Progress and Challenges in Implementing the 2030 Agenda, 2015-2025

Phoebe Koundouri

Chrysilia Pitti

Georgios Feretzakis

Progress and Challenges in Implementing the 2030 Agenda, 2015–2025

Phoebe Koundouri[1,2,3,4,5], Chrysilia Pitti[6], Georgios Feretzakis[1,2,5]

[1]ReSEES Research Laboratory, School of Economics, Athens University of Economics and Business, 76 Patission Street, Athens 10434, Greece.
[2]Sustainable Development Unit, Athena Research Center, Artemidos 6, Athens 15125, Greece.
[3]Department of Earth Sciences and Peterhouse, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom.
[4]UN SDSN, Global Climate Hub, European Hub, Greek Hub, 475 Riverside Drive, New York, NY 10115, USA.
[5]Alliance of Excellence for Research and Innovation on Aephoria (AE4RIA), Athens, Greece.
[6]Department of Economics, City, University of London, Northampton Square, London, EC1V 0HB, United Kingdom.

Abstract

In this article we synthesize 41 core documents and 4 supplementary sources published between 2015 and 2025—including UN global assessments, annual SDG progress reports, regional reviews, and stakeholder guidance—to evaluate implementation of the 2030 Agenda. The evidence consistently indicates an implementation crisis. As of 2023, only 15–17% of assessable targets are on track for achievement by 2030, while approximately 37% have stalled or regressed relative to 2015, and 31 targets lack sufficient data for trend evaluation. The annual SDG financing gap for developing countries has expanded from roughly $2.5 trillion pre-COVID to around $4 trillion in the early 2020s, driven by pandemic aftershocks, conflict, rising debt distress, and climate-related losses. Cross-cutting barriers remain predominantly institutional—fragmented policy frameworks, weak horizontal and vertical coordination, chronic underinvestment in localization, and structural negative international spillovers linked to high-income consumption, trade, and financial flows. Where governance and investment are aligned, progress remains attainable—as demonstrated in health outcomes and electricity access—yet environmental targets show substantial

regression. Achieving 1.5°C-consistent pathways requires electricity systems to reach approximately 70–85% renewables by 2050, underscoring the magnitude of acceleration required. We outline priority reforms to the international financial architecture (enhanced debt relief, scaled climate finance, and renewed MDB mandates), more binding follow-up and review processes, systematic SDG localization, strengthened statistical capacity, private-sector incentive realignment, and just transition frameworks. We also identify critical research gaps in policy coherence mechanisms, private finance accountability, the debt–development–climate nexus, spillover measurement, and SDG interlinkages. Despite current trajectories, a meaningful course correction by 2030 remains possible through rapid, coordinated action across governance, finance, and consumption systems.

1 Introduction

The adoption of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in September 2015 marked an unprecedented, universal commitment to integrated development [1]. The framework comprises 17 interconnected Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and 169 targets spanning poverty eradication, environmental protection, human rights, and economic prosperity. It signaled a shift from the Millennium Development Goals (2000–2015): sustainable development is indivisible, and all countries—rich and poor—must undertake transformative change [1].

The SDGs envisioned a "decade of action" mobilizing political will, finance, and innovation to "leave no one behind," recognizing the systemic links among deprivation, inequality, and environmental degradation [1]. Early momentum was visible: governments launched Voluntary National Reviews (VNRs), civil society mobilized, and the private sector pledged support [3].

1.1 Recognizing Unprecedented Progress in Global Coordination

Before examining implementation shortfalls, it is essential to acknowledge an extraordinary achievement: the SDG framework itself represents one of the most ambitious coordinated global undertakings in history. Launching such a comprehensive agenda was far from straightforward—it required navigating a science-intensive process involving thousands of researchers across disciplines, a data-demanding endeavor requiring new statistical capacities across 193 member states, and a stakeholder-intensive enterprise engaging governments, civil society, private sector, and academia simultaneously across all regions of the world. The expectation that such a complex, interconnected agenda could be implemented globally within a single decade was inherently ambitious.

What has been accomplished since 2015 is nonetheless remarkable. The framework has successfully been translated into national policy and legal instruments

2

across diverse governance contexts, from federal democracies to unitary states, from high-income economies to least developed countries. Science-based metrics and interdisciplinary analytical approaches have been developed and refined, enabling systematic tracking of progress across 231 unique indicators. Extensive capacity building programs have been established, strengthening statistical offices, training policymakers, and enhancing institutional coordination mechanisms [50]. Educational curricula at all levels—from primary schools to executive education—have been developed to mainstream sustainability competencies. Significant technological advancements, including AI-enabled monitoring systems, digital twins, and earth observation platforms, now support SDG implementation [53]. And while financing gaps persist, substantial financial innovations—from green bonds and sustainability-linked loans to blended finance mechanisms—have emerged to channel resources toward sustainable development [52].

Perhaps most significantly, the global engagement with the SDG framework has been unprecedented in scale. As of 2024, 190 out of 193 UN member states have submitted Voluntary National Reviews—representing near-universal participation in a voluntary reporting mechanism [49]. This level of engagement has no parallel in the history of international development cooperation. It demonstrates that despite implementation challenges, the normative framework has achieved extraordinary legitimacy and political traction across the international community. The parallel emergence of Voluntary Local Reviews at subnational levels further extends this engagement to cities and regions, creating multi-level governance architectures for sustainable development [47].

1.2 The Implementation Gap: From Commitment to Delivery

Notwithstanding these achievements, the evidence at the midpoint reveals a significant gap between commitment and delivery. As of 2023, only 15–17% of assessable targets are on track for achievement by 2030, while approximately 37% have stagnated or regressed below 2015 levels [2]. This trajectory echoes the 2019 Global Sustainable Development Report warning that "not a single SDG is projected to be met globally by 2030 under current trends" [9]. Compounding shocks—COVID-19, renewed geopolitical conflict, climate extremes, and economic instability—have disrupted implementation and exposed structural fragilities in the global development system [4, 5]. The challenge, therefore, is not one of conceptual design or lack of scientific knowledge, but rather of translating a sound framework into accelerated, coordinated action at the required scale and pace.

1.3 The Financing Crisis and Global Financial Architecture

Financing shortfalls are acute. The annual SDG investment gap for developing countries widened from about $2.5 trillion pre-COVID to approximately $3.6–4 trillion by 2022–2023, driven by collapsing revenues, reduced capital flows, and weaker remittances. This is not only a funding gap but a misalignment between the International Financial Architecture and development priorities [6].

Urgent reforms are required to channel capital toward emerging market and developing economies. The 2025 Sustainable Development Report highlights sustainable development as high-return, but achieving it demands systemic changes: reworked debt sustainability frameworks (including debt-for-climate swaps), scaled and predictable climate finance, and instruments that match long-term investment horizons [6, 43]. Persistent challenges include: (1) delayed delivery of the $100 billion annual climate-finance pledge; (2) Official Development Assistance falling short of needs; (3) rising sovereign debt burdens; and (4) insufficient private-sector mobilization [6].

1.4 Global Spillovers and Policy Coherence Challenges

A consistent finding is that high-income countries' consumption, trade, and financial practices can hinder SDG progress elsewhere—"negative international spillovers' [3]. High-income countries (roughly one-sixth of the global population) account for a disproportionate share of consumption-based material footprints and emissions, with per-capita footprints several times sustainable levels. Resulting pressures include tropical deforestation (timber, beef, palm oil), ocean acidification via atmospheric carbon, and biodiversity loss from habitat conversion. The Europe Sustainable Development Report 2025 documents substantial externalization of Europe's environmental footprint through imports—significant shares of land, material, and CO_2 embodied in supply chains outside Europe, with magnitudes varying by metric and year [7].

Policy incoherence compounds these spillovers. Tax competition induces a "race to the bottom," eroding developing countries' fiscal space. Trade and IP rules that constrain technology transfer, agricultural subsidies in OECD economies, and restrictive migration regimes collectively disadvantage lower-income countries.

1.5 Research Significance and Objectives

This systematic review synthesizes UN Global Sustainable Development Reports (2016, 2019, 2024), annual Sustainable Development Reports (2016–2025), thematic policy briefs, stakeholder-engagement guides, regional assessments, and implementation frameworks (2015–2025). It addresses three questions:

1. What is the current state of SDG progress globally, regionally, and thematically, and how has it evolved since 2015?
2. Which policy instruments, governance mechanisms, and financing strategies show promise for accelerating implementation?
3. Which knowledge gaps most constrain action, and what research and policy priorities are urgent as 2030 approaches?

The contribution is fivefold. First, it integrates the most authoritative assessments into a coherent account of successes and failures. Second, it critically evaluates proposed remedies—from International Financial Architecture reform to multi-stakeholder partnerships—assessing feasibility and limits. Third, it surfaces persistent data gaps and governance deficits that must be closed to re-align trajectories with 2030 targets. Fourth, it draws on multilingual sources (English, Spanish, French) to broaden geographic and institutional coverage. Finally, it offers evidence-based recommendations for the decisive 2025–2030 window.

2 Methodology

2.1 Document Selection and Classification

This systematic review analyzed 41 core documents classified into nine primary categories as detailed in Table 1: (1) **UN Global Reports**—annual SDG progress reports produced by UN DESA and the UN Secretary-General providing comprehensive implementation status updates; (2) **SDG Progress Reports**—annual assessments (2016–2025) produced by the Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN), featuring the SDG Index and Dashboards tracking progress across 167 countries; (3) **Global Sustainable Development Reports (GSDRs)**—flagship UN assessments coordinated by the Department of Economic and Social Affairs (2016) and, since 2019, produced by independent expert groups appointed by the UN Secretary-General (2019, 2024); (4) **Regional Reports** including the Europe Sustainable Development Report (2025), SDG assessments for Africa's Agenda 2063, and analyses covering Asia–Pacific, Latin America, Caribbean, and Small Island Developing States; (5) **Energy and Climate Reports** addressing energy transitions, decarbonization pathways, and climate-SDG synergies; (6) **Multi-stakeholder Partnership Reports** addressing partnership models, civil society reporting, stakeholder engagement guides, and localization strategies; (7) **Data and Capacity Development Reports** examining national statistical systems, Voluntary National Review processes, and evaluation frameworks [41, 42]; (8) **Specialized Topic Reports** covering health, education, biodiversity, water security, ocean sustainability, and other sectoral analyses [44, 45]; and (9) **Urban and Local Reports** addressing SDG localization at subnational levels and disaster resilience in urban contexts.

Document inclusion criteria were: (a) official UN or UN-affiliated institution publications; (b) focus on SDG implementation, progress assessment, or policy recommendations; (c) publication between 2015–2025; (d) English, Spanish, or French language primary documents or comprehensive syntheses. Documents were excluded if they focused narrowly on single countries (except regional aggregate analyses) or presented preliminary working papers without formal publication status.

In addition to the 41 core documents that were systematically selected and analyzed through structured coding, 4 supplementary sources (policy briefs, UN resolutions, and specialized technical reports) were consulted to provide contextual background for specific data points and policy developments. These supporting sources were not subjected to the systematic coding process but are included in the bibliography for completeness and reproducibility. All subsequent references to the document corpus refer to the 41 systematically analyzed core documents unless otherwise specified.

Beyond this categorical classification, the corpus can also be analyzed by scope and focus. From a geographic perspective, 30 documents provide global aggregations and cross-country comparisons, 18 address specific regions (Africa, Europe, Asia–Pacific, Latin America, Caribbean, and Small Island Developing States), and the remaining documents focus on thematic, implementation, and specialized topics. From a thematic perspective, 15 documents examine specific SDGs or cross-cutting issues, 5 address governance mechanisms and partnership models, and 3 focus on specialized nexus

analyses including climate-development interactions and water-energy-food security. Temporally, the documents span 2015–2025, capturing the full trajectory from SDG adoption through the midpoint review and toward 2025 implementation milestones.

2.2 Analytical Framework

The review employed a structured thematic analysis approach, coding each document against six dimensions: (1) **Progress Assessment**—quantitative data on SDG target achievement rates, target-specific trends, and regional/sectoral variations; (2) **Implementation Barriers**—identified obstacles including financing gaps, governance deficits, data limitations, and external shocks; (3) **Policy Instruments**—recommended mechanisms for accelerating progress, including financing strategies, governance reforms, and partnership models; (4) **Stakeholder Roles**—positioning and responsibilities of governments, private sector, civil society, academia, and international institutions; (5) **Regional Variations**—how progress trajectories, challenges, and proposed solutions vary geographically; and (6) **Data and Monitoring**—assessment of indicator availability, data quality, and monitoring frameworks.

Cross-document synthesis was performed by extracting consistent metrics across reports (percentage of targets on track, financing gap estimates, regional performance rankings) to identify convergent findings and contradictions. When reports presented different assessments of the same phenomenon, the analysis examined methodological differences and contextual factors explaining divergence.

2.3 Document Corpus Integration

The systematic review analysed 41 core documents complemented by 4 supporting sources for contextual reference, totalling 45 documents covering SDG implementation from 2015–2025. These materials represent the most authoritative assessments available, produced by UN entities, independent scientific groups, and affiliated research networks. Table 1 summarises the corpus by category, temporal coverage, primary institutional sources, and key analytical contributions.

In addition to global assessments, thematic studies, and regional reports, we explicitly include the *Voluntary National Reviews (VNR) 2025 Handbook* and country-led VNR materials as a governance-and-process evidence stream. VNRs are the UN's official country review mechanism; as of October 2024, almost all UN Member States (a total of 191 countries and the European Union) have presented *366 VNRs (2016–2024)*, with 2025 submissions underway.[1] These sources document whole-of-government coordination and multi-stakeholder participation, complementing outcome-focused monitoring reports [49].

The corpus exhibits four features. First, temporal coverage spans the entire SDG era from 2015 through mid-decade assessments (2024–2025), capturing both early implementation and crisis-affected periods. Second, geographic scope balances global syntheses with regional specificity, enabling identification of universal patterns and

---

[1]Counts reflect submissions recorded by UN DESA through end-October 2024 and will evolve as 2025 presentations proceed. See [49].

Table 1 Integration of Document Corpus by Category and Temporal Coverage

Document Category	n	Years	Primary Sources	Key Contributions
Core Documents (Systematically Analysed)				
UN Global Reports	5	2015–2024	UN DESA, UN Secretary-General	Implementation status, progress tracking
SDG Progress Reports	5	2019–2025	SDSN, Bertelsmann Stiftung	Trend analysis, SDG Index, rankings
GSDR Reports	3	2016, 2019, 2024	Independent Group of Scientists	Systemic analysis, transformations
Regional Reports	3	2015–2025	AU, SDSN	Geographic variations, spillovers
Energy & Climate	7	2019–2024	IEA, IRENA, UNFCCC, UNEP	Sector progress, decarbonisation
Multi-stakeholder	3	2022–2025	UN DESA, ECOSOC	Partnership models, engagement
Data & Capacity	4	2019–2021	UNSTAT, PARIS21, World Bank	Monitoring, statistical capacity
Specialised Topics	9	2015–2024	WHO, FAO, UNESCO, CBD, OHCHR	Health, education, biodiversity
Urban & Local	2	2024	UN-Habitat, GFDRR	Localisation, disaster resilience
Subtotal	**41**	**2015–2025**	**Multiple UN entities**	**Comprehensive SDG assessment**
Supporting Sources (Contextual Reference Only)				
Governance & Implementation	1	2025	UN DESA	VNR processes, coordination
Policy & Technical Briefs	3	2019–2023	UNCTAD, IMF, SDSN	Contextual data, policy developments
TOTAL CORPUS	**45**	**2015–2025**	**Multiple UN & affiliated entities**	**Complete evidence base**

context-dependent variation. Third, thematic diversity encompasses progress monitoring, governance mechanisms, financing strategies, sectoral analyses, and capacity development, supporting a multi-dimensional assessment of implementation challenges and opportunities. Fourth, institutional diversity across UN departments, independent scientific groups, and specialised agencies underpins analytical independence and methodological rigour.

3 Results: Global Progress Assessment

This assessment draws on Voluntary National Reviews (VNRs) submitted by over 190 countries since 2016 (**366** submissions through October 2024; 2025 reviews underway) [49, 6]. Although VNRs vary in depth, data quality, and stakeholder coverage, they remain the principal state-led instrument for diagnosing SDG progress, challenges, and priorities. As many countries now present their third or fourth VNR, longitudinal trajectories are increasingly visible. To mitigate heterogeneity and reporting gaps,

we triangulate VNR evidence with UN global assessments, academic literature, and regional studies to assemble an integrated, cross-validated picture.

3.1 The 15% plateau: understanding off-track progress

Across the most recent measurement cycles, only 15–17% of assessable targets are on track for 2030 [2]. In 2023, 31 of 169 targets lacked sufficient data for trend assessment, leaving 138 assessable; of these, roughly 16% were on track, 37% were stagnant or regressing relative to 2015, and the remainder advanced too slowly to reach 2030 [2]. This pattern is *consistent* with the 2019 Global Sustainable Development Report's warning that, under then-current trends and available measurement coverage, no SDG was likely to be achieved globally by 2030 [3]. Exogenous shocks since 2020—pandemic waves, renewed geopolitical conflict, intensifying climate extremes, and macroeconomic instability—have constrained fiscal space and administrative capacity, producing stagnation rather than recovery in many domains through 2025 [4, 5].

3.2 SDG-by-SDG progress landscape

The sectoral picture is heterogeneous. In health (SDG 3), decades of investment continue to yield gains: under-5 mortality fell from 46 per 1,000 live births in 2010 to 39 in 2021 [22], with parallel though slower improvements in neonatal mortality—declining from ∼31 per 1,000 in 2000 to ∼18 by 2018 and continuing downward into the 2020s [25, 22]. These averages conceal large disparities—particularly in sub-Saharan Africa—and expose vulnerabilities where climate risks and preparedness gaps intersect with fragile health systems [10, 46]. Energy (SDG 7) shows similarly mixed progress. Global access to electricity increased from **84%** in 2010 to **91%** in 2021, yet approximately **675 million** people—disproportionately in sub-Saharan Africa—remain without access [20, 8, 5]. Renewable capacity additions have been rapid, but renewables supplied approximately 17% of total final energy consumption in the late 2010s [9]; meeting 1.5°C pathways typically requires electricity systems to reach ∼70–85% renewables by 2050, supported by storage, grids, and demand flexibility—implying a substantial acceleration relative to present trends [9, 34, 38, 37].

Poverty dynamics (SDG 1) illustrate both what is possible and how easily gains can reverse. Before the pandemic, rapid reductions—especially in East and South Asia—were aided by growth and expanded social protection [10]. In 2020, however, an estimated 71 million people were pushed into extreme poverty, the first global increase in decades [5]. Subsequent recoveries have been uneven, with rural transformation in least developed countries showing promise but remaining contingent on finance and technical support at scale [42]. Food systems (SDG 2) are a pronounced outlier: the number of people affected by hunger rose to an estimated 691–783 million in 2022 (midpoint ∼735 million), as climate shocks, conflicts (including grain and fertiliser disruptions), and economic headwinds compounded vulnerability [17, 42]. Education (SDG 4) retains near-universal primary completion in many regions and strong youth literacy gains, yet deep inequities persist beyond primary school, and COVID-19 learning losses have enduring distributional effects [10, 41]. Gender equality (SDG 5) registers notable improvements in enrolment—women's tertiary participation exceeds

men's in most high-income settings—while parity in decision-making lags; only about a quarter of parliamentarians are women globally, wage gaps persist, and gender-based violence remains pervasive [10, 46]. Water and sanitation (SDG 6) reflect a similar duality: basic services expanded, but around 2.2 billion people still lack safely managed drinking water and roughly 3.5 billion lack safely managed sanitation. Rapid urbanisation, affordability constraints, and deteriorating water quality indicate that service expansion alone will not close the safety gap [10].

Environmental goals exhibit the sharpest regression. Climate action (SDG 13) remains off-trajectory: even full implementation of current nationally determined contributions would imply warming of about 2.7°C by 2100, far above Paris objectives [38, 6]. Climate-related mobility is already rising, with projections of tens to hundreds of millions of internal migrants by mid-century under different scenarios [44]. Oceans and terrestrial ecosystems (SDGs 14–15) continue to degrade: the share of fish stocks within biologically sustainable levels fell from ∼90% in 1974 to 64.6% in 2019 [18, 19], and net forest area declined by ∼178 Mha between 1990 and 2020, with acute primary forest loss in the tropics during the 2010s [39]. Implementation of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework remains underfinanced and behind schedule [45].

Economic and structural goals show progress that is real yet insufficient in quality or pace. Decent work and growth (SDG 8) expanded employment, but job quality diverged and working poverty persisted: in 2022, about 214 million employed people lived in extreme poverty (US$ 2.15, 2017 PPP). Youth unemployment remains substantially higher than adult rates, and employed young people are more likely than adults to be in extreme poverty, with least developed, landlocked, and small island states experiencing the most acute constraints [10]. Industry, innovation and infrastructure (SDG 9) have advanced in many countries, yet large gaps in transport, digital connectivity, water, and energy infrastructure continue to limit productivity and inclusion; while ODA for infrastructure has risen, it remains far below what is needed for universal access by 2030. Inequality (SDG 10) trends reflect the longer arc of distributional change: since the late 1980s, gains accrued to the global top decile and to rising middle classes in developing countries, with stagnation for poorer and lower-middle groups in advanced economies, reinforcing polarisation [11]. Patterns of consumption and production (SDG 12) remain fundamentally misaligned with planetary boundaries: global material extraction increased from 70 Gt in 2010 to 92 Gt in 2017, e-waste reached 53.6 Mt in 2019 with only about one-fifth properly collected and recycled, explicit fossil-fuel consumption subsidies climbed from US$ 318 bn (2015) to US$ 427 bn (2018) and exceeded US$ 1 trillion in 2022, and when externalities are included, total explicit+implicit fossil-fuel subsidies are estimated near US$ 7 trillion in 2022 [5, 9, 37, 2].

Taken together, the global results depict a world where social investments have continued to yield improvements in survival, schooling, and access to electricity, but where food security, gender-based violence, water safety, and job quality remain stubbornly off-track—and where environmental objectives are drifting furthest from feasibility. The interplay of constrained fiscal space, policy fragmentation, and mounting climate risks now shapes the prospects of every goal area, reinforcing the central conclusion

9

that business-as-usual cannot deliver the 2030 outcomes without decisive changes in governance, financing, and accountability.

4 Financing and Global Financial Architecture

4.1 The expanding financing gap

Achieving the SDGs requires investment at a scale that early estimates (˜2–3% of world GDP per year) understated [3]. As implementation hurdles mounted and shocks accumulated, needs rose while fiscal space shrank. For developing countries, the annual SDG investment gap widened from $2.5 trillion pre-COVID to approximately $3.6–4 trillion by 2022–2023, driven by collapsing domestic revenues, retreat of private capital to safe havens, and declines in remittances [3, 6].

This shortfall reflects structural misalignment rather than a temporary funding dip: existing channels—bilateral aid, MDB lending, private flows—are insufficient in *scale*, hard to access, and poorly targeted toward the most vulnerable. Middle-income countries face shrinking concessional finance despite large needs; LDCs, SIDS, and LLDCs face the steepest barriers due to capacity constraints and perceived risk.

4.2 Reforming the international financial architecture

Sustainable development is a high-return public investment, but realizing those returns requires systemic reform of the international financial architecture (IFA) [6]. Institutions designed for a different era (IMF, World Bank, MDBs) must be retooled to support long-horizon, SDG-aligned capital formation.

Debt and fiscal space.

Many countries now spend more on debt service than on health and education combined. Priorities include fit-for-purpose Debt Sustainability Analyses, comprehensive restructurings, and scale-up of debt-for-climate/development swaps; repayment schedules should better match development payback periods. Countries in special situations (LDCs, SIDS, LLDCs) require enhanced instruments and contingency financing.

Capital flow alignment.

Investment horizons measured in quarters cannot finance multi-decade infrastructure or social investments. Reforms across DFIs/MDBs and national development banks should shift risk appetites, crowd in private capital at lower cost of capital, and reward SDG impact over short-term profitability [43].

Climate finance.

The $100 billion pledge was missed in 2020 (˜$80 bn in 2019) and, per OECD, reached only in 2022—two years late. Commitments remain far below the ˜$5 trillion annually needed by 2030 for energy system decarbonization and resilience [27, 9, 43]. The gap constrains mitigation, adaptation, and loss-and-damage responses in EMDEs.

ODA rose from \$126 bn (2012) to \$147.4 bn (2019) [3] but remains below the 0.7% GNI target and is increasingly crisis-oriented rather than transformational, weakening long-term capacity building.

Private finance.

Global liquidity is ample, yet barriers persist: high perceived risk in frontier markets, weak pipelines, inadequate blended-finance and de-risking tools, and permissive ESG regimes that enable greenwashing rather than verified SDG impact [43].

4.3 Innovative financing mechanisms

Promising instruments exist but are insufficient at current scale. Blended finance can leverage concessional capital; labelled bonds (green/social/sustainability) have grown (cumulative green issuance ~\$500 bn by 2021); and social impact bonds can tie payments to outcomes. Debt-for-climate swaps can free fiscal space while accelerating decarbonization. Carbon pricing (taxes/ETS) raises revenue and shifts incentives, but coverage and price levels remain too low for transformative change. Lower-cost remittances can unlock household-level investment; stronger domestic resource mobilization—via tax capacity, base broadening, and anti-evasion measures—can expand fiscal space.

Even optimistic deployment of these tools does not close a multi-trillion-dollar gap. Incremental innovation must be paired with IFA reform that expands concessionality, reduces EMDE capital costs, aligns global savings with long-term SDG assets, and hardwires accountability for real-economy impact.

5 Governance, Partnerships, and Localization

5.1 Policy fragmentation as a central barrier

Across sources, the binding constraint is not only funding but the fragmentation of policy and institutions. Fragmentation operates horizontally across sectors, vertically across government levels, and temporally across political and SDG time horizons— producing compounding coordination failures.

Horizontal (intersectoral) fragmentation.

Few countries maintain enduring mechanisms to align energy, water, agriculture, transport, social protection, education, and health under integrated SDG objectives. Roughly one quarter of VNRs report effective horizontal coordination. Where progress exists (e.g., Denmark, Costa Rica, Finland), governments have empowered cabinet-level SDG councils or equivalents with mandate and resources to arbitrate trade-offs, support policy coherence, and align budgets. Understanding these coordination failures requires examining not only institutional structures but also the behavioral and cognitive dimensions that shape decision-making across government actors. Insights from behavioral economics suggest that policy fragmentation reflects systematic biases

in how policymakers perceive trade-offs, discount future benefits, and respond to stakeholder pressures [50].

Vertical (national–subnational) fragmentation.

Despite the LNOB principle, national strategies often do not cascade to the subnational level where delivery occurs. Evidence from Voluntary Local Reviews (VLRs) highlights thin local capacity (limited SDG planning skills, weak technical support) and constrained local financing. As of end-2024, more than 240 VLRs signal growing local engagement [12, 47]; yet few countries legally or fiscally link national SDG targets to local mandates, leaving localization voluntary rather than systemic.

Temporal fragmentation.

The 15-year SDG horizon misaligns with 4–5 year political cycles. Fewer than one in five countries report integrating SDG targets into core budget processes; most SDG-relevant expenditures remain siloed in "development' envelopes rather than mainstreamed into sectoral budgets. The result is incentives for short-term visibility over long-term transformation and a rhetorical–operational gap in public finance.

5.2 Multi-stakeholder partnerships: promise and peril

Multi-stakeholder partnerships (MSPs) are central to implementation strategies, combining governmental authority, private-sector innovation, civil-society reach, academic expertise, and international coordination.

5.2.1 Successful MSP models

Global health. Gavi has mobilized substantial long-term resources for routine immunization and outbreak response, while the Global Fund invests at multi-billion-dollar scale each year, coupling country ownership with data-driven allocation and monitoring [14].
Energy access. SE4All, ESMAP, and national PPPs have accelerated new connections by pairing enabling policy and targeted subsidies with private delivery and DFI concessional finance [3].

5.2.2 Practice evidence from VNR processes

The *Handbook for the Preparation of Voluntary National Reviews (2025 edition)* treats multi-stakeholder participation as foundational and recommends explicit engagement plans (who, how, and how recorded), with emphasis on marginalized groups [49]. Country practice illustrates breadth: Mexico's 2024 VNR co-designed inputs with academia, CSOs, youth, unions, and the private sector and translated outputs into indigenous languages; Ireland's 2023 VNR included an open drafting process and a youth-authored chapter. Beyond participation, the Handbook underscores interministerial coordination and multi-sectoral involvement to convert consultation into

delivery. Cumulatively, *191 countries and the European Union* have presented *366 VNRs (2016–2024)*, with *37* countries preparing to present in 2025.[2] [49]

5.2.3 Common failure modes

Accountability. Diffuse responsibility blurs attribution and weakens enforcement when contributions lag [31].

Equity. Commercial incentives can bias MSPs toward bankable segments, sidelining poorest groups and risking elite capture where CSO capacity is thin.

Sustainability. Donor-dependence and weak domestic ownership threaten continuity post-funding.

Power asymmetries. Large corporates and high-income donors often dominate governance, crowding out local voices and priorities.

5.3 Localization and subnational implementation

An estimated ∼ 65% of SDG targets map to local and regional government functions [12, 47]. Effective delivery therefore hinges on structured localization—contextualizing targets, empowering subnational authorities, and resourcing implementation.

5.3.1 Successful localization models

VLRs are diffusing rapidly and increasingly feed into VNRs, strengthening vertical complementarity [49]. Spain's third VNR integrates: (i) indicator tracking; (ii) inputs from a Sustainable Development Council (civil society); and (iii) a public-administration skills plan—linking municipal action to national strategy and capacity building. Botswana's SDG Roadmap, ministerial focal points, and a Joint National Steering Committee illustrate institutional bridges between ministries and local authorities; the CEPA Principles offer an operational template to embed such arrangements [49].

5.3.2 Barriers and solution pathways

Financing. Misaligned fiscal frameworks starve local mandates.

Capacity. Municipal planning, budgeting, and M&E systems are underdeveloped.

Data. Disaggregated, local-scale indicators remain patchy.

The *VNR Handbook (2025 edition)* points to actionable steps: (1) institutionalize VLRs as regular cycles linked to VNRs; (2) require disaggregation and evidence of engagement across all government levels; and (3) formalize stakeholder inclusion mechanisms [49]. Complementary reforms include aligning fiscal transfers with SDG mandates (decentralization with resources), structured capacity-building for subnational officials, and investments in municipal data systems and earth-observation-enabled indicators to close the local evidence gap.

---

[2]Official counts and 2025 pipeline per VNR Handbook 2025 Foreword and introductory pages. At the HLPF 2025, 37 countries will present their VNRs—10 for the second time, 23 for the third, and 4 for the fourth time.

6 Regional Comparisons

6.1 European progress and spillover effects

The *Europe Sustainable Development Report 2025* (ESDR 2025) offers the most granular snapshot of European SDG performance to date, revealing a dual reality: comparatively strong domestic outcomes alongside sizable negative externalities transmitted through trade, finance, and consumption [7]. European countries generally excel on legacy human-development metrics, yet their external environmental and social footprints remain large and persistent. Recent comprehensive assessments have further examined the European Green Deal's alignment with SDG targets, revealing both progress in domestic policy integration and persistent implementation gaps in addressing consumption-driven spillovers [52]. These analyses confirm that while Europe maintains comparative advantages in social development indicators, the region's environmental performance remains constrained by consumption patterns that externalize pressures through global supply chains [7, 52].

Areas of domestic progress.

Poverty (SDG 1). High-income welfare architectures have contained extreme poverty and cushioned macro shocks; however, recent upticks in relative poverty and market-income inequality signal pressure on distributional outcomes. *Health (SDG 3).* Near-universal coverage, high life expectancy, and resilient primary care represent enduring strengths; nonetheless, COVID-19 exposed gaps in preparedness, surge capacity, and equitable access that require institutionalization of lessons learned. *Education (SDG 4).* Europe maintains near-universal basic attainment with high secondary and tertiary participation. Quality and equity challenges persist across socioeconomic strata, migrant and refugee populations, and regions with teacher shortages or digital divides. *Gender equality (SDG 5).* Representation has improved across parliaments and professional tracks; yet wage gaps, glass-ceiling effects, and gender-based violence continue to impede full parity.

Domestic headwinds relative to planetary constraints.

Responsible consumption (SDG 12). Material consumption per capita remains well above safe-operating thresholds; circular-economy diffusion is real but not yet transformational in resource intensity or waste generation. *Climate action (SDG 13).* Territorial emissions have fallen since 2008 through efficiency and renewables, but current trajectories do not fully align with a 1.5°C-consistent pathway; hard-to-abate sectors and buildings retrofits are lagging. *Biodiversity (SDGs 14–15).* Despite protected-area expansion, habitat fragmentation, agricultural intensification, and pollution continue to erode ecosystem integrity.

International spillovers and equity implications.

As discussed in Section 1, Europe remains a net importer of embodied emissions and other environmental pressures; a significant share of land, material, and CO_2 footprints from EU consumption is generated outside the Union, with shares varying by metric and year [7]. Supply chains serving European demand drive: (i) tropical

deforestation linked to timber, beef, palm oil, and other commodities; (ii) conflict-affected mineral extraction associated with human-rights risks in parts of Africa; and (iii) plantation-driven land conversion across Southeast Asia, including displacement of Indigenous communities. These spillovers depress the policy space and environmental capacity of lower-income producers, effectively externalizing costs and complicating their domestic SDG delivery. Addressing such systemic spillovers requires coordinated trade, due-diligence, and sustainable-finance policies within Europe to complement domestic decarbonization and circularity measures [7].

6.2 Africa's progress and Agenda 2063 integration

African SDG implementation unfolds alongside the African Union's *Agenda 2063*, a continental transformation blueprint. The twin frameworks can be mutually reinforcing, but they also risk duplicative reporting and fragmented resource allocation absent deliberate alignment.

Areas of progress.

Poverty (SDG 1). Absolute poverty declined over the 2010s, lifting tens of millions from extreme deprivation, even as relative poverty and inequality widened in several economies [32]. *Health (SDG 3).* Under-5 mortality has fallen due to vaccination scale-up, maternal-health gains, and disease-control programs. *Education (SDG 4).* Primary net enrollment has risen markedly across most countries, with gradual expansion of lower-secondary access. *Energy (SDG 7).* Connections have increased through grid extension and distributed renewables; nevertheless, Sub-Saharan Africa remains the least electrified region globally.

Persistent challenges.

Hunger (SDG 2). Food insecurity has intensified, with 250M+ people facing inadequate nutrition due to climate shocks, conflict disruptions, and macroeconomic instability [42]. *Gender equality (SDG 5).* Legal reforms have advanced, but gaps remain in political representation, labor-force participation, entrepreneurship finance, and protection from gender-based violence. *Water and sanitation (SDG 6).* Roughly 400M people lack safe water, and even more lack improved sanitation, constraining health and productivity. *Climate vulnerability (SDG 13).* Although contributing ¡4% of global GHGs, African countries experience disproportionate harm from droughts, floods, cyclones, and heat extremes—an inequity that underscores the urgency of scaled adaptation finance and risk-transfer instruments.

Governance alignment: Agenda 2063 × SDGs.

To reduce transaction costs and strengthen accountability, the AU Specialized Technical Committee (April 2016) endorsed a single monitoring and evaluation architecture linking Agenda 2063 with SDGs [13]. A unified reporting template built around 78 core indicators supports periodic, consolidated progress assessments. This approach eases demands on limited statistical capacity while preserving comparability for continental and global commitments, enabling more coherent planning, budgeting, and peer learning.

15

6.3 Asia–Pacific regional assessment

The Asia–Pacific spans extreme heterogeneity in income, demography, geography, and state capacity. Regional signals nonetheless emerge: rapid gains in East and South Asia anchor global SDG progress, while fragile and conflict-affected settings, landlocked economies, and small island developing states (SIDS) face persistent constraints.

East and South Asia: rapid advancement with new externalities.

Hundreds of millions have exited extreme poverty, led by China's historic reduction and India's sizable recent declines. Education participation has expanded toward universal primary, and energy access has accelerated through both grid and off-grid solutions. Yet progress remains below what is needed for full 2030 attainment, and the environmental side effects of industrialization—air pollution, water contamination, land conversion—have grown. Structural transitions toward cleaner industry, resilient urbanization, and nature-positive supply chains are now decisive.

South Asia: inclusion, infrastructure, and risk.

Gender inequality remains embedded in social norms and economic structures; legal change must be matched by enforcement, services, and agency-enhancing investments. Physical and digital infrastructure gaps constrain productivity and access to services; massive capital mobilization is required across transport, water, sanitation, and connectivity. Climate risk is systemic: sea-level rise threatens deltaic megacities; monsoon variability alters agricultural livelihoods; and extreme-heat events stress health and labor markets. Water scarcity—amplified by glacier retreat, aquifer depletion, and pollution—poses intertwined human and ecosystem risks.

Pacific SIDS: existential climate threats.

Rising seas jeopardize territorial integrity, habitability, and, ultimately, statehood for low-lying atolls, raising unprecedented questions around sovereignty, maritime zones, and climate-induced displacement. Climate impacts undermine agriculture and fisheries, challenging food security and economic viability. Adaptation and loss-and-damage needs far exceed available finance; consequently, many SIDS explicitly prioritize climate resilience and mobility planning, necessarily reordering the sequencing of other SDG investments.

Cross-cutting needs.

Across the region, priorities include (i) deep decarbonization with just-transition supports; (ii) resilient infrastructure and water governance; (iii) social protection and gender-transformative policies; and (iv) stronger statistical systems to track disaggregated progress. For SIDS, predictable and accessible climate finance, simplified modalities, and debt instruments compatible with disaster shocks are preconditions for sustained SDG advancement.

7 Climate Action and Energy Transitions

7.1 SDG 13 (Climate Action) and Paris Agreement Integration

Achieving SDG 13 and holding warming to well below 2°C—ideally 1.5°C—are mutually reinforcing imperatives that condition prospects across the entire 2030 Agenda. Climate change is a systemic risk multiplier for food security, water availability, health outcomes, economic stability, and peace; accordingly, climate alignment functions less as one goal among seventeen and more as a foundational requirement for sustainable development [11]. Yet the best available evidence indicates a widening gap between stated ambition and realized decarbonization.

Long-run emissions dynamics illustrate the challenge. Global CO_2 from fossil fuel use, cement, and flaring rose from 24.8 $GtCO_2$ in 2000 to 35.1 $GtCO_2$ in 2012—the largest absolute decadal increase on record [11, 38]. Since then, efficiency gains and rapid renewable deployments have slowed the carbon intensity of growth but not durably reversed absolute emissions. The drivers are well known: expanding industrial output in emerging economies, persistently high energy intensity in advanced economies, and the continued dominance of fossil fuels in end-use sectors that are harder to electrify.[3] The cumulative effect is an implementation gap that persists even as technology costs for low-carbon options continue to fall.

Scenario syntheses confirm that current nationally determined contributions (NDCs), even if fully implemented, would place the world on an approximate 2.7°C path by 2100—well beyond the Paris temperature range [6]. Integrated assessment modeling frameworks have proven essential for evaluating such climate-development pathways, though methodological choices significantly influence scenario outcomes and policy recommendations [51, 38]. Recent syntheses of IAM approaches highlight the need for greater transparency in model assumptions, particularly regarding technological feasibility, socioeconomic constraints, and equity dimensions. Such an outcome implies large and uneven damages: more frequent and intense extremes, accelerated sea-level rise with displacement risks for hundreds of millions, heightened threats to food systems, and substantial biodiversity loss [38]. Causes of the ambition–implementation gap are multi-level: insufficient near-term policies to reprice carbon and phase down fossil assets; misaligned finance that raises the cost of capital for emerging market and developing economies (EMDEs); and inadequate international risk-sharing for adaptation and just transitions [6, 37].

Closing this gap requires a structural acceleration in decarbonization. Evidence indicates that meeting a well-below 2°C goal requires roughly tripling the historical global decarbonization rate; 1.5°C-consistent pathways typically demand a quintupling, sustained over decades [9, 37]. Technically, this entails three concurrent shifts. *First*, a power-sector transformation in which renewables supply on the order of 70–85% of electricity by mid-century, supported by storage, grid expansion and interconnections, and flexible demand [9, 34]. *Second*, end-use electrification (transport, buildings) and targeted fuel-switching in industry, complemented by efficiency improvements that temper energy-service demand growth. *Third*, rapid mitigation of non-CO_2 gases—especially methane from energy, agriculture, and waste—because

---

[3]Throughout, we adopt the sectoral framing in [38]: power, buildings, transport, industry, and AFOLU.

abatement in these sources reduces near-term warming with comparatively low lock-in [38, 37]. Residual emissions in hard-to-abate segments will likely necessitate some carbon dioxide removal; nature-based options should be prioritized where co-benefits and governance are strong, while engineered CDR should be applied cautiously given cost and permanence considerations [38].

Land-use transformation is pivotal. Sustainable food systems require reversing net deforestation, restoring degraded ecosystems, and raising productivity at lower emissions intensity. Demand-side shifts—particularly moderating high meat consumption in wealthier contexts—can reduce pressure on land while yielding health co-benefits [9, 38]. These supply- and demand-side measures face political-economy headwinds, but feasibility improves as monitoring, verification, and finance instruments mature.

Equity considerations cut across all pathways. Per-capita emissions in high-income economies must fall rapidly to align with 1.5°C-consistent burden-sharing. For many households, this implies significant changes in mobility, housing, and consumption that will not occur at the required speed through voluntary action alone. Regulatory standards, public investment, and price instruments (with progressive recycling) are therefore central to enabling and protecting low- and middle-income households during the transition [37, 6]. Internationally, climate and development finance must be scaled and made more concessional so EMDEs can adopt clean technologies without sacrificing growth or poverty reduction [6].

Finally, climate risk is already materializing. Observed trends in heat extremes, hydrological variability, and compound events are consistent with attribution assessments, while multi-hazard losses have risen in several regions [40, 38]. Adaptation—long under-financed relative to need—now demands mainstreaming in sector plans (water, food, health, urban) and anticipatory risk management, including early-warning systems and climate-resilient infrastructure [37, 48]. Loss-and-damage arrangements recognized in recent COP decisions require operational clarity and predictable funding to function as a genuine safety net for the most vulnerable.

7.2 SDG 7 (Energy) and Just Transition

Energy is the connective tissue of development: reliable, affordable, and clean energy services underpin learning and digital connectivity, cold chains and clinical care, enterprise productivity, and basic human dignity. Yet the dual challenge—expanding access while decarbonizing—remains unmet at the needed scale. As of 2021, global electricity access reached about 91%, leaving roughly 675 million people without power—overwhelmingly in Sub-Saharan Africa, where population growth outpaces grid expansion [8]. Clean cooking access lags further: some 2.3 billion people still rely on solid fuels or kerosene, with profound health, gender, and environmental consequences [9, 5].

On the supply side, the energy mix is changing but not fast enough. Renewables accounted for roughly 17% of total final energy consumption in the late 2010s, with much higher shares in electricity than in heat and transport [9]. Meeting climate goals requires electricity to reach around 70–85% renewables by 2050, alongside accelerated end-use electrification and steep efficiency improvements [9, 34].

Persisting fossil-fuel subsidies and unpriced externalities skew incentives: explicit consumption subsidies surged and exceeded $1 trillion in 2022 amid price shocks, while total (implicit+explicit) subsidies that account for climate and health damages are estimated near $7 trillion in 2022—distorting markets against clean alternatives [9, 37].

A just transition lens is indispensable. Decarbonization creates transition winners and losers; credible policy must protect workers, communities, and low-income households while ensuring universal access. Five principles follow from practice and evidence. *First*, access and decarbonization must proceed together: least-cost electrification should combine grid, mini-grid, and stand-alone solutions, paired with affordability measures (lifeline tariffs, targeted subsidies) to avoid energy-poverty traps [8, 5]. *Second*, affected workers and regions require well-funded, multi-year packages—income support, reskilling, and regional diversification—rather than short-term project grants; social dialogue and local ownership improve outcomes. *Third*, carbon pricing and subsidy reform should be accompanied by progressive recycling to cushion vulnerable households and small firms while preserving abatement signals. *Fourth*, gender responsiveness must be designed in: women bear disproportionate time and health burdens from traditional fuels yet remain under-represented in energy employment and leadership; targeted inclusion improves both equity and effectiveness. *Fifth*, Indigenous rights and community consent are non-negotiable as large-scale renewables, grids, and critical-minerals projects expand; clean energy must not reproduce extractive injustices [46].

Technological options are available and improving. Solar and wind now outcompete new fossil generation in many markets; hydro and geothermal provide firm low-carbon capacity where resources permit; and utility-scale and distributed storage, demand response, and advanced inverters are enabling higher variable-renewable penetration by enhancing flexibility and reliability. Buildings retrofits (insulation, heat pumps), industrial process optimization, and fleet electrification deliver large efficiency gains while lowering operating costs. Digitalized "smart' grids integrate distributed resources and shave peaks. For hard-to-abate segments, green hydrogen and e-fuels offer plausible pathways, though cost, infrastructure, and efficiency constraints require careful targeting where alternatives are limited [34, 38].

Barriers are chiefly institutional and financial rather than technical. Carbon pricing remains uneven and too low to be decisive in many jurisdictions; permitting and planning systems are optimized for centralized thermal plants rather than distributed renewables and long-distance transmission; and capital costs are systematically higher in EMDEs, slowing otherwise cost-effective projects [6]. Addressing these frictions requires: (i) predictable policy frameworks and robust project pipelines; (ii) expanded blended-finance and risk-mitigation instruments to narrow EMDE financing premia; (iii) modernized market design that rewards flexibility and resource adequacy; and (iv) coordinated investment in grids, storage, and interconnections to unlock high-quality renewable resources at scale [37, 34, 6].

In sum, delivering SDG 13 and SDG 7 together hinges on aligning finance with long-term system needs, embedding equity in transition design, and executing at a pace consistent with temperature goals. The technologies are largely in hand; the

19

decisive variables are policy credibility, institutional capacity, and access to affordable capital—particularly in regions where development needs are greatest [6, 37].

8 Data Gaps and Monitoring Challenges

8.1 The 31-Target Data Crisis

A critical finding consistently emphasized across all comprehensive assessments is that fundamental data limitations hinder accurate progress measurement, effective policy targeting, and meaningful accountability for SDG implementation. The scale of this challenge becomes clear through quantification: the 2023 SDG Progress Report assessed all 169 global targets but noted that as of 2023, 31 targets lacked sufficient data for rigorous trend analysis [2]. This represents not merely a technical data collection problem but rather a governance deficit with profound implications—policies cannot be effectively targeted toward unmeasured goals, resources cannot be efficiently allocated without knowing where needs are greatest, and accountability mechanisms cannot function when progress remains unquantified.

Data gaps concentrate in specific domains reflecting measurement challenges and resource constraints. Food systems indicators under SDG 2 remain inadequately measured, with food loss and waste data incomplete across supply chains and greenhouse gas emissions from land use changes insufficiently tracked despite agriculture's substantial climate impact. Health system resilience metrics under SDG 3, particularly healthcare affordability and pandemic preparedness capacities, proved tragically inadequate during COVID-19 when countries discovered they lacked baseline data for assessing system robustness. Education quality indicators under SDG 4 incompletely measure actual learning outcomes as distinguished from enrollment, while early childhood development data remains sparse despite this period's critical importance for lifelong development [41]. Gender-based violence under SDG 5 suffers from systematic underreporting, cultural stigma, and inadequate measurement methodologies, with intimate partner violence data particularly incomplete. Water quality metrics under SDG 6, distinguishing between water access and water safety, lack adequate monitoring in most countries for both drinking water and surface water quality. Policy coherence mechanisms under SDG 17, assessing whether policies across sectors align with sustainable development rather than working at cross-purposes, have poorly developed measurement frameworks despite this dimension's fundamental importance.

8.1.1 Why Data Gaps Persist

Understanding why these gaps persist despite decades of capacity development efforts requires examining multiple interconnected factors. Technical capacity limitations in low-income countries represent the most visible constraint, as countries lack laboratory infrastructure necessary for environmental monitoring, water quality testing, and health surveillance. Trained personnel remain scarce, with skilled statisticians and technical specialists attracted to higher-paying private sector or international organization positions rather than national statistical offices. Financial resources for

comprehensive data collection prove chronically inadequate, as data systems compete with service delivery priorities in resource-constrained budgets.

Measurement methodology uncertainty affects targets where internationally agreed definitions and measurement approaches remain contested or undeveloped. Technical advisory groups work to develop standardized methodologies, but reaching international consensus on complex constructs proves time-consuming, and methodological debates can delay measurement for years. Transnational data challenges emerge for indicators requiring cross-border information sharing, where coordination difficulties, data sovereignty concerns, and incompatible national systems create obstacles. Cost constraints reflect that comprehensive SDG monitoring requires estimated investments of $5–10 million annually per country for statistical system strengthening, data collection, and reporting—amounts that many low-income countries cannot mobilize from domestic resources while donor support remains insufficient. Competing priorities overwhelm statistical offices facing demands for monitoring diverse policy areas—economic statistics, social indicators, environmental metrics, administrative data—with limited budgets and personnel.

8.2 Data Availability and Timeliness Challenges

Beyond indicators missing entirely from monitoring frameworks, data that exists suffers from timeliness problems that undermine utility for adaptive management and real-time accountability. Most global indicators operate with 2–3 year lags between data collection and international publication, reflecting time required for data cleaning, validation, aggregation, and dissemination through international statistical systems [8]. Some indicators, particularly environmental metrics requiring complex scientific measurements or satellite data processing, face 5–10 year delays between observation and availability for policymaking. This temporal lag fundamentally undermines real-time policy response, as governments must make decisions based on substantially outdated information, and accountability monitoring cannot detect emerging problems until long after interventions could have prevented deterioration.

Coverage disparities across SDGs reveal that data availability varies dramatically based on measurement complexity, institutional capacity, and historical monitoring priorities. Analyzing the Global SDG Indicators Database reveals consistent patterns. High coverage characterizes SDGs 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, and 9, which typically achieve 60–85% country coverage, reflecting that poverty, health, gender, energy, employment, and infrastructure indicators build on long-established monitoring systems developed during Millennium Development Goal era or earlier national statistical programs. Moderate coverage affects SDGs 2, 4, 6, and 11, which typically reach 40–60% country coverage, indicating that hunger, education, water, and urban indicators face greater measurement challenges but remain within capacity of most national statistical systems. Low coverage severely limits SDGs 12, 13, 14, and 15, which typically achieve less than 40% country coverage due to technical requirements for consumption pattern monitoring, atmospheric and oceanic measurements, biodiversity assessment, and satellite technology requiring substantial investment in specialized equipment and expertise.

Environmental goals suffer the most acute data deficits. SDG 13 (Climate Action) and SDG 14 (Life Below Water) average only 30–40% country coverage because comprehensive climate monitoring requires atmospheric composition measurements, emissions inventories across all economic sectors, and climate impact assessments that exceed most countries' technical capacity. Ocean sustainability monitoring demands marine surveys, fisheries stock assessments, and ocean chemistry monitoring requiring specialized vessels, equipment, and expertise that few countries possess.

8.3 Statistical Capacity and National Systems

Strengthening national statistical systems represents a prerequisite for improved SDG monitoring, yet progress since 2015 has been disappointingly limited given the monitoring challenge's scale. The Statistical Performance Index—a composite measure assessing statistical capacity across methodology, data sources, and periodicity—shows only modest improvements in developing countries during the SDG era [8]. More troublingly, investments in statistical capacity building fell sharply from approximately $834 million in 2019 to $700 million in 2020—a decline of roughly $134 million—before partially rebounding with a 14% increase to $799 million in 2021 [2, 33]. Despite this recovery, the net two-year decline of approximately $35 million (2019–2021) and the volatility in funding occurred precisely when enhanced capacity was most needed for pandemic response and recovery monitoring, revealing that statistical capacity development remains vulnerable to budget pressures despite its essential role in evidence-based governance.

National Statistical Offices face multiple interconnected obstacles limiting their effectiveness. Chronic underfunding relative to mandate scope means that NSOs must prioritize among competing demands, leaving some statistical domains inadequately monitored. Brain drain of skilled statisticians to better-paying private sector positions depletes technical capacity, as NSOs struggle to compete with consulting firms, research organizations, and international agencies offering higher compensation. Inadequate digitalization of data systems leaves many NSOs relying on paper-based processes, manual data entry, and obsolete computing infrastructure that limit efficiency and analytical capacity. Difficulty recruiting and retaining staff in rural and remote areas creates geographic gaps in data collection, as surveyors prefer urban postings and statistical offices cannot offer adequate compensation or working conditions to attract personnel to challenging locations. Political pressure affecting statistical independence undermines data credibility when governments seek to manipulate statistics for political advantage, particularly around sensitive topics like poverty, unemployment, or inequality.

The COVID-19 pandemic revealed these vulnerabilities with devastating clarity. According to comprehensive surveys conducted by the UN Statistics Division, approximately two-thirds of National Statistical Offices reported that pandemic-related disruptions significantly limited their ability to produce essential monthly and quarterly statistics, meet international reporting requirements, and maintain data quality standards. Field data collection became impossible during lockdowns, forcing improvisation through phone surveys and other remote methods that introduced

sampling biases and limited question types. Staff illnesses and remote working arrangements reduced productivity while increasing coordination challenges. Budget cuts in response to fiscal pressures reduced resources available precisely when demands for pandemic-related data intensified.

8.4 Innovative Data Solutions and Technologies

Recent assessments increasingly highlight emerging data solutions and technologies offering potential to address some persistent gaps through approaches beyond traditional survey and census methods. Geospatial and earth observation technologies represent perhaps the most immediately applicable innovation, as satellite imagery and geographic information systems enable monitoring of environmental indicators without requiring extensive on-the-ground surveys. Forest cover changes can be tracked through regular satellite observation, detecting deforestation and degradation at high resolution. Urban expansion monitoring through multi-temporal satellite imagery reveals patterns of development and sprawl. Land degradation assessment combines satellite data with ground truthing to map soil erosion, desertification, and agricultural land quality. Water resource monitoring tracks reservoir levels, wetland extent, and irrigation patterns. Programs like Copernicus (operated by the European Union) and Landsat (operated by the United States) provide freely accessible satellite data enabling even capacity-constrained countries to monitor environmental indicators that would otherwise require prohibitively expensive field measurements [2, 29].

Big data from mobile phone networks and digital platforms offers new possibilities for real-time monitoring of population movements, economic activity, and social phenomena. Aggregated mobile network data, properly anonymized to protect privacy, enables population movement tracking useful for urban planning, disaster response, and disease surveillance. Financial transaction data from mobile money platforms reveals patterns of economic activity, consumption, and poverty dynamics at higher frequency than traditional surveys. Social media and digital communication analysis can provide sentiment indicators and early warning of emerging social tensions, though substantial methodological challenges around representativeness and interpretation remain.

Citizen science approaches mobilize public participation in data collection through smartphone applications, community monitoring networks, and participatory surveys. These approaches can dramatically expand data collection coverage, particularly for local-level indicators where official statistical systems face capacity constraints. Environmental monitoring through citizen observers, water quality testing by trained volunteers, and community-based biodiversity surveys have demonstrated value in specific contexts. However, ensuring data quality, maintaining participant engagement, and integrating citizen-generated data with official statistics require careful methodological attention and institutional support.

Artificial intelligence and machine learning techniques offer tools for enhancing traditional data sources and filling gaps through predictive modeling. Model-based estimates can provide indicator values for contexts lacking direct measurements, combining multiple data sources through statistical relationships. Sentiment analysis of social media and digital communications can complement traditional surveys

on attitudes and perceptions, though with substantial caveats about representativeness. Predictive analytics can identify emerging trends and potential crisis situations, enabling proactive policy responses rather than reactive interventions. Machine learning approaches have recently demonstrated value in analyzing complex policy documents and uncovering latent connections between human security frameworks and SDG targets, offering scalable methods for assessing policy alignment that complement traditional indicator-based monitoring [54]. Such computational text-analysis techniques can process large document corpora to identify policy coherence gaps and synergies that manual review might miss.

However, realizing these innovations' potential requires substantial investment rather than providing costless solutions to data challenges. Data platforms must be developed and maintained, requiring technical infrastructure and specialized expertise. Training programs must prepare NSO staff to utilize new technologies and integrate novel data sources with traditional statistics. Quality assurance mechanisms must ensure that innovative approaches generate reliable information meeting statistical standards rather than producing misleading results. Integration strategies must connect new data sources with official statistics in methodologically sound ways, avoiding fragmentary approaches that generate incompatible datasets.

The Partnership in Statistics for Development in the 21st Century (PARIS21) and the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development Data coordinate efforts to deploy these innovations systematically while building national capacity for utilization. However, financing for these coordination mechanisms and country-level implementation remains inadequate relative to the transformation required for closing data gaps at scale.

9 Discussion: Critical Research Gaps and Policy Priorities

9.1 Knowledge Gaps Limiting Effective Implementation

The systematic review process reveals several critical research gaps where inadequate knowledge fundamentally limits effective policy design and implementation. Addressing these gaps should represent research priorities for the academic community, as practical knowledge development could substantially accelerate SDG achievement during the critical remaining years until 2030.

9.1.1 Gap 1: Policy Coherence Mechanisms

While multiple authoritative documents identify policy fragmentation as a central barrier to SDG achievement, systematic knowledge of effective policy coherence mechanisms remains surprisingly limited. Few countries have conducted rigorous studies examining which institutional arrangements most effectively coordinate cross-sectoral policy development and implementation. Numerous unanswered questions demand attention. What cabinet-level governance structures most effectively drive horizontal policy coordination across ministries with competing priorities and constituencies?

How can political cycles operating on 4–5 year timelines be better aligned with long-term SDG requirements spanning 15 years or more? Which fiscal mechanisms most effectively cascade national SDG targets to subnational levels while maintaining local flexibility and accountability? How can parliamentary oversight be strengthened to enhance SDG implementation accountability beyond executive branch commitments?

The research priority here involves conducting systematic comparative analysis of policy coordination mechanisms in demonstrably high-performing countries including Denmark, Costa Rica, and Finland to identify transferable lessons applicable across diverse governance contexts [2]. This research should examine not merely formal institutional structures but also informal coordination mechanisms, leadership styles, and political economy factors enabling these countries to achieve unusual effectiveness in integrated policymaking.

Recent applications of behavioral economics to environmental policy design offer frameworks for understanding how cognitive biases, institutional inertia, and stakeholder dynamics impede policy coherence, suggesting that effective coordination mechanisms must explicitly address these behavioral dimensions rather than assuming purely rational institutional actors [50].

The Handbook for the Preparation of Voluntary National Reviews documents emerging institutional innovations addressing policy coherence challenges, providing baseline evidence for systematic research [49]. Several countries have established national SDG coordination committees with explicit mandates for cross-sectoral policy alignment: Botswana adopted an SDG Roadmap with focal points in each Ministry and created a Joint National Steering Committee to enhance partnerships and coordination across government levels; Kenya established a national stakeholder platform with two levels—strategic guidance and technical/thematic coordination—coordinated through the Ministry of Devolution and Planning; Nigeria created a multi-layer institutional framework including a Senior Special Assistant office and Inter-Ministerial Committee with operational guidelines [49]. While these institutional mechanisms represent progress beyond the baseline of no coordination, rigorous comparative analysis remains absent regarding which design elements most effectively resolve sectoral conflicts, enforce policy coherence across resistant bureaucracies, and sustain coordination across political cycles. The research priority therefore involves systematically evaluating these documented institutional innovations to identify transferable design principles applicable across diverse governance contexts.

9.1.2 Gap 2: Private Sector Incentive Alignment

Achieving SDGs at required scale demands massive private sector mobilization given the multi-trillion-dollar annual investment requirements that public resources alone cannot meet. Yet mechanisms for genuinely aligning profit incentives with social and environmental impact remain fundamentally underdeveloped despite decades of corporate social responsibility rhetoric and more recent sustainable finance enthusiasm. Current challenges limiting effective private sector engagement include insufficient understanding of the business case for SDG investments in least-developed contexts where commercial returns appear uncertain or long-delayed. Limited standardization of SDG impact metrics for corporate reporting enables greenwashing, as companies

can selectively claim SDG contributions without systematic accountability. Inadequate mechanisms for de-risking private investment in frontier markets prevent capital mobilization despite potential returns, as perceived risks exceed institutional investors' tolerance. Insufficient accountability mechanisms for SDG-washing allow corporate claims of SDG commitment unsupported by substantive operational changes or measurable impacts.

The research priority demands systematic analysis of successful public-private partnership models including GAVI, the Global Fund, and Sustainable Energy for All to identify replicable mechanisms for incentive alignment and accountability [43]. This research should examine governance structures, financing arrangements, monitoring systems, and stakeholder engagement approaches that enable these exceptional partnerships to function effectively where most attempts fail.

9.1.3 Gap 3: Debt-Development-Climate Nexus

Sovereign debt burdens in developing countries represent increasingly binding constraints on SDG financing as debt servicing obligations consume resources otherwise available for education, healthcare, infrastructure, and climate action. Yet understanding of optimal debt restructuring mechanisms, debt-for-climate swap modalities, and reformed international debt governance remains incomplete despite debt's centrality to development prospects. Specific knowledge gaps include limited analysis of debt sustainability under accelerating climate change impacts that will damage economies, reduce tax revenues, and increase adaptation costs. Insufficient understanding of how fiscal constraints drive short-term policy optimization that reduces long-term sustainability investments as governments facing debt pressures cut capital budgets and development programs. Inadequate multilateral mechanisms for coordinated debt relief linked explicitly to SDG financing requirements rather than treating debt relief separately from development planning. Incomplete analysis of how debt structures affect country bargaining power in international negotiations, as heavily indebted nations lack leverage to advocate effectively for climate finance or trade reforms.

The research priority involves developing integrated economic models linking debt dynamics, climate impacts, and SDG financing requirements to inform fundamental debt sustainability framework reform [6, 43]. Integrated assessment modeling frameworks offer tools for analyzing these interconnected systems, though current IAM applications often treat debt dynamics, climate impacts, and development pathways in isolation rather than as mutually reinforcing components of a coupled system [51]. Advancing this research agenda requires methodological innovations that bridge macroeconomic modeling, climate science, and development economics within unified analytical frameworks. This modeling should incorporate climate-economy interactions, fiscal policy responses, and development pathway alternatives to provide evidence basis for restructuring global debt architecture.

9.1.4 Gap 4: International Spillover Quantification

Multiple authoritative documents identify that high-income countries' policies and consumption patterns generate substantial negative international spillovers undermining other countries' SDG progress, yet systematic quantification remains incomplete.

Several specific gaps limit understanding and accountability. Inadequate metrics for measuring consumption-based environmental impacts distinguish between production-based and consumption-based accounting, as current systems attribute environmental damage to production locations while obscuring that this damage often serves consumption elsewhere. Limited supply chain transparency regarding labor conditions, environmental impacts, and human rights practices enables exploitation and environmental damage hidden in global supply networks. Insufficient analysis of how trade policies affect SDG achievement in partner countries as wealthy nations' agricultural subsidies, intellectual property regimes, and market access restrictions systematically disadvantage developing countries. Incomplete understanding of tax competition effects on developing country fiscal capacity as multinational corporations exploit regulatory arbitrage and countries compete through unsustainable tax incentives.

The research priority requires developing consumption-based accounting systems for environmental and social impacts integrated with supply chain transparency initiatives [3]. This work should enable tracking material footprints, carbon footprints, water footprints, and labor conditions through supply chains to quantify high-income countries' international spillover effects systematically.

9.1.5 Gap 5: Just Transition Pathways

Energy transition literature widely identifies the imperative for "just transitions' protecting workers and communities dependent on fossil fuel industries from bearing disproportionate transition costs. Yet empirical research on effective just transition mechanisms remains limited despite urgent need as accelerated decarbonization intensifies disruption. Critical questions include which income support mechanisms most effectively facilitate worker transitions to renewable energy sectors or alternative employment while maintaining dignity and economic security. How can community economies be diversified in regions historically dependent on coal mining, oil extraction, or fossil fuel infrastructure to create sustainable livelihoods after fossil fuel phase-out? What role should international climate finance play in supporting just transition efforts in developing countries with limited fiscal capacity for comprehensive worker and community support? How can indigenous peoples' rights and local communities' needs be genuinely centered in energy transition planning rather than treated as afterthoughts in renewable energy deployment?

The research priority involves conducting systematic comparative analysis of just transition programs including Germany's coal phase-out supports, Denmark's renewable energy transition mechanisms, and various regional initiatives to identify effective policy combinations transferable across contexts [8]. This analysis should examine not merely policy designs but also implementation processes and political economy factors enabling or constraining just transition achievement.

9.1.6 Gap 6: SDG Interlinkages and Trade-offs

While SDG documentation consistently emphasizes integration and interconnection across goals, systematic empirical research on interlinkages and trade-offs remains underdeveloped relative to this dimension's theoretical importance. Specific knowledge

27

gaps include limited understanding of how progress on specific SDGs affects others through both synergies (mutual reinforcement) and trade-offs (tensions requiring management). Insufficient analysis of how interlinkages vary across contexts based on region, income level, governance capacity, and geographic characteristics. Inadequate mechanisms for managing apparent goal conflicts such as economic growth versus environmental protection, though these conflicts often reflect incomplete problem framing rather than fundamental incompatibility. Incomplete understanding of how interlinkages operate across temporal and spatial scales, as local-level synergies may conflict with global patterns or short-term trade-offs may enable long-term synergies.

The research priority requires conducting multi-scale analysis of SDG interlinkages using systems dynamics modeling and scenario planning approaches [15]. Emerging computational approaches using machine learning and natural language processing have begun to systematically map policy documents to SDG targets, revealing network structures of goal interactions and enabling quantitative analysis of synergies and trade-offs at scale [54]. These methods complement traditional systems-dynamics approaches and can identify context-specific interlinkage patterns across diverse policy domains and geographic settings. This research should move beyond generic statements about interconnection to provide actionable knowledge about how specific policy interventions affect multiple goals simultaneously under varying contextual conditions.

9.2 Policy Priorities for 2025–2030

Given identified research gaps and comprehensive assessment of current implementation status, several policy priorities emerge as essential for the critical 2025–2030 period. These priorities reflect both immediate urgency and potential for substantial impact if political will can be mobilized effectively.

9.2.1 Priority 1: Accelerate International Financial Architecture Reform

The $3.9 trillion annual financing gap cannot be closed through incremental improvements in existing mechanisms but rather demands systematic reform of global financial architecture fundamentally reshaping how development finance flows. Specific essential actions include comprehensive International Monetary Fund reform restructuring Article IV surveillance reviews and debt sustainability assessments to explicitly center SDG achievement and climate resilience rather than treating these as secondary considerations to macroeconomic stability narrowly defined. Multilateral Development Bank transformation must realign lending criteria moving beyond narrow economic returns to incorporate social and environmental impacts, revise conditionality regimes that often conflict with sustainable development priorities, and reorient organizational culture and staffing toward SDG achievement as primary mission. Debt relief initiatives must be implemented on multilateral basis coordinated explicitly with SDG financing plans rather than treating debt relief as separate from development strategy. Climate finance scaling must increase from current inadequate $80 billion annually to $500 billion annually by 2030 through combination of public finance mobilization and private capital catalyzation [43]. Fiscal space enhancement through international

cooperation combating tax competition requires implementing agreed corporate tax standards including proposed 15% minimum tax to prevent multinational corporations from exploiting regulatory arbitrage while increasing developing country revenues.

9.2.2 Priority 2: Establish Binding Multilateral SDG Review Mechanisms

Current voluntary review processes through Voluntary National Reviews lack effective accountability mechanisms or meaningful enforcement, enabling governments to submit optimistic reports without facing consequences for insufficient implementation. Necessary mechanisms include mandatory regular reporting on SDG progress using standardized metrics enabling cross-country comparison and aggregate assessment. International peer review processes should assess implementation adequacy through expert panels examining whether countries' efforts align with their capacities and responsibilities. Meaningful consequences for insufficient progress might include conditionality affecting development finance access, though implementation must avoid punitive approaches that harm vulnerable populations. Transparent tracking of spillover effects from high-income countries' policies would quantify negative externalities enabling accountability for international impacts. Enhanced parliamentary engagement in SDG oversight across countries would strengthen domestic accountability beyond executive branch commitments, mobilizing legislative oversight and citizen engagement.

These governance reforms would mirror successful accountability mechanisms operating in other international domains including trade obligations enforced through World Trade Organization dispute resolution, human rights monitoring through treaty body review processes, and environmental agreements using compliance mechanisms [2]. Translating these precedents to SDG context requires political will to accept external scrutiny and potential consequences for inadequate implementation.

9.2.3 Priority 3: Systematize SDG Localization

Compelling evidence from successful cases demonstrates that approximately 65% of SDG targets require subnational implementation by local and regional governments given their direct responsibility for service delivery, infrastructure development, and community engagement [12, 47]. Required systematic actions include decentralizing budget allocations enabling subnational governments to allocate resources toward locally-identified SDG priorities while maintaining accountability for results and alignment with national objectives. Supporting comprehensive Voluntary Local Review processes as regular practice rather than voluntary exception would establish accountability mechanisms and generate knowledge about effective local strategies. Building municipal statistical capacity through targeted investment and technical assistance would enable evidence-based decision-making at subnational levels currently constrained by data absence. Fostering city-to-city and region-to-region learning networks would facilitate knowledge exchange accelerating innovation diffusion and providing peer support for addressing common challenges. Establishing municipal SDG councils

with clear mandates and authority would institutionalize local SDG governance. Integrating SDG targets systematically into local development plans and budget processes would mainstream goals rather than treating them as separate initiatives disconnected from core municipal functions. Cities and regions already pioneering these approaches including Barcelona, Bristol, Mannheim, and numerous others demonstrate feasibility and impact when appropriate support and political commitment combine [47, 48].

9.2.4 Priority 4: Strengthen Statistical Capacity and Data Systems

Achieving SDGs requires reliable, timely, disaggregated data enabling evidence-based policymaking, effective resource targeting, and meaningful accountability. Essential investments include substantially increasing funding for national statistical systems by estimated \$5–10 billion annually globally, allocated proportionally to countries' needs and capacities. Expanding geospatial and earth observation technology deployment would enable environmental monitoring at scales impossible through traditional field surveys while building national capacity for utilizing satellite data. Supporting systematic integration of big data sources from mobile networks and digital platforms with traditional official statistics would enhance timeliness and granularity while maintaining statistical standards. Building comprehensive capacity for disaggregated data collection by gender, age, income level, disability status, and geographic location would enable targeting interventions toward those left behind rather than relying on population averages that obscure inequality. Establishing data sharing agreements and technical standards enabling cross-country comparisons would improve international monitoring and knowledge exchange. Strengthening data governance frameworks and privacy protections would ensure that expanded data collection respects rights while serving public purposes.

The Cape Town Global Action Plan for Sustainable Development Data provides comprehensive framework for these investments, but implementation requires sustained financing and political commitment that has not yet materialized at required scale. Development partners must recognize statistical capacity development as essential infrastructure investment rather than technical assistance luxury.

9.2.5 Priority 5: Align Private Sector Incentives with SDGs

Mobilizing private finance toward SDGs at scale requires moving beyond voluntary corporate social responsibility toward systematic incentive alignment through regulation, taxation, and market mechanisms. Essential mechanisms include standardizing SDG impact metrics for corporate reporting through international frameworks enabling comparison and accountability while preventing selective disclosure and greenwashing. Establishing mandatory sustainability disclosure requirements for large corporations and financial institutions would mainstream impact consideration in investment decisions and corporate strategy. Creating sophisticated de-risking mechanisms for frontier market investment through blended finance, guarantee facilities, and first-loss protection would catalyze private capital mobilization where perceived risks currently prevent investment despite potential returns. Implementing corporate tax incentives carefully designed to reward verified SDG-aligned investments rather than creating

new avoidance opportunities would align profit motives with impact. Developing comprehensive supply chain transparency standards and enforcement mechanisms would enable accountability for labor conditions, environmental impacts, and human rights practices throughout global production networks. Establishing rigorous accountability mechanisms for SDG-washing through regulatory oversight, consumer protection, and investor protection would impose meaningful consequences for unsubstantiated sustainability claims [43].

9.2.6 Priority 6: Establish Just Transition Frameworks

Energy transitions and broader economic transformations required for SDG achievement will generate disruption affecting workers and communities dependent on incumbent systems, requiring explicit equity focus preventing unjust burden distribution. Essential components include allocating substantial climate finance specifically for just transition support recognizing that developing countries lack fiscal capacity for comprehensive programs without external assistance. Designing effective income replacement and skill development programs for fossil fuel workers providing sustained support during transitions to alternative employment rather than expecting rapid adjustment through market mechanisms. Supporting community economic diversification in regions historically dependent on coal, oil, gas, or other declining industries through investment attraction, small business development, and infrastructure enhancement. Systematically centering indigenous peoples' rights in renewable energy development and broader transition planning rather than treating indigenous communities as obstacles to overcome or stakeholders to consult superficially. Ensuring women's meaningful participation in energy sector transformation and broader SDG implementation recognizing that transitions affect women differently and women's perspectives improve policy design. Prioritizing energy access for poorest populations ensuring that climate imperatives do not justify leaving billions in energy poverty or making clean energy unaffordable for vulnerable households.

9.2.7 Priority 7: Establish Climate-Development Coherence

Paris Agreement implementation and SDG achievement must be explicitly integrated rather than proceeding on parallel tracks, as climate change fundamentally affects prospects across virtually all SDGs while climate action requires alignment with broader development objectives. Essential integration mechanisms include systematically aligning Nationally Determined Contributions with SDG targets and long-term development plans ensuring that climate commitments support rather than undermine other development priorities. Integrating climate resilience considerations into all sectoral development planning recognizing that infrastructure, agricultural systems, urban development, and social protection programs must function under future climate conditions rather than historical patterns. Ensuring climate action advances rather than undermines other SDGs through careful policy design preventing trade-offs such as biofuel production threatening food security or renewable energy projects displacing communities. Managing climate change adaptation financing within broader development frameworks rather than creating separate climate finance streams disconnected from national development budgets and priorities. Addressing loss and damage

31

dimensions of climate change through international support mechanisms recognizing that some climate impacts cannot be adapted to and require compensatory support for affected populations and countries [44].

Limitations.

Our synthesis emphasizes authoritative UN and affiliated assessments (2015–2025). While broad in scope, it may underrepresent peer-reviewed country case studies and grey literature outside the UN system. Some headline metrics draw from model-based aggregations with evolving methodologies; where estimates differ across sources, we report the most recent or triangulate ranges. Data availability remains uneven across SDGs, regions, and years; findings for SDGs 12–15 in particular should be interpreted with this constraint in mind.

10 Toward Operational Transformation Pathways

While the preceding sections have documented implementation gaps and policy recommendations, accelerating SDG progress ultimately requires moving from diagnosis to operational action. This section presents an integrated framework for developing and implementing transformation pathways that translate SDG commitments into tangible outcomes at national and regional scales.

10.1 The Systems Imperative

The interconnected crises confronting the global community—persistently low growth rates and inflationary pressures, rising sovereign debt distress affecting nearly one-third of countries, accelerating climate change and biodiversity loss, growing insecurity across the food–energy–water nexus, widening inequalities both between the Global North and South and within countries, rapid urbanization, escalating geopolitical tensions, and strains on multilateral effectiveness—are complex, nonlinear, and spatially heterogeneous [53]. A policy that reduces emissions today can create land-use pressures tomorrow or shift water stress across a basin; a technology that improves productivity in one region can displace livelihoods in another, while considerations like sustainable financial mechanisms and equity are often overlooked. Tackling these challenges requires more than single-sector fixes: it demands integrated systems transformation pathways that are actionable, spatially explicit, and able to reconcile short-term trade-offs with long-term goals.

The SDGs represent a comprehensive framework for such integrated systems transformation. Humanity already possesses the science, technology, policies, and financial resources—both public and private—to achieve them. Yet implementation remains strikingly low, below 20% at global scale. The primary barriers lie in the lack of accountability within the global multilateral system and the absence of an operational structure explicitly tasked with driving SDG implementation at scale [53]. What is urgently needed is the creation of explicit operational frameworks capable of aligning global efforts, ensuring effective coordination, and delivering results on the ground, supported by efficient and transparent channels for technology transfer, financial flows, and capacity building.

10.2 The Global Climate Hub Framework

The Global Climate Hub (GCH), anchored within the Alliance of Excellence for Research and Innovation on Aephoria (AE4RIA) and the United Nations Sustainable Development Solutions Network, exemplifies an interdisciplinary initiative that couples advanced AI-ready data infrastructure, mathematical and statistical models, and transdisciplinary stakeholder engagement to produce an open-access digital Global Commons enabling development of operational sustainability pathways at national to global scales [53]. The Hub brings together nine complementary units spanning digital infrastructure, atmospheric physics, energy, transport, health, socio-economics, sustainable finance, innovation, and participatory co-design, ensuring co-production of techno-economic analyses and societal needs.

The GCH approach links sectoral models—energy system simulation and optimization, land-use dynamics and spatial downscaling, hydrological and water-risk assessments, and economy-wide welfare and trade outcomes via Computable General Equilibrium models—creating dynamic feedback loops wherein energy and land constraints inform macroeconomic projections, macroeconomic outcomes reshape land demand and trade, and water stress modifies productivity and feasible technical pathways [54]. Models are not developed in isolation: stakeholder engagement through transformative living labs and participatory workshops embed user priorities and local knowledge into scenarios and assumptions. This two-way process improves legitimacy, surfaces social feasibility constraints including distributional impacts, and helps ensure pathways are implementable.

The GCH framework operates through three integrated stages. The first stage focuses on continuous monitoring and scientific assessment, building a rigorous evidence base that is spatially explicit, temporally consistent, and policy-relevant by harmonizing observational and administrative data, remote sensing layers, socio-economic statistics, and infrastructure inventories. The second stage develops science-based transformational pathways through coupled modelling chains and stakeholder co-design, convening stakeholders in living labs to define objectives, constraints, and plausible narratives, then running scenario ensembles to evaluate synergies, trade-offs, and distributional outcomes across SDG indicators [51]. The third stage addresses financing of co-designed pathways and equitable allocation of results, linking funding sources to priority measures through aligned fiscal instruments, blended finance, and policy coherence [52].

10.3 Beyond-GDP Valuation and Ecosystem Services Integration

A core element of integrated transformation pathways is incorporating ecosystem services valuation into macroeconomic assessments. Measuring ecosystem services in monetary terms is essential for internalizing environmental and social externalities, enabling policymakers and businesses to reflect true costs and benefits of natural and social capital within decision-making processes [50]. When such values are incorporated into fiscal instruments, investment frameworks, or blended-finance schemes, they

33

lay groundwork for bankable instruments that reward conservation, restoration, and sustainable resource use.

This approach connects directly to dynamic equilibrium and Computable General Equilibrium frameworks that analyze global trade, welfare effects, and distributional outcomes. By translating ecological changes—from ecosystem degradation to fisheries recovery and changes in water quality to coastal protection—into quantifiable welfare shocks and sectoral adjustments, the modelling chain enables transition from narrow GDP-based assessments to comprehensive, welfare-oriented evaluations of sustainability pathways. These welfare assessments are further strengthened by the economic rationale for declining discount rates in long-run policy evaluation, which underscores the need to give proportionally greater weight to future ecosystem services, climate benefits, and intergenerational equity considerations [63].

10.4 Scalable Evidence: Operational Case Studies

The transformation pathways approach has been operationalized in place-based studies demonstrating practicability and policy relevance. In Greece, an integrated multi-model assessment combined food-land, water, maritime, and energy system analyses under business-as-usual and National Commitment scenarios for 2020–2050, exposing critical interdependencies such as how renewable land-use expansion competes with agriculture or how shipping decarbonization affects domestic fuel demand [52]. The outcome was a tailored scenario achieving faster, lower-cost decarbonization than single-focused energy plans while flagging governance and infrastructure gaps requiring attention.

Across Europe, application of the framework to 35 diverse national plans revealed continent-wide patterns and pressures including irrigation constraints, water-energy trade-offs, slower transportation electrification in some regions, and need for coordinated cross-border electricity and hydrogen trade [54]. Digital Twins of ocean systems demonstrate how state-of-the-art dynamic virtual models can combine real-time data, predictive modelling, and visualizations to mirror and simulate physical systems, enabling better monitoring and more effective solution development.

These cases demonstrate that transformation pathways can be operationalized in holistic, tangible, locally tailored, and policy-ready ways. An open e-platform that harmonizes data, hosts models and results, and creates interactive scenario explorers enables policymakers and practitioners to select scenarios, alter parameters such as dietary patterns, renewable siting constraints, and carbon prices, and immediately see spatial maps, sectoral balances, welfare indicators, and exposed vulnerabilities— facilitating evidence-informed decisions and rapid policy prototyping.

11 Conclusions

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development remains humanity's most comprehensive and ambitious blueprint for ending poverty, protecting the planet, and ensuring prosperity for all within planetary boundaries. Yet the evidence compiled across 41 core authoritative documents—global assessments, regional analyses, thematic studies, and implementation reviews—points to a troubling midpoint assessment: under

current trajectories and political commitments, the world is fundamentally off track to achieve the majority of SDG targets by 2030 [2, 33, 15]. This conclusion reflects not a deficit of ideas or technology, but an implementation crisis rooted in misaligned incentives, fragmented governance, and underpowered finance.

11.1 Summary of Findings

Our synthesis yields eight interlocking findings that, taken together, portray both the scope of the shortfall and the contours of a feasible course correction.

First, progress has plateaued at low levels: only 15–17% of assessable targets are currently on track, while 37% have stagnated or regressed relative to 2015, and 31 targets lack sufficient data for trend analysis [2]. This is consistent with the warnings of the 2019 and 2024 Global Sustainable Development Reports that, absent a step-change, no SDG will be fully met globally by 2030 [9, 15].

Second, the financing crisis has intensified. The annual investment gap for developing countries widened from roughly $2.5 trillion pre-COVID to approximately $3.6–4 trillion by 2022–2023, reflecting revenue collapses, rising debt distress, and volatile capital flows amid cascading shocks [3, 6, 35]. The gap is structural: it reveals a mismatch between the International Financial Architecture and long-horizon development and climate needs [43].

Third, governance deficits—horizontal, vertical, and temporal—are now a primary constraint. Only a minority of countries report effective cross-ministerial coordination, despite evidence that roughly 65% of SDG targets map to local and regional government functions that require vertical alignment [12, 47]. Budgetary processes remain weakly integrated with SDG targets, reinforcing short-termism over transformation [2].

Fourth, negative international spillovers from high-income consumption, trade, and finance continue to undermine progress elsewhere. Europe, for example, externalizes a significant share of its environmental footprint through imports—though magnitudes vary by metric and year—raising equity and accountability concerns [7, 16]. Addressing these spillovers requires policy coherence across trade, due diligence, taxation, and sustainable finance.

Fifth, regional disparities persist. East and South Asia anchor global gains in poverty reduction and service access, while Africa, LDCs, and SIDS face compounded constraints—from climate impacts to limited fiscal space—despite minimal responsibility for cumulative emissions [33, 42, 44]. This asymmetry underscores the urgency of scaled and accessible mitigation, adaptation, and loss-and-damage finance [27, 43].

Sixth, environmental goals are the farthest off track. Even full implementation of current NDCs would leave the world on a ∼2.7°C pathway; biodiversity loss and ecosystem degradation continue at alarming rates, with implementation of the Global Biodiversity Framework underfunded and delayed [38, 37, 45]. Nature-positive aligned finance and rapid decarbonization are both necessary and complementary.

Seventh, energy transitions are not proceeding at required pace or scale. Electricity access has expanded (to ∼91% in 2021), yet 675 million people remain unconnected and 2.3 billion still lack clean cooking; renewables account for only ∼17% of total final energy consumption, far below what 1.5°C-consistent pathways require for power,

heat, and transport [20, 8, 9]. A just transition lens is essential to protect workers, communities, and affordability.

Eighth, data deficits impede accountability and adaptive management. Thirty-one targets lack sufficient data; gaps are most acute for SDGs 12–15, gender-based violence, affordability metrics in health and education, and policy-coherence indicators. National statistical offices face chronic underfunding and capacity erosion even as demands rise [24, 2, 41].

11.2 Root Causes of the Implementation Crisis

Several structural drivers explain persistent under-delivery despite broad consensus on goals. First, the International Financial Architecture remains poorly suited to financing multi-decade public goods and risk-sharing at scale; debt sustainability frameworks and MDB mandates insufficiently internalize SDG and climate objectives [6, 43]. Second, political-economy dynamics bias decision-making toward short-term visibility over long-term value, with electoral cycles and quarterly reporting horizons crowding out transformative investments. Third, cross-border externalities—environmental, fiscal, and social—export costs to lower-income producers and erode their fiscal base via profit shifting and tax competition [16]. Fourth, policy fragmentation across sectors and tiers of government generates incoherence and delivery failure. Finally, underinvestment in data systems blunts targeting, evaluation, and accountability, enabling rhetoric to outpace results [28, 30].

11.3 Feasibility of Achievement: Why 2030 Targets Remain Possible

Despite sobering diagnostics, course correction is feasible if action is immediate and coordinated. Proven delivery models exist: global health partnerships (Gavi, Global Fund), targeted social protection, and energy access programs have achieved rapid, measurable gains when governance, finance, and evidence align [23, 8]. The technology frontier is not the binding constraint: cost-competitive renewables, storage, efficiency, and digital systems, coupled with nature-based solutions, can drive deep decarbonization with co-benefits for health, jobs, and resilience [34, 21]. Political engagement remains broad—190+ VNRs and accelerating VLRs signal intent—even if credibility requires stronger follow-through [49, 47].

11.4 Necessary Conditions for Achievement

Six conditions emerge as necessary for accelerated progress. (1) *Political will and policy credibility:* front-load reforms that trade short-term costs for long-term gains, backed by transparent trajectories and social dialogue. (2) *International Financial Architecture reform:* scale concessionality, align IMF/World Bank toolkits with SDG and climate goals, expand guarantees and blended-finance instruments, and hardwire debt workouts compatible with development and resilience [6, 43]. (3) *Coherent multi-level governance:* empower cabinet-level SDG councils, integrate SDGs into MTEFs and budget systems, and institutionalize VLR–VNR linkages so national strategies cascade with resources [12, 49]. (4) *Consumption and production shifts:*

advance circularity, phase out harmful subsidies, and deploy pricing and standards that reduce material footprints while protecting vulnerable households [9, 37]. (5) *Genuine multi-stakeholder engagement:* align private incentives via disclosure, taxonomy, and due-diligence regimes; prevent SDG-washing through verifiable impact metrics and accountability [43, 31]. (6) *Data and statistical capacity:* finance NSOs, integrate earth observation and administrative data, and mandate disaggregation to operationalize LNOB in planning and review [30, 24, 41].

11.5 Critical Window and Call to Action

The 2025–2026 window is pivotal. The heads-of-state SDG convenings, Paris-aligned finance dialogues, and the indicator review cycle together offer rare leverage to reset incentives, align standards, and mobilize capital at scale. Without decisive action, cascading impacts will intensify: entrenched poverty, food and water insecurity, climate-induced displacement, and accelerating biodiversity loss with profound macro-financial and geopolitical consequences [44, 45, 48]. Conversely, coordinated reforms can crowd in private investment, reduce risk premia, and translate commitments into bankable pipelines—particularly in EMDEs where needs and returns to resilience are highest [43, 35].

The choice is therefore not between ambition and prudence, but between managed transformation and unmanaged disruption. The knowledge base is adequate; technologies are deployable; and global liquidity exists. What remains is to align rules, resources, and responsibilities at the speed and scale the decade demands.

11.6 Recommendations for Stakeholders

For *UN Member States*: legislate SDG-consistent budget frameworks; establish empowered cross-government SDG councils; codify VLR cycles linked to VNRs; and adopt due-diligence, circular economy, and subsidy-reform packages that curb negative spillovers [49, 7]. Expand social protection and just transition measures to ensure equity and political durability.

For *international institutions*: embed SDG/climate metrics in IMF surveillance and debt sustainability analyses; expand MDB risk appetite, guarantees, and local-currency solutions; streamline access to adaptation and loss-and-damage finance; and scale statistical capacity support as core infrastructure [6, 43, 30].

For the *private sector*: align strategy and capex with credible transition plans; implement supply-chain transparency and human-rights due diligence; participate in blended-finance structures; and support worker and community transition programs consistent with a just transition.

For *civil society and academia*: strengthen independent monitoring of public and corporate commitments; co-produce localized solutions; and prioritize research on policy coherence, spillover quantification, debt–development–climate linkages, and practical just-transition playbooks [15, 16].

11.7 Research and Innovation Pathways

The pivotal 2025–2030 window demands not only scaled finance and reformed governance but also accelerated knowledge production across the critical gaps identified in Section 9. Recent innovations demonstrate that methodological advances can meaningfully accelerate evidence-based policymaking: behavioral insights inform institutional design to overcome coordination failures [50], machine learning approaches enable systematic policy analysis and reveal hidden SDG interlinkages [54], and integrated assessment frameworks link climate, debt, and development trajectories within unified analytical structures [51]. Regional efforts, such as comprehensive European Green Deal–SDG alignment assessments [52], provide templates for translating global commitments into actionable regional strategies. Collaborative platforms including the UN SDSN Global Climate Hub [53, 6] exemplify how research networks can bridge scientific analysis, policy design, and implementation support—a model that warrants replication across regions and thematic areas. Moving forward, research priorities must emphasize not only rigorous analysis but also translational mechanisms that convert findings into policy-ready tools, capacity-building programs, and accessible knowledge products.

11.8 Final Remarks

The implementation crisis documented here is political and institutional rather than technical or purely financial. Transformative change remains possible within this decisive window if actors move from declarations to delivery, align incentives across borders and sectors, and embed accountability in finance and governance. The evidence is clear, the pathways are known, and the dividends—from human dignity to planetary stability—are extraordinary. Whether the next five years mark a turning point or a missed opportunity will depend on choices made now by governments, institutions, firms, and communities alike. The pathways exist; the imperative is to act.

References

[1] United Nations General Assembly (2015) Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Resolution 70/1, United Nations, New York

[2] Sachs JD, Lafortune G, Fuller G, Woelm F (2023) Implementing the SDG Stimulus: Sustainable Development Report 2023. Sustainable Development Solutions Network, New York

[3] Sachs JD, Schmidt-Traub G, Kroll C, Lafortune G, Fuller G (2019) Sustainable Development Report 2019: Transformations to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals. Bertelsmann Stiftung and Sustainable Development Solutions Network, New York

[4] Sachs JD, Schmidt-Traub G, Kroll C, Lafortune G (2020) The Sustainable Development Goals and COVID-19: Sustainable Development Report 2020. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

[5] United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (2020) The Sustainable Development Goals Report 2020. United Nations, New York

[6] Sachs JD, Lafortune G, Fuller G, Woelm F (2025) Sustainable Development Report 2025: Financing Sustainable Development to 2030 and Mid-Century. Sustainable Development Solutions Network, New York

[7] Lafortune G, Zolyomi D, Rusconi F, Benni N, Fuller G (2025) Europe Sustainable Development Report 2025: SDG Priorities for the New EU Leadership. Bertelsmann Stiftung and Sustainable Development Solutions Network, Dublin

[8] Sachs JD, Schmidt-Traub G, Kroll C, Lafortune G, Fuller G (2021) Sustainable Development Report 2021: The Decade of Action for the Sustainable Development Goals. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

[9] Independent Group of Scientists (2019) Global Sustainable Development Report 2019: The Future is Now – Science for Achieving Sustainable Development. United Nations, New York

[10] United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (2019) The Sustainable Development Goals Report 2019. United Nations, New York

[11] United Nations (2016) Global Sustainable Development Report 2016. Department of Economic and Social Affairs, New York

[12] United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (2024) Inter-Agency Policy Brief: Accelerating SDG Localization to deliver on the promise of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. United Nations, New York

[13] African Union (2015) Agenda 2063: The Africa We Want. African Union Commission, Addis Ababa

[14] United Nations (2023) Third Global Conference on Strengthening Synergies Between the Paris Agreement and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. United Nations, New York

[15] Independent Group of Scientists (2024) Global Sustainable Development Report 2024: Times of Crisis, Times of Change – Science for Accelerating Transformations to Sustainable Development. United Nations, New York

[16] Schmidt-Traub G, Hoff H, Bernlhr M (2019) International spillovers and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs): Measuring how a country's progress towards the SDGs is affected by actions in other countries. SDSN Policy Brief, Sustainable Development Solutions Network, New York

[17] Food and Agriculture Organization (2020) The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2020: Transforming food systems for affordable healthy diets. FAO, Rome

[18] Food and Agriculture Organization (2020) The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture 2020: Sustainability in action. FAO, Rome

[19] Food and Agriculture Organization (2022) The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture 2022: Towards Blue Transformation. FAO, Rome

[20] International Energy Agency, IRENA, UNSD, World Bank, WHO (2019) Tracking SDG 7: The Energy Progress Report 2019. International Energy Agency, Paris

[21] United Nations Environment Programme (2019) Addressing Energy's Interlinkages with Other SDGs. UNEP, Nairobi

[22] United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (2024) The Sustainable Development Goals Report 2024. United Nations, New York

[23] United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (2023) Multi-stakeholder Partnerships for the 2030 Agenda: Transformative, Inclusive and Accountable? DESA Working Paper, United Nations, New York

[24] United Nations Statistics Division (2021) Global SDG Indicators Database. United Nations, New York

[25] World Health Organization (2019) SDG 3 Monitoring Report: Health and the Sustainable Development Goals. WHO, Geneva

[26] United Nations Development Programme (2020) COVID-19 and the SDGs: Implications for the Global Response and Recovery. UNDP, New York

[27] United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (2021) Glasgow Climate Pact. Decision 1/CMA.3, UNFCCC, Glasgow

[28] World Bank (2020) Statistical Capacity Indicators Dashboard: Global Assessment. World Bank, Washington DC

[29] PARIS21 Secretariat (2020) Statistical Capacity Development: PARIS21 Quarterly Report. PARIS21/OECD, Paris

[30] United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs Statistics Division (2020) Cape Town Global Action Plan for Sustainable Development Data. United Nations, New York

[31] United Nations Economic and Social Council (2022) 2022 ECOSOC Partnership Forum: Global Multi-stakeholder Online Consultation Summary Report. UN ECOSOC, New York

[32] African Union (2016) First Continental Report on the Implementation of Agenda 2063. African Union Commission, Addis Ababa

[33] United Nations (2024) Progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals: Report of the Secretary-General. United Nations, New York

[34] International Renewable Energy Agency (2023) World Energy Transitions Outlook 2023: 1.5C Pathway. IRENA, Abu Dhabi

[35] International Monetary Fund (2023) World Economic Outlook October 2023: Navigating Global Divergences. IMF, Washington DC

[36] United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (2021) The Least Developed Countries Report 2021. UNCTAD, Geneva

[37] United Nations Environment Programme (2022) Emissions Gap Report 2022: The Closing Window. UNEP, Nairobi

[38] Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (2022) Climate Change 2022: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

[39] United Nations Environment Programme (2019) Global Environment Outlook –

GEO 6: Healthy Planet, Healthy People. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

[40] World Meteorological Organization (2023) State of the Global Climate 2023. WMO, Geneva

[41] UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning (2024) Science for Education and Sustainable Development Report 2024. UIL, Hamburg

[42] International Fund for Agricultural Development (2024) Rural Development and Food Security in Least Developed Countries: 2024 Assessment. IFAD, Rome

[43] United Nations Environment Programme Finance Initiative (2024) Sustainable Finance for Climate Resilience: Investment Pathways to 2030. UNEP FI, Geneva

[44] International Organization for Migration (2024) World Migration Report 2024: Migration and Climate-Induced Displacement. IOM, Geneva

[45] Convention on Biological Diversity Secretariat (2024) Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework Implementation: First Progress Report. CBD Secretariat, Montreal

[46] Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (2024) Human Rights and Climate Justice: Principles for Equitable Climate Action. OHCHR, Geneva

[47] UN-Habitat (2024) Urban SDG Localization Progress Report: Cities Leading the 2030 Agenda. UN-Habitat, Nairobi

[48] Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (2024) Disaster Risk Reduction and SDG Integration: Building Resilience for Sustainable Development. GFDRR, Washington DC

[49] United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (2025) Voluntary National Reviews Handbook 2025: Practical Guidance for Member States. United Nations, New York

[50] Koundouri P, Hammer B, Kuhl U, Velias A (2023) Behavioral economics and neuroeconomics of environmental values. Annual Review of Resource Economics 15(1):153–176

[51] Koundouri P, Chatzigiannakou MA, Dellis K, Landis C, Papayiannis G, Yannakopoulos A (2023) Integrated Assessment Models: Classification and Synthesis. COP28 Subreport. UN SDSN Global Climate Hub, New York.

[52] Koundouri P, Alamanos A, Plataniotis A, Stavridis C, Perifanos K, et al (2024) Assessing the sustainability of the European Green Deal and its interlinkages with the SDGs. npj Climate Action 3(1):23

[53] Koundouri P, Alamanos A, Sachs JD (2024) Innovating for sustainability: the global climate hub. Sustainable Development Solutions Network, New York

[54] Koundouri P, Aslanidis PS, Dellis K, Plataniotis A, Feretzakis G (2025) Mapping human security strategies to sustainable development goals: a machine learning approach. Discover Sustainability 6(1):96

[55] Koundouri P, Landis CFM, Dellis K, Plataniotis A (2025) Integrating Sustainable Development Goals in Environmental, Social, and Governance criteria and the sustainability transformation of the EU business sector. Annual Review of Resource Economics 17:381–399

[56] Koundouri P, Landis C, Plataniotis A (2025) Contribution of digitalization to the sustainable development in Europe (JRC134441). Publications Office of the European Union

[57] Koundouri P, Landis C, Toli E, Papanikolaou K, Slamari M, Epicoco G, Hui C, Arnold R, Moccia S (2023) Twin skills for the twin transition: Defining green and digital skills and jobs. AE4RIA, ATHENA Research Centre, Sustainable Development Unit

[58] Alamanos A, Koundouri P, Papadaki L, Pliakou T, Toli E (2022) Water For Tomorrow: A living lab on the creation of the science-policy-stakeholder interface. Water 14(18):2879

[59] Alamanos A, Xenarios S, Assubayeva A, Landis C, Dellis K, Koundouri P (2025) Systems-thinking innovations for water security. Frontiers in Water 6

[60] Akinsete E, Velias A, Papadaki L, Chatzilazarou LA, Koundouri P (2025) Blending experimental economics and living laboratories in water resource management. Annual Review of Resource Economics 17(1):149–165

[61] Halkos G, Aslanidis PS, Landis C, Papadaki L, Koundouri P (2024) A review of primary and cascading hazards by exploring individuals' willingness-to-pay for urban sustainability policies. City and Environment Interactions 100178

[62] Koundouri P, Alamanos A, Devves S, Landis C, Dellis K (2024) Innovations for holistic and sustainable transitions. Energies 17(20):5184

[63] Gollier C, Koundouri P, Pantelidis T (2008) Declining discount rates: Economic justifications and implications for long-run policy. Economic Policy 23(56):758–795