

The UN SDGs Interaction Matrix – describing impacts and preferences in the SDG process
by Dr. Alexander Dill, Basel Institute of Commons and Economics



The SDG Matrix shows the interaction between the goals. E.g. while Goal 1 ‘reducing poverty’ has a high impact **HI** on Goal 2 ‘zero hunger’, Goal 2 in reverse only has a low impact **LI** on reducing poverty, because the major dependency is in one direction only.

THE UNITED NATIONS GOALS IMPACT MATRIX

Goals	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
1	x	HI	HI	MI	MI	HI	MI	MI	LI	MI	MI	HI	MI	LI	LI	LI	LI
2	LI	x	LI	LI	LI	LI	LI	LI	LI	LI	LI	LI	LI	LI	LI	LI	LI
3	LI	MI	x	LI	LI	LI	LI	LI	LI	LI	LI	LI	LI	LI	LI	LI	LI
4	MI	MI	MI	x	HI	MI	MI	MI	HI	MI	MI	HI	HI	MI	MI	MI	HI
5	LI	LI	MI	MI	x	LI	LI	MI	LI	HI	LI	LI	LI	LI	LI	MI	LI
6	LI	MI	HI	LI	LI	x	LI	LI	MI	LI	HI	HI	MI	HI	HI	LI	LI
7	MI	MI	MI	LI	LI	MI	x	HI	HI	LI	HI	HI	HI	HI	HI	MI	MI
8	MI	MI	MI	MI	MI	LI	LI	x	MI	LI	LI	LI	LI	LI	LI	LI	LI
9	MI	MI	LI	HI	MI	MI	MI	HI	x	LI	HI	HI	HI	HI	HI	LI	LI
10	MI	MI	MI	MI	HI	MI	MI	MI	MI	x	HI	HI	HI	HI	HI	HI	HI
11	HI	HI	HI	HI	MI	HI	HI	MI	HI	MI	x	HI	HI	HI	HI	HI	HI
12	LI	LI	LI	LI	LI	MI	MI	LI	HI	LI	HI	x	HI	HI	HI	LI	LI
13	LI	LI	LI	LI	LI	MI	HI	LI	HI	LI	HI	HI	x	HI	HI	LI	MI
14	LI	HI	HI	LI	LI	HI	LI	LI	MI	LI	MI	HI	HI	x	HI	LI	LI
15	LI	MI	LI	LI	LI	LI	LI	LI	LI	LI	LI	LI	LI	LI	x	LI	LI
16	HI	HI	HI	HI	HI	HI	HI	HI	HI	HI	HI	HI	HI	HI	HI	x	HI
17	HI	HI	HI	HI	HI	HI	HI	HI	HI	HI	HI	HI	HI	HI	HI	HI	x

LI LOW IMPACT - MI MIDDLE IMPACT - HI HIGH IMPACT SOURCE: BASEL INSTITUTE OF COMMONS AND ECONOMICS 2018

This paper on the interactions and the impact among the SDGs started without a summary and any introduction. It is made to *visualize* and *quantify* phenomena within the SDG process since it has been launched in September 2015.

The author entered the process in December 2015 and since then is a member and contributor to various working groups on the SDGs that includes his contribution to the Inter Agency Expert Group (IAEG) on the SDG, the Global Sustainable Development Report (GSDR) 2019 and to the Inter Agency Task Force (IATF) on Financing for Development Report 2018.

The author welcomes comments and debates and regrets that in most of the SDG networks none of the two are supported. By counter the SDGs became reduced to few Goals in favour of donors and governments, as we can see in the following tables.

Table 3: Allocation of the SDGs by partnership sector

Priority Rank	Governments	Intergovernmental Organizations	Industry	Donors Philanthropy	ODA	Academia
1	17 Partnerships for the Goals	17 Partnerships for the Goals	3 Health and Well-Being	3 Health and Well-Being	2 Zero Hunger	17 Partnership for the Goals
2	4 Quality Education	8 Economic Growth	7 Clean Energy	4 Quality Education	3 Health and WB	13 Climate Action
3	7 Clean Energy	13 Climate Action	2 Zero Hunger	9 Infrastructure	6 Water	4 Quality Education
4	13 Climate Action	4 Quality Education	6 Water	6 Water	4 Quality Education	5 Gender Equality
5	9 Infrastructure	5 Gender Equality	9 Infrastructure	17 Partnership for the Goals	5 Gender Equality	12 Responsible Consumption

Source: Basel Institute of Commons and Economics

The high priority of Goals 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 13 roots from the agenda of the Official Development Assistance (ODA). While the share of ODA as a proportion of Gross National Income (GNI) is sub-Goal 17.2.1, supporting SDG 17 for OECD countries only means to replacing ODA by SDG. All sub-Goals of SDG 17 are in fact ensuring the superiority of the OECD countries that can easily provide “Dollar value of assistance provided to developing countries” (17.9.1) or “Fixed internet broadband subscriptions per 100 inhabitants” (17.6.2).

In theory nevertheless the indicator with the highest impact on all SDG of course would be 17.9.1. But the OECD countries are only willing to considering the current ODA and not as well the asset allocation in sovereign debt (\$ 12 tn new debt for the OECD countries) and the transaction costs for military (\$ 1.69 tn per year according to SIPRA)

For all SDG sub-indicators indicators please browse: <https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/metadata/>

For costs and transaction costs of the SDG please browse:

https://developmentfinance.un.org/sites/developmentfinance.un.org/files/IATF%202018_Basel%20Institute_input.pdf

As a result of the declaration of SDG 17 to being achieved by the existing ODA, no further or add-on funding for any of the SDGs is required. Although up to today almost zero new funding opportunities are created for the SDGs, the projects focus on the SDGs the donors and governments are willing to support:

Table 4: Allocation of UN SDG Partnerships for single Goals

Rank	Goal	Number of applicants
1	14 Life below Water	1584
2	8 Decent Work and Economic Growth	693
3	4 Quality Education	595
4	17 Partnerships for the SDGs	589
5	13 Climate Change	552
6	12 Sustainable Consumption	439
7	5 Gender Equality	432
15	16 Peace	222
17	10 Reduced Inequalities	152
		Total: 3798*

Source: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/partnerships/> Feb 2nd 2018

* including commitments for several Goals

In this exceptional allocation nevertheless the Ocean Conference 2016 has to be considered, where almost half of the 3798 commitments joined the UN SDG Partnerships.

To understand how UN SDG Partnership Projects work, have a look at the SDG project of the Basel Institute of Commons and Economics which is the World Social Capital Monitor:

<https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/partnership/?p=11706>

The project has been selected for the Goals 8, 10, 11 and 16 – and therefore drops outside the scope and agenda of all the partners for the SDG (see table 3). Therefore only IGO have some and unfortunately little interest in Goals 8, 10, 11 and 16. E.g. the World Bank joined the presentation of the World Social Capital Monitor at the Palais des Nations in Geneva and published a statement on the Social Dimension of the SDGs:

<http://blogs.worldbank.org/voices/forgotten-dimension-sdg-indicators-social-capital>

Conclusion

The idea, to mixing Sustainable Goals that are only normative benchmarks (that therefore can be enhanced by a few legal and compliance declarations) with crucial Global Goals such as to stopping Global Warming, to overcoming inequalities and to achieving peace, is in general a good way to supporting and to achieving the more challenging Goals as well.

They have been unconsidered unfortunately in the Millennium Goals of 2000 yet. (Thanks to Jeffrey Sachs)

Now Goal 1, 10, 16 and 17 (that includes to financing the SDGs) sail among the Armada of entirely outdated ODA agendas and their favoured SDG that allegedly *drive* the SDG process.

Unless these Global Goals have to sail in the broad wake of the donor's and governments favoured Goals, they have to wait until the wind divides the Armada and reaches the boats that need the fresh breeze so hard.

Without a dramatic increase of investment in the SDGs, estimates are up to \$ 5tn per year, and at the same time a dramatic decrease of transaction costs for military and the damages created by the OECD countries, the SDGs will end by Sweden and Norway confirming Switzerland and Germany to having met the Agenda 2030.

But that was not the intention.



The SDG Armada. First row: SDG 18 (Zero Action) leads together with Goal 4 (Quality Education) and Google.

Second row: the OECD, British Petrol and Goal 3 Health. Not in the picture: Goals 1, 10, 11, 16 and 17.