

Legon Centre for International Affairs and Diplomacy (LECIAD)



**ACHIEVING SDG 17 IN GHANA: AN ASSESSMENT OF
MULTI-STAKEHOLDER PARTNERSHIP INITIATIVES BY
THE GOVERNMENT**

**BY
MAAME ABENA GYAMERAH
(10313224)**

**THIS DISSERTATION IS SUBMITTED TO THE
UNIVERSITY OF GHANA, LEGON, IN PARTIAL
FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
AWARD OF THE MASTER OF ARTS DEGREE IN
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS**

LEGON

JULY 2019

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this dissertation is the result of an original research undertaken by me, under the supervision of Dr. Afua Boatemaa Yakohene and that no part of it has been submitted elsewhere for any other purpose. Further, references to the work of other persons or bodies have been duly acknowledged.

.....
MAAME ABENA GYAMERAH
(STUDENT)

.....
DR. AFUA BOATEMAA YAKOHENE
(SUPERVISOR)

DATE:.....

DATE:.....

DEDICATION

For Mummy

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I am grateful to God for his sustaining grace throughout this graduate programme. I am forever indebted to my parents, Mr. George Gyamerah and Mrs. Patricia Awo Kumiwaah Gyamerah, for the sacrifices they have made for me. To my siblings, Afua, Kwesi and Kwaku, thank you for blazing the trail for me. My sincere gratitude to Rev. Dr. Emmanuel Ansah, Prof. Dr. Evelyn Ansah, as well as, Michael, Michelle and Evonne for being a support system like no other. To my patient supervisor, Dr. Afua Boatemaa Yakohene, your guidance was indispensable, thank you.

I would also like to extend my deepest sense of appreciation to Dr. Felix Addo Yobo of NDPC and Mr. Nana Yaw Yankah of MoF and Mrs. Anita Ammissah Arthur of UNDP, not only for their insight but also their help in securing interviews for this work. Similarly, I thank Mr. Omar Seidu of GSS, Mr. Collins Kabuga of MoF, Mr. George Osei-Bimpeh of SEND Ghana, Ms. Sylvia Senu of UNDP, Mr. Nana Osei Bonsu, Mr. Moses Agyemang and Mr. Thomas Kamkam-Adjei of the Private Enterprise Federation, for their warm reception and the gracious manner in which they shared their knowledge with me.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AAAA	-	Addis Ababa Agenda for Action
AGI	-	Association of Ghana Industries
AMR	-	Annual Review Mechanism
ARDC	-	African Regional Data Cube
CHRAG	-	Commission on Human Rights and Administrative Justice
CPESDP	-	Coordinated Programme of Economic and Social Development Policies (2017-2024)
CSO	-	Civil Society Organisation
DACF	-	District Assemblies' Common Fund
ECOSOC	-	Economic and Social Council of the United Nations
EMT	-	Economic Management Team
EPA	-	Environmental Protection Agency
ERP	-	Economic Recovery Programme
GEA	-	Ghana Employment Association
GNCCI	-	Ghana National Chamber of Commerce and Industries
GoG	-	Government of Ghana
GPSDD	-	Global Partnership for Sustainable Development Data
GSS	-	Ghana Statistical Service
HLM	-	High-Level Ministerial Committee
HLPF	-	High Level Political Forum
IAEG-SDGs-		Inter-Agency and Expert Group on SDG Indicators
ICC	-	Implementation Coordination Committee
IMF	-	International Monetary Fund
IR	-	International Relations
ITC	-	Implementation Technical Committee
MDAs	-	Ministries, Departments and Agencies
MDGs	-	Millennium Development Goals
MMDAs	-	Metropolitan/ Municipal/ District Assemblies
MoF	-	Ministry of Finance

MoP	-	Ministry of Planning
MSPs	-	Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships
NDPC	-	National Development Planning Commission
NDPS	-	National Development Planning System
NGOs	-	Non-governmental Organisations
OECD	-	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PEF	-	Private Enterprise Federation
RCCs	-	Regional Coordinating Council
SAPs	-	Structural Adjustment Programmes
SDGs	-	Sustainable Development Goals
U.N.	-	United Nations
UNCED	-	United Nations Conference on Environment and Development
UNCTAD	-	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNDP	-	United Nations Development Program-
UNESCO	-	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
UNEP	-	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFCCC	-	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNGC	-	United Nations Global Compact
VNR	-	Voluntary National Review

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION	i
DEDICATION	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
ABSTRACT	ix
CHAPTER ONE	1
INTRODUCTION	1
1.0 Background to the Research Problem	1
1.1 Research Problem	6
1.2 Research Questions	7
1.3 Research Objectives	8
1.4 Scope of The Study	8
1.5 Rationale of The Study	9
1.6 HYPOTHESIS	10
1.7 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	10
1.8 LITERATURE REVIEW	14
1.8.1 Governance in Sustainable Development	14
1.8.2 Managing Sustainable Development in Sub-Saharan Africa	17
1.8.3 Collaborative Governance in Sub-Saharan Africa	19
1.9 SOURCES OF DATA	20
1.10 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	20
1.10.1 Research Design	20
1.10.2 Study Population	20
1.10.3 Sample Size	21
1.10.4 Sampling Method	22
1.10.5 Collection of Data	22
1.10.6 Data Analysis	23
1.10.7 Ethical Considerations	23
1.11 ARRANGEMENTS OF CHAPTERS	24

References **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

CHAPTER TWO 25

OVERVIEW OF SDG 17 AND MULTI-STAKEHOLDER PARTENRSHIPS 25

2.0 INTRODUCTION 25

2.1 OVERVIEW OF SDG 17 AND MULTI-STAKEHOLDER PARTNERSHIPS. 25

2.1.1 United Nations Conference on the Human Environment 26

2.1.2 Agenda 21 28

2.1.3 The High-Level Political Forum of Sustainable Development 30

2.1.4 Addis Ababa Action Agenda 31

2.2 SDG GOAL 17 32

2.2.1 Finance 32

2.2.2 Technology 33

2.2.3 Capacity Building 34

2.2.4 Trade 34

2.2.5 Systematic Issues 34

2.3 MSPs IN UNITED NATIONS 35

2.3.1 Legitimacy 39

2.3.2 Efficacy 40

2.4 PARTICIPANTS IN MSPs 41

2.4.1 Private Sector 41

2.4.2 The Civil Society 44

2.5 CONCLUSION 45

References **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

CHAPTER THREE 46

MSPs INITIATIVES IN GHANA'S SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AGENDA 46

3.0 INTRODUCTION 46

3.1 DECENTRALISATION IN GHANA'S DEVELOPMENT PLANNING 46

3.2 COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE IN GHANA 50

3.3 MSP INITIATIVES BY THE GOVERNMENT OF GHANA FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT 51

3.3.1 GoG's Implementation Plan for MSPs under the SDGs 51

3.3.2 The Implementation Coordinating Committee 53

3.3.3 The CSO Platform for SDGs in Ghana 54

3.3.4 Private Enterprise Federation 56

3.3.5 Structure of PEF 57

3.4 SUCCESSFUL AREAS OF PARTNERSHIP UNDER THE MSP INITIATIVES BY GOG58

3.4.1 Finance58

3.4.2 Technology61

3.4.3 Sharing of Knowledge and Expertise.63

3.5 CHALLENGES65

3.5.1 Financing65

3.5.2 Limited data and technological capacity66

3.5.3 Misinformed perception of partnership among stakeholders66

3.5.4 Depth of partnership67

3.5.5 Heterogeneity68

3.5.6 Complex nature of SDGs68

3.6 Conclusion68

References**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

CHAPTER FOUR70

SUMMARY OF RESEARCH FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS70

4.0 INTRODUCTION70

4.1 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS70

4.2 CONCLUSION73

4.3 RECOMMENDATIONS73

4.3.1 Monitoring and Evaluation73

4.3.2 Innovation in resource mobilisation74

4.3.3 Empower private sector and CSO74

4.3.4 Learn from best practices75

4.3.5 Improve advocacy to change mindset75

Annexes88

Annex A-Table 188

Annex B- INTERVIEW GUIDE93

ABSTRACT

Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships (MSPs) have been touted by the UN as a sure way for harnessing synergy to realise the 17 Global Goals. Goal 17 aims to achieve Global Partnership. Targets 17.16 to 17.17 are specifically dedicated to MSPs. They identify, public, private and civil society partnership as a means to boost critical factors, which would equip states to achieve the goals. These include, financial resource mobilisation, technology and sharing of knowledge and expertise. Given the importance of state ownership in Agenda 2030, states are mandated to facilitate these partnerships, thus acting as conveners to provide a reliable avenue for multi-stakeholder engagements. Using a qualitative methodology to acquire primary and secondary data, this study, therefore, focused on how the Government of Ghana (GoG) is enabling MSPs within its borders. The study found that, the GoG is pursuing MSPs in a decentralised and inclusive framework. While strides have been made, there are some challenges that have to be addressed.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Background to the Research Problem

Realists believe that, cooperation is only necessary to enable states ensure their absolute gains within the international system and is secondary to the maintenance of world peace and security (Cai, 2011). Liberalists, on the other hand, are of the view that cooperation is paramount in ensuring stability in the international system and that states are more concerned about comparative gains (Ozkan & Cetin, 2016). Furthermore, while Realists believe that cooperation is reasonable only in the realm of high politics, Liberals, argue that cooperation transcends issues of war and power to economic matters relevant to the parties in question (Rana, 2015). The Realist form of cooperation can, therefore, be seen in the formation of organisations like the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation and the now-defunct Warsaw Pact. Whereas, the Liberalist's form of cooperation is exemplified within organisations like the World Trade Organisation.

Both the Realist and Liberalist perception of cooperation have materialised within the International System. This is affirmed by Liberatore's (2009) observation that leading up to the 1970's, the numerous treaties signed on nuclear ban and the formation of institutions like the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) proved that international cooperation was geared towards the prevention of war and economic growth. These two main areas have largely remained the bedrock of cooperation even with the rise of other sectors of cooperation.

Given their firm belief that cooperation among States is essential for international stability, Liberals have championed the cause for new forms of cooperation. Indeed, sustaining peace and economic prosperity continues to be at the heart of many international cooperation

initiatives. However, these have been undertaken through other forms of cooperation (Liberatore, 2009). This is in line with the liberal stance that the guarantee of peace is not only dependent on military and security resources, but also on other important sectors of a state, namely, the economy, culture, education, natural resources, among others.

To explain this further, scientific cooperation, such as technical collaboration and partnerships, has garnered a lot of attention in international cooperation. This is because it brings about innovation, which is viewed as a guarantor of economic growth (Pradhan, Arvin, Hall, & Nair, 2016). In the same way, scientific and educational programmes conducted by organisations like the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), are believed to foster the promotion of understanding and shared values, and by so doing, contribute to the ‘culture of peace’ (Singh, 2018). Furthermore, Liberal theorists like Keohane posit that cooperation within institutions ensures that the intimidation that comes with high politics is absent, thus states are less threatened and suspicious of each other. There is also the supposition that within the framework of cooperation, norms and values are institutionalised to regulate, to an extent, state behavior towards one another (Ari, 2018); (Keohane & Martin, 1995).

Among the many areas that have emerged as necessary for cooperative action is the matter of the environment and its sustainability (Horton & Reynolds, 2016). The United Nations (U.N.) Conference on the Human Environment held in 1972, Sweden, Stockholm, acted as a trigger for intense collaborative initiatives towards environmental protection; paving way for about 900 agreements to be signed within bilateral and multilateral frameworks (Liberatore, 2009). The emergence of matters of the environment on the international scene, albeit tardy, has become a forerunner in global policy making today. Moreover, it has evolved steadily, over the years, to be a complex subject (Kütting & Cerny, 2015).

The intriguing nature of environmental politics as a global theme bores down to its distinctive characteristic of focusing on the relationship between the human society and the world around them (Carter, 2007). The 1992 Rio conference went further to highlight the link between the environment and human welfare as well as its impact on economic development (Teixeira de Barros, 2017). In other words, attention was drawn to the ecological limitations of economic aspirations and, thus, the urgency of preserving the environment, while ensuring an equitable socio-economic system was brought to light. Furthermore, the role of natural resources in the distribution of power and maintenance of peace, stressed the importance of *'environmental security'* in international affairs and as a priority in foreign policy (Koff & Maganda, 2016) (Liberatore, 2009). Where all these pertinent issues, converge, that is, economic growth, human well-being, environmental protection and the promotion of peace, forms the core of the concept of sustainable development (Godfrey, 2012).

As many social concepts, there exist many definitions of sustainable development with varied perspectives. Nevertheless, the Brundtland Report, titled, *'Our Common Future: World Commission on Environment and Development'*, offers a point of departure (Sagar, 2018). It defines sustainable development as *"development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs"* (United Nations, 1987). This modest and rather open-ended definition has led to a number of misinterpretations (Höjer & Wangel, 2015); nevertheless, it is successful in underlining the collective realisation by Member States of the United Nations that, pursuing any kind of development is futile in the long run if attention is not paid to the effects for posterity. The subtle elusiveness in its conceptualisation brings to fore the fact that, development should not be compartmentalised but rather its scope broadened, as much as possible, to cater for all relevant factors. This equally translates into policy-making and implementation; necessitating a holistic approach in that regard, in view of the interdependence of development indicators.

Moreover, Sustainable Development has gained much popularity due to theoretical and scientific proof of the fragility of the environment, vis-à-vis human activities. This consciousness has created ‘widespread public concern’ in national and international politics and has greatly influenced human behaviour and interaction across the globe (Carter, 2007). Others even Kates, view sustainable development as a social movement, because of the popular support it has garnered; to such an extent that, individuals voluntarily opt to effect lifestyle changes. (Kates, Parris, & Leiserowitz, 2016)

As a result, Sustainable Development has been increasingly prioritised in international treaties, like the Paris Agreement (Spash, 2016), signed in 2016 and in the itinerary of International Organisations. In 2015, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development was launched by the United Nations. The Agenda comprises 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) with defined targets guided by indicators to create ‘the Future we want’ in the next 15 years. It is the second universal strategy for development, succeeding the maiden global plan launched at the onset of the new millennium, that is, the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The MDGs run for 15 years (2000-2015) and were driven by the main aim to reduce poverty and hunger across the globe. It addressed other issues such as gender discrimination, health, and environmental degradation among others. In all, eight key areas were formulated into goals with measurable targets and indicators.

Global partnerships were capsulated in Goal 8 of the MDGs and reiterated in the 17th Goal of the SDGs. Goal 17 calls for cooperation among States within the bilateral and multilateral framework. Moreover, it urges States to facilitate Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships (MSPs) as indicated from Target 17.16 to 17.17. Under Target 17.17, the Civil Society and Private Sector are identified as relevant partners for collaboration and resource mobilisation in the areas of Finance, Technology and Knowledge Sharing.

MSPs is a strong component of Sustainable Development (Pinkse & Kolk, 2012). Similarly, the 17 Goals exhibit inter-connected and interdependent traits of the themes that necessitate an all-inclusive strategy to achieve them. This is illustrated in the goals of Agenda 2030. For instance, Quality Education (Goal 4) is imperative to achieve Innovation in Industries (Goal 9), and the opposite is true, the quality of education will be affected by the innovation in the system. Besides, although States are to play a leading role, they must depend on structures outside the public sphere if they are to be successful. Decent Jobs and Economic Growth (Goal 8), requires that the State works with private companies to ensure that employees are treated with dignity while providing the necessary conditions to boost their profitability. In this regard, academic institutions and civil society are equally important in contributing to skill, training and research (another link to Goal 4) as well as creating social awareness and holding relevant stakeholders accountable (Strong Institutions, Goal 16).

For this reason, Sustainable Development has been a major factor for the increase in state/non-state actors' interaction at the national and international levels. For instance, the 1992 Rio Summit offered full access to Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) with the participation of over 1,400 NGOs and 8,000 journalists. The World Summit on Sustainable Development held 10 years later, in 2002 and which took place in Johannesburg hosted 737 new NGOs and more than 8,046 representatives of major groups including business, farmers, indigenous peoples, local authorities, NGOs, the scientific and technological communities, trade unions, and women. These groups organized themselves into approximately 40 geographical and issue-based caucuses. Non-state actors have, therefore, been very instrumental in pushing cooperation among states in this regard and ensuring their

governments ascribe to the principles of sustainable development. (Kates, Parris, & Leiserowitz, 2016).

Agenda 2030 are Global Goals that encourage domestic solutions, given the peculiarities within every State. The inclusion of domestic technical experts and implementation agencies, facilitates ownership and the drawing up of feasible strategies. The civil society brings on board a different perspective, while representing prominent actors like women and the youth as well as marginalised groups; such as persons with disabilities and the rural population among others within the State. Private entities have also been instrumental in the financing of the sustainable development practices, where States and international organisations have been inadequate. The push for more MSPs in in Agenda 2030 is, therefore, to avoid a top-down approach and facilitate easy implementation. Similarly, collaborative effort is vital to address the issue of equity, in resources, human, institutional and technical capacity.

1.1 Research Problem

Pattberg and Widerberg (2016) argue that States have fallen short in finding efficient long-lasting solutions to pressing global environmental challenges such as climate change, deforestation, and natural disasters. This has, therefore, led to the design of innovative approaches which challenge the hierarchical state-led model of governance when it comes to sustainable development. Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships (MSPs), therefore, emerged to open up the playing field and allow non-state actors to support Governments with their expertise and resources.

SDG Target 17. 16 encourages States to *‘Enhance the global partnership for sustainable development, complemented by **multi-stakeholder partnerships that mobilize and share knowledge, expertise, technology and financial resources, to support the achievement of***

the sustainable development goals in all countries, in particular developing countries'. In the same way, per Target 17. 17, States are to *'Encourage and promote effective public, public-private and civil society partnerships, building on the experience and resourcing strategies of partnerships'* (United Nations, 2019). While IR scholars have discussed MSPs in the SDGs at the global level, usually referred to as Transnational MSPs, little has been done on such partnerships within the domestic structure of States, particularly African States.

Moreover, given that State ownership is key in the implementation of the SDGs, per the paragraph 46 of Agenda 2030, governments are seen as the main coordinators to facilitate interaction and collaboration among the relevant stakeholders to achieve SDG 17. In view of this, the Government of Ghana has made some strides in initiating partnerships with the relevant stakeholders. In June 2018, the UN Sustainable Development Partnership 2018-2022, was jointly signed by the Government of Ghana (GoG) and the UN Office in Ghana. Beyond this, the Government is said to have set up Multi-stakeholder committees which have representation from a variety of government and non-government sectors, including Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs), and representatives from the Civil Society. They are mandated to cater for the planning, implementation monitoring and evaluation for the Global Goals. This research therefore seeks to assess the Multi-Stakeholder initiatives undertaken by the Government of Ghana as efforts to foster partnerships under the SDGs.

1.2 Research Questions

The research seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What initiatives have the Government of Ghana undertaken to promote Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships (SDG Targets 17.16 to 17.17)?

2. How are these MSPs initiatives being implemented?
3. What are the successes chalked and challenges faced in implementing these initiatives?

1.3 Research Objectives

The objectives of the research are

1. To discuss initiatives being taken by the Government of Ghana to promote Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships (SDG Targets 17.16 to 17.17).
2. To examine the implementation of the initiatives in facilitating MSPs.
3. To access the successes chalked and challenges faced in implementing these initiatives in its bid to facilitate MSP.

1.4 Scope of The Study

The study focused on Ghana as a Case Study. This choice was intentional due to the relatively feasible accessibility to personnel and resources. The year of investigation was from 2015 to 2019, because 2015 marked the launch of Agenda 2030 and the Agenda was still on-going at the time the research was conducted. The study concentrated on Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships with Non-State Actors undertaken by the Government of Ghana under the SDGs. This was in line with SDG Targets 17.16 to 17.17.

Target 17.16 outlines three main areas of partnership, namely, Finance, Technology and Sharing of knowledge and expertise. Thus, the above areas were used as demarcation for the scope of partnerships in this study. Furthermore, Target 17. 17 encourages '*effective public,*

public-private and civil society partnerships.' In view of this, the study assessed the GoG's engagements with UNDP Ghana, the Civil Society and the Private Sector under the SDGs. The study did not include initiatives from the SDG Advisory Unit at the Office of the President because this unit was set up to support the role of the President as Co-Chair of the Eminent Advocates for the SDGs. While the unit's initiatives contribute to SDG implementation in Ghana, this study focused on initiatives by the Government mechanism as a whole, independent of the President's role as co-chair.

1.5 Rationale of The Study

While States remain primary actors within the international system, it is evident that in recent times, Non-State Actors, particularly in the area of sustainable development, prove to be viable collaborators for resource mobilisation, technology and sharing of knowledge and expertise. The emergence of sustainable development into international relations discourse has further broaden the stage to accommodate not only transnational non-state actors but national stakeholders as well. This has given new meaning to the phrase 'think globally, act locally'. Particularly in the case of sustainable development, where so many global concerns in need of local action are concerned, IR practitioners need to not only interact with transnational MSPs but also local ones.

The difficulty in implementing international policies within states, especially developing ones, has little to do with the agreements itself but the availability of adequate domestic structures and institutions to actualise these policies (O'Brien & Gowan, 2012). International cooperation in areas like health, gender and children affairs, encourage multi-stakeholder to undertake the implementation of international policies within states (World Health Organisation, 2017). MSPs is therefore a usual practice in international affairs and a significant subject area in IR literature, be it transnational or domestic.

It is worth noting, however, that while MSPs have been hailed as an effective tool for sustainable development, some research prove that, they are not delivering on their full potential (Pattberg & Widerberg, 2016). There is, therefore, the need to assess such partnerships, identify the gaps and offer recommendations to improve their success.

This study will therefore contribute to literature on MSPs, particularly government led initiatives within a national setting. Furthermore, the findings of this research will contribute to policy and decision making on MSPs in Ghana.

1.6 HYPOTHESIS

The Government of Ghana is promoting MSPs in order to achieve SDG 17.

1.7 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The study was conducted within the conceptual framework of Collaborative Governance. As the name suggests, it refers to a system of governance which engages both state and non-state institutions in a cooperative manner. The origins of collaborative governance are rather scattered. Theorists seem to suggest that this is because the concept was a by-product of public administration experiments to challenge existing exclusive and top-down forms of governance. Nevertheless, some literature reveals that the term, ‘collaborative governance’ was first used by Dohahue of Harvard University in 2004 (Sun, 2017).

Proponents like Ansell & Gash, in their article, ‘Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice’ (Ansell & Gash, 2007), define this as a *‘mode of governance which brings multiple stakeholders together in common forums with public agencies to engage in consensus-oriented decision making’* (Ansell & Gash, 2007, p. 543). Collaborative governance is a public administration concept with liberal theoretical underpinnings, which moves away from the

'polycentric' way of addressing public issues to one where actors outside the public sphere are welcomed to the roundtable to deliberate and actively contribute to governance.

Futhermore they argue that, *'it has developed as an alternative to the adversarialism of interest group pluralism and to the accountability failures of managerialism'* (Ansell & Gash, 2007, p. 544). In other words, given the increasing diversity in political and social movements and the interests they profess to represent, collaborative governance is a possible avenue to find common ground. Likewise, it counters the *'outside looking in'* form of accountability and invites 'social watchdogs' like the civil society into the process of policy and decision making to make up for the shortcomings in public management. Although, collaborative governance has not been the most widely accepted form of governance, it is, particularly, relevant in an era where knowledge is more specialised and capacity unevenly distributed among institutions.

Ansell and Gash further outline six main characteristics of Collaborative Governance including;

- (1) The forum is initiated by public agencies or institutions,
- (2) Participants in the forum include non-state actors,
- (3) Participants engage directly in decision making and are not merely "consulted" by public agencies,
- (4) The forum is formally organized and meets collectively,
- (5) The forum aims to make decisions by consensus (even if consensus is not achieved in practice), and
- (6) The focus of collaboration is on public policy or public. (Ansell & Gash, 2007, pp. 544-545)

Emerson, Nabatchi & Stephen (2012), on their part, define it as *“the processes and structures of public policy decision making and management that engage people constructively across the boundaries of public agencies, levels of government, and/or the public, private and civic spheres in order to carry out a public purpose that could not otherwise be accomplished”* (p. 2). Thus, interaction is not only strengthened with private agencies but within public agencies as well. Coordination among public agencies has been a long-standing challenge in public management. This may seem ironic, given that public agencies are usually thought to be working towards the same goal. Nevertheless, more often than not there are limitations to inter-agency interaction in the public sector. Thus, Collaborative governance addresses such gaps among public agencies while inviting external actors on board. Besides, the latter part of the definition shows the distinct capacity of collaborative governance to bring about results that can only be achieved through synergy. This is possible because there is an avenue for new perspectives, improved representation and increased accessibility to resources be it human, financial, institutional or technological. Public institutions, particularly benefit from increased capacity through the sharing of knowledge and expertise from the other stakeholders like the civil society, NGOs, IGOs and private sector.

While the interaction between state and non-state actors on domestic matters, seems like a recent phenomenon, Gordon and Pierik, (2011), argue that the theoretical underpinnings of the civil society can be deduced from the liberal writings of Locke and Hume. Locke’s social contract presents an individual who assertively holds government in check, this responsibility of keeping government accountable, regardless of private interest is what engages the individual in governance. This equally affords them the opportunity to form associations to push their agenda within the public sphere. Hume’s stance is a rather suspicious one of governments, in view of this mistrust, He advances Lockes’s argument of accountability to ensuring the prerogative of government is ‘public’ at heart and not its own selfish interest.

Hume's, however, disagree to the assertion that, government is a universally accepted entity, simply put, not only does every citizen wish to willingly cede to a government, but also not all citizens are represented in government. Hume believes this is why the civil society is essential, because it would offer the individual a chance to contribute, whether, directly or indirectly to governance and caters for the marginalised and under-represented.

In spite of the promise of Collaborative Governance, critics like Huxham, Vangen, Huxham, & Eden (2000) doubt its practicability due to what they term as structural complexities and diversity. On structural complexities, they focus on the day-to day working dynamics of collaborative governance. They posit that public agencies may have more accessibility to each other and so may work easier and more often collectively than with the other organisations. Some of these non-public Organisations may only have interest in in one particular issue and thus would not be involved when other equally important matters arise. They also point to the challenge posed by different working methods. Seeing that, there is usually a stark difference between how public and non-public institutions operate, it is argued that, this could be a limitation in successful collaborative governance.

While the above criticism is based on the complexities of implementing collaborative governance, other critics, base their criticism on the traditional concept of public administration, which has no space for the participation of non-state actors (Sun, 2017). They opine that the participation of non-state actors in main stream governance brings about conflict of interest especially where the private sector is involved. Moreover, pertinent issues may be coopted by businesses who are concerned about their profit as well as by civil society organisations who are usually dependent on transnational donors (Clarke, 2017).

In spite of this, collaborative governance is appropriate for this study because it adequately conceptualises the interaction and cooperation among state and non-state actors in

governance within a given state. Besides, the concept being a response to the limited capacity of government in public administration is the essence for MSPs for the SDGs, such that other stakeholders may fill the gaps to ensure a sustainable mode of governance.

1.8 LITERATURE REVIEW

This section is in three parts. The first section reviews scholarly work on governance in Sustainable Development, this begins with the premise that sustainable development has become a priority in international affairs. However, challenges in its implementation still persist due to accompanying politics and legitimacy of non-state actors. Also, the limitations of sub-national structures are hardly addressed at the global level and this further hamper any significant progress. The second section, therefore looks at the public management of Sustainable Development in Sub-Saharan Africa, particularly at initiatives by governments. The final section concentrates on collaborative governance models practiced on the continent.

1.8.1 Governance in Sustainable Development

Although Sustainable Development has received so much attention, reports show that little progress has been made. One of the main factors for this, is the inadequate governance systems in place. (Carter, 2007) (Elliott, 2004). There is a plethora of bilateral and multilateral treaties, most of which, set up secretariats or some form of implementation mechanisms, still there is more ground to cover.

Kemp, Parto, & Gibson (2005) argue that, governance and sustainable development are '*children of similar history and parentage*' (p. 13). They both emerged in the 80's and grew in popularity as interests in the role of institutions in societal change became more prominent. They both were important in bringing to light a '*broad set of factors that were increasingly important and insufficiently recognised in conventional thinking and encouraged a more*

integrated understanding of how these factors were, or should be, linked' (p. 17). For instance, Governance scholars viewed the political system as comprising both formal and informal arrangements. Although, definitions for both concepts are varied they are clear on the importance of the diversity of actors and the interdependence of factors, implying a *'neo-liberal and democratic pluralistic'* (p. 19) agenda.

Meadowcroft (2007) recommends is a *'turn towards more interactive/reflective modes of governance that encourage societal 'self-analysis' to assess and reassess the development trajectory, and exploit interactive processes to increase the manageability of long term social change* (p. 312)'. In other words, any successes of governance in sustainability would require the active participation of actors in society. This explains the influx of non-state actors in sustainability governance models at the international and sub-national level.

Backstrand (2006), raises concerns regarding the legitimacy of non-state actors in, what she terms as, International Sustainability Governance. She argues that, their advent on the global scene is a by-product of experimenting new governance models to tackle sustainable development. Thus, there is a need to question how *'representative, accountable and effective'* they are. More so, the international institutions, which champion their cause, have themselves been accused of suffering a 'democratic deficit, which begs the question; how is this addressed in the midst of new actors. Nevertheless, she remarks that the increased inclusion, has the potential of improving state ownership and positively affecting implementation, provided there is true and diverse representation. She writes;

'Ownership' of outcomes and agreements by a wider range of stakeholders who are affected by issues and who may be partly responsible for policy implementation along with governments is desirable on grounds of the efficacy of democracy' (p. 472).

Her idea of democracy in sustainability governance is a level playing field for interaction, deliberation and protest. An avenue which encourages '*participatory multilateralism*' and stresses '*communicative action and dialogue in a global public sphere among states, businesses and civil society*' with equal representation from the North and the South. She opines that sustainability governance models are '*post-sovereign hybrid forms of governance*' which '*complement rather than replace sovereign-based decision-making*'.

Pattberg & Biermann (2008) in discussing Governance in International Environmental Politics, begin with varied definitions of Global Governance, first, as a product of socio-political transformations, then as a problem-solving mechanism and finally, from a critical perspective, as a tool to limit the power of nation-states. They then argue that, given the increasing significance of environmental politics in international affairs, Global Environmental Governance emerged as a tool to find solutions to the problems it posed. Due to the technicalities in environmental issues, it brought on board a range of non-state actors. Yet, it is not the mere presence of non-state actors which is remarkable, but the extent of agency they yield. IGOs exercise agency through the States that set them up, the norms, values and institutions they set up, regulate State behavior and hold States accountable when they fall short. NGOs are actively engaged in policy making and implementation, while field experts, whether individual or a group are consulted for their advise on strategies and policies. Activists groups create awareness and represent sidelined voices. In the past, businesses dealt indirectly with international institutions, today, businesses are directly involved in negotiations for Global treaties, a case in point is the UN Global Compact.

Pattberg & Biermann remark that the participation of non-state actors in Global Environmental Governance is not only relevant at the international level but the sub-national level as well. They argue as follows:

'the increasing global institutionalization of environmental politics does not occur, and is indeed not conceivable, without continuing policy making at national and subnational levels. Global standards need to be implemented and put into practice locally, and global norm setting requires local decision making and implementation' (p. 284).

However, they caution that the lack of uniformity in domestic policies can undermine Global Environmental Governance, it is therefore prudent to assess the relative performance of non-state institutions and governance mechanisms set up by States at the domestic level, to ascertain how they meet global demands

1.8.2 Managing Sustainable Development in Sub-Saharan Africa

Agenda 2030 comes to add to the list of development agenda Africa has adopted. The continent's primary political intergovernmental organisation, the African Union, has its own equivalent of Agenda 2063: the Africa we want, which not only tackles economic development, environmental issues, innovation and good governance on the continent. Carter (2007) and Kalu (2017) agree that, an all-encompassing strategy is need for Africa, seeing that the usual developmental measures, mostly, spearheaded by the North have not adequately addressed the 'structural deficiencies' that hold the continent back. According to Professor Kalu (2017), while many reason, like climate, geography, ethnic diversity among others have been pointed to as reasons for Africa's under development, he agrees with Acemoglu & Robinson (2010) that the core problem is the weak institutions in Africa. Professor Kalu adopts a dependency approach and traces the reasons for Africa's weak institutions to the predatory and exploitative character of governance during colonialism in the continent and its perpetuation in post-independence Africa.

Furthermore, Kalu (2017) defines institutions as the incentives that shape choices in any society. In essence, he believes, that institutions have the capacity to effect change in all sectors of the state, even in the lifestyle of citizens. He goes further, to mention that no society has such institutions from the outset but concurs with Acemoglu & Robinson (2010) '*inclusive growth and development arose when there were transitions from one set of institutions to another*'. He, therefore believes that inclusivity in governance is sure to boost state-society relations and guarantee sustainable development.

Pratt (2003) argues that issues raised in sustainable development had already escalated in Africa. While the continent is handicap in many ways, he believes that the sustainable development agenda has great potential in Africa because the communal activism it requires resonates in the African culture. Ubuntu, which translates "I am because we are." Remains a core value in African societies and exhibited in the various aspects of politics, economy and development on the continent. He explains that, '*an African takes action or expresses an opinion based on its implied consistency with norms and thought patterns in a group*'. In view of this, any sustainability initiatives requires '*setting up a system for community input well before they are under way; it requires searching for channels by which community views are represented in organizational decision-making*'. As such communication to stakeholders to get on board are targeting at their moral sensitivities and responsibility to their community.

(Haywood, Funkea, Audouinb, Musvotoa, & Nahmanb, 2018) Beyond this, African governments have taken the initiative to map Goals in the Agenda 2030 unto their national development plan. This creates synergy and avoids redundancy in planning, resource allocation, monitoring and evaluation.

1.8.3 Collaborative Governance in Sub-Saharan Africa

Collaborative governance is stressed under regional initiatives like Agenda 2063, NEPAD (Kanbur, 2002) (Edozie, 2004). African governments have been very dependent on IGOs, NGOs, CSOs and academia in governance on the continent.

Woldesenbet (2018) while researching on collaborative governance model in managing Addis Ababa rivers remarked that, there is a low level of commitment on the part of implementing agencies. This was expressed in terms of how willingly they mobilise resources for activities and how proactive they were in responding to duty.

He also observed low level of communication among public institutions themselves as well with non-public institutions. This was same for coordination of activities risking double tasking or complete neglect of priority areas. African Public institutions are also particularly fond of bickering over hierarchy and staging turf war, further hampering any successful form of collaboration in governance.

The random/non-criterion-based appointment of focal persons and committees has also been identified as a challenge for collaborative governance initiatives activity. Selection of representatives is usually based on political affiliation to the government instead of requisite competences and skills.

The literature on collaborative governance in sustainability, clearly touts the benefits of such efforts, however, its shortcomings are equally highlighted, such conflict of interest on the part of stakeholders, challenges of inter-agency coordination among others. Notably, the discussion hardly looks at domestic structures within States set up by Governments to facilitate inclusivity in sustainability governance. This research therefore sought to address this gap by focusing particularly on Ghana.

1.9 SOURCES OF DATA

This research made use of primary and secondary sources of data. Primary data was derived from interviews. Respondents comprised representatives from the stakeholders under discussion, that is, the GoG, UNDP Ghana, the Civil Society and the Private Sector. On the other hand, secondary data was accessed from official documents such as the Coordinated Plan of the Republic of Ghana, SDGs Baseline Report, NDPC Reports and the UNSDP. Relevant books, journal articles, reports, magazines and websites on the subject were also used as a source of secondary data.

1.10 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

1.10.1 Research Design

The research design considers how the investigation will be conducted. This comprises the method of data collection, instruments to be adopted and how they are exploited for data analysis. Accordingly, this research was conducted using qualitative methodology. This kind of methodology makes use of ‘non-statistical methods of analysis to examine subjective experiences’ (Ingham-Broomfield, 2015). While quantitative research focuses on large-scale trends, qualitative research is appropriate for micro-level social interaction as it enables direct accessibility to relevant actors. This, therefore, enables an in-depth understanding of the subject matter (Crossman, 2019).

1.10.2 Study Population

According to Banerjee & Chaudhury, ‘*A population is a complete set of people with a specialized set of characteristics, and a sample is a subset of the population*’ (2010). In this study, the population comprised actors involved in MSPs for SDG 17. Therefore, the study population included officials from GoG (particularly the NDPC, the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning), UNDP Ghana, the Civil Society and the Private Sector. This was in

keeping with the scope of the study, which has enumerated a specific set of state and non-state institutions to be considered.

The NDPC was chosen as a representative of the GoG, primarily because they act as conveners for the Implementation Coordination Committee (ICC) for the SDGs, set up by the Government to foster MSPs. Besides the Commission is the principal source of reporting on SDG progress in Ghana. The Ministry of Finance (MoF) was also selected as a representative of GoG due to their role in coordinating financial engagement between Ghana and its development partners. The Ministry is also a key member of the ICC. UNDP was included in this study because they are the branch of the UN System in Ghana, in charge of the SDGs. They also collaborate directly with the GoG to offer support for the achievement of the Goals.

1.10.3 Sample Size

The sample size simply refers to the number of participants engaged in the study. Opoku, Ahmed, & Akotia (2016) state that, the sample *'usually represents the view of the population as a whole'*. During this study it was remarked that, the private sector and the CSO had mobilised to set up one point of contact. Thus, the CSO Platform for SDGs and the Private Enterprise Federation are the two organisations directly engaged by the GoG as representatives from the CSO and Private Sector in Ghana, respectively. A total of eight persons were interviewed. This included, Dr. Felix Addo-Yobo, Deputy Director at the NDPC, Mr. Nana Yaw Yankah and Mr. Collins Kabuga, both Senior Economists from the MoF, Mr. Omar Seidu, Head of Demographics Statistics and Coordinator of Data for SDGs at the Ghana Statistical Service, GSS, Ms. Sylvia Senu, Analyst in the Inclusive Growth Department at UNDP Ghana, Mr. George Osei-Bimpeh, Country Director of SEND Ghana and Co-Chair of CSO Platform for SDGs in Ghana as well as Mr. Moses Agyemang and Mr. Thomas Kamkam, Senior Economist and Project Officer, respectively, at the Private

Entreprise Federation. These persons were carefully selected due to the role they play in their organisations and its direct relation to the subject under study.

1.10.4 Sampling Method

The sampling method informs how the selection of interviewees was conducted. This study made use of purposive and snowballing sampling method through interviews. The former method, purposive sampling is a popular qualitative tool, usually credited to Patton. Gentles, Charles, Ploeg, & McKibbin (2015) acknowledge Patton's argument that "The logic and power of purposeful sampling lie in selecting information-rich cases for in-depth study. To explain further. Information-rich cases are those from which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of the inquiry. This is significant because studying information-rich cases yields insights and in-depth understanding.

The latter method, snowballing, refers to a situation where 'the researcher makes initial contact with a small group of people who are relevant to the research topic and then uses them as referrals to contact with others' (Rahi, 2017). This is a very useful method because it gives the researcher access to a larger network of expertise, thereby consolidating the efficiency of data collated.

1.10.5 Collection of Data

This study used two forms of qualitative methods of data collection. In accessing the primary sources of data, interviews were conducted, using semi structured interview guides. Interviews are useful to amass diverse opinions and views. The various perspectives from respondents affords the researcher the opportunity to compare and contrast for an efficient analysis. This is particularly significant for this type of research where various actor, who play specific and different roles towards a set goal, in a given context are being investigated. Furthermore, the semi-structured interview was fashioned based the subject under study. This

kind of interview also facilitates the researcher to probe further, when the respondent makes an interesting and relevant remark. The interviews were recorded and transcribed for analysis; the researcher also took notes during the interviews.

Secondary data was collected through document analysis. Here, relevant policy documents, books, articles, reports and magazines were perused thoroughly to assess relevant information.

1.10.6 Data Analysis

Primary and Secondary Data collected were analysed using content analysis and thematic analysis. Content analysis was done via a dual approach, that is, Basic level or the manifest level and the higher level or latent level of analysis. Simply put, on one hand, the Basic level presents a descriptive account of the data as they have been collected, on the other hand the, Higher level gives a more deductive account of the data collected, that attempts to infer and provide implications of what has been described in the Basic level (University of Leicester, 2019).

Thematic analysis for this study, was conducted by classifying data under different categories and identifying the patterns relevant to the study. To efficiently do this, Maguire & Delahunt's (2017) recommendation of the six-phase guide of Braun and Clarke's framework for thematic analysis, was considered.

1.10.7 Ethical Considerations

Respondents participated voluntarily in interviews for this study. Before interviews were conducted respondents gave their consent and were given the opportunity to express their

preference for anonymity or otherwise. This was to ensure confidentiality between the interviewer and the respondent.

1.11 ARRANGEMENTS OF CHAPTERS

Chapter 1 discusses the Introduction.

Chapter 2 gives an Overview of SDG 17 and Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships.

Chapter 3 assesses Multi-Stakeholder Initiatives by the Government of Ghana towards attaining SDG 17

Finally, Chapter 4 discusses the Summary of Research Findings, Conclusion and Recommendations

CHAPTER TWO

OVERVIEW OF SDG 17 AND MULTI-STAKEHOLDER PARTENRSHIPS

2.0 INTRODUCTION

This chapter begins with a cursory look at major actions taken by the United Nations towards sustainable development leading up to Agenda 2030. This followed by a discussion on SDG 17 and the four main areas it encompasses. The subsequent section will delve into the introduction of MSPs within United Nations and contending issues surrounding its implementation. The final section of the chapter focuses on MSPs and the stakeholders considered in this study.

2.1 OVERVIEW OF SDG 17 AND MULTI-STAKEHOLDER PARTNERSHIPS.

At the dawn of Globalisation, the world was referred to as a global village. A rather apt description to conceptualise the paradoxes of the reality it was succumbed to then and its perpetuation today. The term is a metaphor for how the vast expanse of earth finds a way to stay connected via the marvellous advancements of technology (Srinivasan, 2018). Beumer, Figge, & Elliott (2018) argue that there exists a positive relationship between sustainable development and globalisation. They believe the two concepts are based on the same three factors, that is, economic, social and environmental. Thus, the success of one would guarantee that of the other.

Globalisation offers many unprecedented opportunities for development and growth (Hamdi, 2013). Nevertheless, without any attention to scarce resources, people are at risk of not being able to enjoy its benefits in the first place. Neglecting environmental issues make way for cascading effects on a State's economy, development, peace and security (United Nations Environment Programme, 2016). Seeing this as a global responsibility, the United Nations has adopted sustainable development as a strategic agenda.

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable development is the latest testament of the commitment of States to adapt a more all-rounded approach to development (Kjaerulf, et al., 2016). It touches on crucial aspects of human life including, prosperity, the environment, the economy, technology, partnerships, education and inequality. More so, Agenda 2030 adds to a long line of international agreements on sustainable development, since the concept became more prominent on the international scene, particularly in the late 20th century (Wright, 2013) (Lin, 2015). Other key international agreements on international environmental governance, include the Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Trans-Boundary Context, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and, its predecessor, the Millennium Development Goals.

2.1.1 United Nations Conference on the Human Environment

The 1972 United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, which took place in Stockholm, Sweden, was the first major conference organised specifically to discuss sustainable development (Borowy, 2018) (United Nations, 2019). Boudes (2011), argues that the conference was timely given *'the context of the end of the 1960's when environmental preoccupation has emerged, linked with technical, demographical and cultural issues'*. This conference was regarded a major international conference on global environmental governance and thus, a pivotal moment in international environmental politics.

The Declaration of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment addressed the effects of human and environment interaction, and sought to draw up a common and consensual set of principles to guide States in handling environmental issues. Particularly, the Declaration acknowledged the rapid advancements of technology, at the time, and how States were harnessing these innovations to undertake industrialisation. It noted, however that, environmental resources are non-renewable and this places them at the mercy of man's

actions and inactions (Shelton, 2008). Per paragraph 4 of the preamble, of the Declaration associated environmental problems in developing states to their underdevelopment, whereas in the developed states, rapid industrialisation was underlined as a major concern for the sustenance of the environment. In view of this, it called on industrialising States to take steps to mitigate the impact of manufacturing on the environment, in order to avoid a ricochet effect on humankind, in the long run. However, in Developing Countries, the limited resources of the environment were seen as a major threat to economic development, given their over-dependence on natural resources, thus more responsibility was placed on developed States *'to reduce the gap between themselves and the developing countries'* (United Nations, 1972).

Furthermore, in paragraph 5, while concerns were raised regarding the spurge in population, the declaration equally saw it as an opportunity to harness the potential of human capacity and channel it towards pioneering means of preserving the environment. The UN General Assembly, therefore, called on all persons to exercise responsibility in their interaction with the environment. In the same vein, national governments were encouraged to adjust their public policy machinery, accordingly. The international community was also called to action, with Member States and International organisations, mandated to facilitate knowledge and resource sharing (United Nations, 1972). The declaration, however, noted the different capacities States yield and how that would impact development across the globe (Handl, 2012). Mahbub (2016) opines that though the declaration did not mention, explicitly, the concept of sustainable development, its contents touches all the tenets of the concept, thus promoting *'the holistic approach embodied in the concept'*.

Following the Stockholm Conference, the General Assembly established the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) (Division for Sustainable Development Goals, 2019).

Usually referred to as UN Environment and currently headquartered in Nairobi, Kenya. According to the SDGs Knowledge Platform, the '*UNEP represents the agency responsible for coordinating the UN environmental activities*', and particularly assists developing countries '*in implementing environmentally sound policies and practices*'. In December 1983, the General Assembly by Resolution 38/161 approved the proposal of the Governing Council of the UNEP to establish a special commission, later on christened as the World Commission on Environment and Development (Division for Sustainable Development Goals, 2019). The Commission had the mandate to make proposals on strategies to alleviate development problems ahead of the impending new millennium, at the time, and beyond. The report of the Commission would be submitted to the UNEP Governing Council for consideration, then transmitted the General Assembly (ibid.). The report of the World Commission on Environment and Development entitled "Our Common Future" was submitted to the General Assembly during its 42nd session. The report promoted the concept of 'sustainable development' and highlighted its three main components, the protection of the environment, economic growth and an equitable social system (Mensah, 2017).

2.1.2 Agenda 21

Another major milestone was the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), popularly referred to as the Earth Summit, held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, from 3rd to 14th June, 1992. This conference identified three levels of action, namely, global, national and local. In other words, it broke down environmental governance to include domestic structures within States to ensure durable strategies and solutions (Division for Sustainable Development, 2019). The Conference produced the next major document on Sustainable Development; the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development, simply known as Agenda 21.

Agenda 21 is a 351 paged non-binding document, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations. It is divided into 4 sections, which was reflective of renewed understanding of SD (Craig & QC, 2009). Aside matters of the environment, economy and the society, International cooperation were added to accelerate sustainable development. It stressed the need to empower major stakeholders in the society for the conservation and management of resources for development (UN Sustainable Development, 2019). This is arguably, one of the significant allusion to MSPs in an international document on sustainability. Agenda 21 identified in particular nine stakeholder groups that could play a role in developing policy and implementing what was agreed: Women, Children and Youth, Indigenous Peoples, Non-Governmental Organizations, Local Authorities, Trade Unions, Business and Industry, Scientific and Technological Community and Farmers (UN Sustainable Development, 2019, p. Section III) (Beisheim, 2015).

Moreover, the Stakeholders were to collaborate in the means of implementation by mobilising financial resources, making use of technology, improving institutional capacity and creating awareness. To improve domestic participation, States were encouraged to set up national mechanisms to monitor and evaluate progress. Agenda 21, therefore, marked the beginning of a new global partnership for sustainable development. To facilitate the Implementation of the aspirations in Agenda 21 and ensure Member States upheld their commitment and made efforts in their policy and decision making processes accordingly, the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) was formed in December 1992 (Division for Sustainable Development Goals, 2019).

During its 10th year anniversary, commitment to the Rio principles were reiterated in 2002, at the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) in Johannesburg. The following decade, in 2012, at the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, also referred to as the RIO +20 Conference, Member States adopted the outcome document; ‘The Future

We Want'(ibid.). This document placed on the front burner, the aspiration of Member States to eradicate poverty across the globe. It was also the document which set the tone to begin the process for the establishment of the SDGS to succeed MDGs.

2.1.3 The High-Level Political Forum of Sustainable Development

The High-Level Political Forum of Sustainable Development is the current central monitoring and evaluation mechanism put in place by the United Nations (ECOSOC, 2016). It was established by the 2012 United Nations (UN) Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20) (Abbott & Bernstein, 2015). The Forum subsumed the Commission on Sustainable Development, taking on the commission's role and repositioning itself to cater for the new challenges of sustainable development (Bernstein, 2013). The forum is held annually, under the auspices of the ECOSOC, to afford all stakeholders the opportunity to report on progress on the SDGs. States, for instance, avail themselves for scrutiny through a volunteer review. Private corporations reiterate their commitment to the SDGs and shed light on initiatives they are undertaking in that regard. The Civil Society is also represented with NGO's giving their progress report over the past year and inform of areas for improvement. Persons from academia actively engage in panel discussions and offer their recommendations based on their field of research and expertise. Each year, selected goals are identified for review. SDG 17 is the only goal which is under constant review at every session (Division for Sustainable Development Goals, 2019).

The HLPF review mechanism is crucial to the achievement of the SDGs. It replaced the Annual Ministerial Review (AMR) under the MDGs, which was regarded a laudable initiative but failed to live up to expectation (Beisheim, 2015). The new review mechanism, known as the Voluntary National Review, allows States to avail themselves to be scrutinised regarding their progress in achieving the goals. The process for reporting comprises four stages, namely, preparation, interaction, consideration and implementation (Cooper, 2018).

Throughout these processes, member states are required to allow input from relevant non-state actors.

2.1.4 Addis Ababa Action Agenda

Ahead of the adoption of Agenda 2030 in September 2015, Member States of the UN adopted the Addis Ababa Action Agenda (AAAA), in July 2015, at the Third International Conference on Financing for Development. The document was set to be the framework to facilitate the financing for the SDGs (Division for Sustainable Development Goals, 2019). The AAAA succeeds the Monterrey Consensus in 2002 which was the maiden financing for development working document, adopted at the First International Conference (Bhandary, Kantai, Sharma, Verkuijl, & Wertz, 2015). The essence of the document is to equip States to boost financing for development.

According to the European Commission, financing for development is a broad concept which usually includes the following;

1. Mobilisation of domestic resources (such as tax revenues),
2. International financial resources (such as Official Development Assistance (ODA) and other international public flows),
3. Involvement of the private sector in financing development,
4. Optimum use of innovative financing sources and mechanisms,
5. Increase in trade capacity and investment to create jobs and drive economic growth
6. Promotion of debt sustainability. (European Commission, 2019)

The AAAA is a loaded document which focuses on three main sections, that is; a global framework for financing development post-2015; action areas; and data, monitoring and follow-up (Mepielan Centre, 2015). Nevertheless, analysts opine that the document is not likely to harness maximum financial support for the Goals, mainly due to the reluctance of

developed countries to take on more responsibility and the waning economies of their developing counterparts (Rao, 2017). On another note the document was criticised as mostly politically influenced with little input from senior policy makers, the civil society and the media (Evans, 2015)

2.2 SDG GOAL 17

SDG 17 calls for partnerships for the goal. It is a successor to MDG 8 on Global Partnerships. Goal 17 focuses on bilateral and multilateral partnerships among state and non-state actors. The Goal calls for increased investments in partnership, improving cross sector partnership and working towards policy coherence both domestically and internationally (Maltais, Weitz, & Persson, 2018). Besides, national ownership is important in order to empower states to exercise their agency in drawing up their own strategies towards development (Nilsson & Persson, 2015).

The Inter-Agency and Expert Group on SDG Indicators (IAEG-SDGs) under the auspices of the UN Statistical commission and the ECOSOC enumerated 19 targets grouped under four main areas including finance, technology, capacity building, trade and systematic issues (Division for Sustainable Development Goals, 2019). A summary of the areas is discussed below as they are presented on the SDG Knowledge Platform in Table 1(See Table 1 in annexure).

2.2.1 Finance

Under this sub-heading, five targets are identified to improve domestic resource mobilisation; encourage Developed Countries to effectively discharge their ODI commitment, call for support to Developed Countries to find alternative financial resources, as well as improve their debt sustainability. Finally, it is to undertake investment promotion for LDCs. The main aim of the SDGs is to end poverty and to mitigate environmental challenges, this, therefore

requires intensive financial support. With the recent global crisis and the advent of donor fatigue, both developed and developing nations have to find alternative financial resources to back the policies they put in place (NEPAD&UNECA, 2014). The financial obligation to realise the Goals is rather steep. At the opening of the SDG Financing Lab in 2017, the President of the seventy first session of the UN General Assembly, H.E. Peter Thompson revealed that it would require annual investments of around US\$6 trillion, or US\$90 trillion over 15 years (United Nations, 2017). In view of this, the United Nations has held high-level meetings on financing sustainable development where Member States come to share, learn and partner with one another (IISD, 2018).

2.2.2 Technology

The second theme under SDG 17 is explored through three targets. The main aim is for global cooperation and mutually beneficial regulations on accessibility to science and technology. This is to be achieved by improving on existing frameworks and building upon them to eventually have a global mechanism. Technology shared must be environmentally sound and undertaken on a concessional and preferential basis. It must also be affordable and supported by adequate infrastructure to ensure sustainability (ICC, 2018). To cater for the needs of LDCs, Target 17. 8 calls for the establishment of a technology bank, in order to enhance the use of ICT in deprived areas. According to the target indicator, accessibility to internet would be measured by the number of persons using it as well as the broadband subscriptions per 100 habitants in a given area. Technology is important to increase accessibility to information as well as improve skills development, by so doing, ensuring that no one is left behind (Chowdhury & Koya, 2017).

2.2.3 Capacity Building

The sole target under capacity building is to enable more collaboration in improving institutional and human capacity particularly in developing countries. The aim is to facilitate policy decision making and implementation as states seek to localise the SDGs. The kind of cooperation envisaged ranges from North-North, South – South, North –South among others. Gupta & Vegelin (2016) argue that, capacity building, is key to ensure social inclusiveness, which is often side-lined for economic growth. According to the indicator, capacity building will be measured by the dollar value dedicated to financial and technical assistance.

2.2.4 Trade

The three targets under trade seek to offer a level playing field for developed, developing and LDCs within the multilateral framework of the WTO. Already, the asymmetrical nature of negotiation processes puts the latter two at a disadvantage. Initiatives like the Doha Roundtable was set up to address this gap, however, its outcome has been stalled for some time now (Wolfe, 2015) (Bouët & Laborde, 2017). A significant and rather ambitious target increase exports from LDCs such that they are doubled by 2020. Additionally, the targets seek to implement the WTO decision of granting duty-free and quota-free market access on a lasting basis for all least developed countries

2.2.5 Systematic Issues

This subheading seeks to address systematic lapses at the local, national and international level. It is further broken down to three areas for clarity and coherence. The first part is concerned with Policy and Institutional coherence. Primarily, it seeks to harmonise global macroeconomic factors to ensure stability, through a common platform for policy coordination. Beyond this, this target covers other policies made towards sustainable development, it ensures that such policies are coherent, able to identify trade-offs and reflect

a global mandate (Nilsson, Griggs, & Visbeck, 2016). At the same time, Member States are allowed to act on their agency in drawing up policies that reflect their domestic set-up with little interference and compulsion from other states (Stafford-Smith, et al., 2017). Besides this section focuses on MSPs which is designated as complementary mechanism to global partnership. MSPs function as a platform to share knowledge among the various stakeholders in the implementation of measures towards sustainable development, particularly in the areas of knowledge, expertise, technology and financial resources. This would also enable governments to strengthen cooperation with the private sector and the civil society in governance. The last section dwells on Data, monitoring and accountability. This involves two main milestones, by 2020, enhance the capacity of developing countries and LDCs to provide reliable and disaggregated data according to gender, age, ethnicity among others. By 2030, build on existing initiatives to develop measurements of progress on sustainable development that complement gross domestic product, and support statistical capacity-building in developing countries.

2.3 MSPs IN UNITED NATIONS

MSPs have become a viable global problem-solving tool because it addresses common concerns faced by different actors. Issues are well nuanced as stakeholders give their perspectives, and collectively streamline ideas to tackle them. With MSPs, knowledge is not only shared but created. As actors participate, they come about new knowledge neither had accessed hitherto. In other words, knowledge they could have never acquired if they were acting individually. It has therefore been lauded by public and private entities alike as well as the civil society. Today, MSPs go by many names cross-sector partnerships, roundtable, interactive policy making, cross industry collaboration, stakeholder dialogue among others. (Brouwer, Woodhill, Hemmati, Verhoosel, & van Vugt, 2015)

As the world seeks to come to term with inevitable limits of its ecology, strategies seem to be moving away from the conventional 'state-led' approach to a more inclusive one. MSPs are embedded in international agreements like the Hyogo Framework of Action on natural hazards and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). (Pattberg & Widerberg, Transnational multistakeholder partnerships for sustainable development: Conditions for success, 2016). The UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) has been the leading agency in stakeholder dialogue within the United Nations. In 2013, during the Sixty Eighth Session of the General Assembly, Resolution 68/18/1 was passed to strengthen the ECOSOC as the coordinating arm of the UN in sustainable development. The assembly, by the resolution, recognises the ECOSOC as the principal body for coordination, policy review, policy dialogue and recommendations on issues of economic and social development. Aside the ECOSOC and its subsidiary bodies like the Commission on sustainable development and the Office for Intergovernmental Support and Coordination for Sustainable Development, the Second Committee of the General Assembly, have also discussed Partnerships at the United Nations in general terms every other year (Dodds, 2016). MSPs has now become the go-to implementation approach for UN agreements. While such partnerships do not necessarily replace the presiding role of Member States and their governments, they have been accorded regulatory authority in actualising provisions within the agreements (Raynolds & Bennett (ed.), 2015). At the conclusion of the WSSD, a good number of partnerships in Sustainable development were launched. This was followed by the creation of a database under the auspices of the CSD in 2004. Interviews of UN staff conducted by however suggest that the first attempts at consolidating MSPs in sustainable development were hampered by the lack of political will and the absence of an adequate follow-up strategy (Beisheim & Simon, 2015) .

Resolution A/58/227 titled 'Enhanced cooperation between the United Nations and all relevant partners, in particular the private sector' was submitted by the Secretary General to the General Assembly to outline how global partnerships for sustainable development would be conducted. The report defines Partnerships as;

voluntary and collaborative relationships between various parties, both State and non-State, in which all participants agree to work together to achieve a common purpose or undertake a specific task and to share risks, responsibilities, resources, competencies and benefits. (United Nations, 2003, p. 4)

The premise corroborates the complex matter of sustainable development; it is a concern for all actors, yet the perspectives, interest and approaches vary from one stakeholder to another. The United Nations sees this as an opportunity than a challenge, they believe that a common avenue would not only maximise individual gains but also provide a regulatory platform, transparency and even mitigate negative effects through stakeholder dialogue.

The document enumerates three main styles of partnerships, (1) including direct participation in intergovernmental process like the tripartite structure of the International Labour Organization, (2) consultative status as exemplified in business and civil society associations with the Economic and Social Council and (3) special arrangements targeted at specific sector issues for instance, the Information and Communication Technology Task Force (p. 4).

The document goes on to identify seven main purposes that partnerships could seek to serve at a given time.

Most partnership initiatives have one or more of the following purposes:

(a) Policy dialogue: Non-State actors' formal or informal participation in intergovernmental deliberations, institutional governance, or normative and standard-setting structures within the United Nations system; or policy dialogue with United Nations entities outside official intergovernmental processes through global policy networks and voluntary initiatives;

- (b) Advocacy: Cooperation between the United Nations and non-State actors to raise public awareness of and support for United Nations goals and programmes through joint communications, product-licensing and cause-related or social marketing;
- (c) Mobilizing private funds: Cooperation to mobilize public and private capital for United Nations programmes and projects or for development, including philanthropic funds or investment capital;
- (d) Information and learning: Facilitating information-sharing, research and joint learning between the United Nations, Governments and/or non-State actors for building and disseminating knowledge and know-how on critical development issues and methodologies;
- (e) Operational delivery: Collaborating on joint programme and project design, implementation and evaluation, and mobilization of financial, in-kind, technical or managerial resources;
- (f) Partnership promotion: Actions by United Nations organizations to encourage, foster and facilitate the development of partnerships that help to achieve United Nations objectives.

Other documents that guide MSPs in the UN is the Bali Guiding principles launched at the fourth preparatory meeting for WSSD and the outcome document of the 11th session of the Commission on Sustainable Development (United Nations, 2003, p. 5).

Partnerships have not only been encouraged outside the UN but also among UN agencies to improve multi-stakeholder engagements. The UN 'Delivering as one' project was launched to reposition the UN and its specialised agencies to work towards a common purpose rather than at cross purposes. The UN as one approach was a key recommendation from the 2005 World Summit Outcome Document (United Nations, 2012). It seeks to eliminate redundancies and streamline responsibilities of agencies to reflect the mandate of the organisation. For instance, in the field of environment and sustainable development, UNDP and UNEP collaborate extensively together and with governments, NGOs and other UN agencies to support

countries in which they operate. The UNDP-UN Environment Poverty-Environment Initiative was launched in in 2005 to support country-led efforts to integrate poverty-environment objectives into national and subnational development planning, policy-making, budgeting, implementation and monitoring (UN Environment Evaluation Office, 2016). The UN office for partnerships, through its subsidiary body, Partnership Advisory and Outreach Services (PAOS) provides capacity building for UN agency staff on the administration of MSPs for the Global Goals (Beisheim & Simon, 2016).

2.3.1 Legitimacy

The mandate of governance is given by the governed, thus when private and un-elected entities join in, the question of legitimacy is always raised. As (Orr, Adamowski, Medema, & Milot, 2016) put it, *'When governance does not follow well-known conventions, such as relying on the decision-making authority of elected representatives, its sources of legitimacy may be unclear'*. Thus, for an effective MSPs, actors must be certain of its legitimacy. This not only because, it is a voluntary arrangement but also because, in the absence of legitimacy, the implementation and follow up action of decisions of MSPs will suffer.

As regards to MSPs under Agenda 2030, legitimacy is all the more important because of state ownership. The State as the convening entity, would allocate some public resources to facilitate such arrangement (Dodds, 2016). Legitimacy is therefore imperative in ensuring accountability. Furthermore, on the question of representation, the legitimacy of a MSP arrangement is rooted in the fact that the various stakeholders are representing diverse voices and opinions who have vested interest in the subject matter (Arnesen & Peters, 2018) (Dellmuth & Tallberg, 2015). In view of this, Westmana & Brotob(2018) posit that, *'for partnerships to meet criteria of legitimacy and accountability, they depend on achieving transparency and equal access to participation'*.

Seeing that, Legitimacy is critical to the success of MSPs, its essence would be undermined, when facilitators pay little attention to it. In the case of MSPs under Agenda 2030, there are two main concerns, the neutrality of States, as the convening partner. In other words, the legitimacy of the MSP arrangement could be affected by the objectivity of the State in its choice of actors invited into the partnership. State agencies must be accommodating to all actors even those who may disagree with their policies. Likewise, state may intimidate actors through power play, hampering genuine collaboration and authenticity. Such display of subjectivity and unbalance power distribution has undermined many MSP, a case in point is the National Interpretation process in Colombia from 2008 to 2009 (Dentoni, Bitzer, & Schouten, 2018).

2.3.2 Efficacy

Although, MSPs are gaining steady popularity, many have questioned their efficacy in effecting any significant change in global environmental governance. Some research have proven that, in spite of its popularity, MSPs are not as effective as purported. (Beisheim & Simon, 2015), reference Pattberg's work which reports that 37% of the first-generation partnerships registered with the CSD did not produce any output. Of the remaining 63%, only three out of five produced an output in line with the intended purpose of the partnership. In their own work, they report that, a high degree of effectiveness of MSPs correlates strongly with a high degree of institutionalisation and good process management. In other words, the mere propagation of the efficacy of MSPs is not enough to access its gains, there must be equal attention paid to how such Partnerships are designed and how they work to achieve their mandate.

After thorough analysis of the WSSD partnerships, (Pattberg & Widerberg, 2016) outlined 4 main indicators that seem to explain the inefficiencies of MSPs. Firstly, they notice that there

are ‘*no measurable output*’, what more, the few results do not match the set objectives of the MSP. Secondly, MSPs do not necessarily fill any governance gaps as intended; this is further hampered by their failure to be as inclusive as they ought. Thus, there are still a good percentage of stakeholders who are marginalised. Third, the analysis finds that most partnerships appear to lack the organizational capacity, resources, and transparency to implement their goals. A mere 15 % indicate a budget plan, 23 % have office space, 30 % seem to have staff members, and 5 % disclose a memorandum of understanding. Finally, actors lack neutrality in their approach. They usually are concerned with promoting their subjective views instead of accepted sustainability norms provided under Agenda 2030. This undermines synergy and defeats the whole purpose of MSPs. Similarly, many private actors have been accused of using MSPs as a pawn to gain Un-level recognition, to boost their popularity.

In spite of the above issues, MSPs are still on the increase, and taunted as the ‘end all, be all’ of global and national governance. This makes an assessment into its design and process all the more important.

2.4 PARTICIPANTS IN MSPs

In keeping with the scope of this study, the stakeholders to be discussed in this section would be the private sector and the civil society as provided under Target 17.17.

2.4.1 Private Sector

The private sector comprises privately owned institutions, it includes multinationals and indigenous companies (Mackintosh, et al., 2016). In recent times however, this traditional posture of many private companies has been revised and companies are beginning to realign their values to reflect the global agenda. Seeing that, many private institutions, today, offer services which were once solely governmental responsibility, some scholars believe, that the

perception of business as being only for profit is nearing extinction. (Scherer & Palazzo, 2011). Williams (2018) explains this, as a *'move beyond the neo-classical theory of the firm where the purpose of business is to single-mindedly create wealth to a broader understanding of its purpose, what some specify as the creation of sustainable value for stakeholders'*. Thus, more and more, businesses are not only concerned about the *end* of making profit but also the integrity of their *means* and how that affects society and the environment.

In the wake of multinational corporations, the United Nations established the Global Compact to act as a regulatory framework for businesses across the board (Scherer & Palazzo, 2011). The United Nations Global Compact (UNGC) is a corporate sustainability initiative by the UN for the private sector across the Globe. Launched under the leadership of the late Kofi Annan, former Secretary General, the initiative promotes corporate social responsibility and appeals to the moral obligation of companies to make business choices which do not undermine basic human rights or do irreversible damage to the environment. The response by the Private Sector has been rousing. As at April 2019, 9997 companies had signed up, from 162 countries (United Nations Global Compact, 2019). Due to the multifaceted nature of the Compact; sectors cutting across, human rights, labour issues, good governance and sustainability; its membership comprises companies, trade unions, social organizations—foundations and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and, even, governments (Ortas, Álvarez, & Garayar, 2015).

Like the SDGs the UNGC has objectives it works towards in the form of 10 principles. Needless to say, these principles are connected to the goals in such a way that, the fulfilment of one could contribute to achieving the other. In order to create synergy and facilitate participation, the goals of the SDGs have been mapped unto to principles in the UNGC, so companies see the direct linkages. Furthermore, to promote SDG 17, partnership for the Goals, 10 Action Platforms were created in 2018 (Williams, 2018). These platforms have

multi-level membership comprising, business, UNGC Local Networks, civil society groups, experts, governments and UN partners. Besides, the Platform focuses on 10 strategic areas relevant to the SDGs and UNGC. These include, Breakthrough Innovation for the SDGs; Pathways to Low-Carbon and Resilient Development; Health is Everyone's Business; Reporting on the SDGs; Financial Innovation for the SDGs; Decent Work in Global Supply Chains; Business for Humanitarian Action; Water Security through Stewardship; Business Action Platform for the Ocean; and Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions.

The inclusion of the private sector to MSPs is not the maiden involvement of the private sector in governance; Public Private Partnerships (PPP) gained much popularity in the 1970's under the wave of New Public Management (NPM) and introduced private sector participation and practices into public affairs (Jomo, Chowdhury, Sharma, & Platz, 2016). The Addis Ababa Agenda for Action (AAAA) identifies PPP arrangements as strategic tools to share risks, financial burden and promote collaboration for infrastructural investments. Furthermore, it must be noted that PPPs have been hailed in developing countries as opportunities to facilitate addressing the huge infrastructural deficit given the limited capacity of government as regards to financial resources, expertise and technology (Osei – Kyei & Chan, 2016).

The private sector's participation and contribution to governance is on a multi-level scale. At the national level, they have become a complementary force to public management, particularly when public resources are scarce or inadequate. In developing countries, private sector engagements are increasing, especially in transitioning states who no longer qualify donor assistance. (Taylor, 2018). The private sector may step in to provide support for programmes which were funded by these donor agencies, or may offer some respite in another public venture so government can channel its resources to such programmes.

2.4.2 The Civil Society

The conception of the Civil Society can be traced to the Grecian era. It was based on the notion that just as men could be differentiated from beasts, differences still persisted among mankind (Ehrenberg, 2017). The classical thought assumed that man was a political animal, However, it was soon realised that there was more to man than his/her political tendencies. Furthermore, human relations are governed by personalities, citizenship, marriage, duties and responsibilities among other things, which vary from one person to another. In order to successfully govern, it was imperative to acknowledge the other aspects of human life and create an avenue to cater for them.

Today, the conceptions of the civil society are diverse and based on a mixed bag of ideologies (Kartanegara & Huda, 2016) (Udovyk, 2017). However, most writings base their arguments on the definition furnished by Robert Putnam, who defined the civil society as *'a people's network that by endowments of social capital and horizontal practices can guarantee economic growth and connect people and state'*. This definition stresses the idea of a non-hierarchical collective that is empowered by the individuals who form it. Therefore, the civil society can be viewed as the common denominator among the individual, the society and the state. It is that system which associates personal attributes to the collective, such that the interests of both are adequately met within the public sphere. (Sydorenko, 2017). Thus, Shepherd (2015) reiterates Ronnie Lipschutz's assertion that civil society *'includes those political, cultural and social organizations of modern societies that are autonomous of the state, but part of the mutually-constitutive relationship between state and society'*.

Due to its people centered nature, the civil society has been recognized as essential for the sustenance of liberal democracy. In fact, particularly in Eastern Europe and Asia, civil society only gained popularity after the collapse of Communism. However, its representation can differ from part of the world to another. Eisenstadt (2017), identifies five factors which

qualify a civil society, first and foremost, he underlines the ‘private’ set up, which makes it autonomous and yet does not impede its involvement in public matters. Secondly, actions of civil societies are formally regulated to avoid a haphazard modus operandi. Thirdly, civil societies are very open and not restrictive. It covers a wide range of social subdivisions, including religion, profession, gender, age and other social factors. This leads to the fourth factor which is the multiplicity of sectors. Sydorenko (2017), classifies these sectors under two main forms, namely; typical forms that is registered non-governmental organisations and non-typical forms of civic engagement such as grass-root initiatives. Finally, is the accessibility to the public arena, they enjoy.

Civil Society partnership with the UN is facilitated by the Economic, Social and Cultural Council of the organization. They have been involved in drawing of many UN agreements and the conventions of UN specialised agencies. Besides, they are involved in the implementation of these policies at the global, regional and national levels (World Economic Forum, 2013).

2.5 CONCLUSION

MSPs has become a main stay for the UN’s prescribed policy implementation style, mainly due the collaborative avenue it provides for the different stakeholders. This is in spite of the limited rate of efficacy and concerns of legitimacy, which have been raised. Given that, the popularity of MSPs is unrelenting, the onus is on Member States to ensure that the mechanism they set up to facilitate such partnerships are adequate enough to fulfil their mandate.

CHAPTER THREE

MSPs INITIATIVES IN GHANA'S SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AGENDA

3.0 INTRODUCTION

This chapter begins by discussing decentralisation in Ghana's development planning over the years and how that has paved way for the promotion of collaborative governance. It goes further to examine how this has been translated into the Government's initiatives, which seek to promote MSPs specifically for the SDGs. The areas of partnerships are classified under finance, exchange of expertise and knowledge as well as technology per target 17.16 of SDG Goal 17.

3.1 DECENTRALISATION IN GHANA'S DEVELOPMENT PLANNING

The Guggisberg Plan is usually referenced when speaking of Ghana's first official development plan (Agyekum, Haifeng, & Ayeiwaa, 2016). The plan run from 1920 to 1930 and was initiated by the British colonial administration (Boamah & Amoako, 2013). Tandoh-Offin (2013) argues that it '*served more as a public investment plan than a development plan and provided opportunities for development in the then Gold Coast*'. According to the (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), 2009) public investments comprises:

infrastructural outlays – for road and rail networks, ports, bridges, energy-generating plants, telecommunications structures, water and sanitation networks, government buildings – which can have a productive life of several decades. It is worth noting that, Dadzie (2013) described the ante-independence economy of Ghana, as follows, 'Ghana was an agricultural and commodity-based economies largely serving British colonial interests. Ghana's economy was defined by cocoa cultivation and gold mining. More than half of the labor force was engaged in the production of primary products, with a significant portion of their outputs going to Britain.

From the above, it can be deduced that, the maiden development agenda of Ghana was aimed at building infrastructural and institutional capacity for colonial gain. This objective further informed the top-down approach in which it was conducted. In fact, it was in line with many colonial development strategies across the continent (Boamah & Amoako, 2013). Suffice to say, the Guggisberg Plan was deficient in collaborative and consensual input from other actors other than the colonial government, such as, the private sector and civil society. Furthermore, it lacked an expression of the people's aspirations and was centralized in every aspect in order to favour imperial needs.

Following Ghana's independence in 1957, there was, as expected, a surge in expressing Ghanaian agency in development planning. Nkrumah backed by an ambitious zeal for industrialisation, on the continent as a whole and Ghana in particular, channeled efforts accordingly (Brenya, Adu-Gyamfi, & Warden, 2017). Asante (2018) argues that, this was in tandem with the modernisation theory of development, prevalent at that time and deemed a prescriptive tool for developing countries like Ghana. Specifically, in Africa's context of ethnic diversity, Asante refers to the views of Modernisation theorists, which *"argued that with economic and social development, narrow ethnic sentiments would eventually wither away"*. Thus, it was important that developing and newly independent States follow the industrialisation path as the European pioneers to guarantee economic prosperity and political stability. Tandoh-Offin (2013), on his part, also described the approach to the development planning at the time as *"national in scope and sectoral in nature, and mostly described as a "top-down" and highly centralized"*. He defends this point by highlighting the fact that development plans were formulated *'from the perspective of a few staff of ministries, departments and other central government agencies with little consultation from the masses'*. This was in tandem with the first leader of the republic, Kwame Nkrumah's, conviction of a 'state-led' development strategy (Lanz, Gerber, & Haller, 2018) (Akyeampong, 2018). Thus, there

was a plethora of state enterprises set up to champion the cause for industrialisation and development in Ghana

The process of decentralising development planning began with the country's neo-liberal economic policies vigorously pursued during the mid-1980s under the World Bank/IMF-sponsored Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs)/Economic Recovery Programme (ERP) initiatives (Owusu, 2015). Tandoh-Offin (2013) remarks that this phase was simultaneous with Huntington's "*third wave of democratization which resulted in democratic reforms and transitions throughout much of the developing world, due to efforts from international actors, reforms in US foreign policy and the demonstration effect*". The idea was to fashion local lower level government institution in such way that they facilitate grass root participation in the development process.

Further, reforms for decentralisation was concretised in the 1992 constitution. As Antwi-Boasiako (2010) asserts, '*political decentralization often requires constitutional or statutory reforms*' to ensure direct accountability to their constituents. 1992 marked the beginning of the Fourth Republic and a relatively stable political climate in Ghana (Boamah & Amoako, 2013). The constitution underlines specific legislations including the Local Government Act (Act 462 of 1993), the National Development Planning Commission (NDPC) Act (Act 479 of 1994), the National Development Planning System (NDPS) Act (Act 480 of 1994), and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Act (Act 490 of 1994). This plethora of regulations enumerated above, set out a decentralised and collaborative legal framework within which planning should be pursued and were significant contributors to the drawing up of subsequent development agenda in Ghana (Fuseini & Kemp, 2015). For instance, the NDPC was set up within the legal framework of Act 476 as an advisory organization to the President on development planning and strategy (National Development Planning Commission (NDPC), 2019). The Local Government Service was also set up '*to secure effective administration and*

management of the decentralised local government system in the country” (The Local Government Service, 2019).

From the above, it is clear that, the decentralisation, as practiced in Ghana, usually refers to the internal delegation of power within the government system. In other words, responsibility and authority is shared among lower level arms of government and not without. This more in line with Osei-Wusu Adjei, Busia, & Bob-Milliar’s (2017) definition of decentralisation as *“the transfer of wide- range of powers and resources from the central government to lower units of government and field authorities within a political-administrative and territorial hierarchy of a state”*. To explain further, Osei-Wusu Adjei, Busia, & Bob-Milliar (2017) elaborate that,

The decentralization model adopted in Ghana thrives on a three - tier local government structure. This comprises the Regional Coordinating Council (RCCs), the Metropolitan/ Municipal/ District Assembly (MMDAs), and Unit Committees. According to the ILGS (2008), powers are being transferred from the central government through the Regional Coordinating Council (RCC) to various Metropolitan/Municipal/District Assemblies (MMDAs).

On his part, Bawole (2017) opines that, the transfer of power may be vertical or horizontal within the government structure, that is within a given government agency and among a variety of government agencies. Furthermore, Bawole adds that the transfer of power could even extend outside the official governance structure to include non-state actors.

To consolidate decentralisation efforts, the District Assemblies’ Common Fund (DACF) was set up under Article 252 of the 1992 constitution of Ghana (Common Fund, 2019). The fund would provide financial support to the lower level government agencies, aside the transfers received from the central government (Akudugu, 2018). Thus, the fund empowers government agencies by boosting revenue mobilization for their activities. It was envisaged that this would make them more independent and self-reliant to undertake activities relevant for the

development of the communities, within which they operate. It is prudent to note that, though the decentralisation is a democratic measure which increases participation in governance and development, it does not automatically guarantee collaborative governance or foster Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships. This is because MSPs requires the participation of non-state actors such as the private sector and the civil society, thus a decentralized government which does not include such stakeholders, is not necessarily an MSP.

3.2 COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE IN GHANA

Kpessa (2011) considers that, the practice of a literal collaborative governance, with full participation of state and non-state actors is becoming more evident. This is mainly due to the conducive environment provided by the move from authoritarian and military rule to democratic constitutional rule, since the establishment of the Fourth Republic. Kpessa believes, this facilitated a surge of non -state actors like civil society groupings, think tanks, private electronic and print media. Today, examples include, the Multimedia Group, a media house, Imani Ghana, a think thank and SEND Ghana, a CSO. Such entities have since acted as the vantage point for government and citizenry consultations. Furthermore, the need to uphold accountability and transparency as enshrined in good governance has also facilitated a high level of varied participation in Ghana's governance structure (Fridy & Myers, 2019). Particularly regarding the role of the civil society as the 'watch dog' in governance (Kleibl & Munck, 2017). for instance the IMANI OCP joint seminar on Energy policy (Policy Centre for the New South, 2018) brought together national and international stakeholders to discuss Ghana's energy governance structure.

The practice of MSPs is therefore not an entirely novel one in Ghana. It thus no surprise, the positive response it has received from the Government of Ghana under Agenda 2013.

3.3 MSP INITIATIVES BY THE GOVERNMENT OF GHANA FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

In an interview with Dr. Felix Addo-Yobo, the Deputy Director at NDPC, he said the need to promote Multi-stakeholder Partnerships (MSPs) per SDG targets 17.16 to .17 was very reasonable to the GoG. This was due to the government's experience and challenges faced in realising the MDGs. These challenges mainly comprised limited funding opportunities and uncoordinated efforts. Thus, for the SDGs, the Government was determined to get all relevant stakeholders on board to enable the government to take advantage of the different strengths each actor yields and leverage on them to accelerate development.

In creating an MSP mechanism, Government's strategy was influenced by its traditional development planning framework juxtaposed by the organised participation of non-state actors. The aim was to ensure partnerships across board and also to avoid fragmented engagements with CSOs and the private sector. For instance, Mr. George Osei-Bimpeh, Country Director of SEND Ghana and Co-Chairman of the CSO Platform in Ghana, noted that, GoG was unequivocal about the need for CSOs in Ghana to come together as a unit to facilitate government's collaboration with them. Hence, the creation of the CSO Platform in October 2015 (Hope for Future Generations (HFFG), 2018). Regarding engagements with the private sector, The GoG leveraged their already existing collaborative relationship with the Private Enterprise Federation of Ghana (PEF Ghana), which is a collation of private sector associations, for the attainment of the SDGs.

3.3.1 GoG's Implementation Plan for MSPs under the SDGs

Dr. Addo Yobo explained that, the GoG adopted a 3-tier implementation plan derived from its decentralised planning system, which constitutes the National, Sector and District levels of government. The Sector and District levels are mandated to plan programmes and activities for sustainable development as well draw the budget for its implementation. Thus, to support

coordination for the Goals, a collaborative framework for each level was set up. At the national level, the principal actors are the Honourable Ministers who oversee policy actions. Therefore, in 2017, the High-Level Ministerial Committee (HLM) was appointed, commissioned and inaugurated by the President of the Republic of Ghana, His Excellency, Nana Addo Dankwa Akufo-Addo, following his appointment as co-chair of the Eminent Advocates for the SDGs (United Nations, 2017). It comprises 15 Honourable Ministers whose agencies are directly and indirectly linked to areas under the SDGs. The HLM is chaired by the Honourable Minister for Planning, whose Ministry acts as host and secretariat of the Committee. The mandate of the HLM is to oversee implementation of the Goals in Ghana and to facilitate cross-sector coordination. The HLM meets every quarter to discuss progress on the goals and deliberate on follow-up actions. The UNDP, the Private Enterprise Federation and CSO platform have observer status and participate in these meetings upon the invitation of the Committee Chairperson.

At the sectoral level, technocrats who work in the Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs) are the main players. In order to ensure cross-sector coordination, two key committees have been formed at this level and are hosted by the NDPC. On one hand, the Implementation Technical committee (ITC) comprises experts in a variety of relevant areas for sustainable development. Their role is to provide technical advice on projects and programmes. The committee has a membership of 100 experts drawn from the MDAs, the CSO platform, individual organisations, private sector and academia. On the other hand, the Implementation Coordination Committee (ICC) acts as an avenue to facilitate communication and cooperation among MDAs, as well as non-government agencies. The non-government actors who enjoy membership on this committee are the CSO Platform for SDGs, the Philanthropy platform and UNDP Ghana. This initiative was a strategic move of government to foster MSPs in the day to day affairs of the state and non-state actors alike. The ITC and

the ICC are mainly sponsored by its secretariat at the NDPC, which is funded from the government purse. In the running of specific programs development partners and the CSOs contribute funds as support. The NDPC also has team of 8 personnel who make up the secretariat dedicated to the ICC.

At the district level, the Local Government service supports the MMDAs and RCCs in drawing up relevant programmes and activities towards sustainable development. Dr. Addo-Yobo admitted that, government-led MSP efforts are low at this level. However, the CSO platform has taken the lead and is designing a MSP framework to ensure inclusivity and participation at the district level as well. The goal is to replicate the same system of coordination and collaboration between state and non-state actors, which exists at the sectoral level.

3.3.2 The Implementation Coordinating Committee

The Implementation Coordination Committee (ICC) is by far the most active of the MSP initiatives by government mainly due to the frequency of engagement they have, compared to the ITC who engage on an ‘as-and-when’ basis. Moreover, the ICC has been very instrumental in involving the CSO, in particular, in government programs and activities. In fact, for Dr. Addo Yobo and Mr. Osei- Bimpeh, the ICC has contributed to changing the perception that, there exists a hostile relationship between government and the CSO to one where there is mutual respect and perpetual consultation and collaboration. Aside bridging gaps outside government’s framework, the ICC has done same among MDAs such that, those who used to work disjointly are coming together to exchange knowledge and expertise. Dr. Addo-Yobo exemplified this by mentioning that, the GSS and NDPC have a renewed working relationship that is vital because the data generated by the GSS would inadvertently support the NDPC’s work in development planning.

The ICC works as a collective unit and at the beginning of the year, the various stakeholders meet to decide on the annual plan. The committee is chaired by the NDPC but tasks from the work plan are assigned leaders based on the skills they bring on-board. In 2019, the main objective of the ICC was to submit the Voluntary National Review, (VNR), during the HLPF in July 2019. The VNR is the official review mechanism of the SDGs Member States of the UN. After technical consultations with the relevant stakeholders and a number of surveys, the VNR was completed in July 2019, awaiting publication. The committee also set out to boost public awareness and training of media personnel for reporting on the SDGs. Both objectives were accomplished with technical and financial support from the various stakeholders.

3.3.3 The CSO Platform for SDGs in Ghana

Antwi-Boasiako (2019) , argues that the participation of Ghana's CSO body in governance can be traced to when Ghana was under British colonial rule. Their role became even more significant during the struggle for independence. The consolidation of democracy in Ghana has enhanced CSO participation in governance. They have been instrumental, in political, economic and public management issues (Ohemeng, 2014) and the trend remains under the Agenda 2030 in Ghana. According to Mr. Osei-Bempah for the CSOs in Ghana their role in participating in Government's MSP initiatives is dual faceted. On one hand, they remain committed to their 'watch-dog' responsibility ensuring accountability under Agenda 2030. On another hand, they contribute to Government's agenda through advocacy and activism.

Mr. Osei-Bimpeh stated that, the involvement of CSOs in Ghana dates back to the negotiation period for the SDGs and even the AAAA before their adoption in 2015. He opined that, Government thought it necessary to have CSO input during the negotiation process, so a series of technical consultation with the CSO was undertaken to boost Ghana's effective participation on the negotiation process. Following the adoption of the SDGs, the

Government further saw the need to have a one point of call and thus intended to engage with the CSOs as collective rather than individual organisations. Fortunately, this was in tandem with CSO's aspiration to form a cohort, given the fragmented and uncoordinated approach pursued during the MDGs. The CSO platform was therefore set up.

The platform which has a membership of over 100 CSOs set out to enable CSO participation at the various levels of implementation of SDGs in Ghana as well facilitate their representation on other SDG oriented platforms. The steering committee runs the affairs of platform and is facilitated by a convener. The platform is structured such that, member CSOs are assigned to in sub groups per the goals to which they contribute. Each sub group has a co-convener who works with the convener of the platform. The co-conveners represent their sub-groups on the steering committee and help with the dissemination of information to members across the country. Mr. Osei-Bimpeh noted that the CSO platform was committed to not only enabling but ensuring youth participation. In view of this, a 18th Platform was set up specifically for youth in order to ensure equity in the integration and participation process. The youth platform is also represented on the steering committee and participates in the decision-making on the platform by exercising its voting rights.

Mr. Osei- Bimpeh further noted that, the modalities of review and reporting on the SDGs requires States to directly engage with other stakeholders, giving way to a *sine qua non* scenario for MSPs (United Nations, 2015). In view of this, the CSO Platform actively participated in Ghana's VNR to be submitted at the 2019 HLPF. Representatives from the Platform were engaged to undertake surveys and data collection across the country. The platform was also assigned a section of the VNR to report on. This was successfully undertaken with continued consultations with government.

In spite of such deep engagements, Mr. Osei-Bimpeh noted that the CSO continues to carry out its work with no intimidation from the government. This is because the framework of partnership promotes collective responsibility and mutual accountability for all stakeholders. Thus, the CSO works and even plans with the ICC, but remains independent and points out weaknesses in governance constantly. For instance, in May 2019, the CSO issued a statement condemning government failure to accept responsibility on the increased rate of deforestation (The Ghana Civil-society Cocoa Platform (GCCP), 2019). In this way, the partnership does not shut the CSO down but rather creates a convenient way to discuss sensitive and important issues. This has caused a move from the usual antagonistic stance of government when dealing with CSO and is gradually removing the ‘us and them’ mentality.

During the 2019 HLPF scheduled to take place from 9th July, 2019 to 18th July, 2019, the CSO Platform will present its own shadow report, per paragraph 89 of the Agenda 2030 document (United Nations, 2015), after Ghana presents its VNR. The shadow report of the is a product of the CSOs’ own monitoring mechanism undertaken across all levels of society and on a daily basis. The objective was to evaluate SDG activities in the country assess how citizens are involved in these processes, as well as the extent of their impact. The platform has shared the concept note and the report for with government for comments.

3.3.4 Private Enterprise Federation

The PEF is a collective of business associations in Ghana. Mr. Moses Agyemang, Senior Economist at PEF, stated that, it was founded in 1994, with four business associations, namely, the Association of Ghana Industries (AGI), Ghana National Chamber of Commerce and Industries (GNCCI), Federation of Associations of Heads of Ghanaian Exporters, Ghana Employment Association (GEA). The USAID, under its Trade and Investment Programme, offered financial support to establish the Federation. According to Mr. Agyemang, in 1995,

the federation recruited a full staff body and began operations. In the same year, they received two new members, that is, the Ghana Association of Bankers and the Ghana Chamber of Mines.

Mr. Agyemang elaborated that, objective was to create a unified front for the private sector in order to leverage government's move from a public sector-led growth to a private sector led growth, which began in the 80's. This incorporated platform also sought to directly influence policy and governance as it pertained to their interest as the private sector and promote advocacy and activism for private sector issues.

The Government of Ghana welcomed and favorably recognized the establishment of the PEF. This recognition was expressed through the contribution of seed money to the Federation. Furthermore, frequent invitations were extended to the Federation, from the office of the President to have deliberations. Mr. Agyemang remarked that these meetings were usually held with the Vice President of the Republic Ghana, who is mandated by the constitution to chair the Economic Management Team (EMT). The team also comprises of relevant ministries and agencies. Thus their engagement at the high level which with the EMT and at the Ministerial and Sectoral level with the MDA's.

3.3.5 Structure of PEF

The Governing council of the PEF is made up of thirteen persons, comprising two members, usually, the President and the Vice-President, of six member associations. The thirteenth member is the Chief Executive Officer of the PEF who also acts as the Secretary of the Council. The Board meets every quarter and may convene when a pressing matter arises. The major interest areas of the PEF include, exchange rate management, stability of currency, power fluctuations, market access, infrastructure among others, noted that these issues in these areas still persist and have not been thoroughly dealt with. PEF also organises annual

general meetings with the participation of delegates from member associations. Members of the Board are usually voted for during these general meetings. The standing staff of the PEF includes, the CEO, the Secretariat, the Project Office, the Accounts Office and non-clerical departments.

The PEF has always been active in promoting sustainable practices for businesses in Ghana, for example they were involved with the setting up of the Ghana Educational Trust Fund (GET Fund). They also published a code of ethics material to promote ethical behavior among industries. Today, their portfolio is vast and cuts across a variety of sectors, including agriculture, telecommunications, finance, banking, mining, petroleum among others. Aside advocacy, they conduct research in strategic areas of business and present the findings to government to inform policy-decision making. They also organise training programmes for businesses in Ghana to boost ethical management practices.

3.4 SUCCESSFUL AREAS OF PARTNERSHIP UNDER THE MSP INITIATIVES BY GOG

3.4.1 Finance

In an interview with Mr. Nana Yaw Yankah, Senior Economist at the MoF, he mentioned that, following the adoption of the SDGs, the Ministry of Finance noted that 70% of Ghana's annual budget allocations already covered most of 17 goals. To intensify efforts, the Government went ahead to undertake a strategy for financing sustainable development which involved mapping budget items to the SDG goals. The goal was to ensure strategic allocation of funds from government and development partners and facilitate accountability for expenditure.

Mr. Yankah elaborated that, the financial structure of Ghana is such that District offices inform the MoF of activities and programmes they intend to run during the year. The district

personnel must then prioritise the programmes per the financial resources available at MoF. This indicates a centralized system of disbursement. However, In line with the AAAA which calls for equity and fairness the GoG has social intervention programmes such as the LEAP, MASLOC, and School feeding programmes among others, to address the gaps, traditional government allocation may not be able to fill.

To boost mobilisation for financing sustainable development. The MoF is leading and collaborating with other state and non-state agencies to undertake domestic reforms and revising engagements with development partners. Domestically, the main objective has been to curb corruption and block leakages in the tax and payment systems in Ghana. This is being done through a number of national initiatives. For instance, the promotion of the use of the Tax Identification (TIN) number would help track day-to-day taxable transactions. The National Identification project will also generate a unique identifier for both citizens and non-citizens in Ghana and the generation of GPS locations to help identify illegal transactions. Similarly, the digitisation of the Ghana Ports is another way of blocking the leakages by directing all payments at the port to a central point removing middle men. These efforts are being undertaken by an array of MDAs, working together. The MoF reported that these measures are effectively improving domestic mobilization. Mr. Yankah affirmed this by remarking that, 60% of the 2019 budget was raised internally.

Mr. Collins Kabuga of the MoF, added that, the GoG is actively engaging the private sector in boosting domestic revenue. It is doing this by creating an enabling environment for businesses to thrive and generate more income to accelerate development. More specifically, the ease of doing business is being improved by removing bottlenecks to provide an easier business registration process and simplifying the tax filing procedures for businesses. The GoG is equally providing incentive for the growth of small businesses through the National

Entrepreneurship Initiative. Through this avenue, GoG is providing seed capital to support young small business owners.

Furthermore, in 2017, the MoF in partnership with the SDG Philanthropy and Reach for Change Ghana, a social entrepreneurship incubator, hosted an interactive dialogue with 20 Ghanaian corporations. The aim was to initiate partnerships between the private sector, the development/nonprofit sector and government, enabling them to work together to realise the SDGs in Ghana by 2030. At the end of the forum Ghana launched the Philanthropy and Impact Investment Forum, an association of corporate and private foundations and impact investors (SDG Philanthropy Platform, 2017). This is a rather novel initiative where the GoG will facilitate linking businesses in Ghana to foreign companies, in order to secure investment which, impact sustainable development. In an interview Ms. Sylvia Senu of UNDP Ghana also revealed that, the UN System in Ghana is also looking into a similar role in brokering businesses in Ghana. She intimated that the maiden project, which is still in the registration process, involves a Chinese and Ghana and company for the installation of solar for panels. This partnership would boost Ghana's energy infrastructure.

In 2018, the MoF, in collaboration with the Ghana Investment Promotions Centre and the SDG Advisory Unit at the Presidency, organised the first ever SDG Investment Fair. The fair which was aimed at creating a new vibrant market place, where business, investors and other support systems meet to find solutions to current and future challenges, explore opportunities for private sector collaboration in government pipeline projects as well as kick-start entrepreneurial initiatives especially among youth and women. It brought together stakeholders made up of civil society organizations, politicians, entrepreneurs, investors, technocrats, students and the media (Ministry of Finance, 2018). The fair was successful in convening actors across the various sector mentioned above as well as the launch of the Accra Action Charter. This charter is a declaration by the business Leaders and high-level

representatives of business associations and philanthropic organizations who met in Accra to uphold the values of sustainable development in carrying out their business.

With regard to global partnerships for finance, the MoF has noted a changing terrain in donor support. that is more skewed toward technical assistance than financial grant. Mr. Kabuga explained that, this is mostly due to Ghana's low debt sustainability. Ghana is, therefore, taking advantage of this by strategically engaging development partners in national priority areas. Together with UNDP Ghana, the Government is also working to boost resource mobilization through other multilateral forums.

3.4.2 Technology

The GoG is working with a number of partners in the area of technology to improve its data capacity for the SDGs. The GSS reported that, in 2016, a survey conducted found that, while most of the indicators for the SDGs existed already, they were spread across the various MDAs. The survey also found that, most of the data required were not available via Ghana's traditional sources, like censuses and national surveys undertaken by the GSS. Rather, they were accessible by administrative sources. Mr. Omar Seidu, Head of Demographics Statistics and Coordinator of Data for SDGs, explained that, administrative data is generated from the day to day work of government agencies.

Furthermore, the data that was available was not adequately aggregated. The disaggregation of data for SDGs is paramount because of its 'leave no one behind' principle. It is important that, data is broken down to effectively influence policy interventions. The Survey also found that the frequency of data generation, through the conduction of census and national survey, which usually take place every five to ten years, is not dependable. Finally, the survey found that, not only were there gaps that had to filled, but there was the need to acquire new types

of data from new sources like government agencies and non-state actors like the CSO and private sector.

The GSS is thus undertaking partnerships in technology to enhance generation of administrative data. It also seeks to set up a quality assurance system for data generated, in order to, sanitise the data ecosystem. Therefore, the goal is not only to create more sources of data, but also, make them reliable and effective for use. In November 2016, the GoG made contact with the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development Data (GPSDD). This is a network of government, private, CSO and UN agencies dedicated to rallying support for SDG data. In 2017, with support from the GPSDD, GSS hosted a National Data Roadmap Forum. The Forum was attended by over 150 national stakeholders and international experts, who convened to discuss many aspects of the data ecosystem. Three priority areas for action emerged, namely, filling data gaps, encouraging data use, and strengthening the entire data ecosystem.

Following the successful organization of the forum, a multi-stakeholder advisory committee comprising government, civil society, academia, media and development partners, has, therefore, been established to oversee the implementation of the resulting roadmap. The advisory committee has since established seven thematic work-streams to address specific areas of improvement in the data ecosystem. Mr. Seidu explained the four main thematic projects, which have taken off. These include, a partnership between Statistics Denmark and GSS to help strengthen the administrative data system. This is to streamline administrative data generation, starting with the Births and Deaths department of Ghana. The goal is to make the generation process more effective as well as improve the transfer of data generation among the MDAs. Secondly, the GSS is working on the development of a national data quality assurance framework with participation from the CSO and private sector. This is to ensure that data generated from state and non-state actors go through a quality assurance

system in order to ascertain the credibility and reliability of the data for official use. Thirdly, the GSS is working towards the creation of data system which combines both survey and telecom data. They intend to do this with Vodafone Ghana and Flowminder UK. Flowminder is a non-profit organisation which work with governments, inter-governmental organisations and NGOs to collect, aggregate, integrate and analyse anonymous mobile operator data, satellite and household survey data (The Flowminder Foundation, 2015). The aim to optimize the data ecosystem and fill in the gaps in data generation. Moreover, the launch of a national SDGs data reporting platform, in collaboration with Vodafone Ghana to leverage telecommunication data. Still on telecom generated data, the GSS also intends to initiate a platform to collate citizens' generated data. This platform will allow citizens to send information, which would be treated as data, using their mobile phones. Mr. Seidu of the GSS disclosed that, this would be done by taking a photo or sending an sms to a virtual collection point, where the GSS would be able to assess and collect. He opined that, this would be very relevant to tackle serious issues such as violence against women and children, as well as, waste management because of the easy accessibility and the choice for the reporting citizen to remain anonymous. Finally, the GSS is working to improve spatial data generation through earth observation. This is in partnership with the African Regional Data Cube (ARDC) for SDGs monitoring (Government of Ghana, 2019).

3.4.3 Sharing of Knowledge and Expertise

The ICC has been consistent in its position as a converging point for key stakeholders in sustainable development. Stakeholders who serve on the committee were selected due to the cross-cutting role they play in coordinating and mobilising resources for the SDGs. For instance, the NDPC acts as host and secretariat due to their mandate as the coordination agency for all development planning in Ghana, the Ministry of Finance is represented for its essential role in mobilising and allocating financial resources for development. The Ministry

of Foreign Affairs is also represented to facilitate UN reporting, the Ghana Statistical Service (GSS) is a member because of the crucial need for accurate data for the SDGs. Moreover, the Commission on Human Rights and Administrative Justice (CHRAG) and EPA are also members due to the relevance of governance and human rights issues as well as the important role of environmental governance in sustainable development respectively. The CSO platform plays a pivotal role in activism and supporting data collection and reporting for the SDGs, the Philanthropy platform comprises foundations and the CSR arm of some private institutions like MTN foundation, who donate grant money for the running of the SDG implementation process. The UNDP is equally present on the ICC due to its role as a development policy partner in Ghana.

The ICC has created a number of avenues for deliberation and exchange of knowledge. In March 2019, the Committee organized and facilitated a training program for media personnel in the Northern Region of Ghana, to support awareness creation for the SDGs. Trainers for the program included government state and non-state officials, who came together to share their expertise. The ICC also organized a National Stakeholder forum, which brought together an array of stakeholders from across the country to discuss ways to enhance synergy across sectors and actors. The ITC also hosted by the NDPC is more sector specific and brings together, technocrats, experts and advocates in particular subject areas to foster the exchange of knowledge and expertise.

Moreover, Delegates from the CSO platform also contribute their expertise in data collection as evidenced in their participation in the publication of the Baseline Report and the Voluntary Review. Members from the platform teamed up with government officials to successfully conduct data collection across the country. As mentioned earlier, PEF has developed a number of resources to guide businesses in imbibing sustainable practices. They include: a code of ethics, good corporate governance guidelines; green employment guide (to achieve

Goals 1, 2 and 8); and interventions in renewable energy to provide impetus for achieving Goals 7 and 9. The Federation has also developed an Investor Guide to bring the opportunities that exist to the attention of members (thereby working towards Goals 9, 13 and 17) (Government of Ghana, 2019).

PEF also intends to create a private sector platform like the CSO platform. In this regard, the federation will not deal with associations of businesses as they usually do, rather, they would engage individual companies on matters of the SDG. This is important because, PEF has noted that many businesses already undertake some SDG oriented programmes usually through their Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) department. According to Mr. Thomas Kamkam of PEF, the platform would therefore help businesses in Ghana to intentionally align such activities to the SDG, adequately report and record them, in order to contribute to government efforts.

3.5 CHALLENGES

3.5.1 Financing

The primary challenge across the various agencies, namely, GoG, CSO, Private Sector and UNDP is limited sources of funding. Thus, most of the programmes aimed to encourage MSPs are usually stalled by the limited financial resources available. This, not only affects the GoG's capacity to promote MSPs for sustainable development, but also affects timely delivery for the Goals. Dr. Addo-Yobo remarked that one of the main obstacles in this regard, is the lack of creativity in sourcing for funds. There seems to be an over-dependence on the 'usual' sources, namely, domestic tax, development partners and the UN system. The CEO of PEF, Nana Osei Bonsu, on his part, remarked most of the funding initiatives are not sustainable and are usually 'one-shot' gestures, which may generate some attention for a short while and eventually simmer down.

3.5.2 Limited data and technological capacity

The low level of science, tech and innovation in Ghana affects timely and reliable data. This is a challenge for MSPs because, without adequate data MSP programmes will be determined on assumptions, rather than on informed and verifiable information. The lack of well-informed decision making would undermine the impact of MSPs, preventing the required results from reaching sectors and persons who need it most. Besides, the weak technological infrastructure in Ghana, affects the speed and ease of communication among MSP participants, thus inhibiting the smooth running of programmes and activities. Moreover, this creates a challenge for the seamless transfer of information from one agency to another. Mr. Seidu of GSS affirmed this by stating that, as it stands now, anyone who wishes to access information from one agency or another must be prepared for some leg work.

3.5.3 Misinformed perception of partnership among stakeholders

The political and cultural climate of Ghana breeds distorted perceptions of MSPs. Generally, it appears that the orientation of partnership is mainly concerned with boosting financial resources. In other words, a stakeholder is more acceptable when they can bring in some funds. While this is essential, it does not encourage the participation of solely technical actors who may have some level of expertise to share to boost institutional capacity.

Mr. Osei-Bimpeh, stated that, in his experience with MSPs in Ghana, technocrats seem more responsive to the needs of the central government than to citizenry. Although, this stance may be valid, given that the civil service is commissioned by the 1992 Constitution to support the government in implementing its programmes, it does raise concern regarding the quality of support the technocrats offer, especially if they are not mindful of the needs of the citizenry. He added that, although MSPs are being embraced by the GoG, there is still some remnant intimidation and suspicion of CSOs, on the part of some government officials. This hampers the smooth running of engagements.

Aside, the GoG's own unfounded perception of MSPs, some CSO in Ghana are also yet to appreciate the essence of partnerships. Mr. Osei-Bimpeh and Dr. Addo-Yobbo remarked that there are some civil society groups are hesitant to join the CSO platform and would rather work independently. They propose that, the reason for this is the jerk-knee reaction of most officials is to protect their turf and officials having a misguided strategy to maintain some notoriety and relevance. Such that one becomes disinterested if they are not playing a 'leading' role on the platform. Nevertheless, this cannot be condoned because, it undermines the whole essence of MSPs and is a threat to the coordinated effort required for the SDGs.

3.5.4 Depth of partnership

Undoubtedly MSPs are being promoted by the GoG, however, Mr. Agyemang opines that due to the historical antecedents of Ghana being more prone to state-led development, there is more room for improvement when it comes to the depth of partnership. For instance, he mentioned that, the so-called private-sector led development being taunted by the GoG since the 80's is not being implemented extensively. In other words, though the private sector has been engaged on a number of occasions, there are still many areas in which they may have spoken about but the GoG does not necessarily heed to. Furthermore, the Mr. Osei Bonsu, bemoaned the GoG's penchant to not only be a facilitator but also an implementer, which, for him, signifies a hesitation to actually empower other stakeholders. He explained further that, government should be limited in its participation in business. For instance, instead of brokering business deals the Government should offer more reasonable incentives for the private sector such as credible bail out mechanisms for small businesses.

Moreover, it seems the GoG's MSP initiatives, specifically for the SDGs, are not as strong at the metropolitan and district level as it is at the Ministerial and Sectoral level. The NDPC admits that, the local level is yet to experience such efforts facilitated by the GoG. Fortunately, the CSO platform has taken it upon themselves to strengthen such engagements

at that level. It is also worth noting that, some rural leader have also taken an interest in SDGs and are working in their individual capacity to realise the Global Goals in their communities.

3.5.5 Heterogeneity

The varied capacity of the different stakeholders in MSPs, poses an administrative difficulty. Agencies have different capacity level as well as financial, administrative and technical levels. Even the set-up of some organisations poses as a challenge. Whereas some agencies are more institutionalised, others are loosely structured. For instance, the GoG is more bureaucratic institution while most CSOs are more flexible in how they run their day-to-day affairs. Even among like-organisations, there is some level of heterogeneity, for example in the private sector in Ghana, multinational companies are bound to have a higher capacity than indigenous Ghanaian companies not to mentioned the informal private business owners who usually have a limited market niche. According to Mr. Thomas Kankam of PEF, this usually makes partnerships complicated, especially in assigning roles and ensuring balanced participation.

3.5.6 Complex nature of SDGs

The complex nature of the 17 goals, in itself is a challenge for MSPs in Ghana. This is because of the numerous actors the GoG must engage and bring on board. The technical committee alone has over 100 members from various backgrounds working on sector specific issues. Not only are the indicators for the goals plenty but the inter-dependence of the gaols, albeit convenient for results record, requires a deeper level of coordination and planning to ensure that indeed, no one is left behind.

3.6 Conclusion

The GoG has come a long way in decentralising development and fostering collaborative governance. The government has been very consistent in promoting MSPs for the SDGs,

since its launch in 2015. It has worked with the CSOs, private sector and UNDP in the areas of finance, technology and sharing of knowledge. While strides have been made, there are some challenges that have to be addressed.

CHAPTER FOUR

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.0 INTRODUCTION

This chapter summarises the findings of this study, concludes the research and also offers some recommendations to strengthen government's MSP initiatives. Suggestions for future research are also made.

4.1 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

This study found that, the GoG is committed to promoting MSPs for the SDGs per SDG targets 17.16 and 17.17. This commitment, stems from the Government's experience under the MDGs, where efforts were uncoordinated and fragmented. In this regard, the GOG aimed to intensify collaboration, not only, among MDA's but also the Civil Society and the Private Sector. For instance, the CSO platform for SDGs in Ghana, was birthed from the call of the GoG for one point of call for the Ghanaian Civil Society. The CSOs in Ghana, readily bought into this idea, seeing that it would ensure harmonised collaboration across board. Set up in 2017, the Platform has sub groups of CSO working in the areas relevant to each of the 17 goals. An 18th sub group was formed specifically to engage the youth.

Regarding the Private Sector, the PEF currently consists of business associations in Ghana. The Federation reports that, most of their member companies undertake sustainability activities through their CSR department. Thus, to consolidate efforts and support businesses to be more intentional with commitment to the SDGs the PEF intends to create a Private Sector Platform. This platform would engage individual companies rather than business associations. It will work with both multinational companies operating in Ghana and indigenous Ghanaian companies. Both the CSO Platform and the PEF have representation on the various MSP committees set up by the government.

MSP initiatives by the GoG are based on a three-tier development structure. The HLM exist at the high level to oversee sector efforts for the goals, the sectoral level engages in MSPs through the avenues created by the ICC and ITC. On one hand, the ICC acts a coordination platform for the SDGs, on the other, the ITC is a technical forum of experts in various fields. Both committees have members from within and the without the government structure. While no such committee at the district level, the CSO platform for SDGs in Ghana is working to set up a similar multi-stakeholder avenue at that level.

The ICC is the most active among these committees which have been set up. This is due to the frequency of their meetings and the tasks they undertake. The ICC works as a collective to coordinate all activities and programmes targeted at the SDGs. Their main focus is to promote advocacy and facilitate capacity building for the goals. The ICC, equally acts as a converging point for all SDG reporting, receiving input from all relevant stakeholders aside government.

The committees are funded by the host GoG agency, which also doubles as its secretariat. The HLM is hosted by the Ministry of Planning, while the ICC and the ITC are hosted by the NDPC. These agencies allocate funds to financially support the running of the committees in their annual budget. They also depend on technical and financial assistance from projects supported by development partners.

Per target 17.17, the main areas for partnership include finance, technology, sharing of knowledge and expertise. In the area of finance, the MoF is leading government efforts to increase domestic mobilisation of revenue. First and foremost, the GoG has mapped items on its annual budget to the SDG goals. This is to ensure strategic allocation of funds from government and development partners and facilitate accountability for expenditure.

Furthermore, the GoG is working to deepen the tax net, set up digitised payments systems in public agencies and improve identification processes in Ghana to curb corrupt and illegal transactions.

Besides, the MoF has collaborated with CSOs, the Private Sector and the UNDP organise fund raising programmes towards the SDGs. Prominent among these are the creation of the launched the Philanthropy and Impact Investment Forum, an association of corporate and private foundations and impact investors, SDG Investment Fair which produced the Accra Action Charter; a declaration by the business Leaders and high-level representatives of Business Associations, and Philanthropic Organizations. In collaboration with the UNDP, the Government is also working to boost resource mobilization through other multilateral forums.

In the area of technology, most of the MSP initiatives have been channelled towards the collection and reporting of data for the SDGs. Accurate and reliable data is paramount in the SDG. The data must also be adequately disaggregated in order to plan the most impactful and cost-effective programmes. This study found that the MSPs, in this area have a threefold objective, including, filling data gaps, encouraging data use, and strengthening the entire data ecosystem. These objectives were the outcome of the National Data Roadmap Forum organised in collaboration with the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development Data in 2017. Subsequent to that a multi-stakeholder advisory committee comprising government, civil society, academia, media and development partners, was set up to foster partnerships in technology for SDG data.

The ICC and ITC offer an avenue to share knowledge and expertise among the various stakeholders. This is aimed at building institutional capacity across the various relevant sectors. The exchange of knowledge also goes beyond the set committees. The stakeholders have worked together to publish the SDG baseline report and the Voluntary National Review.

They have also offered training sessions to equip other agencies like the media and businesses to boost practices which favour sustainable development.

In spite of the progress which have been made, there remain some challenges. Mainly, the challenging aspects has been limited sources of fund which inhibits the successful running of MSP initiatives. Furthermore, the political and cultural environment in Ghana fosters distorted perception of partnerships, hampering effective collaboration. Also, the weak technological infrastructure in Ghana, slows down the running of activities. Moreover, the stakeholders involved in MSPs have different capacities. This usually makes partnerships complicated, especially in assigning roles and ensuring balanced participation. Finally, complex nature of the SDGs goals themselves pose a challenge for the seamless coordination of partnership for the Global Goals.

4.2 CONCLUSION

This study has found that, MSP initiatives are being promoted by the GoG, with participation from the CSO and Private Sector and the UN system in Ghana. The implementation of these initiatives are commendable but not without its challenges. MSPs can be complex, and easily made redundant without strategic management. Thus, for the utmost impact, the GoG must not only enable but ensure the MSPs in Ghana for the SDGs are well placed to fulfil their mandate.

4.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

4.3.1 Monitoring and Evaluation

Tandoh-Offin (2013) and Bawole (2017) argue that, in many developing countries, the rhetoric of decentralisation and multi-stakeholder partnerships are manipulated as political tool than an administrative strategy to offer effective service. There is therefore, the need for the GoG to not only enable MSP initiatives but also to ensure that they are impactful.

Partnerships under the SDGs are voluntary; thus, nothing legally binds stakeholders to participate or to deliver. However, effective monitoring and evaluation mechanism must be set up to ensure MSPs are serving their purpose.

Pattberg and Widerberg (2016) propose an ‘open and robust’ reporting system to evaluate partnerships. They suggest a thorough exercise, with input from all relevant stakeholders. To have an effective monitoring and evaluation mechanism, goals must be well set at the beginning of the working year. The goals should be set per the principles of MSPs and the development agenda. This would make it easier to track progress and reveal gaps. A reliable evaluation system would address the issues of legitimacy and boost transparency. It would also go a long way to make Partnerships adaptive and responsive to the necessary changes to make them more effective.

4.3.2 Innovation in resource mobilisation

The PEF estimates a total of 22 billion to achieve the SDGs in Ghana. This is no mean amount and the ‘business-as-usual’ funding strategies may not be adequate enough to raise the needed funds. There is therefore the need to explore creative ways in mobilising resources. This requires leveraging on relationships to source not only cash support but also technical support, which would eventually create an income to support such partnerships.

4.3.3 Empower private sector and CSO

Even though the Government has been ready to facilitate MSPs, it is important they empower the CSO and Private Sector to take some leading role in some initiatives, per the skills they have. For instance, the PEF maintains that the Government should be facilitator not implementer of certain programmes, especially in the area of business brokering. They opine that, it would be more effective to facilitate business to business relationship and allow the private sector itself to work on the implementation. Aside providing an enabling environment

for business, the government must also look into offering businesses with adequate support to sustain their businesses. This could include offering derisking conditions for business in Ghana. Nevertheless, to ensure that, the private sector does not take undue advantage of the government, GoG may consider working with PEF to design a due diligence system of screening businesses who may qualify for some government subsistence.

4.3.4 Learn from best practices

The Government may also wish to boost the learning of best practices from other countries. Admittedly, MSPs are still evolving and thus there is a lot of trial and error taking place with its implementation. Thus, looking to countries who have honed their skills in MSPs. The Government may wish to take advantage of platforms like the HLPF, where states converge to share experiences on the strategies, they are using to implement the SDGs.

4.3.5 Improve advocacy to change mindset

The complex nature of MSPs would invariably create some contention among stakeholders, however, this should not be stumbling block to the benefits therein. Levesque, Calhoun, Bell, & Johnson (2016) argue that, intentionally building trust among stakeholders, balancing power appropriately and creating a learning atmosphere among stakeholders is imperative to turn contention into collaboration.

In view of the above, future research may focus on a comparative study of MSPs in Ghana and another state to highlight the social or political discrepancies. Further research could be done on innovative financial resource mobilisation for partnerships in African States.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

- Ansell, C. (2012). Collaborative Governance. *The Oxford Handbook of Governance*, 1-15.
- Brouwer, H., Woodhill, J., Hemmati, M., Verhoosel, K., & van Vugt, S. (2015). *The MSP Guide- How to design and facilitate MultiStakeholder Partnerships*. Wageningen: Pracrical Action Publishing.
- Carter, N. (2007). *The politics of the environment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ehrenberg, J. (2017). *Civil Soceity, Second Edition: The Critical History of an Idea*. New York: NYU Press.
- Elliott, L. (2004). *The Global Politics of the Environment*. London: Palgrave.
- Mensah, C. (2017). *The United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development. Greening International Institutions*.
- Rahi, S. (2017). *Research Design and Methods: A Systematic Review of Research Paradigms, Sampling Issues and Instruments Development*. *International Journal of Economics & Management Sciences*.
- Raynolds, L., & Bennett (ed.), E. (2015). *Handbook on Research and Fair Trade*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Srinivasan, R. (2018). *Whose Global Village?: Rethinking How Technology Shapes Our World*. New York City: NYU Press.

B. JOURNAL ARTICLES

- Abbott, K. W., & Bernstein, S. (2015). The High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development: Orchestration by Default and Design. *Global Policy*, 222-233.
- Acemoglu, D., & Robinson, J. A. (2010). Why is Africa Poor? *Economic History of Developing Regions*, 21–50.
- Agyekum, C. K., Haifeng, H., & Ayeiwaa, A. (2016). Ghana's Effort towards the Emergence of Green Economy. *International Journal of Ecosystem*, 43-46.
- Akudugu, J. A. (2018). Institutionalising local economic development practice in Ghana. *Local Economy*, 405–420.
- Akyeampong, E. (2018). African socialism; or the search for an indigenous model of economic development? *Economic History of Developing Regions*, 69-87.
- Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2007). Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 545-577.
- Antwi-Boasiako, J. (2019). Drivers of civil society organisations' participation in Ghana's governance processes. *Development in Practice*, 1-9.

- Antwi-Boasiako, K. B. (2010). Public administration: Local government and decentralization in Ghana. *Journal of African Studies and Development*, 166-175.
- Ari, T. (2018). International Regime Theories. In A. University, *Theories of International Relations* (pp. 116-139). Eskisehir, Anadolu University Press.
- Arnesen, S., & Peters, Y. (2018). The Legitimacy of Representation: How Descriptive, Formal, and Responsiveness Representation Affect the Acceptability of Political Decisions. *Comparative Political Studies*, 868–899.
- Asante, K. T. (2018). SOCIAL ROOTEDNESS: EXAMINING ETHNIC AND NATIONAL ATTACHMENTS IN GHANA. Institute for Advanced Study in Toulouse (IAST), 18-83.
- Backstrand, K. (2006). Democratizing Global Environmental Governance? Stakeholder Democracy after the World Summit on Sustainable Development. *European Journal of International Relations*, 467–498.
- Bäckstrand, K. (2006). Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships for Sustainable Development: Rethinking Legitimacy, Accountability and Effectiveness. *European Environment*, 291-305.
- Banerjee, A., & Chaudhury, S. (2010). Statistics without tears: Populations and samples. *Industrial Psychiatry Journal*, 60–65.
- Bawole, J. N. (2017). Pro-Poor Decentralization in Ghana: Exploring the Facilitators and the Limitations. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, 122-139,.
- Beumer, C., Figge, L., & Elliott, J. (2018). The sustainability of globalisation: Including the ‘social robustness criterion’. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 704-715.
- Bhandary, R. R., Kantai, T., Sharma, A., Verkuijl, C., & Wertz, B. (2015, July 19). Summary of the third International Conference on Financing for Development. Retrieved from Earth Negotiations Bulletin (ENB): <https://enb.iisd.org/vol23/enb2314e.html>
- Boamah, E. F., & Amoako, C. (2013). Regionalism and Urban Development Planning in Africa: Towards A Collaborative Framework for Decentralized Planning in Ghana. *Developing Country Studies* , 142-154.
- Borowy, I. (2018). Sustainable Development and the United Nations. In J. Caradonna(ed.), *Routledge Handbook of the History of Sustainability* (pp. 151-163). London & New York: Routledge .
- Boudes, P. (2011). United Nations Conference on the Human Environment. In J. Newman (ed.) , *Green Ethics and Philosophy - The Green Series : Toward a Sustainable Environment* (pp. 410-413). Sage Publications Inc.
- Bouët, A., & Laborde, D. (2017). ASSESSING THE POTENTIAL COST OF A FAILED DOHA ROUND. In A. Bouët, & D. Laborde (ed), *Agriculture, Development, and the Global Trading System: 200-2015* (pp. 155-192). Washington: International Food Policy Research Institute.
- Brenya, E., Adu-Gyamfi, S., & Warden, E. (2017). Globalization and Development Gap in Developing Countries: A Comparison of PostIndependence Development Trajectories of Ghana and Singapore. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, Arts and Sciences*, 114-120.

- Chowdhury, G., & Koya, K. (2017). Information practices for sustainability: Role of iSchools in achieving the UN sustainable development goals (SDGs). *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 2128-2138.
- Clarke, S. (2017). Local Place-Based Collaborative Governance: Comparing State-Centric and Society-Centered Models. *Urban Affairs Review*, 578–602.
- Craig, D., & QC, M. I. (2009). Integrating Sustainable Development into Global Institutions: Reforming the United Nations. *Chinese Journal of Population Resources and Environment*, 3-14.
- Dadzie, R. B. (2013). Economic Development and the Developmental State; Assessing the Development Experiences of Ghana and Malaysia since Independence. *Journal of Developing Societies*, 123–154.
- Dellmuth, L., & Tallberg, J. (2015). The social legitimacy of international organisations: Interest representation, institutional performance, and confidence extrapolation in the United Nations. *Review of International Studies*, 451-475.
- Dentoni, D., Bitzer, V., & Schouten, G. (2018). Harnessing Wicked Problems in Multi stakeholder Partnerships. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 333-356.
- Edozie, K. R. (2004). Promoting African 'Owned and Operated' Development: A Reflection on the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD). *African and Asian Studies*, 145-173.
- Eisenstadt, S. (2017). Civil Society and Democracy in Latin America: Some Comparative Observations. *Estudios Interdisciplinarios de América Latina y el Caribe*.
- Emerson, K., Nabatchi, T., & Balogh, S. (2012). An Integrated Framework for Collaborative Governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 2-31.
- Fridy, K. S., & Myers, W. M. (2019). Challenges to decentralisation in Ghana: where do citizens seek assistance? *Commonwealth & Comparative Politics*, 71-92.
- Fuseini, I., & Kemp, J. (2015). A review of spatial planning in Ghana's socio-economic development trajectory: A sustainable development perspective. *Land Use Policy*, 309-320.
- Gentles, S. J., Charles, C., Ploeg, J., & McKibbin, K. A. (2015). Sampling in Qualitative Research: Insights from an Overview of the Methods Literature. *The Qualitative Report*, 1772-1789.
- Gordon, G., & Pierik, R. (2011). Liberal Political Philosophy: The Role of Non-State Actors and Considerations of Global Justice. *The Ashgate Research Companion to Non- State Actors*, 133-146.
- Gupta, J., & Vegelin, C. (2016). Sustainable development goals and inclusive development. *International Environment Agreements*, 433–448.
- Hamdi, F. M. (2013). The Impact of Globalization in the Developing Countries . *Developing Country Studies*, 142-144.

- Haywood, L. K., Funkea, N., Audouinb, M., Musvotoa, C., & Nahmanb, A. (2018). The Sustainable Development Goals in South Africa: Investigating the need for multi-stakeholder partnerships. *Development Southern Africa*, 2-15.
- Höjer, M., & Wangel, J. (2015). Smart Sustainable Cities: Definition and Challenges. *ICT innovations for sustainability*, 333-349.
- Horton, J. B., & Reynolds, J. L. (2016). The International Politics of Climate Engineering: A Review and Prospectus for International Relations. *International Studies Review*, 438–461.
- Huxham, C., Vangen, S., Huxham, C., & Eden, C. (2000). The Challenge of Collaborative Governance. *Public Management an International Journal of Research and Theory*, 337-358.
- Ingham-Broomfield, R. (2015). A nurses' guide to Qualitative Research . *AUSTRALIAN JOURNAL OF ADVANCED NURSING* , 34-40.
- Kalu, K. (2017). State–Society Relations, Institutional Transformation and Economic Development in sub-Saharan. *Development Policy Review*, 234-245.
- Kanbur, R. (2002). The New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD): An initial commentary. *South African Journal of Political Studies*, 87-100.
- Kartanegara, M., & Huda, M. (2016). Constructing Civil Society: An Islamic Cultural Perspective. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences* , 126-135.
- Kates, R. W., Parris, T. M., & Leiserowitz, A. A. (2016). What Is Sustainable Development? Goals, Indicators, Values, and Practice. *Environment Magazine*, 1-13.
- Kemp, R., Parto, S., & Gibson, R. (2005). Governance for sustainable development: moving from theory to practice. *Int. J. Sustainable Development*, Vol. 8, 12-30.
- Keohane, R. O., & Martin, L. L. (1995). The Promise of Institutional Theory. *International Security*, Vol. 20, No. 1, 39-51.
- Kjaerulf, F., Lee, B., Cohen, L., Donnelly, P., Turner, S., Davis, R., . . . Gilligan, J. (2016). The 2030 agenda for sustainable development: a golden opportunity for global violence prevention. *International Journal of Public Health*, 863–864.
- Kleibl, T., & Munck, R. (2017). Civil society in Mozambique: NGOs, religion, politics and witchcraft. *Third World Quarterly*, 203-218.
- Koff, H., & Maganda, C. (2016). Environmental Security in Transnational Contexts: What Relevance for Regional Human Security Regimes? *Globalizations*, 653 –663,.
- Kpessa, M. W. (2011). The Politics of Public Policy in Ghana From Closed Circuit Bureaucrats to Citizenry Engagement. *Journal of Developing Societies*, 29–56.
- Kütting, G., & Cerny, P. G. (2015). RETHINKING GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY: FROM GLOBAL GOVERNANCE TO TRANSNATIONAL NEOPLURALISM. *Public Administration*, 907–921.
- Lanz, K., Gerber, J.-D., & Haller, T. (2018). Land Grabbing, the State and Chiefs: The Politics of Extending Commercial Agriculture in Ghana. *Development and Change*, 1526-1552.

Levesque, V. R., Calhoun, A. J., Bell, K. P., & Johnson, T. R. (2016). Turning Contention into Collaboration: Engaging Power, Trust, and Learning in Collaborative Networks. *Society & Natural Resources*, 245-260.

Liberatore, A. (2009). INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT. In R. C. Elliot, *Institutional Issues Involving Ethics and Justice - Volume 2* (pp. 24-35). Oxford: Eoloss Publishers Co. Ltd.

Lin, Y.-H. (2015). Sustainability and International Environmental Agreements. *Environmental and Resource Economics Review*, 1-32.

Lu, Y., Nakicenovic, N., Visbeck, M., & Stevance, A.-S. (2015). Five priorities for the UN Sustainable Development Goals . *Nature*, 432–433.

Mackintosh, M., Channon, A., Karan, A., Selvaraj, S., Cavagnero, E., & Zhao, H. (2016). What is the private sector? Understanding private provision in the health systems of low-income and middle-income countries. *The Lancet*, 596-605.

Maguire, M., & Delahunt, B. (2017). Doing a Thematic Analysis: A Practical, Step-by-Step Guide for Learning and Teaching Scholars. *The All Ireland Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (AISHE-J)*, 3352-33514.

Mahbub, N. T. (2016). Sustainable Development and its Evolution in the Realm of International Environmental Law. *Nnamdi Azikiwe University Journal of International Law and Jurisprudence*, 1-16.

Malan, D. (2016). Corporate Support for the SDGs: A South African Perspective. *The Journal of Corporate Citizenship* , No. 64, 98-120.

Maltais, A., Weitz, N., & Persson, Å. (2018). SDG 17: Partnership for the Goals - A review of research needs. Stockholm: Stockholm Environment Institute.

Meadowcroft, J. (2007). Who is in Charge here? Governance for Sustainable Development in a Complex World. *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning*, 299–314.

Nilsson, M., Griggs, D., & Visbeck, M. (2016, June 15). Policy: Map the interactions between Sustainable Development Goals. *Nature*, pp. 320-322.

Nilsson, M., Griggs, D., & Visbeck, M. (2016). Policy: Map the interactions between Sustainable Development Goals. *Nature*, 320–322 .

O'Brien, E., & Gowan, R. (2012). *What Makes International Agreements Work: Defining Factors for Success*. New York City: CENTER ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION.

Ohemeng, F. L. (2014). Civil Society and Policy Making In Developing Countries: Assessing the Impact of Think Tanks on Policy Outcomes in Ghana. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 667–682.

Opoku, A., Ahmed, V., & Akotia, J. (2016). Choosing an appropriate research methodology and method. In V. Ahmed, A. Opoku, & Z. Aziz, *Research Methodology in the Built Environment: A Selection of Case Studies* (pp. 32-49). New York City: Routledge.

- Orr, C. J., Adamowski, J. F., Medema, W., & Milot, N. (2016). A multi-level perspective on the legitimacy of collaborative water governance in Québec. *Canadian Water Resources Journal / Revue canadienne des ressources hydriques*, 353-371.
- Ortas, E., Álvarez, I., & Garayar, A. (2015). The Environmental, Social, Governance, and Financial Performance Effects on Companies that Adopt the United Nations Global Compact Sustainability , 32-56.
- Osei – Kyei, R., & Chan, A. P. (2016). Developing Transport Infrastructure in Sub-Saharan Africa through Public–Private Partnerships: Policy Practice and Implications. *Transport Reviews*, 170-186.
- Osei-Wusu Adjei, P., Busia, A. K., & Bob-Milliar, G. M. (2017). Democratic decentralization and disempowerment of traditional authorities under Ghana's. *Journal of Political Power*, 303-325.
- Owusu, G. (2015). Decentralized Development Planning and Fragmentation of Metropolitan Regions: The Case of the Greater Accra Metropolitan Area, Ghana. *Ghana Journal of Geography*, 1-24.
- Ozkan, E., & Cetin, H. C. (2016). The Realist and Liberal Positions on the Role of International Organizations in Maintaining World Order . *European Scientific Journal* , 85-96.
- Pattberg, P., & Biermann, F. (2008). Global Environmental Governance: Taking Stock, Moving Forward. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 277–294.
- Pattberg, P., & Widerberg, O. (2016). Transnational multistakeholder partnerships for sustainable development: Conditions for success. *AMBIO: A Journal of the Human Environment*, 42-50.
- Pattberg, P., & Widerberg, O. (2016). Transnational multistakeholder partnerships for sustainable development: Conditions for success. *Ambio*, 42-51.
- Pinkse, J., & Kolk, A. (2012). Addressing the Climate Change—Sustainable Development Nexus: The Role of Multistakeholder Partnerships. *Business & Society*, 176–210.
- Pradhan, R. P., Arvin, M. B., Hall, J. H., & Nair, M. (2016). Innovation, Financial Development and Economic Growth in Eurozone Countries. *Applied Economic Letters*, 1141-1144.
- Pratt, C. B. (2003). Managing Sustainable Development in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Communication Ethic for the Global Corporation. In K. Sriramesh, & D. Verčič, *The Global Public Relations Handbook Theory Research and Practice* (pp. 441-459). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Rana, W. (2015). Theory of Complex Interdependence: A Comparative Analysis of Realist and Neoliberal Thoughts. *International Journal of Business and Social Science* , 290-297.
- Rasche, A. (2012). Global Policies and Local Practice: Loose and Tight Couplings in Multi-Stakeholder Initiatives. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, Vol. 22, No. 4, 679-708.

- Sachs, J. (2012). From Millennium Development Goals to Sustainable Development Goals. *Lancet* , 2206–11.
- Sagar, S. (2018). Higher Education and Sustainable Development. *Economic Development of India*, 160-169.
- Scherer, A. G., & Palazzo, G. (2011). The New Political Role of Business in a Globalized World: A Review of a New Perspective on CSR and its Implications for the Firm, Governance, and Democracy. *Journal of Management Studies*, 899-931.
- Shepherd, L. J. (2015). Constructing civil society: Gender, power and legitimacy in United Nations peacebuilding discourse. *European Journal of International Relations*, 887-906.
- Singh, J. (2018). UNESCO: Scientific Humanism and its Impact on Multilateral Diplomacy. *Global Policy Volume 9*, 53-59.
- Spash, C. (2016). This Changes Nothing: The Paris Agreement to Ignore Reality. *Globalizations*, 928–933,.
- Stafford-Smith, M., Griggs, D., Gaffney, O., Ullah, F., Reyers, B., Kanie, N., . . . O’Connell, D. (2017). Integration: the key to implementing the Sustainable Development Goals. *Sustainability Science*, 911–919.
- Sun, X. (2017). Research and Prospect of Collaborative Governance Theory. *Public Policy and Administration Research*, 50-53.
- Sydorenko, S. (2017). MAN AND SOCIETY INTERACTION AS A GUARANTY OF CIVIL SOCIETY DEVELOPMENT. *Humanities Bulletin of Zaporizhzh State Engineering Academy*, 121-129.
- Tandoh-Offin, P. (2013). Development Planning in Ghana Since 1992: Implications for the Decentralization Process. *International Relations and Diplomacy*, 93-107.
- Taylor, K. (2018). The Evolving Case for Public-Private Partnerships to Achieve the Global Goals. *National Academy of Medicine Perspective*, 1-3.
- Teixeira de Barros, A. (2017). Brazil’s Discourse on the Environment in the International Arena, 1972-1992. *Contexto Internacional*, 421-442.
- Udovyk, O. (2017). Beyond the Conflict and Weak Civil Society; Stories from Ukraine: Cases of Grassroots Initiatives for Sustainable Development. *Journal of Ukrainian Studies*, 187-208.
- Westmana, L., & Brotob, V. C. (2018). Climate governance through partnerships: A study of 150 urban initiatives in China. *Global Environmental Change*, 212-221.
- Williams, O. F. (2018). Restorying the purpose of business: The agenda of the UN Global Compact. *African Journal of Business Ethics*, 85-95.
- Woldesenbet, W. G. (2018). Collaborative governance: assessing the problem of weak cross sectoral collaborations for the governance of Addis Ababa Rivers. *Applied Water Science*, 1-24.
- Wolfe, R. (2015). First Diagnose, Then Treat: What Ails the Doha Round? *World Trade Review*, 7–28.

Wright, G. (2013). Conceptualising and combating transnational environmental crime. In R. White, *Transnational Environmental Crime* (pp. 55-67). London: Routledge.

C. REPORTS/POLICY DOCUMENTS

Beisheim, M. (2015). *Reviewing the Post-2015 Sustainable Development Goals and Partnerships. A Proposal for a Multi-level Review at the High level Political Forum*. Berlin: SWP .

Beisheim, M., & Simon, N. (2015). *Meta-governance of partnerships for sustainable development: actors' perspectives*. SFB-Governance Working Paper Series, 68.

Beisheim, M., & Simon, N. (2015, August 30). *Meta-Governance of Partnerships for Sustainable Development: Actors' Perspectives on How the UN Could Improve Partnerships' Governance Services in Areas of Limited Statehood*. SFB-Governance Working Paper Series , 3-34. Retrieved from SSRN.

Beisheim, M., & Simon, N. (2016). *Multi-stakeholder partnerships for implementing the 2030 Agenda: Improving accountability and transparency*. New York: UNDESA.

Dodds, F. (2016). *Multi-stakeholder partnerships: Making them work for the Post-2015 Development Agenda*. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs.

Government of Ghana. (2019). *Voluntary National Review (VNR) Report on the Implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development* . Accra: Government of Ghana.

NEPAD&UNECA. (2014). *Mobilizing Domestic Financial Resources for Implementing NEPAD National and Regional Programmes & Projects - Africa looks within*. Midrand: NEPAD Planning and Coordinating Agency and UN Economic Commission for Africa.

Nilsson, M., & Persson, A. (2015). *How do we get real national ownership of the post-2015 agenda?* Stockholm: Stockholm Environment Institute.

United Nations. (1972). *Declaration on Human Environment*. The United Nations Conference on Human Environment. Stockholm: United Nations.

United Nations. (1987). *Our Common Future: World Commission on Environment and Development*. New York: United Nations.

United Nations. (2003). *Enhanced cooperation between the United Nations and all relevant partners, in particular the private sector*. New York: United Nations.

United Nations. (2012). *Independent evaluation of lessons learned from "Delivering as one"* . New York: United Nations.

United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD). (2009). *Public Investment: Vital for Growth and Renewal, but should it be a Countercyclical Instrument?* Geneva: United Nations.

UN Environment Evaluation Office. (2016). Independent Evaluation of the Scale-up Phase (2008 – 2013) of the UNDP-UNEP Poverty – Environment Initiative. Nairobi: UN Environment.

United Nations Environment Programme. (2016). The Rise of Environmental Crime: A Growing Threat to Natural Resources, Peace, Development and Security. United Nations Environment Programme.

World Economic Forum. (2013). The Future Role of Civil Society. Geneva: World Economic Forum.

World Health Organisation. (2017). The Partnership for Maternal, Newborn and Child Health 2016 annual report: coming of age in a time of transition. Geneva: World Health Organisation.

D. INTERNET SOURCES

Bernstein, S. (2013). The Role and Place of the High-Level Political Forum in Strengthening the Global Institutional Framework for Sustainable Development. Retrieved from Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform:

<https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/2331Bernstein%20study%20on%20HLPF.pdf> Accessed on 7/07/19

Cai, F. (2011, April 28). Absolute and Relative Gains in the Real World. Retrieved from E-International Relations: <https://www.e-ir.info/2011/04/28/absolute-and-relative-gains-in-the-real-world/> Accessed on 18/05/19

Common Fund. (2019, July 17). About Us: District Assemblies Common Fund. Retrieved from District Assemblies Common Fund: <http://www.commonfund.gov.gh/> Accessed on 17/07/19

Cooper, J. (2018). THE HIGH-LEVEL POLITICAL FORUM AND VOLUNTARY NATIONAL REVIEWS. Retrieved from Cultural Survival: <https://www.culturalsurvival.org/publications/cultural-survival-quarterly/high-level-political-forum-and-voluntary-national-reviews>. Accessed on 24/03/19

Crossman, A. (2019, January 14). An Overview of Qualitative Research Methods. Retrieved from Thought Co: <https://www.thoughtco.com/qualitative-research-methods-3026555> Accessed on 16/01/19

Division for Sustainable Development. (2019, 07 10). United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), Earth Summit. Retrieved from SDG Knowledge Platform: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/milestones/unced> Accessed on 7/07/19

Division for Sustainable Development Goals. (2019, 7 10). Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development - Our Common Future. Retrieved from Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/milestones/wced> Accessed on 7/07/19

Division for Sustainable Development Goals. (2019, 07 10). Resources. Retrieved from Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform Website:

<https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/resourcelibrary#> Accessed on 7/07/19

ECOSOC. (2016, 7 11). ECOSOC High-level political forum on sustainable development. Retrieved from UNITED NATIONS ECONOMIC and SOCIAL COUNCIL:

<https://www.un.org/ecosoc/en/events/2016-1> Accessed on 13/05/19

European Commission. (2019, July 11). International Cooperation and Development.

Retrieved from European Commission: https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/policies/financing-development_en Accessed on 11/07/19

Evans, A. (2015, 7 16). Where are the concrete plans for action in the development finance deal? Retrieved from The Guardian: <https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2015/jul/16/where-are-concrete-plans-action-development-finance-deal>

Accessed on 7/07/19

Godfrey, L. (2012, October 12). What Does ‘Sustainable Development’ Mean. Retrieved

from E-International Relations: <https://www.e-ir.info/2012/10/12/what-does-sustainable-development-mean/> Accessed on 7/07/19

Handl, G. (2012). DECLARATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT (STOCKHOLM DECLARATION), 1972 AND THE RIO DECLARATION ON ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT, 1992 . Retrieved from United Nations Audiovisual Library of International Law:

<http://legal.un.org/avl/ha/dunche/dunche.html> Accessed on 7/07/19

Hope for Future Generations (HFFG). (2018). CSO Platform SDG Ghana. Retrieved from

Hope for Future Generations website: <https://hffg.org/cso-platform-sdg-ghana/> Accessed on 8/03/19

ICC. (2018, September 26). 5 ways to ensure new technologies are effective for SDGs.

Retrieved from International Chamber of Commerce: <https://iccwbo.org/media-wall/news-speeches/5-ways-ensure-new-technologies-effective-sdgs/> Accessed on 18/07/19

IISD. (2018, July 10). High-Level Policy Dialogue: Financing the SDGs in Africa. Retrieved

from International Institute for Sustainable Development: <https://sdg.iisd.org/events/high-level-policy-dialogue-financing-the-sdgs-in-africa/> Accessed on 18/07/19

Jomo, K., Chowdhury, A., Sharma, K., & Platz, D. (2016, February). Public-Private

Partnerships and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: Fit for purpose? Retrieved from United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs:

<http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/papers/> Accessed on 18/05/19

Mepielan Centre. (2015, 7 31). The Addis Ababa Action Agenda: Countries Reach Historic

Agreement to Generate Financing for New Sustainable Development Agenda. Retrieved from E Mepielan Bulletin: <http://www.mepielan-bulletin.gr/default.aspx?pid=18&CategoryId=28&ArticleId=211&Article=The-Addis-Ababa-Action-Agenda-Countries-Reach-Historic-Agreement-to-Generate-Financing-for-New-Sustainable-Development-Agenda>

Accessed on 07/07/19

Ministry of Finance. (2018, December 11). 2018 Accra SDG Investment Fair. Retrieved from Ministry of Finance: <https://www.mofep.gov.gh/2018/sdg-investment-fair> Accessed on 13/07/19

National Development Planning Commission (NDPC). (2019, June 6). About us; NDPC. Retrieved from NDPC website: <http://ndpc-cms.herokuapp.com/about/#> Accessed on 18/05/19

Policy Centre for the New South. (2018, September 25). Events. Retrieved from Policy Centre for the New South website: <https://www.policycenter.ma/events/seminars-series/joint-seminar-energy-strategies-africa-identifying-challenges-and-addressing#.XS8mJuhKjIV> Accessed on 10/07/19

Rao, S. (2017, 5 28). Funding Needs for UN's 2030 Development Agenda. Retrieved from Global Policy Watch: <https://www.globalpolicywatch.org/blog/2017/05/29/funding-needs-for-uns-2030-development-agenda/> Accessed on 12/06/19

SDG Philanthropy Platform. (2017, November 29). Ghanaian CEOs Partner for the SDGs. Retrieved from SDG Philanthropy Platform: <https://www.sdgphilanthropy.org/CEO-Breakfast-Philanthropy-Ghana> Accessed on 18/05/19

Shelton, D. (2008, July). Stockholm Declaration (1972) and Rio Declaration (1992). Retrieved from Oxford Public International Law: <https://opil.ouplaw.com/view/10.1093/law:epil/9780199231690/law-9780199231690-e1608#law-9780199231690-e1608-div1-2> Accessed on 18/05/19

The Flowminder Foundation. (2015). About. Retrieved from Flowminder.org: <https://web.flowminder.org/about> Accessed on 20/07/19

The Ghana Civil-society Cocoa Platform (GCCP). (2019, May 16). GHANA CIVIL-SOCIETY COCOA PLATFORM (GCCP) STATEMENT IN RESPONSE TO COCOBOD CEO'S REMARKS IN SWITZERLAND ABOUT COCOA-DRIVEN DEFORESTATION. Retrieved from SEND West Africa: <http://sendwestafrica.org/nu/blog/ghana-civil-society-cocoa-platform-gccp-statement-in-response-to-cocobod-ceos-remarks-in-switzerland-about-cocoa-driven-deforestation/> Accessed on 18/05/19

The Local Government Service. (2019, June 6). About LGS. Retrieved from The Local Government Service-Ghana: <http://lgs.gov.gh/index.php/about-us/> Accessed on 7/07/19

United Nations. (2015). Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Retrieved from SDG Knowledge Platform: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/post2015/transformingourworld> Accessed on 30/04/19

United Nations. (2017, April 18). Opening remarks of H.E. Peter Thomson, President of the UN General Assembly at High Level SDG Action Event "SDG Financing Lab". Retrieved from United Nations General Assembly: <https://www.un.org/pga/71/2017/04/18/opening-of-sdg-financing-lab/> Accessed on 7/07/19

United Nations. (2019, June 15). Sustainable Development Goal 17. Retrieved from Sustainable Development Goals Knowledge Platform: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg17> Accessed on 15/06/19

United Nations. (2019, July 2). United Nations Conference on the Human Environment (Stockholm Conference). Retrieved from Sustainable Development Goals Knowledge Platform: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/milestones/humanenvironment> Accessed on 7/07/19

United Nations. (n.d.). Agenda 21. Retrieved from Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/outcomedocuments/agenda21> Accessed on 21/04/19

United Nations Global Compact. (2019, April). Home Page. Retrieved from United Nations Global Compact: <https://www.unglobalcompact.org/> Accessed on 7/07/19

UN Sustainable Development. (2019, 7 10). AGENDA 21. Retrieved from SDG Knowledge Platform: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/Agenda21.pdf> Accessed on 12/05/19

United Nations . (2017, September 8). President Akufo-Addo reconfirms commitment to the SDGs. Retrieved from United Nations in Ghana: <http://gh.one.un.org/content/unct/ghana/en/home/media-centre/news-and-press-releases/president-akufo-addo-reconfirms-commitment-to-the-sdgs.html> Accessed on 7/07/19

University of Leicester. (2019, April 30). Analysing Qualitative Research Data. Retrieved from University of Leicester: https://www.le.ac.uk/oerresources/lill/fdmvco/module9/page_75.htm Accessed on 7/02/19

Annexes

Annex A-Table 1

SDG 17-Targets and Indicators

Source- SDG Knowledge Platform

Goal 17: Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development

Targets	Indicators
Finance	
17.1 Strengthen domestic resource mobilization, including through international support to developing countries, to improve domestic	17.1.1 Total government revenue as a proportion of GDP, by source 17.1.2 Proportion of domestic budget funded by domestic taxes
17.2 Developed countries to implement fully their official development assistance commitments, including the commitment by many developed countries to achieve the target of 0.7 per cent of gross national income for official development assistance (ODA/GNI) to developing countries and 0.15 to 0.20 per cent of ODA/GNI to least developed countries; ODA providers are encouraged to consider setting a target to provide at least 0.20 per cent of ODA/GNI to least developed countries	17.2.1 Net official development assistance, total and to least developed countries, as a proportion of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee donors' gross national income (GNI)
17.3 Mobilize additional financial resources for developing countries from multiple sources	17.3.1 Foreign direct investment (FDI), official development assistance and South-

South cooperation as a proportion of total domestic budget

17.3.2 Volume of remittances (in United States dollars) as a proportion of total GDP

17.4 Assist developing countries in attaining long-term debt sustainability through coordinated policies aimed at fostering debt financing, debt relief and debt restructuring, as appropriate, and address the external debt of highly indebted poor countries to reduce debt distress

17.4.1 Debt service as a proportion of exports of goods and services

17.5 Adopt and implement investment promotion regimes for least developed countries

17.5.1 Number of countries that adopt and implement investment promotion regimes for least developed countries

Technology

17.6 Enhance North-South, South-South and triangular regional and international cooperation on and access to science, technology and innovation and enhance knowledge-sharing on mutually agreed terms, including through improved coordination among existing mechanisms, in particular at the United Nations level, and through a global technology facilitation mechanism

17.6.1 Number of science and/or technology cooperation agreements and programmes between countries, by type of cooperation.

17.6.2 Fixed Internet broadband subscriptions per 100 inhabitants, by speed

17.7 Promote the development, transfer,

17.7.1 Total amount of approved funding for

dissemination and diffusion of environmentally sound technologies to developing countries on favourable terms, including on concessional and preferential terms, as mutually agreed

developing countries to promote the development, transfer, dissemination and diffusion of environmentally sound technologies

17.8 Fully operationalize the technology bank and science, technology and innovation capacity building mechanism for least developed countries by 2017 and enhance the use of enabling technology, in particular information and communications technology

17.8.1 Proportion of individuals using the Internet

Capacity-Building

17.9 Enhance international support for implementing effective and targeted capacitybuilding in developing countries to support national plans to implement all the Sustainable Development Goals, including through North-South, South-South and triangular cooperation

17.9.1 Dollar value of financial and technical assistance (including through North-South, South-South and triangular cooperation) committed to developing countries

Trade

17.10 Promote a universal, rules-based, open, non-discriminatory and equitable multilateral trading system under the World Trade Organization, including through the conclusion of negotiations under its Doha Development Agenda

17.10.1 Worldwide weighted tariff average

17.11 Significantly increase the exports of developing countries, in particular with a view to doubling the least developed countries' share of global exports by 2020

17.11.1 Developing countries' and least developed countries' share of global exports

17.12 Realize timely implementation of duty-free and quota-free market access on a lasting basis for all least developed countries, consistent with World Trade Organization decisions, including by ensuring that preferential rules of origin applicable to imports from least developed countries are transparent and simple, and contribute to facilitating market access

17.12.1 Average tariffs faced by developing countries, least developed countries and small island developing States

Systematic Issues

Policy and Institutional coherence

17.13 Enhance global macroeconomic stability, including through policy coordination and policy coherence

17.13.1 Macroeconomic Dashboard

17.14 Enhance policy coherence for sustainable development

17.14.1 Number of countries with mechanisms in place to enhance policy coherence of sustainable development

17.15 Respect each country's policy space and leadership to establish and implement policies for poverty eradication and sustainable development

17.15.1 Extent of use of country-owned results frameworks and planning tools by providers of development cooperation

Multi-stakeholder Partnerships

17.16 Enhance the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development, complemented by multi-stakeholder partnerships that mobilize and share knowledge, expertise, technology and financial resources, to support the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals in all countries, in particular developing countries

17.16.1 Number of countries reporting progress in multi-stakeholder development effectiveness monitoring frameworks that support the achievement of the sustainable development goals

17.17 Encourage and promote effective public, public-private and civil society partnerships, building on the experience and resourcing strategies of partnerships

17.17.1 Amount of United States dollars committed to public-private and civil society partnerships

Data, monitoring and accountability

17.18 By 2020, enhance capacity-building support to developing countries, including for least developed countries and small island developing States, to increase significantly the availability of high-quality, timely and reliable data disaggregated by income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other characteristics relevant in national contexts

17.18.1 Proportion of sustainable development indicators produced at the national level with full disaggregation when relevant to the target, in accordance with the Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics

17.18.2 Number of countries that have national statistical legislation that complies with the Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics

17.18.2 Number of countries that have national statistical legislation that complies with the Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics

17.19 By 2030, build on existing initiatives to develop measurements of progress on sustainable development that complement gross domestic product, and support capacity-building in developing countries

17.19.2 Proportion of countries that (a) have conducted at least one population and housing census in the last 10 years; and (b) have achieved 100 per cent birth registration and 80 per cent death registration

Annex B- INTERVIEW GUIDE

DISSERTATION TITLE: ACHIEVING SDG 17 IN GHANA; AN ASSESSMENT OF MULTI-STAKEHOLDER PARTNERSHIP INITIATIVES BY THE GOVERNMENT

1. STATE STAKEHOLDERS (FACILITATORS)

1.1.NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLANNING COMMISSION (NDPC)

- 1.1.1. Is there a strategy of government to ensure Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships in achieving the SDGs, particularly in areas of finance, technology, expertise and knowledge sharing?
- 1.1.2. What is the strategy
- 1.1.3. How is it being implemented?
- 1.1.4. What mechanisms are in place to monitor and evaluate the efficacy of this strategy?
- 1.1.5. The NDPC set up two inter-sector committees for the SDGs, the Implementing Coordination Committee and the Technical Committee. What are their roles?
- 1.1.6. What was the criteria for the selection of stakeholders (state and non-state actors)?
- 1.1.7. Is there a set schedule of roles for each member of the committee, or are roles assigned as and when?
- 1.1.8. Have members been consistent in delivering on roles and in attendance?
- 1.1.9. How are the MSPs initiatives funded?
- 1.1.10. How involved was the private sector and civil society in the Coordinated Plan?
- 1.1.11. What have been the challenges involved in facilitating MSPs?
- 1.1.12. How can this be improved?

1.2. MINISTRY OF FINANCE (MoF)

- 1.1.1. Does Ghana have a strategy for financing sustainable development?
- 1.1.2. How has financing sustainable development in Ghana evolved over the years?
- 1.1.3. In Ghana, is financing for Development centralized?
- 1.1.4. How does Government ensure fairness in allocating financial resources for development?
- 1.1.5. How does Government monitor and evaluate progress in financing development?
- 1.1.6. How does Government go about domestic mobilisation of financial resources for sustainable development?
- 1.1.7. How does Government intend to increase domestic revenue mobilisation for sustainable development financing?
- 1.1.8. Has the involvement of transnational development partners affected ODA receipts for sustainable development?
- 1.1.9. The Addis Ababa Action Agenda encourages countries to consider setting nationally appropriate spending targets for quality investments in essential public services for all, including health, education, energy, water and sanitation, consistent with national sustainable development strategies. How is MoF engaging UNDP Ghana, civil society and private sector in Ghana in this regard?
- 1.1.10. What percentage of public expenditure is channeled towards MSPs?
- 1.1.11. What are the challenges involved Sustainable development and MSPs in Ghana?

1.3. GHANA STATISTICAL SERVICE

- 1.3.1. What is the GSS's role regarding SDGs in Ghana
- 1.3.2. How does the GSS ensure adequate and reliable data from other Government Agencies and CSOs?
- 1.3.3. In what ways is the GSS leveraging global partnerships to boost capacity through technology, expert and knowledge sharing?

2. NON-STATE STAKEHOLDERS (PARTNERS)

2.1. CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANISATION- SEND, GHANA

- 2.1.1. Regarding SDGs in Ghana, what has been the role of the Civil Society?
- 2.1.2. How are CSOs in Ghana undertaking awareness on the SDGs?

- 2.1.3. How do CSOs in Ghana ensure accountability for Goals? (Is there a measurement and reporting mechanism set up specifically designed for this purpose?)
- 2.1.4. What motivated the idea to start the CSO platform for the SDGs?
- 2.1.5. How is the work if the Platform coordinated?
- 2.1.6. Are there monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to assess the work of the CSOs on the platform in particular and the platform in general?
- 2.1.7. Is the Platform engaged by the government within a MSP framework? How?
- 2.1.8. What has been the contribution of the CSO to the MSPs initiatives by the Government particularly in areas of finance, technology, expertise and knowledge sharing?
- 2.1.9. What are the successes and challenges in this regard?

2.2.UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (UNDP, GHANA)

- 2.2.1. How is UNDP Ghana harnessing partnerships for the Global Goals?
- 2.2.2. What is the United Nations Sustainable Development Partnership (UNSDP) 2018-2022?
- 2.2.3. The UNSDP states that the total amount estimated for 2018-2022 is US\$ 441.5 million, comprising US\$ 194.8 million from Agencies' own resources and US\$ 246.7 million to be mobilised. How is the UNDP working with the Government to boost revenue mobilisation?

2.3.PRIVATE SECTOR

- 2.3.1. What is the history of the Private Enterprise Federation?
- 2.3.2. How has the Federation's collaboration with GoG evolved over the years?
- 2.3.3. In what ways is the PEF being engaged by the GoG to harness partnership for the SDGs
- 2.3.4. What are the successes and challenges in this regard?