

University of Groningen

The SDGs and the Arctic: The need for polar indicators

Sköld, Peter; Baer, Kristina; Scheepstra, Adriana; Latola, Kirsi; Biebow, Nicole

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:

2018

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Sköld, P., Baer, K., Scheepstra, A., Latola, K., & Biebow, N. (2018). *The SDGs and the Arctic: The need for polar indicators*. Paper presented at Arctic Observing Summit 2018, Davos, Switzerland.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Arctic Observing Summit 2018

Statement on the Need for the Observing System: Societal Benefits – Long-Term Perspective delivered by EU-PolarNet

The SDGs and the Arctic: The need for polar indicators

Peter Sköld¹, Kristina C. Baer², Annette Scheepstra³, Kirsi Latola⁴, Nicole Biebow²

¹ Arctic Research Centre at Umeå University, SE-901 87 Umeå, Sweden

² Alfred Wegener Institute, Helmholtz Centre for Polar and Marine Research,
Am Handelshafen 12, DE-27570 Bremerhaven, Germany

³ University of Groningen, Arctic Centre, Aweg 30, PO Box 716, NL-9700 Groningen,
Netherlands

⁴ University of Oulu, Thule Institute, PO Box 7300, FI-90014, Finland

Corresponding author

Peter Sköld
Professor, Executive director, Arctic Research Centre at Umeå University,
SE-90187 Umeå, Sweden
Phone: +46 90 7866347
Email: peter.skold@umu.se

1 **The SDGs and the Arctic: The need for polar indicators**

2 **Introduction**

3 Our understanding of the Arctic rests to a great extent on the capacity to build long-term ob-
4 servations series. The overall aim of these scientifically based observations is to reach a sus-
5 tainable development that counter-acts the troublesome future scenario we foresee today.
6 While major drivers of climate change are found outside the Arctic, there is nevertheless a
7 strong need also for the four million people that live in the Arctic to act responsible in order to
8 create capacity for sustainable development. The UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)
9 offer an important framework for both guiding a sustainable development of the region, as well
10 as for improving existing and developing new observation and monitoring systems for the Arc-
11 tic. This allows an approach where the challenges, changes and the adaptation potential of
12 societies and the ecological systems can be well monitored.

13 The 17 goals and 169 targets of the SDGs are set up as an integrated and indivisible concept
14 to enable a global sustainable development (UN, 2015). They are unprecedented in scope and
15 significance (ibid.), however, this global approach has also been criticised as being top-down
16 and too focused on the belief that global problems can be solved on the level of governments
17 and international organisations (Hajer et al., 2015). In order to be relevant to specific contexts,
18 the goals and their targets would need to be scaled down from their global level (Burford et al.,
19 2013).

20 This especially holds true when applying the SDGs to the Arctic. The SDGs have “not been
21 produced with the Polar Regions in mind” (Sköld et al., 2018), which has led to discrepancies
22 to how well the SDGs, their targets and indicators apply to the High North. Due to this mis-
23 match, it is unlikely that pathways towards implementing the SDGs in the Arctic can effectively
24 be assessed and tracked (ibid.). Sköld et al. (2018:3) thus states that “[t]here is a dire need for
25 a suite of polar indicators that allow us to cross-reference to the SDGs while having the tool to

26 monitor change in the Polar Regions. Developing such a suite of polar indicators will neces-
27 sarily inform work on a post-2030 development agenda.” Further it is important to find the
28 prerequisites that will enable UN member states to address sustainable development issues
29 in their countries in a way that gives meaning to ‘nationally owned development’ (Adams,
30 2015:2).

31 **SDG indicators and the need to put them into context**

32 The 232 indicators of the SDGs can be regarded as a voluntary management tool to compre-
33 hend if sustainable development measures prove successful and if the SDGs are on track.
34 While the UN (2017a) has acknowledged that the indicators need to be adjusted to local needs
35 and priorities under involvement of stakeholders, the indicators are still criticized to be of little
36 relevance to local communities (Simon et al., 2016; Sköld et al., 2018). In the Arctic for exam-
37 ple, climate change especially affects indigenous peoples whose way of life, culture and iden-
38 tity are closely interwoven with the environment (Adger et al., 2012; Reid et al., 2014). Sus-
39 tainable development indicators should also monitor the “invisible” losses and changes that
40 are not directly measurable, but play an important role for individuals and communities, such
41 as culture, self-determination and wellbeing (Wolf et al., 2013:549).

42 Already in the development of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), the forerunner of
43 the SDGs, the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UN-PFII) raised its concern that
44 none of the available indicators were appropriate to measure the process of the MDGs in the
45 cultural context of indigenous peoples (UN-PFII, 2006; Burford et al., 2013). Sköld et al. (2018)
46 also point out that in the current SDGs no single indicator focusses on cultural wellbeing or on
47 the retention of ancestral languages. Further, the economic indicators do not pay account to
48 the importance of mixed and subsistence economies, while migration related indicators (10.7.1
49 and 10.7.2) are not applicable to the rapid population and demographic shifts in the Arctic
50 (ibid). Appropriate, context-relevant indicators are thus needed that integrate “all possible lev-
51 els of the polar social-ecological systems (including the atmosphere, cryosphere, hydrosphere,
52 biosphere and socio-cultural and politico-economic systems)” (Sköld et al., 2018:4).

53 **Suggested strategy**

54 This statement advocates developing a suite of polar indicators to assess the state of the so-
55 cial-ecological systems in the Arctic, and to create guidelines for sustainable monitoring and
56 regular assessments that track the progress on pathways towards a sustainable development.
57 This would improve disaster preparedness, the adaptive capacity of hard and soft infrastruc-
58 tures, address food, water and energy security, and sustainable economic development (Sköld
59 et al., 2018).

60 Various efforts are already working towards this goal: The Arctic Council Sustainable Devel-
61 opment Working Group for example proposed a suite of Arctic Social Indicators (ASI, 2014)
62 and the US National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration currently funds a project that
63 looks into possibilities for defining relevant indicators that assess biophysical changes in the
64 Arctic. These projects, however, represent fragmented and disconnected efforts. What is
65 needed is a comprehensive and integrated suite of polar indicators, which includes (1) relevant
66 elements from the biophysical, socio-cultural, and politico-economic environments, and (2) ac-
67 counts for their often coupled nature (Sköld et al., 2018).

68 When selecting appropriate indicators, it is necessary to compare the amount of data already
69 provided (and their potential use for assessing progress) with the cost of creating the neces-
70 sary soft infrastructure to collect the relevant data. It is also essential to co-produce the indica-
71 tors with scientific experts and stake- and right holders respectively and to validate their ap-
72 propriateness with local communities in the Arctic (Sköld et al., 2018).

73 Furthermore, these indicators are only useful if the relevant information is collected on sus-
74 tained, i.e. long-term, basis. This has been a problem for many small-scale research projects,
75 as they typically do not concern themselves with a sustained collection of information beyond
76 the project's duration. This was also a problem with the MDGs where 46% of the data needed

77 were not available for reporting at the end of 2015, and the challenge is apparent for the pre-
78 sent UNECE member countries to currently be able to produce data in support of SDG indica-
79 tors (Road map, 2017).

80 **The way forward**

81 We can conclude that accurate and relevant indicators for the Arctic need to be developed and
82 that sustained and feasible monitoring has to be ensured. This will enable us to observe
83 changes in the complex polar social-ecological systems on a long-term basis and to develop
84 meaningful sustainable development measures based on these observations (Sköld et al.,
85 2018). “Unless, we commit to this [initiative] now, we will miss a unique opportunity to be pre-
86 pared for the future in the Arctic, to build an informed post-2030 development agenda and to
87 link the SDGs to developments and change in the Arctic region.” (Sköld et al., 2018:4). In
88 developing relevant SDG indicators for the Arctic, we suggest the following steps:

- 89 • examination of the existing SDGs indicators' framework and seeing what indicators ap-
90 ply to the Arctic;
- 91 • examination of what other indicators for the Polar Regions have been used/proposed
92 in social science projects (e.g. Arctic Social Indicators, Arctic Human Development Re-
93 port, ECONOR); it would be equally essential to reach out to natural scientists and
94 representatives of indigenous and local communities for their input;
- 95 • estimation of how much data is collected for the current indicators. Even if this data
96 is stored in various forms, locations and institutions, such information could be a great
97 starting point to show the present knowledge about Polar Social and Environmental
98 Standards.

99 Finally, it is important to establish a relation to non-Arctic partners involved in implementing
100 the Agenda 2030, and specifically the use of the SDG indicators. There is a lot to be learned
101 from the work of others, both at regional and national levels, and vice versa the efforts in the
102 Arctic can add significant value to the progress in other regions (a joint discussion has already

103 been established with the Hindu Kush Himalaya Region). This efforts respond to the United
104 Nations, which urges

- 105 • “international organizations to base the global review on data produced by national
106 statistical systems and, if specific country data are not available for reliable estimation,
107 to consult with concerned countries to produce and validate modelled estimates before
108 publication”,
- 109 • “that communication and coordination among international organizations be enhanced
110 in order to avoid duplicate reports, ensure consistency of data and reduce response
111 burdens on countries”,
- 112 • “international organizations to provide the methodologies used to harmonize country
113 data for international comparability and produce estimates through transparent mech-
114 anisms” (United Nations, 2017b:3).

115 **Background**

116 This statement is based on the EU-PolarNet White Paper: The Road to the Desired States of
117 Social-Ecological Systems in the Polar Regions (Sköld et al., 2018), which was developed at
118 the EU-PolarNet white paper workshop. The objective of the workshop, which took place in
119 September 2017 in Spain, was to develop five white papers with topics of high interest to the
120 European society. It brought together thoroughly chosen international polar experts including
121 natural and social scientists, representatives of indigenous peoples and business representa-
122 tives.

123

124

125

126 **References**

- 127 Adger, W. N.; Huq, S.; Brown, K.; Conway, D.; and Hulme, M. 2003. Adaptation to climate
128 change in the developing world. *Progress in Development Studies* 3 (3), S. 179–195.
129 DOI: 10.1191/1464993403ps060oa.
- 130 Adams, B. 2015. SDG indicators and data: Who collects? Who reports? Who benefits?.
131 *Global Policy Watch* 2015:9.
- 132 ASI. 2014. Arctic Social Indicators II: Implementation. Larsen, J.N.; Schweitzer, P.; and Pet-
133 rov, A. (eds.). TemaNord. Nordic Council of Ministers, Copenhagen.
- 134 Burford, G.; Hoover, E.; Velasco, I.; Janoušková, S.; Jimenez, A.; Piggot, G.; Podger, D.; and
135 Harder, M.K. 2013. Bringing the “missing pillar” into Sustainable Development Goals.
136 Towards intersubjective values-based indicators. *Sustainability* 5 (7), S. 3035–3059.
137 DOI: 10.3390/su5073035.
- 138 Hajer, M.; Nilsson, M.; Raworth, K.; Bakker, P.; Berkhout, F.; de Boer, Y.; Rockström, Y.; et
139 al. 2015. Beyond Cockpitness. Four insights to enhance the transformative potential of
140 the Sustainable Development Goals. *Sustainability* 7 (2), S. 1651–1660. DOI:
141 10.3390/su7021651.
- 142 Reid, M.G.; Hamilton, C.; Reid, S.K.; Trousdale, W.; Hill, C.; Turner, N.; Picard, C.R., et al.
143 2014. Indigenous climate change adaptation planning using a values-focused approach.
144 A case study with the Gitga'at Nation. *Journal of Ethnobiology* 34 (3), S. 401–424. DOI:
145 10.2993/0278-0771-34.3.401.
- 146 Road map on statistics for Sustainable development goals. 2017. United Nations Economic
147 Commission for Europe. United Nations: New York and Geneva.
- 148 Simon, D.; Arfvidsson, H.; Anand, G.; Bazaz, A.; Fenna, G.; Foster, K.; Jain, G., et al. 2016.
149 Developing and testing the urban Sustainable Development Goal's targets and indica-
150 tors – a five-city study. *Environment and Urbanization* 28 (1), S. 49–63. DOI:
151 10.1177/0956247815619865.
- 152 Sköld, P.; Liggett, D.; Smieszek, M.; Staffansson, J.; Bastmeijer C. J.; Evengård, B.; Muir,
153 M.; Scheepstra, A.J.M.; and Latola, K., 2018. 'The Road to the Desired States of Social-

154 Ecological Systems in the Polar Regions'. EU-PolarNet White Paper.
155 Manuscript in preparation.

156 United Nations 2015. Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Develop-
157 ment. RES/70/1, Seventieth United Nations General Assembly.

158 United Nations 2017a. Report of the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on Sustainable Devel-
159 opment Goal. Indicators revised list of global Sustainable Development Goal indicators.
160 E/CN.3/2017/2. United Nations.

161 United Nations 2017b. Work of the Statistical Commission pertaining
162 to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. A/RES/71/313. United Nations.

163 UN-PFII, United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues 2006. Report on the fifth
164 session (15-26 May 2006). E/2006/43. United Nations Economic and Social Council. New
165 York (Official Records, Supplement No. 23).

166 Wolf, J.; Alice, I.; and Bell, T. 2013. Values, climate change, and implications for adaptation.
167 Evidence from two communities in Labrador, Canada. *Global Environmental Change* 23
168 (2), S. 548–562. DOI: 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2012.11.007.