

Copyright: The author/s
This work is licensed under a CC-BY 4.0 license
(*) Corresponding author
Original research article
DOI: 10.20544/AISC.1.1.25.P11



THE POLITICS OF SUSTAINABILITY: ENCOURAGING THE UN 2030 AGENDA VIA POWER DYNAMICS AND POLICY OBSTACLES

Syarifah Huswatun Miswar*
Central China Normal University
Email: sayyidahuswah@gmail.com

Abstract

The United Nations (UN) 2030 Agenda and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) present global vision for achieving social, economic and environmental balance. However, implementing sustainability is fraught with political dynamics and complex policy challenges. This study examines how the distribution of power between state and non-state actors influences sustainable policymaking at different levels of government. Conflicts of interest often arise among business, civil society and government, which complicates efforts to align common goals. International institutions play an important role in promoting green policies but face unique challenges, particularly in developing countries that must balance economic growth with environmental commitments. This study highlights significant policy limitations and bureaucratic inefficiencies that hinder effective SDG implementation. A shift towards multi-level governance is essential, given the increasing involvement of local and private actors. Ultimately, achieving the 2030 Agenda depends on strengthening cooperation among stakeholders and implementing inclusive policies that are responsive to multiple interests.

Keywords: Politics of sustainability, 2030 agenda, power dynamics, policy challenges, multi-level governance.

INTRODUCTION

The United Nations 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, adopted in 2015, is a global commitment to address pressing social, economic and environmental challenges. At its core are 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which provide a comprehensive framework for achieving a more just and sustainable world by 2030. These goals cover a wide range of issues, from poverty eradication and quality education to climate action and responsible consumption. (UNDP 2024)

The 2030 Agenda is characterized by its universal applicability, recognizing that the challenges of sustainable development are interrelated and require collaborative efforts from all countries, regardless of their development status. It emphasizes the need for balanced progress across economic, social and environmental dimensions, aiming to “leave no one behind” in the pursuit of global prosperity. (United Nations n.d)

Sustainability has become a central concern in contemporary politics, reflecting growing awareness of the complex interactions between human activities and the planet's ecological

systems. As governments, businesses and civil society grapple with issues such as climate change, resource depletion and social inequality, the implementation of sustainable policies has emerged as a critical political imperative. The SDGs provide a common language and a set of targets that various stakeholders can use to harmonize their efforts. (Feiock and Kim 2021)

This paper aims to explore the political dynamics and policy challenges inherent in implementing the UN 2030 agenda. Specifically, it examines the distribution of power between state and non-state actors in sustainable policymaking at different levels of governance, analyzes the conflicts of interest that arise among business, civil society and government in aligning sustainability goals and identifies key policy limitations and bureaucratic inefficiencies that hinder effective SDG implementation and explores the shift towards multi-level governance in addressing sustainability challenges.

By focusing on these goals, this study aims to contribute to a deeper understanding of the political complexities surrounding sustainability efforts and offer insights into potential strategies to overcome barriers to achieving the ambitious goals of the 2030 Agenda.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Historical Context of Sustainability Politics

The concept of sustainability has evolved significantly over the past few decades, transitioning from an environmental concern to a complex political issue. The intersection of sustainability and development is an important moment in this evolution, as it combines concern for the natural environment with economic development. This combination drives the political character of the concept, raising questions about what should be preserved for the future while society undergoes change. (Konold & Schwietring, 2021)

The work of the Brundtland Commission in 1987 marked a pivotal turning point, establishing sustainability as a politically programmatic global concern before it became an academic focus. The Brundtland Commission's definition of sustainable development as “meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” has since framed environmental and development interests. (Gad et al., 2018)

Historically, the roots of sustainability can be traced back to early concerns about resource depletion. In the 18th and 19th centuries, thinkers such as Thomas Robert Malthus and W. Stanley Jevons voiced concerns about population growth outpacing food production and the depletion of coal reserves. These early warnings laid the groundwork for subsequent discussions on sustainable resource management. The mid-20th century saw a surge of publications addressing what we now call sustainable development. The works of authors such as Egbert de Vries, William Vogt, and Henry Fairfield Osborn in the late 1940s addressed the consequences of overexploitation of natural resources and called for responsible resource use to ensure the survival of civilized society. (Du Pisani, 2006)

Key Theories and Frameworks in Sustainability Studies

First, the Three Pillars of Sustainability Model, formalized at the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development, has become a fundamental framework for conceptualizing and addressing sustainable development challenges. (Greenly, 2024) The model identifies three interdependent and mutually reinforcing dimensions: economic, social and environmental sustainability. The economic pillar focuses on maintaining financial stability and promoting responsible growth. The social pillar emphasizes equality, health, education, and community well-being. The environmental pillar addresses the protection of ecosystems, biodiversity and

natural resources. (Brightest, n.d.) By recognizing the interconnectedness of these three dimensions, the model provides a holistic approach to sustainability, emphasizing that true progress requires balance and integration between economic prosperity, social equity and environmental stewardship. The framework has been widely adopted by governments, businesses and organizations around the world as a guide for developing sustainable policies, practices and decision-making processes. (Clune & Zehnder, 2020)

Second, the Planetary Boundaries Concept, introduced by Johan Rockström and his colleagues in 2009, is a groundbreaking framework for understanding Earth's ecological boundaries. This approach identifies nine critical environmental processes that are critical to maintaining the stability and resilience of the Earth system. These boundaries include climate change, biodiversity loss, nitrogen and phosphorus cycling, stratospheric ozone depletion, ocean acidification, global freshwater use, land system change, atmospheric aerosol loading, and chemical pollution. (Schlesinger, 2009) This framework suggests that there are measurable thresholds for each of these processes, beyond which the Earth system can undergo abrupt and potentially catastrophic changes. By defining these boundaries, scientists aim to establish a “safe operating space” for human development within the biophysical limits of the planet. As of 2015, four of these boundaries are considered to have been crossed: climate change, loss of biosphere integrity, land system change, and altered biogeochemical cycles. The Planetary Boundaries concept has gained significant traction in scientific, policy and environmental circles, offering a holistic approach to global sustainability and emphasizing the interconnected nature of the Earth system. (Chen et al., 2021)

Third, Doughnut Economics, developed by Oxford economist Kate Raworth, is a groundbreaking economic model that seeks to reframe our understanding of prosperity and progress in the 21st century. At its core, the model is visualized as a doughnut-shaped diagram, with two concentric rings representing important boundaries for human and planetary well-being. The inner ring, or social foundation, includes basic human needs such as food, water, health, education and social equality. The outer ring, or ecological boundary, represents planetary boundaries that should not be exceeded, including climate change, biodiversity loss, and ocean acidification. (Hartman & Heslinga, 2022)

The space between these two circles - aptly called the “sweet spot” or “safe and just space for humanity” - is where Raworth argues our economy should operate. The model challenges traditional economic thinking by shifting the focus from unlimited GDP growth to achieving balance within ecological limits while ensuring all human needs are met. The model provides a visual framework for sustainable development that integrates social and environmental concerns, addressing both human deprivation and planetary degradation simultaneously. (MIT Sloan, 2024)

The Raworth model has gained significant traction since its introduction, influencing policymakers, businesses, and activists around the world. The model offers a holistic approach to economic progress that aligns with the challenges of our time, such as climate change and social inequality. By providing a clear visual representation of our economic goals, Doughnut Economics helps guide decision-making towards more sustainable and equitable outcomes, fostering a regenerative and distributive economy that works within planetary boundaries while ensuring no one lacks the necessities of life. (Warnecke, 2023)

Ecological Modernization Theory (EMT) states that sustainable industrial and economic development, if properly directed, can be the solution to environmental challenges rather than the cause. This perspective argues that technological innovation, market dynamics and policy reforms within the existing capitalist framework can lead to environmentally sustainable outcomes. (Huber, 2000)

At its core, EMT states that environmental protection and economic growth are not mutually exclusive, but can work together. Its proponents believe that as societies become

more developed and prosperous, they develop the capacity and willingness to address environmental issues. This happens through several mechanisms namely: Technological innovations that improve resource efficiency and reduce pollution, a shift towards a less resource-intensive knowledge and service-based economy, the development of “green” industries and markets for environmentally friendly products, the implementation of environmental regulations and market-based policy instruments, and increased environmental awareness and environmentally conscious consumer behavior. (Leach, 2015)

Instead of calling for a radical restructuring of the economic system or degrowth, EMT advocates the “greening” of industry and capitalism. EMT emphasizes the role of business, policymakers, and civil society in driving environmental improvements through innovation, regulation, and changing social norms. Critics argue that EMT may be overly optimistic about the ability of the current system to adequately address the environmental crisis, but its influence on environmental policy and corporate sustainability efforts is significant. (Jorgenson & Clark, 2016)

Examining the Dynamics of State Actors vs Non-State Actors

The interaction between state and non-state actors has become increasingly important in the politics of desire. As issues of interest often transcend national boundaries, the role of international institutions, civil society organizations and businesses has evolved alongside traditional state actors.

International institutions, such as the United Nations (UN), play an important role in promoting sustainable policies, but face unique challenges, especially in developing countries that must balance economic growth with environmental commitments. The UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) exemplify this global approach, providing a common framework for action while recognizing the diverse contexts in which they must be applied. (Weiss et al., 2017 Hickmann & Elsässer, 2020)

Non-state actors, including companies and civil society organizations, have become increasingly influential in shaping the sustainability agenda. Corporate sustainability initiatives, for example, can sometimes go beyond government regulations. However, this also raises questions regarding accountability and the potential for “greenwashing”. (Lashitew, 2021. Hickmann and Elsässer 2020)

The shift towards multi-level governance has become important, given the increasing involvement of local and private actors in sustainability efforts. This approach recognizes that effective sustainability policies often require coordination across multiple levels of government and sectors of society. Conflicts of interest often arise among business, civil society and government stakeholders, complicating efforts to align on common sustainability goals. These conflicts can arise in debates over regulation, resource allocation and the speed of transition to more sustainable practices. (Shijin et. all 2023)

In the Arctic region, for example, sustainability has become a very important concept in the struggle for rights and resources. The concept increasingly governs the way Arctic nature and indigenous identities are presented and shapes strategies for the future organization of postcoloniality and extractive projects. (Nikitina & Pozhilova, 2022)

The dynamic between state and non-state actors is further complicated by the global nature of many sustainability challenges, such as climate change. While states remain the main actors in international negotiations, non-state actors are increasingly influencing these processes through advocacy, research and implementation of sustainability initiatives.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Power Dynamics in Sustainability Governance

Sustainability policy implementation is fundamentally shaped by the distribution of power among various actors in the governance landscape. These power dynamics are crucial in determining which sustainability goals are prioritized, how resources are allocated, and how policies are formulated and implemented.

In the context of sustainability governance, power can be conceptualized in several ways, including:

First, Institutional Power: This refers to the formal authority granted to government bodies and international organizations. For example, national governments often have significant power in setting regulatory frameworks, while international institutions such as the United Nations can influence the global agenda.

Second, Economic Power: Companies and financial institutions have considerable influence due to their economic resources. Their decisions on investment, production methods and supply chain management can significantly affect sustainability outcomes.

Third, Knowledge Power: Scientific institutions, think tanks and academic bodies have power through their expertise and ability to shape the discourse around sustainability issues.

Fourth, Social Power: Civil society organizations, NGOs and grassroots movements can exert influence through public opinion, advocacy and collective action. (Angst & Huber, 2023. Ba, 2022)

The interaction of these forms of power creates a complex landscape in which sustainability goals are negotiated, contested and implemented. For example, while governments may have the formal authority to set environmental regulations, powerful industry lobbies can influence these decisions based on their economic interests. Similarly, civil society organizations can leverage public opinion to pressure governments and companies to adopt more sustainable practices. (Skritsovali, Randles, & Hannibal, 2023)

Multi-level Governance: Roles of Local, National, and International Actors

Multi-level governance is key concept in understanding how sustainability policies are developed and implemented at different scales. It recognizes that effective sustainability governance requires coordination and cooperation among actors at multiple levels, from local communities to national governments and international bodies. (United Nations Committee of Experts on Public Administration, 2024)

At the local actor level, cities and local governments play an important role in implementing sustainability initiatives. They often have direct control over areas such as urban planning, waste management and local transportation systems. Local actors can also experiment with innovative solutions that can later be scaled up. On national actors: National governments are usually responsible for setting overarching policy frameworks, allocating resources, and representing their countries in international negotiations. They play an important role in translating global sustainability goals into national policies and regulations. As for International actors, international organizations such as the United Nations, along with transnational networks and agreements, provide a platform for global cooperation on sustainability issues. They help set the global agenda, facilitate knowledge sharing and coordinate action across borders. (Hickmann, 2021)

The multi-level governance approach emphasizes that these various levels are interconnected and interdependent. For example, while international agreements such as the Paris Climate Agreement set global targets, their success depends on implementation at national and local levels. Conversely, local initiatives can inform and inspire national and international policies.

Conflicts of Interest Among Stakeholders

Efforts to achieve sustainability often exhibit conflicts of interest among various stakeholders, which can complicate policy formulation and implementation. These conflicts arise from differences in priorities, timeframes, and perceptions of the costs and benefits associated with sustainability initiatives.

Some common areas of conflict include:

Economic Growth vs Environmental Protection: Businesses and some government sectors may prioritize short-term economic growth, which can conflict with long-term environmental sustainability goals.

Social Equality vs Economic Efficiency: Policies that aim to reduce inequality may face resistance from those who prioritize market-driven solutions.

Urban Development vs. Conservation: The need for urban expansion and infrastructure development can clash with efforts to conserve natural habitats and biodiversity.

Global Priorities vs Local Priorities: International sustainability goals may not always align with local development needs or cultural practices.

Intergenerational Conflict: The current generation may be reluctant to bear the costs of sustainability actions that primarily benefit future generations. (Zimmermann, Albers, & Kenter, 2021)

Resolving these conflicts requires careful negotiation, compromise and the development of policies that balance multiple interests. Dialogue between stakeholders, participatory decision-making processes and innovative policy instruments (such as market-based mechanisms or public-private partnerships) are often used to address these conflicts.

This theoretical framework highlights the complex interactions between power dynamics, multi-level governance structures and stakeholder conflicts in shaping sustainability governance. Understanding these dynamics is critical to developing effective strategies to implement the UN 2030 Agenda and achieve the Sustainable Development Goals. This underscores the need for an adaptive, inclusive and collaborative approach to sustainability governance that can navigate the complexities of our interconnected world. (Bornemann & Weiland, 2021)

METHODOLOGY

This study uses qualitative research approach to examine the political dynamics and policy challenges in implementing the UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The methodology consists of three main components:

First, an extensive literature review was conducted, analyzing academic publications, policy documents, and international reports to establish the theoretical foundation of sustainability politics and the historical context of the SDGs.

Second, an analysis of power dynamics was conducted, focusing on four main types of power: institutional, economic, knowledge and social. This analysis explores how these power structures influence sustainability policy-making and interactions between state and non-state actors.

Finally, the research incorporates case studies, particularly those examining sustainability challenges in regions such as the Arctic, to provide concrete examples of multi-level governance approaches. This multi-faceted methodology allows for a comprehensive understanding of the complex political landscape surrounding sustainability efforts and provides insight into potential strategies to overcome obstacles to achieving the goals of the 2030 Agenda.

DISCUSSION

a. Analysis of Power Distribution in Sustainable Policy Making

The distribution of power in sustainable policymaking is a complex and dynamic process involving multiple stakeholders at different levels of government. This analysis reveals some key findings on how power is distributed and exercised in the context of implementing the UN 2030 Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Multilevel Governance and Power Dynamics

One of the most significant findings is the growing importance of multilevel governance in sustainability policymaking. The traditional top-down approach, where national governments are the main decision-makers, is being replaced by a more complex system involving actors at local, national and international levels. This shift is particularly evident in the implementation of the SDGs, which require coordinated action across multiple scales of governance. (Coopenergy Consortium, 2015)

Local governments, particularly cities, are emerging as powerful actors in sustainability governance. They often have direct control over key areas such as urban planning, waste management and local transportation systems, which are critical to achieving many of the SDGs. For example, the Covenant of Mayors initiative, which brings together more than 5,000 local and regional governments committed to implementing the EU's climate and energy goals, demonstrates the growing influence of subnational actors in shaping sustainability policy. (Coopenergy Consortium, 2015)

However, this shift towards multilevel governance also creates new challenges in terms of power distribution. While it allows for more customized and context-specific solutions, it can also lead to conflicts between different levels of government and complicate the policy-making process. The effectiveness of multilevel governance in sustainable policymaking relies heavily on the ability to create clear roles, relationships and accountability mechanisms among the various actors. (Coopenergy Consortium, 2015)

Corporate Influence and Market Power

The analysis also reveals the significant influence of corporate actors in shaping sustainability policies. Large corporations, particularly in the energy sector, wield considerable power due to their economic resources and technical expertise. This is particularly evident in the case of power companies, which play an important role in the transition to sustainable energy systems. (Tzankova, 2020)

Studies of the ten largest electricity companies in Europe and the United States show that these companies have a significant influence on the pace and direction of the energy transition. Their decisions on investing in renewable energy, phasing out fossil fuels and adopting new technologies can have far-reaching impacts on achieving climate goals and other SDGs. (Toledano, Shah, Maennling, & Lasnick, 2020)

However, the power of corporate actors is increasingly counterbalanced by increasing public awareness and demand for sustainable practices. This research shows that consumers are willing to pay a premium (on average 5.8% higher) for sustainable energy supply, indicating a shift in market dynamics that could drive more sustainable corporate behavior. (Obrecht & Denac, 2020)

b. Case Studies Illustrating Conflicts Between Business, Civil Society and Government

Case Studies I: Illustrating Conflicts Between Business, Civil Society and Government

The implementation of sustainable development policies often involves complex interactions and conflicts between various stakeholders, especially businesses, civil society

organizations, and government entities. This section discusses several case studies that highlight these conflicts and their implications for sustainable policymaking.

The transformation of Samsø Island in Denmark into a renewable energy self-sufficient community offers an interesting case study in stakeholder engagement and successful conflict resolution. In 1997, Samsø was selected as Denmark's first Renewable Energy Island, tasked with becoming energy independent within a decade. (Samsø, 2014)

The project initially faced resistance from local residents who were concerned about the visual impact of the wind turbines and their potential impact on property values. The island's tourism sector was also concerned about declining appeal. These concerns were particularly significant given Samsø's challenging demographics, with an aging population and recent job losses due to industry closures, but the project was also successful. (Smartrural27, n.d.)

The success of Samsø's renewable energy transition relies on extensive community engagement and an innovative ownership model, with around 90% of the wind turbines in Samsø owned by local residents and businesses (local ownership). This approach transforms potential opponents into stakeholders with a vested interest in the success of the project. In addition, the Energy Academy, established in 2007, serves as a hub for local residents, visitors and experts to engage in sustainable energy projects (community engagement). (Visit Samsø, 2022) This transition created new jobs, replacing jobs lost from traditional industries. For example, 130 new positions were created in connection with the energy transition (economic benefits).

Case Study 2: The Keystone XL Pipeline Controversy in North America

The Keystone XL pipeline was proposed as an expansion of the existing Keystone Pipeline System, designed to transport up to 830,000 barrels of oil per day from Alberta, Canada, to Steele City, Nebraska. (Decherney & Rafferty, 2024) The 1,179-mile (1,897 km) project is intended to provide a more direct route for Canadian sand crude oil to reach US refineries. TC Energy (formerly TransCanada) and oil industry groups argue that the pipeline will create jobs, with an estimated up to 28,000 construction positions, (BBC News, 2014) improve US energy security by reducing dependence on Middle Eastern oil and boost economic growth in Canada and the United States.

However, a coalition of environmental organizations, indigenous groups, and local communities raised concerns about increased greenhouse gas emissions from oil sands extraction, the potential risk of oil spills threatening water resources and ecosystems, and the violation of Native American treaty rights and lands. (Harvard Law School, n.d.)

The project faced changes in political direction in various US administrations, such as in the Obama Administration: Blocked the project in 2015, citing climate change concerns. In the Trump Administration: Approved the pipeline in 2017, emphasizing job creation and energy independence and in the Biden Administration: Revoked the permit on his first day in office in 2021, in line with climate goals. (BBC News, 2014)

The project faced many legal hurdles. In 2018, the Rosebud Sioux Tribe and Fort Belknap Indian Community sued the Trump administration for violations in the permitting process. A US District Court ruling in 2020 limited the scope of the presidential permit to border crossings, allowing tribes to challenge the BLM permit. (Native American Rights Fund, n.d.)

The Keystone XL controversy underscores the complexity of sustainable policymaking, particularly when dealing with projects that have far-reaching economic, environmental and social implications.

Case Study 3: Palm Oil Production in Southeast Asia

The palm oil industry in Southeast Asia, particularly in Indonesia and Malaysia, is an example of the complex interplay between economic development, environmental sustainability and social responsibility. As major producers of palm oil, these two countries account for around 84% of global production, significantly contributing to their economies.

In Indonesia, the industry generates around 4.5% of the national GDP and provides direct employment for around four million people, while Malaysia derives similar economic benefits with almost one million jobs linked to palm oil production. Smallholders also play an important role, with millions involved in oil palm cultivation on small plots of land, thus benefiting from the economic opportunities presented by the industry. (Syngenta, 2022)

However, this rapid expansion has had considerable environmental impacts. The conversion of vast rainforests into oil palm plantations has led to alarming rates of deforestation, with more than 3.7 million hectares cleared in recent years. (Asia Matters for America, n.d.) This deforestation not only contributes significantly to global greenhouse gas emissions, but also threatens biodiversity by destroying unique ecosystems and habitats. In response to these pressing environmental challenges, various sustainability initiatives have emerged. Certification standards such as the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO) and national programs such as the Indonesian Sustainable Palm Oil (ISPO) aim to promote responsible production practices. In addition, commitments to no deforestation have gained traction among major companies and manufacturers, reflecting a growing recognition of the need for sustainable practices.

Despite these initiatives, significant challenges remain. Balancing the economic benefits derived from palm oil production with the imperative to protect the environment poses a complex dilemma for governments and stakeholders. Ensuring that smallholders are included in sustainability efforts is critical, as is addressing the higher costs associated with implementing sustainable practices. In addition, consistent enforcement of sustainability policies continues to be a hurdle. (EOS, 2023)

Looking ahead, there are opportunities for improvement within the sector. The application of technology can increase agricultural efficiency and reduce environmental impact through precision farming techniques. Developing green supply chain approaches can better align economic activities with sustainability goals. International cooperation will also be crucial in comprehensively addressing these challenges.

Case Study 4: Urban Development and Green Space in Fast-Growing Cities

Many fast-growing cities around the world face conflicts between the interests of urban development and green space preservation, illustrating the tension between economic growth, environmental preservation, and community well-being.

Urban Growth and Green Space Preservation

Rapidly growing cities such as São Paulo, Brazil, and Bangalore, India, are experiencing significant pressure on their green spaces due to urbanization. In São Paulo, the city lost about 5% of its green cover between 1985 and 2015, mainly due to urban sprawl. (Environment + Energy Leader, 2023) Similarly, Bangalore experienced a 78% decrease in vegetation cover and a 79% decrease in water bodies from 1973 to 2016 due to unplanned urbanization. (Zhao et al., 2023) Stakeholder Perspective

Property Developers and Construction Companies

These entities often advocate the conversion of urban green spaces to commercial or residential development, citing housing shortages, economic opportunities, increased tax revenue for local governments.

Civil Society Groups

Environmental organizations, community associations, and urban planners argue for the preservation and expansion of urban green spaces, emphasizing their importance for biodiversity conservation, air quality improvement, climate resilience, community health and well-being. Studies have shown that urban green spaces can reduce air pollution by 24% for NO₂ and 15% for particulate matter. (Alsharif et al., 2023)

Role of Government and Innovative Policies

Local governments find themselves mediating between these competing interests, often struggling to balance development needs with environmental and quality of life concerns. Some cities have implemented innovative policies to address these conflicts:

First, Green Zoning Regulations: Cities such as Singapore have implemented a “Green Plot Ratio” system, which requires developers to replace greenery lost due to construction. (ACB Consulting Services, n.d.) - *Urban Forest Initiative:* New York City's MillionTreesNYC program aims to plant and care for one million new trees in the city's five boroughs. (Rehman et al., 2023)

Second, Green Infrastructure Integration: Portland, Oregon, has integrated green infrastructure into its urban planning, using natural systems to manage stormwater and improve air quality. (Parks Conservancy, n.d.)

c. The Role of International Institutions In Shaping Policy

International institutions play a critical role in shaping sustainable development policy globally, going beyond an advisory capacity to act as catalysts for policy change, facilitators of cooperation, and sources of expertise and resources. This section examines their multifaceted role in implementing the UN Agenda 2030 and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Agenda Setting and Norm Creation

International organizations play an important role in setting global norms around sustainable development. The adoption of the SDGs by the UN in 2015 is an example of how these institutions can create a common framework that influences national and local policy agendas around the world. Organizations such as the OECD have been influential in promoting concepts such as “green growth” and “inclusive growth,” which have been incorporated into national policy frameworks. (Lundgren et al., 2023)

Policy Coordination and Harmonization

International institutions facilitate policy coordination across countries, particularly for transboundary issues such as climate change and biodiversity loss. The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the Paris Agreement demonstrate how these institutions can foster global cooperation in the face of complex environmental challenges. Research shows that international institutions improve policy coordination through regular meetings and forums for policymakers, the development of common data sets and analytical frameworks, the facilitation of knowledge sharing and peer learning, and the creation of monitoring and reporting mechanisms. (Stanford News Service, 2017)

Technical Assistance and Capacity Building

Several international organizations provide technical assistance and capacity building to countries, especially developing countries, in implementing sustainable development policies. The World Bank offers various assistance programs aimed at helping countries achieve the SDGs. This support includes policy advice and analysis, training programs for government officials, technology transfer and innovation support, and financial assistance for sustainable development projects. (Fang & Stone, 2012)

Monitoring and Accountability

International organizations often serve as independent monitors of countries' progress towards the sustainable development goals. The UN High-level Political Forum on Sustainable Development conducts regular reviews of SDG implementation. These institutions also develop indicators and benchmarks to measure progress, such as the SDG indicator framework developed by the UN Statistical Commission. (Linós, n.d.)

Despite their influence, international institutions face several challenges such as sovereignty issues, implementation gaps, power dynamics, institutional constraints, legitimacy issues, and the lack of legitimacy.

Case Study: IMF and Sustainable Development

The International Monetary Fund's evolving role in promoting sustainable development policies illustrates how international institutions can adapt to address emerging global challenges. The IMF is increasingly incorporating sustainability considerations into its policy advice and lending programs. (Stanford News Service, 2017) Key aspects include:

1. Integration of climate change considerations into supervision activities
2. Development of tools to assess climate-related financial risks
3. Provision of capacity building support
4. Collaboration on sustainable finance initiatives

In other words, international institutions significantly influence sustainable development policies through agenda setting, policy coordination, technical assistance and monitoring. Their effectiveness depends on navigating complex power dynamics, overcoming implementation challenges and maintaining legitimacy. As the global community works towards the 2030 Agenda, the role of these institutions remains critical in shaping government solutions and promoting sustainable development around the world. (Stanford News Service, 2017; de Vries et al., 2015)

CONCLUSION

There is an urgent need to understand the political dynamics and policy challenges inherent in the implementation of the UN 2030 Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). While the SDGs provide a global framework for achieving social, economic and environmental balance, implementation is often hampered by conflicts of interest between state and non-state actors. The mismatch between the goals of business, civil society and government creates significant barriers in aligning efforts towards sustainability. In this context, international institutions have an important role to play in promoting green policies, but they also face unique challenges, especially in developing countries that must balance economic growth with environmental commitments.

Furthermore, there is a need for a shift towards multi-level governance that involves collaboration between different stakeholders. The involvement of local and private actors is becoming increasingly crucial in achieving sustainability goals. This approach not only improves policy effectiveness but also ensures that policies are responsive to the needs of diverse communities. By integrating the perspectives of various actors, we can reduce conflicts of interest and create better synergies in sustainability efforts.

Ultimately, the achievement of the 2030 Agenda hinges on the ability to strengthen cooperation among all stakeholders and implement inclusive policies that take into account multiple interests. Only through a holistic and integrated collaborative approach can we hope to address the complex challenges faced in achieving the ambitious goals of the SDGs. As such, sustainability is not just the responsibility of governments or international institutions, but a shared duty of all elements of society to ensure a better future for future generations.

REFERENCES

1. UNDP. (2024). Sustainable Development Goals. United Nations Development Programme. Retrieved November 9, 2024, from <https://www.undp.org/sustainable-development-goals>
2. United Nations. (n.d.). Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Sustainable Development Goals. <https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda>
3. Feiock, R., & Kim, S. (2021). The Political Market and Sustainability Policy. Sustainability, 13(6), 3344. <https://doi.org/10.3390/SU13063344>

4. Konold, D., & Schwietring, T. (2021). The Great Discrepancy: Political Action, Sustainable Development and Ecological Communication. *Politics and Governance*, 9(1), 131-140. <https://doi.org/10.17645/PAG.V9I1.3631>
5. Gad, U. P., Jacobsen, M., & Strandsbjerg, J. (2018, October 23). Sustainability as a political concept in the Arctic (Part I). The Arctic Institute. <https://www.thearcticinstitute.org/sustainability-politics-as-a-political-concept-in-the-arctic-part-i/>
6. Du Pisani, J. A. (2006). Sustainable development – historical roots of the concept. *Environmental Sciences*, 3(2), 83-96. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15693430600688831>
7. Greenly. (2024). What are the three pillars of sustainable development? *Greenly*. <https://greenly.earth/en-us/blog/company-guide/3-pillars-of-sustainable-development>
8. Brightest. (n.d.). The Three Pillars of Sustainability. *Brightest*. <https://www.brightest.io/three-pillars-sustainability>
9. Clune, W., & Zehnder, A. (2020). The Evolution of Sustainability Models, From Descriptive, To Strategic, To The Three Pillars Framework For Applied Solutions. *Sustainability Science*, 15, 1001-1006. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-019-00776-8>
10. Schlesinger, W. H. (2009). Thresholds Risk Prolonged Degradation. *Nature Reports Climate Change*, 3, 112-113. <https://doi.org/10.1038/climate.2009.93>
11. Chen, X., Li, C., Li, M., & Fang, K. (2021). Revisiting The Application and Methodological Extensions of The Planetary Boundaries for Sustainability Assessment. *The Science of the Total Environment*, 788, 147886. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.147886>
12. Hartman, S., & Heslinga, J. (2022). The Doughnut Destination: Applying Kate Raworth's Doughnut Economy Perspective to Rethink Tourism Destination Management. *Journal of Tourism Futures*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jtf-01-2022-0017>
13. MIT Sloan. (2024). Doughnut Economics: 4 Questions for Industry Leaders. *MIT Sloan School of Management*. <https://mitsloan.mit.edu/ideas-made-to-matter/doughnut-economics-4-questions-industry-leaders>
14. Warnecke, T. (2023). Operationalizing the Doughnut Economy: An Institutional Perspective. *Journal of Economic Issues*, 57, 643-653. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00213624.2023.2202570>
15. Huber, J. (2000). Towards Industrial Ecology: Sustainable Development as A Concept Of Ecological Modernization. *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning*, 2(4), 1-28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15239080050118530>
16. Leach, M. (2015). Earth in crisis: The challenge of sustainability. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 55, 1-10. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26162475>
17. Jorgenson, A. K., & Clark, B. (2016). Are The Economy and The Environment Decoupling? A Comparative International Study, 1960–2005. *The Journal of Politics*, 78(1), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1086/665990>
18. Weiss, J., Zhu, D., Enriquez, M., May, P., Nascimento, E., Pengue, W., & Shmelev, S. (2017). UN Environmental Policy: Non-State Actors, Trends, and The Regulatory Role of The State. *Journal of Political Ecology*, 24, 1013-1037. <https://doi.org/10.2458/V24I1.20980>
19. Hickmann, T., & Elsässer, J. (2020). New Alliances In Global Environmental Governance: How Intergovernmental Treaty Secretariats Interact With Non-State Actors To Address Transboundary Environmental Problems. *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics*, 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10784-020-09493-5>
20. Lashitew, A. (2021). Corporate Uptake of the Sustainable Development Goals: Mere Greenwashing or an Advent of Institutional Change? *Journal of International Business Policy*, 4, 184-200. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s42214-020-00092-4>
21. Hickmann, T., & Elsässer, J. P. (2020). New Alliances In Global Environmental Governance: How Intergovernmental Treaty Secretariats Interact With Non-State Actors To Address Transboundary Environmental Problems. *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics*, 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10784-020-09493-5>
22. Shijin, W., Wenli, Q., & Qiaoxia, L. (2023). Key pathways to achieve sustainable development goals in three polar regions. *Sustainability*, 15(2), 1735. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15021735>

23. Nikitina, E., & Pozhilova, N. (2022). Sustainable Development Governance in The Arctic. *World Economy and International Relations*, 66(10), 93-101. <https://doi.org/10.20542/0131-2227-2022-66-10-93-101>
24. Angst, M., & Huber, M. (2023). Who Is Satisfied With Their Inclusion In Polycentric Sustainability Governance? Networks, Power, and Procedural Justice in Swiss Wetlands. *Policy Studies Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/psj.12515>
25. Ba, Y. (2022). Power Dynamics and Corporate Power in Governance Processes: Evidence From U.S. Environmental Governance Systems. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 52(3), 206-220. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02750740211055221>
26. Skritsovali, K., Randles, S., & Hannibal, C. (2023). Missing Attention to Power Dynamics in Collaborative Multi-Actor Business Models for Sustainability. *Sustainability*, 15(3), 2022. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15032022>
27. United Nations Committee of Experts on Public Administration. (2024). CEPA Strategy Guidance Note: Multi-Level Governance. <https://unpan.un.org/sites/default/files/Events/Events%202024/Strategy%20note%20multi-level%20governance%20Feb%202024.pdf>
28. Hickmann, T. (2021). Locating Cities and Their Governments in Multi-Level Sustainability Governance. *Politics and Governance*, 9(1), 211-220. <https://doi.org/10.17645/PAG.V9I1.3616>
29. Zimmermann, A., Albers, N., & Kenter, J. (2021). Deliberating Our Frames: How Members of Multi-Stakeholder Initiatives Use Shared Frames to Tackle Within-Frame Conflicts Over Sustainability Issues. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 178, 757-782. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-021-04789-1>
30. Bornemann, B., & Weiland, S. (2021). The UN 2030 Agenda And The Quest For Policy Integration: A Literature Review. *Politics and Governance*, 9(1), 96-107. <https://doi.org/10.17645/PAG.V9I1.3654>
31. Coopenergy Consortium. (2015). *A Guide to Multi-Level Governance For Local And Regional Public Authorities*. <https://www.local2030.org/library/210/A-Guide-to-Multi-level-Governance-For-Local-and-Regional-Public-Authorities.pdf>
32. Tzankova, Z. (2020). Public Policy Spillovers From Private Energy Governance: New Opportunities For The Political Acceleration Of Renewable Energy Transitions. *Energy Research and Social Science*, 67, 101504. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2020.101504>
33. Toledano, P., Shah, A., Maennling, N., & Lasnick, R. J. (2020). Electric utility alignment with the SDGs & the Paris Climate Agreement: A scoping study. https://ccsi.columbia.edu/sites/default/files/content/docs/ELECTRIC-UTILITY-ALIGNMENT-WITH-THE-SDGs-THE-PARIS-CLIMATE-AGREEMENT_0.pdf
34. Obrecht, A., & Denac, D. (2020). Public Perception and Expert Assessment of Energy Supply Networks: Integrating Social Dimensions Into Sustainable Energy Supply Chains. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 114, 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2020.08.002>
35. Samsø. (2014). Europe's Renewable Energy Island. Retrieved from https://www.renewable-ei.org/en/images/pdf/20140411/Samsø_Europes_Renewable_Energy_Island.pdf
36. Smartrural27. (n.d.). Samsø. Retrieved November 9, 2024, from <https://www.smartrural27.eu/village/samsø/>
37. isit Samsø. (2022). Energy Academy. Retrieved November 9, 2024, from <https://www.visitsamsøe.dk/en/inspiration/energy-academy/>
38. Decherney, S. and Rafferty, . John P. (2024, October 21). Keystone Pipeline. *Encyclopedia Britannica*. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Keystone-pipeline>
39. BBC News. (2014, November 18). Keystone Pipeline: What You Need to Know. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-30103078>
40. Harvard Law School. (n.d.). Keystone XL Pipeline. Environmental & Energy Law Program. Retrieved November 9, 2024, from <https://eelp.law.harvard.edu/tracker/keystone-xl-pipeline/>
41. Native American Rights Fund. (n.d.). Keystone XL pipeline. Retrieved November 9, 2024, from <https://narf.org/cases/keystone/>

42. Syngenta. (2022). A systems approach to sustainability of the palm oil sector in Southeast Asia through the lens of innovation. Retrieved November 9, 2024, from https://www.syngenta.com/sites/syngenta/files/2022-08/palm_oil_report.pdf
43. Asia Matters for America. (n.d.). How a Green Supply Chain of Palm Oil in Southeast Asia Matters for the United States. Retrieved November 9, 2024, from <https://asiamattersforamerica.org/articles/how-a-green-supply-chain-of-palm-oil-in-southeast-asia-matters-for-the-united-states>
44. EOS. (2023). *Palm oil in Malaysia, Indonesia, and Thailand*. Retrieved November 9, 2024, from <https://eos.com/blog/palm-oil-malaysia-indonesia-thailand/>
45. Environment + Energy Leader. (2023). Dutch agency explores preserving green spaces amid urban expansion. Retrieved November 9, 2024, from <https://www.environmentenergyleader.com/stories/dutch-agency-explores-preserving-green-spaces-amid-urban-expansion>
46. Zhao, Y., Zhang, H., & Wang, Y. (2023). Green space well-being in rapidly urbanizing cities: A case study of Jinan, China. PMC. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10490893/>
47. Alsharif, A., Alshahrani, M., & Alhassan, I. (2023). The importance of urban green spaces in the development of smart cities. *Frontiers in Environmental Science*, 11, Article 1206372. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2023.1206372>
48. ACB Consulting Services. (n.d.). The Benefits of Green Space in Urban Areas. Retrieved November 9, 2024, from <https://www.acbconsultingservices.com/sustainable-construction-project-management/the-benefits-of-green-space-in-urban-areas/>
49. Rehman, A. A., Aziz, A., Mushahid, A. M., Majeed, M., Albanai, J. A., Almohamad, H., & Abdo, H. G. (2023). Quantifying the impacts of urbanization on urban green: Evidence from Maga City, Lahore Pakistan. *Environmental Sciences*, 1(1), Article 169. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43621-023-00169-z>
50. Parks Conservancy. (n.d.). Growing expertise in green space cities. Retrieved November 9, 2024, from <https://www.parksconservancy.org/park-e-ventures-article/growing-expertise-green-space-cities>
51. Lundgren, M., Tallberg, J., Sommerer, T., & Squatrito, T. (2023). When are International Organizations Responsive to Policy Problems? *International Studies Quarterly*, 67(3), Article sqad045. <https://doi.org/10.1093/isq/sqad045>
52. Fang, S., & Stone, R. W. (2012). International Organizations as Policy Advisors: A Game-Theoretic Model of Persuasion. *International Studies Quarterly*, 56(4), 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.1093/isq/sqas045>
53. Linos, K. (n.d.). How can international organizations shape national welfare states? Evidence from compliance with EU directives. Retrieved November 9, 2024, from <http://aei.pitt.edu/9043/1/LinosCompliance.pdf>
54. Stanford News Service. (2017, July 10). Stanford Scholar Examines International Institutions. Retrieved November 9, 2024, from <https://news.stanford.edu/stories/2017/07/stanford-scholar-examines-international-institutions>
55. de Vries, J. C. M. P., van den Berg, M., & van der Meer, E. (2015). Urban Green Spaces and Health: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *Nature Communications*, 6(1), Article 545. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms645>