

Ergebnisse der Stakeholderbefragung zur Bewertung der Deutschen Nachhaltigkeitsstrategie

Durchgeführt vom 17. Oktober bis 1. Dezember 2017 im Rahmen des internationalen Peer Reviews 2018 durch die Geschäftsstelle des RNE

Inhalt

Überblick	3
Academia	4
Fresenius Business School	4
Science Platform Sustainability 2030	8
SRU - Sachverständigenrat für Umweltfragen	18
Sustainable Development Solutions Networks Germany	25
Dr. Maja Göpel	33
Business	37
Bundesverband der Deutschen Industrie e.V.	37
VDMA – Verband Deutscher Maschinen- und Anlagenbau e.V.	43
Wirtschaftsvereinigung Stahl	48
Civil society	51
Brot für die Welt	51
Bund für Umwelt und Naturschutz Deutschland e.V.	57
Christoffel-Blindenmission Deutschland e.V.	62
Deutscher Bundesjugendring e.V.	77
Deutsche Gesellschaft für Nachhaltiges Bauen e.V.	82
DGB (German Trade Union Confederation)	86
Forum Umwelt und Entwicklung	90
genanet - Leitstelle Gender, Umwelt, Nachhaltigkeit	96
Lokale Agenda21 für Feldkirchen-Westerham	101
NABU e.V.	106
Transparency International Deutschland e.V.	113
VENRO e.V (Association of German Development and Humanitarian Aid NGOs)	117
Verbraucherzentraler Bundesverband e.V. (The Federation of German Consumer Organisations)	122
Politics	127
Deutsche UNESCO-Kommission	127
Deutscher Städtetag (German Association of Cities)	131
Deutsches Institut für Menschenrechte (German Institute für Human Rights)	135
Thüringer Ministerium für Umwelt, Energie und Naturschutz	138

Überblick

Die Bundesregierung hat den Rat für Nachhaltige Entwicklung nach 2009 und 2013 erneut mit der Organisation eines Peer Reviews, einem internationalen ExpertInnengutachten zur deutschen Nachhaltigkeitspolitik beauftragt.

Die internationale ExpertInnengruppe hat sich am 27. und 28. September 2017, unter Leitung von Helen Clark, der ehemaligen neuseeländischen Ministerpräsidentin und frühere Leiterin des UN-Entwicklungsprogramms UNDP, zu einer ersten Sitzung getroffen und auf zentrale Themen ihrer Untersuchung geeinigt.

Auf Grundlage der Ergebnisse entwarf die Geschäftsstelle des RNE einen Fragebogen, um Eindrücke und Einschätzungen von Akteuren aus der Zivilgesellschaft, Politik, Wirtschaft und Forschung zu erfassen. Diese Einschätzungen werden allen Peers zur Verfügung gestellt um sie in ihrer Arbeit zu unterstützen.

Im Fragebogen sind die drei Themenkomplexe *Status Quos der deutschen Nachhaltigkeitsstrategie, Governancestrategie und -ansatz* sowie *neue Chancen und Hindernisse der Umsetzung* enthalten. Des Weiteren bestand die Möglichkeit in einem vierten Textfeld zusätzliche Informationen bereitzustellen, die bis dahin nicht abgedeckt wurden.

Der Fragebogen wurde den Teilnehmenden des Nachhaltigkeitsforums beim Bundeskanzleramt zugeschickt und zusätzlich allen weiteren Akteuren frei zugänglich auf der Homepage des RNE zur Verfügung gestellt. Bis zum Ende der Frist am 1. Dezember 2017 wurden 32 Feedbackbögen eingereicht. An der Umfrage beteiligten sich 15 zivilgesellschaftliche Akteure, sechs Akteure aus dem Bereich der Forschung, vier aus der Wirtschaft und sieben aus der Politik.

Alle zur Veröffentlichung freigegebenen Feedbackbögen sind in diesem Dokument aufgeführt. Die Sortierung der Beiträge erfolgte alphabetisch und nach Stakeholderkategorien.

Academia

Fresenius Business School

General Information	
Name and function:	Prof. Dr. Thomas Osburg
Answers on behalf of (name of your organization):	Fresenius Business School
Which stakeholder do you represent or belong to (no ranking implied, multiple answers possible):	<input type="checkbox"/> a) politics, <input type="checkbox"/> b) administration, <input type="checkbox"/> c) enterprise or the business community, <input type="checkbox"/> d) the labour movement, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> e) academia, <input type="checkbox"/> f) municipalities and associations, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> g) youth, <input type="checkbox"/> h) gender interests, <input type="checkbox"/> i) migration groups, <input type="checkbox"/> j) the disabled movement, <input type="checkbox"/> k) the churches, <input type="checkbox"/> l) financial actors, <input type="checkbox"/> m) the countries, <input type="checkbox"/> n) grassroots initiatives or local agenda groups, <input type="checkbox"/> o) other interests?
Have you sent in a contribution on the draft of the 2016 Sustainable Development Strategy?	No
Do you agree with the publication of your contribution on the RNE-website?	Yes

1. The state of play of the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016

- 1.1 In your view, what are the general challenges and benefits for Germany concerning sustainable development? In that regard, have you identified significant gaps in the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016?

Sustainable Development needs the inclusion of people, in that respect Germany could do more. News are dominated by raising CO2 emissions, wrong behavior of politicians and managers, or similar. The population does not fully see the benefits of becoming more sustainable

- 1.2 Have you identified strategic incoherencies within the German Sustainable Development policies? Would you have proposals to increase coherence and meaningful output?

Policies need to focus more on a balanced view of Sustainability. Electric Cars, for example, are not emission-free, it is the outputs of CoalPlants. A more balanced approach is needed, not one single one-size-fits-all approach.

- 1.3 Do you think the measurement and reporting mechanisms are adequate to implement the 2030 Agenda by Germany?

Mainly yes. However, the communication of measures and how to reach them needs to be improved

- 1.4 Which off-track goals and targets (meaning those targets marked with "thunderstorm" or "overcast") in the German Sustainable Development Strategy do you think are the most important? According to you, why are they off track?

We see a lack of focus. Government needs to better prioritize where Germany can have a stronger impact and then shift the resources there. The "Gießkanne" principal might be a political necessity, but not helping the Sustainable Agenda

2. The governance approach and structure

- 2.1 Are you satisfied with the institutions and the enabling environment both the government and the non-state actors have created so far?

Only partially. SDGs, for example, have become extremely dominant to achieve but even me as a sort of expert would rarely know who to turn to. The role of NGOs is single-focused and Digitalization is not at all mentioned. It seems to be driven by particular or personal interests

- 2.2 According to you, is the sense of urgency as determined by science-based goals well understood and does it orient action (e.g. in your area)?

No. The sense of urgency is still not there in Germany. Partially understandable, as the economy is doing well, the "sky is blue and the trees are green". A lot of people don't see the need for action, other than maybe the 2 degrees global warming goal.

- 2.3 As a partner or stakeholders do you feel enabled to actively participate in dialogue on and to contribute actions for sustainability?

Yes, very much so. I would like to bring our research and directions stronger into the discussion but often don't know who to turn to

- 2.4 Is the science-policy interface working? Do results of "science for sustainability" already make a difference?

Only in technical details. There is a lot of research on "hard" facts, but very little on societal impact, consequences and opportunities of digitalization, etc. This is where our own research focusses but it finds little resonance in politics or organizations, as it's rather long term oriented.

3. New opportunities and challenges

- 3.1 Which new opportunities and challenges do you identify for Germany? Does the Sustainable Development Strategy help to address them? (Explanation: „new“ in the sense of: next, or not yet fully grasped, or appearing when you scan the horizon)

Clearly Digitalization. There is very little information or discussion on the effects of Digitalization (positive and negative) , but it will be a key component to win or fail.

- 3.2 Are there areas where Germany can and must show leadership and set new standards?

Basically everywhere, but a focus is needed, so it needs to be (1) in the Climate/Energy sector, (2) in WorldClass Education and (3) Sustainable Cities/Urbanisation. In all those areas the competence is there, but increasingly we leave it to other countries to lead.

- 3.3 Is the "fear of the future and transformation" a notion in society strong enough that you feel your organization and the Government will have to deal with it more carefully?

Absolutely yes. People feel increasingly frightened and seem to more and more accept the facts of today, as Germany "does well right now". There is very little interest and energy to change something and a lot of new developments are neglected or put in the "I'm afraid of but don't know why" category.

- 3.4 Is communication an issue?

Yes. (See above). We need to shift communication to highlight the personal positive effects for individuals. People don't change necessarily habits for a "better Africa" but because of their own interest.

4. Do you have any other general message that you want to share with the Peers?

Nothing that was not said above, within the scope of this questionnaire

Science Platform Sustainability 2030

General Information	
Name and function:	Co-Chairs (Nanz, Messner, Visbeck)
Answers on behalf of (name of your organization):	<p>Science Platform Sustainability 2030</p> <p>As a general remark: The Science Platform Sustainability 2030 was only founded in May 2017 and it is currently developing its programme of work as well as its formats for interaction and communication. Hence, the answers are given by us, the three co-chairs of the platform, in light of its overall mandate and the outcomes of its first deliberations. Whenever possible, our responses will refer to concrete thematic work to be done by the platform. For more generic questions, we will provide answers to the questions based on our own long-standing involvement in sustainability issues.</p>
Which stakeholder do you represent or belong to (no ranking implied, multiple answers possible):	<input type="checkbox"/> a) politics, <input type="checkbox"/> b) administration, <input type="checkbox"/> c) enterprise or the business community, <input type="checkbox"/> d) the labour movement, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> e) academia, <input type="checkbox"/> f) municipalities and associations, <input type="checkbox"/> g) youth, <input type="checkbox"/> h) gender interests, <input type="checkbox"/> i) migration groups, <input type="checkbox"/> j) the disabled movement, <input type="checkbox"/> k) the churches, <input type="checkbox"/> l) financial actors, <input type="checkbox"/> m) the countries, <input type="checkbox"/> n) grassroots initiatives or local agenda groups, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> o) other interests?
Have you sent in a contribution on the draft of the 2016 Sustainable Development Strategy?	<p>NO.</p> <p>The constitution of the Science Platform Sustainability 2030 itself was triggered by the new German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016 (SDS) (cf. SDS, pp. 48-49) ; that said, both SDSN Germany and IASS as "Trägerorganisationen" of the Platform commented on the draft Strategy in 2016.</p>
Do you agree with the publication of your contribution on the RNE-website?	Yes

1. The state of play of the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016

- 1.1 In your view, what are the general challenges and benefits for Germany concerning sustainable development? In that regard, have you identified significant gaps in the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016?

Germany has, overall, a good track record on sustainability policy. The concept of sustainability is widely known and often well accepted. However, more has to be done to apply the Sustainability Strategy in all policy processes in order to turn this Strategy into action. Until now, the Sustainability Strategy was not yet able to shape several central political processes, debates and direct action in politics, economy and society.

The Sustainability Strategy 2016 (hereafter: Strategy) as a deliberative process and consented result is – both in terms of content and management architecture – a major achievement that translates overarching goals and a broad consensus into a wide variety of actions. It must be emphasized that in a country like Germany the rapid translation of an international agreement such as the 2030 Agenda into a comprehensive set of national policies is by no means a given. However, little progress has been made towards implementing the desired changes in such key transformation areas as decarbonization, mobility, or the current status of the nutrition and agro-production sector, to name but a few.

The very fact that the Strategy proclaims that the SDGs should be implemented in, with and by Germany – a potentially far-reaching attempt to implement the “universal nature” of the 2030 Agenda – is a good indicator that sustainability has taken its place on the agenda in German politics, society, and business. It remains to be seen, however, if and how the Strategy can be implemented by 2030.

It is a challenge in its own right that the timeframe of 2030 is extremely ambitious for several of the problems we are facing. At the same time, there are some issue areas where the targets of the previous Strategy were not fulfilled and simply carried forward into the 2030 timeframe. Thus, a more rigorous deficit analysis followed by action to overcome implementation deficits is required for the 2016 Strategy.

It is to be welcomed that the Strategy underlines the importance of science in implementing but also critically reflecting upon the 2030 Agenda/Strategy. Knowledge is crucial to sustainable development. The Strategy underlines that policy targets and instruments are to be designed on a scientific basis. This scientific basis should encompass diverse forms of knowledge and science, e.g. basic research, applied research, transformation research as well as transformative research.

The establishment of the Science Platform Sustainability 2030 is a key step towards systematically linking scientific findings and, more generally, a scientifically informed way of implementing sustainable development based on the implementation process of the Strategy. Thus, by making the Science Platform an independent part of the German sustainability architecture, a gap has been closed and the dialogue between science and policy has been further enhanced.

The Science Platform builds upon a strong foundation of sustainability-related research in Germany (e.g. FONA and many other activities), which needs to be strengthened – quantitatively, qualitatively, but also structurally as sustainability-related research – in the coming years. The research landscape relevant for implementing the 2030 Agenda/the Strategy includes basic research and innovative forms of science-policy interface, which should also be strengthened further. In this context, the Science Platform should be supported and used to initiate strategic dialogues on its identified topics between actors from science and those interested in implementing both the 2030 Agenda and the Strategy.

1.2 Have you identified strategic incoherencies within the German Sustainable Development policies? Would you have proposals to increase coherence and meaningful output?

There is a basic incoherence in the Strategy. On the one hand it is composed (bottom-up) of different policy fields and policies, making certain linkages and highlighting some synergies, trade-offs, conflicts and potentials for innovative crosscutting initiatives/structures. On the other, it still lacks top-down framing, a standard-setting strategy and programme with robust quality control, a more profound deficit analysis, reforming and transforming effects on policies and societal realities. This incoherence affects the sectoral dimension as well as levels of decision-making, the territorial dimension, and the necessary links between short-, medium-, and long-term activities.

It is also often pointed out that the “in, with and by Germany” approach of the Strategy is not yet matched by the indicators identified by the Strategy. In fact, most of them address the “in” Germany dimension.

On the one hand, coherence is per se a challenge for sectorally-oriented policymaking. The Science Platform is therefore a promising vehicle to foster more coherent analysis and subsequently action, in policy and science alike – as science is often organised according to disciplines and used for inter- and transdisciplinary processes at the same time. The potential to address challenges for sustainability is therefore often not fully met. On the other hand, the notion of “trade-offs” and synergies between different goals, targets and respective action are at the core of the 17 SDGs. The Science Platform can be understood as an important instrument to identify ways towards coherence. The platform is accordingly very clear about the need to ask questions and design research processes across different SDGs and the related sectors, and will base its efforts on scientific understanding and expertise.

Thus, the Science Platform itself is a concrete proposal made by the Strategy in the context of coherence. However, the Strategy – even the latest version – is not yet seen as a key instrument by some political actors and processes. A key indicator for this might be the rather weak chapter on “Governance” vis-à-vis the Strategy, which is mentioned only at the very end of the Strategy in a fairly superficial way. The Science Platform is very clear about the fact that “Governance” will be a key focus of

its work, both for concrete sustainability areas and for the sustainability governance architecture as such.

1.3 Do you think the measurement and reporting mechanisms are adequate to implement the 2030 Agenda by Germany?

It is important that the official monitoring and reporting mechanisms be strengthened internally, for example in order to cope with the enhanced needs but also potentials that arise from aligning the Strategy with the 2030 Agenda and its 17 SDGs. Furthermore, due to the overall “pledge and review” approach of the 2030 Agenda, it was/is key that the German sustainability governance architecture be supplemented by further instruments and activities that open up further stakeholder engagements for monitoring and review, such as the “Forum Nachhaltigkeit” organised by the Chancellery. As the government is very clear about the fact that the implementation of the 2030 Agenda (including monitoring and review) must involve the government, civil society, the business sector and, in the end, every citizen, a wider basis for “reporting” and monitoring is crucial.

The government’s invitation to the scientific community to create the Science Platform as a part of the new sustainability architecture in itself is also a distinct step in this direction. It supplements the official reporting mechanisms and “logics” with another, science-based and independent approach to analysis and reporting. As stated before, the integrative nature of the 2030 Agenda, which has to address and capture progress as well as deficits across sectoral policy and reporting processes, underlines the call for greater engagement by a wider scientific audience. One part of this challenge is also achieving a better understanding, communication and constant improvement of the impact of sustainability-related research, as it relates to fundamental and applied research alike.

1.4 Which off-track goals and targets (meaning those targets marked with “thunderstorm” or “overcast”) in the German Sustainable Development Strategy do you think are the most important? According to you, why are they off track?

The Science Platform is not yet in a position to express a view on which off-track goals and targets are the most important. However, we can make two comments: First, the improved use of existing knowledge and a more targeted dialogue between “implementers” and “knowledge producers” in the context of the 2030 Agenda is meant to trigger new and innovative interventions (e. g. across individual SDGs or sectors). Second, as an independent Science Platform, we will address questions and trigger work processes that also challenge perceptions of “trade-offs” or “thunderstorms”, as these concepts are/can be often too static. The Science Platform can help to identify new options for solutions in order to overcome off-track roads with alternative options and innovative solutions.

That said, the Science Platform has identified and will address four types of problem that can also be seen as an answer to this question, i.e. focusing on off-track targets. These are as follows:

a) Areas in which Germany is lagging behind (e.g. child poverty in Germany, unsustainable patterns of production and consumption); b) Areas that are ripe for action but which possibly require another impulse (also) from science (e.g. current discourse on mobility, future of work, particularly as relating to digitalisation); c) Key transformation processes (e.g. the German energy transition, decarbonization strategies, future models of prosperity and welfare); and d) Problems relating to the integrative nature of the 2030 Agenda (e.g. natural resources and commons).

2. The governance approach and structure

2.1 Are you satisfied with the institutions and the enabling environment both the government and the non-state actors have created so far?

Progress in this field has been ongoing and the 2016 Strategy has further contributed to this. The State-Secretary Committee, the newly established “Coordinators” at each federal ministry, the Parliamentary Council, and the RNE are key actors and processes. The Chancellery's newly founded “Forum Nachhaltigkeit” could provide an important platform for efforts to deepen the exchange with multi-stakeholder groups, incl. science. However, it remains to be seen how the forum will be implemented under the incoming government.

As a science platform, we are not yet in a position to comment in depth on the existing approach to governance with respect to the multitude of remaining gaps in implementation and the political importance of the 2030 agenda. However, even if we can be overall “satisfied” particularly with the general level of the “enabling environment” for science, it is one of the central questions for profound analysis also for the Science Platform is about the effectiveness of the institutions created and governance put in place so far.

With respect to science, the Strategy clearly states: “The Federal Government has embraced these [scientific] initiatives and offers a platform on which scientific support for the implementation of the SDGs will be pooled. The platform’s work will be systematically integrated into the further management, dialogue and implementation process of the 2030 Agenda in order, in close cooperation between science, society and policymaker, to highlight the advances and the shortcomings in the implementation of the SDGs in Germany, by Germany and with Germany and thus to conduct the debate over sustainability policy on a scientific basis.” (p. 49)

We perceive this as recognition of the important role of science (in all of its forms and disciplinary backgrounds) and its various contributions to the ongoing transformative processes of sustainability. It is also an invitation or a request to critically review, support, and “push” for the effective implementation and enhancement of the Strategy. The very fact that the Science Platform is accompanied by an inter-ministerial circle open to all federal ministries (the following ministries are currently actively involved: BMBF, BMUB, BMZ, BMEL, BMAS and the Federal Chancellery) can be seen as a rather strong indication that this Science Platform is indeed becoming “strategically integrated” into the dialogue and implementation processes, as stated in the Strategy (p. 49).

2.2 According to you, is the sense of urgency as determined by science-based goals well understood and does it orient action (e.g. in your area)?

By enabling science to create such a Science Platform as part of the sustainability architecture, the overall importance of science is generally understood. Whether the sustainability architecture is already well-equipped to turn the sense of urgency into action is as yet unclear. And whether the Strategy has the political clout to proactively frame those policy fields addressed by the 2030 Agenda is yet another – and even less promising – issue. The main remaining gaps are not so much within the Strategy, but rather between the Strategy and different sectors – politically, economically, but also as it relates to consumer behaviour etc. Thus, the lack of understanding (vis-à-vis urgency as well as opportunities that a more forceful implementation of the 2030 Agenda would offer Germany) is rather to be described as a lack of power of the Strategy.

This has two consequences for the role of science: first, the challenges and the scope of an agenda as ambitious as the implementation of the 2030 Agenda in, with and by Germany cannot build upon a perfect scientific basis yet. There are still several challenges to be understood, both in terms of concrete scientific insights but also in terms of governance, of overall visions, orientations, or narratives for a more forceful implementation of the targets. The 2030 Agenda is also an agenda of scientific advancement - and much has already been moved in the past couple of years.

Second, science, due to its own universal nature, its particular pluralistic arrangements for cooperation in basic research in Germany, its strong track record of innovative science-policy formats, and its potential to think across sectors, can be a key actor in efforts to improve understanding and provide options for solutions to close this gap between an ambitious Strategy and the established sectors and processes that are meant to be subject to its guidance. And while it does not behave science to decide upon political positions and strategies, sustainability-related research in general and transformation research in particular has done much to address such knowledge-action gaps. Hence the questions arising around HOW knowledge can be translated into action in concrete issue areas (whether individual goals or clusters of SDGs) will be at the centre of the platform's programme of work.

2.3 As a partner or stakeholders do you feel enabled to actively participate in dialogue on and to contribute actions for sustainability?

The Science Platform's mandate, objectives, structural interactions, and cooperative ties afford it a good starting position in this regard. The Science Platform itself is an invitation to the wider scientific community to participate, e.g. in working groups or other interactive formats currently being developed by the platform. Furthermore, the setup of the steering group and the use of different outreach formats are concrete offers for participation the Science Platform provides to foster science-policy-society interactions in the context of the Strategy's implementation. That said, the platform's steering group will, for sure, reflect upon the question whether or not

enabled participation is really leading towards contributions that are being taken up in the implementation process. In other words, this coordinating body will help to raise reflection on crucial science-policy interfaces to a new level of understanding and effective action.

2.4 Is the science-policy interface working? Do results of “science for sustainability” already make a difference?

We see in the creation of the Science Platform a signal that the scientific community is viewed as a key actor for the implementation process of the 2030 Agenda. Hence, the science-policy interface is working insofar as the “worlds of science and politics” are not operating in isolation anymore. The question of whether results are already making a difference could only be answered on a case-by-case basis – leading in the end to mixed results.

The existence in Germany of a very rich landscape of research/advisory councils is a particularly important aspect. The platform is currently considering how it could cooperate with these organisations (e.g. WBGU or SRU, to mention just two) to make better use of this potential for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda and the Strategy.

Furthermore, the German context is special. Its pluralistic scientific landscape entails not only different methods, ways of doing research, and foci. It is also shaped by the federal system (Länder level) underpinning the education system, the university landscape, and the academies that interact with the research organisations and research funding programmes supported and/or initiated by the Federal Government. Like some other countries, Germany does not have a Senior Science Adviser to the Government but a complex architecture of science organisations and processes of advice. Science in Germany is and can be operating on a firm conviction of the principle of freedom of science in all of its forms. The Science Platform must be viewed in this context, underlining its role as platform for this wide and diverse research landscape.

It should also be mentioned that the creation and implementation of the global 2030 Agenda and the Strategy cannot be understood without a strong science-base on various accounts (see question 2.2). The field of sustainability research – as broadly understood as possible – has been a pioneer for scientific advancements (e.g. integrative assessments) and, particularly in Germany, for innovations for a more effective science-policy interface (e.g. transdisciplinary approaches, platforms, but also funding programmes).

Science has contributed to sustainability discourse from the outset. The continuous growth seen in this field of research in recent years – quantitatively and qualitatively – is a major achievement. If this growth is to be sustainable, research around the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, for example, must operate on two levels, driving the further development of the research agenda (e.g. by elevating scientifically relevant questions and advancing cooperation) and further improving its ability to contribute its insights into politically and societally relevant problems. The

Science Platform in particular is meant to explore new ways and formats of science-policy interface that will enhance the use of knowledge in the implementation of the 2030 Agenda and facilitate broader and deeper participation by the research community by using the multiplicity of research forms, knowledge claims, or specific expertise.

Thus, can science play an even more proactive role, and if so, is it already well-equipped to keep up with the substantial increase of ambition put forward by the 2030 Agenda? A key instrument for this is certainly to continue research funding for sustainability in a structural manner (e.g. FONAs), at least at its current levels, and to continue the dialogue between those in charge of the 2030 Agenda/Strategy and research funders and research institutions of these topics. The pluralistic research landscape in Germany should be continuously used to build on the freedom of research for a productive support of the implementation process. We are therefore also convinced that the independent nature of the Science Platform is of crucial importance, in particular with respect to its interactions with existing governmental advisory bodies as well as with the bottom-up research community.

The Science Platform itself is a (sustainability-related) governance innovation, as it links the worlds of top-down policymaking (and their scientific advisory bodies) and bottom-up research, analysis, and criticism. We are also convinced that the platform's modest budget of around 1.34 million euros for its inception phase (2017/18) represents a sound investment, building upon areas of research of direct relevance to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda/Strategy which are supported by hundreds of millions of euros in spending annually.

3. New opportunities and challenges

- 3.1 Which new opportunities and challenges do you identify for Germany? Does the Sustainable Development Strategy help to address them? (Explanation: „new“ in the sense of: next, or not yet fully grasped, or appearing when you scan the horizon)

In our view, knowledge is the key “resource” that underpins both Germany's capacity to innovate and develop sustainable business models, and its ability to find coherent and cohesive modes of operation and cooperation. Any of these new opportunities and challenges, be it digitalization, changes in the mobility sector, or the future of work more generally, will need answers informed by facts and accompanied by dialogues between different societal actors, including science.

The Science Platform cannot and does not wish to duplicate work done by other scientific actors. Accordingly, the potential for transformation and the domestic and international relevance of issues will rank high among the selection criteria for its programme of work. In the context of a first set of topics to be addressed by the Science Platform (see question 1.4), the Science Platform is going to establish formats to constantly reflect upon new opportunities and challenges from a scientific basis and hence the platform can be seen as a place to address exactly these

aforementioned questions in an “institutionalised” manner and from the perspectives of science.

3.2 Are there areas where Germany can and must show leadership and set new standards?

The implementation of the 2030 Agenda in, with, and by Germany is an ambitious undertaking. If this goal is pursued with great determination, Germany would set new standards for efforts to realize the universal nature of the 2030 Agenda that other countries could follow based on their specific circumstances. A lack of action in Germany on key transformation processes (e.g. around decarbonization or the spill-over effects of German production and consumption patterns) would call the country’s role as a frontrunner into question.

We are convinced that Germany has already set new standards for the science-policy interface and the role of science-based targets and stakeholder processes, including science, for the implementation of the agenda. In the coming years, the Science Platform and its findings have to be firmly integrated in the implementation processes to strengthen, for instance, both the analysis of deficits and opportunities of the implementation process.

3.3 Is the “fear of the future and transformation” a notion in society strong enough that you feel your organization and the Government will have to deal with it more carefully?

On one hand, the answer to this question is clearly a “yes”. On the other hand, the debates in Germany are to a fairly high degree informed by science and facts more generally. Given that sustainability issues are per se complex, multi-scale (in space and time) and dynamic, the crucial role of knowledge cannot be overestimated. The Science Platform can therefore also be seen as an offer to science and society alike to address proactively the challenges of “fear of the future and transformation”. In this respect, one issue could be highlighted: Additionally to its thematic work and to strengthening science-informed policymaking in concrete issue areas, the Science Platform must also reflect upon the notions of “fear” and “transformation” and provide the space and concrete formats to do so in an interactive manner. The challenges of the past two years, for example, around the notion of “post truth” are a clear reminder once again that a sound knowledge base for informed decision-making can be found not on the margins but in the centre of prosperous and free societies.

3.4 Is communication an issue?

Communication and cooperation are decisive dimensions of problem-solving and political action within the scope of the Agenda 2030 and the Strategy. A substantial strengthening of participation and cooperation processes within the Strategy, including the creation of the Science Platform, will support these efforts. However, the contribution of the Science Platform to the communication challenge would be to ensure that the “classic” understanding of communicating facts to “power” is

complemented by involving “users” in an appropriate manner in the research process. This is all the more important as the 2030 Agenda as a transformative agenda will have to change positions, expectations, and interest structures. Therefore, communication and provision of information will have to be supplemented by processes of collaborative work and the creation of a common understanding of the different and at times conflicting positions.

4. Do you have any other general message that you want to share with the Peers?

The Science Platform has issued as a first publication a paper about its role, key goals, key topics, and formats of interaction. This paper is attached to this questionnaire.

SRU - Sachverständigenrat für Umweltfragen

General Information	
Name and function:	Dr. Julia Hertin, Stv. Generalsekretärin
Answers on behalf of (name of your organization):	Sachverständigenrat für Umweltfragen (SRU)
Which stakeholder do you represent or belong to (no ranking implied, multiple answers possible):	<input type="checkbox"/> a) politics, <input type="checkbox"/> b) administration, <input type="checkbox"/> c) enterprise or the business community, <input type="checkbox"/> d) the labour movement, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> e) academia, <input type="checkbox"/> f) municipalities and associations, <input type="checkbox"/> g) youth, <input type="checkbox"/> h) gender interests, <input type="checkbox"/> i) migration groups, <input type="checkbox"/> j) the disabled movement, <input type="checkbox"/> k) the churches, <input type="checkbox"/> l) financial actors, <input type="checkbox"/> m) environment organization <input type="checkbox"/> n) development organization <input type="checkbox"/> o) "the Länder", <input type="checkbox"/> p) grassroots initiatives or local agenda groups, <input type="checkbox"/> q) other interests?
Have you sent in a contribution on the draft of the 2016 Sustainable Development Strategy?	yes
Do you agree with the publication of your contribution on the RNE-website?	yes

1. The state of play of the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016

1.1 In your view, what are the general challenges and benefits for Germany concerning sustainable development? In that regard, have you identified significant gaps in the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016?

- Germany has extensive and generally well-thought out SD institutions, but they often remain in the sustainability 'niche'. The key challenge still is a lack in implementation and mainstreaming of sustainability into all areas of policy-making and society.
- Economic interests still typically override environmental concerns in conflicts between SDGs and key policy decisions. The example of the transition in the power sector has shown that it is possible to establish and mobilise new economic interests to support sustainability transitions (renewables sector, innovative businesses) which then make political change possible, but this process takes too much time. Agriculture and transport are the two most important sectors which are on deeply unsustainable development pathways. While for transport, technical and social visions slowly become visible, large parts of the agricultural (policy) sector have not begun to face up to the sustainability challenge.
- Germany's SDS 2002 and 2016 provide an integrated framework for transformation and sustainability. In comparison with the previous strategy, the 2016 SDS adopts a broader view. It now covers certain environmental issues missed out in the former SDS, e.g. fishing, water, consumption and production. It combines targets and indicators with future measures. This key link was missing before and is a first step to identify concrete responsible ministries for any target.
- The current SDS should be improved in three regards: 1) It is still somewhat 'technocratic' and is missing concrete visions about sustainability pathways for individual sectors and society as a whole. These have, for example, been developed by the Environment Ministry in its "Integrated Environmental Programme 2030", but this kind of strategy does not exist at Cabinet level. Instead, different ministries pursue different pathways or just manage the status quo. 2) There needs to be more reflection on why certain targets are not being reached. All goals should have quantitative targets for 2030. 3) In some areas, targets are still framed as efficiency targets. Indicators for resource use and energy use have to be decoupled from GDP because we need absolute reductions independent from economic growth.

1.2 Have you identified strategic incoherencies within the German Sustainable Development policies? Would you have proposals to increase coherence and meaningful output?

- Incoherencies within German Sustainable Development policies are inherent because in general sustainable development addresses a comprehensive scope of topics and interest, e.g. the goal of a growing GDP inevitably leads to rising resource use.
- There is a lack of balancing the interests of different ministries in general. Compromise often takes the form of the 'smallest common denominator' which is

agreed at high administrative levels at the end of the decision-making process. A procedure to handle the conflicting goals in the SDS through the development of win-win strategies or joint visions is missing. Especially ministries representing strong economic sectors and interests, e.g. agriculture, transport, energy or industry, have not yet integrated the SDGs in their decision-making. Current examples of policies inconsistent with SDGs are the continuous high level of power generation from coal, weak standards for CO₂-emissions from cars and the implementation of the EU-Nitrogen Directive.

- There are also inconsistencies in the SDS targets: E.g. the NERC-goals 3.2.a are too weak to reach the goals 3.2.b (particulate matter) and 15.2 (eutrophication).
- Recommendations to foster more coherence and integration of sustainability in Germany's policy making include: the right of legislative initiative for the Environmental Ministry in 'other' policy areas, a veto of the Environmental Ministry on decisions of major environmental concern, a reform of the sustainability impact assessment, process for visioning/scenario development for transformation pathways carried out by several ministries - either within the SDS or in the context of sectoral strategies. A more transparent and less corporatist law-making process would help to reduce incoherence due to power asymmetry.

1.3 Do you think the measurement and reporting mechanisms are adequate to implement the 2030 Agenda by Germany?

The mechanisms are adequate for reporting in relation to individual topics. They do not provide a systems view and are not a forward-looking tool for policy development on SD. In addition to existing reporting mechanisms, a future oriented planning and assessment process is required for a broad as well as deep implementation of the Agenda 2030. The implementation of transformation should be understood as a creative and transparent learning process different from the well-known "technocratic model".

1.4 Which off-track goals and targets (meaning those targets marked with "thunderstorm" or "overcast") in the German Sustainable Development Strategy do you think are the most important? According to you, why are they off track?

- The reduction of nitrogen emissions is the starting point to come on track for various targets: nitrogen surplus in agriculture (2.1.a), nitrate concentration in groundwater (6.1.b), nutrient inputs in coastal and maritime waters (14.1.a). Additionally the driving force agriculture is responsible for some other negative effects regarding environment and health, e.g. Phosphor in rivers (6.1.a), biodiversity and landscape quality (15.1), air pollution (3.2).
- The most important reason for being off track is intensive agricultural production.
- The target for sustainable land use is not on track and will not be reached 2020. The target is to limit the expansion of built-up area and transport infrastructure to 30

hectares per day in 2020. Even though the expansion was reduced significantly in the last years, it is still twice as high with 66 hectares per day on average over the period 2012-2015. Recent trends show only a very slight decrease. The reason is that there are still too many greenfield developments in the outskirts of cities and villages instead of brownfield development in the cities. The target for 2030 (30 hectares “minus X”) should have been specified and tightened.

2. The governance approach and structure

2.1 Are you satisfied with the institutions and the enabling environment both the government and the non-state actors have created so far?

- Germany has a sophisticated institutional architecture to foster sustainable development but the sustainability ‘niche’ – although gaining in importance - still lacks power.
- Suspensive veto inside a ministry: Under the current strategy, each ministry appointed a central contact person (“Nachhaltigkeitsbeauftragte”). In the future, these individuals should be equipped with the competences necessary to implement the strategy into the policy of their ministry. In addition, the contact person should receive additional resources and staff. Ideally, the coordinator for sustainable development in each ministry should be a small central unit. Furthermore, the coordinator for sustainable development should have a suspensive right of veto. With this veto the coordinator should be able to halt intra-departmental decisions which are not in line with sustainable development in order to allow for renewed debate and a reconsideration of the decision inside the ministry. Ultimately, controversial points must be decided by the minister.
- Suspensive veto at cabinet level: The environmental ministry should be given the right to intervene in the legislative process by suspending the decisions which have considerable negative environmental effects. Again, this veto should allow a reconsideration of the decision.
- A strengthening of impact assessment is essential, e.g. stronger institutional integration, earlier action in legislative process, more transparency and the need to provide alternatives may increase coherence.
- Germany’s administrative culture is traditionally characterised by a specialisation, a focus on legal expertise and a high degree of conservatism. This hinders cooperation and slows down change. There is already experimentation with new forms of cooperation (e.g. inter-ministerial committees, SD ‘representatives’) but there also needs to be a broader change in administrative culture, e.g. through a higher mobility of staff members, a learning culture and more diversity in backgrounds (social scientists, natural scientists, economists etc.).

- 2.2 According to you, is the sense of urgency as determined by science-based goals well understood and does it orient action (e.g. in your area)?

While climate change is broadly recognised as important threat, the urgency of other environmental issues – biodiversity loss, nitrogen pollution, land use etc. - is not yet recognised in mainstream politics and society. Despite efforts by many institutions, relevant scientific input is rarely communicated outside specialist audiences. Non-environmental actors (media, companies, other ministries, etc.) should make more active contributions to communicating the sense of urgency. There is also not enough awareness for the need of profound transformation.

- 2.3 As a partner or stakeholders do you feel enabled to actively participate in dialogue on and to contribute actions for sustainability?

Yes, but mostly within the area of sustainable development under direction of Chancellors Office or Ministry for the Environment (and to some extent the Ministry of Economic Affairs). Other ministries such as Transport, Agriculture, Finance or Social Affairs tend to work in a more corporatist and less participatory style.

- 2.4 Is the science-policy interface working? Do results of “science for sustainability” already make a difference?

In some areas – for example energy – there have been considerable efforts to make research more relevant to sustainability challenges (‘transformative science’, participatory agenda setting etc.). In others, this is less the case. Generally, there is need for reform of the science-policy interface: Knowledge input needs to become more transparent, there is a need to link expertise-based processes and participation/consultation better, there is too much mono-disciplinary policy advice (e.g. mainstream economics), some advice mechanisms are not yet geared towards sustainability, there is need for reflexive policy based on monitoring and a culture of error tolerance.

3. New opportunities and challenges

- 3.1 Which new opportunities and challenges do you identify for Germany? Does the Sustainable Development Strategy help to address them? (Explanation: „new“ in the sense of: next, or not yet fully grasped, or appearing when you scan the horizon)

- Germany has not yet drawn up a comprehensive transformation agenda for a sustainable future. Incremental changes will not be enough. In the past, many steps in the right direction have been done but the process is not finished, e.g. energy and resource efficiency.
- For the first time the SDS 2016 shows the connection between Germany and the world. The three-steps "in Germany - by Germany - with Germany" are useful to

avoid shifting of negative environmental effects from Germany to other countries. This view must be sharpened in all political decisions.

- On the other hand as result of the election in September 2017 the AfD as a strong conservative-right party moved into the parliament. The AfD is arguing against scientific findings in the area of climate change, creates fears towards migration.
- The result with 12,6 % of votes for the AfD indicates that a significant proportion of voters is fearful of change that modernisation and transformation require.

3.2 Are there areas where Germany can and must show leadership and set new standards?

- Germany still is a leader in energy transition, but as mentioned the process has somewhat stalled. The next step in Germany must be a plan for phasing-out of coal in the energy system. Furthermore the transition process must be moved beyond electricity towards energy saving, transport sector and heating. It is absolutely necessary to organize strong support in civil society for these steps.
- Germany could and should also be a leader in relation to a broader competence of organising transformations (innovation, social dialogue, policy instruments, and implementation).
- Germany could also become a thought leader and pioneer in the area of conceiving and experimenting with models and practices for prosperity without economic growth.

3.3 Is the “fear of the future and transformation” a notion in society strong enough that you feel your organization and the Government will have to deal with it more carefully?

- One reason for the widespread fear of the future and transformation results from the complexity and overarching size of the task. The feeling must not be ignored. It is vital that citizens support these transformation processes. Generally, however, surveys show that the support for the energy transitions remains very high.
- The government should involve civil society in first steps, let them create their ideas of the future. Therefore an openness in the administration to accept broad and open minded participation processes is required as well as the will to implement these ideas in policy making.
- It is also essential to discuss risks and benefits honestly and organise an equitable burden-sharing. The increasing welfare gap between social levels and the inequitable distribution of costs e.g. for energy transition threaten Germanys social cohesion, leading to or foster fear of comprehensive changes and question political decision.

3.4 Is communication an issue?

The complexity of the issues and conflicts around policy decisions and their factual basis (e.g. the ecological footprint of e-mobility) leaves a lot of space for misinformation. Communicating both the evidence base and the uncertainties is a time-consuming but important task for all involved in SD policy-making.

4. Do you have any other general message that you want to share with the Peers?

Sustainable Development Solutions Networks Germany

General Information	
Name and function:	Adolf Kloke-Lesch (Executive Director)
Answers on behalf of (name of your organization):	Sustainable Development Solutions Network Germany (SDSN Germany)
Which stakeholder do you represent or belong to (no ranking implied, multiple answers possible):	<input type="checkbox"/> a) politics, <input type="checkbox"/> b) administration, <input type="checkbox"/> c) enterprise or the business community, <input type="checkbox"/> d) the labour movement, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> e) academia, <input type="checkbox"/> f) municipalities and associations, <input type="checkbox"/> g) youth, <input type="checkbox"/> h) gender interests, <input type="checkbox"/> i) migration groups, <input type="checkbox"/> j) the disabled movement, <input type="checkbox"/> k) the churches, <input type="checkbox"/> l) financial actors, <input type="checkbox"/> m) the countries, <input type="checkbox"/> n) grassroots initiatives or local agenda groups, <input type="checkbox"/> o) other interests?
Have you sent in a contribution on the draft of the 2016 Sustainable Development Strategy?	Yes
Do you agree with the publication of your contribution on the RNE-website?	Yes

1. The state of play of the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016

- 1.1 In your view, what are the general challenges and benefits for Germany concerning sustainable development? In that regard, have you identified significant gaps in the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016?

Note: The answers to this and the following questions draw to a large extent on the contribution by SDSN Germany on the draft of the 2016 Strategy which in most regards is still topical and relevant. In addition, it takes up initiatives and statements by SDSN Germany issued in the context of the federal elections. All relevant documents are listed under para 4.

Germany's long term development and prosperity heavily depend on the sustainable development of other parts of the world and the planet at large. At the same time Germany's own development path significantly impacts other places and threatens planetary boundaries. Furthermore, there are many domestic societal and economic problems in Germany that could be better tackled if understood and addressed as sustainable development challenges. In both regards the Strategy shows major shortcomings:

a) The Strategy claims to better address the "by Germany" dimension but fails to provide enough and sufficient indicators and targets under many SDGs, e.g. SDG2, SDG5, SDG8, SDG10, SDG12, SDG14, SDG15 and SDG16. With the key positive exception in the case of climate, indicators and targets dealing with the impact of domestic consumption and production patterns on other countries and the planetary system are largely neglected. In this context, footprints (such as the water, land, carbon and material footprints widely accepted in the world of research) are also important indicators alongside the macro-indicators when it comes to identifying targeted measures. The Strategy should provide instruments to develop relevant indicators, if these are not yet available. It is insufficient to compensate for these shortcomings by introducing some arbitrary indicators related to the "with Germany" dimension. With regard both to the "by Germany" and "with Germany" dimensions the strategy fails to address broad areas of German foreign relations (such as foreign and security policy, foreign trade policy, foreign cultural policy) and their impact on and contribution to sustainable development globally and in Germany.

b) In its "in Germany" dimension the Strategy is weak in linking the SDGs and the chosen indicators and targets to burning societal problems like child and old age poverty (SDG1), in the health sector (SDG3), equivalent living conditions in all parts of the country (e.g. SDG8). In addition, SDG Targets quite relevant for Germany like Target 1.2 (halve poverty according to national definitions), Target 12.3 (halve food waste) and SDG Target 8.6 (by 2020 substantially reduce the proportion of youth not in employment, education or training) are not mirrored in the Strategy. Furthermore, it is highly deplorable that the Strategy and the parallel process "Gut leben in Deutschland" also driven by the Chancellery with its own indicator system were developed in a highly unconnected manner and did not inform each other.

1.2 Have you identified strategic incoherencies within the German Sustainable Development policies? Would you have proposals to increase coherence and meaningful output?

One major strategic shortcoming of the Strategy is its widely lacking and incoherent dealing with previous targets and target achievement levels. The same applies in many cases to the effects of the numerous activities outlined in the Strategy and of past activities of the German Government. In many areas, goals and indicators are placed in an unrelated juxtaposition with the activities of the German Government, making it almost impossible for lessons to be drawn for society from successes and failures or for new goals and activities to be defined transparently and with a focus on results. The clearer the understanding of past interdependencies, the more effectively new measures can be designed. The German Government should present the previous targets and previous level of target achievement for each indicator (previous actual developments for new indicators), analyse underlying causes (including best practice) and mistakes, and develop new goals and activities on this basis.

Already the indicator report 2014 from Germany's Federal Statistical Office on sustainable development in Germany showed that with regard to the previous 38 targets, if hitherto existing annual trends continued, Germany would fall significantly short of the targets for at least half of these indicators, or even move in the wrong direction. Also the new Strategy admits that with regard to the new extended set of indicators and targets slightly more than half of them show either a negative status or a negative trend. However, instead of documenting and analysing the shortcomings of the past, the new Strategy postponed more than a quarter of the initially defined targets to a later date than agreed on or even cut back expectations. This concerns areas as diverse as resource productivity, obesity, biodiversity, crime, or development assistance. One example: the previous Strategy set the target to double resource productivity by 2020 compared to 1994. After 20 years only an increase of 50% was achieved. The new Strategy - while not even mentioning the previous target - changes the base year to 2000, documents an annual increase of 1.5% since then and sets the target to maintain this trend until 2030 implicitly saying that the previous target of doubling by 2020 will not even be reached by 2030.

1.3 Do you think the measurement and reporting mechanisms are adequate to implement the 2030 Agenda by Germany?

It is highly commendable that the new Strategy is structured along the 17 SDGs. This by itself helps a lot with measurement and reporting on the implementation of the 2030 Agenda. However, as mentioned under para 1.1 the Strategy needs to do more to capture spillover effects from and global responsibilities of Germany by its indicators and targets. Furthermore, measuring and reporting on indicators alone does not address the difficulties and stumbling blocks in implementing the Agenda and the Strategy. Indicators can only provide the basis for a thorough self-assessment by the Federal Government followed by debates in parliament and with stakeholders. In order to make the monitoring and review processes more stringent one should either shorten the strategy development cycle from four to three years or the Federal Government should issue explanatory statements on the biannual indicator reports.

In addition, the German Bundestag should regularly pass resolutions on the Sustainable Development Strategy and its implementation.

- 1.4 Which off-track goals and targets (meaning those targets marked with “thunderstorm” or “overcast”) in the German Sustainable Development Strategy do you think are the most important? According to you, why are they off track?

This question should be put differently because it ignores the shortcomings of the Strategy with regard both to the 2030 Agenda and its internal deficiencies as mentioned above (e.g. the resource productivity is labelled "on track"). Issues of major concern are e.g. child and old-age poverty (SDG 1), the transition to sustainable agriculture (SDG 2), the achievement of gender equality (SDG 5) and distributive justice (SDG 10), sustainable cities with affordable housing and healthy mobility (SDG 11), ensuring sustainable consumption and production patterns (SDG 12), climate change mitigation (SDG 13), marine conservation (SDG 14) and protection of terrestrial ecosystems (SDG 15).

2. The governance approach and structure

- 2.1 Are you satisfied with the institutions and the enabling environment both the government and the non-state actors have created so far?

Although over the years Germany has developed quite a remarkable sustainability architecture its governance approach and structure are not up to the job. The German sustainability architecture is heavily executive-focused and -centered. The Strategy is a governmental one. There is no formal role of parliament neither in developing nor in reviewing the Strategy. The Federal Government as well as e.g. the RNE have created a plethora of dialogue fora around the strategy that allow for participation of non-state actors. However, the political parties have not yet embraced the 2030 Agenda and the Strategy. They turn out to be a particularly weak point in the German sustainability architecture which has become quite clear during the recent election campaign and coalition talks (Adolf Klope-Lesch: Germany's 2017 elections and the SDGs: did we miss something?, Forum Entwicklungspolitik Brandenburg 7 (2017), Welttrends, Potsdam; attached).

Immediately after 2015 the 2030 Agenda and the relaunch of the Strategy had visibly attracted attention in parliament and government, and at national, federal-state and municipal level. Since then it has proven difficult to maintain and build on this level of momentum. For this purpose, capacities need to be expanded and structural changes to be introduced, e.g.:

- a) An increase of the human and financial resources of the Federal Chancellery, all German ministries, the Federal Statistical Office and the German Bundestag for implementing the Sustainable Development Strategy is needed.
- b) The Sustainability Officers in German Government authorities should be given statutory duties and rights comparable to those of the budget officers pursuant to Section 9 of the German Federal Budget Code.
- c) The Federal Government, the business sector and civil society organizations should jointly identify three to five key areas of sustainable development and establish new kinds of sector-wide multi-stakeholder partnerships in order to achieve the urgently

needed and particularly difficult transformational breakthroughs on the agreed goals (e.g. the transition to sustainable agriculture, the decarbonisation of the transport system, the digitalization process, and the integration of refugees and migrants).

d) The political parties need to review in detail their relationship with the 2030 Agenda and work out which means of their respective programmatic and strategic approaches they intend to use to achieve the SDGs. A high-ranking official within each party's organisational structures should be entrusted with the task of mainstreaming the 2030 Agenda right across the party's activities. So far all of the parties lack an official working group with responsibility across policy areas for the 2030 Agenda or sustainability in the first place, let alone one that is effective.

- 2.2 According to you, is the sense of urgency as determined by science-based goals well understood and does it orient action (e.g. in your area)?

No. Top politicians who acknowledge the universal nature of the 2030 Agenda at sustainability conferences and on the international stage hesitate to do so boldly at party conferences and on the campaign trail. Consequently, it was no surprise that the manifestos of the political parties for the 2017 general elections mentioned the 2030 Agenda, with one exception, at best as a frame of reference for development policy and other foreign relations, but not as an overarching narrative for economic and social policy in Germany itself. Only one (another) party mentioned the Strategy itself though without providing any further specifics. During the failed Jamaica coalition talks the Strategy didn't make it into the draft papers while the 2030 Agenda was only recognized as a guideline for development policy. This is particularly astounding since quite a number of the contested topics is highly relevant to the 2030 Agenda and the Strategy.

- 2.3 As a partner or stakeholders do you feel enabled to actively participate in dialogue on and to contribute actions for sustainability?

There is ample room for dialogue but when it comes to actual decision making it is quite difficult to get to the core of the processes. Dialogues are mostly held among sustainability oriented actors from within the government, civil society and business. Those who represent blockers are seldom brought to the table. Transformative science as a new means of implementation is not yet embraced by politics (cf para c) under question 2.1).

- 2.4 Is the science-policy interface working? Do results of "science for sustainability" already make a difference?

Not quite, there is still a long way to go. Despite a basic recognition of the significance of research in implementing the 2030 Agenda, the Strategy still lacks - beyond listing ongoing activities - a clear and forward looking statement by the German Government on how it intends to align its own research and technology policy with the 2030 Agenda. The indicator and target on research and development (9.1) only refers to the overall share of R&D as percentage of GDP without any qualification to what extent this share is geared towards sustainable development and whether research results actually impact.

With a whole host of advisory Work on an indicator that signals the impact of research on sustainable development is listed as a task under Section III. Next steps of the Strategy (p. 228). We consider this to be an urgent task under the lead of the Science ministry and with active participation of the other ministries, and stakeholders from the research community.

With a whole host of advisory councils and scientific policy advice institutions established by the Federal Government and its ministries, Germany has enormous potential for supporting implementation of the Strategy. The Government could use this potential if it would call on all advisory boards and councils appointed by itself to gear their activities to the 2030 Agenda and the Strategy, and on the federal states to link their sustainable development strategies to research policy. The work of the WBGU (German Advisory Council on Global Change) and the SRU (German Advisory Council on the Environment) provides an ample research basis both for policy design and implementation and for the elaboration of an impact indicator of research policy. It is laudable that the Strategy initiated the launch of the Science Platform Sustainability 2030 with DKN Future Earth, SDSN Germany and the Institute for Advanced Sustainability Studies as the three organizing institutions. That Platform can and should become a major means in overcoming the existing gaps and bottlenecks of the science-policy interface, and it could also contribute to the elaboration of the new indicator. However, without a broad redirection of the German R&D policy and a significantly scaled-up funding for transformative research the Strategy will continue to lack a scientific underpinning comparable to climate policy.

3. New opportunities and challenges

3.1 Which new opportunities and challenges do you identify for Germany? Does the Sustainable Development Strategy help to address them? (Explanation: „new“ in the sense of: next, or not yet fully grasped, or appearing when you scan the horizon)

a) Migration: While the Strategy does dedicate a chapter to addressing the considerable challenges in the areas of asylum, migration, and integration, it fails to develop any indicators and targets for these monumental tasks although they were a fundamental argument of the Government when it started the consultation process on the new Strategy and would fit very well under SDG 10 and 1.

b) Digitalization: The challenges and opportunities posed for sustainable development in this area are poorly reflected in the 2030 Agenda and the Strategy. The issue should be taken up within the sustainability architecture and lead to a next generation of sustainability targets.

c) Europe: The link between the sustainability discourse and the one on the future of Europe is still very weak. The Strategy should roll out a vision that specifies how Germany is to promote the sustainable development of the EU.

3.2 Are there areas where Germany can and must show leadership and set new standards?

a) Phasing out coal

b) Transition to sustainable agriculture

- c) Transition to a circular economy and doubling resource efficiency
- d) Decarbonisation of the transport system
- e) Integration of migrants

3.3 Is the “fear of the future and transformation” a notion in society strong enough that you feel your organization and the Government will have to deal with it more carefully?

Yes. The so-called "Gegentransformation" is a very serious issue. The sustainability communities have failed to recognise the underlying trends early enough and link the fears in larger parts of the population to a positive notion of sustainable development (Dirk Messner: Passt das Ökologische zum Sozialen? Überlegungen in turbulenten Zeiten, Neue Gesellschaft Frankfurter Hefte 03/2017).

3.4 Is communication an issue?

Yes. As it has become quite clear during the election campaign in 2017 the 2030 Agenda and the Strategy do not resonate enough with the broader public, large swathes of the leadership of the political parties, and the major societal and business associations. All the many well-intentioned awareness-rising activities by governmental and non-governmental organisations will be a Sisyphean task if not accompanied by a change of tack e.g. by trade unions and business associations.

4. Do you have any other general message that you want to share with the Peers?

For further information please consider the following documents.

"Time to take the SDGs into our own hands
Statement by SDSN Germany at the beginning of the coalition negotiations"

http://www.die-gdi.de/fileadmin/user_upload/20171020_SDSN_Erklaerung_Beginn_der_Koalitionsverhandlungen_Erklaerung.pdf

https://www.die-gdi.de/fileadmin/user_upload/pdfs/dauerthemen_spezial/20171129_SDSN_Time_to_take_the_SDGs_into_our_own_hands.pdf

New Bundestag and next German Government must place focus on 2030 Agenda - Call by SDSN Germany

https://www.die-gdi.de/fileadmin/user_upload/pdfs/dauerthemen_spezial/20170925_Pressemitteilung_SDSN_Germany_Bundestagswahl.pdf

https://www.die-gdi.de/fileadmin/user_upload/pdfs/dauerthemen_spezial/20171012_SDSN_call_Bundestagswahl_EN.pdf

Germany's 2017 elections and the SDGs: did we miss something? (Adolf Kloke-Lesch , Executive Director of SDSN Germany in Forum Entwicklungspolitik Brandenburg 7 (2017), Welttrends, Potsdam)

https://www.die-gdi.de/fileadmin/user_upload/pdfs/dauerthemen_spezial/20171005_Kloke_Lesch_Wahlkampf_EN.pdf

https://www.die-gdi.de/fileadmin/user_upload/pdfs/dauerthemen_spezial/20171005_Kloke_Lesch_Wahlkampf_17_und_die_2030_Ziele_FINAL.pdf

SDSN Germany fordert Bekenntnis zu Zielen für nachhaltige Entwicklung im Bundestagswahlkampf - Pressemitteilung SDSN Germany vom 21.04.2017

https://www.die-gdi.de/fileadmin/user_upload/pdfs/dauerthemen_spezial/20170421_PM_SDSN.pdf

Transformationswissen für nachhaltige Entwicklung stärken! Die Deutsche Nachhaltigkeitsstrategie als wissenschaftlich unterstützter Lernprozess - Stellungnahme von SDSN Germany zum Entwurf der Neuauflage 2016 der Deutschen Nachhaltigkeitsstrategie

https://www.bundesregierung.de/Content/DE/StatischeSeiten/Breg/Nachhaltigkeit/Nachhaltigkeitsdialog-stellungnahmen/2016-07-28-sdsn-germany.pdf;jsessionid=CA2FD37BA3345934F6E0F3CD2A978253.s1t2?__blob=publicationFile&v=2

(english version attached to the peer review)

Dr. Maja Göpel

General Information	
Name and function:	Maja Göpel, Secretary General WBGU
Answers on behalf of (name of your organization):	myself
Which stakeholder do you represent or belong to (no ranking implied, multiple answers possible):	<input type="checkbox"/> a) politics, <input type="checkbox"/> b) administration, <input type="checkbox"/> c) enterprise or the business community, <input type="checkbox"/> d) the labour movement, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> e) academia, <input type="checkbox"/> f) municipalities and associations, <input type="checkbox"/> g) youth, <input type="checkbox"/> h) gender interests, <input type="checkbox"/> i) migration groups, <input type="checkbox"/> j) the disabled movement, <input type="checkbox"/> k) the churches, <input type="checkbox"/> l) financial actors, <input type="checkbox"/> m) the countries, <input type="checkbox"/> n) grassroots initiatives or local agenda groups, <input type="checkbox"/> o) other interests?
Have you sent in a contribution on the draft of the 2016 Sustainable Development Strategy?	yes
Do you agree with the publication of your contribution on the RNE-website?	Yes

1. The state of play of the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016

- 1.1 In your view, what are the general challenges and benefits for Germany concerning sustainable development? In that regard, have you identified significant gaps in the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016?

It is sad that the strategy has not managed to make sustainability-relevant outcomes the thick red line in all indicators. R&D expenditures are positive, regardless of what they are spent on; private investment rates need should be high without tracking where they flow; successfully completing education is positive without asking if the content enables people to co-create sustainability, GDP growth is per se good, regardless of what is actually produced and consumed - and still overarching.

- 1.2 Have you identified strategic incoherencies within the German Sustainable Development policies? Would you have proposals to increase coherence and meaningful output?

Having a future traffic plan should not be declared a supportive mechanism if its design was heavily criticized by all environmentally minded stakeholders. For crucial sector transformations Germany should install cross-ministerial agenda-setting processes under the inclusion of science, business and civil society. Industry 4.0 is far-reaching in that way but cannot continue without participation of the environment and labor ministries, at best also adding the development ministry. In addition the right of initiative for new political measures should be revised and granted to all ministries that have relevant stakes in particular issues, not only to the ministry that officially hosts the issue.

- 1.3 Do you think the measurement and reporting mechanisms are adequate to implement the 2030 Agenda by Germany?

No. I think the reporting of very influential advisory boards

- 1.4 Which off-track goals and targets (meaning those targets marked with “thunderstorm” or “overcast”) in the German Sustainable Development Strategy do you think are the most important? According to you, why are they off track?

Land use patterns and organic agriculture because the lobby is incredibly strong and the European CAP a solid bastion to defend outdated, undifferentiated and increasingly harmful subsidies.

2. The governance approach and structure

- 2.1 Are you satisfied with the institutions and the enabling environment both the government and the non-state actors have created so far?

There are good improvements in the architecture and important additional bodies like the dialogue platform or the science platform and support staff for the Committee of State Secretaries. In comparison to the tasks, however, the amount of

resources and human power is still very low and none of these institutions have any teeth. Adding an explicit "governance innovation team" as a cross-cutting support unit with expertise in institutional change in service of the State Secretaries and ministerial representatives seems like one promising way forward. The other is the long-asked for High Representative for Future Generations or Sustainable Development that has a small unit operating solely from the long-term perspective and speaking up for long-term consequences of current policy proposals to tackle the widely acknowledged structural short-termism in democracies. This would also cast a new narrative around what sustainable development is about: securing good living conditions for children and grandchildren.

- 2.2 According to you, is the sense of urgency as determined by science-based goals well understood and does it orient action (e.g. in your area)?

No, it does not. This is why a long-term unit should also always calculate costs of inaction from a multi-dimensional point of view. This could also become an obligation for all government advisory councils.

- 2.3 As a partner or stakeholders do you feel enabled to actively participate in dialogue on and to contribute actions for sustainability?

Yes, but the impact is often not often traceable

- 2.4 Is the science-policy interface working? Do results of "science for sustainability" already make a difference?

I feel that there is a rising willingness to listen to what science for sustainability has to say, but there are also many facets of science in that field and the transparency about terms of reference and financing or data sourcing is not always at the level where it should be. I would thus really appreciate a "clearinghouse" initiative that makes underlying assumptions and methodological differences visible, so that citizens and policy-makers do not simply get conflicting "evidence" but can understand that differing prognoses depend on different selective representations of our complex world. This way they would get a chance to see which worldview, causality and data choices they find convincing and choose the evidence accordingly.

3. New opportunities and challenges

- 3.1 Which new opportunities and challenges do you identify for Germany? Does the Sustainable Development Strategy help to address them? (Explanation: „new“ in the sense of: next, or not yet fully grasped, or appearing when you scan the horizon)

Digitalization is a revolution on the horizon that could help many sustainability dreams come true - but also could aggravate existing unsustainable trends in unprecedented speed and force.

- 3.2 Are there areas where Germany can and must show leadership and set new standards?

The leading role in industry 4.0 should be amended to tackle the responsibility of sustainable production and consumption patterns formulated in SDG12.

- 3.3 Is the “fear of the future and transformation” a notion in society strong enough that you feel your organization and the Government will have to deal with it more carefully?

Yes. My sense is that the majority of people feel that things are changing fast and that future solutions have to be very different from present ones. The populist upswing to me is also a sign of mistrust against a political system in which the culture of "predict and control - and be beaten if you fail" leads to a blame-game about who has the best answers. To me, the same fear and anger might be tapered by being properly listened to and transparently communicated with, which could lead to renewed trust in strong and well-informed leadership. This holds true for science as well. Wicked problems have no simple answers nor singular drivers. Systemic approaches in science start doing so when they spend time on a proper, participatory and constructive inquiry into the problem and its understanding with relevant stakeholders. Then different, possibly totally juxtaposed, solutions can be suggested and tested from which to pick successful ones for roll-out. This approach could work for strategic yet adaptive and participatory policy-design in times of transformation. It would shift the feeling from "being transformed" to "being co-transformer" and thus reduce the fear - but would require a significant cultural shift in science, business and even more so in party politics.

- 3.4 Is communication an issue?

Yes, I think we need to shift the burden of proof around. Defending the status quo should be equally scrutinized for its implications on the future like the suggested alternatives, the impacts of omission modeled as much as those of action. Status quo cannot be the benchmark, as we know it won't stay this way.

- 4. Do you have any other general message that you want to share with the Peers?**

Bringing the human and his or her personal journey into conversations shifts the quality of exchange tremendously.

Business

Bundesverband der Deutschen Industrie e.V.

General Information	
Name and function:	Dr. Claas Oehlmann, Senior Manager Circular Economy and Sustainability
Answers on behalf of (name of your organization):	Bundesverband der Deutschen Industrie e.V.
Which stakeholder do you represent or belong to (no ranking implied, multiple answers possible):	<input type="checkbox"/> a) politics, <input type="checkbox"/> b) administration, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> c) enterprise or the business community, <input type="checkbox"/> d) the labour movement, <input type="checkbox"/> e) academia, <input type="checkbox"/> f) municipalities and associations, <input type="checkbox"/> g) youth, <input type="checkbox"/> h) gender interests, <input type="checkbox"/> i) migration groups, <input type="checkbox"/> j) the disabled movement, <input type="checkbox"/> k) the churches, <input type="checkbox"/> l) financial actors, <input type="checkbox"/> m) the countries, <input type="checkbox"/> n) grassroots initiatives or local agenda groups, <input type="checkbox"/> o) other interests?
Have you sent in a contribution on the draft of the 2016 Sustainable Development Strategy?	yes
Do you agree with the publication of your contribution on the RNE-website?	yes

1. The state of play of the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016

1.1 In your view, what are the general challenges and benefits for Germany concerning sustainable development? In that regard, have you identified significant gaps in the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016?

Challenges and benefits:

- Promoting sustainable development while taking digitization as a megatrend with its disruptive potential as a catalyst into account.
- Developing new production processes and business models that fit to the UN Sustainable Development Goals and which create an advantage for German enterprises on the world market.
- Creating awareness and structural support especially for small and medium sized enterprises to help them contribute to a sustainable future.
- Promoting international standards which contribute to global supply chains to guarantee a common framework for enterprises for a sustainable supply chain management.

Gaps:

- Insufficient consideration of digitization and especially industry 4.0 for a sustainable development.
- The 17 SDGs and the three dimensions of sustainability lead to trade-offs between specific goals (e.g. emission free mobility in the use-phase of vehicles will lead to an enormous demand for critical raw materials to produce necessary batteries). Such trade-offs have to be identified and discussed carefully.
- The role and potential of a circular economy in Germany, Europe and world-wide is not addressed sufficiently. Germany's and Europe's largest stock of raw materials consists of waste streams (e.g. End-of-Life Vehicle, Waste Electronic and Electrical Equipment etc.). Therefore, a strong focus on creating a common framework to support business models for a circular economy is needed.
- So far, the contribution of industrial by-products of the primary industries and their application is not addressed in a sufficient way. Innovative materials contribute in a large scale to the sustainable use of resources. An appreciation of the achievements of such materials and products made of them is necessary.

1.2 Have you identified strategic incoherencies within the German Sustainable Development policies? Would you have proposals to increase coherence and meaningful output?

I. Public authorities should comply to their role model function and structure their public procurement policy according to sustainable criteria. This would foster the demand of sustainable technologies, innovations, products and services.

II. It has to be appreciated that the strategy wants to limit the use of mineral resources in connection with "not renewable natural heritage". But this will only be successful if not only the sustainability strategy but also German politics generally focus on an increase of recycling and the use of secondary raw materials and by-

products. These materials and their application need to be prioritised, especially with regard to the use as constructional material in public procurement as far as they have similar properties as primary ones.

- 1.3 Do you think the measurement and reporting mechanisms are adequate to implement the 2030 Agenda by Germany?

The overall goal of every measurement and reporting scheme should be to ensure comparability of data with other country strategies. Therefore, common and valid indicators are needed. For example, the indicator "Number of enterprises in the German Textilbündnis" seems not suitable to us to measure sustainable production processes. In addition, no indicator for the use of secondary raw materials exists within the German Sustainable Development Strategy.

- 1.4 Which off-track goals and targets (meaning those targets marked with "thunderstorm" or "overcast") in the German Sustainable Development Strategy do you think are the most important? According to you, why are they off track?

2. The governance approach and structure

- 2.1 Are you satisfied with the institutions and the enabling environment both the government and the non-state actors have created so far?

I. In our view, a coordination of all governmental sustainability policies between Federal Ministries on the one hand and the Länder on the other hand is needed. The German Sustainability Development Strategy, coordinated within the Kanzleramt, should function as an umbrella strategy for all sustainability policies.

II. The involvement of stakeholders to further develop and transpose the German Sustainable Development Strategy is absolutely necessary. The German industrial sector plays an outstanding role for Germany's prosperity. Almost a quarter of Germany's gross domestic product (GDP) is generated by German industry. If industry-related services are included, this figure rises still further to around a third of GDP. Germany is and remains an industrial nation. Together with industry-related services, industry and its over 7 million employees is a key player for sustainability. Therefore, German enterprises and industry associations are key players for developing strategic sustainability policies.

III. The German Sustainable Development Strategy and all acts transposing it have to be strongly based on democratic decision making processes. The German Bundestag and Bundesrat have consequently to be at the core of all processes.

- 2.2 According to you, is the sense of urgency as determined by science-based goals well understood and does it orient action (e.g. in your area)?

- 2.3 As a partner or stakeholders do you feel enabled to actively participate in dialogue on and to contribute actions for sustainability?

BDI represents 36 different industrial branches which enables BDI to play its role by creating a sustainable future. Taking this into account, BDI as the voice of German industry plays and will play a key role in the discussion of a sustainable industry policy. Creating innovation, welfare and social security through attractive jobs and highly qualified employees is a main task for German enterprises. For the first time, the Agenda 2030 calls for an active inclusion of the industry to transport the 17 SDGs. Taking this into account German sustainability policies have to reflect the potential and function of the German industrial sector.

- 2.4 Is the science-policy interface working? Do results of “science for sustainability” already make a difference?

3. New opportunities and challenges

- 3.1 Which new opportunities and challenges do you identify for Germany? Does the Sustainable Development Strategy help to address them? (Explanation: „new“ in the sense of: next, or not yet fully grasped, or appearing when you scan the horizon)

I. Technological changes through digitisation and industry 4.0 brings about permanent changes and a major restructuring impact on our labour markets. Such developments will affect work contents, raise requirements for qualifications and competencies and put greater pressure on employees to adapt to these structural changes. The Center for European Economics (ZEW) estimates that the share of jobs that could be completely technically automated within the next decade is about 12 % of employees in Germany (over 4 million employees). In addition, a strong change of qualifications and competency requirements is expected.

While machines will take on tasks which are easier to automate, human labour will mainly be needed for tasks involving creativity or social interactions. Therefore, an increasing demand for highly qualified workforce among both businesses and employees can be assumed.

II. The transformation of the mobility and transportation sector creates a number of challenges. Zero emission concepts which are based on electric mobility, often combined with lithium-ion-batteries will lead to a strong limitation concerning the supply with critical raw materials for such technologies. European countries are dependent on importing such raw materials, in some cases up to 100 % of the overall demand. It has to be accepted that future mobility and transportation systems have to be developed without any ideological predefinition of the "right" technology to establish low emission transports.

III. The development of instruments and technologies to fight climate change has to be independent of ideological concepts. A market based approach which prices emissions on the European level or, ideally on a global market, brings along effective and efficient options for climate protection.

3.2 Are there areas where Germany can and must show leadership and set new standards?

It is expected that the SDGs will have a significant impact on the global modernisation agenda. It is beyond dispute that these ambitious goals can be achieved only with the help of industry – its innovative strength and willingness to invest. For this reason, industry must be put into a position – through the appropriate economic, ecological and social framework conditions – in which it can realise its full potential to implement the SDGs.

Innovation in the industrial sector is the main reason for Germany's success in exporting goods worldwide. To safeguard this, an European and global level playing field for sustainable development is needed. Equal social and environmental standards on the international level will guarantee fair conditions for competition. Therefore, e.g. the design of free trade agreements would be an approach to support investments in sustainable production.

3.3 Is the “fear of the future and transformation” a notion in society strong enough that you feel your organization and the Government will have to deal with it more carefully?

3.4 Is communication an issue?

4. Do you have any other general message that you want to share with the Peers?

World-wide, a tendency of widening inequalities and not enough jobs to keep up with a growing labour force can be observed. According to the International Labour Organization, more than 204 million people were unemployed world-wide in 2015. SDG 8 promotes sustained economic growth, higher levels of productivity, technological innovation, encouraging entrepreneurship and job creation. In Germany, the term "growth" is used with different connotations. On one side, there is the fundamental growth criticism, which is reflected in discussions about "post-growth society" or "sufficiency". Opposed to this exists the perception that work, social advancement, political stability and peace are functionally closely linked to growth. Globally, the role of growth, particularly in developing and emerging economies, should be given a high priority in order to increase the level of prosperity and thus the quality of life for people.

Transferred to the triad of sustainability, "growth" can always bring with it conflicting goals between the two pillars "social" and "economy" on the one hand, and "ecology" on the other hand. Of course, this also applies to potential conflicts between environmental and social goals as well. In order to tackle these conflicts and, for example, to balance resource consumption and its environmental impacts while facing a growing world population a constant increase in efficiency is needed and possible. Examples here are concepts of the circular economy. More and more raw materials from waste are returned to the material cycle. Impressive recycling

rates over 90 % e.g. for steel and aluminum are already reached. Waste streams such as plastics provide still a great potential for secondary raw materials.

In addition, the fact that disruptive developments such as digitalization currently offer a huge potential for a completely new balancing of economy, social and ecology. Examples in this field are potentials in the digital solutions for transparent supply chains, the demand-oriented use of decentralized energy through intelligent control systems or the use of information systems for ecological data in the agricultural sector.

Taking all this into account BDI calls for an international approach to the debate concerning growth in Germany to enable all potentials of the German industry to contribute to a sustainable growth worldwide.

VDMA – Verband Deutscher Maschinen- und Anlagenbau e.V.

General Information	
Name and function:	Judith Herzog-Kuballa Sustainability Officer
Answers on behalf of (name of your organization):	VDMA (Verband Deutscher Maschinen- und Anlagenbau e.V.)
Which stakeholder do you represent or belong to (no ranking implied, multiple answers possible):	<input type="checkbox"/> a) politics, <input type="checkbox"/> b) administration, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> c) enterprise or the business community, <input type="checkbox"/> d) the labour movement, <input type="checkbox"/> e) academia, <input type="checkbox"/> f) municipalities and associations, <input type="checkbox"/> g) youth, <input type="checkbox"/> h) gender interests, <input type="checkbox"/> i) migration groups, <input type="checkbox"/> j) the disabled movement, <input type="checkbox"/> k) the churches, <input type="checkbox"/> l) financial actors, <input type="checkbox"/> m) environment organization <input type="checkbox"/> n) development organization <input type="checkbox"/> o) "the Länder", <input type="checkbox"/> p) grassroots initiatives or local agenda groups, <input type="checkbox"/> q) other interests?
Have you sent in a contribution on the draft of the 2016 Sustainable Development Strategy?	yes
Do you agree with the publication of your contribution on the RNE-website?	yes

1. The state of play of the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016

1.1 In your view, what are the general challenges and benefits for Germany concerning sustainable development? In that regard, have you identified significant gaps in the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016?

Benefits:

- Germany will still be a leader in sustainable high-tech production, which provides also a good life for its population.

Challenges:

- Germany has to strengthen its efforts towards an international level playing field: to ensure (and not to lose) competitiveness
- Education and ensuring of skilled employees
- Implementing SDGs for example in governmental and public institutions.
- Considering and focusing more on the EU domestic market instead of national individual approaches

Gaps:

- Germany will fail the 2020 goals for climate protection
- Insufficient consideration of Digitization and especially Industry 4.0 for sustainability.
- No comment on how sustainability issues can be implemented in the (school) education
- Sustainability should be a fix educational topic in industrial training (dual system) and not only a topic in different training projects.

1.2 Have you identified strategic incoherencies within the German Sustainable Development policies? Would you have proposals to increase coherence and meaningful output?

- We claim homogeneous limiting values in Europe and no principle of subsidiarity. The German sustainability strategy recommends on page 80, e.g. national air pollution prevention programs on all levels (international, EU, German federal government, state governments, local authorities), who must guarantee fulfillment of the reduction obligations. We do not consider this as constructive, because this may lead to different product and machinery requirements.
- Disagreements to the point of complete contrary declarations and actions of different departments (Federal ministries) in the implementation of the German Sustainability Strategy --> We claim a better cooperation.
- Public or municipal institutions should comply with their role model function and, e.g. arrange their public procurements according to sustainable criteria. This fosters the request of sustainable technologies and innovations.
- Addressing conflicts of objectives and, if applicable, to resolve them. One example: The aim to reduce the energy consumption, often leads to a replacement to a lighter material (for example light weight construction), where often plastic material is used as substitute. Here, the discussion about the need of petrochemie at the beginning of that product life cycle or increasing marine litter at the end of the product life cycle clarifies the conflict of objective. And this is only one among others.

- 1.3 Do you think the measurement and reporting mechanisms are adequate to implement the 2030 Agenda by Germany?

Problems we identify:

The significance of indicators is not clear. The question is: Is there a prioritization or are all indicators comparable? Does this mean that the indicator of the "smoking rate" is equal to the indicator of the "total resource production"?

In general, the strategy followed by the German government is too ambiguous in some areas. We miss clear and smart goals as well as precise steps and actions by the federal governments (see example of the energy consumption in the freight and passenger transport market, page 163 ff.)

- 1.4 Which off-track goals and targets (meaning those targets marked with "thunderstorm" or "overcast") in the German Sustainable Development Strategy do you think are the most important? According to you, why are they off track?

Due to a lack of clear strategy, it's no wonder that the targets of the indicators "energy consumption in passenger transport" and "energy consumption in freight transport" are off track.

At the same time, the energy consumption and CO₂-pollution by private households is out of control. One reason is that the user behavior often contradicts the technical requirements. Another reason is that the price for oil and gas in comparison is rather low at present.

Another indicator, which is inaccurate (over casted), is the amount of EMAS certified organisations. The most important reason is that considerably more organisations are following the ISO norm 14001 than EMAS. The ISO 14001 norm is the international environmental management system and it must be included into this indicator.

One more remark:

If you compare the indicator "early school leavers and school leavers" and the topic broadband (SDG 9) with the European SDG indicator report, Germany is only in the midfield and has to strengthen its efforts!

2. The governance approach and structure

- 2.1 Are you satisfied with the institutions and the enabling environment both the government and the non-state actors have created so far?

Not always: We complain the lack of transparency with regard to the composition of the different stakeholder groups, e.g. in the "Forum Nachhaltigkeit" or at the "CSR-Konsens" of the federal government. The composition of the "Rat für Nachhaltige Entwicklung" does not adequately reflect the heterogeneous society in Germany. It would be better if more than one member represents producing companies.

- 2.2 According to you, is the sense of urgency as determined by science-based goals well understood and does it orient action (e.g. in your area)?

-

- 2.3 As a partner or stakeholders do you feel enabled to actively participate in dialogue on and to contribute actions for sustainability?

Yes, we contribute with technological solutions, better efficiency, providing workplaces, apprenticeships, further education and social efforts, but in some cases there is too little offers for participation in dialogues or contributions, see question 2.1.

- 2.4 Is the science-policy interface working? Do results of “science for sustainability” already make a difference?

-

3. New opportunities and challenges

- 3.1 Which new opportunities and challenges do you identify for Germany? Does the Sustainable Development Strategy help to address them? (Explanation: „new“ in the sense of: next, or not yet fully grasped, or appearing when you scan the horizon)

Digitalization is a huge challenge for Germany's economy. Bringing together the Digitalization strategy and Sustainability strategy would be a large opportunity for Germany.

- 3.2 Are there areas where Germany can and must show leadership and set new standards?

Yes, in (environmental) technology, in energy and resource efficient energy management systems, in solutions for circular economy and in solutions for industry 4.0. Germany's role must be to promote investments in such solutions in the EU and in export markets, also into developing countries.

- 3.3 Is the “fear of the future and transformation” a notion in society strong enough that you feel your organization and the Government will have to deal with it more carefully?

What do you exactly mean with "more carefully". In our opinion this question is too suggestive.

- 3.4 Is communication an issue?

For the government: Yes! This shows for example the issue "energy consumption and CO2-emissions by private households", which is off track. Another sign that there is more need for communication is, that the SDGs or topics as climate protection played only a very tiny role in the last election battle. And the impact or even what the SDGs are, is only little known in public.

For businesses: It is already very important to have a sustainable business strategy for companies and organizations and in future, it has to become an automatism. But required reporting obligations do not show the right way, especially for small and medium sized businesses, who often don't have the capacity to communicate this. And the question is: Who reads all the big paper reports, except of NGOs?

4. Do you have any other general message that you want to share with the Peers?

Industry as well as research and development of innovations are the enabler for sustainability. A political technology neutral approach is important for sustainable innovation!

Wirtschaftsvereinigung Stahl

General Information	
Name and function:	Gerhard Endemann, Head Sustainability
Answers on behalf of (name of your organization):	Wirtschaftsvereinigung Stahl
Which stakeholder do you represent or belong to (no ranking implied, multiple answers possible):	<input type="checkbox"/> a) politics, <input type="checkbox"/> b) administration, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> c) enterprise or the business community, <input type="checkbox"/> d) the labour movement, <input type="checkbox"/> e) academia, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> f) municipalities and associations, <input type="checkbox"/> g) youth, <input type="checkbox"/> h) gender interests, <input type="checkbox"/> i) migration groups, <input type="checkbox"/> j) the disabled movement, <input type="checkbox"/> k) the churches, <input type="checkbox"/> l) financial actors, <input type="checkbox"/> m) the countries, <input type="checkbox"/> n) grassroots initiatives or local agenda groups, <input type="checkbox"/> o) other interests?
Have you sent in a contribution on the draft of the 2016 Sustainable Development Strategy?	yes
Do you agree with the publication of your contribution on the RNE-website?	yes

1. The state of play of the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016

- 1.1 In your view, what are the general challenges and benefits for Germany concerning sustainable development? In that regard, have you identified significant gaps in the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016?

The strategy does not mention contributions by products and by-products of the primary industries and their application in a sufficient way. Innovative modern materials contribute in a large scale to the sustainable use of resources. A appreciation of the achievements of such materials and products made of them is necessary.

Additionally, there is a need to concede the necessary acceptance of permanent materials' contribution to e.g. sustainability, an efficient use of resources and environmental protection.

- 1.2 Have you identified strategic incoherencies within the German Sustainable Development policies? Would you have proposals to increase coherence and meaningful output?

It has to be appreciated that the strategy wants to limit the use of mineral resources in connection with "not renewable natural heritage. But this will only be successful if not only the sustainability strategy but also the German politic generally focusses on an increase of recycling and the use of secondary raw materials and by-products. These materials and their application need to be prioritised, especially with regard on the use as constructional material in public procurement.

- 1.3 Do you think the measurement and reporting mechanisms are adequate to implement the 2030 Agenda by Germany?

Yes, aside of above mentioned issues.

- 1.4 Which off-track goals and targets (meaning those targets marked with "thunderstorm" or "overcast") in the German Sustainable Development Strategy do you think are the most important? According to you, why are they off track?

2.1.a Farming, especially -Nitrogen surplus

6.1.a Water quality. especially Nitrate in groundwater

11.2.a-c Mobility, especially energy consumption in connection with CO2 emissions (Need for better support of the sustainable traffic carriers railway and inland water vessels)

12.1.b Sustainable consumption/Energy consumption and CO2 emissions from consumption

2. The governance approach and structure

- 2.1 Are you satisfied with the institutions and the enabling environment both the government and the non-state actors have created so far?

- 2.2 According to you, is the sense of urgency as determined by science-based goals well understood and does it orient action (e.g. in your area)?
- 2.3 As a partner or stakeholders do you feel enabled to actively participate in dialogue on and to contribute actions for sustainability?
- 2.4 Is the science-policy interface working? Do results of “science for sustainability” already make a difference?

3. New opportunities and challenges

- 3.1 Which new opportunities and challenges do you identify for Germany? Does the Sustainable Development Strategy help to address them? (Explanation: „new“ in the sense of: next, or not yet fully grasped, or appearing when you scan the horizon)
- 3.2 Are there areas where Germany can and must show leadership and set new standards?
- 3.3 Is the “fear of the future and transformation” a notion in society strong enough that you feel your organization and the Government will have to deal with it more carefully?
- 3.4 Is communication an issue?

4. Do you have any other general message that you want to share with the Peers?

Civil society

Brot für die Welt

General Information	
Name and function:	Thilo Hoppe, Entwicklungspolitischer Beauftragter (Senior Development Policy Advisor - Policy, Dialogue and Theology Unit)
Answers on behalf of (name of your organization):	Brot für die Welt, Evangelischer Entwicklungsdienst ("Bread for the World", Development Service of the Protestant Churches in Germany - Member of the international ACT Alliance)
Which stakeholder do you represent or belong to (no ranking implied, multiple answers possible):	<input type="checkbox"/> a) politics, <input type="checkbox"/> b) administration, <input type="checkbox"/> c) enterprise or the business community, <input type="checkbox"/> d) the labour movement, <input type="checkbox"/> e) academia, <input type="checkbox"/> f) municipalities and associations, <input type="checkbox"/> g) youth, <input type="checkbox"/> h) gender interests, <input type="checkbox"/> i) migration groups, <input type="checkbox"/> j) the disabled movement, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> k) the churches, <input type="checkbox"/> l) financial actors, <input type="checkbox"/> m) the countries, <input type="checkbox"/> n) grassroots initiatives or local agenda groups, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> o) other interests?
Have you sent in a contribution on the draft of the 2016 Sustainable Development Strategy?	Ja / yes (siehe Anlage)
Do you agree with the publication of your contribution on the RNE-website?	Ja / yes

1. The state of play of the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016

1.1 In your view, what are the general challenges and benefits for Germany concerning sustainable development? In that regard, have you identified significant gaps in the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016?

Germany played a positive role in the negotiation process to develop Agenda 2030 and campaigned for ambitious goals. For this reason, Germany should act as a role model when it comes to implementing Agenda 2030 as well – both for ethical reasons and because it is well understood that this is in the country's own interests. For instance, Germany already plays a leading role in the production of environmental technology, which it could maintain and/or expand if the German government also implemented policies in the transport sector forcing the industry to innovate (low-emission drive systems for vehicles and eco-friendly mobility concepts).

We welcome the fact that the revised German Sustainable Development Strategy adopted in early 2017 is based on the structure of Agenda 2030. However, it does not reflect the 17 Sustainable Development Goals and 169 sub-goals of the Agenda 2030 in full: it concentrates on a number of issues from Agenda 2030 and omits others, unfortunately.

All in all, Germany's trade, transport and agricultural policies are a long way from true sustainability. Although renewables have been ramped up enormously, even the country's energy policy is far from sustainable because it relies too heavily on power generated using hard coal and brown coal.

1.2 Have you identified strategic incoherencies within the German Sustainable Development policies? Would you have proposals to increase coherence and meaningful output?

1.2 The incoherencies lie not so much with the German Sustainable Development Strategy but with the government's actions. As mentioned in 1.1, there is little evidence of any adjustments in favor of true sustainability in a number of policy areas. For example, nothing is being done to counteract the trend in the automotive industry towards launching bigger and bigger cars – especially SUVs – on the market and promoting them. Likewise, no attempt is being made to end the tax subsidies for diesel and aviation fuel (kerosene). And although the government says that it supports biodiversity preservation, Germany backed a license extension for the herbicide glyphosate in an EU vote. Whether the weedkiller is carcinogenic or not is a matter of debate, but it is clearly linked to the dramatic rise in species extinction (72% of insects have disappeared in Germany).

To ensure greater coherence, the Parliamentary Advisory Council on Sustainable Development should be upgraded to a full Committee of the German Bundestag with the remit of reviewing all decisions made by the German government and parliament to check whether they are in line with Agenda 2030.

1.3 Do you think the measurement and reporting mechanisms are adequate to implement the 2030 Agenda by Germany?

Unfortunately, the indicators used for the German Sustainable Development Strategy do not correspond fully to those used for Agenda 2030. They should be better aligned. There is still

work to be done on how the government accounts to parliament and civil society. Clear structures and mechanisms are needed here: although these have been discussed, they have not yet been put in place sufficiently.

1.4 Which off-track goals and targets (meaning those targets marked with “thunderstorm” or “overcast”) in the German Sustainable Development Strategy do you think are the most important? According to you, why are they off track?

For some time now, the target of using at least 20 per cent of the available agricultural land for organic farming has formed part of the German Sustainable Development Strategy. However, even after many years, the figure is still only approximately 7 per cent. This is partly because no time frame was set for achieving the 20 per cent target. For this reason, a target date (possibly with interim targets) should be added when the German Sustainable Development Strategy is next revised. For it to succeed, however, it will be crucial to analyse why there has been very little progress in this field to date. A substantial increase in subsidies is also needed to make it easier for farmers to switch from conventional to organic agriculture.

2. The governance approach and structure

2.1 Are you satisfied with the institutions and the enabling environment both the government and the non-state actors have created so far?

2.1 We see it as a welcome development that the German government has already created a new participation format, the ‘Forum Nachhaltigkeit’ (Sustainability Forum). It provides an opportunity for government and non-government players to come together and tell one another what they have done to implement Agenda 2030 and what they plan to do in the future. This could lead to the various players encouraging one another and thereby raising ambition. However, this will only succeed if the German government provides all the members of the ‘Forum Nachhaltigkeit’ with timely written reports before they meet so that they are well prepared and able to provide constructive criticism.

The German government has announced a second new participation format, but this has not yet been created. In the future, meetings of the State Secretaries’ Committee for Sustainable Development are to be preceded and followed up by a ‘dialogue group’ comprising 15 non-government organisations and/or associations. We believe it is important that the new government upholds this plan and sets up this ‘dialogue group’ in the foreseeable future. Civil society will face the challenge of helping to ensure that this ‘dialogue group’ has a representative membership.

2.2 According to you, is the sense of urgency as determined by science-based goals well understood and does it orient action (e.g. in your area)?

One of the most ambitious goals in the Agenda 2030 is SDG 2: finally ending hunger in the world by 2030. To achieve this, an accurate academic analysis is needed of how many people in which countries, population groups and regions suffer from chronic undernourishment or

malnutrition, and when. There is no reliable data on this in many countries. However, the FAO has established that overall the hunger figures rose further last year (2016). This should come as alarming news because the trend is heading in the wrong direction. If we are to achieve SDG 2 (zero hunger by 2030), the figures for hunger have to fall significantly year for year. A precise analysis is urgently needed of why and where exactly the hunger figures have risen further as well. The German Sustainable Development Strategy also urgently needs an indicator for the international dimension of SDG 2. We have proposed using as an indicator the number of countries which implement the FAO's voluntary guidelines on the right to adequate food with Germany's support and use the associated procedures and instruments that are contained in these guidelines. This would lead – amongst other things – to registries that contain a precise record of the number of people affected by hunger and analyse the causes.

2.3 As a partner or stakeholders do you feel enabled to actively participate in dialogue on and to contribute actions for sustainability?

We were heavily involved (advising, commenting) in the negotiation process to develop Agenda 2030 as well as the consultation process to develop the German Sustainable Development Strategy. The Federal Chancellery, the Ministry for Development and the Ministry for the Environment gave the impression of listening to us and taking us seriously. Nevertheless, we hope and expect that the new participation formats which have been announced will be set up soon and will be well structured.

Brot für die Welt believes that it has been making an important contribution towards overcoming extreme poverty and hunger, upholding human rights and supporting sustainable development for a long time with its projects, programmes and lobbying. We now see this work as a contribution towards implementing the Agenda 2030 as well. However, we also view Agenda 2030 as a challenge to review our work and ask ourselves whether it is truly coherent and corresponds to the holistic approach of the Agenda 2030. It goes without saying that we also want to help achieve the goals which the federal government has set itself in the new German Sustainable Development Strategy. We are committed to making concrete suggestions to ensure that the German Sustainable Development Strategy is developed further to make it more comprehensive (covering all the goals of Agenda 2030) and more ambitious.

2.4 Is the science-policy interface working? Do results of “science for sustainability” already make a difference?

2.4 As explained in 2.2, we believe that sound academic monitoring is essential when implementing the Agenda 2030 and the German Sustainable Development Strategy. Wherever possible, more measurable and verifiable indicators should be added with concrete target dates and interim goals. A reliable academic assessment of the achievement or non-achievement of these is needed. Greater academic monitoring is also necessary to support the analysis of failures.

3. New opportunities and challenges

3.1 Which new opportunities and challenges do you identify for Germany? Does the Sustainable Development Strategy help to address them? (Explanation: „new“ in the sense of: next, or not yet fully grasped, or appearing when you scan the horizon)

As mentioned in 1.1 and 1.2, the biggest challenges are those policy areas where Germany is still far from achieving sustainability. As there is no time to waste when it comes to halting climate change, Germany should phase out coal-fired power stations – especially those that use brown coal – as quickly as possible and slash emissions in the transport and agricultural sectors, i.e. initiate a transport and agricultural reform. Trade agreements also need to be completely restructured so that they promote sustainable development instead of counteracting it.

Digitisation has not yet been recognised as posing a challenge to sustainable development. It presents both opportunities and enormous risks. This area has not yet been examined sufficiently – either by the government or by civil society.

3.2 Are there areas where Germany can and must show leadership and set new standards?

Germany could and should promote an alternative trade policy – both at EU level and as part of the WTO – which is in line with the Agenda 2030. In addition to this, Germany could and should once again become a leading nation in the expansion, establishment and use of renewable energies.

3.3 Is the “fear of the future and transformation” a notion in society strong enough that you feel your organization and the Government will have to deal with it more carefully?

As we work towards true sustainability, we must not neglect the social dimension. There is absolutely no doubt that Germany cannot achieve its climate targets or SDG 13 without phasing out the use of coal-fired power stations. In doing so, we must not abandon the people who currently work in this industry and are worried about their jobs. Sufficient conversion, retraining and social schemes must be put in place for them to ensure that they do not end up unemployed with bleak prospects and susceptible to populist rhetoric.

3.4 Is communication an issue?

Yes! Awareness of the Agenda 2030 is very low in Germany. Although it is a historic agreement which was signed in September 2015 at the biggest summit of all time, the media paid little attention to it. It barely played a role in the last general election campaign either. Government and non-government players should work much harder to raise awareness of the Agenda 2030 and inspire more people with a sense of enthusiasm about its ambitious, coherent implementation. The German Sustainable Development Strategy should contribute towards this, i.e. be seen more clearly as a key means of implementing the Agenda 2030.

4. Do you have any other general message that you want to share with the Peers?

Bund für Umwelt und Naturschutz Deutschland e.V.

General Information	
Name and function:	Christine Wenzl / Leiterin Nachhaltigkeit (Coordinator Sustainability)
Answers on behalf of (name of your organization):	Bund für Umwelt und Naturschutz Deutschland e.V. (BUND) (Friends of the Earth Germany)
Which stakeholder do you represent or belong to (no ranking implied, multiple answers possible):	<input type="checkbox"/> a) politics, <input type="checkbox"/> b) administration, <input type="checkbox"/> c) enterprise or the business community, <input type="checkbox"/> d) the labour movement, <input type="checkbox"/> e) academia, <input type="checkbox"/> f) municipalities and associations, <input type="checkbox"/> g) youth, <input type="checkbox"/> h) gender interests, <input type="checkbox"/> i) migration groups, <input type="checkbox"/> j) the disabled movement, <input type="checkbox"/> k) the churches, <input type="checkbox"/> l) financial actors, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> m) environment organization <input type="checkbox"/> n) development organization <input type="checkbox"/> o) "the Länder", <input type="checkbox"/> p) grassroots initiatives or local agenda groups, <input type="checkbox"/> q) other interests?
Have you sent in a contribution on the draft of the 2016 Sustainable Development Strategy?	We have sent a statement to the German Government, which we also published on our Website (June 2016). We also commented on the cabinet decision with a press release (January 2017).
Do you agree with the publication of your contribution on the RNE-website?	yes

5. The state of play of the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016

- 1.1 In your view, what are the general challenges and benefits for Germany concerning sustainable development? In that regard, have you identified significant gaps in the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016?

Our priority is to limit resource-use to planetary boundaries and the preservation of the natural resource base. This is one of Germany's mayor challenges, as the government and the economy still focus mainly on economic growth.

It's an achievement, that the German Sustainable Development Strategy contains long-term quantitative goals and indicators (new and generally positive: the allocation of the German objectives to the 17 UN Sustainable Developments Goals). However, we believe the current goals and indicators are not sufficient; the framework could in many points be more ambitious.

So far, neither the strategy nor its goals have been effectively implemented. To achieve a consistent implementation, the strategy would need to have a binding character and mechanisms that enable a high commitment, including binding intermediate targets and measures.

Last but not least: The government need to adjust policies as soon as it is obvious that objectives will not be reached. This necessary large-scale adjustment is not taking place. For example, Germany will probably fail in reaching the German climate goals for 2020 – which has not led to any substantial policy change so far.

- 1.2 Have you identified strategic incoherencies within the German Sustainable Development policies? Would you have proposals to increase coherence and meaningful output?

We see fundamental contradictions and inconsistencies for instance between the policies of the ministry of environment and those of the ministries of economics, agriculture and transport. Often, in case of conflicting interests, environmental concerns are being shelved - for example when it comes to the voting of the German government in Brussels concerning new emission limits for passenger cars or the latest decision by the ministry of agriculture on the authorization of glyphosate.

We therefor suggest to anchor a right of initiative in other sectors - or even the right to veto - for the ministry of environment.

- 1.3 Do you think the measurement and reporting mechanisms are adequate to implement the 2030 Agenda by Germany?

(see point 1.1)

- 1.4 Which off-track goals and targets (meaning those targets marked with “thunderstorm” or “overcast”) in the German Sustainable Development Strategy do you think are the most important? According to you, why are they off track?

The following off-track goals and targets we think are essential for an ecologically sound and sustainable development :

Climate protection goals (2020!); Sustainable Land Use (30 hectares or less per day in 2030); species diversity and conserving species – protecting habitats; the mobility goals; Organic Farming (the share of farmland used for organic farming should reach 20 % in the next few years). For the reasons given see answers 1.1 / 1.2 / 2.1/ 2.2.

6. The governance approach and structure

- 2.1 Are you satisfied with the institutions and the enabling environment both the government and the non-state actors have created so far?

The implementation of the sustainability strategy must be given a stronger and more binding character for the work of the ministries. For this reason a structure has been created with the newly appointed coordinators. However, this must now also be reflected in concrete policies. Conflicting goals between the ministries need to be more clearly disclosed and evaluated according to the criteria of a sustainable development.

The Parliamentary Advisory Council must be strengthened and better anchored in the rules of procedure of the German parliament, for example by being automatically set up at the beginning of a legislative session - without the necessity of a renewed decision.

- 2.2 According to you, is the sense of urgency as determined by science-based goals well understood and does it orient action (e.g. in your area)?

From the environmental and development perspectives the urgency of action needs to be addressed in a much better and coherent way. Planetary boundaries have already been exceeded in essential areas. Action has to be taken now to reach the goals of the Paris climate agreements as well as the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

For example, the new government must clearly act upon to the expected dramatic failure of not meeting the German climate objectives for 2020. The main reason for this failure is the persistently high level of coal-fired power generation and the rising emissions in traffic. What we need is the short-term shutdown of all old coal-fired power plants, a government decision on the exit from coal technology in 2018 and a socially acceptable implementation of this exit before 2030. In addition, it would be necessary to expand renewable energies much faster in an ecologically sensitive way and to remove all environmentally harmful subsidies.

- 2.3 As a partner or stakeholders do you feel enabled to actively participate in dialogue on and to contribute actions for sustainability?

We appreciate the Federal Government inviting us to forums and events, and asking us to submit comments (published on the website of the Federal Government). However, we can't see any substantial implementation of our suggestions.

- 2.4 Is the science-policy interface working? Do results of “science for sustainability” already make a difference?

Greater efforts must be undertaken to make these results more visible and relevant for political debates. In general, we think it is necessary to significantly stronger promote sustainable science in close cooperation with NGOs.

7. New opportunities and challenges

- 3.1 Which new opportunities and challenges do you identify for Germany? Does the Sustainable Development Strategy help to address them? (Explanation: „new“ in the sense of: next, or not yet fully grasped, or appearing when you scan the horizon)

1) The recognition of the limits of growth, the necessity of sufficiency in the industrial countries and the preservation of the planetary boundaries must be much more addressed as a substantial part of future sustainability politics - aiming towards a life in dignity for everybody living on this planet.

More concrete:

2) Digitalization: taking advantage of opportunities, knowing the limits

3) Planning e-mobility in a way that is environmentally sound and compatible with an environmentally friendly shift in energy policy (naturverträgliche Energiewende). We not only need a change in technology, but we need smaller cars - and less cars in our streets and cities.

4) Shaping structural change and just transition (coal regions, automotive industry)

5) Not new - but still very challenging and up-to-date: implementing the goals of Paris

- 3.2 Are there areas where Germany can and must show leadership and set new standards?

Germany has to assume international responsibility for its policy much more consistently than before. Above all, this also affects the impacts of our policies, our economy and our lifestyles on other countries of the world - especially the global South.

- 3.3 Is the “fear of the future and transformation” a notion in society strong enough that you feel your organization and the Government will have to deal with it more carefully?

Yes, we think, we have to deal with this carefully. To put it positively: A possibly higher quality of life and the opportunities that come with transformation should be

communicated in an attractiv way; the cultural dimension of sustainability should be strengthened.

At the same time: It takes courage to implement the transformation; positive examples of successful change in the past are the smoking ban (highly accepted in the meantime) - or further in the past: the implementation of the obligatory wearing of seat belts (strongly opposed by the public when the idea first came up)

3.4 Is communication an issue?

YES (see e.g. 3.3)

8. Do you have any other general message that you want to share with the Peers?

Bund für Umwelt und Naturschutz Deutschland e.V. (BUND) (Friends of the Earth Germany)

Friends of the Earth Germany (BUND) is an independent, federal and non-profit association that campaigns for the protection of nature and the environment through publicity measures and lobbying. With more than 570,000 members and supporters, 16 state associations and over 2,000 local and district groups, the BUND is the largest environmental association in Germany.

For further information see: www.bund.net

Christoffel-Blindenmission Deutschland e.V.

General Information	
Name and function:	Ms Sarah Meschenmoser, Advocacy Officer
Answers on behalf of (name of your organization):	CBM Germany (disability inclusion NGO)
Which stakeholder do you represent or belong to (no ranking implied, multiple answers possible):	<input type="checkbox"/> a) politics, <input type="checkbox"/> b) administration, <input type="checkbox"/> c) enterprise or the business community, <input type="checkbox"/> d) the labour movement, <input type="checkbox"/> e) academia, <input type="checkbox"/> f) municipalities and associations, <input type="checkbox"/> g) youth, <input type="checkbox"/> h) gender interests, <input type="checkbox"/> i) migration groups, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> j) the disabled movement, <input type="checkbox"/> k) the churches, <input type="checkbox"/> l) financial actors, <input type="checkbox"/> m) environment organization <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> n) development organization <input type="checkbox"/> o) "the Länder", <input type="checkbox"/> p) grassroots initiatives or local agenda groups, <input type="checkbox"/> q) other interests?
Have you sent in a contribution on the draft of the 2016 Sustainable Development Strategy?	yes, uploaded on the Federal Government homepage.
Do you agree with the publication of your contribution on the RNE-website?	yes

1. The state of play of the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016

- 1.1 In your view, what are the general challenges and benefits for Germany concerning sustainable development? In that regard, have you identified significant gaps in the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016?

An opportunity but also challenge for German sustainable development policies is to move the originally predominantly ecological (1992 Earth Summit/ UNCED process) characterized concepts, approaches, ownership away to an understanding of three inherently interlinked and equally important sustainability dimensions - this has the potential to change the current prism through which sustainability is approached . While we do see that the German Sustainable Development Strategy (GSDS) partly moves in this direction (e.g. revision of sustainability goal triangle with added absolute limit of "a life in dignity for all", p.24) we are missing a consistent and rigorous adaptation of the set up the GSDS takes to implement the SDGs in this interlinked manner. No transformative vision is set out, specifying how these three dimensions will be brought together, there is no analysis of its implications and ways to go about it - the 17 SDGs are looked at in a rather isolated manner.

We believe that the three inherently interlinked sustainability dimensions is one major transformational element the 2030 Agenda should bring to the national sustainability efforts, however more socially dominant SDGs (e.g. SDG 1, 4, 10) lack forward-looking, ambitious and integrated contributions - e.g. to overcome social inequalities while protecting the environment and climate. To us this becomes very evident in the subordinate (or even lacking) role the core principle to the new global sustainable development agenda to "leave no one behind" plays. This foundational, innovative principle (grounded in binding human rights law) is briefly explained in the introductory section on the "Current Challenge Sustainability", where the 2030 Agenda itself is introduced. The once off attesting that this principle runs through the whole 2030 Agenda, but then when defining sustainability principles, objectives, functioning, institutions and single contributions not at all drawing back on it, leaves a huge gap. The operationalization of "leave no one behind" as per definition a mainstreaming imperative across all SDGs is hence missing.

Another major potential for German sustainability policies is the firm grounding of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in international human rights treaties (firm component of the vision the 2030 Agenda lays out). However the fact that a basic rule was added to the "Management rules for sustainability", bringing intergenerational equity, social cohesion, quality of life and human rights implementation etc together, in itself is not sufficient to align SDG implementation with human rights obligations. Postulating that these elements "are to be united so that developments will be permanently sustainable" (basic rule (2), GSDS, p.33) leaves unanswered the crucial question of "how" can and should they be united? What is the German compass to that? The guiding principle to sustainable development currently fails to provide clear practical orientation (which the management rules standing next to each other per se cannot provide). Consequently, rules of application or a code of practice to operationalize the elements of the

guiding principle are still needed – that way it could be ensured that human rights obligations are taken up consistently.

1.2 Have you identified strategic incoherencies within the German Sustainable Development policies? Would you have proposals to increase coherence and meaningful output?

In the introduction to Chapter C, where the GSDS lays out Germany's contributions to achieving every single SDG, it is acknowledged: "Given the universality of the 2030 Agenda, the Federal Government needs to make appropriate contributions to the achievement of all 17 sustainable development goals as a whole, both with its national policies and on the international level. This affects the ministries and their respective full ranges of concrete political measures (ministry strategies, programmes, projects, legislation, promotion, etc.)." (p.53) The GSDS then introduces the strongly welcomed threefold division of measures in Germany, by Germany, with Germany. What is largely missing however under the different goal-contributions are integrated measures beyond the usual department responsibilities. It is widely assignable which department added what contribution for the select in, by, with Germany areas. Mutual dependence of measures originating from different departments is not portrayed. Also, there are only rare examples of new and future-directed policy measures innovative to the extent that departments working in interconnected policy fields join hands to resolve potential conflicts, dependencies and synergies from the outset (see Education Cannot Wait study on German practice, English executive summary pp.6-7, <https://www.bildungskampagne.org/sites/default/files/download/Bildung%20darf%20nicht%20warten.pdf>). A solution to this could have been the GSDS providing a clear political framework defining common, specific and shared responsibilities of different ministries and calling for subordinate strategies (sector wide government strategies) cutting across the usual department delineations (like about to happen regarding Global Health). Also the mere attestation that conflicts of goals imply weighting of individual aspects which is subject to a case-by-case assessment process does neither provide for transparent and mandatory nor coherent instruction how this is supposed to effectively happen (at what level, by which standards and procedures etc). An arching over, interdepartmentally agreed implementation plan for the aligned implementation of GSDS could contribute to this as well.

Another insight leading over to a suggestion how coherence and meaningful output could be increased is a recent initiative by the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, so-called "Marshallplan with Africa" (https://www.bmz.de/en/countries_regions/marshall_plan_with_africa/contents/index.html). This initiative on the one hand is limited in its alignment with 2030 Agenda-principles and imperatives (e.g. focus on most vulnerable countries, ensure that when focusing on economic progress no one is left behind etc), it solely refers to the 2030 Agenda in its Outlook Chapter 5. On the other hand it is an example of a department initiative which sets positive tones e.g. with regards to trade and investment policies, which however are outside the remits of this department's responsibilities. As this department's initiative was not agreed by the whole government, other departments which should be involved too, would not necessarily

see themselves addressed. To counter this, the whole of government approach pursued needs strengthening. As mentioned this implies more sector/policy field wide integrated government strategies. Also the procedures within the Federal Government for the GSDS implementation outlined in its Overview box (p. 244, IV.) should be expanded and deepened. This includes more spelled out guidance and regular monitoring by the State Secretary Committee (see answer to question 1.3. for more details). It also requires the Federal Chancellery to facilitate ownership and consistent use of the GSDS by all departments as well as cross-departmental coordination in a more compulsory and administered manner. Moreover, the Parliamentary Body for Sustainable Development needs to be upgraded into a full-fledged parliamentary committee with the mandate and competence to substantively examine laws and regulations as well as policies, action plans, strategies in the context of the regulatory impact assessment (currently limited to procedural matters). The Parliamentary Body could then i.a. point out where interdepartmental cooperation and coordination is lacking, where goals in other policy fields are harmed by ignoring or inadequately considering them etc.

1.3 Do you think the measurement and reporting mechanisms are adequate to implement the 2030 Agenda by Germany?

We do not believe that the measurement and reporting mechanisms currently in place through GSDS are sufficient to monitor 2030 Agenda implementation by Germany. This assessment has several aspects to it:

1) According to GSDS the various ministries represented in the State Secretaries' Committee on Sustainable Development regularly report on current sustainability issues in their own fields of business and activity. To our knowledge to date these reports have not been regularly handed in and published, they do not follow a guiding structure along GSDS principles and set rules (see sustainability management components). The reports made public online (https://www.bundesregierung.de/Webs/Breg/DE/Themen/Nachhaltigkeitsstrategie/5-BerichteReden/Berichte-Ministerien/_node.html) rather lead to the conclusion that some ministries at times hand in some independently set up and structured reports on what they see as their sustainability contributions – these reports contain very little on current issues, challenges or even setbacks. Against this backdrop, we welcome the specification the GSDS makes that ministries ought to regularly submit reports on results and objectives to the State Secretary Committee and to the Parliamentary Body for Sustainable Development (PBnE) – explaining how they are contributing to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda and all (!) SDGs as a whole (!) (GSDS, p.45). This regularity should be defined as annual or bi-annual reports, with the department reports following a mandatory, unified structure along all SDGs and targets. There should be sections prescribed on synergies, overlaps and frictions with other departments, both for domestic, international or national policies having international impact – this would lead to increased coherence, too. Last but not least, these reports must contain a distinct section on how the core principle of “leave no one behind” is operationalized at all levels of the respective department's fields of competence (according to 2030 Agenda, national review instruments should be “people-centred and have a particular focus on the poorest, most vulnerable and

those furthest behind”, para. 74 (e)). To live up to the 2030 Agenda furthermore requiring review processes to be open and transparent we would like to see these reports published in an accessible and timely manner.

2) The German Federal Statistical Office is charged to compile and analyze data on the set indicators for measuring progress on the GSDS. Every two years the Federal Statistical Office (Destatis) publishes an independent report on the status of development of the indicators towards the set targets (last one 02/2016). While this work by Destatis as such is undoubted, the set of indicators and level of granularity of data analyzed is insufficient in light of the commitments set out in the 2030 Agenda. While the GSDS lays out legitimate reasons why the number of indicators needs to be manageable, the extent to which the set of national indicators reflects Germany’s international responsibility is unreasonably limited: Less than five indicators are of development cooperation relevance, crucial SDGs requiring significantly enhanced international efforts to be achieved by many countries behind, e.g. SDG 1, 2, 3, 4, 10, 16, lack indicator-backed political targets for German policies. At the HLPF 2016 the German government reported that “For the German Government, the universal applicability of the Agenda means making appropriate contributions to meeting all 17 sustainable development goals – both in its national policies and internationally.” (HLPF-report, p.3) We strongly believe that for the GSDS management system to live up to this affirmation, it needs to be widened in terms of setting political targets and accompanying indicators for activities by and with Germany internationally. Another shortcoming to the current measurement system is that it does not live up to the core principle of 2030 Agenda to “leave no one behind” in implementing all targets. This is internationally and in various statements by the German government unambiguously translated to require disaggregating data by all relevant discrimination grounds (see para. 74 g) 2030 Agenda). For the measurement of progress broken down by discrimination characteristics the GSDS states that “this is implemented as far as reasonable” (p.40). Such “reasonability” standard is inadequate, since many more GSDS indicators in line with the respective SDG targets should be disaggregated but for unclear reasons are not. One obvious example would be employment rate (GSDS indicators 8.5.a and b): There are reliable data on employment e.g. by disability (EU labour force survey ad hoc modules; Federal Employment Agency data), but this disaggregation is not required by GSDS standards. Even more so, we know that even in cases for which fine levels of disaggregation are not doable right now, the 2030 Agenda avoids the responsibility to invest in strengthened statistical capacities to live up to the data requirements. Choice of indicators and generation of data so they can be disaggregated according to 2030 Agenda standards definitely comes with budget implications. Yet the German government should not shy away from investing in Destatis capacities to fulfil these new data requirements adopted by all UN member states at the General Assembly in 2015, the sooner the better (see question 3.1.).

3) Previously there has been little engagement of the German Parliament/Bundestag with the GSDS and related German sustainable development policies. For both the statistical report by Destatis and the „regular reports“ by ministries to the State Secretaries’ Committee to unfold political meaning, an annual reporting on

implementation progress by the Federal Government to the Bundestag with a 1-2 hours debate in core hours on this Government report is indispensable.

4) Another reporting mechanism is the national review which led to the report by Germany at the HLPF. While Germany volunteering had a great signal effect, there has been no national review process leading up to the German progress report at the UN in 2016. Two ministries (BMUB/BMZ) were in charge of commissioning the voluntary national report for Germany. Shortly before presenting it in NY, the report was shared with civil society organizations and stakeholders participating in the dialogue forum hosted by BMUB and BMZ for comments. Despite this brief opportunity to input (short notice and brief feedback period of roughly one week), the drafting of the report for HLPF did not follow a distinct “regular and inclusive review of progress at the national and sub-national levels” as required by 2030 Agenda (para. 79). It is therefore to be welcomed that the GSDS states that the comprehensive and coherent implementation of the SDGs requires a constant overview of measures in all policy areas and that all stakeholders who contribute to the implementation shall be more involved in the work of the Federal Government (p.44). In that regard, the newly introduced or strengthened formats for “greater involvement of social stakeholders” are a step forward, however they do not sum up to a structured review process meeting the standards as set out in the 2030 Agenda (para. 74). It is crucial for civil society organizations to be able to inclusively and transparently feed in their views and evidence on achievements, challenges and gaps and not being addressed foremost as stakeholders contributing to the implementation of 2030 Agenda. Also, while we do see the constraints upon Government to arrive at viable reporting mechanisms, inclusive, participatory and people-centred review processes demand for the reporting by all relevant stakeholders, especially those representing people in vulnerable situations and those furthest behind. This is why we suggest set up accessible, responsive, structured and policy-relevant participation formats which are transparent regarding contents, agreements and participants. (see question 2.1.).

- 1.4 Which off-track goals and targets (meaning those targets marked with “thunderstorm” or “overcast”) in the German Sustainable Development Strategy do you think are the most important? According to you, why are they off track?

2. The governance approach and structure

- 2.1 Are you satisfied with the institutions and the enabling environment both the government and the non-state actors have created so far?

On the government institutions side as mentioned partly above, we do believe there is still potential for strengthening structures: The Parliamentary Body/Parliamentary Advisory Council for Sustainable Development (PBnE) currently has the powers and visibility of a second class parliamentary committee. In case the imminent establishment of parliamentary committees for the next legislative term does not upgrade it into a full-fledged parliamentary committee with the mandate and

competence to substantively examine laws and regulations as well as policies, action plans, strategies (within the regulatory impact assessment), we would see this as a huge opportunity missed the first time forming committees after 2030 agenda was adopted. Beyond its lacking basis in parliamentary law, the current substantive engagement could be improved: It would be welcomed if the parliamentary body would engage more with overriding topics of sustainability, with specific implementation challenges, coherency questions or conflicts of targets/objectives on ministries' sides. We do see that this would require increased financial and human resources.

Regarding the State Secretary Committee, on the one hand we appreciate its high level domicile with the Federal Chancellery. On the other hand as outlined above (question 1.2.), we believe that the whole of government approach requires more guided coherence and stronger enforcement. The State Secretary Committee (SSC) is supposed to be the coordinator/switching point ensuring that the GSDS runs through all policy areas as a common (red) thread. We believe for this it is required that the SSC meets more often (2-3 times/year) and more regularly than currently, with one fixed meeting to discuss the annual departmental reports (along a unified structure, see answer 1.3.1.). Furthermore the topic and agenda items an upcoming SSC meeting addresses should be made public well in advance (incl. the two-year work program of the SSC). Also the phrase the GSDS uses that the SSC "works towards policy coherence between the ministries" requires some transparent specification – via what avenues, instruments and follow-up mechanisms is this happening?

Aside these potentials for institution strengthening, we appreciate the commitment that social groups will be "systematically and transparently involved in preparing and following up the meetings of the State Secretaries' Committee on specific issues". Having the involvement of "society representatives" select and matched to the meeting topics at hand is reasonable.

However we think several aspects should be considered:

- > "society representatives" as a broader and less specific term shall not undermine the role of civil society and citizen representation organizations;
- > the respective advisory group shall be agreed upon through a transparent and participatory mechanism and participation in the group should be permeable according to the meeting topics at hand;
- > the understandable selection of representatives should demonstrate how the representation of marginalized groups is ensured (and not being lost in the mainstream);
- > preparations and follow up of SSC meetings through the advisory group need to be well-informed, substantive, relevant and with reasonable timelines;
- > the respective advisory group should have opportunities for direct contributions at the SSC session;
- > documentation around the advisory group's contributions should be accessible to the remainder civil society.

Lastly, the public resolutions by the SSC on meeting outcomes could be more substantiated and displaying evaluated achievements but also conflict of goals or interests in a more comprehensive manner.

Another governing mechanism are the presently twelve management rules which were adapted only moderately for the new GSDS. These minor changes are welcomed, e.g. the including of a basic rule on appropriate participation of stakeholders and the added language on human rights into the basic rule (2) on sustainable development broadly speaking. Also, it is positively noted that rule (10) contains a brief reference to “leave no one behind” – however beyond the inserting of these terms, rule (10) is not scaled up into a constitutive guidance for social justice and equity. As major inherent incoherencies and gaps (especially regarding the social dimensions of sustainable development) remain with the management rules it is appreciated that the Sustainable Development Council/SDC currently performs a comprehensive revision. In order to arrive at an impactful management tool for “sustainable development” the management rules need to be more closely linked with the SDGs and the overriding 2030 Agenda principles. We hope that the currently underway process will also bring more transparency into the previous usage (where, by whom/function, at what stage of policy/law making, to what extent) and impact of the management rules. Basing on the reworked management rules it is crucial that the government specifies the target group within ministries, the context and stages of use and sets out rules of application.

Furthermore, the newly established “Sustainability Forum”, a regular dialogue format the Federal Government wants to hold annually with “social stakeholders”, contributes to a SDG-implementation enabling environment. It is said to be a mutual presenting and commenting of implementation progress and working programs by ministries and the invited organizations. As this format as well provides a forum only for select representatives, the requirements set out above regarding transparent participant selection and flexible/representative participant group, disclosed agenda, preparatory and result documentation are equally relevant here – we do not see a legitimate reason why the discussions and outcomes of this regular dialogue should be kept confidential vis-à-vis the remainder “social stakeholders”. Also we think for civil society to participate in the implementation of the 2030 Agenda as part of the GSDS this “Sustainability Forum” needs to formally link back to a broader consultation and feedback mechanism which allows for continuous, regular participation in monitoring and implementation, which is not restricted in its access, which functions in the preparation for an upcoming Forum and feeds in views to the Forum discussions. The “Sustainability Forum” could for instance be complemented adequately prior to and immediately after its meeting with a fully accessible online platform for civil society reporting and open exchanges on Germany’s sustainable development efforts.

A previously and continuously existent exchange platform between government and non-state actors is the so-called “dialogue forum” hosted by BMUB and BMZ. During the negotiations of the 2030 Agenda this indeed was a helpful information platform for actors involved on the global policy level and/or engaged with these two ministries. Since Germany’s state reporting at the HLPF 2016 however meetings have not been convened on a regular basis anymore. For this platform to gain policy relevance again we would appreciate it being held twice a year, regularly, with min. 6-8 weeks prior notice to meetings, with a meeting agenda shared in advance and with more broadly circulated invitations. It could for instance function as sort of a preparatory contributing forum to the “Forum Sustainability”.

For the institutions and enabling environment created by civil society organizations (other non-state actors efforts we do not feel apt to assess) we saw a lot of activities to align efforts immediately prior and after 2030 Agenda adoption in 2015. Civil society focusing on domestic and international development, on environmental, climate, financial, social, governance etc issues intensely discussed and exchanged to overcome silo thinking and to work within broader civil society. This dialogue has found some structuring in roughly six-monthly open civil society exchange conferences where current developments and NGO strategies are discussed. In addition many umbrella associations and federations from all different policy fields joined forces within the so-called “Network 2030”. This network not only organizes and hosts an annual conference on cutting edge sustainable development issues but also implements individual activities towards the government with aligned messaging on the fundamentals of German sustainability policies. Moreover many development cooperation CSOs are united in the German NGO network VENRO, where NGOs closely exchange on 2030 Agenda implementation and develop joint initiatives working towards a more ambitious and consistent implementation in the field of international cooperation. These structured collaborations are crucial in our view. However we also believe on the one hand that some more and immediate exchange would be helpful between single organizations with national and international perspective. On the other hand, well-functioning integrated approaches to SDG implementation from CSO side require more publicity and learning exchanges – there better tap the potential for these good practices to be duplicated or adapted.

2.2 According to you, is the sense of urgency as determined by science-based goals well understood and does it orient action (e.g. in your area)?

In our thematic area of social injustice, exclusion and marginalization of particular population groups, when it comes to progress in human development, there is ample evidence and a reliable knowledge base on the dimensions of inequality, the causes and the effects of inequality on individuals, societies if not regions.

It is well understood in science and since the agreement on SDG 10 and the imperative to reach all targets for all segments of society/ to “leave no one behind” it is equally formally acknowledged by the community of states, that ignorance, lack and delay of action is not an option anymore. This partly results from the track record of MDG implementation, in the final report 2015 the UN unambiguously states: “Although significant achievements have been made on many of the MDG targets worldwide, progress has been uneven across regions and countries, leaving significant gaps. Millions of people are being left behind, especially the poorest and those disadvantaged because of their sex, age, disability, ethnicity or geographic location. Targeted efforts will be needed to reach the most vulnerable people.” Looking at current systems and interdependences, it is evident that SDG 10 and the cross-cutting commitment to “leave no one behind” will require profound and lasting changes to the current economic and development models: Reducing inequalities and discrimination is not about economic growth (only or mainly), economic growth must be inclusive and disparities must be dismantled with a standard targeting of the most disadvantaged and marginalized persons.

We think that this robust common sense is shared by the German Government. However, the principle of achieving all targets for all people without leaving anyone behind is explained as one aspect of the 2030 Agenda without drawing any conclusions from it (see answer to question 1.1.): The understanding that “in the next 15 years ... even greater efforts than before will be required in order to reach all disadvantaged people and populations and to counteract rising inequality” (GSDS, p.23) does not orient any commensurate action in the operative sections of GSDS. To the contrary existing initiatives are quoted yet no new efforts/commitments rolled out which could contribute to the greater efforts needed in the next 15 years to ensure that no one is left behind.

Looking at Germany’s contributions to SDG 10 specifically, amongst the aspects considered important to reach its targets, the reduction of social inequalities does not appear to be understood as an end by itself but as a means to improve social cohesion and economic performance (GSDS, p. 144). Moreover with the Gini coefficient of income distribution as national indicator, focus for future additional measures will expressly rest on sustainable growth and more employment. This ignores the fact that participation opportunities depend on much more than income – overlapping inequalities like education, knowledge, health or gender/social status are not addressed by GSDS.

“Reaching the furthest behind first” is a fundamental paradigm shift both for domestic policies and for international cooperation – this shift is undeniably needed now and not sometime in the distant future. It would be welcome if this transformational shift was taken up against the traditional efficiency debates or initiatives around the engagement of the private sector. The deficient orientation of the substantive contributions set out in GSDS towards leaving no one behind instead of reaching the low hanging fruits first gives leeway to ministries launching departmental strategies what direction to take. While the BMZ for instance produced a sector strategy on WASH with strong language and standards on inequalities, a much needed overarching paper to address all development policies through a “leave no one behind”-prism disappeared after an initial consultation with civil society.

2.3 As a partner or stakeholders do you feel enabled to actively participate in dialogue on and to contribute actions for sustainability?

We have not experienced distinct proactive enabling or empowerment of civil society actors to get involved in dialogues or actions beyond the supports which existed before the adoption of 2030 Agenda or the revision of the German Sustainable Development Strategy. The level of participation we can exercise beyond the two new fora set out in the GSDS (advisory group to SSC and “Forum Sustainability”) very much depends on the rooms for participation civil society worked for themselves. On a more situational level there have been welcomed and crucial ad hoc opportunities opened up to feedback e.g. on the draft GSDS or the draft HLPF report. But there was no enablement beyond the information that feedback is possible within a given period of time. Moreover, in the beginning there have been various conferences and

activities with various government involvement which did not always appear interlinked or aligned. In busy participation opportunity times (esp. via conferences) it has been difficult to maintain an overview, whereas meanwhile things have gotten quieter (even before the German election campaigning period started).

Contributions to concrete actions for sustainability mostly remain within the structures and practices that had previously existed – e.g. bilateral co-funding through the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) for development cooperation NGOs. For instance, the “Initiative Programme Agenda 2030” striving to support partner countries in setting up national sustainability strategies, accompanying architecture and review mechanisms launched by BMZ has not involved CSOs in a structured manner. Despite the fact that many German development NGOs active in partner countries of the Federal Government have robust contacts to civil society in these countries who ought to be involved, these sustainability activities have not been pro-actively opened up to consult, contribute or collaborate on them. As opportunities to collaborate strategically with the BMZ on SDG implementation have remained rather limited, some NGOs advocate for a more long-term directed cooperation and reduction of transaction costs for 2030 Agenda relevant activities in development cooperation via facilitating and financing constant and comprehensive work by civil society.

- 2.4 Is the science-policy interface working? Do results of “science for sustainability” already make a difference?

3. New opportunities and challenges

- 3.1 Which new opportunities and challenges do you identify for Germany? Does the Sustainable Development Strategy help to address them? (Explanation: „new“ in the sense of: next, or not yet fully grasped, or appearing when you scan the horizon)

There are two major and intersecting opportunities/challenges not yet fully grasped or translated into required action when scanning the horizon from a social justice perspective.

1) On the one hand, on global policy level much attention has been put to the fact of huge data gaps to measure sustainable development. If politics shall not be guided by what is feasible (in terms of current data collections) but by what is desirable or even more so by what is firmly agreed as global goals regarding sustainable development until 2030, Germany must address the global as well as national data challenges. The data for sustainable development debates internationally clearly conclude on: What is treasured is measured, since what gets measured gets done. Behind these proverbs are huge needs for action – in terms of methodological alignment between countries to arrive at robust and comparable data, in terms of coordinating national statistical systems and more importantly in terms of statistical capacity building (also relating to both of the former). Germany is a member of the Inter-agency Expert Group on SDG Indicators and even co-leads the work stream on data disaggregation for purposes of

measuring who is left behind under each people-relevant global indicator. Germany should continue to constructively and ambitiously contribute to these at the same time technical and political processes in line with 2030 Agenda provisions.

However looking at how GSDS currently addresses the data challenges for Germany, for one there are deplorably insufficient references to data disaggregation for the national indicators within GSDS (see question 1.3.). Secondly this is subject to the fact that there have been no additional budgets for Germany's national data production in light of the 2030 Agenda monitoring needs. Consequently, it is urgently required to conduct a comprehensive review of the data system currently in place mainly at the National Statistical Office Destatis, a mapping compared to SDG-data requirements and then an action plan how to build the required statistical capacities. For this, the respective human and financial resources will need some considerable expanding in Germany as well.

Another well-established challenge is the considerable underfunding of statistics worldwide in spite of the vast agreement of their key role in the implementation of 2030 Agenda. The SDGs stipulate clearly that support to partner countries shall be provided to significantly increase the availability of high-quality, timely, reliable and disaggregated data by 2020 (SDG 17.18) – there is not much time left, but nearly nothing has been done in terms of additional bilateral support for statistical systems, with the GSDS not referring at all to this crucial international responsibility. The OECD very recently confirmed that “[s]upport to statistical capacity building has been supply driven and piecemeal, with little emphasis placed on partner countries' demand for data. There is greater emphasis on the data needed by development co-operation providers for their monitoring, reporting and accountability”; also figures are shockingly low at 0.3% of all ODA dedicated to improving data for development in 2015 (OECD Development Co-Operation Report 2017, p.78).

If the strongly invoked “data revolution” is to unfold, international support especially by a country like Germany with solid statistical expertise must massively and sustainably increase, become more needs based/partner country-led and follow the revitalized approach to donor support for statistics (see OECD Development Co-Operation Report 2017, p.87). As the 2020 global census round is of utmost importance for the monitoring of sustainable development worldwide, preparations in many countries require comprehensive and well-coordinated support. It is urgently needed to acknowledge the intrinsic and instrumental value of development data and consequently set it out as a strategic cross-cutting priority for German Sustainability Policy. Respective comprehensive initiatives and budget allocations should be agreed by the government without further delay.

2) On the other hand, the fact that global inequalities and instabilities are at Germany's national door step with many displaced persons seeking protection and humane living conditions in Germany resulted in a misled and abridged presentation of global contexts. The previous development understanding has to be fundamentally changed into a renewed global partnership which “will work in a spirit of global solidarity, in particular solidarity with the poorest and with people in vulnerable

situations” (para. 39 2030 Agenda). The universal character of sustainable development goals and targets until 2030 and the need for revitalized and enhanced Global Partnership should not be guided by a one-sided focus on engaging private sector and investments or be misrouted by a “me first”-perspective but always have a people-centered approach. Consequently, whatever is planned, decided or implemented regarding sustainable development must happen via a “who has been left behind previously”, “how can we reach the furthest behind first” and “how to ensure no one is newly left behind”-prism. This core imperative must orient all efforts in all policy areas. We do not see this huge shift addressed, not even initiated for a start in GSDS.

3.2 Are there areas where Germany can and must show leadership and set new standards?

Linking back to the previous question but also to other assessments provided in this survey, there are three areas in which Germany should show leadership:

1) Germany should become the leading or one of the leading champions worldwide in consistently implementing the “leave no one behind” imperative. A lot of transformative potential does come with this and a lot of synergies could be created in terms of human rights obligations regarding non-discrimination already incumbent on Germany. This requires formulating an operationalization framework, including strengthening the institutional set up for sustainability in Germany as well as the management system in this regard. Yet it also necessitates new approaches, standards and innovative partnerships. Germany should forge ahead in showcasing how to reach the SDG targets for those furthest behind, for marginalized and hard-to-reach groups.

2) As extensively outlined for question 3.1. Germany should also re-define its previous and play a much more significant role as a donor supporting statistical capacity building. Together with actors already more involved in strengthening statistical systems, Germany should play a constructive and visible role in prioritizing and significantly moving ahead this underrated development issue.

3) Finally, there has been much international attention paid to the German sustainability infrastructure and guiding principles. With the increased level of ambition because of the 2030 Agenda, with more visible interlinkages and still some concealed/blinded out connections amongst targets in different areas, with the three dimensions of sustainability strongly interwoven, Germany should redouble its efforts to arrive at tangible policy coherence and integrated approaches. If Germany could demonstrate that a well specified sustainability vision, a potent accompanying architecture and compulsory whole of government approach together with a pervasive involvement of civil society in fact can lead to economically, environmentally and socially sustainable development this would shine a long way internationally.

3.3 Is the “fear of the future and transformation” a notion in society strong enough that you feel your organization and the Government will have to deal with it more carefully?

3.4 Is communication an issue?

There are three regards to which communication on sustainable development is an issue.

Firstly, the government maintains in the GSDS section on “sustainability communication” (p.43) that there was a “continuous offer of talks with social stakeholders” and that a “continuous, open and transparent exchange of information is simultaneously an essential condition for the targeted intensification of cooperation between the government and social stakeholders”. As outlined above (question 2.1.) we currently do not see a sufficiently regular, open and transparent dialogue on sustainability. The open and broad dialogue conferences at national and regional levels between October 2015 and February 2016 undoubtedly were constructive opportunities to exchange, but they appear to have been once off in the preparations of the reviewed Sustainability Strategy.

Secondly and interlinked with the former is the fact that there is no broad and comprehensive communication plan or campaign on national level to make the SDGs and GSDS known to the general public. During the drafting of the post-2015 framework Germany repeatedly spoke about a communications plan around the 5Ps to make the 2030 Agenda widely known; in effect there have been various supports on different levels, yet with no over-arching, strategic awareness raising initiative. Unquestionably, the regular newsletter on Sustainability Politics could be part of such a communication initiative, but in itself the newsletter cannot cover this.

Thirdly, we observe too little integration, referencing and orientation of general politics in action plans, strategies or initiatives of various ministries towards sustainable development and GSDS/SDG-imperatives. The GSDS establishes that “[in] the framework of their own communication, the ministries take care to highlight any links to the Sustainable Development Strategy.” (p.244) For instance there was an extensive initiative on “Wellbeing in Germany- what matters to us” by the federal government, which was concluded after 2030 Agenda adoption and touches upon health, decent work, equitable participation, on educational opportunities, urban development, preservation of nature and environment, equality before the law or security and peace – all of which are policy areas rolled out with concrete targets in the SDGs and transferred meanwhile into the GSDS. However the government report on “Wellbeing in Germany” (published May 2017) only contains a broad reference to GSDS and 2030 Agenda in its introductions, without linking the initiative to it substantively. Further references to German Sustainability Politics and SDG implementation are only found in the section on “Acting with Global Responsibility and Securing Peace” – hence the domestic relevance of SDGs, the policy priorities set out in GSDS are not taken up (communicatively nor strategically...). Another example

for a contribution to 2030 Agenda/GSDS-implementation which is insufficiently aligned to it on a communications level is the so-called “Marshall Plan with Africa” by BMZ: It is only in its last chapter on “Outlook” this plan states that the future shall be shaped in the spirit of the 2030 Agenda and the Paris Agreement. Given that this leads to the presumption that not only communications do not link back to GSDS but also the politics themselves are not set out consistently through the prism of the management system and strategic guidelines of GSDS, there is both potential and need to improve alignment and communicative linking of departmental policies to GSDS (see question 1.2.).

4. Do you have any other general message that you want to share with the Peers?

Deutscher Bundesjugendring e.V.

General Information	
Name and function:	Christoph Röttgers, Co-Chairman
Answers on behalf of (name of your organization):	Deutscher Bundesjugendring e.V.
Which stakeholder do you represent or belong to (no ranking implied, multiple answers possible):	<input type="checkbox"/> a) politics, <input type="checkbox"/> b) administration, <input type="checkbox"/> c) enterprise or the business community, <input type="checkbox"/> d) the labour movement, <input type="checkbox"/> e) academia, <input type="checkbox"/> f) municipalities and associations, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> g) youth, <input type="checkbox"/> h) gender interests, <input type="checkbox"/> i) migration groups, <input type="checkbox"/> j) the disabled movement, <input type="checkbox"/> k) the churches, <input type="checkbox"/> l) financial actors, <input type="checkbox"/> m) the countries, <input type="checkbox"/> n) grassroots initiatives or local agenda groups, <input type="checkbox"/> o) other interests?
Have you sent in a contribution on the draft of the 2016 Sustainable Development Strategy?	Yes
Do you agree with the publication of your contribution on the RNE-website?	Yes

1. The state of play of the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016

- 1.1 In your view, what are the general challenges and benefits for Germany concerning sustainable development? In that regard, have you identified significant gaps in the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016?

From a young people's perspective and in regard to future generations, several challenges can be identified for the new edition of the Sustainable Development Strategy. Unfortunately, it misses out on the opportunity to become a new and ambitious strategy that aligns fully with the Sustainable Development Goals. So far, the SDGs have been rather added as a subsequent idea to already existing and extended strategies instead. SDG 16, for instance, is a particular example for the existing potentials remaining unused. It fails to inform new ideas and perspectives; for example concerning the matter of promoting democracy and the fight against racism. Furthermore, the perspective and political participation of young people within and towards the strategy are barely given any worthy role. In regard to topics like poverty, mobility, living environment, digitalization and participation, the strategy fails to meet the expectations of young people. Even though these are the topics future generations are specially interested in and by which their lives will be influenced.

- 1.2 Have you identified strategic incoherencies within the German Sustainable Development policies? Would you have proposals to increase coherence and meaningful output?

For a strategy which could lead the way into the future, the set goals and provisions lack boldness and bravery for a fresh start or at least a consistent alignment with the SDGs. The classic metaphor of the Old Wine in New Wineskins seems quite accurate. One of the biggest inconsistencies of the strategy is claiming the will to create present and future perspectives for young people, without even including them sufficiently. Many provisions reveal an economy-friendly atmosphere which stands for some parts as an obvious contradiction to social requirements or ambitions.

- 1.3 Do you think the measurement and reporting mechanisms are adequate to implement the 2030 Agenda by Germany?

Generally speaking, it is meritorious that there actually is a system for measuring and reporting observed developments and changes. However, it quickly becomes obvious that there still is a lack of tangible ideas and non-measurable provisions. Some of the goals reveal this shortfall more than others, like SDG 16, for instance. There are no clear visions for the implementation of the 2030 agenda which would either run deeper or go beyond already existing mechanisms of measurement and reporting. It could be a useful additional value to include expertise and external assessment, especially coming from the civil society.

- 1.4 Which off-track goals and targets (meaning those targets marked with “thunderstorm” or “overcast”) in the German Sustainable Development Strategy do you think are the most important? According to you, why are they off track?

From a young people's perspective, deficits within the areas of mobility and individual transportation are among the most urgent to get rid of. These matters have huge impacts on climate change. The demands of reduction are already characterized by little ambition, but the actual deviation from the goals are problematic. Similarly critical: the situation on the real estate market. With respect to industry and landlords, the strategy is not daring enough here. The same critic applies to the area of sustainable consumption, there is a lack of clear rules and of an honest pricing policy. Those could be achieved through a cutback on subventions and by a toll on not-sustainable consequences.

2. The governance approach and structure

- 2.1 Are you satisfied with the institutions and the enabling environment both the government and the non-state actors have created so far?

So far, the attempts to unite non-governmental and governmental agents are valuable first steps in order to establish a dialogue for the sustainable development strategy. RNE takes on an important role within this process. It is necessary to implement further effective and efficient dialogues, such as the dialogue group to the Committee of State Secretaries. There has to be a strong coordination of governmental policies in the spirit of the 2030 agenda, ideally with contributions and participation of the civil society. It is important that the structural framework is followed by results which are in the interests of the stakeholders.

- 2.2 According to you, is the sense of urgency as determined by science-based goals well understood and does it orient action (e.g. in your area)?

We are not in a position to answer this question.

- 2.3 As a partner or stakeholders do you feel enabled to actively participate in dialogue on and to contribute actions for sustainability?

The existing approaches which aim at partnership in provisions for sustainability are an important first step for the exchange and further development of policies for sustainability. Nevertheless, we stress the importance of actual results as an outcome of the dialogue - as mentioned in question 2.1. What matters to us, the German Federal Youth Council, is an increase and enhancement of young people's participation within the Sustainable Development Strategy since until now, the interest and perspective of future generations obviously fall short.

- 2.4 Is the science-policy interface working? Do results of “science for sustainability” already make a difference?

It is important that the 2030 agenda as well as the implementation of the 2030 agenda are accompanied through scientific monitoring. This means it has to significantly exceed the analysis of data and strongly imply social sciences. The scientific platform Sustainability 2030 is an interesting tool to support the provisions for sustainability in Germany scientifically.

3. New opportunities and challenges

- 3.1 Which new opportunities and challenges do you identify for Germany? Does the Sustainable Development Strategy help to address them? (Explanation: „new“ in the sense of: next, or not yet fully grasped, or appearing when you scan the horizon)

Question 3.1. and 3.2. can be combined to one answer: A large spectrum of social, economic and ecological challenges are being outlined through the 2030 agenda and the SDGs. Germany has to take on a pioneering role in every single area. Hence, this means that ecological standards cannot be the only significant center of attention. The social and societal questions which are being raised in regard to the goals of sustainable development should rather gain importance; for instance fighting poverty, strengthening democracy and combating racism.

- 3.2 Are there areas where Germany can and must show leadership and set new standards?

see answer 3.1

- 3.3 Is the “fear of the future and transformation” a notion in society strong enough that you feel your organization and the Government will have to deal with it more carefully?

From a young people's perspective and with regard to future generations, we have the hopeful wish that 'fear of the future and transformation' will not stand in the way of advancement of the sustainability developments. However, we rather consider it important to address forward-looking tasks and topics regarding sustainability promptly and boldly. There is a need for social-ecological transformation.

- 3.4 Is communication an issue?

For us, a serious exchange with - respectively the communication at eye level among - non-governmental stakeholders and the government, is key for a successful process in the spirit of the promotion for sustainable development.

4. Do you have any other general message that you want to share with the Peers?

Since the publication of the first edition of the German Sustainable Development Strategy there is a lack of perspectives, expertise and political participation of young people. Presently, but as well in their nature as future generations, young people are contributing to all areas and topics of sustainability developments. It happens through their own actions, through their political representations as well as through education - inside and outside schools. Therefore, young people must be sufficiently considered, included and respected within this central field of politics; now but also in the future.

Deutsche Gesellschaft für Nachhaltiges Bauen e.V.

General Information	
Name and function:	Prof. Alexander Rudolphi, Chairman of the Board
Answers on behalf of (name of your organization):	DGNB German Sustainable Building Council
Which stakeholder do you represent or belong to (no ranking implied, multiple answers possible):	<input type="checkbox"/> a) politics, <input type="checkbox"/> b) administration, <input type="checkbox"/> c) enterprise or the business community, <input type="checkbox"/> d) the labour movement, <input type="checkbox"/> e) academia, <input type="checkbox"/> f) municipalities and associations, <input type="checkbox"/> g) youth, <input type="checkbox"/> h) gender interests, <input type="checkbox"/> i) migration groups, <input type="checkbox"/> j) the disabled movement, <input type="checkbox"/> k) the churches, <input type="checkbox"/> l) financial actors, <input type="checkbox"/> m) the countries, <input type="checkbox"/> n) grassroots initiatives or local agenda groups, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> o) other interests?
Have you sent in a contribution on the draft of the 2016 Sustainable Development Strategy?	no
Do you agree with the publication of your contribution on the RNE-website?	yes

1. The state of play of the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016

- 1.1 In your view, what are the general challenges and benefits for Germany concerning sustainable development? In that regard, have you identified significant gaps in the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016?

The environmental goals of sustainable development - above all the objectives of climate and resource protection - are not negotiable. They can be exceeded, but under no circumstances must they be undercut. All other SDGs must be considered as part of the implementation of these goals through optimization and effectiveness strategies if the process is to be peaceful, liberal, economic and socially responsible. The most important deficits of the German sustainability strategy are addressed in question 1.2.

- 1.2 Have you identified strategic incoherencies within the German Sustainable Development policies? Would you have proposals to increase coherence and meaningful output?

The temporal and functional separation of objectives and, above all, their separate treatment and assessment deny the actual interactions and synergies between the individual goals. When evaluating raw materials and products of any kind, the temporal shift of sustainability deficits into pre- or post-use phases is almost completely hidden. Here an adjustment of the used evaluation instruments and the associated indicators is necessary. Where it is possible, the evaluation must be holistic (including all interactions) and life-cycle-comprehensive. Some of the necessary tools are already available, but they have not yet been implemented in the national regulations.

- 1.3 Do you think the measurement and reporting mechanisms are adequate to implement the 2030 Agenda by Germany?

The review of the objectives is sometimes complicated or obscured by non-targeted indicators. Thus, the relative indicator "total raw material productivity" (SDG 8, indicator 8.1) just does not allow any statement regarding dwindling resources, as it ignores the rebound effect. The same applies to the targets for land use and housing (SDG 11). Particularly regarding climate protection (SDG 13) the problem is significant. The German Energy Saving Regulations for buildings (EnEV) records a relative improvement measure for the consumption of primary energy. This has no relation to the actually responsible greenhouse gases and no relation to absolute target values, e.g. for CO₂e.

- 1.4 Which off-track goals and targets (meaning those targets marked with "thunderstorm" or "overcast") in the German Sustainable Development Strategy do you think are the most important? According to you, why are they off track?

In most cases, the missed target is either an inaccurate indicator or the choice of target size is inaccurate. Behind every single case there is an individual problem. Particularly important for us is the goal of "affordable housing". Being off-track regarding this goal has to do with

several components: the rebound effect on living space consumption, tax-assisted land speculation and an inaccurate cost accounting which is limited to the investments.

2. The governance approach and structure

- 2.1 Are you satisfied with the institutions and the enabling environment both the government and the non-state actors have created so far?

Transparency and culture on the part of politics has improved significantly in recent years, but it continues to suffer from the above-mentioned separate and isolated discussion of the individual goals. This gives particular interests a much too high weight. Interactions appear as conflicting goals that are not treated as part of optimization strategies but as competing ones. The best example of this problem is the ongoing discussion about brown coal electricity generation.

- 2.2 According to you, is the sense of urgency as determined by science-based goals well understood and does it orient action (e.g. in your area)?

This happens too little. For the assessment of the built and to be built environment scientific approaches and proven instruments already exist. But there is too little consideration given to them. Holistic optimisation strategies conflict with the political interpretation of individual goals.

- 2.3 As a partner or stakeholders do you feel enabled to actively participate in dialogue on and to contribute actions for sustainability?

No, the opportunities to contribute are still too few. The necessary dialogue deepens too slowly and still finds too little consideration in political action.

- 2.4 Is the science-policy interface working? Do results of “science for sustainability” already make a difference?

This question has already been answered above.

3. New opportunities and challenges

- 3.1 Which new opportunities and challenges do you identify for Germany? Does the Sustainable Development Strategy help to address them? (Explanation: „new“ in the sense of: next, or not yet fully grasped, or appearing when you scan the horizon)

Based on the assumption that global sustainability problems such as climate protection, scarcity of resources, unjust global production chains, etc., will tend to intensify, dealing with these issues early on and developing solution offerings is a key opportunity for Germany in the future.

- 3.2 Are there areas where Germany can and must show leadership and set new standards?

In the construction industry, there are these areas in any case - but it requires the willingness to implement actions.

3.3 Is the “fear of the future and transformation” a notion in society strong enough that you feel your organization and the Government will have to deal with it more carefully?

3.4 Is communication an issue?

Yes, but it is not an end in itself. The constructive willingness to prioritise the common objectives to the respective particular interests is a fundamental prerequisite.

4. Do you have any other general message that you want to share with the Peers?

For the German sustainability strategy, we consider it necessary to introduce important and in the area of the built environment overdue adjustments of the German rules and strategies to the sustainability goals. This includes the already practically tested holistic and lifecycle-comprehensive assessment of buildings and districts, the change from an energetic view of buildings to the CO₂e focus, i.e. the change from an energy saving law (Energiespargesetz) to a climate protection law. This also includes replacing relative indicators with absolute targets where possible. These steps have already been discussed in professional circles, some are majority-eligible and await political implementation.

DGB (German Trade Union Confederation)

General Information	
Name and function:	Daniel Schneider, Policy Officer for Environmental and Climate Policy
Answers on behalf of (name of your organization):	German Trade Union Confederation
Which stakeholder do you represent or belong to (no ranking implied, multiple answers possible):	<input type="checkbox"/> a) politics, <input type="checkbox"/> b) administration, <input type="checkbox"/> c) enterprise or the business community, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> d) the labour movement, <input type="checkbox"/> e) academia, <input type="checkbox"/> f) municipalities and associations, <input type="checkbox"/> g) youth, <input type="checkbox"/> h) gender interests, <input type="checkbox"/> i) migration groups, <input type="checkbox"/> j) the disabled movement, <input type="checkbox"/> k) the churches, <input type="checkbox"/> l) financial actors, <input type="checkbox"/> m) environment organization <input type="checkbox"/> n) development organization <input type="checkbox"/> o) "the Länder", <input type="checkbox"/> p) grassroots initiatives or local agenda groups, <input type="checkbox"/> q) other interests?
Have you sent in a contribution on the draft of the 2016 Sustainable Development Strategy?	Yes
Do you agree with the publication of your contribution on the RNE-website?	Yes

1. The state of play of the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016

- 1.1 In your view, what are the general challenges and benefits for Germany concerning sustainable development? In that regard, have you identified significant gaps in the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016?

The agenda 2030 and the SDGs can be a very good guideline in the transformation of our society towards a more sustainable, low-carbon economy. The question is how ambitious the government is regarding the national implementation.

If the implementation of the SDGs is taken seriously by the German government, it has to think about creating or upgrading existing institutions such as the Sustainability Council or the Parliamentary Council for Sustainable Development. Also of fundamental importance is the determination of ambitious national indicators for the national implementation of the SDGs, which must also be evaluated at short intervals and also with the broad participation of civil society. There are also some major gaps regarding certain aspects in the strategy, for example the absence of the serious problem of child poverty.

- 1.2 Have you identified strategic incoherencies within the German Sustainable Development policies? Would you have proposals to increase coherence and meaningful output?

In many areas too often only technical indicators are referred to. The 2030 Agenda can be the basis for shaping the necessary renewal of our economy. Science shows that it is imperative to get on the way. By lacking a common vision the term "sustainable" becomes somewhat arbitrary. One example is that the discussion about the German Energy Turnaround is often lacking the aspects of long-term planning. It is also not taking the trade union demand for a just transition into account. Trying to solve problems only in short-term is not sustainable.

- 1.3 Do you think the measurement and reporting mechanisms are adequate to implement the 2030 Agenda by Germany?

In some areas certain areas are missing completely. For example the problem of child poverty in Germany is not treated at all.

There is also the need to disaggregate more data on aspects like gender, age and disability.

For other areas there are no indicators, such as the goal of decent work. An adequate set of indicators is essential for this area. They have to take aspects such as collective bargaining, workers participation, education and gender equality into account. A good indicator could be something like the DGB Index "Decent Work.

Apart from this there should also be more ambitious international indicators, for example regarding the aspects of poverty, food and nutrition and health.

- 1.4 Which off-track goals and targets (meaning those targets marked with “thunderstorm” or “overcast”) in the German Sustainable Development Strategy do you think are the most important? According to you, why are they off track?

An important goal that is off-track is the primary energy consumption. The main reason for this is the lacking ambition and lacking of coherent long-term strategies regarding energy efficiency in Germany.

2. The governance approach and structure

- 2.1 Are you satisfied with the institutions and the enabling environment both the government and the non-state actors have created so far?

The creation of the monitoring group for the State Secretaries' Committee for sustainable Development, the Sustainability Forum and the institution of the department coordinators for sustainable development are important aspects that have been taken into account so far. Of these the Parliamentary Advisory Council should become part of the parliamentary by-laws, meaning it does not need to be newly established by parliament at the beginning of each legislative period. It should also be given the task to check all draft bills for their impact on sustainable development, functioning as a Sustainable Development Supervisory Board.

- 2.2 According to you, is the sense of urgency as determined by science-based goals well understood and does it orient action (e.g. in your area)?

The scientific background is pretty clear in areas like fighting climate change. However that urgency is not necessarily reflected in political willingness to on the basis of a medium and long-term vision.

- 2.3 As a partner or stakeholders do you feel enabled to actively participate in dialogue on and to contribute actions for sustainability?

The trade unions and civil society were given sufficient opportunities to participate in the whole process, be it during the creation of the National Sustainable Development Strategy or the participation process afterwards. This opportunity should be maintained and increased.

- 2.4 Is the science-policy interface working? Do results of “science for sustainability” already make a difference?

We would like to see a broader support for scientific research on social transformation issues for example regarding the aspects of a just transition and the impacts on workers and their communities. Also the results of studies should be distributed much broader. This could lead to a much wider knowledge and acceptance of the Agenda2030 and the SDGs in the public.

3. New opportunities and challenges

- 3.1 Which new opportunities and challenges do you identify for Germany? Does the Sustainable Development Strategy help to address them? (Explanation: „new“ in the sense of: next, or not yet fully grasped, or appearing when you scan the horizon)

The energy turnaround and the just construction of the structural change that is happening in the coming years and decades is the biggest challenge for Germany in the future. Fighting climate change presents a great opportunity for clean energy and good jobs if managed wisely. To avoid social hardship and structural breaks it is imperative to make long-term plans for the affected regions, branches and workers. In including the workers demand for a Just Transition Germany can set a standard worldwide. It has to be the guideline for all discussions in the future and where Germany must show leadership.

- 3.2 Are there areas where Germany can and must show leadership and set new standards?

see question 3.1

- 3.3 Is the “fear of the future and transformation” a notion in society strong enough that you feel your organization and the Government will have to deal with it more carefully?

The people affected by the structural change must not be disappointed and left behind. If that fails it leads to rejection. The policies of Trump and Brexit are exemplary expressions of when parts of the population felt detached. To avoid that a just transition has to be the guideline for all discussions in the future.

- 3.4 Is communication an issue?

Communication is an issue. Apart from the "sustainable community" on political level the Sustainable Development Strategy and its content are hardly known to the public.

4. Do you have any other general message that you want to share with the Peers?

Forum Umwelt und Entwicklung

General Information	
Name and function:	Elisabeth Staudt, Policy Advisor
Answers on behalf of (name of your organization):	Forum Umwelt und Entwicklung
Which stakeholder do you represent or belong to (no ranking implied, multiple answers possible):	<input type="checkbox"/> a) politics, <input type="checkbox"/> b) administration, <input type="checkbox"/> c) enterprise or the business community, <input type="checkbox"/> d) the labour movement, <input type="checkbox"/> e) academia, <input type="checkbox"/> f) municipalities and associations, <input type="checkbox"/> g) youth, <input type="checkbox"/> h) gender interests, <input type="checkbox"/> i) migration groups, <input type="checkbox"/> j) the disabled movement, <input type="checkbox"/> k) the churches, <input type="checkbox"/> l) financial actors, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> m) environment organization <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> n) development organization <input type="checkbox"/> o) "the Länder", <input type="checkbox"/> p) grassroots initiatives or local agenda groups, <input type="checkbox"/> q) other interests?
Have you sent in a contribution on the draft of the 2016 Sustainable Development Strategy?	Yes
Do you agree with the publication of your contribution on the RNE-website?	Yes

1. The state of play of the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016

- 1.1 In your view, what are the general challenges and benefits for Germany concerning sustainable development? In that regard, have you identified significant gaps in the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016?

We welcome the central role and high political priority the German government has given the implementation of the Agenda 2030. The government has quickly moved forward with providing an ambitious process to implement the SDG on the national level. We also would like to highlight the broad inclusion of important stakeholders and all departments and ministries in developing the German Sustainable Development strategy, which identifies important steps towards a sustainable transformation in Germany.

However, as continuous and growing challenges such as inequality, climate change, poverty, migration, missing gender equality prevent the transformation of our societies towards sustainable development, the German Sustainable Development strategy 2016 only provides us with a general direction.

The biggest challenge in archiving sustainable development in Germany, has been neglected so far: The German Government still defends their one-sided economic paradigm based on unlimited growth (the call for a growth-based economy is even part of our constitution), and fossil-fuel based energy provision (electricity generated from coal still makes up 40% of German electricity mix). As our economic model and way of life are the root-cause for a multitude of social, economic and ecological issues in Germany itself as well as in countries and communities around the globe, a strategy aiming for real sustainability must tackle the issues arising from this. Biodiversity loss is at an alarming rate. The enormous German export surplus implies substantial trade deficits in other countries since the world's trade balance can only be zero. Population in cities is suffering from poisonous air pollution due to NOx emissions from Diesel automobiles produced by German companies under crooked circumstances. Our economic model and hunger for resources are destroying the livelihood of people around the globe and drive armed conflicts and forced migration. Many more examples can be found and have been highlighted by NGOs. Unfortunately, this long overdue discussion about the transformation of our economic system is missing from the German Sustainable Development strategy 2016. The German government is blocking political debates and transformative policies in crucial policy fields such as agriculture, transportation, resource consumption, energy, trade and the financial market design. On the contrary, economic growth remains an indicator in the German Sustainable Development strategy and is one of the few rated as successfully implemented. The German Sustainable Development strategy is thus missing the political will and concrete measures for a necessary transformation towards archiving the 2030 agenda.

- 1.2 Have you identified strategic incoherencies within the German Sustainable Development policies? Would you have proposals to increase coherence and meaningful output?

It is difficult to understand why the German government chose not to include the international SDG targets in the Sustainable Development strategy, but decided to

develop their own indicator system. This procedure does not properly reflect the universal character of the SDG, and makes the German Sustainable Development strategy impossible to compare to other SDG implementation strategies or the UN process. Even if all targets included in the German Sustainable Strategy 2016 were to be implemented by 2030, this would not be sufficient to reach the Agenda 2030. NGOs have therefore called for a real SDG implementation strategy which does justice to the task of implementing the Agenda 2030 in Germany.

One concrete proposal to increase coherence would be to ask all ministries to reorganize their own reports on policy coherency according to the seventeen SDGs. Those reports could help identifying areas of conflict between different goals. The federal government should report annually on the coherency of the sustainable development strategy. These summary reports should be published and discussed publicly including voices from civil society.

Another proposal that has been unanswered so far is a comprehensive and early on „sustainability-check“ far exceeding the currently implemented impact assessment of all new policy proposals (laws, strategies, actions plans etc.). This check would have to include the effects both on the national as well as the international level.

1.3 Do you think the measurement and reporting mechanisms are adequate to implement the 2030 Agenda by Germany?

Germany has published several sustainable development strategies in the past, thus most indicators in the German Sustainable Development strategy were developed before the adoption of the Agenda 2030. In the 2016 strategy the preexisting indicators were reorganized, now monitoring specific SDGs. While consistency of existing measurements is important, this has unsurprisingly led to the fact, that there are many indicators missing in the German Sustainable Development strategy 2016. The German government did not include the internationally agreed SDG indicators into the strategy of 2016, even though Germany itself is a member of the IAEG. In a separate report on the international indicators, Germany only reports on about half of them, as there is a lack of capacity and political will to monitor all indicators. It is unclear how both processes are linked and impact the political agenda of the government.

Furthermore, the international dimension and impact of German policy decisions in other countries is widely missing from the assessment. Only 10 out of 63 indicators are focused on international processes – issues such as hunger, (mal-)nutrition and health completely lack an international indicator so far.

From our point of view, the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016 is primarily building on ongoing processes in Germany. While on the one hand this contributed to the quick development of the new strategy, it does not reflect the innovative and transformative idea behind the Agenda 2030. The measurement and reporting mechanism overwhelmingly focuses on specific and isolated issues; many critical areas are not even mentioned in the strategy (e.g. impact of our consumption and life style, privatization of public goods, weapon exports into crisis regions, neglect of social and environmental standards by German companies, transparency of financial markets). Additionally, there is a strong bias towards economical assessment, neglecting social and ecological challenges Germany is facing.

1.4 Which off-track goals and targets (meaning those targets marked with “thunderstorm” or “overcast”) in the German Sustainable Development Strategy do you think are the most important? According to you, why are they off track?

We would like to highlight the universal character of the Agenda 2030 and the Sustainable Development Goals. They need to be the guiding principle in all political decisions and strategies. We see the risk of cherry picking specific targets by the government – meaning that more ‘difficult’ SDGs will be neglected or not addressed at all. The current selection of indicators in the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016 is unbalanced between the different goals and does not include many pressing issue facing Germany.

An alarmingly high amount of targets is marked with “thunderstorm” or “overcast” symbols in the 2016 strategy, reflecting the systematic failure to implement sustainable policies in certain fields. Moreover, they have been marked with these symbols for many years, thus showing that the sustainability strategies in the past had little influence on the policies areas it was supposed to monitor, and there was no consequence for not complying with the strategy.

One prominent example is the farming sector in Germany. The negative consequences of our current intensive farming (and livestock) systems are reflected in several indicators ranging from issues as malnutrition and hunger, health and quality of oceans. Excessive input of nitrogen is the main cause for air quality problems, water contamination and eutrophication of coastal areas. Germany must tackle these problems with new policies in order to become sustainable; however, there are no political majorities for the necessary steps, despite strong indications that majorities in the electorate would support such policies.

The same is true in other policy areas in urgent need of a sustainable transformation, e.g. German energy production and the transportation system to name just two.

Even though there are several indicators and dimensions of measurement still missing from the strategy it is important to highlight there is not one goal (with the exception of SDG1) that does not at least include one indicator that is marked off-track (with “thunderstorm” or “overcast”). As for the farming example, a worrisome development with the new German sustainable development strategy is a regression in the indicator timelines: While the indicator on organic farming percentage used to be 20% by 2020, since 2016 it is marked as 20% “in the coming years”.

Overall the strategy is missing a mechanism how to react to negative developments and/or no progress in certain sectors. The overwhelming number of off-track targets and goals is calling for the inclusion of a strong feedback-mechanism that will initiate concrete actions (e.g. allocate more finances or call for immediate action by the chancellery).

2. The governance approach and structure

2.1 Are you satisfied with the institutions and the enabling environment both the government and the non-state actors have created so far?

The German government appointed several important governmental and non-state actors and institutions to support the implementation of the Agenda 2030. This process is led by the German chancellery underlining the high relevance of the

implementation process. The three main bodies supporting the implementation are the committee of ministers of state from all ministries, the parliamentary advisory council on sustainable development, and the council for sustainable development. We would like to positively highlight the establishment of these institutions. Most recently the chancellery also appointed coordinators for sustainable development in all ministries in Germany to make sure the principles of the Agenda 2030 are promoted in all levels and areas of the executive trying to ensure coherence of the implementation process. Whether this will be successful remains to be seen. On the legislative side the restructuring towards sustainable development can be seen as rather weak. Even though a sustainability check of all new legislation is an essential part of the impact assessment process, the checking procedure is quite generic and has not led to fundamental change of new legislation. The parliamentary advisory council on sustainable development is supposed to play a watchdog role in the process, but the influence and power of this body is limited. This is partly due to the fact that all decision of the advisory council needs to be made by consensus. We want to support a content-based assessment of all new legislation and their contributions towards achieving the SDGs. The competences and powers of the parliamentary advisory council need to be strengthened to enable its role as sustainability checkpoint.

- 2.2 According to you, is the sense of urgency as determined by science-based goals well understood and does it orient action (e.g. in your area)?
- 2.3 As a partner or stakeholders do you feel enabled to actively participate in dialogue on and to contribute actions for sustainability?
- 2.4 Is the science-policy interface working? Do results of “science for sustainability” already make a difference?

3. New opportunities and challenges

- 3.1 Which new opportunities and challenges do you identify for Germany? Does the Sustainable Development Strategy help to address them? (Explanation: „new“ in the sense of: next, or not yet fully grasped, or appearing when you scan the horizon)
- 3.2 Are there areas where Germany can and must show leadership and set new standards?

- 3.3 Is the “fear of the future and transformation” a notion in society strong enough that you feel your organization and the Government will have to deal with it more carefully?

Studies show that the idea of sustainability is anchored in the head of German society. Environmental protection and social standards are not viewed as isolated issues but as part of the bigger solution for pressing challenges. At the same time, society is growing more and more skeptical on whether we can solve the global problems we are facing today. There is a growing anger and frustration in society against politicians and political institutions. The recent outcome of the federal elections and subsequent problems to build a functioning government are just small indicators of these worrying tendencies.

A growing divide is noticeable within our society. Unsustainable development, growing inequalities, the degradation of the environment and the erosion of social systems can be identified as main causes of this development. The main principles of the 2030 Agenda and its call to leave no one behind can provide guiding principles on finding solutions to these pressing issues. Therefore, we strongly support the efforts to further integrate the principles and goals of the 2030 Agenda in all policy processes and decisions.

- 3.4 Is communication an issue?

4. Do you have any other general message that you want to share with the Peers?

Any strategy for sustainable development must start with an honest analysis of the status quo. So far no German government has acknowledged that the status quo in Germany is fundamentally unsustainable in key areas such as agriculture, transport, energy, and growing inequality. As long as governments try to portray the status quo too rosy, it is no surprise that the resulting policy implications are insufficient. We believe that in many areas the population is more prepared to make Germany more sustainable than the politicians. Germans want less industrial agriculture, do not want German agricultural exports to destroy the livelihoods of African farmers, do not want the air in cities polluted by car exhausts, want better public transport and want less automobiles clogging the roads in inner cities, want more social justice and higher wages in the growing low-wage sector (about a third of the workforce) – to name just a few examples. The government’s approach – trying to “educate the public towards more sustainability” – is the wrong approach. Politicians are among the people with the highest need for education for sustainability.

genanet - Leitstelle Gender, Umwelt, Nachhaltigkeit

General Information	
Name and function:	Ulrike Röhr
Answers on behalf of (name of your organization):	genanet - Leitstelle Gender, Umwelt, Nachhaltigkeit
Which stakeholder do you represent or belong to (no ranking implied, multiple answers possible):	<input type="checkbox"/> a) politics, <input type="checkbox"/> b) administration, <input type="checkbox"/> c) enterprise or the business community, <input type="checkbox"/> d) the labour movement, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> e) academia, <input type="checkbox"/> f) municipalities and associations, <input type="checkbox"/> g) youth, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> h) gender interests, <input type="checkbox"/> i) migration groups, <input type="checkbox"/> j) the disabled movement, <input type="checkbox"/> k) the churches, <input type="checkbox"/> l) financial actors, <input type="checkbox"/> m) the countries, <input type="checkbox"/> n) grassroots initiatives or local agenda groups, <input type="checkbox"/> o) other interests?
Have you sent in a contribution on the draft of the 2016 Sustainable Development Strategy?	yes
Do you agree with the publication of your contribution on the RNE-website?	yes

1. The state of play of the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016

- 1.1 In your view, what are the general challenges and benefits for Germany concerning sustainable development? In that regard, have you identified significant gaps in the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016?

To follow the goal of a sustainable development, a transformation of our economic and societal system is required. Putting justice (including gender justice) into the center of all developments in all policy fields is one of the requirements, stopping neo-liberal economic developments another one. The German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016 is more or less 'business as usual', a real vision for a 'Sustainable Germany, that leaves no one behind' is completely lacking.

- 1.2 Have you identified strategic incoherencies within the German Sustainable Development policies? Would you have proposals to increase coherence and meaningful output?

This is in particular true for climate and energy policy. Both policies are (or should be) driven by targets set by Germany and the EU. Germany will not reach the target of reducing CO₂ emissions by 30% by 2020, as little as the goal for increasing the share of renewable energy production, which is currently stagnating. Both is driven by einer tentative, diffident policy, which aims mainly at economic growth instead of sustainability. Same is with the issue gender justice, which is tackled in a very conservative way, doing business as usual with goals, measures and indicators already implemented (share of women in boards) or at least discussed (gender pay gap) in the respective policy.

Looking at the issues "future of the work": the Sustainability Strategy addresses gainful employment (Ererbsarbeit), the entire issue of care work is completely absent, even though the care economy is the basis of the whole economy, with growing importance in the future. The care economy includes the unpaid work done (mainly by women) to care for children, elderly, diseased persons, as well the the highly undervalued and underpaid professional care in Kindergartens, hospitals homes for elderly and so on. And it has a clear link to the gender pay gap. A societal discourse is needed about a just allocation of paid and unpaid / underpaid work, e.g. between the genders (see the statement by genanet - Focal Point Gender, Environment, Sustainability to the Draft Sustainability Strategy).

Furthermore, the implementation of Gender Mainstreaming in all policies is completely lacking in the strategy as well as in 'real' policy, although this is determined by the rules of procedure of the Federal Government since 2004.

Moreover, economic growth is underpinned as the basis for prosperity in various goals, but also in the overarching chapters. The lack of coherence in the SDGs of the United Nations between some targets, e.g. SDG 8 and 10 continues in the German sustainability Strategy. Increase of coherence can only be achieved by addressing the issue of economic growth and start or continue the debates about (economic) degrowth in all parts of society..

- 1.3 Do you think the measurement and reporting mechanisms are adequate to implement the 2030 Agenda by Germany?

The goal of gender equality refers to indicators that are important from a general justice point of view, but whose contribution to a fundamental change in gender and power relations by addressing the root causes of (gender) inequality is marginal. Here it is of particular importance to share the care work equitably. However, as mentioned above, the sustainability strategy is very clearly focused on paid employment. (see the statement by genanet - Focal Point Gender, Environment, Sustainability to the Draft Sustainability Strategy). Same is true for other indicators, e.g. in goal 10.

In general, the indicators are within the narrow scope of available quantitative data of the Federal Statistical Office, which do not meet the possible progress (or regression) in the objectives. The data available from the Federal Statistical Office and other federal agencies may be used to simplify the compilation of data to measure the achievement of the objectives, but they map by no means the real progress or regression in the various fields. Progress or regress is not always quantifiable, and often there are no data available, including disaggregated data by gender, income, education. But only with these disaggregated data it can be measured whether the achievement really apply equally to all groups of persons or direct towards those, who bear the burden of achieving the goals. These differentiated data are also a prerequisite for developing adequate measures for achieving justice based on goals.

On top of that, the targets for 2030 are missing for the indicators - how should the progress or the level of achievement of the goals be assessed if no target is set? Thus, the indicators often remain too pale and empty content.

- 1.4 Which off-track goals and targets (meaning those targets marked with “thunderstorm” or “overcast”) in the German Sustainable Development Strategy do you think are the most important? According to you, why are they off track?

Don't understand what is meant by 'marked with thunderstorm or overcast'

2. The governance approach and structure

- 2.1 Are you satisfied with the institutions and the enabling environment both the government and the non-state actors have created so far?

No, not at all. Non-governmental stakeholder are not truly included, their positions are not valued and not recognised. The decision, which stakeholders are involved, which not is not at all transparent, nor the whole process. To direct the society towards sustainability needs an transparent and open process, not a debate conducted behind closed doors..

- 2.2 According to you, is the sense of urgency as determined by science-based goals well understood and does it orient action (e.g. in your area)?

In the field of climate change the urgency is understood, but does not orient action (see 1.2). Regarding gender justice, it is not even recognised...

- 2.3 As a partner or stakeholders do you feel enabled to actively participate in dialogue on and to contribute actions for sustainability?

Not at all, our activities of women and gender organisations/experts are not recognised nor valued. Has there ever been a workshop or input on gender and sustainable development in one of the annual conferences of the Nachhaltigkeitsrat? Was gender expertise given any recognition in the remake of the Sustainable Development Strategy? No! Not by the government, nor by the Sustainability Council. From debates 'behind closed doors' it is reported, that gender justice is seen as irrelevant or not important.

- 2.4 Is the science-policy interface working? Do results of "science for sustainability" already make a difference?

3. New opportunities and challenges

- 3.1 Which new opportunities and challenges do you identify for Germany? Does the Sustainable Development Strategy help to address them? (Explanation: „new“ in the sense of: next, or not yet fully grasped, or appearing when you scan the horizon)

See point 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3

- 3.2 Are there areas where Germany can and must show leadership and set new standards?

See point 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3

- 3.3 Is the "fear of the future and transformation" a notion in society strong enough that you feel your organization and the Government will have to deal with it more carefully?

There is an urgent need to deal with it, we can't do business as usual anymore if we really want to follow a sustainable development path. Addressing the fear of the future and transformation can't be done by political statements only but must be done in a true - and for sure lengthy - dialogue. And by leaving no one behind in this process.

- 3.4 Is communication an issue?

For whom? Of course, communication is always an issue. Not one-way communication, but exchange and understanding of different perspectives and perceptions. It was not properly undertaken in the development of the first version of the Sustainability Strategy, nor in the development of the new strategy, nor

regarding the new version. The Sustainability Strategy is known only in the community of the 'converted', those who are familiar with the issues and future developments

4. Do you have any other general message that you want to share with the Peers?

Talk to people, instead of asking for and reading written statements. Would be good also for those writing the statements to see the reaction of the peers. That's what we have done for many years now: providing inputs, assessments, positions on the Sustainability Strategy and its biannual assessment, without getting any reaction to it (really none, never). It is like giving input into a black hole - not the way we want to be involved and spend our (unpaid) time with

Lokale Agenda21 für Feldkirchen-Westerham

General Information	
Name and function:	Helmut Schulte, spokesman of "Lokale Agend21 für Feldkirchen-Westerham"
Answers on behalf of (name of your organization):	Lokale Agenda21 für Feldkirchen-Westerham
Which stakeholder do you represent or belong to (no ranking implied, multiple answers possible):	<input type="checkbox"/> a) politics, <input type="checkbox"/> b) administration, <input type="checkbox"/> c) enterprise or the business community, <input type="checkbox"/> d) the labour movement, <input type="checkbox"/> e) academia, <input type="checkbox"/> f) municipalities and associations, <input type="checkbox"/> g) youth, <input type="checkbox"/> h) gender interests, <input type="checkbox"/> i) migration groups, <input type="checkbox"/> j) the disabled movement, <input type="checkbox"/> k) the churches, <input type="checkbox"/> l) financial actors, <input type="checkbox"/> m) environment organization <input type="checkbox"/> n) development organization <input type="checkbox"/> o) "the Länder", <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> p) grassroots initiatives or local agenda groups, <input type="checkbox"/> q) other interests?
Have you sent in a contribution on the draft of the 2016 Sustainable Development Strategy?	no
Do you agree with the publication of your contribution on the RNE-website?	yes

1. The state of play of the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016

- 1.1 In your view, what are the general challenges and benefits for Germany concerning sustainable development? In that regard, have you identified significant gaps in the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016?

challenge: climate change!

setting a world wide example not only in ending nuclear power and expanding renewable energy production, but also in fundamental reforms in the sectors of traffic/transportation and agriculture;

benefit: comprehension of developing countries; staying competitive as a high tech country;

gaps: too little integration of the (private) banking industry; fundamental changes in agricultural policy (Germany/EU) are missing (* no significant rise in eco-farming, * without reversal/turnabout in the EU especially Africa's ecological and economic suffering will persist and migration will rise enormously)

- 1.2 Have you identified strategic incoherencies within the German Sustainable Development policies? Would you have proposals to increase coherence and meaningful output?

All in all theory and knowledge is in full contrast to political and economical action: 99 percent of the decisions in daily politics prefer economic growth and shareholder profit ALTHOUGH obviously foiling SDGs and often defeating the purpose of measurements (i.e. CO2 emissions in traffic, Glyphosate vs. biodiversity --decision Nov 27th 2017);

a neglected field of incoherency: promotion of air traffic:

an indicator regarding air traffic is lacking completely; international air traffic is not even captured by CO2 emission indicators;

WHY are planning a 3rd runway at MUC-airport when increasing air traffic is not at all affordable thinking in terms of sustainability? see statement 2.4)

proposal: Being focused on the target and not on political strategies and tactics would help to achieve the target

- 1.3 Do you think the measurement and reporting mechanisms are adequate to implement the 2030 Agenda by Germany?

no, see key indicators (question 1.4);

measurements and even transparency regarding SDGs remained VOLUNTARY in the year 2016. The German government almost completely failed to implement OBLIGATORY SDG-reporting in corporate reporting during the transfer of EU-CSR-Directive into national law.

see DNS page 32: "Die Bundesregierung unterstützt den DNK als FREIWILLIGES

Instrument, um die Nachhaltigkeitsidee weiter zu verbreiten und nachhaltiges Wirtschaften zu fördern."

1.4 Which off-track goals and targets (meaning those targets marked with "thunderstorm" or "overcast") in the German Sustainable Development Strategy do you think are the most important? According to you, why are they off track?

2.1.a: We are far too slow to implement this;
(better orientation would be: regional bound circular economy/closed loop)
2.1.b: ecological agriculture area (6.3% instead of 20%, 20% even being far too little)
3.2.a: Our political representatives don't take this seriously ("diesel gate")
6.1.a: too much fertilizer being one point, phosphor resources runnign short, this should cause fundamental change in agriculture NOW
6.1.b nitrate in groundwater being a problem almost all over Germany by now
7.1.b: If we want to reach the agreed CO2 target, we need a massive increase in power production of renewable sources and switch off the use of fossil energy sources
11.1.a increase of settlement and traffic area in Feldkirchen-Westerham, Rosenheim, Bavaria
11.2.a/b NO PROGRESS AT ALL: energy/CO2-emissions of goods an passenger traffic
12.1.b CO2 emissions of private consumption (convenience, rebound effects; see 7.1.b
14.1.aa & 14.1.ab: see 6.1.a
15.1 loss in biodiversity (see 11.1.a; pesticides etc. should be reduced should be banned)
the ok-status is absurd in 17.1: expense in Development < 0.7% while not even mentioning the promise to increase military budget to 2.0%; Germany is world No.3 in military/armament export

2. The governance approach and structure

2.1 Are you satisfied with the institutions and the enabling environment both the government and the non-state actors have created so far?

no

2.2 According to you, is the sense of urgency as determined by science-based goals well understood and does it orient action (e.g. in your area)?

no, for example losing area by road building and new commercial zones is always low priority (see above 1.2)

2.3 As a partner or stakeholders do you feel enabled to actively participate in dialogue on and to contribute actions for sustainability?

in dialogue yes, in important decisions no;

- 2.4 Is the science-policy interface working? Do results of “science for sustainability” already make a difference?

in communicating sustainability yes, in political decisions hardly ever; thus the majority of accurately defined goals, indicators and measurements can be misused for PR purposes (only pretending to act consistently, "Green-washing")

3. New opportunities and challenges

- 3.1 Which new opportunities and challenges do you identify for Germany? Does the Sustainable Development Strategy help to address them? (Explanation: „new“ in the sense of: next, or not yet fully grasped, or appearing when you scan the horizon)

Germany should seriously take up the goal to become market leader in sustainable technologies, being the basis for economic success in the long run;
Challenge: finding ways to transfer (corporate and state) governance goals to everyday and strategic decisions

- 3.2 Are there areas where Germany can and must show leadership and set new standards?

yes:
(EU) agricultural policy;
full transition to renewable energy
sustainable mobility INCLUDING the reduction and replacement of air traffic (i.e. by rail traffic) (see 1.2)

- 3.3 Is the “fear of the future and transformation” a notion in society strong enough that you feel your organization and the Government will have to deal with it more carefully?

yes, need for transformation is not yet accepted - keeping up wealth is general orientation;
this is something we should focus on: transformation by design or by disaster

- 3.4 Is communication an issue?

yes! Even we - as "Agenda21"stakeholders since 1992.Rio/1997.Feldkirchen-Westerham - got no information about this sample/peer review; we got it by chance (Munich group of www.ecogood.org);
it has been no topic in news/media;
... and by the way: such an important assessment should be worth of being delivered with the questions translated (German). Especially grassroots and municipal stakeholders might not understand many important technical terms.

4. Do you have any other general message that you want to share with the Peers?

1. don't forget the responsibility of the banking industry
2. today the key sector EU-agricultural policy is still contrary to almost all SDGs: no fundamental change here --> no sustainability at all
3. CSR-reporting standards (German law) must be enhanced to an obligatory SDG-audit* for all business companies (more than 500 employees)
4. there is a fundamental contradiction in promoting projects to save peanuts while not taking care of projects dumping coconuts in the same sector, i.e. biodiversity in agriculture, mostly responsible for the loss of 75% of insects in two decades

*) [compare <https://www.ecogood.org/en/common-good-balance-sheet/>
and
<http://www.eesc.europa.eu/en/our-work/opinions-information-reports/opinions/new-sustainable-economic-models>
and
<http://www.eesc.europa.eu/en/our-work/opinions-information-reports/opinions/economy-common-good>]

NABU e.V.

General Information	
Name and function:	Julia Balz, Policy Officer Strategic Planning and Sustainability
Answers on behalf of (name of your organization):	NABU e.V.
Which stakeholder do you represent or belong to (no ranking implied, multiple answers possible):	<input type="checkbox"/> a) politics, <input type="checkbox"/> b) administration, <input type="checkbox"/> c) enterprise or the business community, <input type="checkbox"/> d) the labour movement, <input type="checkbox"/> e) academia, <input type="checkbox"/> f) municipalities and associations, <input type="checkbox"/> g) youth, <input type="checkbox"/> h) gender interests, <input type="checkbox"/> i) migration groups, <input type="checkbox"/> j) the disabled movement, <input type="checkbox"/> k) the churches, <input type="checkbox"/> l) financial actors, <input type="checkbox"/> m) the countries, <input type="checkbox"/> n) grassroots initiatives or local agenda groups, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> o) other interests?
Have you sent in a contribution on the draft of the 2016 Sustainable Development Strategy?	yes
Do you agree with the publication of your contribution on the RNE-website?	yes

1. The state of play of the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016

1.1 In your view, what are the general challenges and benefits for Germany concerning sustainable development? In that regard, have you identified significant gaps in the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016?

1.1.b) general challenges for Germany concerning sustainable development:

- policy coherence
- to get all government departments interested and active
- to align the many and different governmental strategies and programs with the German Sustainable Development Strategy
- to identify and address the conflicts between different targets
- to make the German Sustainable Development Strategy binding, e.g. by defining a survey mechanism that contains concrete and strict measures for non-achievement
- to get a critical view on GDP focused growth-paradigm / replace it
- development of new indicators (e.g. sustainable consumption)
- development of a new systemic approach and indicators for innovation
- lack of incentives for science to deploy an effect in society

1.1.a) general benefits for Germany concerning sustainable development:

Almost all challenges named could be turned into benefits:

- policy coherence and an alignment of strategies and programs are very much desired
- if all resorts would act towards more sustainability we would see an increase in environmental protection and justice in society and intergenerational justice
- replacing the GDP focused growth-paradigm could support a transformation of society and economy towards a more just society
- if a „strong sustainability“ (starke Nachhaltigkeit) is implemented in Germany (saving the planet is the overarching goal with the sub goals of balancing social and economic interests while not affecting the need of the next generations) (in Germany and worldwide), the state of our planet, our society and our well-being would greatly improve

1.1.c) significant gaps in the German Sustainable Development Strategy;

- lack of concrete measures in many areas
- lack of ambitious long-term targets and concrete short- and midterm targets in many areas
- governmental strategy calls for sustainable consumption, but public procurement still is not sustainable and has no target to get there
- „Europe“ is missing in the strategy, even though many decisions that affect sustainability in Germany are taken on European level and a new EU wide Sustainable Development Strategy is still missing
- some indicators are missing, others are not concrete or insufficient. Examples:
- Goal 9, „Private and public spending on research and development“ is not a good indicator to measure innovation, a different indicator is needed
- Goal 8, „Number of members of the Textile Partnership“. The indicator here is just the number of members in a voluntary alliance of companies. This is not a

meaningful indicator for global supply chains/enabling decent work worldwide. The same is true for

- goal 12.1.a, sustainable consumption, „Market share of goods certified by independently verified sustainability labelling schemes (future perspective: market share of products and services with trustworthy and ambitious eco- and social labels)“: Sustainable consumption cannot be measured just by the market share with governmental eco-labels. „Eco“ is not the only aspect of sustainability; but more, sustainable consumption includes also long-term-usage, re-use, recycling, sufficiency. Further, non-governmental labels need to be included, especially of other aspects of sustainability are to be considered, too.
- Goal 12.1.b, sustainable consumption, „Energy consumption and CO2 emissions from consumption“: This target is not concrete enough and also needs to include the energy-consumption during the use of the product (whole life cycle).
- We need a general indicator for our use of resources. This indicator should be the main pillar for the continuation of the Progress strategy
- An indicator for food-waste is missing

- 1.2 Have you identified strategic incoherencies within the German Sustainable Development policies? Would you have proposals to increase coherence and meaningful output?

The success of German Sustainable Development policies hinges on the integration of sustainability strategies into all major policy areas. Conflicts with other political strategies need to be identified and resolved. A prominent example is the GDP focused growth paradigm which is still to the fore in many political areas while it is incompatible with ecological and social sustainability - facing the limited potential of strategies decoupling economic growth from resource and energy consumption. The growth paradigm is encouraged by using the GDP as a main indicator for economic wealth. A set of alternative indicators taking account of environmental and social aspects could help to shift the focus and increase coherence.

- 1.3 Do you think the measurement and reporting mechanisms are adequate to implement the 2030 Agenda by Germany?

Measurement and reporting mechanisms are not sufficient to implement the 2030 Agenda by Germany, because the strategy is not binding and not concrete enough: It cannot be sufficient just to mark the indicators every two years with a weather-symbol. What is needed is

- a) to monitor indicators closely if they are likely to reach or not reach their target
- b) if targets are likely to fail (and if they fail, too): a sincere and in depth analysis why targets are not reached or will not be reached failed
- c) adaptation of measures
- d) sanctions for failure

- 1.4 Which off-track goals and targets (meaning those targets marked with “thunderstorm” or “overcast”) in the German Sustainable Development Strategy do you think are the most important? According to you, why are they off track?

THUNDERSTORM:

Target 2.1.a, „Overall nitrogen surpluses for Germany to be reduced to 70kilogram per hectare of utilized agricultural land in the annual average from 2028-2032" and target 6, „50mg/l of nitrate in groundwater to be complied with by 2030":

Off track -even though the target (70kg/ha) is already too high!- because German legislation is too weak. There is a lack of concrete and binding measures such as targeted fertilizing, binding use of low-emission application techniques and especially the allowed nitrogen surplus is too high. The failure of this target is even more dramatic since an improvement in this area would also help against air-pollution, eutrophication of soils and waters and against climate change.

Targets 11.2 a and b, „Final-energy consumption in freight- and passenger transport reduced by 15 to 20 percent by 2030“:

Off track because freight-transport is too cheap. Toll for trucks remains on a low level, ship and air fuels are even tax free despite emissions rapidly growing in these sectors.

Target 12.1b, „Continuous reduction of energy consumption“ in terms of the indicator „energy consumption and CO2 emissions of consumption“:

This target is off track because there are hardly any measures undertaken to really reduce our energy demand. Energy is cheap and while the government invests in energy efficiency, there are no impulses to implement measures for sufficiency. The contrary is the case, even the German sustainability strategy aims for economic growth measured in GDP which leads to an increase in energy- and resource use. Fuel consumption is on a high level since 2012 as car producers use loopholes instead of investing in efficiency. Consumption of goods and services is still the priority target for politics and politicians.

Target 15.1, „Species diversity and landscape quality to be increased to the index value of 100 by 2030“:

Off track because the „National Strategy for Biodiversity" is not taken seriously by the relevant resorts, especially the ministries for agriculture and for traffic. Just recently, a Fitness Check-Study showed the overall ineffectiveness of the current Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) and highlighted it's incoherence with the SDGs:

https://www.idiv.de/fileadmin/content/iDiv_Files/Documents/peer_et_al_2017_cap_fitness_check_final_20-11.pdf.

A change in the common agricultural policy of the EU is urgently needed, but also a stricter regulatory baseline to prevent environmentally harmful land use practices.

Target 15.2, „Eutrophication of ecosystems to be reduced by 35 percent by 2030 compared to 2005“:

Off track because the measures against air pollution and over fertilization are not sufficient.

OVERCAST:

Target 3.2.a, „Emissions of 2005 to be reduced to 55 percent (unweighted average of the five pollutants (SO₂, NO_x, NH₃, NMVOC, PM_{2,5}) by 2030“ and

Target 3.2.b „WHO particulate matter benchmark of an annual average of 20 micrograms/cubic meter for PM₁₀ to be achieved as widely as possible by 2030“:

Off track because government is still paying subsidies for diesel-cars, is not fighting for stronger air-pollution limits (on EU level) and does neither control the keeping and breaking of limits nor loop holes sufficiently.

Target 7.1.a and b, „Final energy productivity to be increased by 2.1 percent per year from 2008 to 2050“ and „ Primary energy consumption to be reduced by 20 percent by 2020 and 50 percent by 2050 compared to 2008“

Off track because of the missing sufficiency strategy and losses of energy efficiency through rebound effects.

Target 14.1 aa & ab, "Adherence to the good conditions according to the ordinance on the protection of surface waters (annual averages for total nitrogen in rivers flowing into the North/Baltic Sea shall not exceed 2,6 respectively 2,8 miligrams per litre)" as well as Target 14.1.b, „Share of sustainably fished fish stocks in the North Sea and Baltic Sea Fish stocks used for economic purposes to be sustainably managed in accordance with the Maximum Sustainable Yield approach by 2020“:

Off track because the provisions of the government are not acceptable and do not suffice to the Habitats Directive as well as OSPAR and HELCOM agreements. The WFD suffers from lack of enforcement and is not sufficient as a measure to reduce nutrients in coastal- and seawaters. Thus, it is not adequate to cover MSFD obligations on top. With respect to Natura 2000 implementation and effective management of MPAs Germany is running behind. In particular no fisheries measures are in place, proposals for the German North Sea are in discussion with neighboring countries, Baltic Sea measures are lacking at all.

Two indicators that have a sun, but:

Target 11.1.a, „Built-up area and transport infrastructure expansion to be reduced to 30 ha minus x per day by 2030“ was postponed without explanation - it is an "easy win" to get a sun by just postponing the targetdate.

Target 8.1, „Total raw material productivity: (GDP+imports)/raw material input (RMI): Trend of 2000–2010 to be maintained until 2030“: The sub-indicator „raw-material extraction and import“ is still rising, so the sun is not justified.

2. The governance approach and structure

2.1 Are you satisfied with the institutions and the enabling environment both the government and the non-state actors have created so far?

Important steps have been taken to create an enabling environment so far, but still there could be done much more!

Good: Implementation of SDG-science-platform, Green cabinet (State Secretary committee responsible for sustainable development).

Parliament has to take over more responsibility for coherent policies concerning SDGs and sustainability First of all, the member of parliament need to be informed and become aware of the SDGs.

Not so good: The German Chancellery needs to implement new governance approaches that support the issue more (e.g. more personnel in the chancellery) and to promote policy-coherence more.

The “Normenkontrollrat” is only activated to check if sustainability issues are content of the justification text for changed/new acts/regulations. We miss an institution (department within a ministry, ministry, or similar) or process that assesses the consequences of legislation on the future use of natural resources.

- 2.2 According to you, is the sense of urgency as determined by science-based goals well understood and does it orient action (e.g. in your area)?

The sense of urgency seems not to be understood enough in many areas (climate, resources, agriculture, loss of biodiversity, pollution of the seas) - and even where it is understood, efforts to act are running up against powerful vested interests who seek to delay action.

- 2.3 As a partner or stakeholders do you feel enabled to actively participate in dialogue on and to contribute actions for sustainability?

We can give input and participate in some dialogues, but sometimes it remains unclear how much of our input is considered when making the relevant decisions. General problem for civil society all over the world: To get funding in order to properly participate in (government or industry led) dialogues, etc. without being dependent from donors' influence – if the last is existing anyway .

- 2.4 Is the science-policy interface working? Do results of “science for sustainability” already make a difference?

Far too many state-funded scientific projects are following the interests of German industry, while some of these industries (structures – such as global value chains with lacking transparency and sustainability requirements; products – such as cars with internal combustion engine or single use drinks packaging) do not fit into the vision of a sustainable development.

Transdisciplinary approaches aiming for societal transformation have to get mainstreamed in research and innovation. But incentives for transdisciplinary research and scientific career opportunities are still very small and remain in a niche. Public funding and public money for research need a clear bias for transformative and transforming science

3. New opportunities and challenges

- 3.1 Which new opportunities and challenges do you identify for Germany? Does the Sustainable Development Strategy help to address them? (Explanation: „new“ in the sense of: next, or not yet fully grasped, or appearing when you scan the horizon)

Challenges: climate policy is a big matter and is addressed in the strategy, but that does not seem to help much.

The loss of biodiversity is another big challenge and is addressed in the strategy (not very prominent, but it is) - but one of the major leverages, the common agricultural policy of the EU, desperately needs to be mentioned in the strategy. Changes in this

policy will also help the water and biodiversity targets. Other challenges are social cohesion and the cohesion of EU.

3.2 Are there areas where Germany can and must show leadership and set new standards?

Germany must take the leadership in climate policy again and that should include leadership in a sustainable transport policy.

Germany has during its presidencies recently initiated resource efficiency dialogues on the G20 and G7 level. Efficiency in the use of all natural resources is only sustainable if measures are taken to prevent rebound (technical, financial, etc.) effects. Germany should go straight forward towards this target, pushing the developed indicators raw-material footprint per inhabitant (RMC/inh.) and domestic material consumption (DMC/inh.).

Germany should streamline political and economical strategies under the roof of the sustainability strategy. Otherwise targets and measures are implemented that contradict a sustainable development.

3.3 Is the “fear of the future and transformation” a notion in society strong enough that you feel your organization and the Government will have to deal with it more carefully?

The “fear of the future and transformation” is a notion that NABU as a civil society organization and the government have to deal with carefully. It is a challenge to ask for and suggest substantial changes in society, economy and politics and to get a majority of the public on board. Although there is generally broad societal support for many of the changes we ask for, a silent majority, there is at the same time a well organised and loud pushback from certain groups who stand to lose the most. NABU does work on some measures to deal with those topics such as participation measures, but might have to deal with it more. Same is true for the government. All need to keep sight of this matter.

3.4 Is communication an issue?

Always! Sustainability is not very much known in general public and if so, it is a term used not very exactly. What we need here are models, especially in politics! and communication on what sustainability really is, needs and aims for (concrete examples and guidelines).

4. Do you have any other general message that you want to share with the Peers?

Transparency International Deutschland e.V.

General Information	
Name and function:	Edda Müller, chair of the board
Answers on behalf of (name of your organization):	Transparency International Deutschland e.V.
Which stakeholder do you represent or belong to (no ranking implied, multiple answers possible):	<input type="checkbox"/> a) politics, <input type="checkbox"/> b) administration, <input type="checkbox"/> c) enterprise or the business community, <input type="checkbox"/> d) the labour movement, <input type="checkbox"/> e) academia, <input type="checkbox"/> f) municipalities and associations, <input type="checkbox"/> g) youth, <input type="checkbox"/> h) gender interests, <input type="checkbox"/> i) migration groups, <input type="checkbox"/> j) the disabled movement, <input type="checkbox"/> k) the churches, <input type="checkbox"/> l) financial actors, <input type="checkbox"/> m) the countries, <input type="checkbox"/> n) grassroots initiatives or local agenda groups, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> o) other interests?
Have you sent in a contribution on the draft of the 2016 Sustainable Development Strategy?	yes
Do you agree with the publication of your contribution on the RNE-website?	yes

1. The state of play of the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016

- 1.1 In your view, what are the general challenges and benefits for Germany concerning sustainable development? In that regard, have you identified significant gaps in the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016?

Germany is an important economic actor in the global market. Better integration of social and ecological objectives in businesses is crucial. There are a number of activities to promote CSR on a voluntary basis but more should be done to integrate sustainability in international trade policies.

For Transparency Germany the appropriate measure for reaching the targets of the Sustainable Development Strategy are the support of open, inclusive and accountable and effective governance and economic behaviour free of corruption and bribery. Therefore, Transparency Germany supports governmental institutions and other initiatives in their efforts for anti-corruption strategies on the national as well as on the international level.

Because sustainability is not possible without tackling corruption and weak governance, it is essential to establish anti-corruption as a cross-cutting issue to all Sustainable Development Goals.

- 1.2 Have you identified strategic incoherencies within the German Sustainable Development policies? Would you have proposals to increase coherence and meaningful output?

There is still a huge gap between short term policies and long term strategies. One example is climate policy. To increase coherence the priorities of all relevant political and economic actors have to be changed. Institutional factors and scientific advice can help but are not sufficient to achieve this.

- 1.3 Do you think the measurement and reporting mechanisms are adequate to implement the 2030 Agenda by Germany?

In addition to the official reporting (the HLPF-Report in New York 2016) and the SDG Index and Dashboards Report of the Bertelsmann-Stiftung together with the Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN) it is important to recognise also the Shadow Reports and 2030-Watch of non-governmental organisations as additional information in an ongoing process.

Moreover the SDG-related spillover effects (e.g. supply chains, palm oil from South-East Asia) which were measured by the Bertelsmann-Stiftung and SDSN this year for the first time should be deepened in future.

- 1.4 Which off-track goals and targets (meaning those targets marked with “thunderstorm” or “overcast”) in the German Sustainable Development Strategy do you think are the most important? According to you, why are they off track?

2. The governance approach and structure

- 2.1 Are you satisfied with the institutions and the enabling environment both the government and the non-state actors have created so far?

Yes, but the impact of those institutions in day to day political decision making needs to be improved .

- 2.2 According to you, is the sense of urgency as determined by science-based goals well understood and does it orient action (e.g. in your area)?

There is a strong sense of urgency concerning climate change, the losses of biodiversity, the social conditions worldwide and violation of human rights. The majority of German citizens support e.g. renewable energies and accept higher electricity prices. On a voluntary basis however changes of behaviour are not sufficient and the public trust in policymakers to solve those problems is declining. Politics should learn that the right tools and binding obligations are needed to transfer the general awareness into action and to protect our democratic systems from a loss of confidence.

- 2.3 As a partner or stakeholders do you feel enabled to actively participate in dialogue on and to contribute actions for sustainability?

Transparency Germany is actively involved in debates and comments on sustainability.

- 2.4 Is the science-policy interface working? Do results of “science for sustainability” already make a difference?

Science plays an important role for sustainable development. The integrative nature of the SDGs requires research agendas at all levels and across disciplines. It is vital to know the possible consequences of actions for most of the SDGs. In order to exploit potential synergies whenever possible the interaction between the goals have to be analysed and evaluated scientifically. The new established "Wissenschaftliche Plattform" should act as an interface between science and political decision makers.

3. New opportunities and challenges

- 3.1 Which new opportunities and challenges do you identify for Germany? Does the Sustainable Development Strategy help to address them? (Explanation: „new“ in the sense of: next, or not yet fully grasped, or appearing when you scan the horizon)

The integration of social and ecological objectives as well as anti-corruption strategies into multilateral and bilateral trade policies has to be put on the political agenda. Without major reforms of the international financial market, the change of

tax behaviour of multinational companies and effective measures against money laundering sustainable development will not be successful.

- 3.2 Are there areas where Germany can and must show leadership and set new standards?

There are some areas where Germany can and should show leadership: decarbonization of the energy system, increase of resource efficiency and sustainable urban settlements and planning.

- 3.3 Is the “fear of the future and transformation” a notion in society strong enough that you feel your organization and the Government will have to deal with it more carefully?

Yes, if we do not successfully fight growing insecurity and the fear of the future and transformation we risk the revival of extreme right and left wing political streams which will endanger democracy and open society.

- 3.4 Is communication an issue?

Communication in the sense of more and better public relation activities are not enough. We have to work towards more concrete information and transparency in the area of sustainable production and consumption, tax behaviour, beneficial ownership, open government and sustainable management of companies.

4. Do you have any other general message that you want to share with the Peers?

The sustainability strategy is not only relevant in the context of UN Agenda 2030, but also of the G20 Action Plan to implement Agenda 2030, adopted in Hangzhou and updated in Hamburg. When the sustainability strategy was developed, German civil society provided inputs and is now monitoring implementation in Germany. The German government should not only ensure that civil society here has an enabling environment for contributing and monitoring, but that likewise, other G20 countries also give civil society the space and financial resources for playing such a role.

VENRO e.V (Association of German Development and Humanitarian Aid NGOs)

General Information	
Name and function:	Heike Spielmans, Director
Answers on behalf of (name of your organization):	Association of German Development and Humanitarian Aid NGOs (VENRO e.V.)
Which stakeholder do you represent or belong to (no ranking implied, multiple answers possible):	<input type="checkbox"/> a) politics, <input type="checkbox"/> b) administration, <input type="checkbox"/> c) enterprise or the business community, <input type="checkbox"/> d) the labour movement, <input type="checkbox"/> e) academia, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> f) municipalities and associations, <input type="checkbox"/> g) youth, <input type="checkbox"/> h) gender interests, <input type="checkbox"/> i) migration groups, <input type="checkbox"/> j) the disabled movement, <input type="checkbox"/> k) the churches, <input type="checkbox"/> l) financial actors, <input type="checkbox"/> m) the countries, <input type="checkbox"/> n) grassroots initiatives or local agenda groups, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> o) other interests?
Have you sent in a contribution on the draft of the 2016 Sustainable Development Strategy?	Yes. VENRO has sent five statements on specific issues and one overall statement together with civil society partners.
Do you agree with the publication of your contribution on the RNE-website?	yes

1. The state of play of the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016

- 1.1 In your view, what are the general challenges and benefits for Germany concerning sustainable development? In that regard, have you identified significant gaps in the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016?

We welcome that the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016 lays the groundwork for implementing the 2030 Agenda in Germany and incorporating it into German policies.

Nevertheless, there are a number of general challenges Germany has to face in order to reach the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The biggest challenge is the government's focus on an economic model solely based on quantitative growth (cf. question 1.2).

Despite the Sustainable Development Strategy, the German government avoids opening up for a concrete shift in direction towards more sustainability in central policy domains such as agriculture, infrastructure, energy, trade, the financial market and resource use. The Strategy has a focus on technical progress and efficiency but does not support a transformation towards sustainable economy.

Another significant gap is that the Parliamentary Advisory Council (PBnE) only checks new laws as well as political initiatives (such as strategies and plans) on formal requirements. Currently, no material review on the effects on sustainability takes place. VENRO, together with partners, already asked for a Sustainable Development Supervisory Board ("Nachhaltigkeits-TÜV") when commenting on the draft of the 2016 Sustainable Development Strategy.

The two most significant gaps VENRO has identified are 1) that the international dimension of the SDGs is only insufficiently represented in the goals and indicators of the Strategy, and 2) that the level of data disaggregation is in large parts insufficient.

- 1.2 Have you identified strategic incoherencies within the German Sustainable Development policies? Would you have proposals to increase coherence and meaningful output?

As mentioned above, there is a strong strategic incoherence between the goal of implementing the 2030 Agenda and the envisaged economic policies. The government's current agricultural policy, for example, is not saving natural resources. Economic policy still supports the generation of energy from coal. Despite the so-called "Diesel-Gate", owners of a diesel-fueled car still receive tax advantages. As long as such policies are in place, it will be impossible to reach the SDGs. Thus, there is a need for a concrete shift to more sustainability in central policy domains of the German government, e.g. in agriculture, energy, the financial markets, infrastructure, resource use and trade.

- 1.3 Do you think the measurement and reporting mechanisms are adequate to implement the 2030 Agenda by Germany?

Never before did the German Sustainable Development Strategy comprise so many national and international indicators. At the same time, so far there are too few international indicators: Some are not ambitious and others not meaningful enough.

These need to be improved in order to have adequate measurement and reporting mechanisms for the 2030 Agenda to be implemented by Germany. Within the Sustainable Development Strategy, we are calling for at least one international indicator for each SDG.

From VENRO's point of view, three issues should have priority:

- 1) A number of indicators already introduced should be re-formulated and become more ambitious, e.g. the target on the indicator for SDG 6.2 (clean water and sanitation). The indicator for SDG 8.6 does not even have a target. They should aspire to an improvement over the status quo.
- 2) Ambitious international indicators should be introduced for all SDGs.
- 3) Following the guiding principle of 'Leave No-one Behind', more data on people (such as on gender, age, disability) need to be disaggregated than has been done so far.

- 1.4 Which off-track goals and targets (meaning those targets marked with “thunderstorm” or “overcast”) in the German Sustainable Development Strategy do you think are the most important? According to you, why are they off track?

VENRO is happy to see that so many goals and targets are on track. There is nevertheless a need for more international goals and targets in the Sustainable Development Strategy (see also above).

With respect to the goals and targets that are off track, there is a need to act most urgently on 3.1.a (premature mortality among women) and 13.1.a (climate protection).

2. The governance approach and structure

- 2.1 Are you satisfied with the institutions and the enabling environment both the government and the non-state actors have created so far?

VENRO applauds the institution of the monitoring group for the State Secretaries' Committee for Sustainable Development, the Sustainability Forum and the department coordinators for sustainable development. We regard the Sustainability Forum as an important stakeholder forum for the participation mechanism. The department coordinators could play an important role in ensuring coherence between the departments.

We appreciate that the Parliamentary Advisory Council (PBnE) is part of the German Sustainable Development Strategy. From our perspective, however, there is a need to 'upgrade' this parliamentary group: The Council should become part of the parliamentary by-laws, meaning it does not need to be newly established by parliament at the beginning of each legislative period. By including it in the by-laws, the Council also should be expanded in its capacities. Ideally, it would check all draft bills for their impact on sustainable development, functioning as a Sustainable Development Supervisory Board.

- 2.2 According to you, is the sense of urgency as determined by science-based goals well understood and does it orient action (e.g. in your area)?

We assume that the urgency as determined by science-based goals is well understood by political decision-makers. However, we observe that the political will to act on this knowledge is limited. This is especially true for issues concerning the fight against poverty and hunger, where the numbers of people living in poverty and suffering from hunger are again rising, as well as climate change, where political decision-makers still hesitate to take decisive action.

- 2.3 As a partner or stakeholders do you feel enabled to actively participate in dialogue on and to contribute actions for sustainability?

VENRO welcomes that the Federal Government wants to strengthen civil society participation in the implementation of the Strategy. VENRO feels well-involved in the process: We had the possibility to propose ideas for the new German Sustainable Development Strategy and did so through one statement by ten civil society networks and associations, as well as five statements on specific issues. We also had the opportunity to discuss our recommendations directly with the responsible division in the Federal Chancellery. We welcome that our statements are being reviewed and that we are being invited to different dialogues and other formats of participation.

However, it also needs to be ensured that all relevant associations, organisations and alliances are being represented by individuals of their choice. Based on the "Leave No-One Behind" maxim, organisations representing people with disabilities, migrants and disadvantaged groups should be invited as well.

- 2.4 Is the science-policy interface working? Do results of "science for sustainability" already make a difference?

From our perspective the science-policy interface is evolving. The German government established a Sustainability Knowledge Platform and supports the exchange within the SDSN Germany. However, we observe that the German government rather prefers to draw on science when it comes to technical solutions to face the global challenges. While technical solutions are important and a necessary component for achieving sustainable development, we believe that social change, e.g. the transformation of global economic activities, production and consumption, is paramount when it comes to sustainable development. Therefore, we would like to see broader support for scientific research on social transformation issues and a stronger participation of civil society in the decision-making on research policy agenda-setting. Both could contribute to strengthening the science-policy interface and the social acceptance of sustainable development innovation.

3. New opportunities and challenges

- 3.1 Which new opportunities and challenges do you identify for Germany? Does the Sustainable Development Strategy help to address them? (Explanation: „new“ in the sense of: next, or not yet fully grasped, or appearing when you scan the horizon)

VENRO identifies two challenges that have not yet been fully grasped: Climate change and migration. Climate change is already being addressed in the Sustainable

Development Strategy, though not comprehensively. Migration is not addressed but offers opportunities as well as challenges in many regards.

- 3.2 Are there areas where Germany can and must show leadership and set new standards?

The German government already regards itself as a global leader in the fields of climate and renewable energies. Other countries have caught up and overtaken Germany; thus, it is crucial that Germany does more to actually fulfil this role. With e.g. its current coal policies, this is not possible.

- 3.3 Is the “fear of the future and transformation” a notion in society strong enough that you feel your organization and the Government will have to deal with it more carefully?

The government should consider the Leave No-one Behind maxim in implementing the Sustainable Development Strategy. In the current political context, this means taking into account the shift to the right in political discourse, as well as socially disadvantaged groups. However, this must not lead to delays in implementation.

- 3.4 Is communication an issue?

The Sustainable Development Strategy and its content is too little known in both politics (e.g. in election manifestos) and the broader German population. VENRO would welcome if the government communicates the goals of the Strategy further.

- 4. Do you have any other general message that you want to share with the Peers?**

Verbraucherzentraler Bundesverband e.V. (The Federation of German Consumer Organisations)

General Information	
Name and function:	Klaus Müller, Executive Director
Answers on behalf of (name of your organization):	The Federation of German Consumer Organisations - vzbv
Which stakeholder do you represent or belong to (no ranking implied, multiple answers possible):	<input type="checkbox"/> a) politics, <input type="checkbox"/> b) administration, <input type="checkbox"/> c) enterprise or the business community, <input type="checkbox"/> d) the labour movement, <input type="checkbox"/> e) academia, <input type="checkbox"/> f) municipalities and associations, <input type="checkbox"/> g) youth, <input type="checkbox"/> h) gender interests, <input type="checkbox"/> i) migration groups, <input type="checkbox"/> j) the disabled movement, <input type="checkbox"/> k) the churches, <input type="checkbox"/> l) financial actors, <input type="checkbox"/> m) the countries, <input type="checkbox"/> n) grassroots initiatives or local agenda groups, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> o) other interests?
Have you sent in a contribution on the draft of the 2016 Sustainable Development Strategy?	yes
Do you agree with the publication of your contribution on the RNE-website?	yes

1. The state of play of the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016

- 1.1 In your view, what are the general challenges and benefits for Germany concerning sustainable development? In that regard, have you identified significant gaps in the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016?

The need to implement sustainable development within governmental action is well known across decision makers in politics, industries and society. However, the political will, and apparently the urgency, to act in such a way are not strong enough. In this context the vzbv advocates the consumer interests and takes care that the burden of responsibility is shared fairly between the stakeholders.

From a consumer perspective the strategy has two significant gaps:

1. Sustainable consumption should be based on sustainable production: In line with SDG12 which calls to ensure sustainable production and consumption patterns. However the German government puts the responsibility for SDG12 mainly on consumer shoulders and neglects the impact of sustainable production to achieve SDG 12. We are convinced that consumers can only act in a sustainable way if they are in an environment that facilitates the conditions that allow sustainable behaviour, make it easy and, their first choice. Therefore the government is asked to set up those conditions for industries and consumers.

From a consumer perspective efficiency, consistency and sufficiency are the trend-setting approaches. The vzbv would appreciate a political and public social discourse about sufficiency. There are two relevant supporting arguments: On the one hand without a political discussion about consumption and lifestyles led by the government the entire Agenda 2030 and SDG 12 is accomplishable. On the other hand, many consumers do not want to minimize their consumption so far.

2. The missing "level-playing- field": Germany lacks a framework that allows sustainable development to evolve. Germany needs a change in perspective towards the so-called "Level-playing-field" of stakeholders. Sustainable action by companies for example has to be rewarded and triggered by incentives whereas unsustainable action needs to be penalised. The government itself could be one of the frontrunners by changing the rules of public (sustainable) procurement and be a trustworthy role model within the markets.

- 1.2 Have you identified strategic incoherencies within the German Sustainable Development policies? Would you have proposals to increase coherence and meaningful output?

A lack of coherence between the action of governmental departments is striking. Policy for sustainable development, is like consumer policy, a cross-departmental issue that can only be solved by joint action rather than single action. The SDGs make the interactions and connections of topics within governmental departments visible.

Examples are manifold: subsidies in conventional agriculture vs. high nitrate drain and a shrinking soil quality endangering water quality (SDG 6), abuse of antibiotics in animal feed vs. contaminated poultry that leads to antibiotic resistance microbes jeopardizing humans health (SDG 3/SDG 12).

Coherence between the national program for sustainable consumption and the national platform education for sustainable development needs to be realized. Existing educational activities like the "Materialkompass " that are stated to be governmentally funded have to be realized (SDG4/SDG12).

- 1.3 Do you think the measurement and reporting mechanisms are adequate to implement the 2030 Agenda by Germany?

-

- 1.4 Which off-track goals and targets (meaning those targets marked with "thunderstorm" or "overcast") in the German Sustainable Development Strategy do you think are the most important? According to you, why are they off track?

-

2. The governance approach and structure

- 2.1 Are you satisfied with the institutions and the enabling environment both the government and the non-state actors have created so far?

In our opinion the government has not created a sufficient enabling environment yet, mainly due to insufficient political and strategic will to gain a transformation towards sustainability.

For example: Education for sustainable development is based on governmental and non-state actors. As the engagement of civil society is explicitly integrated in SDG 4 the financial foundation for realizing the aim needs to be provided by governmental actors. Additional investments in public educational settings are a necessary and important pre-condition to fulfilling the ambitious aim of SDG 4.

- 2.2 According to you, is the sense of urgency as determined by science-based goals well understood and does it orient action (e.g. in your area)?

Regarding SDG 12 the government enacted in 2016 a National strategy on sustainable consumption, a network on sustainable consumption and a centre of competence to support sustainable consumption within Germany. Together with our member organisations the vzbv raises 3 main critical points:

(1) Sustainability needs a higher significance within governmental action due to cross-departmental nature of the issue. Especially the Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy, the Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs and the Federal Ministry of Transport and Digital Infrastructure need to contribute their competencies.

(2) The responsibility for sustainable consumption has been put single-sided on the shoulders of consumers instead of sharing the responsibility among the government, industry and consumers. Manufacturers and retailers should be obligated to ensure due diligence in respect to human rights and environmental damage.

(3) The national strategy on sustainable consumption lacks a precise timetable and financial budget to ensure a comprehensible and verifiable implementation.

- 2.3 As a partner or stakeholders do you feel enabled to actively participate in dialogue on and to contribute actions for sustainability?

The framework of participation for stakeholders has been mainly covered by written or oral input so far. An in-depth discussion with the stakeholders did not take place.

- 2.4 Is the science-policy interface working? Do results of “science for sustainability” already make a difference?

-

3. New opportunities and challenges

- 3.1 Which new opportunities and challenges do you identify for Germany? Does the Sustainable Development Strategy help to address them? (Explanation: „new“ in the sense of: next, or not yet fully grasped, or appearing when you scan the horizon)

Well-being and the social dimension of sustainable development within Germany are a "new" challenge that urgently needs to be tackled. From a consumer perspective a focus should be set on vulnerable consumers that suffer from fuel poverty, unaffordable renting costs, indebtedness, few digital education and access to digital gadgets that lead to societal exclusion. All those factors diminish the ability to participate in society within an industrialised country like Germany. The SDGs address those topics. However decision makers have difficulties to implement joined action and eliminate drivers that encourage social inequality.

- 3.2 Are there areas where Germany can and must show leadership and set new standards?

-

- 3.3 Is the “fear of the future and transformation” a notion in society strong enough that you feel your organization and the Government will have to deal with it more carefully?

-

- 3.4 Is communication an issue?

-

4. Do you have any other general message that you want to share with the Peers?

In November 2017, the vzbv asked 1.008 German citizens via an independent representative survey about the publicity of the Sustainable Development Goals in Germany.

The SDGs are only well known to four out of ten German citizen. Respondents with formal higher education are above average (52 %) saying that they know the SDGs. Very few respondents believe that the SDGs can be achieved through voluntary action and behavioral change among businesses and citizens. The vast majority (92 %) consider concrete rules and laws to be necessary.

The consumer opinion supports our strong conviction that Germany needs a holistic approach creating conditions that allow a sustainable consumer behaviour.

Politics

Deutsche UNESCO-Kommission

General Information	
Name and function:	Dr Lutz Möller, Deputy Secretary-General
Answers on behalf of (name of your organization):	German Commission for UNESCO
Which stakeholder do you represent or belong to (no ranking implied, multiple answers possible):	<input type="checkbox"/> a) politics, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> b) administration, <input type="checkbox"/> c) enterprise or the business community, <input type="checkbox"/> d) the labour movement, <input type="checkbox"/> e) academia, <input type="checkbox"/> f) municipalities and associations, <input type="checkbox"/> g) youth, <input type="checkbox"/> h) gender interests, <input type="checkbox"/> i) migration groups, <input type="checkbox"/> j) the disabled movement, <input type="checkbox"/> k) the churches, <input type="checkbox"/> l) financial actors, <input type="checkbox"/> m) the countries, <input type="checkbox"/> n) grassroots initiatives or local agenda groups, <input type="checkbox"/> o) other interests?
Have you sent in a contribution on the draft of the 2016 Sustainable Development Strategy?	yes
Do you agree with the publication of your contribution on the RNE-website?	yes

1. The state of play of the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016

- 1.1 In your view, what are the general challenges and benefits for Germany concerning sustainable development? In that regard, have you identified significant gaps in the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016?

Germany has made considerable progress over the last years through the successful predecessor Strategy and its institution-building effect. A key driver has been the RNE. There is growing understanding in all areas of public life, public administration and also the business sector that sustainable development requires REAL intersectoral action, comprise and negotiating trade-offs and dilemmas. This understanding has translated into tangible action.

A key achievement of the new Strategy, also in comparison to its predecessor, is the new triple perspective: "in Germany", "with Germany" and "by Germany". For the first time, the externalisation of costs has come to the table in a tangible way. However, the new Strategy still is not intersectoral enough, does not address sufficiently the externalization of costs and generally lacks ambition, simply continuing existing policies. The societal reality in Germany in some areas is more advanced than what can be read in the new Strategy.

- 1.2 Have you identified strategic incoherencies within the German Sustainable Development policies? Would you have proposals to increase coherence and meaningful output?

The Sustainability Strategy should be drafted through a non-standard process which brings together government ministries - as well as other actors such as the federal states - in a non-sectoral way, to avoid adding up individual contributions.

- 1.3 Do you think the measurement and reporting mechanisms are adequate to implement the 2030 Agenda by Germany?

Generally yes.

- 1.4 Which off-track goals and targets (meaning those targets marked with "thunderstorm" or "overcast") in the German Sustainable Development Strategy do you think are the most important? According to you, why are they off track?

All goals and targets related to agriculture, biodiversity and groundwater as well as those related to decentral GHG emissions (mobility, consumption). So far, agricultural policies do not seriously take into account Sustainable Development; GHG emissions reduction policies so far have only seriously addressed the low-hanging fruits of electricity production. Trade-offs leading to serious climate change mitigation efforts are avoided.

2. The governance approach and structure

2.1 Are you satisfied with the institutions and the enabling environment both the government and the non-state actors have created so far?

Yes.

2.2 According to you, is the sense of urgency as determined by science-based goals well understood and does it orient action (e.g. in your area)?

Yes and no. Science-based goals are well understood. Yet action is limited, avoiding addressing any serious trade-offs.

2.3 As a partner or stakeholders do you feel enabled to actively participate in dialogue on and to contribute actions for sustainability?

Yes.

2.4 Is the science-policy interface working? Do results of "science for sustainability" already make a difference?

Yes, the interface is working in principle. But "science for sustainability", as inter alia understood in the new UNESCO guidelines (<https://en.unesco.org/sustainability-science/guidelines>), is supported only to a rather small part within Germany.

3. New opportunities and challenges

3.1 Which new opportunities and challenges do you identify for Germany? Does the Sustainable Development Strategy help to address them? (Explanation: „new“ in the sense of: next, or not yet fully grasped, or appearing when you scan the horizon)

In our submission to the new Strategy in summer 2016, we have focused first of all on the "cultural dimension" of sustainable development. Subsequently, culture has been much better reflected, but still too much as a "transmission belt" for top-down policies. Culture must be understood as the best opportunity (apart from education) to create spaces in which citizens mutually engage bottom-up in processes of forming new values, attitudes, narratives which can be conducive to sustainable development. Cultural diversity (not only communities of migrants, also "subcultures", associations, etc) and institutions of public cultural life are key resources to use.

In addition: Although we highly appreciate that the new Strategy addresses SDG 4.7. and specifically education for sustainability for the first time explicitly, we regret that it widely ignores the other targets of SDG 4.

Finally, the new Strategy does not capitalize on "pilot regions" for Sustainable Development - while Germany can already boast the most convincing "Sustainability Model Regions" globally, the German UNESCO Biosphere Reserves. The Biosphere Reserve Rhön, for example, has been globally recognized by scientific study from Australia to provide THE most exciting sustainability results of all such regions; such

recognition within Germany, and learning from their experiences, is much more limited.

- 3.2 Are there areas where Germany can and must show leadership and set new standards?

Yes. The "energy transition" must enter its next phase, going beyond the "low hanging fruits". Also in agriculture and related biodiversity and resource conservation, there is need for decisive action.

- 3.3 Is the "fear of the future and transformation" a notion in society strong enough that you feel your organization and the Government will have to deal with it more carefully?

This does not seem to be the most appropriate description. It is not about "fear of transformation", it is more about overly strong incentives that work against transformation.

- 3.4 Is communication an issue?

Yes. Communication about sustainable development seems to be too much facts-and-knowledge-based. Knowledge alone does not necessarily generate transformation. There needs to be much more attention to creating spaces for revisiting values and attitudes and new narratives of transformation.

4. Do you have any other general message that you want to share with the Peers?

Sustainable Development needs Culture, because transformation depends upon all citizens finding opportunities to start discussing and engaging in transformation.

Deutscher Städtetag (German Association of Cities)

General Information	
Name and function:	Detlef Raphael, Head of Department, Department of environment and economy
Answers on behalf of (name of your organization):	German Association of Cities
Which stakeholder do you represent or belong to (no ranking implied, multiple answers possible):	<input type="checkbox"/> a) politics, <input type="checkbox"/> b) administration, <input type="checkbox"/> c) enterprise or the business community, <input type="checkbox"/> d) the labour movement, <input type="checkbox"/> e) academia, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> f) municipalities and associations, <input type="checkbox"/> g) youth, <input type="checkbox"/> h) gender interests, <input type="checkbox"/> i) migration groups, <input type="checkbox"/> j) the disabled movement, <input type="checkbox"/> k) the churches, <input type="checkbox"/> l) financial actors, <input type="checkbox"/> m) the countries, <input type="checkbox"/> n) grassroots initiatives or local agenda groups, <input type="checkbox"/> o) other interests?
Have you sent in a contribution on the draft of the 2016 Sustainable Development Strategy?	yes, please check chapter D; IV
Do you agree with the publication of your contribution on the RNE-website?	yes

1. The state of play of the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016

- 1.1 In your view, what are the general challenges and benefits for Germany concerning sustainable development? In that regard, have you identified significant gaps in the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016?

Within the framework of their sustainability policy, municipalities, the federal government and the federal states face major challenges: the integration of refugees with a stay-in-perspective takes place in the cities. However, this only succeeds if the federal government and the federal states improve the financial situation of the municipalities and create a proper legal framework for integration. Another challenge is the transition to a digital society in developing the infrastructure, municipal services as well as the local economy in a digital society. Local governments are policy makers, catalysts of change and the level of government best placed to link the global goals with local communities. In this regard local governments could be more actively involved in the German Sustainable Development Strategy as providers of ideas, decision-makers and visionaries.

- 1.2 Have you identified strategic incoherencies within the German Sustainable Development policies? Would you have proposals to increase coherence and meaningful output?

German Sustainable Development Policies are not sufficiently considering the impact of locally determined contributions. Although we appreciate new forms of dialog and consulting like the "IMA-Stadt" on federal level or the involvement of municipalities at regional level as in NRW we think it could be done more. An important step would be to involve actively the municipal level in decision processes before drafting strategic sustainability plans.

- 1.3 Do you think the measurement and reporting mechanisms are adequate to implement the 2030 Agenda by Germany?

We appreciate the efforts of the federal government to report on its progress towards achieving the Agenda 2030 targets on a regular basis. So far the municipal level has not been systematically integrated into the reporting of the federal government. This is especially challenging related to SDG 7 and SDG 13. Climate goals such as reducing energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions by 2050 are not representable without taking into account local contributions at an aggregated basis. In this context we propose further methodological efforts to specify the municipal contributions to the climate goals.

- 1.4 Which off-track goals and targets (meaning those targets marked with "thunderstorm" or "overcast") in the German Sustainable Development Strategy do you think are the most important? According to you, why are they off track?

11.1.c: population density: We support the demand for a constant density of

settlements. This objective can only be achieved through a spatial development that is capable of action. In addition, regional development plans should be oriented towards the objectives of the area and counteract a further reduction in the density of settlements.

11.2 a: mobility: In addition to freight transport, there is a need for a change in the transport policy in view of the growth rates of fossil-motorized transport.

11.3 Affordable Housing: With the prospective increase in social housing support to a total of 4 billion euros from 2017 to 2019 and the decision of the 10-point programme on a housing strategy, the federal government has made substantial improvements. However, it must be noted that there is still a need for further significant efforts to take more account of the high demand of a sustainable housing policy, including an effective distribution of Federal real estate.

13.1 Climate mitigation: lack of holistic and transboundary climate action

17.3: Development Cooperation and open markets: EU-bilateral trade policies especially with single African Countries are very much counterproductive to EU development aid and development aid of EU member states

2. The governance approach and structure

- 2.1 Are you satisfied with the institutions and the enabling environment both the government and the non-state actors have created so far?

Governments, Non-State Actors and other institutions should visibly address the local level.

- 2.2 According to you, is the sense of urgency as determined by science-based goals well understood and does it orient action (e.g. in your area)?

Science-based goals could be important drivers for local action but they should not be alone standing goals before considering views of municipal practitioners.

- 2.3 As a partner or stakeholders do you feel enabled to actively participate in dialogue on and to contribute actions for sustainability?

Yes, we do, see above

- 2.4 Is the science-policy interface working? Do results of "science for sustainability" already make a difference?

Yes, science-based goals do make a difference but there is still some room for improvement in better involving perspectives of municipal practitioners.

3. New opportunities and challenges

- 3.1 Which new opportunities and challenges do you identify for Germany? Does the Sustainable Development Strategy help to address them? (Explanation: „new“ in the sense of: next, or not yet fully grasped, or appearing when you scan the horizon)

Challenging for Germany is the new approach of "Universality". Germany must make more efforts to advance development cooperation on eye level with municipalities. We identified an urgent need to involve local representatives of the recipient countries, so that German aid reaches the levels where it is most needed. Concretely: We appreciate the planned "municipal development fond", but we need to face the problem that financial support often sticks to federal levels if there is no supervision by municipal representatives.

- 3.2 Are there areas where Germany can and must show leadership and set new standards?

The German system of local self-government is worldwide very much acknowledged whereas Asian or African cities are often more acting as agencies of state. More, the German initiative "SDG-Indicators for Municipalities" could set new standards in international contexts.

- 3.3 Is the "fear of the future and transformation" a notion in society strong enough that you feel your organization and the Government will have to deal with it more carefully?

Apparently, new challenges and transformations could raise anxieties in society. The local level as closest level to the citizens has an important role as a mediator.

- 3.4 Is communication an issue?

Yes, it is.

4. Do you have any other general message that you want to share with the Peers?

Please consider actively the "The Bonn-Fiji Commitment of Local and Regional Leaders to Deliver the Paris Agreement at all levels" with its commitments, ambitions and actions; calls and positions; concrete and joint initiatives. In this context we want to highlight the initiative "SDG Indicators for Municipalities". This initiative crafts indicators for the municipal level in Germany, to ensure local governments align and track progress towards global targets.

Deutsches Institut für Menschenrechte (German Institute for Human Rights)

General Information	
Name and function:	Dr. Anna Würth
Answers on behalf of (name of your organization):	German Institute for Human Rights - National Human Rights Institution
Which stakeholder do you represent or belong to (no ranking implied, multiple answers possible):	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> a) politics, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> b) administration, <input type="checkbox"/> c) enterprise or the business community, <input type="checkbox"/> d) the labour movement, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> e) academia, <input type="checkbox"/> f) municipalities and associations, <input type="checkbox"/> g) youth, <input type="checkbox"/> h) gender interests, <input type="checkbox"/> i) migration groups, <input type="checkbox"/> j) the disabled movement, <input type="checkbox"/> k) the churches, <input type="checkbox"/> l) financial actors, <input type="checkbox"/> m) environment organization <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> n) development organization <input type="checkbox"/> o) "the Länder", <input type="checkbox"/> p) grassroots initiatives or local agenda groups, <input type="checkbox"/> q) other interests?
Have you sent in a contribution on the draft of the 2016 Sustainable Development Strategy?	yes
Do you agree with the publication of your contribution on the RNE-website?	yes

1. The state of play of the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016

- 1.1 In your view, what are the general challenges and benefits for Germany concerning sustainable development? In that regard, have you identified significant gaps in the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016?

While the NHS does address some pertinent social issues in Germany (e.g. poverty), overall the NHS still conceptualizes sustainability as relating to ecological sustainability at home and abroad, and development as pertaining to other countries, but not to Germany as an industrialized country.

- 1.2 Have you identified strategic incoherencies within the German Sustainable Development policies? Would you have proposals to increase coherence and meaningful output?

The NHS addresses actions in, through and by Germany, but the implementation remains incoherent and patchy at best. From a human rights perspective, implementation should be related to recommendations Germany received from the UN-treaty bodies, to ensure coherence and create synergies.

- 1.3 Do you think the measurement and reporting mechanisms are adequate to implement the 2030 Agenda by Germany?

While Germany pushed for data disaggregation in the negotiations leading to the 2030 Agenda, Germany does not practice what it preached even though its HLPF report stressed that data disaggregation will be decisive for Germany to monitor its progress in fulfilling the SDGs. However, data collection and interpretation undertaken by the responsible German authority is not in line with § 74 (d-f), lacking inter alia transparency, inclusiveness and participation. With respect to reporting, re-labeling remains a challenge and devalues the SDGs. This holds true for the government and the private sector.

- 1.4 Which off-track goals and targets (meaning those targets marked with “thunderstorm” or “overcast”) in the German Sustainable Development Strategy do you think are the most important? According to you, why are they off track?

2. The governance approach and structure

- 2.1 Are you satisfied with the institutions and the enabling environment both the government and the non-state actors have created so far?

The institutional set-up has become more participatory. However, participation is fostered mainly at the design stage, and focuses on those civil society actors engaged in environmental issues and development. The government needs to undertake serious efforts to engage non-state actors working on SDG-relevant topics in Germany, e.g. groups working on violence against women in Germany, migration,

poverty, or disability. In addition, participation needs to be strengthened with respect to monitoring and reporting.

- 2.2 According to you, is the sense of urgency as determined by science-based goals well understood and does it orient action (e.g. in your area)?
- 2.3 As a partner or stakeholders do you feel enabled to actively participate in dialogue on and to contribute actions for sustainability?
- 2.4 Is the science-policy interface working? Do results of “science for sustainability” already make a difference?

3. New opportunities and challenges

- 3.1 Which new opportunities and challenges do you identify for Germany? Does the Sustainable Development Strategy help to address them? (Explanation: „new“ in the sense of: next, or not yet fully grasped, or appearing when you scan the horizon)

The main challenge for Germany will be to manage a transition to clean energy and the ensuing changes in workforce qualification and export earnings.

- 3.2 Are there areas where Germany can and must show leadership and set new standards?

Germany has been a strong supporter and acknowledged champion for the human rights based approach in development. It now has the unique chance to use this approach also at home, for sustainable development in Germany.

- 3.3 Is the “fear of the future and transformation” a notion in society strong enough that you feel your organization and the Government will have to deal with it more carefully?

- 3.4 Is communication an issue?

With its federal character, Germany needs to address most implementation issues with the Länder and Kommunen. Communication with these entities should be improved.

4. Do you have any other general message that you want to share with the Peers?

No

Thüringer Ministerium für Umwelt, Energie und Naturschutz

General Information	
Name and function:	Thomas Koch, Referatsleiter Nachhaltigkeit
Answers on behalf of (name of your organization):	Thüringer Ministerium für Umwelt, Energie und Naturschutz
Which stakeholder do you represent or belong to (no ranking implied, multiple answers possible):	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> a) politics, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> b) administration, <input type="checkbox"/> c) enterprise or the business community, <input type="checkbox"/> d) the labour movement, <input type="checkbox"/> e) academia, <input type="checkbox"/> f) municipalities and associations, <input type="checkbox"/> g) youth, <input type="checkbox"/> h) gender interests, <input type="checkbox"/> i) migration groups, <input type="checkbox"/> j) the disabled movement, <input type="checkbox"/> k) the churches, <input type="checkbox"/> l) financial actors, <input type="checkbox"/> m) the countries, <input type="checkbox"/> n) grassroots initiatives or local agenda groups, <input type="checkbox"/> o) other interests?
Have you sent in a contribution on the draft of the 2016 Sustainable Development Strategy?	no
Do you agree with the publication of your contribution on the RNE-website?	yes

1. The state of play of the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016

- 1.1 In your view, what are the general challenges and benefits for Germany concerning sustainable development? In that regard, have you identified significant gaps in the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016?

Challenges: efficiency (energy and resources)
biodiversity
inequalities within Germany
demography (shortage of professionals, longterm welfare, social security systems)

benefits: moderate climate risks (moderate vulnerability, high adaptability)
high potential in renewables (energy and resources)

gaps: reliable integration of non-environmental and non-development partnership sectors (i.e. education, social security systems, financial sector, agriculture, transport/traffic, political system))

- 1.2 Have you identified strategic incoherencies within the German Sustainable Development policies? Would you have proposals to increase coherence and meaningful output?

Not on the strategic level, but in reality the implementation is weak (i.e. agricultural policy, social security policy, transport/traffic/infrastructure policies)
as well: Gaps between national, regional and local levels.

Proposals: higher efforts in communication / information / motivation and support to enable people (no only experts and people within the sustainability-bubble) for implementation of Agenda 2030 in reality - make sustainability conventional

- 1.3 Do you think the measurement and reporting mechanisms are adequate to implement the 2030 Agenda by Germany?

Yes for the international level/communication

No for the communication/adaption within Germany (to many indicators and goals, no (recognizable) sharpening for central policies/goals)

- 1.4 Which off-track goals and targets (meaning those targets marked with "thunderstorm" or "overcast") in the German Sustainable Development Strategy do you think are the most important? According to you, why are they off track?

See 1.2

Clean Water/Life under water/Life on Land (Biodiversity): agricultural policy

Sustainable Cities and Communities: traffic/transport policies, housing and rural development policies

responsible consumption and production: innovation / economic policies / waste-management (well managed but too much waste / end-of-pipe- technology), nutrition

2. The governance approach and structure

- 2.1 Are you satisfied with the institutions and the enabling environment both the government and the non-state actors have created so far?

Yes and No: Yes in terms of the structural situation, No regarding to the (reliable) collaboration between the people

- 2.2 According to you, is the sense of urgency as determined by science-based goals well understood and does it orient action (e.g. in your area)?

No - should it? - urgency is a risky precondition for good policies and usefull dialogues. I would recommend reliable dialogues and joint action instead of trouble-shooting "risks/problems of the day"

- 2.3 As a partner or stakeholders do you feel enabled to actively participate in dialogue on and to contribute actions for sustainability?

participation:partly
action: think global - act local - means: yes within my personal /organizational / regional/local range/area/reach

- 2.4 Is the science-policy interface working? Do results of "science for sustainability" already make a difference?

Yes, but political implementation and the interface between politics an society have to be improved

3. New opportunities and challenges

- 3.1 Which new opportunities and challenges do you identify for Germany? Does the Sustainable Development Strategy help to address them? (Explanation: „new“ in the sense of: next, or not yet fully grasped, or appearing when you scan the horizon)

see 1.1 - challenges; partly addressed in the strategy, partly not respectively not reliable / applicable

- 3.2 Are there areas where Germany can and must show leadership and set new standards?

renewables (can and does), education (could do more), consumption and production (could an should), inequality (could and has to)

3.3 Is the “fear of the future and transformation” a notion in society strong enough that you feel your organization and the Government will have to deal with it more carefully?

"Fear" is a very dangerous term. I would prefer awareness or similar, furthermore:
see 2.4

3.4 Is communication an issue?

YES

4. Do you have any other general message that you want to share with the Peers?

The main goal should be: bring Agenda 2030 to the people - not just to the experts - and listen to the people, not only/mostly to the (self-appointed) experts.
And than: stop talking - start action. .