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This paper was prepared by The Regional Bureau for Arab States (RBAS) / The Sub-Regional Response Facility (SRF) for the Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan (3RP) Inter-Sector Coordinators’ Meeting, which took place between the 8th and 9th of July 2019. Its aim was to present pathways for alignment of the 3RP Syria crisis response to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The synergies between the 3RP and the SDGs allow the 3RP to harness the power of the SDGs global frameworks to strengthen the response to the Syria refugee crisis and its resilience component.

¹ The views expressed in this working paper those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the United Nations/ UNDP
Introduction

The 2030 Agenda is a transformational agenda, universal in scope, and uniquely ambitious in its aspiration to ‘leave no one behind and to reach the furthest behind first’. It seeks to eradicate poverty in all its forms and to promote shared prosperity while protecting people and the planet. However, fulfilling these aspirations is a daunting challenge around the world, particularly in the Arab region where recurrent and protracted conflicts and crises have caused major development setbacks and led to massive and protracted displacements. Climate change and environmental vulnerabilities are compounding and exacerbating these challenges, highlighting the need for comprehensive, integrated responses to mitigate the impacts of conflicts and crises, alongside commensurate efforts to tackle the various and interrelated root causes of vulnerability and fragility and build long term resilience.

Resilience is the ability of individuals, households, communities, cities, institutions, systems and societies to prevent, resist, absorb, adapt, respond and recover positively, efficiently and effectively when faced with a wide range of risks, while maintaining an acceptable level of functioning and without compromising long-term prospects for sustainable development, peace and security, human rights and well-being for all. CEB-approved paper on Risk and Resilience (CEB, 2017).

“Resilience is the ability of individuals, households, communities, and societies to withstand shocks and stresses, recover from such stresses, and work with national and local government institutions to achieve transformational change for sustainability.” UNDG Position Paper, 2014 “A Resilience-Based Development Response to the Syria crisis”

Resilience has emerged as an important agenda at both the regional and global levels. The concept has impacted policy thinking and development, within and beyond the UN, changing approaches in the areas of food security\(^2\), climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction\(^6\), urbanization\(^5\), health and wellbeing\(^7\), macro-economics\(^8\), and more recently in the spheres of conflict and fragility, protracted displacements, peace and state-building\(^8\). Remarkably, the High-Level Panel on Humanitarian Financing\(^9\) explicitly called for a “systematic investment in resilience-building in countries experiencing all kinds of shocks”, warning that “without investing to reduce fragility where it is most profound, the humanitarian bill will continue to rise” and eradicating poverty will only remain a far cry.

\(^2\) This definition of resilience is taken from the 2017 CEB-approved paper on Risk and Resilience (CEB, 2017). It broadens the concept by placing a greater emphasis on proactively preventing or resisting crisis
\(^3\) The Rome-Based Agencies’ Collaboration on Strengthening Resilience For Food Security And Nutrition (2015);
\(^4\) As reflected of the numerous existing global and regional initiatives and reference documents related to resilient development, disaster risk reduction, and climate change adaptation. At the global level, these include: (i) Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (2015-2030); (ii) Paris Agreement on Climate Change (2015); (iii) UN Plan of Action \(\backslash\) Disaster Risk Reduction for Resilience (2016); (iv) UN Climate Resilience Initiative “Anticipate, Absorb, Reshape” (2015)
\(^5\) https://citiesprogramme.org/focus-area/urban-resilience/
\(^7\) http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/Poverty%20Reduction/Inclusive%20Development/Towards%20Human%20Resilience/Towards_SustainingMDGProgress_Ch7.pdf
\(^8\) See: https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/economics/strengthening-economic-resilience_6b748a4b-en
Resilience building is a central mechanism to making progress on the 2030 agenda for sustainable development and the SDGs.

The 2030 Agenda encapsulates an increased emphasis on systemic risk prevention and resilience building through increased investments in inclusive and sustainable development cutting across development, humanitarian and peace realms, including addressing inequalities, strengthening institutions and ensuring that development strategies are risk informed. The Agenda explicitly recognized resilience-building as a major pathway to eradicate poverty (SDG1) through its holistic Target 1.5 “By 2030, build the resilience of the poor and those in vulnerable situations, and reduce their exposure and vulnerability to climate-related extreme events and other economic, social and environmental shocks and disasters”.

Therefore, the international community has been exploring how risk-informed, resilience-based approaches to development planning and programming can effectively support the achievement of the SDGs (through sustaining progress/avoiding reversals), particularly so in fragile and crisis-affected contexts. Under the broader UNDG SDG Mainstreaming and Acceleration (＆) Policy Support (MAPS) response Framework for the implementation of the SDGs, UNDP has been working on a framework to address the implementation of the SDGs in fragility contexts10. Likewise, the SDG Acceleration toolkit, developed as part of the UNSDG MAPS, contains a full module on “Risk-informed planning tools”11 to help countries map their vulnerabilities, as “key efforts to enhance resilience to risk and sustain momentum on the SDGs over time”. Furthermore, the 2017 UNDAF Guidance12 underscores ‘sustainability and resilience’ as a core, cross-cutting programming principle for addressing the root causes of multidimensional poverty13.

As shown in this paper, many post conflict countries in the world, including in the Arab Region (e.g. Somalia, Iraq, Sudan) have already started to use the SDGs as a framework to align their national development plans. In many instances, these plans integrate actions to tackle both humanitarian and more structural challenges and support transitions towards long-term recovery, and resilient and sustainable development. This sends a clear signal that the ‘apparent’ divide between resilience programming and the SDGs needs to be reconsidered and more efforts should be made to anchor resilience-building action onto national SDG implementation frameworks.

As it turns out, efforts have been made in some countries – particularly in countries facing protracted crises - to integrate resilience-building priorities and the SDGs in UN assistance plans (UN Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAFs)/UN Strategic Frameworks (UNSFs). This goes along with the recognition that the 2030 Agenda and its overarching aspiration to “Leave No One Behind” and “Reach the furthest behind first”, provides an important framework for strengthening synergies between humanitarian and development action.

This is also in line with the New Way of Working (NWOW) that emerged from the World Humanitarian Summit (2016) and charts a clear pathway for development and humanitarian partners, along with

---

10 http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/SDGs/English/SDG_Implementation_in_Fragile_States.pdf
11 https://undp.org/2030-agenda/sdg-acceleration-toolkit/guidance/
national and local partners, to support the implementation of the 2030 Agenda and the SDGs, through tailored SDG-relevant ‘collective outcomes’ (see Box 1).

**Box 1 - The Humanitarian Development Nexus and the SDGs**

“The volume, cost and length of humanitarian assistance provision over the past ten years has grown dramatically, in large part due to the protracted nature of crises (...). Such a trend has given new urgency to the long-standing discussion around better connectivity between humanitarian and development efforts. At the same time, the adoption of the 2030 Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) set out not just to meet needs, but to reduce risk, vulnerability and overall levels of need, providing a reference frame for both humanitarian and development actors to contribute to the common vision of a future in which no one is left behind” (....) “In some settings, identifying the link between collective outcomes and national plans to pursue the SDGs, in areas such as nutrition, education, health, and others, can offer a clear means to align short- and medium-term programming to bring the most vulnerable onto the path of development progress.”(OCHA, 2017 New Way of Working)

“Using the SDGs to align strategies and actions” is relevant “Because of the broad scope of the SDGs, which encompasses areas that are critical to all the components of post-conflict interventions, from humanitarian action to rebuilding the basic capacity of the State to longer-term development strategies. The SDGs therefore provide a convenient common framework where strategies at different levels can be anchored” World Public Sector Report, 2018.

However, there is scope for a more in-depth articulation between resilience-building action and the SDGs. In this regard, it would seem particularly important to give more consideration to the extent to which the SDG framework, across its 169 targets and 232 core indicators and particularly SDG 1.5, could, as such, frame a course of action for building long-term resilience and tracking resilience building efforts in countries affected by crisis and fragility.

**Bridging the divide between Resilience-based and SDG-based development planning and programming.**

The present paper is an attempt to reconcile this apparent divide between resilience responses to crises and the SDGs. It does not intend to impose any kind of standard in approaching the SDGs from a ‘resilience lens’ or approaching resilience-building from a ‘SDG lens’ but rather, it seeks to provide a basis for discussion, with some insights on implications for resilience planning and programming in crisis affected countries in the Arab region.

---

14 Bridging humanitarian and development action by committing to resilience, Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), and other collective outcomes was indeed a central call of the World Humanitarian Summit in Istanbul, 2016. The UN Secretary-General urged humanitarian and development actors “to transcend their traditional silos” and work together “towards agreed collective outcomes over a multi-year time horizon” (UN Doc. A/70/709, 2016: 33)


16 See Chapter 7 p.144

17 By 2030, build the resilience of the poor and those in vulnerable situations, and reduce their exposure and vulnerability to climate-related extreme events and other economic, social and environmental shocks and disasters
Conceptually, the paper builds upon pioneer work by ODI\(^\text{18}\), which explored the extent to which various SDG targets and indicators resonate with resilience-building imperatives. Given the methodological and practical challenges surrounding the measurement of “resilience”\(^\text{19}\) as an outcome, the paper looks at the ‘HOW’ of resilience-building and vulnerability reduction across their economic, social, environmental and institutional dimensions and identifies linkages with a set of specific SDG process targets. The underlying Theory of Change (as implicit in the ODI paper\(^\text{20}\)) is that building a comprehensive set of individual, community and institutional/systemic resilience capacities, alongside efforts to reduce exposure, should help deliver resilient-sustainable development outcomes, despite increases in shocks and stresses.\(^\text{21}\)

**Figure 1: Securing Resilient Outcomes despite shocks and stresses**

A. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the SDGs: An Agenda for Resilience?

Sustainable development requires sustainable societies, and resilience-building is a critical part of the equation, calling for structural processes and effective solutions to address the vulnerability of people, economies and the planet. As noted earlier, by adopting the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, Member States recognized resilience-building as a major pathway to eradicate poverty (SDG1) through its holistic Target 1.5 “By 2030, build the resilience of the poor and those in vulnerable

---


\(^{19}\) A Resilience Measurement Technical Working Group (RM-TWG), with representation from a variety of donors, multilateral agencies, academic institutions, consulting firms and INGOs, was formed in June of 2013 and has developed useful conceptual frameworks and analytical tools for measuring resilience, but its work has made most progress in the context of food security interventions, where the well-being outcome at the household level is well-defined and measurable. See papers by the RM-TWG at the Food Security Information Network [http://www.fsincop.net/topics/resilience-measurement/outupts/en](http://www.fsincop.net/topics/resilience-measurement/outupts/en)

\(^{20}\) Op.cit

situations, and reduce their exposure and vulnerability to climate-related extreme events and other economic, social and environmental shocks and disasters.”

Intrinsically linking with this core, people-centered resilience target, various other SDG goals and targets call for building resilient systems. The language of resilience is explicitly used under SDG 2 on promoting resilient agricultural practices (target 2.4). SDG 9 calls for investing in resilient infrastructure (targets 9.1 and 9.a); SDG 11 for building resilient cities and human settlements (targets 11.b); SDG 13 increasing resilience to climate-related hazards and disasters triggered by natural hazards (targets 13.1 and 13.2) whilst SDG 14 underscores strengthening the resilience of marine and coastal ecosystems (target 14.2).

However, many other SDG targets can drive resilience across a broad spectrum of risks, shocks and stresses and at various levels, even if the language of resilience is not explicitly used in the definition of the goal or target. The ODI paper points out the limitations of the proposed global indicator to monitor the core resilience target of the SDG framework (SDG 1.5) (i.e. the number of people affected by hazardous events, disaggregated by age and sex), noting that while this is an important indicator, it clearly does not address resilience-building and vulnerability reduction: “There is a need to focus on positive attributes such as capacity, governance, resources and social safety nets, along with access to and availability of systems and services”. This is where the recent literature on resilience and particularly the analysis of resilience capacities can further help connect the dots between the 2030 Agenda, the SDGs and the emerging resilience agenda.

A.1 Tracing Resilience Building commitments across the SDG targets

As mentioned earlier, the working assumption (underlying ‘Theory of Change’), adopted in this paper, is that building a comprehensive set of individual, community and institutional-systemic resilience capacities should help deliver resilience-sustainable development outcomes despite increases in shocks and stresses and/or through reducing exposure to these.

Figure 2:

This approach also underpins, for instance, the “Dynamic Resilience Wheel” developed by the

---

22 Target 1.5 is an extremely broad target in terms of the scope of shocks and stresses to be addressed, broader than targets that apply only to ‘climate-related hazards and natural disasters’ (target 13.5) or ‘disasters’ (target 11.5 – somewhat ambiguous, but generally interpreted as natural hazards, possibly including technological hazards). This is similar to target 13.1, but significantly broader than target 11.5, which requires states only to reduce human and economic losses.
Lutheran World Relief\textsuperscript{23}. The model provides a dynamic snapshot of the key components of resilience thinking in development environments, whereby resilience capacities enable the achievement of development outcomes (layer 5) by allowing vulnerable systems to more effectively absorb, adapt, transform in the face of shocks and stressors (layer 6).

In other words, if a country succeeds in building resilience capacities in order to reduce poverty, and sustain growth, improve well-being, and preserve the environment, despite shocks and stresses, then it is clearly becoming more “resilient” and/or less “exposed”.

\textbf{A.2 The Resilience Capacity Conundrum}

While definitions vary greatly, the most recent thinking on resilience generally defines resilience as a set of interrelated capacities to anticipate, mitigate, plan for, respond to, learn from, take advantage of, and to the extent possible, influence the occurrence of different kinds shocks or stresses\textsuperscript{24}.

These capacities are commonly classified as absorptive, adaptive, anticipative/anticipatory, preventive and transformative\textsuperscript{24} (see Box 2).

\textbf{Box 2 – Defining “Resilience capacities”}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{Absorptive capacity}: The ability to take protective action and ‘bounce back’ after a shock using predetermined responses to preserve and restore essential basic structures and functions. It involves anticipating, planning, coping and recovering from shocks and stresses (Cutter et al., 2008; Béné et al., 2012; Oxfam 2017).
  \item \textbf{Adaptive capacity}: The ability to make incremental adjustments, modifications or changes to the characteristics of systems and actions to moderate potential changes, in order to continue functioning without major qualitative changes in function or structural identity (OECD, 2014; Inter-governmental Panel on Climate Change, 2012; Béné et al., 2012; Oxfam 2017).
  \item \textbf{Anticipative capacity}: The ability to take early action in anticipation of a potential threat to reduce its potential negative impacts; including through early warning, and forecast-based financing (A2R, 2017).
  \item \textbf{Preventative capacity}: The ability to implement activities and take measures to reduce existing risks and avoid the creation of new risks. While certain risks cannot be eliminated, preventative capacity aims at reducing vulnerability and exposure in such contexts where, as a result, the risk is reduced (adapted from the OIEWG, 2016).
  \item \textbf{Transformative capacity}: The ability to create a fundamentally new system when ecological, economic or social structures make the existing system untenable (OECD, 2014; Walker et al., 2004). Transformative capacity is required when the change needed goes beyond the system’s anticipatory, absorptive, adaptive and preventative abilities and when there is recognition that ecological, economic or social structures keep people trapped in a vicious circle of poverty, disasters and conflict and make the existing system unsustainable (ActionAid, 2016).
\end{itemize}

Source: UN Common Guidance on Helping Build Resilient Societies (first draft, 2018 p.12)

\textsuperscript{23} Source: https://www.preventionweb.net/publications/view/53570

\textsuperscript{24} However, boundaries between what is qualified absorptive, adaptive, transformative and anticipatory are sometimes quite porous...
These capacities are interconnected and can be strengthened at multiple levels (individual, household, community, state and institutions, systems). Absorptive and adaptive capacities can often be built or strengthened in the short or medium-term (e.g. disaster preparedness).

Transformative capacity development however typically involves system adjustments that require extended periods of time to materialize (e.g. institutional and behavioral, changes in mindsets) to address the root causes of risk and vulnerability. For instance, OXFAM (2017) underscores 6 transformative pathways to resilience: accountable governing, informing, forward and flexible planning, learning and innovation, securing and enhancing livelihoods, and gender justice and empowerment. Generally, (transformative) capacities of actors to participate in governance processes and to transform societal structures themselves in a way that foster individual welfare and sustainable societal robustness in the event of present and future crises are seen as key dimensions of social resilience (Keck & Sakdapolrak, 2013, p. 13).

**Figure 2: Resilience Capacity Continuum**

A resilient outcome can be considered as the result of these three sets of capacities. These can either be tapped upon/developed concomitantly as part of a “contiguum”, whereby absorptive, adaptive, preventive and transformative capacities are built at the same time or, as illustrated in Figure 2, as part of a continuum with – somehow- transformation as the desired goal. Note that anticipatory

---

capacities - defined as the ability to anticipate and reduce the impact of shocks through preparedness and planning - somehow cut across the other three.

However, as noted by a recent UNDP/ESCAP report (2017): "Building anticipatory capacity is not enough and ultimately requires translating information and knowledge into action, and needs to take social, cultural and gender considerations into account".

From Concepts to Practice

It is important to note that there is no exhaustive list of resilience capacities-capacity strengthening interventions and policies established for each of these four categories because resilience is not a sector and is highly context specific and time-sensitive.29

However, a number of recent contributions provide useful insights and concrete examples of such capacities across various ‘resilience realms’, that can help trace resilience building commitments across the SDG framework.

Capacities for Resilient Livelihoods Systems: For instance, the Livelihood-centered Resilience Building framework developed by the OECD in 2014 suggests a set of absorptive, adaptive and transformative resilience-building actions for each building block of livelihoods assets (financial, human, social, natural, physical political).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absorptive capacity</th>
<th>Adaptive capacity</th>
<th>Transformative capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support access to markets to increase the sale of agricultural/livestock products</td>
<td>Better access to micro-credit and revolving funds, to encourage risk taking for new incoming generating activities</td>
<td>Open a formal insurance market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting up and linking savings groups, pooling of community goods, mutual solidarity banks</td>
<td>Introduction of e-banking mechanisms</td>
<td>Social protection systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of displaced children into new schools in host communities</td>
<td>Increase understanding of the rights of the child (including education)</td>
<td>Simplify and explain the tax law to limit corruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of traditional medicine</td>
<td>Establish formal health insurance schemes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social support groups to help families pay for health care</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide free education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decentralise the healthcare system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale or slaughter of livestock</td>
<td>Diversification of livestock holdings</td>
<td>Reform of land tenure law: assuring proper planning and synergies with different land users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving to a more secure area</td>
<td>Animal vaccination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaccination</td>
<td>Support to the REDD+ process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reforestation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting and securing national park boundaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen community committees in charge of infrastructure maintenance</td>
<td>Introduce new technologies: efficient combustion</td>
<td>Advocate for greater decentralisation of national budgets and systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure community participation in planning processes for community infrastructure</td>
<td>fireplaces, recycling and improved management of waste, alternative energy sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promote civic education in schools, including a component on energy, environmental protection and climate change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advocate for greater decentralisation of national budgets and systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better transparency and accountability in community decision-making</td>
<td>Support community organizations to participate in local power structures, including greater inclusion of women and different ethnic groups</td>
<td>Advocate to improve election transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support and strengthen local initiatives for community meetings, and for land conflict resolution</td>
<td>Educate voters, strengthen democratic culture, and increase dialogue between political parties</td>
<td>Educate citizens about democratic principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of mediation and peace committees</td>
<td></td>
<td>Advocate for the respect and the reform of land-related legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community networks for the protection of children, youth patrols to prevent theft and rape</td>
<td>Training of peace committees and other groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion of shared community spaces and natural resources</td>
<td>Support the restoration of formal justice systems and promote trust in these mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strengthen the role of women in community governance</td>
<td>Reinforce women in leadership positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Remove the stigmatisation of those suffering from rape and other critical protection incidents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OECD, 201430

29 WHO (2017) notes for instance that in childhood and adolescence, family related processes determine resilience to a large degree. In adulthood and later life, it may be affected by entrenched patterns of coping acquired over time, physiological stress responses and social relationships

Thus, access to micro-credit is identified as a means to strengthening **adaptive capacities**, whilst the development of insurance markets and social protection, are underscored as **building transformative capacities**. In the realm of physical capital assets, environmental education, recycling and management of waste and use of alternative energy sources are identified as ways to strengthen adaptive capacities, whilst decentralization of infrastructure financing support **transformation capacities**.

**Resilience capacities for Food Security:** The Integrated Resilience Framework developed by Tango International (2013)\(^3\) combines elements from livelihoods, disaster risk reduction (DRR) and climate change (CC) approaches to address the underlying causes of vulnerability to food insecurity. The framework emphasizes **individual adaptive capacities**, as the ability to access diverse array of productive assets (e.g., natural resources, land, credit, markets), improved human capital (e.g. health, education, nutrition) and the ability to participate in diverse and equitable social networks (e.g., self-help groups, savings groups). It also includes the ability to access and utilize information on changing market and climatic conditions, as well as openness to new practices (e.g., sustainable agriculture practices, value-added practices) and technological innovation (e.g., cell phones, cash transfers).

Within the same framework, **transformative capacities** are associated with the **availability and access to formal safety nets, early warning systems, improved information and communications systems, laws/policies and other governance mechanisms that promote gender-equity, peace building and conflict resolution mechanisms, and sustainable natural resource management practices**. Likewise, Bower et al. (2016)\(^4\) underscore **absorptive capacities** as access to such as bonding social capital, informal safety nets, assets, insurance, and the presence of a disaster preparedness program, and **adaptive capacities** as aspirations and confidence to adapt to changing conditions, exposure to information, and access to human and social capital and economic capital, whilst individual “**transformative capacities**” are characterized as access to formal safety nets, infrastructure, basic services, and markets.

**Capacities for Resilient Health Outcomes:** Looking at the connections between resilience, health and the SDG Agenda, a recent publication by WHO\(^5\) underscores the availability/development of health-supportive environments (such as health-protective and promoting resources in social and physical

---


\(^4\) Tom Bower, Carrie Presnall, Tim Frankenberger, Lisa Smith, Vicky Brown and Mark Langworthy Resilience Capacities and Response Trajectories Over Time ILRI, 2016 on behalf of the Technical Consortium for Building Resilience in the Horn of Africa, a project of the CGIAR.

settings, cultural, economic and political resources necessary for the health and well-being of the population) as key to resilience building. It also points to the importance of health systems shifts towards “people-centered care”, that is towards transformative systems that engage patients in co-designing and self-managing their treatment and healing processes. The aim of this is to help patients get a better control of their life and become more confident to be able to manage long-term chronic conditions, as well as efforts to engage communities in shaping health policy and the delivery of health services. Stressing the inter-sectorality of health outcomes and action and resilience-capacity building efforts, the WHO paper also considers institutional capacities to protect population health from climate change, and capacities of educational systems to promote health and influence children’s resilience capacities. It also flags the resilience-building features of urban systems that provide equitable access to parks and green open spaces, arguing that people living in such inclusive environments are likely to be more resilient since they “are more likely to know their neighbors, show more solidarity, be more trusting, and have higher levels of participation in politics and better relationships with formal governmental institutions, compared with people living in other areas”34.

Resilience Capacities in protracted ‘refugee crises’: Within the specific context of the multi-sectoral response to the Syrian crisis, and specifically the Refugee and Resilience Plan (3RP), Sherif and allii (2016)35 analyzed various dimensions of resilience capacities at individual, community and institutional levels.

At the individual level, access of affected populations and households to education, vocational training, life-long skill development, livelihoods/ opportunities and psychological support, were identified as core dimensions of absorptive and adaptive capacities. Transformation capacities are associated with additional “action on values, perceptions, attitudinal and cultural issues36 that are at the root of vulnerability, as a prerequisite for lasting social change.” At community level, absorptive capacities may relate to the presence of ‘solidarity networks’ and conflict management mechanisms, whilst adaptive capacities are related to the development of approaches for collective decision-making37.

Transformative capacities operate at the level of values, culture and perceptions and the interface between community and institutions. At the institutional level, absorptive and adaptive resilience capacities include the capacity of national and particularly local institutions to identify and analyze risks, anticipate and respond to emergencies, develop effective response plans and critically whilst transformation underscores the introduction of more ‘systemic changes’ as well as

36 For instance, programs that address taboos about girls working outdoors, engage vulnerable young people in thinking about the challenges facing their communities and have them team up with local experts to finding innovative solutions.
37 For instance, engaging refugee youth and women in decision making process within camps, community dialogue on gender based violence.
capacities to win the trust of communities, elicit their genuine participation, create and maintain unity in the face of various threats.

**Resilience, Gender and Social Exclusion:** The need to address the role of social exclusion and gender inequality in enhancing resilience is increasingly recognized. This goes along with the need to carefully deal with the socio-economic and political dimensions of resilience-building.

In a recent blog on the nexus between gender equality, women’s empowerment and resilience within the framework of Canada’s international assistance policy, Angélica V. Ospina (June 27, 2017) mapped out 6 key gender-related pillars of Resilience Building.

The **GEWE pillar** argues that strengthening women’s organizations and movements contributes to self-organization thereby enhancing the provision of services to women and girls and increasing the robustness of local institutions;

The **Human Dignity** pillar emphasizes access to health care, nutrition and education in humanitarian settings as a cornerstone of inclusion, needed to sustain long-term change;

The **Inclusive Growth** Pillar underscores increasing women’s access to economic resources and opportunities, which is essential for livelihoods diversification and ensures that women have the flexibility and the autonomy needed to adapt to changing circumstances;

The **Environmental & Climate pillar** prioritizes fostering women’s entrepreneurship and women-led initiatives to address environmental challenges—including the use of renewable energy—as a way to increase experimentation and learning, which are both essential for resilience.

Under the **Inclusive Governance Pillar**, the framework stresses that the participation of women in positions of influence can act as a precursor of change across scales—community, regional, national—and improve institutional robustness.

---

Under the *Peace and Security Pillar*, it recommends ensuring the participation of women in peacebuilding and post-conflict reconstruction. This is key for long-lasting prosperity, ensuring that women help shape the design and implementation of security strategies.

**'Macro and sectoral Policies for Resilience Capacity Building’**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of resilience capacity</th>
<th>Macroeconomic and sectoral policies</th>
<th>Targeted policies and social protection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anticipatory</td>
<td>- Education policies</td>
<td>- Early warning systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Information and communications policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive</td>
<td>- Macroeconomic policies (e.g. fiscal, monetary and exchange rate policies)</td>
<td>- Social security policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Sectoral policies (e.g. agriculture)</td>
<td>- Targeted price subsidies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Climate change and disaster risk reduction policies</td>
<td>- Public health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Access to microfinance schemes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Minimum wage and labour market policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absorptive</td>
<td>- Migration and remittance policies</td>
<td>- Social protection programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Social policies</td>
<td>- Food-for-work programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformative</td>
<td>- Climate change policy</td>
<td>- Women’s empowerment policies and programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Energy policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Forestry policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The recent UNDP/ESCWA report (2017) on “Transformation towards sustainable and resilient societies in Asia Pacific” brings an interesting a ‘macro-policy perspective’ to resilience building capacities, with a particular focus on macro/sectoral policies and more targeted policies, including social protection. On the macro-policy side, **adaptive capacities** are associated with prudent macro-fiscal management (the management of macroeconomic vulnerabilities); mainstreaming risks (disaster, climate) into national planning and budgeting; Social/Social protection policies and the management of migration which is the main focus of **absorptive capacity development**.

Source: UNDP/ESCAP Report - Adapted from Béné and others, 2012, and Tanner and others, 2017

**Transformation** is, for instance, associated with shifts in development pathways (e.g. policies in support of energy transitions, climate change adaptation and mitigation), gender equality and women’s empowerment, regulatory changes, systemic changes, and include changes emerging from crisis (e.g. establishment of new health management systems). **Anticipatory capacities** relate to education, information & communication, and early warning.

**Box 3 Resilience Building & Sustaining Peace**

The 2030 Agenda recognizes that there can be no sustainable development without peace and no peace without sustainable development. The inclusion of **Goal 16 (Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels)** and the upholding of peace as a cross-cutting theme in the SDG framework, marked a breakthrough in mainstreaming of peace into the development discourse. The agenda includes **24 targets from seven** other SDGs that are linked to SDG 16 (so called **SDG16+Targets**), thereby providing a results framework that can be utilized to underpin the sustaining peace approach and align it with the more comprehensive SDG agenda


[https://cic.nyu.edu/sites/default/files/peaceful_just_inclusive_targets_analysis_aug2016.pdf](https://cic.nyu.edu/sites/default/files/peaceful_just_inclusive_targets_analysis_aug2016.pdf)
While the concepts of Resilience and Sustaining Peace have not been explicitly used within the SDG16 narrative, despite the aspiration to make societies resilient to violent conflict and to sustain peace, these are nonetheless critical dimensions of the Goal.

A recent Brief from “Inter-peace”42, which explores the concept of Resilience for Peace and its relevance to Goal 16, underscores the importance of building endogenous capacities and agency of local actors, alongside the need for effective institutions to ensure not only that the goal is met, but also sustained over time. This strongly resonates with the notion of Sustaining Peace which entails a new focus on supporting national actors to develop the resilient national capacities they need to address structural inequalities, exclusion, and other drivers that undermine social cohesion, and may over time lead to violent conflict if they are not addressed.

The two notions can be easily reconciled considering that “If a society is fragile, it means that social institutions that govern its politics, security, justice, and economy lack resilience”, in other words. the capacities to “absorb and adapt in order to sustain an acceptable level of functioning, structure, and identity under stress” 43.

This also means that in the context of sustaining peace, resilience cannot be equated with “bouncing back to the status quo ex ante”, as it requires deep changes in societal, community relationships from where the “shock” originated from. Whilst this would increasingly apply to other shocks and stresses (including natural disasters with this notion that these are increasingly “man-made” and not exogeneous44), this is particularly critical when it comes to conflicts.

The Brief further contends that the resilience approach can also “promote a preventive approach to conflict and violence, making this universally relevant – including to societies where violent conflict is not manifest” (p.6), another core dimension of the sustaining peace paradigm. In their policy statement on the “Pathways for Peace” the UN and World Bank highlight the importance of conflict prevention both before the breakout of armed conflict and in immediate post-conflict settings, placing the SDGs and the development of resilience at the core of conflict preventive actions45.

Goal 16 makes an important statement about the link between state/society relations and peace, specifically by way of targets 16.6 (Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels) and 16.7 (Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels). As the Inter-Peace Brief notes, these targets should however be given a broader interpretation, beyond just building the capacity of state institutions and promoting participation to also include the critical issue of building trust between the state and society. This also holds for other dimensions and goals of the SDGs – notably in relation to wider humanitarian and development goals and resilience building. “A resilience -based approach to peacebuilding traces a pathway for moving from a survival mode where only the manifestations and symptoms of conflict are being addressed, to generating the impulse for long term transformation” (ibid) … “Gender equality, health and well-being, reduced poverty, food security, economic growth and reduced inequality are all aspirations of the SDGs, but they are all also necessary components of peaceful societies. Therefore, whereas access to justice and effective, accountable and inclusive institutions are necessary conditions for a peaceful society, they are by no means sufficient. In this regard, it is necessary that we do not limit ourselves to Goal 16 when looking at the peacebuilding potential of the SDGs, but rather look at all goals”.

---


44 https://www.debate.org/opinions/are-most-natural-disasters-man-made-today

A.3 Identifying “Resilience Drivers” across the SDG targets

Based on the above review of the resilience literature, we sought to identify SDG targets whose implementation can be expected to enhance the capacities of individuals, communities and institutions to deal with shocks and stressors, considering both macro and micro vulnerabilities, in their economic, socio-political, environmental and institutional dimensions. The intent is not to be exhaustive, but to trace, across the 169 targets of the SDGs, some critical ‘resilience-drivers’.

While examining the SDG targets from a resilience building lens, it is worth noting that the SDG framework comprises a set of both outcome and process targets and indicators. Our focus being on the “HOW of resilience”, the distinction seems relevant. As shown by OECD (2016), the 169 targets include 81 ‘Process targets’ to facilitate outcomes. These include the 19 targets under SDG 17 (on global partnerships), the 43 ‘Means of Implementation’ targets for SDGs 1 to 16 (which are separately identified using small letters after the Goal number, e.g. 16.a) and 19 other targets that also primarily relate to policy measures or other implementation related actions.

Figure 3: SDG Outcome and Process targets

For the purpose of this analysis however, a number of SDG targets identified as “Outcome targets” in the OECD framework were considered both as process/input indicators for resilience building (viz. SDG 1.5) and indicators of resilient development outcomes. These include SDG 3.8 (Achieve universal health coverage); SDG 4.1 (Complete primary and secondary education), access to safe and affordable

---

46 The approach expands on the pioneer paper by ODI (op.cited)
48 These include: SDG 8.3 (promote development policies that support productive activities, decent jobs, creation, entrepreneurship,...encourage the formalization of MSMEs), 8.9 (devise policies to promote sustainable tourism, local culture...), 8.10 (Strengthen domestic financial institutions); SDG 9.1 (develop quality, reliable, sustainable and resilient infrastructure), 9.3 (increase the access of small scale industrial and other enterprises to financial services); SDG 10.5 (Adopt policies, esp. fiscal, wage and social protection policies, and progressively achieve greater equality), 10.5 (ensure enhanced representation and voice for developing countries), SDG 11.3 (enhance (...) capacity for participatory, integrated and human settlement planning), 11.4 (strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world); SDG 12.1 (implement the 10 year Framework of Programs on Sustainable Consumption and Production Patterns), 12.2 (encourage companies to adopt sustainable practices), 12.7 (promote sustainable public procurement practices); 12.8 (ensure people have relevant information and awareness for sustainable development); SDG 13.2 (Integrate climate change measures into national policies...); SDG 14.4 (Effectively regulate harvesting and end overfishing...), 14.6 (prohibit certain forms of fisheries subsidies...); SDG 15.5 (take urgent and significant action to reduce the degradation of natural habitats), 15.7 (take urgent action to end poaching and trafficking), 15.8 (introduce measure to prevent the introduction and reduce the impact of invasive aliens.)
drinking water (SDG 6.1), SDG 8.6 (Reduce the proportion of youth not in employment, training) 11.1 (Ensure access for all to housing and basic services), as well as 11.5 and 11.6 (Reduced exposure to disasters and environmental stress). **A working assumption is that sustained investments in people centered-basic services (health, education)**, youth education and employment, are key to people’s resilience. Conversely, the absence of reversals in such target[indicators] over time would indicate that countries have succeeded in building resilience capacities (cf. ToC above).

**Altogether, 77 SDG targets (out of 169)** were tentatively identified as key SDG-based ‘resilience drivers’, i.e. as directly and *indirectly but ultimately* contributing to building ‘people’s resilience’ (SDG 1.5), leading to more resilient development outcomes overtime. This suggests that the SDG framework can provide a consistent reference framework for resilience – based planning and programming efforts.

Figure 4: SDG-based ‘Resilience-drivers’

---

49 As noted by the World Bank, "Human capital" – the potential of individuals – is going to be the most important long-term investment any country can make for its people’s future prosperity and quality of life.

For tractability and easy reference, the targets identified as “Resilience Drivers” were clustered around four interrelated dimensions of Vulnerability & Resilience: Macroeconomic, Socioeconomic (Micro-level); Climate-Ecological; and a fourth category defined as “Societal”, to reflect on the cross-cutting contribution of the targets considered in this category to various levels and dimensions of resilience. Resilience drivers in this category mostly relate to social justice, gender equality, women and youth empowerment, support to inclusive, effective governance institutions and the rule of law, as well as education (in connection also to their contribution to anticipatory and transformative capacities) (see Figure 4).

Annex I (work in progress) gives more details regarding the meaning (underlying Theory Of Change elements) of each SDG target from a resilience building lens - the contribution of each target to resilience building is also tentatively differentiated along the categories discussed earlier in terms of anticipatory, absorptive, adaptive and transformative capacities.

It is important to note that within the framework of the 2030 Agenda, these four clusters of SDG targets (‘resilience drivers’) are necessarily interconnected, suggesting that synergies and potential trade-offs between them should be duly considered in setting SDG priorities within resilience planning and programing frameworks. For instance, as noted in the UNDP/UNESCAP Report, “there might be for instance critical trade-offs between some of the paths to greater infrastructure connectivity (including through resilient infrastructure) and wider objectives of promoting environmentally sustainable development and sustainable consumption and preserving ecosystems. There may also be a risk that greater connectivity can undermine self-sufficiency and thereby resilience” (p.28).

A.4 Can SDG (global) indicators help track resilience building commitments? A few points to consider

Data availability issues notwithstanding, it seems fair to say that that the current set of ‘globally agreed’ SDG indicators attached to the targets that have been identified above as “resilience drivers” might not be fully relevant/adapted for monitoring performance on resilience building commitments and efforts.

For some targets, the proposed global indicators do not necessarily capture the dimension of the SDG target that is most relevant to resilience. Note for instance, that 2 out of the 4 indicators proposed for monitoring SDG 1.5 (the Core Resilience target of the 2030 Agenda) are particularly relevant from a resilience-building lens ( “1.5.4 Proportion of local governments that adopt and implement local disaster risk reduction strategies in line with national disaster risk reduction strategies”; and 1.5.3 Number of countries that adopt and implement national disaster risk reduction strategies in line with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015–2030). However, these indicators only capture

---

50 As stressed in UNDP, 2015, “Towards Human Resilience: Sustaining MDG Progress in an Age of Economic Uncertainty”, “Building the resilience of poor and vulnerable households to economic and financial shocks will necessarily require building systemic resilience to such macro-level shocks. In turn, systemic resilience requires weakening the drivers of macroeconomic vulnerability, which are not household driven, but rather determined by specific structural economic conditions” (p.5)

investments in building resilience to natural disasters, whilst the target itself also considers other shocks.

Likewise, the indicator used to monitor progress on the SDG target related to resilient infrastructure (SDG 9.1) captures people's access to roads. However, it does not include references to the resilience of road infrastructure to shocks and stresses. The indicators associated to SDG 3.4 do not reflect investments in prevention and mental health.

As noted in the Inter-Peace Brief on Resilience for Peace\textsuperscript{52} with reference to SDG 16 specifically, the current set of SDG indicators for monitoring delivery on SDG 16 are mostly outcome indicators; e.g. number of conflict related deaths, % of population satisfied with government services. These might not be adapted to fragility contexts or countries emerging from conflicts suggesting that intermediate resilience capacity focused and SDG consistent indicators could instead be considered, for instance the “degree of coherence between formal and informal justice systems’ for SDG 16.3 (Ensure equal access to justice for all).

These are just a few examples, but because resilience building is a dynamic process of investments in human, physical, financial and institutional resilience capacities, the monitoring of resilience building efforts through the SDG framework may require a broader set of output/process indicators, tailored to country contexts.

B. Strengthening the Nexus between Resilience planning and programming and the SDGs in the Arab Region: current trends and prospects

Mitigating the immediate and longer-term impacts of crises, particularly conflicts, on affected people, societies, institutions, economies and ecosystems, whilst building long-term resilience by addressing the underlying drivers of crises will be paramount to breaking the vicious cycle and achieving the SDGs in the Arab Region. Structural challenges revolving around the lack of economic opportunities for the young men and women, inequality and exclusion, governance and accountability gaps, as well as natural resources-and climate related stresses and risks deserve special scrutiny. A resilience-based approach to promoting sustainable and peaceful development in the region also engages the reality that climate change and environmental vulnerabilities, as well as massive and protracted displacements should be addressed by countries and partners in a comprehensive manner.

In this section, the nexus between Resilience planning (and programming) and the implementation of the SDGs is considered from two points of view: (i) the extent to which national planning processes in crisis affected/post-crisis countries incorporate Resilience and the SDGs; and (ii) the extent to which international /UN partners’ crisis/resilience response frameworks integrate the 2030 Agenda and the SDGs, with the response to the Syrian crisis analyzed in more detail.

B.1 SDG and Resilience Mainstreaming in national development plans in the region’s fragile and crisis affected countries: A dynamic underway

Around the world, a number of fragile /post conflict countries (e.g. Chad, Côte d’Ivoire, DRC, Sierra Leone, Mali, Togo, Colombia, Salomon Islands, Timor Leste have already used the SDGs as a framework to align their medium to long-term development strategies and plans, as well as other key instruments such as budgeting processes. In the Arab Region, similar efforts are currently underway, specifically in Somalia, in Iraq, in Sudan, and Palestine. Remarkably, some of these plans (see below), incorporate humanitarian & resilience building priorities linked to the SDGs.

Somalia: Somalia stands out as a pioneer country in promoting such an integrated approach. As illustrated below, the National Development Plan 2018-2020 (NDP) is structured around nine pillars that cut across the humanitarian-development-peace continuum and link with most of the SDGs. Building effective and efficient institutions (a key dimension of building systemic/societal resilience) is addressed in a cross-cutting manner across all SDGs.

The NDP pillar on ‘Building resilience capacity’ seeks to address the need for a ‘durable solutions’ approach to the socioeconomic integration of displaced people, the return of refugees or migrants, as well as to the sustainable management of the environment, with linkages to multiple SDGs, including SDG1 (Poverty), 2 (Food Security and Sustainable Agriculture), 8 (Growth and Decent Employment), 11 (Sustainable cities and communities), and s SDG 15 (life on earth/biodiversity).

The NDP aims to promote the “Development and implementation of a comprehensive approach to displacement from a development point of view; and underscores “More resilient communities that can withstand internal and external shocks, including cyclical droughts and other natural disasters”.

53 In Sierra Leone, for example, the SDGs have been integrated into the 2016 National Budget
54 World Public Sector Report, 2018
The Resilience Chapter outlines how all Somalis will benefit from and contribute towards peace and prosperity and how that development will be risk-informed. The plan notably emphasizes that the “economic and social integration of youth, displaced, returnees and diaspora and the extremely poor will be independent and access developmental, not humanitarian support”.

The NDP chapter on building resilience capacity actually cuts across most of the priorities and strategies of other chapters of the Plan, connecting those priorities to specific populations or to address specific cross-sectoral issues, such as the Re-integration of the displaced and returnees (durable Solutions), Migration (safe management of Tahriib and return), Diaspora (remittances, knowledge transfer, and investment), Disaster management (preparedness, response), Climate change & Environment (natural resource& urban environment management), Social Protection (poverty reduction, economic growth for vulnerable, employment for youth), Food & Nutrition Security (availability, accessibility, prices).

Somalia NDP Monitoring Framework

**Annex 8 Core Indicators of Building Resilience Capacity Pillar Aligned To the SDG**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Resilience Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Goals: To improve resilience through reintegration of the displaced people & returnees, promoting role of diaspora, regulating migration, establishing social protection systems, promoting food & nutrition security, strengthening disaster preparedness and sustainable management of natural resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. No of relevant Laws, Policies, Strategies formulated and adapted for each sector mentioned in the above goal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry Records, Parliamentary Records</td>
<td>1.2.2 Number of countries with sound and local disaster risk reduction strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No of households registered under National Social Protection Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Protection Program database</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.1 Proportion of population covered by social protection floorsystems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. No of National and Regional disaster management organizations and centers established and functional</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ministry Records, Programme/Project Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Proportion of population and livestock affected by disasters</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry Records, Survey, Programme/Project Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5.1 Number of deaths, missing persons and persons affected by disaster per 100,000 people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Total No of displaced people</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry Records, DP Surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. No of DPs reached our successfully reintegrated and provided better living conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry Records, Programme/Project Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.1.1 Proportion of urban population living in slums, informal settlements or inadequate housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. No of returnees/refugees repatriated through formal mechanisms</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>Ministry Records, Programme/Project Reports, Reports of international Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Number of houses constructed for displaced/refugees</td>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. No of people registered as overseas Somalis</td>
<td>1 million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Proportion of people dependent on charcoal for fuel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry Records, Survey, FAO estimates</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.3.2 Proportion of population with primary reliance on clean fuels and technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Proportion of land that is degraded over total land area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Indicators of food price anomalies</td>
<td></td>
<td>Food price surveys</td>
<td>2.c.i Indicator of food price anomalies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Efforts have also been made to link the M&E framework of the NDP to SDG target indicators (see above). The performance indicators (a mix of humanitarian and development indicators) retained by the Somali NDP to track the implementation on “building resilience capacities” (with a strong focus on resilience of displaced people) have been mapped to SDG indicators, including indicators related to
the means of implementation. However, as previously noted, the approach was necessarily “selective and incremental, to reflect Somalia’s unique situation and constraints”\textsuperscript{55}.

**Iraq:** The Iraqi Government is committed to implementing the SDGs, using its newly adopted National Development Plan for Iraq 2018-2022 (NDP). Whilst the SDGs are not explicitly featured in the Plan, a Rapid Integrated Assessment of the NDP, recently conducted with support of UNDP suggests that overall **70% of the SDG targets (out of 119 identified as applicable) correspond** to the objectives, priority actions set forth in NDP 2018-2022, suggesting that the NDP can serve as an important channel for SDG implementation in the medium term.

Figure 6 Iraq: % of SDG targets covered by the NDP (2018-2022) (partially or fully) - interim findings

![SDG Profile - NDP 2018-22](image)

Source: UNDP (SDG Support Mission to Iraq\textsuperscript{56}, October 2018)

For SDGs 1 to 16, the rate of coverage is 77%. The NDP displays a strong focus on Peace and Governance (SDG16), in a cross-cutting manner. Remarkably, the plan spans across 19 “sector plans” and about 40% of these post an implicit link with 16.6 (Effective, Accountable Institutions); close to 60% of sector plans also link with SDG 1.4 (all men and women, especially the poor and the vulnerable, have equal rights to economic resources, as well as access to basic services, ownership, control over land, inheritance, natural resources, financial services). The Plan also has dedicated sections and action plans on Sustainable Solutions for IDPs (Sustainable solutions), women, youth empowerment; vulnerable children, people with disabilities and special needs.

**Table 1: Mapping of the Iraq Poverty Reduction Strategy to the SDGs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Relevant SDG targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Higher and sustainable income for the poor from work</td>
<td>2.3; 4.4; 8.3; 10.1; 1.4; 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Improved health status of the poor</td>
<td>3.2; 3.7; 4.2; 6.1;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improved education for the poor</td>
<td>4; 4.1; 4.4; 4.5; 8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Suitable housing and environment responsive to challenges</td>
<td>11; 11.1; 13; 8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Effective social protection for the poor</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Emergency response activities, related to IDPs and returnees</td>
<td>16; 10.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Governance, Gender and Environment are seen as cross cutting issues (no separate outcomes)


The Government of Iraq also adopted a Poverty Reduction Strategy (2018-2022), which explicitly features linkages between its six Outcomes (including Outcome 6 on Emergency Response Activities) with the SDGs, specially 10.2 (By 2030, empower and promote the social, economic and political inclusion of all, irrespective of age, sex, disability, race, ethnicity, origin, religion, or economic or other status).

**Palestine:** Palestine has been particularly proactive in advancing SDG mainstreaming efforts. Critical milestones and achievements include the establishment by National decree of a National SDG Committee in February 2016 under the Prime Minister’s Office. The concurrence of the launching of the 2030 Agenda with the preparation process of the NPA 2017-2022 was an opportunity to work towards integrating the SDGs into the NPA.

This “localization” process went through two steps: identifying the national priorities viz the SDGs and integrating the key priority SDG targets in the NPA and sectoral strategies. The mapping of the NPA to the SDGs, reveals that the NPA addresses 75 out of 169 targets (if other strategies are included, the target coverage reaches 105). The Annex to the VNR report provides a detailed mapping.

**Box 4: The Palestinian VNR and the SDGs: A Narrative about Resilience**

The NPA acknowledges the need for tailored response, focusing on sustainable development in a way that contributes directly towards building economic, political and social independence from Israel, to strengthen the resilience of Palestinian communities and the Palestinian nation. The concept of resilience is indeed omnipresent throughout the Policy Agenda’s and VNR stated priorities for eradicating poverty (SDG1) – and likewise food security (SDG2): The approach to poverty reduction “relies on re-building the resilience of the poor and vulnerable households and empowering them economically” (VNR, p.23) including efforts to provide social protection and promote the social and economic integration of persons with disabilities”. Education (SDG4) is seen as “is a tool for empowerment and resilience”, including through kindergartens in public primary schools in marginalized areas, improving students’ attitudes towards vocational education, and provide them with basic life skills” (VNR, p.34). Improving the management of natural resources is seen as a key pathway to reducing the erosion of resilience of Palestinian communities, land and water (VNR p.42). Ensuring access to water and the sustainable management of water resources (SDG6) are seen as key for the resilience of Palestinian communities in the face of water confiscation and intensifying climate change (SDG 13). The document also features “energy sustainability and resilience” (SDG7) (VNR, p.47). The protection of ecosystems is a priority, the VNR recalling that “olive trees represent a symbol of Palestinian resilience, culture and heritage as a people of the land” (VNR, p.47). The agenda for SDG 8, stresses that “decent work and economic growth are two key components to community resilience in Palestine” (VNR, p. 62). The agenda for Peace, acknowledges the importance of enhancing “resilience and sustainability of Palestinian cities and communities where growing population density and the restrictions to urban expansion pose additional challenges to peace” (VNR p. 70) and protecting the cultural
heritage (“an integral part of the Palestinian identity, and of the resilience of Palestinian communities”) through the greening Palestine initiative (SDG11), and increasing the amount of usable public space (SDG 11, p.72). The Agenda underscores Partnerships (SDG17) calling for “partnerships to “transcend financial support to the Palestinian people towards supporting the building blocks of resilience through establishing a shared vision of ending the occupation alongside fostering trade between Palestine and its regional and global partners” (VNR, p.80).

**Sudan:** The Government has set up the National Mechanism to Supervise the Sustainable Development Goals for coordinated implementation of the SDGs, chaired by the Vice-President and co-chaired by the Minister of Welfare and Social Security. Under the leadership of the National Population and Development Council (NPDC), the Government has produced the first draft of National Program for Sustainable Development 2016-2030. The draft program reviews the lessons learned from the MDG era, presents mechanisms for SDG implementation and coordination, proposes priority pillars for 2017-2020 for SDG implementation, and maps the existing national policies, strategies and plans as well as relevant ministries and agencies against the SDGs. There is a clear notion within the Government that the SDG framework must work for all people including people living in war affected areas. Furthermore, the framework should reduce vulnerability and facilitate country’s transition from humanitarian to development assistance.

**B.2 SDG Mainstreaming and UN Assistance/Resilience Plans in crisis contexts**

As the previous section highlights, governments in conflict/post conflict countries of the region have engaged in developing national development plans that integrate transitions from short-term humanitarian towards longer-term recovery, resilient and sustainable development priorities and incorporate explicit linkages with the SDGs. This is expected to provide a strong impetus for both humanitarian and development partners in conflict and other crisis-affected countries to also revisit their response plans using an SDG lens.

As illustrated below, notable steps have been taken in this direction in some countries. However, we argue that more efforts could be made to “more organically link” resilience responses and the SDG Framework. As shown earlier, many of the SDG targets can indeed be considered as ‘drivers of resilience/resilient outcomes’ and might be used as benchmarks for developing SDG-based results frameworks in crisis (resilience) response plans.

A quick scan of the UN assistance frameworks (UN Strategic Frameworks/UNDAFs) developed in the wake of the adoption of the SDGs in some crisis-affected countries of the region suggests that SDG mainstreaming is underway to various extents. This is of course in line with the new UNDG Guidance for UNDAF, which explicitly calls for mainstreaming the 2030 Agenda and the SDGs.

---

57 Source: MAPS mission back to office report (2017)
58 Source Government comments on inter-agency MAPS Missions in Sudan
59 The UNDAF is a strategic, medium-term results framework that describes the collective vision and response of the UN system to national development priorities and results on the basis of the normative programming principles. The UNDAF should be fully aligned with national priorities and the national development cycle as appropriate or relevant, or with key national development initiatives where there is no unified national program.
60 https://undg.org/document/2017-undaf-guidance/
Overall, the language of ‘vulnerability’ and ‘resilience’ proves to be quite instrumental in articulating and bridging humanitarian and sustainable development priorities in the formulation of SF/UNDAFs. SF/UNDAF narratives generally incorporate the 2030 Agenda’s core principles (e.g. Leaving No One Behind) and their key outcomes are also increasingly discussed from a cross-sectoral and longer term-resilience-building perspective. However, SDG linkages are commonly established at the outcome (or even higher) level within Results Frameworks. In some countries (Sudan, Palestine), attempts were also made to establish more granular linkages with the SDG targets and related indicators. However, there is overall limited effort to more strategically and explicitly bring in the SDGs and targets in the theories of change underpinning each priority/focus outcomes.

**Box 5: SDG Mainstreaming in Somalia UN Strategic Framework (UNSF, 2017-2020)**

“While it is important to plan for the next political cycle, the UN should also consider a longer-term perspective to strengthen resilience in Somalia, linked to the 2030 Agenda”⁶¹

“Realizing the importance of envisioning a longer-term development perspective for Somalia, every effort has been made to align this UNSF and its associated results framework with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and its associated Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)”⁶².

**Strategic Priority Alignment with National & International Frameworks (extract)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Priority</th>
<th>National Framework</th>
<th>International Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5: PS1: Supporting socio-economic opportunities for Somalis, leading to meaningful poverty reduction, access to basic social services and sustainable, inclusive and equitable development.</td>
<td>Somalia NDP</td>
<td>United Nations 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (SDGs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: PS2: Supporting socioeconomic development</td>
<td>Somalia UNSF 2017-2020</td>
<td>SDGs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“The UN will support the Ministry of Planning, Investment and Economic Development to collect, process and analyze data and oversee the dissemination of geographic, sex- and age-disaggregated data collected by other government agencies and the UN, with a focus on the SDGs.”⁶³

Somalia UNSF 2017-2020⁶⁴

**Somalia.**⁶⁵ In Somalia, UN Strategic Framework (UNSF, 2017-2020) encapsulates the UN’s collective commitment to support Somalia’s humanitarian, development, political and security priorities as outlined in the Somalia NDP and is also aligned to the SDGs. The UNSF Strategic Priority 5 “Supporting socio-economic opportunities for Somalis, leading to meaningful poverty reduction, access to basic social services and sustainable, inclusive and equitable development” is officially linked with 14 SDG goals (see Box 5).

---

⁶¹ P.20  
⁶² P.20  
⁶³ P.39  
**Sudan:** the new UNDAF (2018-2020) outlines how the UN Country team aims to collaborate with partners during the UNDAF period on the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The core focus areas, including *community stabilization* are explicitly linked to the SDGs (Goal levels) and, as applicable, integrate a number of SDG indicators (over 10 indicators)\(^\text{66}\). The intent is to foster a greater alignment between UNDAF monitoring and broader SDG monitoring activities carried out with government partners.

**Libya:** whilst there seems to be some interest among decision makers across political divides to introduce the SDGs as a “meta-goal structure” for planning frameworks, the authorities have yet to develop a national development strategy with which to align support to the achievement of the SDGs\(^\text{67}\). However, the UN system recognizes the need for a more systematic use of the SDGs/SDG indicators for assessing the country situation and for taking note of relevant SDG targets and indicators while developing the new UN Strategic Framework (UNSF 2019-2020). Efforts are currently underway to map out the various pillars of the SDGs (Target level).

**Palestine:** The UN Common Country Assessment built upon a multi-dimensional, cross-sectoral LNOB focused Vulnerability Assessment\(^\text{68}\) while the formulation of the UNDAF (2018-2020) involved a concerted effort to align/adapt the indicators with SDG indicators relevant to Palestine\(^\text{69}\).

Whilst humanitarian assistance support through the Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) is not reflected in the UNDAF, the document acknowledges that the two documents have a common focus on addressing vulnerability. Remarkably, the document has a dedicated Outcome, which states that “*Vulnerable Palestinian communities and institutions are better equipped to cope with protracted threats and shocks*”. This fully echoes the HRP Strategic Goal “*Strengthen the ability of acutely vulnerable Palestinian households to cope with protracted threats and shocks*”. The notions of vulnerability and resilience therefore serve as a bridge to strengthen the humanitarian-development nexus within the UNDAF under the umbrella of the 2030 Agenda and SDG framework (see Box below).

As in the case of Sudan, efforts have been made to explicitly integrate SDG target-indicators in the results framework to the extent possible, in light of the availability of data, particularly disaggregated data (the framework includes a total of 20 SDG indicators). The level of integration/adaptation is quite significant for SDGs 16 (peace and institutions), 8 (growth-employment) and 6 (water) related targets\(^\text{70}\).

---


\(^{67}\) Source: Draft SF 2019-2020


\(^{69}\) [https://unsco.unmissions.org/sites/default/files/faq_undaf.pdf](https://unsco.unmissions.org/sites/default/files/faq_undaf.pdf)

\(^{70}\) (Number of youth, women and persons with disabilities elected to/running for office in public institutions (PLC) (SDGI 16.7.1); Proportion of children aged 10-17 years engaged in child labor (Related to SDGI 8.7.1); Number of cases on violence against women filed with FIPU annually (related to SDGI 16.3.1); Percent of Palestinian public who are satisfied with the performance of the police (16.6.6).
Box 6: Humanitarian- SD/G Nexus in Palestine UNDAF

“The UN’s efforts in this regard will be in direct alignment with the NPA’s ‘people-centered’ approach and the SDGs. Investing in resilience enhancing measures, health, education and social protection are key to alleviating poverty and tackling structural inequities that subject certain groups to marginalization and exclusion.”


Interestingly, some SDG indicators do not have baseline data, but their inclusion is meant to provide an impetus for national efforts to produce and supply required data. Additionally, in Palestine a Resilience Development Facility (RDF) is being established with the explicit purpose of accelerating the achievement of Palestine national goals and the SDGs, including other the government’s international commitments (“Placing the Palestinian Government strategies at the center of the RDF design will also enable the development of programs and the building of partnerships towards coordinating development interventions taken to achieve multiple SDGs and targets by managing trade-offs and maximizing synergies across sectors”).

Jordan and Lebanon: In Jordan and Lebanon, efforts have been made to integrate short term/medium term priorities set forth in crisis response plans (see section C.2.2) across various outcomes of UN assistance frameworks ((UNSF (2017-2020) in Lebanon; and UN Sustainable Development Framework (2018-2022) in Jordan), including action targeting refugees, whilst Results and Resource Frameworks are also linked to the SDGs (Goal level), and integrate some SDG indicators; see Annex 2)

---

71 Pp 20-21
72 “Some indicators listed within the results matrix do not have current baseline data, however as these are mostly global SDG indicators, their inclusion is intentional to support plans voiced by the Government to collect the requisite data”.
73 UNDP, RDF Concept Note
74 This worth noting. The UN support to crisis response plans are not integrated in an “ad hoc” “add-on” manner, e.g under a separate strategic priority, outcome or pillar.
B. 3 The case of the Response to the Syria crisis

This section considers the nexus between the 2030 Agenda & the SDGs and one of the pioneer multi-partner regional response program for building resilience in countries neighboring Syria that have been impacted by the protracted Syrian refugee crisis: The Refugee and Resilience Plan (3RP).

“It is timely for the resilience response to the Syria crisis to be aligned to national development agendas and aspirations toward achieving Sustainable Development Goals, especially in their promotion of justice, inclusion and equity”
Renewed Resilience Commitment Meeting Outcome Document, April 2018

The 3RP is an inclusive model for delivering an effective and coordinated response, which addresses, through national response plans75, immediate vulnerabilities, strengthens social cohesion, and builds the resilience of people, communities and national systems76. As shown below, the 3RP and its supportive country response plans can quite naturally serve as important channels to support national and local efforts towards the achievement of the SDGs in a way that leaves no one behind, including refugees and host communities.

The Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan (3RP): A channel for the implementation of the SDGs in Syria neighboring countries77: The case for strengthening linkages between the 3RP and the SDGs has become stronger for several reasons:

• The 3RP and national response plans, initially designed as short-term-humanitarian plans, have evolved into multi-year medium-term planning frameworks - from National Resilience Plan 6 (NRP6) to Jordan Response Plan (JRP 2015); to JRP 2016-2018 and JRP 2018-2020; from Lebanon Crisis Response Plan (LCRP) 2015-2016 to LCRP 2017-2020. Moreover, these plans are also increasingly focused on addressing structural (pre-crisis) bottlenecks and challenges to reducing vulnerability.

• The initial divide between support to Refugees (humanitarian assistance) and Resilience support (more or less equating with support to host communities) has somewhat vanished over the years (“Resilience for All”). Whilst the Jordan Response Plan (JRP) 2015 comprised of a “Refugee response” and a “Resilience Response”78, the JRP 2016-2018 brought together humanitarian and development/resilience response plans under a common set of sectoral strategic objectives79. For instance, basic assistance is no longer a separate sector but features as an integral component of the

75 The 3RP is composed of country chapters developed under the leadership of national authorities with support from the UN and NGOs in each country. It draws together the Jordan Response Plan, which is also the Jordan chapter of the 3RP, the Lebanon Crisis Response Plan and country chapters in Turkey, Egypt and Iraq - including support to existing UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) strategies
76 The document references “stabilization”, as Lebanon has found that “resilience” was a politically sensitive term, but fundamentally shares the same aspects of absorbing, adapting, preventing and transforming when faced with threats.
77 The 3RP 2019-2020 Strategic Overview mentions that the “3RP plans to further explore the intersections between humanitarian and development processes, including with ongoing current global processes, such as the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, and the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF)/Global Compact on Refugees” (p.11) - see https://www.nolostgeneration.org/sites/default/files/makhalid/3RP%20RSO%202019-2020.pdf
79 However refugee and resilience are still divided into specific resilience and refugee objectives and funding requirements are also broken down into funding for refugee activities and resilience activities.
JRP social protection sector strategy. Whilst the LCRP 2015-2016 had separate objectives for humanitarian assistance/protection and stabilization/resilience building efforts respectively, these were eventually brought together under the new cycle (2017-2020).

- The key principles underpinning resilience/stabilization programming under the 3RP and national response plans are fully consistent with the key principles guiding the implementation of the 2030 Agenda and the SDGs. This includes national ownership, interconnectedness and indivisibility, inclusion, fulfillment of human rights, multi-stakeholder partnerships and innovation, and the development of strong accountability frameworks, supported by quality, accessible, reliable disaggregated data (see Table 2 below).

Table 2: Alignment of the 3RP and the 2030 Agenda Implementation Principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2030 AGENDA KEY PRINCIPLES</th>
<th>3RP - RESILIENCE AGENDA/RESILIENCE PROGRAMMING FEATURES (Highlights)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Ownership: The 2030 Agenda is first and foremost about the national ownership of the Sustainable Development</td>
<td>Strong national Leadership: 3RP is founded on the principle of national ownership and leadership of the response in each country, incl. making effective use of existing capacities, avoiding creating parallel systems; Reinforcing local capacities (resilience-based approach is focused on supporting and enabling local institutions to deliver...) Coordination at the country level is determined by each country context and under the leadership of the national governments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interconnectedness and Indivisibility: All entities responsible for the implementation of SDGs treat them in their entirety instead of approaching them as a menu list of individual goals from which they pick and choose</td>
<td>Promotion of integrated multi-sector approaches: the 3RP endeavors multi-sectoral responses to address needs of refugee and host communities in a consistent and sustainable manner, including efforts to link education, protection and livelihood interventions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusiveness - Leaving No One Behind: The 2030 Agenda seeks to benefit all people and commits to “leave no one behind” by reaching out to all people in need and deprivation, wherever they are, in a manner which targets their specific challenges and vulnerabilities. Governments must prioritize the needs and identify and address barriers and mechanisms of exclusion of the most vulnerable and those furthest behind in every policy and action</td>
<td>Focus on most vulnerable populations among refugee and host communities, including female-headed households and youth. The Plan seeks to ensure that refugees’ protection needs are fully identified and addressed, including by ensuring age, gender and diversity inclusion in programming across all sectors to address these risks and help to realize durable solutions. As part of the 3RP, the No Lost Generation initiative focuses on strengthening national and local child protection systems, as well as providing immediate and coordinated services to the most vulnerable children, adolescents and youth. 3RP partners are also committed to increasing female and youth access to livelihoods activities; the plan considers the urban-rural continuum of needs and recovery efforts, including the need for rural economic livelihoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect, protection and fulfillment of human rights: The 2030 Agenda is a rights-based agenda, which commits to realizing the human rights of all including mainstreaming gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls across all of the Goals and targets</td>
<td>New and inclusive Partnerships to build resilience, foster innovation, promote relevance, effectiveness and efficiency Resilience is an inclusive undertaking that requires a wide range of stakeholders and the establishment of innovative partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships &amp; Innovation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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gender, ethnicity, and identity—to contribute to its implementation.

It calls for establishing multi-stakeholder partnerships for mobilizing and sharing knowledge, expertise, technology and financial resources, to support the achievement of SDGs in all countries.

SDG 17: “Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development” which tasks countries to strengthen domestic resource mobilization, meet aid commitments and mobilize additional financial resources for development from multiple sources

SDG 17: “Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development” which tasks countries to strengthen domestic resource mobilization, meet aid commitments and mobilize additional financial resources for development from multiple sources

The 3RP is a broad partnership platform for planning, advocacy, fundraising, information management and monitoring that brings together Syrian refugees; impacted communities in host countries and their governments; donors; and more than 270 national and international development and humanitarian actors in the respective countries, including UN, INGOs, national governments, ministries, municipalities, NGOs, CSOs, private Sector

The 3RP advocates for a new financing architecture, stressing the need for Importance of multi-year, predictable and flexible funding

The 3RP relies upon effective coordination mechanisms at regional and national levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peace, intercultural understanding, global citizenship: the 2030 Agenda recognizes that “sustainable development cannot be achieved without peace and security” and commits to intercultural understanding, mutual respect, and “an ethic of global citizenship and shared responsibility”.</th>
<th>Safeguard social cohesion to jointly foster resilience and peaceful cooperation – Efforts to promote social cohesion and peaceful co-existence between refugee and local communities are integrated in 3RP programmatic activities. Livelihoods support goes along with community -based interventions to support social cohesion in partnership with local and municipal institutions, with a strong focus on engaging women and youth. 3RP partners seek to empower the youth to achieve change as leaders and problem-solvers in their own communities and to contribute to resilience and social cohesion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accountability - High-quality, accessible, timely, reliable and disaggregated data SDG target 17.18 aims 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”, while target 17.19 calls for new measures of sustainable development progress beyond GDP.</th>
<th>Evidence-based policy/program design and implementation; Evidence-building, collection of lessons learnt. Country-level working groups and task forces gather evidence to inform planning, monitoring and reporting, in consultation with national counterparts and other stakeholders, including NGOs, the private sector and community-based organizations Promotion of two-way communication with beneficiaries, enabling people to engage meaningfully, in feedback and response system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universality- Bridging the Humanitarian-Development Divide The 2030 Agenda is universal in scope and commits all countries, irrespective of their income levels and development status, to contribute towards a comprehensive effort towards sustainable development. The Agenda stresses the need to pay greater attention to the special needs of the countries which are in conflict and crisis situations. This is vital to addressing the protracted nature of crises in many humanitarian and conflict settings as well as building the resilience of the poor and of those in vulnerable situations, by reducing their exposure and liability to climate-related extreme events. It is committed to bridging the humanitarian-development divide.</th>
<th>Synergies between humanitarian and development investments and approaches The 3RP has created spaces for synergies among humanitarian and development partners to build on their comparative advantages and helped to ensure that the response is coherent and the outcomes collective. Partnerships with local respondents and efforts to use and strengthen national and local systems are part of this important dynamic.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Source: various
• As mentioned above, key elements of UN support to crisis response plans are integrated across various outcomes within broader UN support frameworks – the UN Strategic Framework (2017-2020) in Lebanon and the UN Sustainable Development Framework (2018-2022) in Jordan, which are also broadly linked with the SDGs (see Annex 2).

• Political commitment towards a better integration between crisis response plans and the SDGs. Any step forward in terms of integrating 3RP planning processes and the SDGs would need to originate from the country level/national partners. In this regard, it is worth noting that in their Voluntary National Review (VNR) Reports to the High Level Political Forum - a key platform for following up and reporting on the implementation of the 2030 Agenda and SDGs at global level - Jordan (2017) and Lebanon (2018) refer to the national response plans – the LCRP and the JRP - as important medium-term channels for SDG implementation, and Partnerships for the SDGs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box 7 – Key Messages of Jordan and Lebanon National Voluntary Reviews (VNR) Regarding Syria crisis response plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The Lebanese government—in collaboration with the UN, national and international NGOs, and other donors—has developed the LCRP as a coordinated response to address the impact of the Syria crisis on Lebanon. The LCRP goes beyond humanitarian assistance to displaced people and other vulnerable groups. It takes a multi-dimensional, integrated humanitarian and developmental approach, in line with the SDGs and Agenda 2030’s principle of ‘leaving no one behind’.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“These JRPs form a development compliment to national EDPs ensuring adherence to our charted path of comprehensive reforms and achieving the sustainable development goals.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“In the coming years, the Government will focus on strengthening coordination at all levels, on mainstreaming the 2030 Agenda in its current and future EDPs and JRPs, and also on increasing the availability of data for monitoring and evaluation.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To which extent are country response plans embracing the SDGs? A quick scan of the LCRP and the JRP? The 2030 Agenda and the SDGs have to a certain extent already filtered into the LCRP narrative. Thus, the LCRP (update 2018) states that “many LCRP projects also integrate the principles of the UN

---

81 Prospects for such an integration may seem more limited in Lebanon, in the absence of a comprehensive development plan. However, SDG mainstreaming efforts are also underway among sector ministries whilst the recently formulated Government’s Vision for Stabilization, Growth and Employment (presented to the international community during the CEDRE conference) could open new opportunities.
82 VNR 2018, p.12
83 EDPs are multi-year integrated national government development plans that integrate and track development and sectoral plans and strategies under Jordan Vision “Jordan 2025”.
84 Jordan VNR 2017, Opening Statement
85 Jordan VNR 2017, p.64
86 https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/LCRP2018_EN_Full_180122.pdf
Sustainable Development Goals, a set of globally agreed goals to end poverty, protect the planet and ensure prosperity for all as part of a new sustainable development agenda” (p.20).

As such, the LCRP strategy strongly embeds the core principles of the 2030 Agenda and the SDGs. There is a strong focus on Leaving No One Behind, including mainstreaming Gender Equality and Women’s empowerment, addressing the needs of Youth and of People with Special Needs under each sector, as well as mainstreaming environmental (environmental task force established) and conflict sensitivity. An integrated (inter-sectoral) approach to implementation is adopted for every sector’s strategy, where ‘input and output linkages’ with other key sectors are systematically identified. The implementation framework involves strong commitments to strengthening of national ownership, partnership and accountability (including accountability to affected population (SDG 17).87

Whilst calling for gender mainstreaming, the strategy makes an explicit reference to SDG5, noting that ‘Achieving gender equality and eliminating gender-based violence is one of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Efficiently mainstreaming gender requires assessing the implications of any planned action for women, girls, men and boys, as well as making their concerns and experiences an integral dimension of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programs in all spheres’.

LCRP expected contribution to the achievement of the SDGs is also explicitly acknowledged under the Water sector strategy, which “is guided by the broader strategies and plans of the Government of Lebanon, primarily through the National Water Sector Strategy (NWSS, MoEW, 2010) and the Wastewater Strategy (MoEW, 2010) (...) and Aligns with Lebanon’s efforts to meet obligations under Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 and 11 of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, in particular SDG 6”. It also notes that Lebanon is a pioneer country through the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Program for Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP) to establish a clear baseline from which to measure progress on achieving universal and equitable access to safe and affordable drinking water for all (SDG6.1)88. The strategy also recommends prioritizing “pre-planned specific projects identified as essential within the Government of Lebanon’s strategies and master plans, which benefit the most vulnerable communities and would make the greatest contribution to the SDGs”89.

Similar to the LCRP, the JRP embraces the core principles of the 2030 Agenda. The foreword mentions that “The JRP has further evolved with the endorsement of the Jordan Compact in February 2016 by incorporating important commitments on education, stemming from our joint belief of leaving no one behind”).

As regards partnerships, participation and accountability, the JRP is seen as a “a genuine commitment of the Government of Jordan to put into practice the aid effectiveness and coordination principles that were established in the 2005 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and reinforced subsequently in

87 LCRP (2018 update), p. 24
88 Pp 185-186
89 P.190
Accra in 2008 and Busan in 2011 as well as at the Third International Conference on Financing for Development in Addis Ababa in 2015” (..)90.”

However, whilst the document calls for strengthened linkages between the resilience plan and Jordan Executive Development Program (the key channel for implementing the SDGs); it remains virtually silent when it comes to the 2030 Agenda and the SDGs, with the exception of the JRP Livelihoods Sector strategy, which explicitly recommends to “Design interventions in line with 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda with clear emphasis on Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) 5 and 8 (p.30).

National Response Plans and the SDGs: A Rapid Integrated Assessment of the Jordan Response Plan (JRP 2018-2020) and Lebanon Crisis Response Plan (LCRP 2017-2020): 'The analysis of the JRP 2018-2020 and the LCRP 2017-2020 tentatively uses the UNDP Rapid Integrated Assessment (RIA) tool to assess the level of “alignment” between the LCRP and the JRP with the SDG targets and indicators91.

Figure 7: LCRP and JRP indicative ‘SDG Profiles’92

90 JRP, p.99
91 Methodological Note: For the sake of simplicity, from the 169 targets of the SDG framework, the RIA of the LCRP and JRP did not cover the 19 targets related to SDG 17 (partnerships/Means of Implementation) targets and the “Means of Implementation” (MoI) targets (1.a.; 3.c.;....etc.) attached to other Goals (1-16). We also excluded other targets which, in essence, were considered to be beyond the scope of the response planning frameworks: SDG 14 targets - Life below water; 2.5 (preservation of genetic diversity); 9.2 (sustainable industrialization); 9.5 (scientific research); 10.5 (regulation of global financial markets); 10.6 (enhanced representation of developing countries in decision making in global international and financial institutions); 15.6 (utilization and benefit sharing of genetic resources), 15.7 (poaching and trafficking), 15.8 (reduced impact of invasive alien species), 15.9 (mainstreaming of ecosystem and biodiversity values in plans and budgets). The response plans were thus reviewed against 88 ‘relevant’ targets.

92 These findings are based on a quick review of the LCRP and JRP Results Frameworks and thus necessarily indicative. A more in-depth analysis engaging key stakeholders would need to be conducted for a full analysis of the plans.
Overall, the LCRP 10 sector strategies (through their various Outcomes, Outputs and Activities) were found to link altogether with **roughly 76% of the (88) SDG targets under review**. The RIA of the JRP involved reviewing the linkages between the SDGs and the specific objectives, and key action of the JRP 12 sector strategies. Altogether, these were found to **resonate with 81% of the SDG targets** identified as applicable. **This suggests that the JRP and the LCRP can serve as an important channel for the implementation of the SDGs in a way that leaves no one behind.**

As can be seen from the above figures, the JRP ‘SDG profile’ and the Lebanon ‘SDG profile’ are quite similar. **Expectedly, the two plans exhibit extensive linkages with SDG People-related targets (SDG1 to 5).** They also work for Prosperity-related targets (SDG 8, 9, particularly through the Livelihoods and Food & Agriculture, and Energy strategies), as well as Planet related targets, particularly SDG 6, and in a cross-cutting manner for SDG 12 (sustainable consumption and production) with a focus on waste management, recycling, reduction of food wastage) and climate change adaptation (SDG 13). Virtually all sector strategies emphasize gender equality and social inclusion (SDG 5, SDG 10.2) and institutional capacity development support for more effective national-local service delivery (16.6), participation of actors (17.7).

Overall, the JRP places a stronger (or more explicit) emphasis on growth and decent jobs related targets, supporting economic growth on access to justice (SDG 16. 3) and sustainable urban-municipal development (SDG 11, including access of vulnerable population to safe public spaces (11.7). In the LCRP, the ‘social stability’ sector strategy serves an important window for strengthening local violence prevention capacities (16.a).

**Box 8: The LCRP, the JRP and (SDG-based) ‘resilience- drivers’**

The LCRP and the JRP display linkages with a large number of the SDG targets that were identified as ‘resilience drivers’ in Section B.2 of this paper (see Figure 4: SDG-based ‘resilience drivers’ and Annex 1). As shown in the figures below, both plans exhibit a ‘reasonable’ balance between **societal resilience related targets** (reducing/preventing violence, incl. GBV, inclusive-participatory governance,
rule of law, youth and women’s empowerment, social justice, education for sustainable development (including peace, social cohesion), socioeconomic resilience (including social protection, inclusive access to basic services) and climate-ecological resilience related targets.

In the case of the LCRP, our study also reviewed the list of LCRP Outcome and Output indicators “corresponding” to the SDG targets covered by the LCPR and assessed their consistency with the set of global SDG indicators. **Altogether, around 66% of the of SDG targets ‘covered’ by the LCRP have corresponding indicators.** Expectedly, some indicators are “input oriented” and humanitarian in nature (e.g. the percentage of the targeted population, the number of beneficiaries). Whilst this would require further analysis, **out of 70 LCRP indicators under review, around 50% are however found to be reasonably consistent with the SDG indicators, suggesting they could serve as good proxies for monitoring progress on SDG implementation in areas impacted by the Syrian refugee crisis.** This is particularly true for poverty (SDG 1), education (SDG4), health (SDG3) and water related indicators (SDG6). This is also true for a number of LCRP indicators under the Protection sector, which provide a good basis to monitor the response contribution to 16.9 (legal status with focus on displaced); and 16.a (support to the prevention of violence). Whilst SDG7 is well covered in terms of focus (renewable energy), LCRP indicators are more “input oriented” and quite distant from the definition of SDG indicators. **Generally, the LCRP Monitoring framework offers a significant window of opportunity for supporting SDG monitoring efforts at the local level, and from an LNOB perspective (SDG localization).**

**The 3RP: an incubator for SDG localization and transformational resilience**98: The 2030 Agenda and the SDGs are transformative, and this has significantly influenced the thinking and understanding of societal goals, and the processes for achieving welfare, and measuring progress towards peace, development and human rights.

Due to the fact that 3RP interventions are largely localized towards most vulnerable areas, the 3RP and related national plans can serve as important channels for localizing the SDGs, not merely in terms of supporting and tracking SDG achievements for all vulnerable people living in crisis affected areas (Leaving No One Behind), but also through enabling, incubating and demonstrating transformative changes.

---

98 In simple terms, localization involves formulating, implementing and monitoring strategies at the local level to realize global national and subnational SDGs and targets.
Remarkably, both the LCRP and JRP have dedicated provisions for institutionalizing an effective mechanism for environmental mainstreaming as part of their implementation. Another distinct transformational feature of the plans lies in the emphasis placed on promoting green energy transitions across response sectors (energy, education, health, agriculture, water, municipal planning and development), alongside the awareness raising of sustainable development.

Critically, the JRP and the LCRP serve as ‘incubators’ for transformational changes in local governance and service delivery systems, with a catalytic potential for the decentralization agenda in both countries. As noted by UNDP– Sherif et al. (2016) support to local systems goes beyond strengthening absorptive and adaptive capacities of municipalities. It is about strengthening transformative resilience, by changing the interface between communities and local governments, through building “capacities to win trust...elicit genuine participation and to create and maintain unity in the face of various threats”, thereby creating new pathways of good governance at the local level. Therefore, one of the objectives of the JRP is “to support decentralization process through revised local development priorities, plans and projects (p/82)”. The plan spurs changes in the way councils at local, municipal and governorate levels engage in the planning and the management of the crisis to better meet the needs of poor and vulnerable groups, with a strong focus on participatory approaches to planning and budgeting. In Lebanon, the LCRP support to municipalities has been institutionalized as a decentralized structure within the Ministry of Social Affairs.

C. Conclusions

1. There is a significant level of conceptual and policy congruence between Resilience (Building), the 2030 Agenda and the SDGs: As suggested in this paper, the SDG framework, through various SDG targets, including and beyond targets that explicitly refer to resilience – particularly SDG 1.5, can frame a course of action for building long-term resilience, and tracking resilience building in countries affected by crisis and fragility. We tentatively identified 78 targets (out of the 169 SDG targets) as drivers of resilient development outcomes (‘resilience drivers’), because of their contribution to building resilience anticipatory, absorptive, adaptive, preventive and/or transformative capacities in various risk/vulnerability areas (macroeconomic, socio-economic, climate-ecological, societal) and at various levels (individuals, communities, institutions).

2. The language of resilience – ‘resilience-based approaches’ - has been instrumental in reconciling humanitarian and sustainable development/SDG narratives in the new generation of national development plans and UN response frameworks developed in the crisis-affected countries of the region.

3. However, there is room to further “SDGize” resilience-based response plans and monitoring frameworks in the region. Efforts to integrate the 2030 Agenda and the SDGs are underway in a
number of UNDAFs/UNSFs recently developed in crisis affected countries. This generally mirrors commensurate efforts by governments to align their national plans with the SDGs. However, when it comes to the integration of the SDGs specifically, linkages with the SDGs tend to be quite loose, mostly established at the Goal-Outcome level only.

Thus, there is a ‘missing middle’ – whereby greater efforts could be made to mainstream the SDG targets into the results chains/ theories of change (TOCs) underpinning core strategic priorities and outcomes of Crisis Response Plans and the UNSFs/UNDAFs, with a focus on those SDG targets that carry a strong resilience building potential in light of a country’s vulnerability context.

3. This is particularly true when it comes to the resilience response plans to the Syria crisis. The Rapid Integrated Assessments of the LCRP and the JRP, conducted for the purpose of this paper, reveal that the objectives, priority interventions set forth in those plans resonate with a large subset of SDG targets – particularly the targets identified as “resilience drivers” (drivers of socioeconomic, societal and climate-ecological resilience). This suggests that the JRP and the LCRP (and the 3RP at the regional level) could serve as important channels for the implementation and localization of the SDGs in a transformative way that leaves no one behind. Mainstreaming the SDGs in these plans -- with a focus on the ‘resilience-drivers’ and underpinning TOCs – would contribute to raise awareness and increase the visibility of the resilience response within a narrative that showcases UN and other partners’ added value in achieving the SDGs, through SDG-based resilience planning and programming.

Such a multi-layer ‘integration process’ should be nationally-owned and driven and at pace with neighboring countries’ efforts to align their medium term national development planning frameworks with the SDGs. It also means that, ultimately, crisis/resilience response priorities should be mainstreamed into national development plans (aligned with SDGs and principles of the 2030 Agenda).
Initiating such a process may require for instance increased interactions between national coordination platforms established to follow-up on the implementation of the SDGs, UN ‘SDG task forces or equivalent’ – and 3RP regional and national coordination mechanisms. The process should also be backed-up by renewed commitments to strengthen the humanitarian-development nexus and to bridge humanitarian and development funding streams to cover gaps in national and subnational resilience-building and SDG service delivery systems.

4. Whilst this was not the purpose of this paper, it would be especially critical to further identify and discuss the opportunities, as well as the specific challenges and bottlenecks - including those related to the “political economy” underpinning such an integration process.

5. The measurement of resilience is generally a new but rapidly growing area for research. Data availability issues notwithstanding, the current set of ‘globally agreed’ SDG indicators corresponding to the SDG targets identified in this paper as “resilience drivers”, might not be fully relevant/adapted for monitoring the extent of resilience-building commitments and efforts. Because resilience-building is a dynamic process of investments in human, physical, financial and institutional resilience capacities, the monitoring of resilience-building efforts through the SDG framework may require a broader set of output/process indicators (as opposed to outcome/impact indicators), tailored to country contexts. Thus, whilst SDG targets could be easily mainstreamed in resilience response plan strategies, more research is needed to assess how to better integrate resilience-relevant SDG indicators in response monitoring frameworks.
ANNEX I – “Resilience Drivers within the SDG framework” – tentative analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESILIENT DEVELOPMENT OUTCOMES</th>
<th>Despite shocks and stresses:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sustained progress on core human development indicators (SDG1.2; SDG 2.1, SDG 3.1, 3.2; SDG 4.1, 4.6, SDG 6.1; SDG 8.1 ...;11.1 ..)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced impacts of shocks and stresses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDG 11.5: significantly reduce the number of deaths and the number of people affected and decrease by [x] per cent the economic losses relative to gross domestic product caused by disasters, including water-related disasters, with a focus on protecting the poor and people in vulnerable situations…’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDG 3.9: reduction in number of deaths and illnesses from hazardous chemicals and air water and soil pollution and contamination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDG 16.1: significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOW ?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ULTIMATELY BUILDING PEOPLE’S RESILIENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VULNERABILITY</th>
<th>SDG targets</th>
<th>Resilience capacities/Elements of Theory of Change (Notes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global financial and economic crises</td>
<td>SDG 10.5 (improve the regulation &amp; monitoring of global financial markets and institutions)</td>
<td>Preventive capacities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Macroeconomic instability | SDG 17.4 (debt management)  
SDG 17.13 (macroeconomic stability)  
SDG 17.14 (policy coherence)  
SDG17.10 (non-discriminatory and equitable trading system);  
SDG 17.12 (implementation of duty-free and quota free market access on lasting basis.) | Adaptive capacities: Changes in budget strategies and tax systems can help insulate them against the effects of commodity shocks; Fiscal and financial strategies, including countercyclical fiscal policy and stimulus programs as well as countercyclical lending, flexible exchange rate policies can help caution the impact of economic shocks (which overwhelmingly affect the poor).  
Integrating strategic provisions within trade agreements, especially preferential trade agreements, can |

---

98 For an analysis of drivers of macroeconomic vulnerability and resilience, see for instance UNDP, 11, “Towards Human Resilience: sustaining MDG Progress in an age of economic uncertainty”.  
http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/Poverty%20Reduction/Towards_SustainingMDG_Web1005.pdf
| Food price shocks | SDG 2.c (Adopt measures to ensure proper functioning of food commodity markets, facilitate the timely access to market information, including on food reserves to help limit extreme food price volatility) | **Anticipatory/Absorptive:** Regional, national-level, community-level food stocks can be created to cope with any unexpected food shortages |
| Commodity shocks | SDG 8.2 (policies for economic diversification) SDG 8.a Increase Aid for Trade support for developing countries SDG 9.2 Promote sustainable industrialization SDG 9.b (Support domestic technology development, research and innovation...ensure a conducive environment for inter alia industrial diversification) | **Adaptive/Transformative:** Economic prosperity is linked to a country’s ability to prevent, withstand, and quickly recover from major disruptions to its underlying economic base. A more diversified economy reduces exposure and vulnerability to commodity shocks. |

**SOCIOECONOMIC RESILIENCE (people-communities)**

- **SDG target linkages:** 1.3; 1.4, 2.3, 3.5, 3.8, 3.d, 4.1, 4.2, 4.a, 5.3 6.1, 7.1, 8.3, 8.8; 8.10, 9.3; 14.b,

| Household & Corporate resilience | SDG 8.3 (support to decent job creation - including through access to financial services - financial inclusion) SDG 8.10 Strengthen the capacity of domestic financial institutions to encourage and expand access to banking, insurance and financial services for all SDG 9.3 Increase access of SMEs to financial services. | **Absorptive/Adaptive/Anticipatory:** While access to and use of formal financial services has been primarily associated with the reduction of household poverty, newer theories of change suggest that the use of financial services for poor households results in enhanced resilience. In effect, financial services help households prepare and cope with shocks. In the case of SMEs and entrepreneurs, the diversification of financing instruments available to SMEs and entrepreneurs, to address diverse financing needs in varying circumstances, contributes to increases in SMEs’ resilience to changing conditions in credit markets and improve their contribution to economic growth. |

| Safety (work) | SDG 8.8 Protect labor rights and promote safe and secure working environments for all workers, including migrant workers, in | **Safe working environments contribute to individual and organizational resilience.** |

---


103 [https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4316693/](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4316693/)
| Access to resources | SDG 1.4 ensure that all men and women, particularly the poor and vulnerable have equal rights to economic resources, access to basic services, ownership and control over land and other forms of property, inheritance, natural resources, financial services | Absorptive and Adaptive capacities: Socioeconomic resilience at individual/community level is linked to the ability of accessing critical resources and services |
| Access to agricultural resources and assets | SDG 2.3 (Agricultural livelihoods support, through secure and equal access to land, other productive resources and inputs, knowledge, financial services, markets and opportunities for non-farm employment)  
SDG 14.b Provide access for small scale artisanal fishers to marine resources and markets | Absorptive – Adaptive capacities Insecure rights to the land not only reduce farmer’s resilience and ability to adapt to the extreme weather brought on by climate change, but also compromise their ability to adopt critical mitigation practices. Insecure land rights have profound consequences for climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies and policies on the national and even global level.103 |
| SDG 6.1 (universal access to water) | | |
| Access to energy | SDG 7.1 (universal access to affordable, modern energy services) | “Increasing access to modern energy services can yield an expansion of job markets and business activities; it can cause improvements in health, gender equality, safety and education; and it can contribute to strengthening the resilience against shocks and disasters.”104 |
| Social Protection, preventive health | SDG1.3 Implement nationally appropriate social protection systems and resources for all, and by 2030 achieve substantial coverage of the poor and vulnerable)  
SDG 10.4 Adopt policies, especially fiscal, wage and social protection policies that progressively achieve greater equality  
SDG 3.8 Achieve universal health coverage, including financial risk protection, access to quality essential health care services  
SDG 3.5 (prevention and treatment of substance abuse) | Absorptive and transformative capacities Social protection systems help individuals and families cope with civil war, natural disaster, displacement, and other shocks. Social protection systems also help build human capital by connecting people to jobs, investing in the health and education of their children, and protecting the elderly and other vulnerable groups. |
| Global health risk management | SDG 3.d Strengthen the capacity of all countries (in particular developing countries) for early warning, risk reduction and management of global health risks | Anticipatory/Preventive – Adaptive capacities |

104 http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/ourwork/climate-and-disaster-resilience/sustainable-energy/energy-access/
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ecosystem preservation - Ecological Vulnerability</th>
<th>Water scarcity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SDG 2.4: Ensure sustainable food production systems and implement resilient agricultural practices...</td>
<td>SDG 9.1: &quot;develop quality, reliable, sustainable and resilient infrastructure...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG 2.5 Maintenance of genetic diversity</td>
<td>SDG 9.a ‘facilitate sustainable and resilient infrastructure’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG 15.1 (conservation, restoration and sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems); SDG 15.2 (sustainable management of forests)</td>
<td>SDG 11.6: reduce the adverse per capital environmental impact of cities, including by paying attention to air quality and municipal and other waste management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG 15.3 (combat desertification); SDG 15.4 (conservation of mountain ecosystems)</td>
<td>SDG 11.b: ‘substantially increase the number of cities and human settlements adopting and implementing integrated policies and plans towards inclusion, resource efficiency, mitigation and adaptation to climate change, resilience to disasters, develop and implement, in line with the Sendai Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG 15.5 (action to reduce the degradation of natural habitat)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG 14.2 Sustainably manage and protect marine and coastal ecosystems to avoid significant adverse impacts, including by strengthening their resilience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG 6.6 (Protection of water related ecosystems)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate mitigation and adaptation</td>
<td>13.1 Strengthen resilience and adaptive capacity to climate-related hazards and natural disasters in all countries’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.2 Integrate climate change measures in national policies, strategies and planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.3 Improve education, awareness raising and human and institutional capacity on climate change mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.b Promote mechanism for raising capacity for effective climate change related planning and management in LDCs, including focusing on women, youth and local marginalized communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adaptive - Transformative capacities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All these targets and their monitoring can provide a clear picture of changes in building climate adaptive &amp; transformative capacities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.b SDG 7.2 (Increase the share of renewable energy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDG7.a (facilitate access to clean energy research and technology, including renewable energy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adaptive &amp; transformative capacities: Transition towards renewable energy can help act on climate change risks and promote more sustainable consumption and production patterns, while also increasing the resilience of the overall energy-provision system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CROSS-CUTTING (SOCIETAL RESILIENCE)
- SDG target linkages: 4.1, 4.2, 4.a, 4.5,4.6,4.7; 5.1; 5.2; 5.4; 5.5; 5.a; 5.b; 5.c; 9.c;10.2, 10.3;10.7; 11.7;17.8; SDG 16. 1; 16.2; 16.3,16.5,16.6;16.7, 16.10;16.a;16.b

#### Inclusive, Quality education

| 4.1 Universal access to free equitable and quality primary and secondary education... |
| 4.2 (quality early childhood development) |
| 4.a Upgrade education facilities that are child disability and gender sensitive and provide safe, non-violent, inclusive and effective learning environmental for all |
| 4.7 Ensure that all learners acquire knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development, inc...human rights, gender equality, promotion of culture of peace and non violence, global citizenship, appreciation of cultural diversity |
| Anticipatory, absorptive, adaptive capacities |
| Education is key enhancing the resilience of children and youth, the broader society. Relevant quality education can help address the underlying causes of violence and foster inclusion. It can help communities understand disaster and climate risks, reduce vulnerabilities to natural hazards, and better prepare for and mitigate the impact of crises. |

#### Anticipatory-Transformative capacities

Resilience approaches generally emphasize learning as a way to better understand and anticipate threats and opportunities.

This target specifically underscores education for Sustainable Development to enable learners to constructively and creatively address present and future global challenges and create more sustainable and resilient societies, understanding that actions here and today can have implications for the lives and livelihoods of people in other parts
| Women and youth empowerment, inclusion | SDG 5.1 (End all forms of discrimination against all women and girls) | Transformative capacities
Discrimination in women and girls’ access to education, health care and employment, lack of control over productive and financial resources, and marginalization from decisions make women and girls extremely vulnerable to the impacts of climate change, violent conflict, economic and political insecurity.

At the same time, “women and girls play a vital role in unlocking the transformative potential of development assistance and in achieving long-term change. They are key in the capacity of households and communities to cope with, adapt and potentially transform in the face of shocks and stressors” 105

The sustaining peace approach also reaffirms the substantial link between women’s full and meaningful involvement in efforts to prevent and resolve conflict effectively and on a sustainable basis. “The best predictor of a country’s ability to sustain peace is how it treats its women”. The larger the gender gap between the treatment of men and women in a society, the more likely it is that a country will experience conflict.

There is increased evidence that economies are stronger, more resilient where youth and women meaningfully participate in social, economic and political life. The sustaining peace approach also recognizes the important role youth can play in the prevention and resolution of conflicts and as key drivers of sustainability and inclusiveness 106.

---

| Violence reduction | SDG 5.2 (Eliminate GVB); SDG 16.1 (Significantly reduce all forms of violence) SDG 16.2 End abuse and all forms of violence against children | Violence against women and girls, and children is not only a violation of human rights but also affect both the physical and psychological health of those who suffer from it, as well as their ability to develop and sustain their livelihoods. Violence renders women vulnerable and in most cases seeks to disempower them.


108 Interrogating the resilience of women affected by violence, 2017,


| Migration management | SDG 10.7 Facilitate safe, regular and responsive migration and mobility of people, through the implementation of planned and well managed migration policies | Migration is of central relevance to resilience. If unmanaged, large-scale migration often generates new sets of personal risks and vulnerabilities, planned and well-organized movement of individuals has the potential to help people preserve and access resources to cope and recover in the face of adversity and mitigate impacts on host countries and communities. Migration management also underscores the need to help local actors adapt in order to build resilience to migration shocks.


108 Interrogating the resilience of women affected by violence, 2017,


| Access to ICTs | SDG 9.c Increase access to information and communication technologies SDG 17.8...enhance the use of enabling technology, in particular information and communication technology | Anticipatory, absorptive and adaptive capacities: Towards “e-resilience”: Information and communication technologies in particular have the potential to strengthen people and communities’ capacities to cope with climate related disasters, food insecurity, armed conflicts and health emergencies and other emergencies. This, by enabling increased preparedness or by enabling people to


108 Interrogating the resilience of women affected by violence, 2017,


more effectively respond to shocks once they occur. A recent report provides evidences that e-governance systems are essential for resilience building and underscores the need to integrate emerging innovations in digital technology, such as artificial intelligence (AI), social media, space applications and geospatial information.

| Social networking, connectivity | SDG 11.7 Universal access to safe, inclusive and accessible green and public spaces, in particular for women and children, older persons and persons with disabilities | Absorptive and Adaptive capacities: There is evidence that equitable access to parks and green open spaces increases social contact and a sense of belonging, incl. higher levels of participation in politics and better relationships with formal governmental institutions. Urban planning and cultural and social policies affect levels of isolation and connectedness. Evidence from a meta-analysis of 148 studies on social relationships and mortality risk shows that individuals with strong social relationships have higher levels of resilience and are likely to live longer than those with lower levels.

| Accountable institutions | SDG 16.6 Development of effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels | Adaptive & transformative capacities: Progress made against this target will be an effective component of understanding changes in adaptive capacity because polycentric, responsive and democratic governance processes are often linked to enhanced resilience, as they enable societies to successfully engage with multiple, dynamic shocks and stresses.

| Access to justice | SDG 16.3 Promote the rule of law, access to justice for all | Protection and promotion of human rights, the rule of law and political participation are fundamental attributes of resilient societies,

| Reduced corruption | SDG 16.5 ‘Substantially reduce corruption and bribery in all their forms’ | Absorptive- Adaptive capacities: A recent paper on the social impacts of corruption on resilience shows that people most dependent upon self-reliance are most prone to its erosion by exploitation, ubiquitous impediments to prerequisites of resilience – latent abilities to ‘accommodate and recover’ and to ‘change in order to survive’ for

---

111 UNDESA, E-Governance: A powerful tool to combat, mitigate and sustainably manage disaster risks  

112 The Rockefeller Foundation. Building greater resilience and more inclusive economics. New York: The Rockefeller Foundation; 2016  
[https://www.google.it/search?q=The+Rockefeller+Foundation.+Building+Greater+Resilience+and+more+inclusive+Economy&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiLi7GFrqfVAhVJJ1AKHZ2JdD4UQ7yUI5SgA&biw=1266&bih=729](https://www.google.it/search?q=The+Rockefeller+Foundation.+Building+Greater+Resilience+and+more+inclusive+Economy&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiLi7GFrqfVAhVJJ1AKHZ2JdD4UQ7yUI5SgA&biw=1266&bih=729)

long-term effectiveness, sustainability and reliability, eradication of corrupt practices should be prerequisite to initiatives for climate change, poverty reduction, disaster risk reduction and resilience (...). \[114\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusive Governance</th>
<th>SDG 16.7 Responsible, inclusive participatory and representative decision making at all levels</th>
<th>Adaptive and transformative capacities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to information</td>
<td>SDG 16.10 Ensure public access to information and protect fundamental freedoms.</td>
<td>Anticipatory &amp; adaptive capacities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence prevention</td>
<td>SDG 16.a strengthen national institutions for building capacities to prevent violence and combat terrorism</td>
<td>Preventive – transformative capacities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDG 16.b Strengthen relevant national institutions...for building capacity to prevent violence and combat terrorism and crime</td>
<td>Preventive – transformative capacities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANNEX II. Mainstreaming of Crisis Response Plans and SDGs in UNDAFs in Lebanon and Jordan**

Whilst considering the scope for “SDGizing Resilience/Crisis response frameworks in Jordan and Lebanon”, it is also worth looking at the extent to which UN development assistance frameworks (UNSF (2017-2020) in Lebanon; and UN Sustainable Development Framework (2018-2022) in Jordan) are ‘integrating’ national/country crisis response plans, including humanitarian support components – whilst supporting the SDGs.

In this regard, it is worth noting that in both countries, both frameworks are primarily considered as aligned with/‘complementary’ to crisis/resilience response plans, and share a common intent to strengthen the Humanitarian-Development (and Peace-building) nexus.

“The UNSDF will align fully with the Government’s overall strategy for the coming years, Jordan 2025, and with other key policy documents. These include the Jordan Response Plan for the Syria Crisis (JRP) (p. 7)”

“The UNSF reaffirms humanitarian principles in relation to the impact of the Syria crisis, including the needs of over 1 million Syrian refugees, and acknowledges the continued requirement for a Lebanon Crisis Response Plan (LCRP) that supports the Syrian refugees while also strengthening the resilience of local institutions and host communities to manage the current situation. UN support for the LCRP, which is expected to be extended to cover the 2017-2020 period, is outlined in the UNSF. The LCRP and UNSF are thus fully aligned and complementary”.

In both cases, efforts have been made to integrate short term/medium term priorities set forth in crisis response plans, including action targeting refugees. In the case of Jordan, there is this notion

that development assistance priorities should however go beyond ‘resilience’ and take a ‘broader approach to vulnerability’: “Linking humanitarian and development initiatives calls for complementing shorter action plans such as the JRP with a longer-term perspective that prioritizes not only resilience, but also a broader approach to vulnerability that reaches the furthest behind first, and that is more responsive to the people being served....p.8).

In Jordan, the UNSDF explicitly reflects on JRP priorities (including refugee needs) under its Outcome 2 reaffirming UN support to the “provision of life-saving services” to refugees and asylum-seekers, Outcome 3, where the aim is to empower refugees and vulnerable Jordanian hosting communities to exercise their rights and access decent jobs under the Jordan Compact115, to improve their sense of belonging behavior and attitudes, community tolerance, resilience and social cohesion, as well as Outcome 1 (see Table 1 below).

In Lebanon, the UNSF (2017-2020) reflects “activities presently being undertaken by UN agencies under the “Lebanon Crisis Response Plan (LCRP) that are likely to be continued under future joint Government and UN crisis response plans in the coming years. The activities (...) aim at supporting all vulnerable populations in Lebanon, with particular focus on the Lebanese. The approach focuses on building the resilience of the target group at every level” (see Par. 96)” (....) “Through the inter-agency mechanism led by UNHCR and UNDP, a number of existing “sectors” established under the LCRP will be engaged – according to their relevance – for the oversight/implementation of some outputs of the UNSF (par. 151)”. LCRP priorities are thus mainstreamed, possibly to a larger extent compared to Jordan-under most UNSF Outcomes, and the Results Framework contains a large number of indicators capturing refugee-specific needs.

As regards SDG linkages, the UNSDF strategic priorities are anchored onto the national priorities set forth in Jordan Vision 2015 and broadly linked with the SDGs the Goal level. The Results and Resources Framework does not establish explicit linkages with relevant SDG target indicators. As there is no national development plan (linked to the SDGs) in Lebanon, UNSF linkages with the SDGs have necessarily been established in a more ad hoc– though more granular- manner than in Jordan. Annex III of the UNSF in Lebanon maps out the framework Core Priorities and Outcomes to the SDGs and relevant SDG target indicators (with some being explicitly integrated into the UNSF Results Framework).

Table 1: Jordan UN Sustainable Development Framework, the Jordan Response Plan and SDG Linkages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNDD STRATEGIC PRIORITIES &amp; OUTCOMES</th>
<th>SDG linkages</th>
<th>JRP relevant indicators116</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Strengthened Institutions</td>
<td>All SDGs</td>
<td>Number of laws and policies which are adopted and/or modified in line with international/UN standards and conventions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Outcome 1: Institutions in Jordan at national and local levels are more responsive, inclusive, accountable, transparent and resilient | \[115\] ODI, 2018, «The Jordan Compact: Lessons learned and implications for future refugee compacts” https://data2.unhcr.org/fr/documents/download/61932
\[116\] It is noted that “Specific targets and indicators contained in the RRF insist that all indicators are disaggregated by gender, age, location, vulnerable groups in order to gauge progress specifically in these areas. Where appropriate other levels of disaggregation will be applied, including by sector. This is consistent with the ‘vulnerabilities approach’ of the UNSDF and the 2030 Agenda ‘leave no one behind’ and ‘reaching the farthest first’ prerogatives. Where possible the UN has sought to adopt indicators and targets in national plans or those contained in the universally available SDG monitoring framework” |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LCRP-relevant UNSF Outcomes</th>
<th>LCRP relevant- UNSF indicators</th>
<th>SDG Linkages (cf. UNSF Annex III)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 1.1: Territorial integrity and security strengthened in accordance with human rights principles (i.e. external security).</strong></td>
<td>Number and type of administrative procedures to identify individuals in need of international protection and access to territory adopted and implemented at border points by national authorities.</td>
<td>SDG 16 (Indicator 16.1.2) (conflict related deaths...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 1.3: Lebanon has institutionalized mechanisms to promote peace and prevent, mitigate and manage conflict at municipal and local level</strong></td>
<td>Number of communities maintaining peace and security through improved service provision and peace building efforts. Number of structures/mechanisms comprising Lebanese and refugee communities that play an active role in dispute resolution and conflict prevention.</td>
<td>SDG 16 - Indicators 16.1.3 (Population subjected to violence); 16.1.4 (Proportion of people that feel safe walking alone around the area they live)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 2.1: Government’s ability to improve the performance of institutions and promote participation and accountability increased.</strong></td>
<td>Number and type of policies and plans adopted by the Government vis a vis: refugees, asylum seekers, women and children in line with international standard Number of people (including refugees, women, children, youth, elderly, persons with disabilities, and others) accessing services from Social Development Centers Number of new legal measures adopted to facilitate timely and affordable access to justice to vulnerable groups (refugees, migrant workers, Lebanese poor, victims of trafficking).</td>
<td>SDG 16 - Indicators 16.7.1 (proportion of positions by age, sex, ...) in public institutions; 16.7.2 (youth multisectoral needs addressed in national development plans); 16.b.1 (satisfaction with experience of public services)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Outcome 2.2: State has institutionalized mechanisms for enhanced protection of human rights, rule of law and access to justice for all people in Lebanon. | % girls and women reporting satisfaction with services provided (disaggregated by Lebanese and refugees). | Number of court rulings making reference to international human rights, refugee and labor norms.  
Number of new legal measures adopted to facilitate timely and affordable access to justice to vulnerable groups (refugees, migrant workers, Lebanese poor, victims of trafficking).  
Percentage of refugee newborn babies having their birth registered with Lebanese authorities (PSD/Nofous) | SDG 16 – b.1 (population reporting discrimination or harassment...) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outcome 3.1. Productive sectors strengthened to promote inclusive growth and local development especially in most disadvantaged areas. | Number of people accessing new and decent short and long-term employment through policy support and employment creation programs within Lebanese law (disaggregated by gender and age as well as Lebanese and refugees).  
Number of people with improved access to local, communal infrastructure and services in the 251 most vulnerable cadastres (disaggregated by gender and age as well as Lebanese and refugees). | SDG 1.2.1. Percentage of population living below the national poverty line  
SDG 2, SDG 10, SDG 8, SDG 9, SDG 17 |
| Outcome 3.2. Improved equitable access to and delivery of quality social services, social protection and direct assistance. | % increase of population without formal health insurance coverage, who access primary, secondary and tertiary health care at affordable cost with support from UN (disaggregated by Lebanese and Syrians and Palestinian refugees and gender)  
% of population using safely managed drinking water services with support from the UN (disaggregated by Lebanese and refugees and gender) [SDG 6.1.1].  
Percentage of wastewater safely managed with support from the UN (disaggregated by Lebanese and refugees) [SDG 6.3.1].  
Number of vulnerable individuals with access to social protection (including social safety net) disaggregated by gender and age.  
Number of non-Lebanese vulnerable individuals with access to direct assistance (e.g. cash benefits, shelter, emergency assistance, food assistance). | SDG 6 (Indicators: 6.1.1. Percentage of population using safely managed drinking water services  
6.3.1. Percentage of wastewater safely treated  
5 DG 3 (Indicators 3.b.1. Proportion of the population with access to affordable medicines and vaccines on a sustainable basis  
SDG 4 (Indicators) 4.3.1. Participation rate of youth and adults in formal and non-formal education and training in the last 12 months  
SDG 2, SDG 9, SDG 5, SDG 17 |
| Outcome 3.3. Lebanon has improved environmental governance | Number of initiatives linked to the national solid waste management Strategy implemented at regional and local level. (....) | SDG 11 (11.6.1 Percentage of urban and rural solid waste regularly collected and with adequate final discharge with regard to the total waste generated
SDG 7 (7.2.1. Renewable energy share in the total final energy consumption
15.9.1 Number of national development plans and processes integrating biodiversity and ecosystem services values
Other SDGs : SDG 13, 12, 15 |