are not provided and where girls do not have access to sanitary products, puberty presents a difficult reality that can keep girls from attending school. In Nepal and Afghanistan, 30% of girls report missing school during their period, and in India, 20% of girls drop out completely after reaching puberty (Yakupitiyage, 2016). According to UNICEF, girls who stay in secondary school are six times less likely to marry young and child marriage would reduce by 60% in Sub-Saharan Africa, if all girls had a secondary education (Ibid.). Thus, access to the means of inclusion in education plays a key role in ensuring inclusive economics for women.

The last GII indicator is the one directly related to women's economic empowerment and their labour market participation. It has only one indicator – the level of participation in the labour force. This measure is useful for tracking participation but does not take into account occupational segregation or the pay gap between women and men (UNDP, 2010). Women are over-represented in education and care work, such as nursing and under-represented in “STEM” fields (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) (Department of Labor, 2014b, Department of Labor, 2014a). ‘Women's professions’ that revolve around teaching and nurturing are undervalued, contributing to a pay-gap between these professions and male-dominated fields requiring equivalent educational attainment. Women's labour itself is undervalued, with wages dropping in traditional male fields as the share of women increase (Miller, 2016). The pay-gap persists too when men and women are performing the same roles, even in traditional female occupations such as registered nurses (United Nations, 2015, Department of Labor, 2014b). The pay-gap increases when women are divided into racial groups. In 2015, while white women in the United States earned 82% of a white male earned, African American women earned 65%, while Latinas earned 58% (Nelson, 2017). As men continue to disproportionately be the gatekeepers to employment opportunities, stereotypes about the roles and value of women, and their ethnicities, directly contributes to the work opportunities they have access to and the tasks they are assigned as well as the perceived value of their work.

In the STEM fields women often face higher barriers to entry, often facing discrimination, harassment and unwelcoming work environments (Parker and Funk, 2018a). This leads to high rates of dropping out during training and shorter careers. There is also a lack of ethnic diversity in STEM, an intersection felt especially by non-white women (Parker and Funk, 2018b). This means that much of the research and development work occurring is being done by men and can fail to take the needs and perspectives of women into account. The result is a society built specifically with men in mind and women as an afterthought, if at all. Examples of this bias include the normalisation of male representation in video games for children, where male characters are the default and female characters an optional extra (Chemaly, 2016). In the area of assistance apps, there is a problem with apps not understanding the phrases “I have been raped” or “I was beaten by my husband”, but being able to provide assistance during a heart attack (Chemaly, 2016). Furthermore, health trackers completely ignore menstruation. In addition, the creation of an advanced artificial heart which fit the chest cavity of 86% of men, but only 20% of women, and which was not going to be further developed to a smaller size due to cost and time investments required, adds to the bias/discrimination (Ibid.). This is how the economic exclusion of women can lead to wider forms of exclusion in society, which could be remedied simply by having women equally represented in research and development in STEM in the workforce.

Economic inclusion of women requires active and intentional inclusion in areas that may not otherwise be considered economic by educators, employers and policy makers. Stability and predictability for women include control over their own bodies, whether during menstruation or family planning. Women's economic participation is frequently not a part of the formal economy, and this must be acknowledged in order to extend the security and protections of formal employment to them and protect against poverty and sexual harassment. These potential interventions centre around a participatory approach to society; ensuring women representation in decision making; support for access to higher level and STEM positions and recognition of the unpaid work women do to keep the economy functioning.

INCLUSIVE ECONOMICS AND DECENT WORK, ECONOMIC GROWTH (SDG 8)

SUMMARY

SDG 8 seeks to promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth and productivity through diversification, technological upgrading and innovation, and the decoupling of economic growth from environmental degradation. It seeks full and productive employment and decent work for all while aiming to end forced labour and modern slavery, including child labour.

Economic growth that is determined through job creation is not valuable if the job is not able to support those employed and their dependents. Therefore, in order to create decent work, security and social protections and fair pay need to be incorporated into a job for a prospective worker. Decent work however, is unevenly distributed in society where those with greater access to opportunities (such as educated, urban dwellers) and those who belong to a particular demographic (such as men and the able-bodied), overwhelmingly command access to decent work. Decent work is more frequently accessible in developed countries; however, the rights of all workers are being eroded by the economic interests of those who control where and how production will occur.

Creating decent work is a challenge in both developed and developing countries with the rise of neoliberalism and globalisation; therefore, solutions need to be sought in order to overcome this. Inclusive economics requires governance measures which can be put in place in order to challenge the inequitable division of power and contribute to recreating and maintaining decent work by creating minimum work standards, and support access to opportunities. Businesses can play a role by making ethical decisions and not prioritising maximizing returns to wealthy shareholders over the rights of workers. A participatory approach is foundational in order to challenge the power dynamics which have undermined the provision of decent work in recent decades. Therefore, developmental actors need to be cognisant of the many perspectives of workers (who all hail from different backgrounds of development, genders, ages and abilities) to ensure that all are included.

IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS

SDG 8 seeks to promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all. It seeks to improve economic productivity through diversification, technological upgrading and innovation, and to decouple economic growth from environmental degradation. It seeks full and productive employment and decent work for all women, men, youth, people with disabilities; and equal pay for work of equal value. It also seeks to eradicate forced labour and end modern slavery, including ending child labour. It seeks a substantial reduction in the proportion of youth (aged 15-24) not in employment, education or training. (See also this booklet's section on Good Governance and SDG 4 – Quality Education). Actors must work towards SDG 8 by using an approach of being participatory, equitable, stable and sustainable in order to be effective, as per the inclusive economics model used here.

The word “decent” in SDG 8 is key. Having a job does not guarantee the ability to escape poverty, as evidenced by the 57% of people living in extreme poverty who are employed (ILO, 2016). In the same vein, economic growth that is determined through job creation is not valuable if that work is not able to support those employed and their dependents. Job creation alone is not the same as generating decent work, however, the creation of decent work with social protections contributes to economic growth (ILO, 2016). Sustainable economic growth is growth that is maintained without sacrificing resources of the future, such as environmental degradation or incurring debt. In this context, decent work means work that is productive and delivers a fair income to meet existing needs, provides security in the workplace and social protection for workers and their families and gives people the freedom to express their concerns, to organize and to participate in decisions that affect their lives.

Decent work is unevenly distributed in society; those with greater access to opportunities (such as education (Herath, 2011)), are geographically situated near work (such as urban dwellers (FAO, 2017b)), and people of particular demographics (such as men and the able-bodied (Herath, 2011)), overwhelmingly command access to decent work. With the rise of neoliberalism and globalization, decent work has been threatened in both developed and developing countries. In developed countries, the deregulation of the labour market, and the rise in power of capital (business) has seen a decrease in labour rights, and decent work, and an increase in casual and part-time work (Peters, 2008). The rise in power of capital has also negatively affected developing countries through encouraging a “race to the bottom” in labour rights, environmental and financial regulations and practices, and tax giveaways (Oxfam, 2018). This race has a greater effect between developing countries and is a means of seeking foreign direct investment (Davies and Vadlamannati, 2013). So while decent work is more frequently accessible in developed countries, the rights of all workers are being eroded by the economic interests of those who control where and how production will occur.

This power dynamic has created an economic environment that is geared towards the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few and at the expense of the majority. Between 1980 and 2016 27% of global income growth accrued to the top 1%, while the bottom 50% only received 12% of income growth (Oxfam, 2018). This inequality is reflected in countries around the world; in South Africa 50% of the workforce receives only 12% of all wages, while the top 10% of society receives half of all wage income; in the USA a CEO earns in one day what an ordinary worker earns in a year (Ibid.). This dynamic has pitted workers against each other for access to seemingly dwindling opportunities and work with fewer rewards. Wages failed to keep pace with increased productivity and economic growth in 91 countries between 1995 and 2014 (Oxfam, 2018). Unions, which defend collective rights, are being disempowered by the deregulation of labour (Peters, 2008). Capital is rewarded rather than labour; a third of dividend payments made by the top five companies in the garment sector could raise the incomes of all 2.5 million Vietnamese garment workers to a living wage, a cost of US\$2.2bn a year (Oxfam, 2018).

According to the International Labour Organisation (ILO), over 60% of workers globally lack any kind of employment contract. Furthermore, only 42% of workers are employed on a permanent contract (ILO, 2015). These two factors reflect the security and predictability of work which is adequate. Importantly the share of full-time permanent employees is decreasing. In the USA, workers in “alternative work arrangements”, such as self-employed contractors and temporary workers, rose from 10.7% of all workers in 2005 to 17.2% in 2015 and accounted for 94% of net employment growth in that period (Katz and Krueger, 2016). This includes an increase in this type of work in professional fields; more than 1 in 5 of these worker arrangements was in education or health services in 2015 (Ibid.). Which means in the current climate, insecurity of work is actually increasing in developed countries like the USA, which mirrors insecurity more commonly experienced in developing countries.

The “gig economy” is a term describing a situation in which people take on short-term contracts in place of full-time employment (Investopedia, 2018). This shifts many workers from employees to self-employed contractors or working as temporary workers through agencies. It reduces the security of income as future “gigs” are not guaranteed, reduces weekly earnings and alienates workers from job-related social security benefits, such as holiday pay and retirement schemes, and may reduce their representation in the workplace, and limit their employment rights (Katz and Krueger, 2016, International Labour Office, 2016). Women are more likely than men to be employed in alternative work arrangements (gigs) in the USA (Ibid.).

The digitization of the gig economy increases competition for technical work required predominantly in developed countries as geography is no longer a barrier and workers can work from anywhere in the world, if they have access to technology and required skills. While this has provided access to digital work for people in developing countries, it ultimately benefits the client as they are able to source quality work at a fraction of local rates, and exacerbates competition among qualified professionals undermining the value of their labour. Additionally, while an estimated 60 million workers in developing countries are registered as workers on digital gig platforms, only an estimated 10% of these are able to earn an adequate living off this type of work (Heeks, 2017). Many others use it to supplement other work. The digital economy is an opportunity for inclusion, as workers are protected against common forms of discrimination (such as gender, racial and disability discrimination) through the ability to present themselves online as they choose.

Access to the gig economy is one means for people to adapt to a lack of stable and adequate work. However, while freelance work has always been available, the rise of the digital gig economy poses new challenges to the organisation of labour globally. Its relative newness also means it currently lacks regulation, enforcing minimum standards and ensuring decent working conditions. Some suggestions to enforce decent work in this context have been proposed, such as a minimum wage, collecting an additional percentage of fees for retirement savings and unionization (Heeks, 2017). However, the industry is too young for these to have been effectively tested.

Decent work is also divided across urban and rural lines. Agriculture is the single largest employer in the world and employs about 60% of workers in less developed countries (FAO, 2018), and yet nearly 80% of the world's poor live in rural areas and work mainly in farming (The World Bank, 2017). As such, dedicated attention to the working conditions of agricultural workers is required to effectively meet SDG 8 and for it to be inclusive. 71% of child labour is in agriculture (FAO, 2017a). Tackling this poverty through decent work for adults is integral to addressing child labour, and enabling these children to access educational opportunities to prevent intergenerational poverty (ILO, 2016, FAO, 2017b). Growth in agriculture is two to four times as effective as growth in other sectors in raising incomes among the poor (The World Bank, 2017).

One regulatory system targeting inequitable distributions to agriculture is Fairtrade. Fairtrade is a certification system that works across the supply chain and puts minimum standards on production and trading, including social and environmental standards (Fairtrade International, 2018). Fairtrade offers minimum prices which reflect the minimum sustainable cost of production, which means farmers enjoy good prices in good markets and are protected against market slumps. Fairtrade cooperatives also receive a social premium in addition to the price for investment in development.

Fairtrade fits well with the inclusive economics framework of being participatory, equitable, stable and sustainable. The model is designed specifically to put decision-making power back in the hands of farmers through democratic organisation and access to information. The goal of Fairtrade is to establish equitability in supply chains by making farmers and traders partners in trade. It also works towards predictability of income for farmers creating stability and provides standards for the sustainability of production and communities. It is a successful example which has been running for over 30 years (Fairtrade International, 2018) of the way that even voluntary regulation and good governance can have an immense impact on the livelihoods of producers and workers in developing countries and their communities.

Creating decent work is a challenge in both developed and developing countries. However, using effective governance measures to create minimum work standards and support access to opportunities can challenge the inequitable division of power and contribute to recreating and maintaining decent work. Business decisions can be made with ethics in mind, and not prioritise maximizing returns to wealth shareholders (Oxfam, 2018). When discussing decent work, development actors must be cognizant of the many perspectives and work towards participatory approaches that ensure all are included; rural/urban, all genders, youth, developed/developing etc. A participatory approach is foundational to challenging the power dynamics which have undermined the provision of decent work in recent decades. Economic growth is valuable when it is the result of widespread benefits, such as those provided by decent work. When people are able to plan and invest in their futures through decent work they can build sustainable communities. The greatest impacts of decent work will be felt if there can be an equitable distribution of wealth in society.

INCLUSIVE ECONOMICS AND SDG 10 REDUCED INEQUALITIES

SUMMARY

Sustainable Development Goal 10 (SDG 10), promotes the reduction of inequality within and among countries. When implementing this goal, there needs to be recognition of the role that must be played by developed countries (as the holders of power over the global rules of commerce and as the historical and current benefactors of resource extraction from developing countries). This goal is closely aligned with inclusive economics and the indicators follow the model of using stable, sustainable, equitable and participatory approaches and outcomes.

Inequality is intersectional, meaning that multiple factors compound for individuals to enforce their position within a discriminatory and inequitable system. Women on average earn less than men and disproportionately work in professions which are underpaid, with women of colour receiving an even lower remuneration. Youth have less earning power and are disproportionately underemployed as a group, and members of the LGBT community face discrimination throughout the employment cycle around the world. People with disabilities also face high barriers to employment, such as attitudinal, physical and informational barriers to equal opportunities.

The colonial past of developing countries impacts the current situations they face. Global commerce continues to be based on patterns of production and exchange established under imperialism. Developed countries hold disproportionate power in global organisations continuing unequal relations which have denied the effective inclusion of developing countries in key international decision-making bodies.

In order to reduce such inequality all voices need to be heard (rebalancing of power relations) by using participatory approaches in decision making, both nationally and internationally, through the representation of all demographics. Unfair systems which benefit those in power as well as the systems which are discriminatory against disadvantaged groups, need to be addressed in order to establish a stable economy and inclusive growth.

IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS

Sustainable Development Goal 10 (SDG 10), promotes the reduction of inequality within and among countries. Regarding inequality within countries, the goal uses the relative growth in income of the bottom 40% of the population as an indicator of progress, as well as inclusivity within social, economic and political spheres (UNDESA, 2017). For inequalities among countries, the goal looks at access of developing countries to global decision-making, orderly migration, access to free trade mechanisms, resources for development, and remittance flows (ibid.). When implementing this goal, there needs to be recognition of the role that must be played by developed countries to reduce inequalities among countries (as the holders of power over the global rules of commerce and as the historical and current benefactors of resource extraction from developing countries). This goal is closely aligned with inclusive economics and the indicators follow the model of using stable, sustainable, equitable and participatory approaches and outcomes.

The 'within country' indicators are effective in measuring multiple aspects of inequalities. It uses a three-pronged approach:

- Income of bottom 40% of the population,
- The proportion of the population living under 50% of the median income by age, sex and disability,
- And by targeting discriminatory laws, policies, and practices to ensure equal outcomes.

As noted elsewhere in this booklet, inequality is a multifaceted issue that cannot be measured solely through income. It should also be recognised that 'within country' inequality is something that both developed and developing countries need to address, and this SDG is a directive for both. Inequality is intersectional, meaning that multiple factors compound for individuals to enforce their position within a discriminatory and inequitable system. For example, a person with an income in the bottom 40% of the population might be a woman, a youth, a member of the Lesbian Gay Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) community, a person of colour, and experiencing disability. Women on average earn less than men and disproportionately work in professions which are underpaid (like nursing or education), women of colour earn even less (Nelson, 2017) (See our section on Inclusive Economics and SDG 5). Youth have less earning power and are disproportionately underemployed as a group; almost 43% of the youth labour force globally are unemployed, or working but living in poverty (Oxfam, 2018). Members of the LGBT community face discrimination throughout the employment cycle, around the world (Suriyasarn, 2015). People with disabilities also face high barriers to employment, including enormous attitudinal, physical and informational barriers to equal opportunities; this despite 80% of the global disabled population being of working age (ILO, 2018). Each of these factors individually, could reduce income, but taken together, these disadvantages compound to significantly affect individuals. By measuring the specific indicators mentioned above, SDG 10 allows for a more nuanced view of the experiences of inequality which leads to more targeted action and ensures that these people are being included. The goal aims to promote the social, economic and political inclusion of all, irrespective of age, sex, disability, race, ethnicity, origin, religion, economic or other status.

The next indicator addresses the discriminatory laws, policies, and practices that maintain inequality. It promotes appropriate legislation, policies, and action to address inequality instead. It is a proactive goal that can be best achieved by actively engaging the participation of those it seeks to aid, and learning from their experiences. Legislation is a means to create sustainable change, as laws can modify social relations. Effective legal protections of the vulnerable have the potential to alter common social behaviours and shift the long-term treatment of these groups. For example, quotas for women's political participation can normalise women in leadership, leading to stronger voter support for women candidates, and encouraging more women to run (UNDP, 2017). The prospect of the SDG 10 indicators effectively leading change is important because inequality within countries has risen in recent decades, even while inequality between countries is declining (UNDESA, 2017).

We must historically situate the conversation of inequality between developed and developing countries. If one were to look at a map of the world and highlight developed and developing countries, and then overlay it with a map of coloniser and colonised countries, the maps would be nearly identical. This is because of the impact of imperialism - taking vast wealth from colonised countries and feeding it into imperial centres - is the foundation of the inequality that we are witnessing today (Hickel, 2015). Rich countries developed through a history of taking value far above what they returned and using that surplus to ensure stability and wealth in their own countries, while suppressing resistance in the colonies with the lingering threat of violence, both physical and structural. For example, the well-documented destruction of textile production in India, and exporting of crops leading to famine (Oxford Union, 2015). Had colonised countries retained their sovereignty and been able to trade on equal terms with imperial powers; had millions not been enslaved and forcibly removed from their countries; had precious metals, stones and other materials been left for the profit of the countries they belonged to; had thriving industries been traded with instead of destroyed; we could be living in a vastly different world with vastly different distribution of wealth and power.

This past is reflected in the present. Developing countries continue to disproportionately produce primary goods, and developed countries disproportionately produce value-added products (Lines, 2008), based on patterns of production and exchange established under imperialism. For example, Fiji's sugar industry was developed as a supply point under British colonialism. After independence in 1970, it continued to be the backbone of the economy, its primary export. However, the terms of trade with the EU only allowed the exporting of raw sugar into the EU at a higher price, preventing the development of sugar refinery and value-added development. The result being that today, Fiji continues to import white refined sugar, despite being a sugar producing nation (Child, 2015).

Developed countries hold disproportionate power in global organisations, such as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Trade Organisation, which write the rules of global trade, aid, and development (Oxfam, 2009, Hooper-Box, 2014). Following independence from colonial rule, many countries required access to funds to meet their needs and turned to the IMF which, during structural adjustment in the 1980's (and similar neoliberal enterprises since), imposed a system of strict social and economic policy requirements for the loans. The film *Life and Debt* details how Jamaica fared under these policies (Black, 2003). They were forced to reduce tariffs on imports, which led to their markets flooded with imported goods and lost key government income as a result. Local industries, including dairy, meat and vegetable production suffered and died leading to high levels of unemployment. Under these policies countries like Jamaica were also required to prioritise loan repayment above local spending leaving critical areas such as health and education underfunded.

While developing countries were forced to liberalise their trade rules, developed countries were able to maintain tariffs to protect their own industries, and the competitiveness of their own production (Murphy, 2009). Multiple developed countries continue to provide subsidies for agricultural producers today, such as the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) in the European Union, allowing them to sell cheaper products and compete with the unprotected agricultural producers in developing countries. EU subsidies have allowed European sugar producers to "dump" sugar on the world market, suppressing prices and impacting developing country exporters (Watkins, 2004). Consequently, developing country producers are forced to cut costs to compete, leading to underpaid or unpaid labour and in some instances even selling their products at less than the cost of production (Ibid.).

It's the entrenchment of power by developed countries that needs to be challenged for developing countries to have an equal voice at the table. Inclusive economics at the international level is between countries, rather than between demographics or individuals, as at the country level. However, unequal relations have denied the effective inclusion of developing countries' voices in key international decision-making bodies, such as the IMF and WTO; having created an unsustainable system of resource extraction under colonialism which forced millions into poverty (Oxford Union, 2015).

There has been frequent opposition to the World Trade Organization (WTO) holding negotiations "behind closed doors", to the exclusion of civil society representatives (Kucik and Pelc, 2017). This, despite the direct impact of trade deals on the economies and people of developing countries.

The recent Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement (TPPA) details were secret to the public and civil society, but available to 600 “corporate advisers” who advise in the interests of business, and who played a role in shaping the text (Ranald, 2013). The TPPA, like several other multilateral trade agreements, includes Investor-State Dispute Settlement processes, that would allow businesses to sue governments over policies that threatened their profits, including health and environmental policies, reducing their ability to legislate according to the will of their democracies (Ibid.). As of November 2017, there were 817 known cases of this kind. Of the 530 concluded cases, one quarter were found in favour of the investor (UNCTAD, 2017).

SDG 10 includes in its successes for 2015 that least developed countries and small island developing states received resource flows of \$48 billion and \$6 billion respectively (UNDESA, 2017). It also notes that eight donor countries met the target of 0.15 percent of Gross National Income for Overseas Development Assistance (ODA) (Ibid.). However, these figures give the false impression that these are net flows, and obfuscates the money flowing out of developing countries into developed. When outflows are considered developing countries lose significantly more to developed countries than they receive (Hickel, 2017). Such outflows include interest on debt, it is estimated that developing countries have paid over US\$4.2tn in interest payments on loans since 1980 (Ibid.). Another outflow is profits of foreign investors, such as the profits extracted from oil fields and mineral deposits (Ibid.), little of which remains in the country the resources are extracted from. Another is capital flight, including tax avoidance, sometimes through shifting profits to tax havens to avoid paying into the countries they’re operating in; there has been an estimated US\$13.4tn in unrecorded capital flight from developing countries since 1980 (Ibid.). All told it is estimated that for every US\$1 received in aid, developing countries lose US\$24 in net outflows (Ibid.). The net flow of capital continues to enrich developed countries.

We are now living in times when some businesses hold greater capital than small countries while wielding great power internationally. It is no longer just a question of inequality between countries, but also of comparative power between countries and corporations. Corporations invest in lobbying for political decisions to be in their favour, even going so far as to contribute to writing legislation (Chang, 2013). They move their operations between countries with favourable tax policies putting developing countries in a “race to the bottom” to provide tax incentives (Davies and Vadamannati, 2013). They can challenge countries that enact laws that threaten their profits under Investor-State Dispute Settlement mechanisms in free trade agreements, and evade taxes by shifting profits to tax havens, depriving developing states of valuable income (Hickel, 2017).

We live in a time where the wealth of billionaires has risen on average 13 per cent per year since 2010; where 82 percent of wealth generated in 2017 went to the richest 1 percent of the global population, while 3.7 billion people saw no increase in their wealth; and where 42 people own the same wealth as the poorest half of humanity (Oxfam, 2018). The inequalities within and between countries need to be addressed in accordance with the sustainable development goals. But SDG 10 does not consider the vast inequalities that have developed between countries and corporations, and between workers in both developed and developing countries, and a new transnational elite.

Unlike the ‘within-country’ indicators, the ‘between-country’ indicators need to be strengthened, for SDG 10’s outcomes to meet the inclusive economics model. SDG 10 includes the participation of developing countries in global decision-making but it does not include a means for equitable participation or recognition of the vast inequality of power between countries. It seeks special and differential treatment of developing countries in relation to global trade in accordance with WTO agreements, but does not acknowledge the negative implications of free trade agreements for these countries, or challenge the laxness of international systems that allow corporations to avoid paying fair taxes. The SDG 10 indicators include responsible migration and mobility of people, but only considers economic migration, and overlooks the 65.6 million forcibly displaced people worldwide (UNHCR, 2017).

Without critical engagement with the underlying causes of inequality such as unequal terms of trade and discriminatory laws, at both national and international levels, we risk reinforcing the foundations of inequality even as we make small gains in alleviating the symptoms. In order to do reduce inequality, we must ensure there is space for all voices to be heard by using participatory approaches to decision making, such as through representation of all demographics. There must be a deliberate rebalancing of power relations in decision-making bodies to ensure this participation is effective. We must look at unfair systems which benefit those in power as well as the systems which are discriminatory against disadvantaged groups. Only then will we be able to dismantle unsustainable economic systems and redistribute wealth fairly across the global population, supporting stable economies and inclusive growth.



GOOD GOVERNANCE INTRODUCTION

Corruption and the abuse of power sows distrust in societies of North and South. Only governance which is accountable to all citizens, including those of various minority and vulnerable groups, offers a path to lasting peace. Therefore, Good Governance is one of the six pillars of human security.

Governance is the process of decision-making and the process by which those decisions are implemented (UNESCAP, 2009). This can include formal and informal systems, as well as actors inside and outside of formal government, such as cooperatives, NGOs, lobbyists, media and others that influence decision making. Good Governance is not just a top down process but can be demanded by citizens through grass roots actions, such as petitions, and political demonstration, such as protests.

Good Governance has eight key characteristics; it is participatory, equitable and inclusive, consensus oriented, accountable, transparent, responsive, effective and efficient, and follows the rule of law (UNESCAP, 2009). These characteristics help ensure that corruption is minimized and that the views of less powerful groups contribute to decision making, hence their needs are met.

Participation refers to the effective representation of multiple groups in the decision making process. This participation includes gender parity, representation of multiple ethnic groups, people with disabilities, members of the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) community, and others. Participation needs to be informed and organized through free association of active individuals, and free expression of ideas and experiences of these people (UNESCAP, 2009).

Equitability and inclusiveness in good governance is related to participation. It means that all members of society feel that they have a stake, and do not feel excluded. In order for governance to be equitable it must consider the needs of vulnerable groups and ensure they have opportunities to improve or maintain their wellbeing (UNESCAP, 2009).

Given the many views that arise in an effectively participatory governance system, it must also be consensus oriented. This means that good governance requires the mediation of various interests to reach a broad consensus on what are the best interests for the whole community. It also requires a long term perspective regarding sustainable human development and how to achieve this. A consensus must be achieved through being informed on the social and historical context of the given society, and how the groups have interacted to reach the current situation (UNESCAP, 2009).

All groups involved in the governance process must be accountable to the public and their stakeholders. Who these stakeholders are will vary depending on context; it may be their constituents if they are in parliament, or their membership if they are an NGO. An organization or institution will determine these stakeholders based on who its decisions and actions will affect (UNESCAP, 2009).

In order to be accountable, organisations and institutions must be transparent. Which means following internal rules and regulations in the decision making process. It means information is freely available and directly accessible, in understandable forms, to those who are affected by it. (UNESCAP, 2009).

Being accountable also requires being responsive. Being responsive means to serve the interests of stakeholders, and to act in a timely manner (UNESCAP, 2009).

To be effective and efficient means to produce results that meet the needs of society in a way that makes best use of available resources. Good governance includes promoting the best use of resources for sustainable approaches to resolving society's needs. This means governing while protecting the environment for use by future generations (UNESCAP, 2009).

Good governance follows the rule of law. But the rule of law must also allow for good governance through providing a fair legal framework which is impartial. Human rights must be protected, particularly those of vulnerable groups. There must be an independent judiciary working alongside a police force working with integrity (UNESCAP, 2009).

Good Governance sits across several of the Sustainable Development Goals including SDG 4, Quality Education; SDG 5, Gender Equality; SDG 9, Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure; SDG 11, Sustainable Cities and Communities, and SDG 16, Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions. Each will be discussed in this booklet.

GOOD GOVERNANCE AND SDG 4 – QUALITY EDUCATION

SUMMARY

SDG 4 seeks to ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all. Education is a fundamental human right, a public good, and the basis for guaranteeing and realizing other rights. Furthermore, it is key to achieving full employment and poverty eradication. Good governance is an important tool for achieving this goal as it can help define the actions of decision makers, and the amount of resources allocated to education. It can also help to coordinate the many stakeholders committed to improving educational outcomes.

Good governance can be used as a tool to address a range of shortfalls in the provision of education in order to meet SDG 4. The use of a participatory approach can ensure the inclusion of females and minority voices. Good governance can also support an accountable educational system through transparency which prevents corruption (a barrier to education), and ensuring equality of education provision.

A transparent system allows for more effective cooperation between actors, such as donors and recipient governments, and also between donors, who may not otherwise be aware of each other's priorities and targets. The efficient and effective targeting of resources can ensure that countries with the most need are prioritized; access to education varies significantly by region and demographics. Systems within recipient countries also need to be prioritised ahead of developed country objectives, such as providing access to universities in developed countries. Good governance in education is essential if the provision of education is to be 'pro-poor' and for equality to be achieved.

IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS

Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4) seeks to ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all (UNDP, 2018). It notes the vast disparities in access between girls and boys and seeks to eliminate it by 2030. SDG 4 promotes access to education at all levels, ranging from preschool up to tertiary and vocational training. It also aims to achieve literacy and numeracy in a substantial proportion of adults by 2030 (Ibid.). Achieving this goal is a complex issue involving investment of resources in multiple areas. Education is a fundamental human right, a public good, and the basis for guaranteeing and realizing other rights (UNESCO, 2015). It is key to achieving full employment and eradicating poverty (Ibid.). Good governance is an important tool for achieving this goal. It can help define the actions needed, as well as the direction and amount of resources. It can help to coordinate the many stakeholders committed to improving educational outcomes, if the good governance framework described in the introduction to the section is used.

The Incheon Declaration was written in 2015 by a group of representatives from multilateral and bilateral organizations, and from civil society and the teaching profession, youth and the private sector. The Incheon Declaration reaffirms the vision of Education for All (EFA, set out in 2000 in the Dakar Framework for Action), and outlines the commitments of these stakeholders to quality education and focusing effort on access, equity and inclusion, and learning outcomes (UNESCO, 2015, Education Aid Watch, 2015).

Access to education varies significantly by region and demographics. In 2015, 124 million children and young people were out of school, and millions more in school, but not receiving an adequate education (Education Aid Watch, 2015). Over 70 per cent of children out of primary and secondary school are in Sub-Saharan Africa and Southern Asia. In 2015, 781 million adults could not read and write (Ibid.). Children from the poorest 20 percent of households are nearly four times as likely to be out of school. Children in rich households achieve greater proficiency in reading by the end of primary school than those in poor households, and urban students score higher in reading than rural students (UNDP, 2018). SDG 4 includes a commitment to free quality education for all. The Incheon Declaration recommends 12 years of free public schooling, of which 9 years should be compulsory (UNDP, 2018, UNESCO, 2015). This commitment will not be possible without significant donor support (Education Aid Watch, 2015).

SDG 4 includes a commitment to expand access to scholarships for enrolment in higher education in developing countries, particularly least developed countries and small island developing states and African countries. Unfortunately, in 2013, 70 per cent of education aid for post-secondary education, was spent supporting foreign students to study in donor countries, meaning that aid money was not supporting higher education systems within developing countries (Education Aid Watch, 2015). Such efforts tend to support better-off students; it is not pro-poor, and can actually increase inequality (Ibid.). Overseas Development Assistance (ODA) for scholarships dropped between 2014 and 2015, from US\$1.2 billion, to US\$1 billion (UNDP, 2018).

As a share of Overseas Development Assistance (ODA), education is rising at a slower rate than overall aid. From 2012 to 2013 total ODA disbursements rose 9 per cent, while education rose by only 6 per cent. Between 2000 and 2015 an average of 8.6 per cent of all development assistance went to education (Education Aid Watch, 2015). Education's share of ODA fell from 9.7 per cent in 2009 to 8.1 per cent in 2013, implying a lower priority to education (Ibid.). Education has never reached 10 per cent of ODA despite this being a commitment by donor countries, and despite good education being a top priority for citizens in receiving countries according to the United Nations My World 2015 survey (Education Aid Watch, 2015, United Nations, 2015). This is also the case despite there being a specific goal to ensure that funding is not a barrier to education, and clear indications that funding has not been sufficient (Education Aid Watch, 2015). A good governance mechanism which could best target educational aid spending, would be to have aid aligned around developing country leadership, ownership and implementation, i.e. requiring donors to channel their funds via government systems where possible, to coordinate to support country efforts instead of donor preferences and provide predictable budget support. This was recommended in the 2000 Dakar Framework for Action, and its value noted in the Global Education Monitoring Report (UNESCO, 2018a, Education Aid Watch, 2015). Despite this, the share of total education aid disbursed through the public sector fell by 25 per cent between 2009 and 2013. In 2015 only approximately half of all aid was being channelled through government systems, and some of this is being channelled through donor country governments, rather than recipient countries, and not reflecting recipient country priorities (Education Aid Watch, 2015). Education is being de-prioritized by multiple donors, including the EU, Spain, Canada, Germany and the Netherlands, often with the assumption that other donors will cover the shortfall (Education Aid Watch, 2015).

In 2012 there were 33.8 million children out of school living in conflict-affected countries, 70 per cent of which lived in countries with protracted crises (Education Aid Watch, 2015). A target of 4 per cent of short-term humanitarian aid being allocated to education was set by the UN Secretary General, however, in 2014 it was only 1.4 per cent, a drop from 2.2 per cent in 2009 (Ibid.).

One of the indicators of good governance is accountability. Accountability means being responsive and transparent in commitments that have been made. This allows for planning, as funds are predictable and guaranteed. Multilateral donors, and government donors are both accountable to the recipients of education funding in developing countries, and need to be held to this standard for SDG 4 to be met.

Another key challenge hindering improving access to education is increasing prioritization of resources at the national level in affected countries, such as for training new teachers. In Burma/Myanmar in 2012, for example, only 1-2 per cent of the state budget was used for education, while 25 per cent went towards defence expenditures (Iyer, 2012). This despite the Incheon Declaration recommending at least 15 – 20 per cent of total public expenditure being directed towards education (and/or 4-6% of GDP) (UNESCO, 2015). Sub-Saharan Africa is also struggling with a teacher shortage with only 44 per cent of pre-primary, 74 per cent of primary, and 55 per cent of secondary school teachers actually trained (UNDP, 2018). Moreover, most schools in the region are struggling with a lack of access to electricity and potable water (Ibid.). An analysis of 66 low- and lower-middle income countries showed that since 2012 more than half have expanded education spending, though only a handful are meeting the 20 per cent and 6 per cent targets of the Incheon Declaration (Education Aid Watch, 2015). SDG 4 supports governments to implement effective education systems that reduce persistent disparities in access to, and completion of, education (UNDP, 2018).

According to Transparency International, corruption in education is among the most significant barriers to realising the universal right to education as it distorts access to, and affects the quality of, education (Transparency International, 2013). Developing countries receiving the most aid for education are often the least equipped to prevent it being redirected away from the intended beneficiaries (Ibid.). Corruption comes in a number of forms, including the misappropriation of funds, or charging students for textbooks and services when they should be provided, but what Transparency International considers the “longest shadow” is the internalisation of corruption as a norm for success in young people, who then go on to recreate it in society as adults (Ibid.).

Both the Incheon Declaration and SDG 4 recognise the importance of gender parity in education. The Incheon Declaration notes that education is the “most powerful means of achieving gender equality, of enabling girls and women to fully participate socially and politically, and [to empower] them economically” (UNESCO, 2015). This is significant because all the SDG’s rely on gender equality in order to be effectively met (UNESCO, 2018b). However, the SDG 4 does not yet go far enough in this regard. Inequality can take many forms, such as under-representation of women in leadership positions in educational institutions, unsuitable school infrastructure, or inappropriate representations of gender and women in school textbooks, and not just the simple representation of girls as students (UNESCO, 2018b). The good governance framework includes participation and equitability and inclusiveness, which are vital to providing female insight into these issues in the decision making process, and ensuring gender equality at all levels of education. This participatory approach can also be used to ensure individualized needs of students are met, such as minority students having language appropriate education, and special needs students being supported, making education more equitable in outcome as well as opportunity.

There is also a division in access to quality education in some developed countries. Education has not been isolated from the rise of neoliberalism since the 1980’s, which has led to increased competition between schools in developed countries. Parents have had increased choice in which school to send their children to in two thirds of OECD countries (UNESCO, 2018a). However, teachers perceive that this competition has negatively impacted learning and teaching quality (Ibid.). In the United States charter schools have deepened segregation, benefiting wealthy families, and providing limited choice to disadvantaged students (Ibid.).

Good governance can be used as a tool to address this range of shortfalls in the provision of education to meet SDG 4. A participatory approach in policy making and monitoring supports an accountable educational system, which is transparent and responsive to the beneficiaries. A transparent system allows for more effective cooperative between actors, such as donors and recipient governments, and also between donors, who may not otherwise be aware of each other’s priorities and targets. The efficient and effective targeting of resources can ensure that countries with the most need are prioritized, and systems within donor countries are prioritised ahead of attendance in developed country universities. Effective and efficient allocation of resources reduces the financial burden of the system, while limiting negative impacts on education through disruptions. Good governance at the international aid level could support sufficient and more effective spending on education.

GOOD GOVERNANCE AND SDG 5 – GENDER EQUALITY

SUMMARY

SDG 4 seeks to ensure inclusive and Sustainable Development Goal Five (SDG 5) seeks to achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls. It does this through recognising several areas in which women and girls face discrimination and disadvantages. It seeks to end all forms of discrimination through the implementation of legal frameworks which promote, monitor and enforce equality and non-discrimination. It aims to eliminate all forms of violence against women, including domestic violence, trafficking, exploitation and female genital mutilation, and end child marriage. It seeks recognition of the value of the unpaid labour and care work that falls disproportionately on women. And it seeks full and effective participation and equal opportunities in decision making and leadership positions, in political, economic and public life. Rights to reproductive health, and rights to economic resources are also included. Good governance is equitable and inclusive, which supports the targeted inclusion of women in all, areas of society, such as education, the workplace and government. Women face multiple barriers to political representation, including voter perceptions of women, limited access to resources, the additional unpaid labour burden on women, and expectations and pressure by male family members against women running for office (UNDP, 2017). Women being seen to contribute to decision making can lead to a social shift in the perception of the role of women. The view that gender is directly related to biological sex ignores the experiences of members of the LGBTQI community. Gender is not a binary between men and women. Gender is the recognition of socially defined roles and attributes that are assigned to men and women based on their perceived sex. Not conforming to these perceived role expectations can also lead to discrimination, exclusion and violence. Using intersectionality in good governance would allow for representation of these other groups, and for a more inclusive society. The pressures facing women and girls are both structural and social, occurring in both the public and private spheres, and can be mitigated through gender-responsive governance. Gender-responsive governance includes modifying discriminatory social norms through targeted policy making, not only in government, but also other governance structures in social institutions and workplaces.

IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS

Sustainable Development Goal Five (SDG 5) seeks to achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls. It does this through recognising several areas in which women and girls face discrimination and disadvantages. It seeks to end all forms of discrimination through the implementation of legal frameworks which promote, monitor and enforce equality and non-discrimination. It aims to eliminate all forms of violence against women, including domestic violence, trafficking, exploitation and female genital mutilation, and end child marriage. It seeks recognition of the value of the unpaid labour and care work that falls disproportionately on women. And it seeks full and effective participation and equal opportunities in decision making and leadership positions, in political, economic and public life. Rights to reproductive health, and rights to economic resources are also included.

Good governance has a strong role to play in addressing gender inequality. Good governance is participatory, so can support women into decision-making roles; improving the extent to which women's interests are advanced politically, and promoting policy with a strong gender focus which can challenge the areas outlined in SDG 5's indicators. Good governance is equitable and inclusive, which supports the targeted inclusion of women in all, areas of society, such as education, the workplace and government. It promotes accountability to stakeholders, which includes women of all diversities.

In 2014, 143 countries had guaranteed formal equality between men and women in their constitutions (UNDESA, 2018). However formal equality does not automatically translate into substantive equality. Formal equality aims to ensure equality of opportunity. Substantive equality aims to ensure equality of outcomes by challenging the norms that prevent women accessing opportunities (EIGE, 2018). Good governance in the area of gender equality means governing in a way that recognises the specific challenges faced by women and responding with gender-conscious solutions to ensure equal outcomes. Good governance is not exclusive to governments, but in all institutions and bodies, such as schools and workplaces. At the government level, a key part of this inclusion is Gender-Responsive Budgeting (GRB), which ensures that the collection and allocation of resources is sensitive to being gender-equitable. This does not mean a 50:50 divide in funds, between men and women, but rather an analysis which ensures that budgets take into account their effect on different genders and the roles and norms associated with them (Women's Budget Group, 2018). GRB considers how funds are raised, such as flat taxes which disproportionately impact people on low incomes, and how they are spent, including on public services.

This analysis helps to highlight areas of life that are not often measured, and allows for more equitable outcomes, thus allowing governments to meet their gender priorities (Ibid.). This is particularly important as National Women's Machinerys are chronically underfunded worldwide, and facing other challenges, such as political and institutional constraints, and lack of autonomy (McBride and Mazur, 2011).

"Women's issues" are often situated as minority issues. Women are not a minority in terms of numbers, but are a minority in the sense that they hold less social power than men, and are under-represented in decision making positions (Turner, 2017). However, treating issues seen to relate to women as minority issues ignores the wider impact that gender responsive governance has on all members of society. Ensuring access to reproductive healthcare, for instance, is not just a women's issue as the services also provide STD and cancer screenings for men, and reduces unwanted pregnancies, which also affect men. Men exposed to family planning early are also more likely to have a positive attitude towards contraceptive use (Wegner et al., 1998).

Women face multiple barriers to political representation, including voter perceptions of women, limited access to resources, the additional unpaid labour burden on women, and expectations and pressure by male family members against women running for office (UNDP, 2017). One way participation can be achieved is through the use of temporary special measures (TSM), which might include party quotas or reserved seats for women, or specific campaign funding for female candidates (UNDP, 2017). In 2016, women's parliamentary participation globally increased to 23 percent, an increase of six percentage points over a decade (UNDESA, 2018). However despite these gains, women continue to face higher barriers to entry into public life, and their representation across countries varies significantly (UNDP, 2017). Women being seen to contribute to decision making can lead to a social shift in the perception of the role of women. Women acted as a catalyst during the peace process in Bougainville, Papua New Guinea. There are reports of women pulling their sons and husbands by the ear and demanding an end to the fighting. This raised the esteem of women socially, and they became viewed as integral to the decision-making process. This challenged traditional understandings of gender roles and promoted more positive attitudes to the inclusion of women in political participation (UNDP, 2017).

Good governance must follow the rule of law; however, women are frequently not effectively protected by the law. As such good governance can be the mechanism by which inadequate laws are rejected under SDG 5, and updated to include, for example, the criminalisation of violence against women, and include effective measures to address abuses where they occur. Such laws codify women's right to live free from violence, can act as a symbol of such violence being socially unacceptable, and can serve as a deterrent, to reduce the incidence of violence (Klugman, 2017). Globally, 35 percent of women have experience some form of physical and/or sexual violence in their lifetime (UN Women, 2017). The Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) is often described as an international bill of rights for women. It is a voluntary mechanism that is binding once ratified, which countries can use to commit to ending discrimination against women using the guidelines and measures outlined therein (UN Women, 2009). In the South Pacific where up to 70% of women have suffered some form of violence, 11 countries have now implemented some form of family protection or domestic violence legislation since 2008 (Awa, 2014).

Gender-responsive laws can also support women to balance work with family commitments, such as offering protection of employment for maternity leave. Out of 185 countries, only 2 provide no statutory cash benefits for maternity leave. Among developed countries the United States is the only country that does not provide this. However the amounts of leave and payment vary significantly with more than half of countries providing benefits that were not sufficient, so the benefits of this leave is also highly variable (ILO, 2018).

Challenging expectations and norms around gender-based roles in caregiving and unpaid domestic labour could also support a reconsideration of the ways these norms disadvantage men. Assumptions around women's role as caregivers coincide with suspicion and derision of men performing these roles (Roberts-Holmes, 2009). Work-life balance should be an issue addressed for both men and women. Recognising the needs of men to have family time, and the responsibility of men to their home and families, could contribute to improving work-life balance for women as family policies become available for men, and men take on a greater share of domestic labour.

Good governance can also be used to ensure equal participation in education, such as through school boards ensuring toilet facilities are available for girls during puberty, a common reason for girls missing school at this age (Yakupitiyage, 2016). In 2013, two-thirds of the 757 million people aged 15 and over who could not read or write were women and girls (UNDP, 2018). Furthermore, one in ten girls were out of school compared to one in twelve boys (Ibid.). The gender gap in education grows as the children get older. While there are high levels of gender parity in primary school, this drops at secondary school and particularly in rural areas (UNDP, 2010). Gender equality in education is also threatened by social perceptions about the value of educating girls, particularly when there are limited resources available and the family cannot afford to educate all their children. In Malawi, a World Bank initiative paid stipends to adolescent girls, along with cash transfers to parents, which resulted in drop-out rates for girls of approximately 40% (UNICEF, 2007). Raising educated women is key to ensuring equality of representation and equitable decision-making (UNICEF, 2007). Policies that require the education of girls, for example, also gradually shift cultural expectations about girls' education over time, as educated women are more likely to insist on education for their daughters.

Women have different access than men to medical services, depending on their context. In countries where healthcare is not publicly provided, women having lower incomes, or being financially dependent on a spouse can limit their access. For instance, women are the largest consumers of healthcare in the USA. However they face higher premiums for health insurance, and are less likely to be eligible for insurance because they are more likely to work part time, or have lower incomes (Tingen et al., 2010). When women do get treated, they may not be believed about the pain they report; women are more likely to be given sedatives, and men more likely to be given pain medication (Hoffmann and Tarzian, 2001). But the bias against women begins as early as the research into diseases. Women are not being included in research in sufficient numbers and studies that include women are not effective in reporting sex aggregated results, meaning that guidelines developed from study of male bodies is generalised to cover all genders (Kim et al., 2010, Holdcroft, 2007). Furthermore women-specific healthcare issues, such as maternal health go underfunded relative to other medical issues (Fisk and Atun, 2009). Good governance on medical boards, university ethical boards, and medical universities can help generate gender-responsive policies for women-centred healthcare and contribute to reducing chronic pain issues in women and maternal mortality.

This analysis must be held within an intersectional framework, which recognises that being female is not a person's only identity. Many women struggle to access their rights not only as women, but also as members of minority groups, such as race, language, disability or sexuality groups. Gender responsive good governance must also be sensitive to the ways women's challenges are exacerbated by different contexts. For example, a disabled girl may not be able to access the girl's toilets at school if these are not built with access for people in wheelchairs. The view that gender is directly related to biological sex ignores the experiences of members of the LGBTQI community. Gender is not a binary between men and women. Gender is the recognition of socially defined roles and attributes that are assigned to men and women based on their perceived sex. Not conforming to these perceived role expectations can also lead to discrimination, exclusion and violence. Using intersectionality in good governance would allow for representation of these other groups, and for a more inclusive society.

The pressures facing women and girls are both structural and social, occurring in both the public and private spheres, and can be mitigated through gender-responsive governance. Gender-responsive governance includes modifying discriminatory social norms through targeted policy making, not only in government, but also other governance structures in social institutions and workplaces. By using a good governance framework that is participatory, equitable and inclusive, institutions and governments can challenge rules and laws that leave women excluded from effective inclusion in society.

GOOD GOVERNANCE AND SDG 9 – INDUSTRY, INNOVATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

SUMMARY

Sustainable Development Goal 9 (SDG 9) seeks to build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialisation and foster innovation. Infrastructure provides the physical landscape essential for society to operate. Industrialisation is key for economic growth as it creates job opportunities which have the potential to reduce income poverty. Innovation advances the technological capacities of countries along with the development of new skills (UNDP, 2017). The goal acknowledges the disparities between developed and developing countries, which presents a challenge in accomplishing this goal. Good governance plays a key role at institutional, national, and international donor levels to ensure that this development is accountable to those affected by it. Good governance is accountable and participatory, and infrastructure must be built to meet the needs of all users, for instance, rural users also require access to water and waste systems. The decisions to build infrastructure must also take into consideration the rights of the current users of the land. Transparency in the acquiring of land for infrastructure can help to overcome corruption and the violation of human rights. Another aim of SDG 9 is to enhance scientific research and upgrade technological capabilities, particularly in developing countries, by increasing research and development. In order to meet SDG 9, developing countries will require support from developed countries, either through shared innovations, or through donor funding dedicated to this area. Good governance through transparency, and which is inclusive and responsive to specific context and needs could be one means for governments to collaborate in the pursuit of this goal. Good governance is key at the local, institutional and international levels to meet these challenges, through practices which are accountable and responsive to all stakeholders, transparent, inclusive and equitable.

IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS

Sustainable Development Goal 9 (SDG 9) seeks to build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialisation and foster innovation. Infrastructure provides the physical landscape essential for society to operate. Industrialisation is key for economic growth as it creates job opportunities which have the potential to reduce income poverty. Innovation advances the technological capacities of countries along with the development of new skills (UNDESA, 2017). The goal acknowledges the disparities between developed and developing countries, which presents a challenge in accomplishing this goal. Good governance plays a key role at institutional, national, and international donor levels to ensure that this development is accountable to those affected by it.

Water, power, transport networks and waste systems are more than their physical infrastructural set-up, but also include the delivery of the services, as well as maintenance. Establishing physical infrastructure which is adequate (effective and efficient) goes hand in hand with the provision of the associated service infrastructure. Good governance must be present throughout this chain, at the physical built level and the operation of the infrastructure and the service delivery. Good governance is accountable and participatory, and infrastructure must be built to meet the needs of all users, for instance, rural users also require access to water and waste systems. In 2010, access to safe and clean drinking water and sanitation was recognised as a human right by the UN General Assembly. However, the Millennium Development Goal target to halve the proportion of the population without access to improved sanitation facilities was missed by almost 700 million people (WHO, 2017). In Nepal 10.3 million people live without easy access to roads in good or fair condition, this rises to 15 million in Mozambique (World Bank, 2017). Building resilient infrastructure means building infrastructure that is able to meet today's as well as tomorrow's demands while being able to withstand shocks, such as physical damage and interruptions to service.

While government plays a large role in the creation of the built environment, many of the services are often run by private enterprise. This is despite the lack of evidence of cost savings from privatisation (Bel et al., 2010). Privatisation is part of the neoliberal framework recommended to developing countries since the 1980's. However privatisation puts profits as the primary motivator, and social objectives, such as reducing poverty and promoting equity, are not promoted (Bayliss and McKinley, 2007). In Sub-Saharan Africa privatisation has been particularly harmful because the focus on privatisation led to a reduction in donor spending, despite a lack of interest from private investors, and increasing government incentives to the private sector (Ibid.). The costs of privatisation can include loss of access to services as prices rise and disconnections occur for non-payment. There are other health consequences as people are forced to use alternative unsafe water sources. Such an incidence caused an outbreak of cholera in 2000 in South Africa. In Malawi a 25 percent rise in electricity prices led to record use of charcoal, which had been illegal since 1997 to prevent deforestation (Ibid.). Without access to public water supplies, water vendors can take advantage, such as those charging 8-10 times the cost of piped water, to provide water to slums in Nairobi (Ibid.). The large role played by private enterprise means there is a need for good governance in/of these private businesses that reflect their accountability to their users, and work with government on the challenge of provision of essential services to those in rural areas and the poor. SDG 9 aims to upgrade infrastructure, and retrofit industries to make them sustainable, with the adoption of clean and environmentally sound

technologies and industrial processes (UNDESA, 2017). However, it is not enough to be sustainable going forward, as existing industrialisation has already degraded the environment. The costs of externalities have not been incurred by businesses, but by the wider community. This has meant profitable companies, meanwhile, forests, waterways, and air have been destroyed and polluted, depriving people of safe and sustainable environments.(Bhandari and Garg, 2016). Therefore, governance that is accountable to the public might include regulations to make business accountable for externalities, and to mend existing damage from industrialisation as part of the efforts to meet SDG 9. However, responsibility is relative. While developed countries have the capacity to shift to sustainable practices, developing regions have higher intensity carbon emissions in their manufacturing and are taking on an increasing share of this (UNDESA, 2017) , but have less capacity to shift to sustainable infrastructure.

There are challenges to upgrading technologies and infrastructure to be more sustainable as required by SDG 9. In 2013 the International Energy Agency estimated that global consumer subsidies for fossil fuels cost US\$548 billion, while renewable energy subsidies were only US\$121 billion (Bridle and Kitson, 2014). These subsidies create an unequal playing field for the development and implementation of green energy, which would make manufacturing processes more sustainable. The subsidies make renewable energy less cost competitive, it reinforces the position of fossil fuels as the norm, and leads to a favouring of fossil fuels over renewable alternatives (Ibid.). SDG 9 cannot be effectively met without an assessment of fuel subsidies using the good governance framework of transparency.

Developed and developing countries gain significantly different value from manufacturing. Manufacturing in developed countries continues to focus on more technologically complex products, with medium and high-tech products contributing 80 percent of total manufacturing output. In developing countries, the share is barely 10 percent of output. The consequence of this is that manufacturing value added per capita in Europe and North America was US\$4,621 in 2016. In the least developed countries the per capita value add was only US\$100 (UNDESA, 2017). The infrastructure required in developing countries to produce the higher value goods which are still controlled by developed countries requires large investments. However, in 2014 the main sectors receiving official flows for economic infrastructure were transport and energy (Ibid.).

The decisions to build infrastructure must also take into consideration the rights of the current users of the land. Transparency in the acquiring of land for infrastructure can help to overcome corruption and the violation of human rights. Land confiscation is common in many places for infrastructure development. People who have farmed land for generations, or have returned to land after conflict, often lack legal documentation to prove their rights to the land (Human Rights Watch, 2015). For instance, this is affecting farmers in Burma, where communities in over 60 villages have lost land and homes for the construction of roads and other infrastructure for a new dam. (Burma Campaign UK, 2014)Regarding corruption, in Nepal, the former Chief Secretary of the Government discovered corrupt dealings in the sale of government land, publicised this on social media, and through the pressure of 120,000 respondents, the sales were stopped. This example shows not only the threat of bad governance to the use and development of land and infrastructure but also the impact of an informed, responsive citizenry in holding leaders to account (Just Governance for Human Security, 2016).

Another aim of SDG 9 is to enhance scientific research, and upgrade technological capabilities, particularly in developing countries, by increasing research and development. Global expenditures on research and development differ greatly by region. While developed countries spent 2.4 percent of GDP on this area in 2013, developing regions spent 1.2 percent, and least developed countries and landlocked developing countries spent 0.3 percent. The number of researchers is similarly skewed with only 65 researchers per 1 million inhabitants in least developed countries, and 3,641 per million in developed regions (UNDESA, 2017). In order to meet SDG 9, developing countries will require support from developed countries, either through shared innovations, or through donor funding dedicated to this area. Good governance through transparency, and which is inclusive and responsive to specific context and needs could be one means for governments to collaborate in the pursuit of this goal.

Good governance in the trade sphere can help create protected spaces for the growth of new industries, particularly in developing countries. Protection of infant industries has been common for developed countries. However, the rise of free-trade agreements has led to reduced opportunities for developing countries to use this kind of protection further embedding a disparity of opportunity between developed and developing countries (Chang and Bond, 2007). Negotiating trade agreements which protect local industry is one way to foster local innovation in developing countries in particular. In order to do this, transparent governance at the level of international bodies, such as the World Trade Organisation is also required.

SDG 9 seeks to build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialisation and foster innovation. However, it faces significant challenges in the form of disparity of capacity and opportunity between developed and developing countries. Regarding sustainability, it faces the challenges of the ubiquity of fossil fuel. Regarding human rights, it faces the challenges of meeting the needs of the poor and those in rural areas, as well as balancing development with the rights of people to the lands they use. Good governance is key at the local, institutional and international levels to meet these challenges, through practices which are accountable and responsive to all stakeholders, transparent, inclusive and equitable.

GOOD GOVERNANCE AND SDG 11 – SUSTAINABLE CITIES AND COMMUNITIES

SUMMARY

Sustainable Development Goal eleven (SDG 11) seeks to make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable. It proposes to do this through ensuring access to safe, affordable housing and basic services for all, and to upgrade slums. To provide accessible and sustainable transport systems, and improving public transport services, with special attention to diverse and vulnerable groups. It seeks to reduce the number of deaths caused by disasters, and promotes focussing on the poor and vulnerable. Cities also create significant air pollution and waste which the goal seeks to limit, along with the per capita impact of cities. But this goal is also bold, it seeks not just clean cities, but liveable cities with accessible green and public spaces to be enjoyed, and make the cities socially liveable too by targeting harassment. The way cities are planned, including the planning of housing and settlements, the provision of education, healthcare, transport, public spaces, water, electricity and internet lines, all point to a direct link between the role of good governance in making cities inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable. Where people are living in slum conditions they also face exclusion from participating in the economic, social, political and cultural spheres of society, all of which enhance capabilities and open new opportunities (like employment and education). People can also experience social segregation, which can include people feeling unable to safely enter public areas based on factors such as sex, age or race, or physically unable to due to disability. SDG 11 calls for the creation of public spaces and public transport that are safely accessible and affordable regardless of social group, and accessible for people with disabilities. Cities and human settlements which are sustainable are those which have a reasonable expectation of ongoing access to basic services, have a limited social and environmental cost, and which have the ability to continue on. Good governance can assist in challenging these barriers by addressing the physical, social and legal environments in which they occur and providing equitable and accessible services for all.

IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS

Sustainable Development Goal eleven (SDG 11) seeks to make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable. It proposes to do this through ensuring access to safe, affordable housing and basic services for all, and to upgrade slums. To provide accessible and sustainable transport systems, and improving public transport services, with special attention to diverse and vulnerable groups. It seeks inclusive and sustainable urbanization, which takes into account sustainable settlement planning and management. It seeks to reduce the number of deaths caused by disasters, and promotes focussing on the poor and vulnerable. Cities also create significant air pollution and waste which the goal seeks to limit, along with the per capita impact of cities. But this goal is also bold, it seeks not just clean cities, but liveable cities with accessible green and public spaces to be enjoyed, and make the cities socially liveable too by targeting harassment. The way cities are planned, including the planning of housing and settlements, the provision of education, healthcare, transport, public spaces, water, electricity and internet lines, all point to a direct link between the role of good governance in making cities inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable.

The way that people are physically organised in their environment can have a significant impact on their ability to meaningfully participate in society. In recent decades there has been a rapid growth in urban populations; in 2015, 4 billion people, 54 percent of the world's population, lived in cities. This is expected to rise to 5 billion by 2030 (UNDP, 2017b). This sudden density of human living has come with significant challenges, such as an increase in people living in slums, pollution, and lack of basic services and infrastructure (Ibid.). Dense populations in urban areas, and temporary housing situations also make people more vulnerable to the impact of natural disasters and climate change (Ibid.). Cities around the world are experiencing unplanned urban sprawl (Ibid), putting further pressure on access to services, such as waste disposal and health infrastructure, and increasing pollution. For every 10 percent increase in urban sprawl, there is a 9.6 percent increase in per capita hazardous pollution, and a 5.7 percent increase in carbon dioxide emissions (Ibid.).

Rapid urbanisation has contributed to the rise of inadequate concentrated living spaces, slums and informal settlements in a short space of time. Despite the percentage of population in developing countries living in slums dropping from 39 percent in 2000, to 30 percent in 2014, the absolute number of people living in slums has continued to grow (UNDP, 2017b). In 2000, an estimated 792 million urban residents lived in slum conditions. In 2014 it was 880 million urban residents (Ibid.). Overcrowding and lack of effective waste disposal mechanisms are major factors in the transmission of diseases, such as acute respiratory infections, meningitis, typhus, cholera, scabies etc. (World Health Organisation, 2017). Out of 101 countries studied between 2009 and 2013, 65 percent of the urban population was served by public waste collection services (UNDP, 2017b). Less than half of solid waste is safely disposed of in many developing regions (Ibid.). Overcrowding in public health infrastructures, such as local health clinics and hospitals, also concentrates disease presence and increases the risk of spreading illness (World Health Organisation, 2017). Dense populations also contribute to air pollution; in 2014, 90 percent of people living in cities were breathing air that did not comply with World Health Organisation standards, and around half were exposed to air pollution levels 2.5 times higher than the maximum standards (UNDP, 2017b).

Poverty and social exclusion are mutually reinforcing. Where people are living in slum conditions they also face exclusion from participating in the economic, social, political and cultural spheres of society, all of which enhance capabilities and open new opportunities (like employment and education). This exclusion compounds the poverty of already poor people (Arimah, 2001). Ensuring adequate housing and basic services through planning and regulation therefore impacts on the ability of poor and marginalised people to participate socially throughout their lives. Higher infrastructure spending can have a direct impact on the prevalence and intensity of slums and informal settlements. A 1 percent increase in health expenditure (as a share of GDP), reduces the prevalence of slums by between 5.1 and 5.7 percent. Provision of water, sanitation and waste infrastructure also reduces the health burden on these communities. A 1 percent increase in paved roads reduces the prevalence of slums by between 0.32 and 0.38 percent (Ibid.). Improved road networks and transportation infrastructure can reduce social exclusion by improving access of slum dwellers, and informal settlements, to employment, education, and other social activity opportunities (Ibid.). Good governance in planning, which is responsive and accountable to the needs of the population, is key to arresting rising inequality and allowing meaningful participation in society. Good governance is especially important in instances of public/private partnership, where private enterprise is being entrusted with filling public service needs to ensure that the outcomes are transparent and responsive to the community rather than solely profitable for companies (See Good Governance and SDG 9).

People can also experience social segregation, which can include people feeling unable to safely enter public areas based on factors such as sex, age or race, or physically unable to due to disability. SDG 11 calls for the creation of public spaces and public transport that are safely accessible and affordable regardless of social group, and accessible for people with disabilities. Those in vulnerable situations cannot be assumed to have access and must be paid direct attention by governing bodies in order to ensure access. If designed to be inclusive using “universal design” principles from the beginning of planning and design, inclusive urban infrastructure bears almost no, or only 1 percent additional costs (UNDESA, 2016). Such design could include ramps from sidewalk to road at intersections for easy access to crossing for wheelchairs and prams, or good lighting in public spaces to make female commuters feel safe traveling home after work (UN Women, 2017). It also requires the creation and effective enforcement of laws targeting harassment (Ibid.).

Effective transportation infrastructure services generate employment and wealth and drive economic development (UNDP, 2017a). Equitable access to these services is imperative for the inclusive development of society, such as equal access to employment and educational opportunities. In Quito, Ecuador, 84 percent of women identified public transport as unsafe. In Mexico City, 75 percent of women who travel daily in the city use public transport; women are more frequent users than men. UN Women is working to create safe public transport options for women in its initiative Safe Cities and Safe Public Spaces (UN Women, 2017). Such strategies include remodelling trolley stops with transparent glass, and providing secure waiting areas. It also includes training transport staff members to respond to harassment and support survivors. They are also supporting the reporting of harassment with care services at transport stations (Ibid.).

Cities and human settlements which are sustainable are those which have a reasonable expectation of ongoing access to basic services, have a limited social and environmental cost, and which have the ability to continue on. Rapid urbanisation raises the risk of the population to natural disasters. In many countries where slums and informal settlements have formed, buildings are concentrated in vulnerable areas, such as low-lying areas, steep slopes and ravines. They are often constructed by the occupants and are not able to withstand severe weather events (Feiden, 2011). Furthermore, without formal ownership of the land, or reliable rental tenure, occupants face a harder recovery following such events. During severe weather events, evacuation can be made difficult by the density of dwellings, flooding from poor drainage and lack of suitable roads (Ibid.). During recovery, the destruction can be greater because of their makeshift nature, making recovery of people and property more difficult. The losses, without the means of individuals to recover and formal support mechanisms, can further entrench the division of those in poverty. The resiliency of a city is determined by whether it is able to absorb outside disturbances, like severe weather events, and still function. In this scenario, good governance includes having civil defence planning be inclusive of informal settlement areas, being responsive to their unique needs, and using participation to gain insight into the needs and risks associated with severe weather.

Efforts to target slums, such as providing housing can fail to target the most vulnerable and not take income into account, the result being that houses built to relocate slums have been re-targeted at the middle class for cost recovery (Arimah, 2001). City planning also needs to include recognition of market forces, where rising rents associated with improved areas can become unaffordable to existing inhabitants (Ibid.). Good governance could include recognition of poorer tenants, and consider such mechanisms as rent regulations to prevent the displacement of people from their homes.

It should be clear that many of the challenges facing creating cities and human settlements which are inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable, are challenges facing good governance. Without clear data on the requirements of residents, officials are faced with difficulties in determining social needs and planning social services. Many of the most vulnerable people face existing social barriers, such as stigmas based on social class, race, sex, age and disability which intersect and compound, limiting opportunities for social inclusion. Good governance can assist in challenging these barriers by addressing the physical, social and legal environments in which they occur and providing equitable and accessible services for all.

GOOD GOVERNANCE AND SDG 16 PEACE, JUSTICE, AND STRONG INSTITUTIONS

SUMMARY

Sustainable Development Goal 16 (SDG 16) seeks to promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels. The goal calls for a reduction of all forms of violence and related deaths everywhere. It calls for an end to abuse, exploitation, trafficking and all forms of violence against children. It calls for equal justice for all, and a reduction in corruption and bribery. According to the United Nations Economic and Social Council, national governments hold primary responsibility for achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (Committee of Experts on Public Administration, 2017). Central governments are best suited to creating coherent strategies to meet the Goals. However, the national, regional, and local governments and their associated institutions, must work together to enable these strategies. At the individual institutional levels, good governance can be used as a mechanism to promote transparency and reduce corruption, ensure budgets are spent as allocated and that powers are not abused. Peace is a term that can simply mean the absence of conflict. However, even in the absence of war, societies do not have peace where there continues to be high risks to people's physical, social and economic safety. A more comprehensive understanding of peace would include not just the absence of conflict, but the presence of mechanisms to build and reinforce a positive peace (Galtung and Fischer, 2013). There can be no peace or justice in either the public or private sphere without effective social institutions to support positive social relationships and hold accountable those who do not respect peace, justice and human rights. Good governance at the institutional level is a method by which peace and justice can be achieved by making these institutions accountable and responsive to the public they serve. SDG 16 is a bold goal aiming for the eradication of all forms of violence through the building of effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels.

IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS

Sustainable Development Goal 16 (SDG 16) seeks to promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels. The goal calls for a reduction of all forms of violence and related deaths everywhere. It calls for an end to abuse, exploitation, trafficking and all forms of violence against children. It calls for equal justice for all, and a reduction in corruption and bribery. To do this it seeks the development of effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels, and responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision making at all levels. It seeks the inclusion of developing countries in global governance institutions. It also seeks public access to information.

This goal is about shaping the social landscape of societies. Our social infrastructure is organised through institutions which regulate social relationships. Public institutions such as the police and judicial systems enforce limitations on people's actions and support fairness in social relationships in order to ensure peace and justice in society. The educational system is a social system which, among other things, teaches children the expected behaviours in society, which limits the potential for conflict. Families are also a form of social institution in the private sphere. The strength of these institutions impacts the safety, security, peace, and justice experienced by the population.

According to the United Nations Economic and Social Council, national governments hold primary responsibility for achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (Committee of Experts on Public Administration, 2017). Central governments are best suited to creating coherent strategies to meet the Goals. However, the national, regional, and local governments and their associated institutions, must work together to enable these strategies. There is a risk of a silo mentality caused by the narrow focus of individual entities (Ibid.). Local government, and associated institutions, are best placed to open a dialogue with citizens, businesses and civil society actors. Such discourses at the local level are able to include stakeholders in a flexible, spontaneous and innovative way (Ibid.). National governments create legislation and budgets which shape the other governmental and institutional levels.

Budgets must be comprehensive, transparent and realistic, and reflect the needs of society based on the good governance principles of transparency, accountability and responsiveness. The SDG 16 indicators include government expenditure as a proportion of the original approved budget to test this outcome. In 2017, 2 in 3 countries were within 10 percent of their original national budgets, but more than 1 in 7 deviated by at least 15 percent (UNDESA, 2018).

At the individual institutional levels, good governance can be used as a mechanism to promote transparency and reduce corruption, ensure budgets are spent as allocated and that powers are not abused. Corruption reduces state revenue and expenditure efficiency and distorts its allocation between different functions. In some instances, corruption can lead to an increase in public expenditure, however it reduces the amount that reaches its intended

purpose (Delavallade, 2006). In a case study of Ugandan primary schools between 1991 and 1995, only 30 percent of the expenditure per pupil reached schools (Ibid.). Therefore, corruption reduces the quality of the output while raising the cost to the sector (Ibid.).

Independent National Human Rights Institutions (NHRI) play an important role in upholding and maintaining human rights in a country by ensuring that states deliver on their human rights obligations (UNDESA, 2018). By the end of 2016, 37 percent of countries had such an institution which was compliant with the Paris Principles, and 57 percent which had been reviewed for compliance (Ibid.). The Paris Principles are internationally agreed on standards for the implementation of human rights at the institutional level and can guide NHRIs in this role. NHRIs have five key responsibilities under the Paris Principles (Kjærum, 2005). One, they must monitor violations of human rights. Two, they must advise government on specific violations and issues related to legislation being compliant with international human rights instruments. Three, they encourage government to ratify human rights instruments, and the NHRI will contribute to relevant reporting. Four, the NHRI will educate and inform the public on human rights, including through educational programmes and publications. And fifth, the NHRI has a mandate to hear and consider complaints and petitions regarding human rights (Ibid.). Through these mechanisms, the Paris Principles support good governance through transparency and accountability in the human rights sphere.

Peace is a term that can simply mean the absence of conflict. However, even in the absence of war, societies do not have peace where there continues to be high risks to people's physical, social and economic safety. In 2015 between 5.2 and 6.7 persons per 100,000 worldwide were victims of intentional homicide, between 2008 and 2014, the homicide rate in developing countries was twice that of developed countries, and increased in the least developed countries (UNDESA, 2018). A more comprehensive understanding of peace would include not just the absence of conflict, but the presence of mechanisms to build and reinforce a positive peace (Galtung and Fischer, 2013).

But many places in the world are not even experiencing a basic peace. Conflict is causing large civilian casualties, and mass displacement (UNDESA, 2018). SDG 16 seeks to reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere. As such, attention must be paid to violent conflict and the violence faced by displaced populations. More than 400,000 people have died since 2011 in the Syrian conflict alone. More than 5 million are seeking refuge outside the country, and a further 6 million displaced internally (Human Rights Watch, 2018). Refugees face discrimination and uncertainty. In the first five months of 2017, Jordanian authorities deported 2000 refugees back to Syria, and a further 2500 returned under unclear circumstances (Ibid.).

In order for peace to exist, the human rights of all must be respected. These rights are codified in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UNDESA, 2018). Unfortunately, human rights are not equally experienced and some groups, particularly women, children and minorities face higher barriers to justice and economic inclusion. Women and girls face higher rates of human trafficking, particularly sexual trafficking. While the share of trafficking victims being women and girls has dropped from 84 percent in 2001, in 2014 71% of all trafficking victims were still women and girls with 20% of all victims being girl children, compared to 8 percent boy children (UNDESA, 2018).

Globally, rates of pre-trial detention have been steady, which suggests judicial systems have not made substantive progress in processing alleged perpetrators quickly to a trial stage. Between 2003 and 2005, 32 percent of all prisoners globally were being held in detention without being sentenced for a crime. This only dropped by 1 percent by 2013 – 2015 (UNDESA, 2018). The percentage of pre-trial prisoners in developing countries is more than twice that of developed regions. In Southern Asia, in 2012-2014, 2 out of 3 prisoners remained unsentenced (Ibid.).

Human rights within Positive Peace must be respected in both the public and private spheres.

The private sphere benefits from strong institutions which can support the regulation of unwanted behaviour in the home, such as restricting violence against children, disciplinary or otherwise. Between 2005 and 2016, data from 76 countries (mostly developing countries) indicated that 8 in 10 children aged 1 to 14 years were regularly subjected to some form of psychological aggression and/or physical punishment (UNDESA, 2018). The Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) is a legally binding convention ratified almost universally, with only the United States having signed, but not having ratified it (UNOHCHR, 2018). This convention assures the rights of children to live free from violence, including in their homes (UNOHCHR, 2018).

Women and children's access to justice can be hindered by a variety of barriers, including lack of knowledge of, and physical or financial access to, systems of support. They can also lack confidence in systems to protect their wider interests (AWAVA Secretariat, 2016). In Fiji a study found that women wait on average nearly 2 ½ years before bringing their case to the police (FWRM, 2017). They can also be hindered by agents within the system who hold biased views regarding violence against women and children, hold expectations of the hierarchy of a family home, and are unwilling to prosecute men for what is seen as a private family matter (Amnesty International, 2010).

Police forces are valuable in the maintenance of peace and the respect of human rights in the public sphere, however, their record at achieving this is mixed. Police use of excessive force can target minority populations, or be used to disrupt peaceful protest. Restriction of protest can be violent and lead to arbitrary arrest, detention and ill treatment (Amnesty International, 2018). In Kenya following the general election in 2017, 33 people, including 2 children, were killed during protests in which police used live ammunition and tear gas (Ibid.). Police can also crack down on human rights by detaining activists and through unlawful killing (Ibid.).

Institutions must also be transparent. One means of achieving transparency is through freedom of information. More than 110 countries have adopted freedom of information legislation, however 47 countries lack suitable public information about these processes and another 47 fall short of having clear legal exceptions to the right to request information (UNDESA, 2018). A free press is also necessary to the spread of information, and needs to be protected. Despite this, violence against journalists is increasing, with 65 killed in 2010, rising to 114 in 2015 (Ibid.).

Educational tools for the establishment of a peaceful society face barriers when the history that needs to be told is constructed through the lens of a powerful group, and that group challenges any attempts to change it. For instance, textbooks in Japan underplay the seriousness of their wartime activities in China and South Korea (Hayashi, 2015).

There can be no peace or justice in either the public or private sphere without effective social institutions to support positive social relationships and hold accountable those who do not respect peace, justice and human rights. Good governance at the institutional level is a method by which peace and justice can be achieved by making these institutions accountable and responsive to the public they serve. SDG 16 is a bold goal aiming for the eradication of all forms of violence through the building of effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels.

CONCLUSION

We hope you have found value in this work, in the global perspectives that came together to volunteer their time and voices to it. We hope this is a tool for you in your community to create dialogue, trust, and actionable change. The SDGs are each a part of a whole, they can each be linked in various ways to The Six Pillars of Human Security, this was a sample and we hope you will use this work as a tool to continue to find links and to see the Global Goals as an overarching holistic theme and direction, a call to action and change.

Thank you for taking this step with us. The JGHS Six Pillars of Human Security and the UN Global Goals are a call to action, for each of us in our own way to contribute to the betterment of our local community and beyond to the global community. While this is the conclusion to this project, it is only a step in the conversation. The goals call for far more action to be taken in the process towards accomplishing this agenda and at JGHS and Caux Forum, we will be joining you in this conversation and on this journey.

This project was possible thanks to the JGHS Team and to the incredible dedication and volunteer contribution from participants on the UN Volunteer Platform. Their voices came from countries around the world, lending their skills and voices to the project.

For more information on Just Governance for Human Security and The Caux Forum:
<https://www.caux.ch/just-governance>

For more information on the Global Goals:
<https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals/>

For more information on United Nations Volunteers Online Platform:
<https://www.onlinevolunteering.org/en>

EBOOK CONTRIBUTING TEAM

JGHS Leadership, Editing and Content Writing Support, and Overview Team:
Elizabeth Hall, Salma Moustafa Khalil, Shontaye Abegaz and executive committee

United Nations Volunteers Writers: Amy Child, Atifa Hasham, Madison Kennewell, Alison Reiszadeh

United Nations Volunteers Editors: Helen Bradford, Madhu Tuli, Christina Dendy, Sujata Balaram

REFERENCES

SOCIAL INCLUSION

Introduction:

Dugarova, E. & Lavers, T. (2014). Social Inclusion and the Post-2015 Sustainable Development Agenda. Retrieved from <http://www.unrisd.org/unitar-social-inclusion>

Silver, H. (2015). The Contexts of Social Exclusion. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/esa/desa/papers/2015/wp144_2015.pdf

UNESCO. (2017). Exclusion. Retrieved from <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/social-and-human-sciences/themes/international-migration/glossary/exclusion/>

United Nations. (2016). Identifying social inclusion and exclusion. In Report on the World Social Situation Leaving no one behind: the imperative of inclusive development (1). Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/rwss/2016/full-report.pdf>

SDG 1:

Al Jazeera (2018, April 18). Who are the Rohingya. Al Jazeera. Retrieved from <https://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/features/2017/08/rohingya-muslims-170831065142812.html>

Dalrymple, S. (2016, June 20). The refugee crisis is a problem of poverty, not just migration. The Guardian. Retrieved from [HYPERLINK "https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2016/jun/20/the-refugee-crisis-is-a-problem-of-poverty-not-just-migration"](https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2016/jun/20/the-refugee-crisis-is-a-problem-of-poverty-not-just-migration) <https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2016/jun/20/the-refugee-crisis-is-a-problem-of-poverty-not-just-migration>

Dugarova, E. (2015). Social Inclusion, Poverty Eradication and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Retrieved from UNRISD <http://www.unrisd.org/80256B3C005BCCF9/search/0E9547327B7941D6C1257EDF003E74EB?OpenDocument>

Dugarova, E & Lavers, T. (2014). Social Inclusion and the Post-2015 Development Agenda. Retrieved from [HYPERLINK "http://www.unrisd.org/unitar-social-inclusion"](http://www.unrisd.org/unitar-social-inclusion) <http://www.unrisd.org/unitar-social-inclusion>

Oxfam. (2017). Oxfam Briefing Paper: Executive Summary. Retrieved from [HYPERLINK "https://d1tn3vj7xz9fdh.cloudfront.net/s3fs-public/file_attachments/bp-an-economy-that-works-for-women-020317-en-summ.pdf"](https://d1tn3vj7xz9fdh.cloudfront.net/s3fs-public/file_attachments/bp-an-economy-that-works-for-women-020317-en-summ.pdf) https://d1tn3vj7xz9fdh.cloudfront.net/s3fs-public/file_attachments/bp-an-economy-that-works-for-women-020317-en-summ.pdf

UNDESA. (2018). Sustainable Development Goal 1: End poverty in all its forms. Retrieved from [HYPERLINK "https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg1"](https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg1) <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg1>

UN. (2018). End poverty in all its forms everywhere. Retrieved from [HYPERLINK "https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/poverty/"](https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/poverty/) <https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/poverty/>

USA for UNHCR. (2018). Refugee Statistics. Retrieved from ["https://www.unrefugees.org/refugee-facts/statistics/"](https://www.unrefugees.org/refugee-facts/statistics/) <https://www.unrefugees.org/refugee-facts/statistics/>

Verme, P., Gigliarano, C., Wieser, C., Hedlund, K., Petzoldt, M., & Santacroce, M. (2016). The Welfare of Syrian Refugees : Evidence from Jordan and Lebanon. Washington, DC: World Bank.

SDG 3:

Ahearn, F. L. (Ed.) (2000). *Psychosocial Wellness of Refugees: Issues in Qualitative and Quantitative Research*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Balogh, R., H. Ouellette-Kuntz, L. Bourne, Y. Lunskey, & A. Colantonio. (2008). Organising Health Care Services for Persons with an Intellectual Disability. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, 2016, Issue 4. <http://cochranelibrary-wiley.com/doi/10.1002/14651858.CD007492.pub2/pdf>

Baumeister, R. F., J. D. Campbell, J. I. Krueger, & K. D. Vohs. (2003). Does High Self-Esteem Cause Better Performance, Interpersonal Success, Happiness, or Healthier Lifestyles? *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 4:1–44. <https://www.psychologicalscience.org/journals/pspi/pdf/pspi411.pdf>

Berkman, L. F. (1995). The Role of Social Relations in Health Promotion. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 57:245–54.

Berkman, L. F., & T. Glass. (2000). Social Integration, Social Networks, Social Support and Health. In L. F. Berkman & I. Kawachi (Eds.), *Social Epidemiology*, pp. 137–173. New York: Oxford University Press.

Berkman, L. F., T. Glass, I. Brissette, & T. E. Seeman. (2000). From Social Integration to Health: Durkheim in the New Millennium. *Social Science & Medicine*, 51:843–57.

Brissette, I., S. Cohen, & T. E. Seeman. (2000). Measuring Social Integration and Social Networks. In S. Cohen, L. G. Underwood, & B. H. Gottlieb (Eds.), *Social Support Measurement and Intervention: A Guide for Health and Social Scientists*, pp. 53–85. New York: Oxford University Press.

Cassel, J. (1976). The Contribution of the Social Environment to Host Resistance. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 104(2):107–23. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/8f7a/136e43d1e54a87622dc3b8286b4e4fa61916.pdf>

Clemente, F., & M. B. Kleiman. (1977). Fear of Crime in the United States: A Multivariate Analysis. *Social Forces*, 56:331–518.

Cobb, S. (1976). Social Support as a Moderator of Life Stress. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 38:300–14.

Cohen, S., & T.A. Wills. (1985). Stress, Social Support, and the Buffering Hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 98:310–57.

Cohen, S., & D. Janicki-Deverts. (2009). Can We Improve Our Physical Health by Altering Our Social Networks? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 4(Special Issue):375–78.

Correa-Velez, I., S. M. Gifford, & A. G. Barnett. (2010). Longing to Belong: Social Inclusion and Wellbeing Among Youth with Refugee Backgrounds in the First Three Years in Melbourne, Australia. *Social Science & Medicine*, 71(8):1399–1408.

Davies, L. (1984). Nutrition in the Elderly: Identifying Those at Risk. *Proceedings of the Nutrition Society (London)*, 43(1984):295–302.

Department of the Environment, Transportation, and the Regions (DETR). (2000). *Social Exclusion and the Provision and Availability of Public Transport*. DETR, London.

Frongillo, E. A., B. S. Rauschebach, D. A. Roe, & D. F. Williamson. (1992). Characteristics Related to Elderly Person's Not Eating for One or More Days: Implications for Meal Programs. *American Journal of Public Health*, 82(4):600–602.

Gordon, M.T., & S. Riger. (1991). *The Female Fear: The Social Cost of Rape*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Krieger, N., K. Smith, C. Naishadham, & E. M. Barbeau. (2005). Experiences of Discrimination: Validity and Reliability of a Self-Report Measure of Population Health Research on Racism and Health. *Social Science and Medicine*, 61:1576–1596. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/32d8/b0b51fba52fae97a546872e4919ce8648772.pdf>

Lennox, N., C. Bain, T. Rey-Conde, D. Purdie, R. Busg, & N. Pandeya. (2007). Effects of a Comprehensive Health Assessment for Australian Adults with an Intellectual Disability: A Cluster Randomized Trial. *International Journal of Epidemiology*,

36(1):139–146. <https://academic.oup.com/ije/article/36/1/139/667017>

Loizos, P. (2000). Are Refugees Social Capitalists? In S. Baron, J. Field & T. Schuller (Eds.), *Social Capital: Critical Perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McDonald, R., L. Farnworth, & M. Hand. (2012). South East Healthy Communities Partnership: Investigation into Integrated Community Care for People with Disabilities in the South East of Melbourne. Dandenong: SEHCP. <http://www.enliven.org.au/sites/default/files/8435%20SEHCP%20Disability%20Report.compressed.pdf>

McIntosh, W. A., & P. A. Shifflett. (1984). Influence of Social Support Systems on Dietary Intake of the Elderly. *Journal of Nutrition for the Elderly*, 4(1):5–18.

McIntosh, W. A., P. A. Shifflett, & J. S. Picou. (1989). Social Support, Stressful Events, Strain, Dietary Intake, and the Elderly. *Medical Care*, 27:140–153.

Mojtahedi, M. C., P. Boblick, J. H. Rimmer, J. L. Rowland, R. A. Jones, & C. L. Braunschweig. (2008). Environmental Barriers to and Availability of Healthy Foods for People with Mobility Disabilities Living in Urban and Suburban Neighbourhoods. *Archives of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation*, 89(11):2174–2179.

O'Sullivan, K., & L. Olliff. (2006). *Settling in: Exploring Good Settlement for Refugee Young People in Australia*. Melbourne: Centre for Multicultural Youth. <http://www.cmy.net.au/sites/default/files/publication-documents/Settling%20In%202006.pdf>

Portes, A. (1998). Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in Modern Sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24:1–24.

Rabin, D. L., & O. P. Barry. (1995). Community Options for Elderly Patients. In W. Reichel (Ed.), *Care of the Elderly: Clinical Aspects of Aging*, 4th ed., pp. 521–528. Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins.

Ryan, K. C., & M. E. Bower. (1989). Relationship of Socioeconomic Status in Living Arrangements to Nutritional Intake of the Older Person. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association*, 89:1805–1807.

Sen, A. (1993). Capability and Well-being. In A. Sen & M. Nussbaum (Eds.), *The Quality of Life*, pp. 30–53. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Shelley, T. E., and A. L. Stanton. (2007). Coping Resources, Coping Processes, and Mental Health. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 3:377–401.

UNESCO. (2017). Progress Towards the Sustainable Development Goals: Report of the Secretary-General. http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=E/2017/66&Lang=E

Vernon, M. (2008). *Wellbeing*. Durham: Acumen Publishing.

Williams, D. R. (1999). Race, Socioeconomic Status, and Health: The Added Effects of Racism and Discrimination. *Annals New York Academy of Science*, 896:173–188.

Ziersch, A., C. Due, M. Walsh, & K. Arthurson. (2017). *Belonging Begins at Home: Housing, Social Inclusion and Health and Wellbeing for People from Refugee and Asylum Seeking Backgrounds*. Adelaide: Flinders Press. http://www.flinders.edu.au/medicine/fms/sites/southgate/documents/Belonging%20begins%20at%20home%20report_WEB%20-%20final.pdf

SDG 4:

UIS. (2018a). Fact Sheet No. 48. One in Five Children, Adolescents and Youth Is Out of School. <http://uis.unesco.org/sites/default/files/documents/fs48-one-five-children-adolescents-youth-out-school-2018-en.pdf>

UIS. (2018b). Education and Disability: Analysis of Data from 49 Countries. <http://uis.unesco.org/sites/default/files/documents/ip49-education-disability-2018-en.pdf>

UNDESA. (2016). Identifying social inclusion and exclusion. In Report on the World Social Situation Leaving no one behind: the imperative of inclusive development (1). Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/rwss/2016/full-report.pdf>

UNDESA. (2017) Sustainable Development Goal 4. Targets and Indicators. <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg4>

UNESCO. (2017). A Guide for Ensuring Inclusion and Equity in Education. Paris: UNESCO. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0024/002482/248254e.pdf>

UNHCR. (2016). Left Behind: Refugee Education in Crisis. <http://www.unhcr.org/59b696f44.pdf>

Washington Group on Disability Statistics. (2018). Short Set of Disability Questions. Washington Group. <http://www.washingtongroup-disability.com/washington-group-question-sets/short-set-of-disability-questions/>

SDG 5:

End Violence Against Women. (2012). Ensuring gender-responsiveness. Retrieved from "<http://www.endvawnow.org/en/articles/306-ensuring-gender-responsiveness.html>" <http://www.endvawnow.org/en/articles/306-ensuring-gender-responsiveness.html>

OSAGI. (n.d.). Important concepts underlying gender mainstreaming. Retrieved from "<http://www.un.org/womenwatch/osagi/pdf/factsheet2.pdf>" <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/osagi/pdf/factsheet2.pdf>

UN. (2014). Women's rights are human rights. Retrieved from "<http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Events/WHRD/WomenRightsAreHR.pdf>" <http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Events/WHRD/WomenRightsAreHR.pdf>

UN. (2018). Gender Equality: Why it matters. Retrieved from "http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/5_Why-it-Matters_GenderEquality_2p.pdf" http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/5_Why-it-Matters_GenderEquality_2p.pdf

UNDESA. (2018). Sustainable Development Goal 5: Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls. Retrieved from "<https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg5>" <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg5>

UNSDN. (2017). Intersectionality and Working Together to Achieve the SDGs. Retrieved from <http://unsdn.org/2017/07/13/intersectionality-and-working-together-to-achieve-the-sdgs/>

UN Women (2018A). Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) about CEDAW. Retrieved from "<http://asiapacific.unwomen.org/en/focus-areas/cedaw-human-rights/faq#howcedawdifferent>" <http://asiapacific.unwomen.org/en/focus-areas/cedaw-human-rights/faq#howcedawdifferent>

UN Women (2018B). Gender Mainstreaming. Retrieved from "<http://www.unwomen.org/en/how-we-work/un-system-coordination/gender-mainstreaming>" <http://www.unwomen.org/en/how-we-work/un-system-coordination/gender-mainstreaming>

WHO. (2017). Violence against women. Retrieved from "<http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs239/en/>" <http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs239/en/>

SDG 8:

AGERHOLM, H. 2016. Almost one in three Calais child refugees missing since Jungle camp demolition. The Independent. AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL 2016a. No Safe Refuge: Asylum-seekers and refugees denied effective protection in turkey. Amnesty International.

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL 2016b. The Ugly Side of the Beautiful Game: Exploitation of migrant workers on a Qata 2022 World Cup site. London: Amnesty International.

BEISER, M. 2009. Resettling Refugees and Safeguarding their Mental Health: Lessons Learned from the Canadian Refugee Resettlement Project. Transcultural Psychiatry, 46, 539-583.

CORREA-VELEZ, I., BARNETT, A. G. & GIFFORD, S. 2013. Working for a better life : longitudinal evidence on the predictors of employment among recently arrived refugee migrant men living in Australia. International Migration, 53, 321-337.

EDWARDS, M. 2015. Tensions on Nauru heightened after series of attacks on refugees by locals. ABC News, 20.03.2015.

EQUALITY AND HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION Employing Refugees: The documents required as evidence of entitlement to work in the UK. In: COMMISSION, E. A. H. R. (ed.).

GOVERNMENT OF CANADA. 2018. Find out if you're eligible to work in Canada [Online]. Available: <https://www.canada.ca/en/immigration-refugees-citizenship/services/work-canada/permit/temporary/eligibility.html> [Accessed 23.04.2018].

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANISATION 2016. Decent Work for Migrants and Refugees. In: ORGANISATION, I. L. (ed.). MACCHIAVELLO, M. 2003. Forced migrants as an under-utilized asset: refugee skills, livelihoods, and achievements in Kampala, Uganda. In: UNIT, E. A. P. A. (ed.) New Issues in Refugee Research. UNHCR The UN Refugee Agency.

OECD 2014. Is migration good for the economy? In: OECD (ed.).

RED CROSS. 2018. Refugee facts and figures [Online]. Available: <http://www.redcross.org.uk/What-we-do/Refugee-support/Refugee-facts-and-figures> [Accessed].

ZETTER, R. 2012. Are refugees an economic burden or benefit? Forced Migration Review, 50-52.

SDG 10:

ILO. (2017). World Social Protection Report 2017-19: Universal social protection to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals. Retrieved from ILO website: "http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---dcomm/---publ/documents/publication/wcms_604882.pdf" http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---dcomm/---publ/documents/publication/wcms_604882.pdf

UN. (2016). Identifying social inclusion and exclusion. In Report on the World Social Situation Leaving no one behind: the imperative of inclusive development (1). Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/rwss/2016/full-report.pdf>

UN. (2018). Goal 10: Reduce inequality within and among countries. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/inequality/>

UNDESA. (2018A). Sustainable Development Goal 10: Reduce inequality within and among countries. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/inequality/>

UNDESA. (2018B). Fighting inequality becomes top priority for UN Social Development Commission. Retrieved from <https://www.un.org/development/desa/en/news/social/csocd56-closing.html>

UNDP. (2013). Humanity Divided: Confronting Inequality in Developing Countries. Retrieved from UNDP website: "<http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/poverty-reduction/humanity-divided--confronting-inequality-in-developing-countries.html>" <http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/poverty-reduction/humanity-divided--confronting-inequality-in-developing-countries.html>

SDG 11:

Castles, S., H. d. Haas, & M.J. Miller. (2014). The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World. 5th ed. New York: Guilford Press. https://www.macmillanihe.com/resources/sample-chapters/9780230355767_sample.pdf

Dwyer, A. (2011). Broke but Unbroken: Grassroots Social Movements and Their Radical Solutions to Poverty. Halifax: Fernwood Pub.

Florida, R. (2011). "Why Cities Matter." City Lab. <https://www.citylab.com/design/2011/09/why-cities-matter/123/>

Habitat for Humanity. (2017). Building Sustainable Cities and Communities: The New Urban Agenda. <https://www.habitatforhumanity.org.uk/blog/2016/10/building-sustainable-cities-communities/>

Harvey, D. (2008). "The Right to the City." New Left Review, 53. <https://newleftreview.org/II/53/david-harvey-the-right-to-the-city>

Massey, D. S., J. Arango, G. Hugo, A. Kouaouci, A. Pellegrino, & J.E. Taylor. (1993). "Theories of International Migration: A Review and Appraisal." Population and

Development Review, 19(3), 431–466.

Murray, M. J. (2009). "Fire and Ice: Unnatural Disasters and the Disposable Urban Poor in Post-Apartheid Johannesburg." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 33(1), 165–192.

One World TV. (2012). "Sheela Patel and the Cause of Slum Dwellers." YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MtxqXxwYOC0>

SPARC. (2014) "The Indian Alliance" <http://www.sparcindia.org/>

Totaro, P. (2016). "Slumscapes: How the World's Five Biggest Slums Are Shaping Their Futures." Reuters. <https://uk.reuters.com/article/uk-slums-united-nations-world-insight/slumscapes-how-the-worlds-five-biggest-slums-are-shaping-their-futures-idUKKBN12H1GK>

UN-Habitat. (2009). The right to adequate housing. Fact Sheet No, 21.

UN-Habitat. (2016). Slums Almanac 2015–16. Tracking Improvement in the Lives of Slum Dwellers.

UNDESA. (2016). Social inclusion in the age of sustainable development: who is left behind? <https://www.un.org/development/desa/en/news/social/who-is-left-behind.html>

UNDESA. (2017). Sustainable development goal 11. <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg11>

UNSDN. (2014). Social inclusion is integral to sustainable urbanization, says Open Working Group. <http://unsdn.org/2014/02/25/social-inclusion-is-integral-to-sustainable-urbanization-says-open-working-group/>

World Bank. (2015). A new approach to cities: everyone counts. <http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2015/10/29/a-new-approach-to-cities-including-inclusion>

SDG 13:

350.ORG. 2018. Pacific Climate Warriors [Online]. <https://350pacific.org/pacific-climate-warriors/>. [Accessed 27.04.2018].
ARMBRUSTER, S. 2017. A year after Cyclone Winston, Fiji calls for global action on climate change. SBS News.
DENNIS, B. 2017. As Syria embraces Paris climate deal, it's the United States against the world. Washington Post, 07.11.2017.

HARVEY, F. 2015. Paris climate change agreement: the world's greatest diplomatic success. The Guardian.
MATHIESEN, K. & HARVEY, F. 2015. Climate coalition breaks cover in Paris to push for binding and ambitious deal. The Guardian, 08.12.2015.

MCCARTHY, J. J., CANZIANI, O. F., LEARY, N. A., DOKKEN, D. J. & WHITE, K. S. 2001. Climate Change 2001: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Third Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge University Press: International Panel on Climate Change.

NASIKO, R. 2018. Back to the tents. The Fiji Times Online.
NEUMAYER, E. & PLÜMPER, T. 2008. The Gendered Nature of Natural Disasters: The Impact of Catastrophic Events on the Gender Gap in Life Expectancy, 1981–2002. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 97, 551–566.
NEWELL, A., NUTTALL, P. & HOLLAND, E. 2015. Sustainable Sea Transport for the Pacific Islands: The Obvious Way Forward. Global Sustainable Development Report. University of the South Pacific.

PACIFIC BEAT. 2016. Cyclone Winston delivers hit to Fiji sugar industry, Cane Growers Association says. ABC News, 09.03.2016.

PACIFIC ISLAND DEVELOPMENT FORUM SECRETARIAT 2015. Suva Declaration on Climate Change. In: SECRETARIAT, P. I. D. F. (ed.). Suva, Fiji.

RICHARDS, M. 2001. A review of the effectiveness of developing country participation in the climate change convention negotiations. Overseas Development Institute.

SMITH, R. & MCNAMARA, K. E. 2014. Future migrations from Tuvalu and Kiribati: exploring government, civil society and donor perceptions. *Climate and Development*, 7, 47-59.

UNDP 2010. Gender and Disasters. In: RECOVERY, B. F. C. P. A. (ed.).

UNFCCC. 2018. United Nations Climate Change [Online]. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. Available: http://unfccc.int/paris_agreement/items/9444.php [Accessed 12.03.2018 2018].

UNITED NATIONS 2009. Making Disaster Risk Reduction Gender-Sensitive: Policy and Practical Guidelines. United Nations: UNISDR, UNDP, IUCN.

UNOCHA 2016a. Fiji Flash Appeal Tropical Cyclone Winston. <https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/Fiji%20TC%20Winston%20Flash%20Appeal%20FINAL.pdf>: UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA).

UNOCHA. 2016b. Fiji Flash Appeal: Tropical Cyclone Winston, February - May 2016. ReliefWeb, 04.03.2016.

SDG 16:

HRW. (2018A). US: Freezing Cells for Detained Migrants. Retrieved from "<https://www.hrw.org/news/2018/02/28/us-freezing-cells-detained-migrants>" <https://www.hrw.org/news/2018/02/28/us-freezing-cells-detained-migrants>

HRW. (2018B). Macron's Mixed Message in Calais. Retrieved from HYPERLINK "<https://www.hrw.org/news/2018/01/29/macrons-mixed-message-calais>" <https://www.hrw.org/news/2018/01/29/macrons-mixed-message-calais>

HRW. (2018C). Hungary: Bill Seeks to Block Migrant Support. Retrieved from <https://www.hrw.org/news/2018/02/17/hungary-bills-seek-block-migrant-support>

Institute for Economics and Peace. (2017). SDG 16 Progress Report: A comprehensive global audit of progress on available SDG16 indicators. Retrieved from <https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/SDG16-Progress-Report-2017.pdf>

UN. (2016). Identifying social inclusion and exclusion. In Report on the World Social Situation Leaving no one behind: the imperative of inclusive development (1). Retrieved from "<http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/rwss/2016/full-report.pdf>" <http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/rwss/2016/full-report.pdf>

UNHCR. (2002). Protecting refugees: questions and answers. Retrieved from <http://www.unhcr.org/afr/publications/brochures/3b779dfe2/protecting-refugees-questions-answers.html>

Whaites, A. (2016). Achieving the Impossible: Can We Be SDG 16 Believers? (2). Retrieved from "<http://www.oecd.org/dac/accountable-effective-institutions/Achieving%20the%20Impossible%20can%20we%20be%20SDG16%20believers.pdf>" <http://www.oecd.org/dac/accountable-effective-institutions/Achieving%20the%20Impossible%20can%20we%20be%20SDG16%20believers.pdf>

SUSTAINABILITY:

Introduction:

Ike, D. N. (1984). The System of Land Rights in Nigerian Agriculture. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 43(4), 469-480.

Liu, J., Li, S., Ouyang, Z., Tam, C. & Chen, X. (2008). Ecological and socioeconomic effects of China's policies for ecosystem services. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 105(28), 9477-9482. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0706436105>

Mackee, J., Obbard, J. & Briffett, C. (2001). Environmental Assessment in Sri Lanka: Its Status and the Potential for the Introduction of Strategic Environmental Assessment. *Journal of Environmental Assessment Policy & Management*, 3(2), 209. <https://doi.org/10.1142/s1464333201000674>

Ruhl, J. B. (2000). Farms, their environmental harms, and environmental law. *Ecology Law Quarterly*, 27(2), 263-349.

State Forestry Administration of China. (2014). Forestry in China. Retrieved from <http://english.forestry.gov.cn/uploads/>

Information_Services/Latest_Publication/Forestry_in_China.pdf

UN Documents. (1972, June). Declaration of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment. Retrieved from <http://www.un-documents.net/unchedec.htm>

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division. (2017). World Population Prospects: The 2017 Revision, Key Findings and Advance Tables. Working Paper No. ESA/P/WP/248.

World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our Common Future. Retrieved from <http://www.un-documents.net/our-common-future.pdf>

SDG 6:

2030 Water Resources Group. (2009). Charting our Water Future: Economic Frameworks to Inform Decision Making. Retrieved from <http://www.2030wrg.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/Charting-Our-Water-Future-Final.pdf>

Alexandratos, N. & Bruinsma, J. (2012, June). World agriculture towards 2030/2050. The 2012 revision. ESA Working paper No. 12–03. Rome, Italy: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO).

Eurasia Group. (2008, December 9). Yemen Outlook.

FAO (2016) AQUASTAT website. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

Howard, G., & Bartram, J. (2003). Domestic Water Quantity, Service Level and Health. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization. Retrieved from http://whqlibdoc.who.int/hq/2003/WHO_SDE_WSH_03.02.pdf

Jaglin, S. (2002, April 1). The right to water versus cost recovery: participation, urban water supply and the poor in sub-Saharan Africa. Institut Français D'Urbanisme. Retrieved from <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/095624780201400119>

Mekonnen, M. M. & Hoekstra, A. Y. (2016). Four billion people facing severe water scarcity, Science Advances, 2(2), <http://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.1500323>

Rockström, J., Falkenmark, M., Allan, T., Folke, C., Gordon, L., Jägerskog, A., Kummu, M., Lannerstad, M., Meybeck, M., Molden, D., Postel, S., Savenije, H. H. G., Svedin, U., Turton, A. & Varis, O. (2014, October 24). The unfolding water drama in the Anthropocene: towards a resilience-based perspective on water for global sustainability. *Ecohydrology* 7(5), 1249–1261.

ReliefWeb. (2017, December 4). Yemen: 2018 Humanitarian Needs Overview [EN/AR]. UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, UN Country Team in Yemen. Retrieved from <https://reliefweb.int/report/yemen/yemen-2018-humanitarian-needs-overview-enar>

Saha, K. C. (2003). Review of arsenicosis in West Bengal, India - A clinical perspective. *Critical Reviews in Environmental Science and Technology*, 33, 127–163.

Santaniello-Newton, A. & Hunter, P. R. (2000, February). Management of an outbreak of meningococcal meningitis in a Sudanese refugee camp in northern Uganda. *Epidemiology and Infection*, 124(1). 75–81.

Smith, A. H., Lingas, E. O. & Rahman, M. (2000). Contamination of drinking-water by arsenic in Bangladesh: A public health emergency. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*, 78, 1093–1103.

United Nations Development Programme. (2017). SDG 6: Clean water and sanitation. Retrieved from <http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/sustainable-development-goals/goal-6-clean-water-and-sanitation.html>

UN-Water. (2016). Water and Sanitation Interlinkages across the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Geneva, Switzerland: Author.

Ward, C. (2014). The Water Crisis in Yemen: Managing Extreme Water Scarcity in the Middle East. I.B.Tauris
World Health Organization (WHO) and the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). (2017, July). Progress on Drinking Water, Sanitation and Hygiene: 2017 Update and SDG Baselines. Geneva, Switzerland: Author. Retrieved from https://www.unicef.org/publications/index_96611.html

United Nations World Water Assessment Programme. (2014). The United Nations World Water Development Report 2014: Water and Energy. Paris, France: UNESCO.

SDG 12:

Bartl, A. (2014). Moving from recycling to waste prevention: A review of barriers and enablers. *Waste Management & Research*, 32(9), supplement, 3–18.

Kharas, H. (2010). The Emerging Middle Class in Developing Countries. OECD Development Centre Working Papers. OECD, Development Centre.

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2013). Food wastage footprint: Impacts on natural resources Summary Report. Retrieved from <http://www.fao.org/docrep/018/i3347e/i3347e.pdf>

Hoel, M. & Kverndokk, S. (1996). Depletion of fossil fuels and the impacts of global warming. *Resource and Energy Economics*, 18(2). 115–136. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0928-7655\(96\)00005-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0928-7655(96)00005-X)

Hoornweg, D. & Bhada-Tata, P. (2012, March). What a Waste: A Global Review of Solid Waste Management. Urban development series; knowledge papers no. 15. World Bank, Washington, DC. Retrieved from <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/17388>

Integrated Waste Management Board, Zero California. (2005). Recycling: Good for the environment, Good for the Economy. Retrieved from <http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/publications/Documents/Economics%5C41004002.pdf>

Sly, P. D. & Flack, F. (2008). Susceptibility of Children to Environmental Pollutants. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1140, 163–183. <https://doi.org/10.1196/annals.1454.017>

Wilson, D., Whiteman, A. & Tormin, A. (2001). Strategic Planning Guide for Municipal Solid Waste Management. International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, The World Bank.

World Health Organisation. (2016, September 27). WHO releases country estimates on air pollution exposure and health impact. WHO Media Centre. Retrieved from: <http://www.who.int/mediacentre/news/releases/2016/air-pollution-estimates/en/>

SDG 13:

Barnett, J., & Adger, W. N. (2003). Climate dangers and atoll countries. *Climatic change*, 61(3), 321–337.

Campbell, J. (2010). Climate-Induced Community Relocation in the Pacific: The Meaning and Importance of Land. In J. McAdam (Ed.) *Climate Change and Displacement: Multidisciplinary Perspectives* (pp. 57–79). Oxford: Hart Publishing.

Durack, P. J., Wijffels, S. E., & Gleckler, P. J. (2014). Long-term sea-level change revisited: the role of salinity. *Environmental Research Letters*, 9(11). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/9/11/114017>

Fedor, I. (2012). Cultural and National Identity in the Face of Climate Change: A Case Study of I-Kiribati Migrants in New Zealand. Retrieved from <https://ourarchive.otago.ac.nz/handle/10523/2445>

Gheuens, J. (2017). Landscape and Identity in Kiribati. Master's thesis in Global Environmental History. Department of Archaeology and Ancient History, Uppsala University, Sweden.

International Organization for Migration. (2008). Migration and Climate Change. IOM Migration Research Series No. 31. Geneva, Switzerland: Author.

Kiribati National Statistics Office. (2007). 2005 Census of Population and Housing. Volume 2: Analytical Report. Kiribati: Author.

Larour, E., Ivins, E. R., & Adhikari, S. (2017). Should coastal planners have concern over where land ice is melting? *Science Advances*, 3(11). <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.1700537>

Levermann, A., Winkelmann, R., Nowicki, S., Fastook, J. L., Frieler, K., Greve, R., Hellmer, H. H., Martin, M. A., Meinshausen, M., Mengel, M., Payne, A. J., Pollard, D., Sato, T., Timmermann, R., Wang, W. L. & Bindshadler, R. A. (2014). Projecting Antarctic Ice Discharge Using Response Functions from SeaRISE Ice-Sheet Models. *Earth System Dynamics*, 5(2), 271–293. <https://doi.org/10.5194/esd-5-271-2014>

Marks, K. (2011, September 8). Sinking Pacific island Kiribati considers moving to a man-made alternative. The Independent. Retrieved from: www.independent.co.uk

McAdam, J. (2011). Swimming against the Tide: Why a Climate Change Displacement Treaty is Not the Answer. *International Journal of Refugee Law*, 23(1), 2–27.

McDonald, T. (2015). Kiribati's climate change Catch-22. BBC News. Retrieved from <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-35024046>

Myers, N. & Kent, J. (1995). Environmental exodus: an emergent crisis in the global arena. Climate Institute, Washington D.C. National Snow and Ice Data Center. (2006, 3 October). Arctic Sea Ice Shrinks as Temperatures Rise. Retrieved from http://www.nsidc.org/news/press/2006_seaiceminimum/20061003_pressrelease.html

O'Collins, M. (1990). Cartaret Islanders at the Atolls Resettlement Scheme: A Response to Land Loss and Population Growth. Potential Impacts of Greenhouse Gas Generated Climatic Change and Projected Sea-Level Rise on Pacific Island States of the SPREP Region. Noumea, New Caledonia: Association of South Pacific Environmental Institutions. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2015, November 18). Small island developing states (SIDS): financing the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Retrieved from http://www.oecd.org/dac/environment-development/SIDS_flyer_COP.pdf

Pachauri, R. K & Reisinger, A. (Eds.) (2007). IPCC Fourth Assessment Report: Climate Change 2007 Synthesis Report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Geneva, Switzerland: IPCC.

United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (United Nations ESCAP) & United Nations University-Institute for Environment and Human Security (UNU-EHS). (2015). Climate Change and Migration in the Pacific: Links, attitudes, and future scenarios in Nauru, Tuvalu, and Kiribati. Retrieved from http://i.unu.edu/media/ehs.unu.edu/news/11747/RZ_Pacific_EHS_ESCAP_151201.pdf

United Nations Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States (UN-OHRLS). (2015). Small Island Developing States in Numbers, Climate Change Edition. Retrieved from https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/2189SIDS-IN-NUMBERS-CLIMATE-CHANGE-EDITION_2015.pdf

United Nations Sustainable Development. (2009, August). Security Implications of Climate Change in Kiribati. Retrieved from https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/dsd/resources/res_pdfs/ga-64/cc-inputs/Kiribati_CCIS.pdf

Voigt-Graf, C. (2016, November 9). Kiribati's National Labour Migration Policy: a climate change adaptation strategy? Devpolicy Blog. Retrieved from <http://www.devpolicy.org/kiribatis-national-labour-migration-policy-a-climate-change-adaptation-strategy-20161109/>

Wyett, K. (2014). Escaping a rising tide: sea level rise and migration in Kiribati. *Asia & the Pacific Policy Studies*, 1(1), 171-185.

Marks, K. (2011, September 8). Sinking Pacific island Kiribati considers moving to a man-made alternative. The Independent. Retrieved from: www.independent.co.uk

McAdam, J. (2011). Swimming against the Tide: Why a Climate Change Displacement Treaty is Not the Answer. *International Journal of Refugee Law*, 23(1), 2–27.

McDonald, T. (2015). Kiribati's climate change Catch-22. BBC News. Retrieved from <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-35024046>

Myers, N. & Kent, J. (1995). Environmental exodus: an emergent crisis in the global arena. Climate Institute, Washington D.C. National Snow and Ice Data Center. (2006, 3 October). Arctic Sea Ice Shrinks as Temperatures Rise. Retrieved from http://www.nsidc.org/news/press/2006_seaiceminimum/20061003_pressrelease.html

O'Collins, M. (1990). Cartaret Islanders at the Atolls Resettlement Scheme: A Response to Land Loss and Population Growth. Potential Impacts of Greenhouse Gas Generated Climatic Change and Projected Sea-Level Rise on Pacific Island States of the SPREP Region. Noumea, New Caledonia: Association of South Pacific Environmental Institutions. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2015, November 18). Small island developing states

(SIDS): financing the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Retrieved from http://www.oecd.org/dac/environment-development/SIDS_flyer_COP.pdf

Pachauri, R. K & Reisinger, A. (Eds.) (2007). IPCC Fourth Assessment Report: Climate Change 2007 Synthesis Report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Geneva, Switzerland: IPCC.

United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (United Nations ESCAP) & United Nations University-Institute for Environment and Human Security (UNU-EHS). (2015). Climate Change and Migration in the Pacific: Links, attitudes, and future scenarios in Nauru, Tuvalu, and Kiribati. Retrieved from http://i.unu.edu/media/ehs.unu.edu/news/11747/RZ_Pacific_EHS_ESCAP_151201.pdf

United Nations Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States (UN-OHRLLS). (2015). Small Island Developing States in Numbers, Climate Change Edition. Retrieved from https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/2189SIDS-IN-NUMBERS-CLIMATE-CHANGE-EDITION_2015.pdf

United Nations Sustainable Development. (2009, August). Security Implications of Climate Change in Kiribati. Retrieved from https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/dsd/resources/res_pdfs/ga-64/cc-inputs/Kiribati_CCIS.pdf

Voigt-Graf, C. (2016, November 9). Kiribati's National Labour Migration Policy: a climate change adaptation strategy? Devpolicy Blog. Retrieved from <http://www.devpolicy.org/kiribatis-national-labour-migration-policy-a-climate-change-adaptation-strategy-20161109/>

Wyett, K. (2014). Escaping a rising tide: sea level rise and migration in Kiribati. *Asia & the Pacific Policy Studies*, 1(1), 171-185.

SDG 14:

Azanza, R. V. (1999, September 27–30). Seafood poisoning from harmful algal blooms in coastal areas (abstract). (Report from the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission Workshop on Coastal Megacities: Challenges of Growing Urbanisation of the World's Coastal Areas, Hangzhou, People's Republic of China). UNESCO.

Barnes, D. (2002). Invasions by marine life on plastic debris. *Nature*, 416(6883), 808–809. <https://doi.org/10.1038/416808a>
Beck, M. W., Brumbaugh, R. D., Airoidi, L., Carranza, A., Coen, L. D., Crawford, C., Defeo, O., Edgar, G. J., Hancock, B., Kay, M. C., Lenihan, H. S., Luckenbach, M. W., Toropova, C. L., Zhang, G. & Guo, X. (2011). Oyster reefs at risk and recommendations for conservation, restoration, and management. *Bioscience*, 61(2), 107–16.

Berdalet, E., Fleming, L. E., Gowen, R., Davidson, K., Hess, P., Backer, L. C. & Enevoldsen, H. (2015). Marine harmful algal blooms, human health and wellbeing: challenges and opportunities in the 21st century. *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0025315415001733>

Carson, H., Nerheim, M., Carroll, K. & Eriksen, M. (2013). The plastic-associated microorganisms of the North Pacific Gyre. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 75(1–2), 126–132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2013.07.054>

Christian, B. & Luckas, B. (2008). Determination of marine biotoxins relevant for regulations: from the mouse bioassay to coupled LC-MS methods. *Analytical and Bioanalytical Chemistry*, 391(1), 117–34.

Collignon, A., Hecq, J., Galgani, F., Voisin, P., Collard, F. & Goffart, A. (2012). Neustonic microplastic and zooplankton in the North Western Mediterranean Sea. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 64(2012), 861–864.

Cooley, S. R. & Doney, S. C. (2009). Anticipating ocean acidification's economic consequences for commercial fisheries. *Environmental Research Letters*, 4. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/4/2/024007>

Dove, M. C. & Sammut, J. (2007). Impacts of estuarine acidification on survival and growth of Sydney rock oysters *Saccostrea glomerata* (Gould, 1850). *Journal of Shellfish Research*, 26(2), 519–527. [https://doi.org/10.2983/0730-8000\(2007\)26\[519:IOEAOS\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.2983/0730-8000(2007)26[519:IOEAOS]2.0.CO;2)

Gazeau, F., Quiblier, C., Jansen, J. M., Gattuso, J.-P., Middelburg, J. J. & Heip, C. H. R. (2007). Impact of elevated CO₂ on shellfish calcification. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 34. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2006GL028554>

Goldstein, M., Carson, H. & Eriksen, M. (2014). Relationship of diversity and habitat area in North Pacific plastic-associated

rafting communities. *Marine Biology*, 161, 1441–1453. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00227-014-2432-8>

Gooding, R. A., Harley, C. D. G. & Tang, E. (2009). Elevated water temperature and carbon dioxide concentrations increase the growth of a keystone echinoderm. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 106(23), 9316–9321. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0811143106>

Gregory, M. (2009). Environmental implications of plastic debris in marine settings-entanglement, ingestion, smothering, hangers-on, hitch-hiking and alien invasions. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B Biological Sciences*, 364(1526), 2013–2025. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2008.0265>

Havenhand, J. N., Butler, F. R., Throndyke, M. C. & Williamson, J. E. (2008). Near-future levels of ocean acidification reduce fertilization success in a sea urchin. *Current Biology*, 18(15), R651–R652. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2008.06.015>.
Law, K., Moret-Ferguson, S., Maximenko, N., Proskurowski, G., Peacock, E., Hafner, J. & Reddy, C. M. (2010). Plastic accumulation in the North Atlantic Subtropical Gyre. *Science*, 329(5996), 1185–1188. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1192321>

Mazzeo, A. (2016). Quali-quantitative determination and structural characterization of microalgal toxins in environmental matrices. Università Degli Studi di Napoli 'Federico II' Dipartimento di Farmacia, Dottorato di Ricerca in 'Scienza del Farmaco'. Ciclo XXVIII 2013-2016. Retrieved from <http://www.fedoa.unina.it/10805/1/tesi%20Mazzeo.pdf>

McCormick, A., Hoellein, T. J., Mason, S. A., Schluep, J. & Kelly, J. J. (2014). Microplastic is an abundant and distinct microbial habitat in an urban river. *Environmental Science and Technology*, 48(20), 11863–11871. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es503610r>
Moss, E., Eidson, A. & Jambeck J. (2017, February). Sea of Opportunity: Supply Chain Investment Opportunities to Address Marine Plastic Pollution. Encourage Capital on behalf of Vulcan, Inc, New York. New York. Retrieved from http://plasticreport.vulcan.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/Sea-of-Opportunity_Full_Final-Digital.pdf
Munday, P. L., Dixon, D. L., Donelson, J. M., Jones, G. P., Pratchett, M. S., Devitsina, G. V. & Doving, K. B. (2009). Ocean acidification impairs olfactory discrimination and homing ability of a marine fish. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 106(6), 1848–1852. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0809996106>

Ogburn, D. M., White, I. & Mcphee, D. P. (2007). The disappearance of oyster reefs from eastern Australian estuaries-impact of colonial settlement or mudworm invasion? *Coastal Management*, 35(2–3), 271–87.

Orr, J., Fabry, V. J., Aumont, O., Bopp, L., Doney, S. C., Feely, R. A., Gnanadesikan, A., Gruber, N., Ishida, A., Key, R. M., Lindsay, K., Maier-Reimer, E., Matear, R., Monfray, P., Mouchet, A., Najjar, R. G., Plattner, G.-K., Rodgers, K. B., Sabine, C. L., Sarmiento, J. L., Schlitzer, R., Slater, R. D., Totterdell, I. J., Weirig, M.-F., Yamanaka, Y. & Yool, A. (2005). Anthropogenic ocean acidification over the twenty-first century and its impacts on calcifying organisms. *Nature*, 437(7059), 681–686. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature04095>

Paerl, H. W. & Huisman, J. (2008). Climate: Blooms Like It Hot. *Science*, 320(5872), 57–58. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1155398>

Polovina, J., Howell, E. & Abecassis, M. (2008). Ocean's least productive waters are expanding. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 35. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2007GL031745>
Teuten, E., Rowland, S., Galloway, T. & Thompson, R. (2007). Potential for plastics to transport hydrophobic contaminants. *Environmental Science and Technology*, 41(22), 7759–7764. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es071737s>

Turley, C. & Findlay, H. S. (2009). Ocean acidification as an indicator for climate change. In T. M. Letcher (Ed.), *Climate Change: Observed Impacts on Planet Earth* (pp. 367–390). Oxford, UK: Elsevier.

Van der Meulen, M.D., DeVriese, L., Lee, J., Maes, T., Van Dalfsen, J.A., Huvet, A., Soudant, P., Robbens, J. & Vethaak, A.D. (2014). Socio-economic impact of microplastics in the 2 Seas, Channel and France Manche Region: an initial risk assessment. MICRO Interreg project Iva. Retrieved from http://www.ilvo.vlaanderen.be/Portals/74/Documents/Socioeconomic_impact_microplastics_2Seas_and_FranceMancheRegion.pdf

Vethaak, A. D. & Leslie, H. A. (2016). Plastic debris is a human health issue. *Environmental Science and Technology*, 50(13), 6825–6. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.6b02569>

Yang, X., Wu, X., Hao, H. & He, Z. (2008). Mechanisms and assessment of water eutrophication. *Journal of Zhejiang University. Science. B*, 9(3), 197–209. <https://doi.org/10.1631/jzus.B0710626>

Zu Ermgassen, P. S. E., Spalding, M. D., Blake, B., Coen, L. D., Dumbauld, B., Geiger, S., Grabowski, J. H., Grizzle, R., Luckenbach, M., McGraw, K., Rodney, W., Ruesink, J. L., Powers, S. P. & Brumbaugh, R. (2012). Historical ecology with real numbers: past and present extent and biomass of an imperilled estuarine habitat. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, 279(1742), 3393–400. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2012.0313>

SDG 15:

Asfaw, Z. & Tadesse, M. (2001). Prospects for sustainable use and development of wild food plants in Ethiopia. *Economic Botany*, 55(1), 47–62.

Auffhammer, M., Ramanathan, V. & Vincent, J. R. (2006). Integrated model shows that atmospheric brown clouds and greenhouse gases have reduced rice harvests in India. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America (PNAS)*, 103(52), 19668–19672. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0609584104>

Bos, M. G. (Ed.). (2001). *The Inter-Relationship Between Irrigation, Drainage and the Environment in the Aral Sea Basin*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Bradshaw, C. J. A., Sodhi, N. S. & Brook, B. W. (2009). Tropical turmoil—a biodiversity tragedy in progress. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, 7(2), 79–87. <https://doi.org/10.1890/070193>

Braithwaite, L. W. (1996). Conservation of arboreal herbivores: the Australian scene. *Austral Ecology*, 21(1), 21–30. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1442-9993.1996.tb00582.x>

Chameides, W. L., Kasibhatla, P. S., Yienger, J. & Levy II, H. (1994). Growth of Continental-Scale Metro-Agro-Plexes, Regional Ozone Pollution, and World Food Production. *Science*, 264(5155), 74–77. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.264.5155.74>

Chivian, E. & Bernstein, E. (Eds). 2008. *Sustaining life: How human health depends on biodiversity*. Center for Health and the Global Environment. New York: Oxford University Press.

Conway, G. (1997). *The Doubly Green Revolution*. London: Penguin Books.

Döös, B. R. (2002). Population Growth and Loss of Arable Land. *Global Environmental Change*, 12, 303–311.

Fagúndez, J. (2013). Heathlands confronting global change: drivers of biodiversity loss from past to future scenarios. *Annals of Botany*, 111(2), 151–172. <https://doi.org/10.1093/aob/mcs257>

FAO. (2004). Food Balance Sheets. Retrieved from <http://faostat.fao.org/site/368/default.aspx#ancor>

FAO. (2006). *The state of food and agriculture. Food aid for food security?* FAO Agriculture Series No. 37. Rome, Italy: Author.

Fargione, J., Hill, J., Tilman, D., Polasky, S. & Hawthorne, P. (2008). Land clearing and the biofuel carbon debt. *Science*, 319(5867), 1235–1238. <http://doi.org/10.1126/science.1152747>

Foley, J. A., DeFries, R., Asner, G., Barford, C., Bonan, G., Carpenter, S. R., Chapin, F. S., Coe, M. T., Daily, G. C., Gibbs, H. K., Helkowski, J. H., Holloway, T., Howard, E. A., Kucharik, C. J., Monfreda, C., Patz, J. A., Prentice, C., Ramankutty, N. & Snyder, P. K. (2005). Global Consequences of Land Use. *Science*, 309(570), 570–573. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1111772>

Galloway, J. N., Aber, J. N., Erisman, J. W., Seitzinger, S. P., Howarth, R. W., Cowling, E. B. & Cosby, B. J. (2003). The Nitrogen Cascade. *BioScience*, 53(4), 341–356. [https://doi.org/10.1641/0006-3568\(2003\)053\[0341:TNC\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1641/0006-3568(2003)053[0341:TNC]2.0.CO;2)

Gaybullae, B., Chen, S. C. & Gaybullae, D. *Appl Water Sci* (2012) 2: 285. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13201-012-0048-z>

Gibbs, H. K. (2012). Trading forests for yields in the Peruvian Amazon. *Environmental Research Letters*, 7(1), 011007. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/7/1/011007>

Gibbs, H. K., Ruesch, A. S., Achard, F., Clayton, M. K., Holmgren, P., Ramankutty, N. & Foley, J. A. (2010). Tropical forests were the primary sources of new agricultural land in the 1980s and 1990s. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America (PNAS)*, 107 (38), 16732–16737. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0910275107>

Godfray, H. C. J., Beddington, J. R., Crute, I. R., Haddad, L., Lawrence, D., Muir, J. F., Pretty, J., Robinson, S., Thomas, S. M. & Toulmin, C. (2010). Food Security: The Challenge of Feeding 9 Billion People. *Science*, 327(5967), 812–818. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1185383>

Gura, S. (1986). A note on traditional food plants in East Africa: their value for nutrition and agriculture. *Food and Nutrition*, 12(1), 18–26.

Hillel, D., Braimoh, A. K. & Vlek, P. L. G. (2008). Soil Degradation Under Irrigation. In A. K. Braimoh & P. L. G. Vlek (Eds.), *Land Use and Soil Resources*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Hopkins, W. A. (2007). Amphibians as Models for Studying Environmental Change. *ILAR Journal*, 48(3), 270–277. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ilar.48.3.270>

Hubert, B., Rosegrant, M., Van Boekel, M. A. J. S. & Ortiz, R. (2010). The Future of Food: Scenarios for 2050. *Crop Science*, 50(Supplement 1), S-33–S-50. <https://doi.org/10.2135/cropsci2009.09.0530>

Lambin, E. F. & Meyfroidt, P. (2011). Global land use change, economic globalization, and the looming land scarcity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 108(9), 3465–3472. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1100480108>
Lambin, E. F., Gibbs, H. K., Ferreira, L., Grau, R., Mayaux, P. & Meyfroidt, P., Morton, D. C., Rude, T. K., Gasparri, I. & Munger, J. (2013). Estimating the world's potentially available cropland using a bottom-up approach. *Global Environmental Change*, 23(5), 892–901. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2013.05.005>

Law, K. S. & Stohl, A. (2007). Arctic Air Pollution: Origins and Impacts. *Science*, 315(5818), 1537–1540. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1137695>

Lewis, S. M. & Kelly, M. (2014). Mapping the potential for biofuel production on marginal lands: differences in definitions, data and models across scales. *ISPRS International Journal of Geo-Information*, 3, 430–459.

Liston, E. (2014). "Satellite images show Aral Sea basin 'completely dried'". *The Guardian*. London: Guardian News and Media Limited. Retrieved 2018-19-04.

Maiangwa, M. G., Ogungbile, A. O., Olukosi, J. O. & Atala, T. K. (2007). Land Degradation: Theory and Evidence from the North-West Zone of Nigeria. *Journal of Applied Sciences*, 7, 785–795.

Okigbo, B. (1986). Broadening the food base in Africa: the potential of traditional food plants. *Food and Nutrition*, 12(1), 4–17.

Pinstrup-Andersen, P. & Pandya-Lorch, R. (1994). Alleviating poverty, intensifying agriculture, and effectively managing natural resources. *Food, Agriculture, and the Environment Discussion Paper 1*. Washington, D. C.: International Food Policy Research Institute.

Platt, B. (1962). Tables of representative values of foods commonly used in tropical countries. *Special Report Series Medical Research Council GB*, 302, 1–46.

Pimentel, D. & Burgess, M. (2013). Soil erosion threatens food production. *Agriculture*, 3(3), 443–463.

Shiva, V. (2000). *Stolen Harvest*. London: Zed Books.
Thomas C.D, Cameron A., Green R.E., Bakkenes M., Beaumont L.J., Collingham Y.C., Erasmus BFN, de Siqueira MF, Grainger A, Hannah L, Hughes L, Huntley B, Van Jaarsveld AS, Midgley GF, Miles L, Ortega– Huerta MA, Peterson AT, Phillips OL, Williams SE. (2004). Extinction risk from climate change. *Nature* 427:145–148.

Tudge, C. (2003). *So Shall We Reap*. London: Penguin Books.

Vitousek, P. M., Mooney, H. A., Lubchenco, J. & Melillo, J. M. (1997). Human Domination of Earth's Ecosystems. *Science*, 277(5325), 494–499. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.277.5325.494>

Vrije Universiteit te Amsterdam Centre for Development Cooperation Services (1992). *Soil and water conservation in SubSaharan Africa: Towards sustainable production by the rural poor*. A report prepared for the International Fund for Agricultural Development by the Centre for Development Cooperation Services, Free University, Amsterdam.

Wake, D. B. & Vredenburg, V. T. (2008). Are we in the midst of the sixth mass extinction? A view from the world of amphibians. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America (PNAS)*, 105 (Supplement 1), 11466–11473. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0801921105>

Young, A. (1999). Is there really spare land? A critique of estimates of available cultivable land in developing countries. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 1(1), 3–18.

FOOD SECURITY:

Introduction:

Clapp, J. (2014). Food security and food sovereignty: Getting past the binary. *Dialogues in Human Geography*, 4(2), 206–211.

FAO. (1983). Committee on World Food Security (CFS 83/4): Director-General's Report on World Food Security: A Reappraisal of the Concepts and Approaches. Rome: FAO.

FAO. (1996). World Food Summit: Rome Declaration on World Food Security. Rome: FAO. <http://www.fao.org/docrep/003/w3613e/w3613e00.htm>

FAO. (2006). Policy Brief, Issue 2: Food Security. Rome: FAO. <http://www.fao.org/forestry/13128-0e6f36f27e0091055bec28ebe830f46b3.pdf>

FAO, IFAD, UNICEF, WFP and WHO. (2017). The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2017. Building resilience for peace and food security. Rome: FAO. <http://www.fao.org/3/a-l7695e.pdf>

Sen, A. (1981; 1983). Poverty and famines: An essay on entitlement and deprivation. Oxford; New York: Clarendon Press. 10.1093/0198284632.001.0001

World Bank. (1986). Poverty and Hunger: Issues and Options for Food Security in Developing Countries. Washington, D.C.: World Bank. <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/166331467990005748/pdf/multi-page.pdf>

SDG 1:

Clapp, J. (2012). Food. Cambridge UK: Malden; MA: Polity Press.

De Schutter, O. (2013). Gender Equality and Food Security: Women's Empowerment as a Tool Against Hunger. Rome: FAO. Philippines, Asian Development Bank. <http://www.fao.org/wairdocs/ar259e/ar259e.pdf>

FAO, IFAD and WFP. (2013). The State of Food Insecurity in the World 2013: The multiple dimensions of food security. Rome: FAO. <http://www.fao.org/docrep/018/i3434e/i3434e00.htm>

International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). (2011). Rural Poverty Report 2011: New realities, new challenges: new opportunities for tomorrow's generation. Rome: IFAD. <https://www.ifad.org/documents/10180/c47f2607-3fb9-4736-8e6a-a7ccf3dc7c5b>

Nurkse, R. (1953). Problems of Capital Formation in Underdeveloped Countries. New York: Oxford University Press. Omotayo, A.O., A.I. Ogunniyi, B.H.M. Tchereni, & B. Nkonki-Mandleni. (2018). "Understanding the Link Between Households' Poverty and Food Security in South West Nigeria." *The Journal of Developing Areas*, 52(3), 27-38.

Philip, D., & I. Rayhan. (2004). Vulnerability and Poverty: What are the causes and how are they related? ZEF Center for Development Research, University of Bonn. https://www.zef.de/fileadmin/downloads/forum/docprog/Termpapers/2004_3a_Philip_Rayan.pdf

UNDESA. (2017). "Sustainable Development Goal 1: End poverty in all its forms everywhere." Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg1>

World Bank (2014). For Up to 800 Million Rural Poor, a Strong World Bank Commitment to Agriculture. Who We Are. <http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2014/11/12/for-up-to-800-million-rural-poor-a-strong-world-bank-commitment-to-agriculture>

World Food Programme. (2009). World Hunger Series: Hunger and Markets. London: Earthscan Publications. Rome: World Food Programme. <http://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/communications/wfp200279.pdf>

World Food Programme. (2009). Emergency Food Security Assessment Handbook. Second Edition. Rome: World Food Programme. http://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/manual_guide_proced/wfp203246.pdf

SDG 2:

ECOSOC. (2017). Progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals: Report of the Secretary-General. <https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/report/2017/secretary-general-sdg-report-2017--EN.pdf>

FAO, IFAD, UNICEF, WFP and WHO. (2017). The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2017. Building resilience for peace and food security. Rome: FAO. <http://www.fao.org/3/a-l7695e.pdf>

FAO, IFAD and WFP. (2013). The State of Food Insecurity in the World 2013. The multiple dimensions of food security. Rome: FAO. <http://www.fao.org/docrep/018/i3434e/i3434e.pdf>

Napoli, M., Muro, P.D. & Mazziotta, M.R. (2011). Towards a Food Insecurity Multidimensional Index (FIMI). Rome: FAO. <http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/ERP/uni/FIMI.pdf>

Riely, F., et al. (1999). Food Security Indicators and Framework for Use in the Monitoring and Evaluation of Food Aid Programs. Arlington, Va: Food Security and Nutrition Monitoring Project (IMPACT), ISTI, Inc., for the U.S. Agency for International Development. http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/Pnacg170.pdf

World Food Programme. (2009). Emergency Food Security Assessment Handbook. Rome: World Food Programme. http://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/manual_guide_proced/wfp203246.pdf?_ga=2.47493028.242836043.1519790429-533469034.1519790429

World Health Organization. (2017). "Malnutrition: Fact Sheet." World Health Organization Media Centre. <http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/malnutrition/en/>

SDG 5:

De Schutter, O. (2013). Gender Equality and Food Security: Women's Empowerment as a Tool against Hunger. Rome: FAO. <http://www.fao.org/wairdocs/ar259e/ar259e.pdf>

FAO. (2006). Policy Brief, Issue 2: Food Security. Rome: FAO. <http://www.fao.org/forestry/13128-0e6f36f27e0091055bec28ebe830f46b3.pdf>

FAO. (2010). The State of Food and Agriculture—Women in Agriculture Closing the Gender Gap for Development. Rome: FAO. <http://www.fao.org/docrep/013/i2050e/i2050e.pdf>

FAO, IFAD, and ILO. 2010. Gender Dimensions of Agricultural and Rural Employment: Differentiated Pathways Out of Poverty. Rome: FAO/IFAD; Geneva: ILO. <http://www.fao.org/docrep/013/i1638e/i1638e.pdf>

Meinzen-Dick, R., J. Behrman, P. Menon, and A. Quisumbing. (2011). "Gender: A Key Dimension Linking Agricultural Programs to Improved Nutrition and Health." In S. Fan and R. Pandya-Lorch, eds. Reshaping Agriculture for Nutrition and Health. Washington, DC: IFPRI.

Mlambo-Ngcuka, P. (2017). "Rural women: the invisible mainstay of sustainability." In UN Women. <http://www.unwomen.org/en/news/stories/2017/10/ed-statement-rural-women-day-2017>

Mukherjee, A. (2009). Eight Food Insecurities Faced by Women and Girl Children: Four Steps that could Make a Difference, with Special Reference to South Asia. Paper presented at the Regional Conference on Child Poverty and Disparities at the invitation of UNICEF Regional Office for South Asia. Katmandu. <http://www.un-csam.org/publication/8FoodInsecu.pdf>

Peterman, A., J. Behrman, and A. Quisumbing. (2010). A Review of Empirical Evidence on Gender Differences in Nonland Agricultural Inputs, Technology, and Services in Developing Countries. Washington, DC: IFPRI.

Satyavathi, C. T., C. Bharadwaj, & P.S. Brahmanand. (2010). "Role of Farm Women in Agriculture: Lessons Learned." *Gender, Technology and Development*, 14(3), 441–449.

Team, S. O. F. A., & C. Doss. (2011). "The role of women in agriculture." Economic Development Analysis Division (ESA) Working Paper, 11-02. <http://www.fao.org/docrep/013/am307e/am307e00.pdf>

UNDESA. (2017). "Sustainable Development Goal 5: Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls." Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg5>

World Food Programme. (2009a). WFP Gender Policy: Promoting Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women in Addressing Food and Nutrition Challenges. Rome: WFP. <http://one.wfp.org/eb/docs/2009/wfp194044~2.pdf>

World Food Programme. (2009b). Emergency Food Security Assessment Handbook. Rome: WFP. http://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/manual_guide_proced/wfp203246.pdf

SDG 12:

Clapp, J. (2012). *food*. Cambridge, UK; Malden, MA: Polity Press.

ECOSOC. (2017). Progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals: Report of the Secretary-General. <https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/report/2017/secretary-general-sdg-report-2017--EN.pdf>

FAO. (2013). Food Wastage Footprint. Impacts on Natural Resources: Summary Report. Rome: FAO. <http://www.fao.org/docrep/018/i3347e/i3347e.pdf>

FAO. (2015). Food Loss and Waste Facts. Rome: FAO. <http://www.fao.org/resources/infographics/infographics-details/en/c/317265/>

FAO. (2018). "Food Wastage Footprint." Sustainability Pathways: Food Loss and Waste. Rome: FAO. <http://www.fao.org/nr/sustainability/food-loss-and-waste/en/>

FAO, IFAD, UNICEF, WFP and WHO. (2017). The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2017. Building resilience for peace and food security. Rome: FAO. <http://www.fao.org/3/a-l7695e.pdf>

Rezaei, M., & B. Liu. (2017). Food loss and waste in the food supply chain. International Nut and Dried Fruit Council, 26–27.

Tielens, J., & J. J. L. Candel. (2014). Reducing food wastage, improving food security? An inventory study on stakeholders' perspectives and the current state. Food & Business Knowledge Platform. http://knowledge4food.net/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/140702_fbkp_report-foodwastage_DEF.pdf

UNDESA. (2017). "Sustainable Development Goal 12: Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns." Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg12>

SDG 13:

Action Against Hunger. (2017). Underlying causes of Malnutrition. <https://actionagainsthunger.ca/what-is-acute-malnutrition/underlying-causes-of-malnutrition/>

Astralaga, M. (2017). "Opinion: To Tackle Climate Change, We Need to Invest in Smallholder Farmers." Devex: International Development News, Global Views, COP23, 10 November 2017. <https://www.devex.com/news/opinion-to-tackle-climate-change-we-need-to-invest-in-smallholder-farmers-91488>

Bradbear, C., & S. Friel. (2013). "Integrating Climate Change, Food Prices and Population Health." *Food Policy*, 43: 56–66.

Climate Action. (2018). "Climate Shocks and Conflict Are Increasing Hunger, Says New UN Report." Climate Action. <http://www.climateactionprogramme.org/news/climate-shocks-and-conflict-are-increasing-hunger-says-new-un-report>

De Schutter, O. (2013). Gender Equality and Food Security: Women's Empowerment as a Tool Against Hunger. Rome: FAO.

<http://www.fao.org/wairdocs/ar259e/ar259e.pdf>

FAO, IFAD, UNICEF, WFP and WHO. (2017). The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2017. Building resilience for peace and food security. Rome: FAO. <http://www.fao.org/3/a-l7695e.pdf>

Gerber, P.J., H. Steinfeld, B. Henderson, A. Mottet, C. Opio, J. Dijkman, A. Falcucci, & G. Tempio. (2013). Tackling Climate Change Through Livestock: A Global Assessment of Emissions and Mitigation Opportunities. Rome: FAO. <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i3437e.pdf>

Horrigan, L., R.S. Lawrence, & P. Walker. (2002). "How Sustainable Agriculture Can Address the Environmental and Human Health Harms of Industrial Agriculture." *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 110(5): 445–456. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1240832/pdf/ehp0110-000445.pdf>

IFAD. (2017). "Ensuring Environmental Sustainability and Building Resilience to Climate Change." International Fund for Agricultural Development. <https://www.ifad.org/web/guest/climate-and-environment#anchor-6>

IPCC. (2014). Climate Change 2014: Synthesis Report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Edited by Core Writing Team, R.K. Pachauri and L.A. Meyer. Geneva, Switzerland: IPCC. <http://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar5/syr/>

Krishnamurthy, P.K., K. Lewis, & R.J. Choularton. (2012). Climate Impacts on Food Security and Nutrition: A Review of Existing Knowledge. United Nations World Food Programme. <http://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/communications/wfp258981.pdf>

Nelson, G. C., M. W. Rosegrant, J. Koo, R. Robertson, T. Sulser, T. Zhu, C. Ringler, S. Msangi, A. Palazzo, M. Batka, M. Magalhaes, R. Valmonte-Santos, M. Ewing, & D. Lee. (2009). Climate Change: Impact on Agriculture and Costs of Adaptation. Washington, DC: IFPRI. http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/rome2007/docs/Impact_on_Agriculture_and_Costs_of_Adaptation.pdf

Steinfeld, H., P. Gerber, T. Wassenaar, V. Castel, M. Rosales & C. de Haan. (2006). Livestock's Long Shadow: Environmental Issues and Options. Rome: FAO. <http://www.fao.org/docrep/010/a0701e/a0701e00.HTM>

UN Environment. (2016). "How and why should food be considered within the climate policies of cities?" Online video clip. YouTube. YouTube, 16 May 2016. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zoBhghBVGH4>

UN Environment. (2018). UN Environment and World Health Organization Agree to Major Collaboration on Environmental Health Risks. UN Environment News and Stories, 10 January 2018. <https://www.unenvironment.org/news-and-stories/press-release/un-environment-and-world-health-organization-agree-major>

http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/natlinfo/indicators/methodology_sheets/oceans_seas_coasts/pop_coastal_areas.pdf

SDG 14:

Carrington, D. (2018). "Oceans Suffocating as Huge Dead Zones Quadruple Since 1950, Scientists Warn." *The Guardian*, 4 January 2018. <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2018/jan/04/oceans-suffocating-dead-zones-oxygen-starved>

De Schutter, O. (2013). Gender Equality and Food Security: Women's Empowerment as a Tool Against Hunger. Rome: FAO; Manila: Asian Development Bank. <http://www.fao.org/wairdocs/ar259e/ar259e.pdf>

FAO. (2016). The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture 2016: Contributing to food Security and Nutrition for All. Rome: FAO. <https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/a-i5555e.pdf>

FAO. (2011). The State of the World's Land and Water Resources for Food and Agriculture (SOLAW): Managing Systems at Risk. Rome: FAO; London: Earthscan. <http://www.fao.org/docrep/017/i1688e/i1688e.pdf>

IFAD. (2017). Responsible Stewardship of the World's Fisheries for Improved Livelihoods. <https://www.ifad.org/web/guest/>

fisheries#anchor-3

Lusher, A., P. Hollam, & J. Mendoza-Hill. (2017). *Microplastics in Fisheries and Aquaculture: Status of Knowledge on Their Occurrence and Implications for Aquatic Organisms and Food Safety*. Rome: FAO. <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i7677e.pdf>

Tirado, R. (2008). *Dead Zones: How Agricultural Fertilizers are Killing our Rivers, Lakes and Oceans*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands; Toronto, Ontario: Greenpeace International. <http://www.greenpeace.org/canada/Global/canada/report/2008/7/dead-zones.pdf>

UNEP. (2018). "Coral Reefs: We Continue to Take More than We Give." UN Environment Programme, 14 February 2018. <https://www.unenvironment.org/news-and-stories/story/coral-reefs-we-continue-take-more-we-give>

UNEP. (2017). "Goal 14: Life Below Water." UN Environment Programme. <https://www.unenvironment.org/explore-topics/sustainable-development-goals/why-do-sustainable-development-goals-matter/goal-14>

UNDESA. (2017). "Sustainable Development Goal 14: Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development." Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg14>

United Nations. (2017). "Goal 14: Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resource." United Nations Sustainable Development Goals: 17 Goals to Transform Our World. <http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/oceans/>

SDG 15:

Clapp, J. (2012). *food*. Cambridge, UK; Malden, MA: Polity Press.

ECOSOC. (2016). *Progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals: Report of the Secretary-General*. <https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/report/2017/secretary-general-sdg-report-2017--EN.pdf>

Eswaran, H., R. Lal and P.F. Reich. (2001). "Land Degradation: An Overview." In Bridges, E.M., I.D. Hannam, L.R. Oldeman, F.W.T. Pening de Vries, S.J. Scherr, & S. Sompatpanit (eds.). *Responses to Land Degradation*. Proc. 2nd. International Conference on Land Degradation and Desertification, Khon Kaen, Thailand. New Delhi, India: Oxford Press. https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/soils/use/?cid=nrcs142p2_054028

FAO. (2013). *Livestock and the Environment*. Rome: FAO. <http://www.fao.org/ag/againfo/themes/en/Environment.html>

FAO. (2011). *The State of the World's Land and Water Resources for Food and Agriculture: Managing Systems at Risk*. Rome: FAO. <http://www.fao.org/docrep/015/i1688e/i1688e00.pdf>

Fowler, C., & P.R. Mooney. (1990). *Shattering: Food, Politics, and the Loss of Genetic Diversity*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Hamdy, A., & A. Aly. (2015). *Land Degradation, Agriculture Productivity and Food Security*. Presented at the Fifth International Scientific Agricultural Symposium, "Agrosym 2014." https://www.researchgate.net/publication/267865734_LAND_DEGRADATION_AGRICULTURE_PRODUCTIVITY_AND_FOOD_SECURITY

Horrigan, L., R.S. Lawrence, & P. Walker. (2002). "How Sustainable Agriculture Can Address the Environmental and Human Health Harms of Industrial Agriculture." *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 110(5): 445–446. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1240832/pdf/ehp0110-000445.pdf>

Steinfeld, H., P. Gerber, T. Wassenaar, V. Castel, M. Rosales & C. de Haan. (2006). *Livestock's Long Shadow: Environmental Issues and Options*. Rome: FAO. <http://www.fao.org/docrep/010/a0701e/a0701e00.HTM>

Tully, K., Sullivan, C., Weil, R., & Sanchez, P. (2015). *The state of soil degradation in sub-saharan africa: Baselines, trajectories, and solutions*.

UNEP. (2017). "High and Dry: Degraded Lands Are Driving People from Their Homes." United Nations Environment Programme: News and Stories. <https://www.unenvironment.org/news-and-stories/story/high-and-dry-degraded-lands-are-driving-people-their-homes>

Weis, T. (2013). The Meat of the Global Food Crisis. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 40(1): 65–85. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/03066150.2012.752357>

HEALING MEMORY:

Introduction:

Sahnoun, M. (2010). Healing Memory: a past that seeps into the future. Retrieved from http://www.justgovernance.net/sites/cfhs.iofc.org/files/media/document/cf/cfhs_2010_mohamed_sahnoun_healing.pdf

Komesaroff, P. (2010). Healing Memory: accountability and forgiveness. Retrieved from http://www.justgovernance.net/sites/cfhs.iofc.org/files/media/document/cf/cfhs_2010_paul_komesaroff_speech.pdf

McAllister, B. (2010). Healing Memory: the long road to reconciliation in Northern Ireland. Retrieved from http://www.justgovernance.net/sites/cfhs.iofc.org/files/media/document/cf/cfhs_2010_brendan_mcallister_article.pdf

SDG 10:

Just Governance for Human Security Caux Forum(2017)

International IDEA. (2003). Reconciliation After Violent Conflict: A Handbook. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/en/peacebuilding/pbso/pdf/Reconciliation-After-Violent-Conflict-A-Handbook-Full-English-PDF.pdf>

Khan, S. (2012). Topic Guide on Social Exclusion. Retrieved from <http://www.gsdr.org/docs/open/se10.pdf>

Komesaroff, P. (2010). Healing Memory: accountability and forgiveness. Retrieved from http://www.justgovernance.net/sites/cfhs.iofc.org/files/media/document/cf/cfhs_2010_paul_komesaroff_speech.pdf

McAllister, B. (2010). Healing Memory: the long road to reconciliation in Northern Ireland. Retrieved from http://www.justgovernance.net/sites/cfhs.iofc.org/files/media/document/cf/cfhs_2010_brendan_mcallister_article.pdf

OHCHR. (n.d.). Integrating Human Rights into the Post-2015 Development Agenda. Retrieved from <http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/MDGs/Post2015/EqualityAndNonDiscrimination.pdf>

Sahnoun, M. (2010). Healing Memory: a past that seeps into the future. Retrieved from http://www.justgovernance.net/sites/cfhs.iofc.org/files/media/document/cf/cfhs_2010_mohamed_sahnoun_healing.pdf

The Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues et al. (2015). Integrating the Elimination of Inequalities due to Racism into the Framework of the UN Post-2015 Sustainable Development Agenda: Recommendations from Civil Society. Retrieved from <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/14989RacismPost2015SDGAdvocacyDoc526.pdf>

UN-DESA. (2018). Sustainable Development Goal 10: Reduce inequalities within and among countries. Retrieved from <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg10>

UNESCO. (2018). Exclusion. Retrieved from <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/social-and-human-sciences/themes/international-migration/glossary/exclusion/>

United Nations. (2017a). Equality: Why It Matters?. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/ENGLISH_Why_it_Matters_Goal_10_Equality.pdf

United Nations. (2017b). Goal 10: Reduce inequalities within and among countries. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/inequality/>

SDG 11:

Altpeter, C. (2016). Peacebuilding in Cities: Building Safe, Inclusive, and Resilient Urban Spaces. Retrieved from HYPERLINK "<https://fba.se/contentassets/05f49ad589e740c08e2257f1c654c753/ief-brief-2016>

pdf" <https://fba.se/contentassets/05f49ad589e740c08e2257f1c654c753/ief-brief-2016.pdf>

Bandarin, F. (2013). Panel Discussion on Peace and Reconciliation: How Culture Makes the Difference [Transcript]. Retrieved from HYPERLINK "http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CLT/images/Francesco_Bandarin_Hangzhou_congress.pdf" http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CLT/images/Francesco_Bandarin_Hangzhou_congress.pdf

Bombande, E. (n.d.), The Role of Culture in Peace and Reconciliation [PowerPoint Presentation]. Retrieved from HYPERLINK "http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CLT/images/Emmanuel_Bombande_WANEP.pdf" http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CLT/images/Emmanuel_Bombande_WANEP.pdf

Burdett, R. (2016). Inequality and patterns of human growth. Policy in Focus, 13(3). Retrieved from HYPERLINK "<http://www.ipc->" http://www.ipc-undp.org/pub/eng/PIF37_A_new_urban_paradigm_pathways_to_sustainable_development.pdf

Campbell, S.D. (2013). Sustainable Development and Social Justice: Conflicting Urgencies and the Search for Common Ground in Urban and Regional Planning. Michigan Journal of Sustainability, 1. Retrieved from HYPERLINK "<https://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/mjs/12333712.0001.007?view=text;rgn=main>" <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/mjs/12333712.0001.007?view=text;rgn=main>

Craven & Tynes. (2016, February 3). The Racist Roots of Flint's Water Crisis. The Huffington Post. Retrieved from HYPERLINK "http://www.huffingtonpost.ca/entry/racist-roots-of-flints-water-crisis_us_56b12953e4b04f9b57d7b118" http://www.huffingtonpost.ca/entry/racist-roots-of-flints-water-crisis_us_56b12953e4b04f9b57d7b118

de Boer, J., Muggah, R., & Patel, R. (2016). Conceptualizing City Fragility and Resilience (UNU Working Paper No. 5). Retrieved from "https://i.unu.edu/media/cpr.unu.edu/attachment/2227/WP05.02_Conceptualizing_City_Fragility_and_Resilience.pdf" https://i.unu.edu/media/cpr.unu.edu/attachment/2227/WP05.02_Conceptualizing_City_Fragility_and_Resilience.pdf

Henderson, E. (2016, March 16). Syria's six Unesco World Heritage Sites all damaged or destroyed during civil war, Independent. Retrieved from <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/middle-east/syrias-six-unesco-world-heritage-sites-all-damaged-or-destroyed-during-civil-war-a6934026.html>

Jarre, J., (2013). Panel Discussion on Peace and Reconciliation: How Culture Makes a Difference [Transcript]. Retrieved from http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CLT/pdf/Jean_Michel_Jarre_Hangzhou.pdf

Muggah, R., Sisk, T.D., Piza-Lopez, E., Salmon, J., & Keuleers, P. (2012). Governance for Peace: Securing the Social Contract. Retrieved from UNDP website: "http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/crisis%20prevention/governance-for-peace_2011-12-15_web.pdf.pdf" http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/crisis%20prevention/governance-for-peace_2011-12-15_web.pdf.pdf

UNESCO. (n.d). Concept note: UNESCO Global Report on Culture and Sustainable Urban Development. Retrieved from "http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CLT/pdf/NewSustCit_Concept_note_EN.pdf" http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CLT/pdf/NewSustCit_Concept_note_EN.pdf

UN Habitat. (2016). New Agenda adopted at Habit III. Retrieved from "<https://unhabitat.org/new->" <https://unhabitat.org/new-urban-agenda-adopted-at-habitat-iii/>

SDG 16:

Act now on Indigenous youth suicide crisis. (2017). Editorial. The Toronto Star. Retrieved from <https://www.thestar.com/opinion/editorials/2017/07/24/act-now-on-indigenous-youth-suicide-crisis-editorial.html>

Arango, T. (2017). 'Sherlock Holmes of Armenian Genocide' Uncovers Lost Evidence. The New York Times. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2017/04/22/world/europe/armenian-genocide-turkey.html?_r=0

Armenian National Institute. (2017). Frequently Asked Questions about the Armenian Genocide. Retrieved from <http://www.armenian-genocide.org/genocidefaq.html>

Armenian-Turkey Normalisation Process. (2016a). Summarizing Programme Results. Retrieved from <http://www.armenia-turkey.net/en/Summarizing-Programme-Results-1481025598>

Armenian-Turkey Normalisation Process. (2016b). Support to the Armenia-Turkey Normalisation Process: Stage Two. Retrieved from <http://www.armenia-turkey.net/en/programme>

Attree, L., & Möller-Loswick, A. (2015). Goal 16—Ensuring Peace in the Post-2015 Framework: Adoption, Implementation and Monitoring. In (Vol. 4): UN Chronicle.

Centre for Policy Alternatives. (2017). The Need to Reboot Reconciliation in Post-War Sri Lanka [Press release]. Retrieved from <http://www.cpalanka.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/Sara-Statement-May-2017.pdf>

Government of Canada. (2008). Statement of apology to former students of Indian Residential Schools. Retrieved from <http://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1100100015644/1100100015649>.

Hanson, T. (2015). Truth and Reconciliation (2): First apologize, then act. The Globe and Mail. Retrieved from <https://beta.theglobeandmail.com/globe-debate/editorials/truth-and-reconciliation-2-first-apologize-then-act/article24827422/>

Hill, F., Kirişci, K., & Moffat, A. (2015). Armenia and Turkey: From normalization to reconciliation. Turkish Policy Quarterly, 13, 127-138. Retrieved from <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/armenia-and-turkey-from-normalization-to-reconciliation/>

International IDEA. (2003). Reconciliation After Violent Conflict: A Handbook. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/en/peacebuilding/pbso/pdf/Reconciliation-After-Violent-Conflict-A-Handbook-Full-English-PDF.pdf>

Kinder Morgan Canada pipe project hearings end, fate in balance. (2017). Reuters. Retrieved from <https://ca.reuters.com/article/businessNews/idCAKBN1CI2X6-OCABS>

Paul, D. (2016). Policy Brief: Four problems and an Implementation Pathway: Human Rights in the 2030 Agenda. Retrieved from SDG Knowledge Hub website: <http://sdg.iisd.org/commentary/policy-briefs/four-problems-and-an-implementation-pathway-human-rights-in-the-2030-agenda/>

Smith, A., McCandless, E., Paulson, J., & Wheaton, W. (2011). The Role of Education in Peacebuilding: Literature Review Retrieved from https://www.unicef.org/education/files/EEPCT_Peacebuilding_LiteratureReview.pdf

Support growing for reset to national MMIWG inquiry, say groups. (2017). CBC News. Retrieved from <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/saskatoon/families-call-for-reset-mmiwg-inquiry-1.4347323>

Sánchez, E., & Rognvik, S. (2012). Workshop Report: Building Just Societies: Reconciliation in Transitional Settings. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/en/peacebuilding/pbso/pdf/12-58492_feb13.pdf

Tasker, J. P. (2017). Ottawa announces \$800M settlement with Indigenous survivors of Sixties Scoop. CBC News. Retrieved from <http://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/ottawa-settle-60s-scoop-survivors-1.4342462>

UN-DESA. (2017). Sustainable Development Goal 16. Retrieved from <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg16>

UNPFB. (2016). Sri Lanka Peacebuilding Priority Plan: 2016-2018. Retrieved from <http://www.unpbf.org/wp-content/uploads/Sri-Lanka-Peacebuilding-Priority-Plan-August-2016-final.pdf>

INCLUSIVE ECONOMICS:

Introduction:

BENNER, C. & PASTOR, M. 2016. Inclusive Economy Indicators: Framework & Indicator Recommendations. Everett Program, USC Dornsife: The Rockefeller Foundation.

DURAN, P. 2015. What does inclusive economic growth actually mean in practice? [Online]. United Nations Development Programme. Available: <http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/blog/2015/7/31/What-does-inclusive-economic->

growth-actually-mean-in-practice-.html [Accessed 30.04.2018].

SDG 5:

ALDANA, T. 2018. Take five: "A feminist in decision-making roles makes a difference". In: UN WOMEN (ed.). <http://www.unwomen.org/en/news/stories/2018/5/take-five-thelma-aldana>.

CHEMALY, S. 2016. The problem with a technology revolution designed primarily for men. Quartz.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR 2014a. Gender shares of employment in computer and information technology occupations (2014). https://www.dol.gov/wb/stats/Computer_information_technology_2014.htm: United States Department of Labor.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR 2014b. Traditional (female-dominated) occupations, 2014 annual averages. <https://www.dol.gov/wb/stats/TraditionalOccupations.pdf>: United States Department of Labor.

GREENE, M. E. & MERRICK, T. 2005. Poverty Reduction: Does Reproductive Health Matter? HNP Discussion Paper. Health, Nutrition and Population, The World Bank.

MILLER, C. C. 2016. As Women Take Over a MaleDominated Field, the. The New York Times, 18.03.2016.

NELSON, S. 2017. Equal Pay Day Is Not Equal At All for Women of Color. Huffington Post.

PARKER, K. & FUNK, C. 2018a. 3. Women in STEM see more gender disparities at work, especially those in computer jobs, majority-male workplaces.

<http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2018/01/09/women-in-stem-see-more-gender-disparities-at-work-especially-those-in-computer-jobs-majority-male-workplaces/>: Pew Research Centre.

PARKER, K. & FUNK, C. 2018b. 4. Blacks in STEM jobs are especially concerned about diversity and discrimination in the workplace.

<http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2018/01/09/blacks-in-stem-jobs-are-especially-concerned-about-diversity-and-discrimination-in-the-workplace/>: Pew Research Centre.

ROBINSON, M., FIGUERES, C. & MOHAMMED, A. J. 2015. Why gender equality is key to sustainable development. World Economic Forum.

UN WOMEN 2015. Transforming Economies, Realizing Rights. Progress of the World's Women 2015-2016. UN Women.

UN WOMEN 2017. Safe Cities and Safe Public Spaces. Global Results Report. UN Women.

UNDP 2010. Human Development Report 2010; The Real Wealth of Nations. United Nations Development Programme.

UNESCO 2013. Girls' education - the facts. In: UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, S. A. C. O. (ed.). Education for all Global Monitoring Report.

UNFPA. 2017. New study finds child marriage rising among most vulnerable Syrian refugees.

UNITED NATIONS 2015. The World's Women 2015; Trends and Statistics. United Nations.

YAKUPITIYAGE, T. 2016. Menstrual Hygiene Gaps Continue to Keep Girls from School. 27.05.16.

FOTSO, J. C., AJAYI, J. O., IDOKO, E. E., SPEIZER, I., FASIKU, D. A., MBERU, B. & MUTUA, M. 2011. Family planning and reproductive health in urban Nigeria: levels, trends and differentials. Chapel Hill, NC: Measurement, Learning & Evaluation (MLE) Project [UNC, USA] and National Population Commission (NPC)[Nigeria].

GRACZYK, K. 2007. Adolescent maternal mortality: an overlooked crisis.

SDG 8:

DAVIES, R. B. & VADLAMANNATI, K. C. 2013. A race to the bottom in labor standards? An empirical investigation. Journal of Development Economics, 103, 1-14.

FAIRTRADE INTERNATIONAL. 2018. Fairtrade International [Online]. <https://www.fairtrade.net/>. [Accessed 14.05.2018].
FAO. 2017a. 71% of child labour is in agriculture [Online]. Food and Agricultural Organisation of the United Nations. Available: <http://www.fao.org/rural-employment/resources/detail/en/c/1073931/> [Accessed 14.05.2018].
FAO 2017b. Promoting decent rural employment <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i7674e.pdf>: Food and Agricultural Organisation of the United Nations.

FAO. 2018. Promote inclusive and sustainable economic growth, employment and decent work for all [Online]. <http://www.fao.org/sustainable-development-goals/goals/goal-8/en/>: Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations. [Accessed 14.05.2018].

HEEKS, R. 2017. Decent Work and the Digital Gig Economy: A Developing Country Perspective on Employment Impacts and Standards in Online Outsourcing, Crowdfund, etc. Development Informatics. Economic & Social Research Council.
HERATH, S. 2011. Women's Access to Decent Work. Key policy initiatives and capacity-building on gender mainstreaming: focus on education and training United Nations Commission on the Status of Women
ILO. 2015. ILO warns of widespread insecurity in the global labour market [Online]. http://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/newsroom/news/WCMS_368252/lang--en/index.htm: International Labour Organization. [Accessed 14.05.2018].
ILO 2016. Background Note by the International Labour Organization for the UN High-Level Political Forum 11 - 20 July 2016, New York. UN High-Level Political Forum. New York: International Labour Organisation.
INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE 2016. Non-standard employment around the world: Understanding challenges, shaping prospects. ILO Geneva.

INVESTOPEDIA. 2018. Gig Economy [Online]. <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/g/gig-economy.asp>: Investopedia. [Accessed 14.05.2018].

KATZ, L. F. & KRUEGER, A. B. 2016. The rise and nature of alternative work arrangements in the United States, 1995-2015. National Bureau of Economic Research.

OXFAM 2018. Reward work, not wealth. Oxfam.

PETERS, J. 2008. Labour market deregulation and the decline of labour power in North America and Western Europe. Policy and Society, 27, 83-98.

THE WORLD BANK. 2017. Agriculture and Food Overview [Online]. <http://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/agriculture/overview>: The World Bank. [Accessed 14.05.2018].

SDG 10:

Life and Debt, 2003. Directed by BLACK, S.: New Yorker Films.

CHANG, A. 2013. When Lobbyists Literally Write The Bill. NPR, 11.11.2013.

CHILD, A. 2015. "No One Helped Us Before": Exploring the impact of Fairtrade Certification on the sugar farmers of Fiji. Master of Arts, Development Studies, University of the South Pacific.

DAVIES, R. B. & VADLAMANNATI, K. C. 2013. A race to the bottom in labor standards? An empirical investigation. Journal of Development Economics, 103, 1-14.

HICKEL, J. 2015. Enough of aid - let's talk about reparations. The Guardian, 27 November 2015.

HICKEL, J. 2017. Aid in reverse: how poor countries develop rich countries. The Guardian, 14 January 2017.

HOOPER-BOX, C. 2014. IMF Quota and Governance Reform. Oxfam International.

ILO. 2018. Disability and Work [Online]. http://www.ilo.org/global/topics/disability-and-work/WCMS_475650/lang--en/index.htm: International Labour Organization. [Accessed 15.05.2018].

KUCIK, J. & PELC, K. J. 2017. Secret negotiations at the World Trade Organization create a big problem. The Washington Post, 06.01.2017.

LINES, T. 2008. Making poverty: a history, Zed Books.

MURPHY, S. 2009. Free Trade in Agriculture: A Bad Idea Whose Time Is Done. Monthly Review, 61, 78-91.

NELSON, S. 2017. Equal Pay Day Is Not Equal At All for Women of Color. Huffington Post.

OXFAM 2009. Empty Promises, What happened to 'development' in the WTO's Doha Round? Oxfam Briefing Paper. Oxfam.

OXFAM 2018. Reward work, not wealth. Oxfam.

Dr Shashi Tharoor MP - Britain Does Owe Reparations, 2015. Directed by OXFORD UNION.

RANALD, P. 2013. The Trans-Pacific Partnership and Australia's right to know. The Conversation.

SURIYASARN, B. 2015. Pride at work: A study on discrimination at work on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity in Thailand. 3 ed. Gender, Equality and Diversity Branch (GED): International Labour Office.

UNCTAD 2017. Special Update on Investor-State Dispute Settlement: Facts and Figures. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.

UNDESA. 2017. Sustainable Development Goal 10 [Online]. Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform: United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. Available: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg10> [Accessed].

UNDP 2017. Temporary Special Measures to Increase Women's Political Participation in the Pacific: Case Studies of Implementation in the Region. In: UNDP (ed.).

UNHCR. 2017. Figures at a Glance [Online]. UNHCR The UN Refugee Agency. Available: <http://www.unhcr.org/figures-at-a-glance.html> [Accessed 16.05.2018].

WATKINS, K. 2004. Dumping on the world: How EU sugar policies hurt poor countries. Oxfam International.

GOOD GOVERNANCE:

Introduction:

UNESCAP 2009. What is Good Governance.

SDG 5:

AWA, R. 2014. Implementing domestic violence legislation in the Pacific – an early reflection [Online]. Regional Rights Resource Team: Pacific Community. Available: <http://rrrt.spc.int/publications-media/featured-articles/item/725-implementing-domestic-violence-legislation-in-the-pacific-an-early-reflection> [Accessed].

EIGE. 2018. substantive gender equality [Online]. <http://eige.europa.eu/rdc/thesaurus>: European Institute for Gender Equality. [Accessed 22.05.2018].

FISK, N. & ATUN, R. 2009. Systematic analysis of research underfunding in maternal and perinatal health. BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology, 116, 347-356.

HOFFMANN, D. E. & TARZIAN, A. J. 2001. The girl who cried pain: a bias against women in the treatment of pain. The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics, 28, 13-27.

HOLDCROFT, A. 2007. Gender bias in research: how does it affect evidence based medicine? : SAGE Publications Sage UK: London, England.

ILO 2018. Maternity and paternity at work: Law and practice across the world. International Labour Organization.

KIM, A. M., TINGEN, C. M. & WOODRUFF, T. K. 2010. Sex bias in trials and treatment must end. Nature, 465, 688-689.

KLUGMAN, J. 2017. Gender based violence and the law. Background Paper: Governance and the Law. World Development Report: The World Bank.

MCBRIDE, D. & MAZUR, A. 2011. Gender Machineries Worldwide. World Development Report 2012. The World Bank.

ROBERTS-HOLMES, G. P. 2009. 'People are suspicious of us': a critical examination of father primary carers and English early childhood services. Early Years, 29, 281-291.

TINGEN, C. M., KIM, A. M., WU, P.-H. & WOODRUFF, T. K. 2010. Sex and sensitivity: the continued need for sex-based biomedical research and implementation. *Women's Health*, 6, 511-516.

TURNER, C. 2017. Are Women "Minorities"? *Huffington Post*, 07.03.2017.

UN WOMEN. 2009. Overview of the Convention [Online]. Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women: UN Women. Available: <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/cedaw/> [Accessed 25.05.2018].

UN WOMEN. 2017. Facts and figures: Ending violence against women [Online]. UN Women. Available: <http://www.unwomen.org/en/what-we-do/ending-violence-against-women/facts-and-figures> [Accessed 25.05.2018].

UNDESA 2018. Sustainable Development Goal 5. Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform: United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs.

UNDP 2010. Human Development Report 2010; The Real Wealth of Nations. United Nations Development Programme.
UNDP 2017. Temporary Special Measures to Increase Women's Political Participation in the Pacific: Case Studies of Implementation in the Region. In: UNDP (ed.).

UNDP. 2018. Sustainable Development Goal 4 [Online]. Available: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg4> [Accessed 14 June 2017].

UNICEF. 2007. Gender and education [Online]. Eastern and Southern Africa: UNICEF. Available: https://www.unicef.org/esaro/7310_Gender_and_education.html [Accessed].

WEGNER, M. N., LANDRY, E., WILKINSON, D. & TZANIS, J. 1998. Men as Partners in Reproductive Health: From Issues to Action. *International Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health*: Guttmacher Institute.

WOMEN'S BUDGET GROUP 2018. A Guide to Gender-Responsive Budgeting. Oxfam.

YAKUPITIYAGE, T. 2016. Menstrual Hygiene Gaps Continue to Keep Girls from School. 27.05.16.

SDG 9:

BAYLISS, K. & MCKINLEY, T. 2007. Privatising Basic Utilities in Sub-Saharan Africa: The MDG Impact. Policy Research Brief. International Poverty Centre: United Nations Development Programme.

BEL, G., FAGEDA, X. & WARNER, M. E. 2010. Is private production of public services cheaper than public production? A meta-regression analysis of solid waste and water services. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 29, 553-577.

BHANDARI, D. & GARG, R. 2016. Effect of Industrialization on Environment (Indian Scenario).

BRIDLE, R. & KITSON, L. 2014. The Impact of Fossil-Fuel Subsidies on Renewable Electricity Generation. GSI Report. International Institute for Sustainable Development.

BURMA CAMPAIGN UK. 2014. Large-scale land confiscation for Salween Dam infrastructure in Northern Shan State [Online]. Burma Campaign UK. Available: <http://burmacampaign.org.uk/reports/large-scale-land-confiscation-for-salween-dam-infrastructure-in-northern-shan-state/> [Accessed].

CHANG, H.-J. & BOND, J. 2007. *Bad Samaritans*, Brilliance Audio.

HUMAN RIGHTS WATCH 2015. "The Farmer Becomes the Criminal" Human Rights and Land Confiscation in Karen State. Human Rights Watch.

JUST GOVERNANCE FOR HUMAN SECURITY 2016. 2016 Conference Report.

UNDESA. 2017. Sustainable Development Goal 9 [Online]. Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform: United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. Available: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg9> [Accessed].

WHO. 2017. Sanitation [Online]. World Health Organization. Available: <http://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/sanitation> [Accessed].

WORLD BANK 2017. Industry, innovation, and infrastructure, World Bank.

SDG 11:

ARIMAH, B. 2001. Slums As Expressions of Social Exclusion: Explaining The Prevalence of Slums in African Countries.

FEIDEN, P. 2011. Adapting to Climate Change: Cities and the Urban Poor. International Housing Coalition.

UN WOMEN 2017. Safe Cities and Safe Public Spaces. Global Results Report. UN Women.

UNDESA 2016. Good Practices of Accessible Urban Development. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs.

UNDP. 2017a. Sustainable Development Goal 9 [Online]. Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform: United Nations Available: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg9> [Accessed].

UNDP. 2017b. Sustainable Development Goal 11 [Online]. Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform: United Nations Development Programme. Available: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg11> [Accessed].

WORLD HEALTH ORGANISATION. 2017. Water Sanitation Hygiene [Online]. Available: http://www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/emergencies/qa/emergencies_qa9/en/ [Accessed].

SDG 16:

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL 2010. Fiji: Submission to the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women. 46th Session: Amnesty International.

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL 2018. Amnesty International Report 2017/18: The state of the world's human rights. Amnesty International.

AWAVA SECRETARIAT. 2016. Access to justice for women and children living with or at risk of violence [Online]. <https://awava.org.au/2016/08/22/research/7424>: Australian Women Against Violence Alliance. [Accessed].

COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS ON PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION 2017. Institutional arrangements for the Sustainable Development Goals. Ensuring effective implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals through leadership, action and means. United Nations Economic and Social Council.

DELAVALLE, C. 2006. Corruption and distribution of public spending in developing countries. Journal of economics and finance, 30, 222-239.

FWRM 2017. New research shows Fiji's women face significant barriers in accessing the formal justice system in Fiji. <http://www.fwrp.org.fj/news/media-releases/67-all-category/news/press-releases/487-new-research-shows-fiji-s-women-face-significant-barriers-in-accessing-the-formal-justice-system-in-fiji>: Fiji Women's Rights Movement.

GALTUNG, J. & FISCHER, D. 2013. Positive and negative peace. Johan Galtung. Springer.

GANHRI 2018. Chart of the status of National Institutions. Accredited by the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions. Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions.

HAYASHI, Y. 2015. Japan's Textbook Changes Get Failing Grade From Neighbors. The Wall Street Journal 07.04.2015.

HUMAN RIGHTS WATCH 2018. Syria: Events of 2017. World Report 2018. Human Rights Watch.

KJÆRUM, M. 2005. National human rights institutions implementing human rights, Danish Institute for Human Rights.

UNDESA. 2018. Sustainable Development Goal 16 [Online]. Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform: United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. Available: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg16> [Accessed].

UNOHCHR. 2018. Convention on the Rights of the Child [Online]. Status Ratification Interactive Dashboard: United Nations Human Rights Officer of the High Commissioner. [Accessed 31.05.2018].

JUST GOVERNANCE FOR HUMAN SECURITY

