



Global Social Policy in Achieving Sustainable Development Goals

*Dr.U.Sarangi**

**The author is an officer in Government of India, New Delhi*

ABSTRACT

The research paper entitled “*Global Social Policy in Achieving Sustainable Development Goals*” aims to study the concepts of universal health coverage(UHC), social protection floor approaches that determine the global health agenda. The paper also highlights certain aspects such as the role of WHO in determining the global health agenda, assessing inequalities in health systems of national economies and in adopting corrective measures to reduce them. The paper also dwells into the study of the role of various other global institutions such as United Nations, UNRISD, ILO, OECD, World Bank, IMF etc., which govern global social policy through various interventions such as the SDGs, sustainable development performance indicators, social solidarity enterprise(SSE), sustainable livelihoods framework, social value international’s social return on investment, financing SSE etc., The global issues that are covered at length include policy coherence to achieve UHC, persistent global inequities challenge the achievement of UHC, social protection floors(SPFs) as a strategy to address inequities i.e. universal social protection schemes & systems, policy coherence through whole-of-government approaches involving high-level policy coordination globally, nationally, sectorally and sub-nationally, achieving policy coherence and coordination, definition of SSE, initiatives linked to the SSE sector, evaluation of social usefulness, balance social, measuring impact as a burden for SSE organizations, standard global policy issue in times of COVID-19, achieving SDG-10 through Public Service Inclusion Strategies for Ethnic and Religious Minorities, global social policy formulation, social policy making process, global institutions, challenges facing global institutions in shaping global social policy and way forward among others. The paper analyzes the fact that National social policy is not only relevant but also helps in the design of global social policy. In order to evaluate the roles played by global institutions and their inter-linkages with that of global social policy, it is pertinent to look at how fair and amenable the national social policy is to global social policy. This means that as long as one can understand global social policy by looking at national social policy, one also can understand national social policy by looking at global social policy. The regional social policy also matters and has a vital role to play though not directly, but by influencing national social policy in the long run and need to be taken into account while assessing the role of national social policy in global governance. Therefore, the national, regional and global institutions are all interrelated and interdependent and in turn affect the global social policy in the long run.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 15 Jan 2021

Received in revised form 28 Feb 2021

Accepted 11 March 2021

Keywords: Global

Social Policy, UHC, SPF,
SSE, Policy Coherence

1.0 Introduction

Universal Health Coverage(UHC) has been discussed and analyzed for more than a decade by World Health Organization(WHO) in 2010 and remains high on the global health agenda, more specifically on account of the emergence of the global pandemic. This global pandemic is both a global health crisis and as well as a global humanitarian crisis. There is a need for focusing on policy coherence to achieve UHC at the global level with specific focus on social protection floor approach, given the present global pandemic which the global societies are reeling with. UHC aims to provide equitable access to quality care for all in need and to ensure financial risk protection in case of sickness so that the use of care does not create financial hardship. However, when striving towards UHC globally, many countries are challenged by these requirements. In fact, UHC is the basic requirement and lifeline of every economy/society at large. The various economies/societies across the world have been striving very hard to achieve the twin objectives of UHC and equitable societies. However, due to the unprecedented crisis, particularly the COVID-19 crisis which is the global humanitarian as well as global health crisis, the various economies, particularly the LDCs, SIDSs, Land locked and the African economies are really crippling to achieve the objectives of UHC.

2.0 Theoretical Background

(i) Persistent global inequities challenge the achievement of Universal health coverage (UHC)

Recent studies show large inequities in access to UHC, such as between rural and urban population. Globally, 56 percent of the rural population is excluded from health coverage as compared to 22 percent of the urban population. In addition, 52 percent of rural population is affected by health worker shortages, which limit their access to quality care as compared to 24 percent of urban population. Underfunding of health systems excludes 63 percent of the global rural and 33 percent of urban population, while out-of-pocket payments (OOP) exceed 40 percent for both global rural and urban population and impact mostly on the poor. As a result, inequities in maternal mortality are significant. The rural maternal mortality ratio (MMR) worldwide is double the urban MMR. Due to the persistence of global inequities achieving the UHC have posed a real challenge to the economies/societies at large worldwide and especially due to the COVID-19 crisis.

(ii) Role of Social Protection Floors (SPFs) as a strategy to address Inequities

SPFs work as a strategy to address inequities across economies/societies. Much can be done to address some of these issues within health systems, such as reducing OOP. However, other issues require broader policy frameworks to ensure sustainable progress towards UHC. This concerns closing funding gaps, creating jobs for health workers and addressing social determinants of health, such as poverty (*International Labour Organization [ILO], Report 2017: Pgs 25, 116, 148*). Sustainable progress in these and other social and political determinants of health (*WHO, 2008*) can only be achieved by applying coherent policies beyond health systems, particularly in relation to macroeconomic, fiscal and labor market policies. A comprehensive policy approach addressing the underlying links between the health, social, and economic sectors in the context of UHC provides the

framework for the SPF. Its objectives are two-fold viz; (i) ensuring equitable access to at least essential health care and (ii) addressing the often-neglected root causes of ill health, such as the lack of income and poverty of people at all ages. The main SPF strategies to achieve these objectives consist of developing the following:

- (a) **Universal social protection schemes and systems** including national health systems and programmes, and social assistance schemes that are based on inclusive national legislation that support people in poverty at any stage of the life cycle through services and social transfers. These include health and disability services, cash benefits for children and people at working age, as well as old-age pensions.
- (b) **Policy coherence** through whole-of-government approaches involving high-level policy coordination at multiple scales: globally, nationally, sectorally and sub-nationally. At national level, related priorities might be set by heads of governments and coordinated by Ministries of finance, health, labor and social welfare. Issues to be addressed are those that are rooted within and beyond the health and social sector and hamper the achievement of UHC and universal coverage in social protection.

3.0 SPFs Objectives and Linkages with SDGs

These objectives are reflected in various SDG targets, especially 1.3 (i.e. implement nationally appropriate social protection systems and measures for all including floors) and 3.8 (i.e. achieve UHC including financial risk protection). The main policy principles for establishing national SPFs are outlined in **ILO Recommendation 202 (R202)**. They incorporate key aspects of UHC, namely universality and equity in access to quality services for all in need. This requires social inclusion and non-discrimination whether against women, older persons, the poor, ethnic and other groups, though in SPFs, UHC is not limited to marginal or low-income groups, for example, the close-to-poor are covered by R202. This broad definition of universality is anchored in the rights-based approach requiring national legislation that covers the whole population and thus equal treatment of all.

SPFs should allow a life in dignity through access to a nationally defined set of goods and services for essential health care, including curative, preventive and maternal care, as well as basic income support for people at all ages, be they economically active or inactive. Essential health care should meet the criteria of availability, accessibility, acceptability and quality. This necessitates providing financial protection, covering OOP and ensuring access to acceptable quality care through an adequate number of well-trained health workers. Besides UHC, SPF policy principles require providing universal coverage for all social risks that have the potential to impoverish. Thus, basic income support should be accessible for all in need to alleviate poverty and support persons at risk due to lack of income or low income, for example, through paid sick leave.

Related social protection schemes and systems including health systems need to be closely coordinated and matched to achieve policy coherence in the area of social protection ensuring efficiency and effectiveness. This entails close monitoring, setting time frames for achievements and defining performance indicators for all social protection schemes and systems towards key issues,

such as progress in coverage rates, quality of services and adequacy of cash benefits.

Achieving UHC also requires policy coherence across multiple sectors. This concerns mainly Government Ministries and other administrative structures interacting with the health, social, economic and other sectors. SPF policies should focus on coordinating and aligning sectoral objectives and interventions with a view to achieving UHC, such as ensuring that human rights perspectives are systematically integrated in fiscal policies (OECD, 2020).

Furthermore, SPF policy principles include participation, such as social dialogue between governments, trade unions, employers and civil society in a broad sense, for example regarding health system reforms, financing and monitoring. Engaging stakeholders in political processes and decision making is an important component of SPFs as it is likely to result in sustainable solutions given the need to settle controversial policy questions.

Generating sufficient funds for UHC within the health sector involves assessing the pros and cons of financing mechanisms with a view to affordability at the individual and national level. Thus, they should be based on broad risk pools and related solidarity across the population. The main financing mechanisms are the following:

Tax-funded systems for health and income support, such as national health systems and social assistance schemes;

Contribution-based (payroll taxes) social insurance schemes, such as social health, old-age and unemployment insurances.

4.0 Achieving policy coherence and coordination

Applying these mechanisms at the national level requires creating a common agenda in all policies and thus strong policy coherence and coordination between health, social, and finance ministries to mobilize necessary resources, ensure solidarity and avoid financial hardship, including with respect to setting tax and contribution rates, tax evasion and corruption. Often, it is necessary to generate additional funds by creating fiscal space beyond the health and social sectors. Such policies might range from adopting enabling macroeconomic frameworks to support employment-generating growth, allowing acceptable levels of fiscal deficits, reallocating public expenditure or increasing tax revenues for highest incomes and/or harmful products such as alcohol and tobacco. Related funds should be used to develop, match and adjust health and social protection schemes towards UHC. This includes closing coverage gaps, providing quality services and income support, reducing OOP and developing infrastructure for those that are hardest to reach. Investments are also needed for health workforce developments. They should be supported by adequate labor market policies creating jobs and addressing decent work deficits that result in workforce shortages, such as low salaries, poor occupational health and safety and a lack of career perspectives. Such policies are mutually beneficial and reinforce positive health sector and labor market outcomes as they involve the

potential to develop health, social and economic returns in terms of lower poverty levels, higher employment rates and increasing productivity due to better population health.

Given the focus on policy coherence through whole-of-government approaches, generating political will is highly important for progress towards UHC. It requires aligning and involving stakeholders ranging from parliamentarians, public and private sector representatives, development partners and donors to civil society. Furthermore, it is important to build opportunities for political pressure, such as social/national dialogue and parliamentary task forces. Policy coherence and coordination also requires addressing technical challenges and administrative capabilities.

Many of these policies could be observed in Thailand, where UHC was achieved within the short period of just one decade despite reform efforts starting in unfavorable economic conditions of relatively low per capita income and a large informal economy in the aftermath of the Asian financial crisis. Thailand established comprehensive social protection schemes for the elderly, and today it provides pensions for more than 80 percent of older persons (*ILO, 2017: 87*). The sustainable progress is based on reforms that involved the highest levels of political commitment including from Parliament, policy coherence and an engaged civil society in policy design and implementation (*Evans et al., 2012*).

In summary, achieving and maintaining UHC is largely supported and sustained by ensuring policy coherence through SPF strategies. In this way, key issues can be addressed, such as equity, affordability and availability of quality services both within and beyond the health sector. The experience of Thailand shows that sustainable progress can be achieved, and many expectations of the population matched, even if challenges remain. However, the broader achievements of SPF strategies lie beyond the health, social and economic sectors and they consist in delivering the environment needed for achieving the SDGs and protecting fundamental elements of society, namely social stability, peace and security. This would in turn, help in achieving the SDGs slated by the United Nations by 2030.

5.0 UNRISD and Sustainable Development Performance Indicators

The UNRISD is an umbrella organization of United Nations dealing with research project on 'Sustainable Development Performance Indicators' which seeks to contribute to assessing and improving methodologies and indicator systems that measure and evaluate the performance of a broad range of economic entities in relation to the vision and goals of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. It assesses the adequacy of existing methods and systems for gauging the contribution of enterprises to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), seeks to expand the scope of sustainability measurement, disclosure and reporting beyond for-profit enterprises to encompass enterprises and organizations that make up the social and solidarity economy (SSE); identifies data points and indicators related to SSE that may inform conventional approaches to sustainability measurement associated with for-profit enterprises; and proposes and tests a set of sustainable development impact indicators that can address key sustainable development challenges of the early 21st century.

The last decade has seen a growing interest in the measurement of the impact and

performance of social and solidarity economy (SSE) organizations. This has been fuelled, among other things, by the rapid growth of the importance given to social enterprise, social entrepreneurship and impact investing in recent years. The United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD) as part of its Sustainable Development Performance Indicators project, attempts to review the methodologies, metrics and indicators implemented in the SSE today. Based on a review of the existing literature, it presents a selection of assessment tools and indicators that have been applied to SSE and so-called blended value enterprises since the 1990s.

6.0 Review of Literature

In recent years, influential authors have argued that there are two predominant trends in the field of social impact assessment (*Reisman et al. 2015; Vo and Christie 2018*). The first and oldest is rooted in the field of evaluation as developed and adopted by government, philanthropic and non-profit organizations. The second and more recent trend is linked to approaches of social impact measurement that are closer to the market-oriented needs and practices of social enterprises and impact investing organizations.

Many literature reviews focusing on the second trend have been conducted over the last decade (*Dufour 2015; Grieco, Michellini, and Lasevoli 2015; Maas and Liket 2011; Olsen and Galimidi 2008; Simsa et al. 2014*). Together, they have identified close to one hundred different frameworks, tools and methodologies currently in use internationally. The diversity and fragmentation of these numerous initiatives are identified as a problem both for SSE organizations as well as for funders. In order to reduce this “noise” and impose some coherence on the approaches currently used, the focus is only on a few initiatives judged more relevant because they either i) are widely used among a significant number of organizations around the world or ii) appear especially promising and innovative with regard to UNRISD SDPI Project’s specific objectives.

7.0 Definition of SSE

The exact definition of SSE can vary based on geographic and institutional contexts. The social and solidarity economy (SSE) refers to the production of goods and services by a broad range of organizations and enterprises that have explicit social and often environmental objectives, and are guided by principles and practices of cooperation, solidarity, ethics and democratic self-management. The field of SSE includes cooperatives and other forms of social enterprise, self-help groups, community-based organizations, associations of informal economy workers, service-provisioning NGOs, solidarity finance schemes, amongst others. (*UN Inter-Agency Task Force on Social and Solidarity Economy, 2014*).

8.0 Research Method

Some of the key approaches considered in this research study include: the theory of change; the social accounting, reporting and auditing streams; various tools developed by the cooperative sector; the concept of “utilité sociale” (social usefulness) elaborated in France; the Sustainable

Livelihoods framework; the Social return on investment (SROI) method; the IRIS bank of indicators; the impact assessment system developed by B Lab; and the principles advocated by the Impact Management Project. Specific attention is given to the origin and diffusion of these approaches, the role indicators may play in assessing the contribution of SSE to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and other key issues related to the field.

This research study also reviews the methodologies, metrics and indicators implemented in the SSE at a micro level, that is, focusing on the impact of a specific organization to evaluate the compliance of their activity with their stated objectives. Many of these enterprises are not considered part of the SSE but have moved beyond the traditional boundaries of private enterprise and the priority of profitability, to include broader social, environmental and governance objectives. The measurement tools designated specifically for the SSE are evolving and until recently, reporting complied, in most cases, with funding imperatives, accounting practices and available tools drawn from private enterprise and non-profit organizations, among others. Exceptions to this exist and have been very influential in expanding the measurement criteria applied to SSE enterprises and organizations to better reflect their objectives.

The research study assesses the extent to which existing methods and innovations effectively address these dimensions. Can the measurement and evaluation of enterprise performance move beyond a triple-bottom line approach aimed at reducing negative impacts or enhancing the efficiency of existing systems to a “transformational” approach? Are recent innovations playing a constructive role in this regard? (*UNRISD 2018*).

In September 2018, UNRISD commenced a four-year project to assess and improve methodologies and indicator systems that measure and evaluate the performance of a broad range of economic entities in relation to the transformative vision and goals of the 2030 Agenda. These entities include the private sector and the enterprises and organizations that make up the Social and Solidarity Economy (SSE).

Among other initiatives, metrics have been developed for impact investing by the GIIN (Global Impact Investing Network) to assure investors that multiple impact objectives are being met in addition to generating financial returns on their investment. Impact measures are selected from an array of criteria by the parties concerned. These are not standardized, for the most part. Hybrid enterprises and organizations and a growing capital market seeking multiple returns have expanded the goals of traditional private sector and financial markets.

Social return on investment (SROI) is a framework designed to analyze social, economic and environmental impacts. It consists of measuring the changes that can be attributed to a specific intervention and then ascribe a monetary value. This process allows a shared understanding of the benefits, that is, their comparison on the basis of a common unit of value. However, guidance on the use and application of SROI usually advises against the comparison of return on investments ratios derived from different fields or projects.

The method was first developed in the late 1990s by the Roberts Enterprise Development Fund, in

California, with Harvard Professor Jed Emerson (*Zappalà and Lyons 2009, 14*). The method was then popularized in the UK, first by the New Economics Foundation and eventually by the UK Government. It progressively spread throughout the world with the successful efforts of a large international SROI network. That network eventually merged with the Social Impact Analysts Association (SIAA) and became Social Value International in the spring of 2015 (Social Value International 2015).

Carrying out an SROI analysis involves six stages:

- (i) Establishing scope and identifying key stakeholders.
- (ii) Mapping outcomes.
- (iii) Evidencing outcomes and giving them a value.
- (iv) Establishing impact.
- (v) Calculating the SROI.
- (vi) Reporting, using and embedding.

There is no specific list of indicators for SROI. Similar to the theory of change or cost-benefit analysis, both of which influenced the development of the SROI method, it begins with the organization's objectives and involves the selection of adapted indicators. As a matter of fact, an important part of the "craft" of conducting SROI is to find adequate indicators and proxies. Commonly used proxies can be found in different sectors that apply SROI indicators and may be applied and/or adapted for specific organizations. Others are more generally applicable across sectors.

SROI is a very influential method in terms of assessing social value. Social Value UK collected over 800 reports and case studies using this method around the world (*Social Value UK 2018*). SROI also has been the target of many criticisms, notably because the chosen monetary values are often based on subjective estimates (*Maier et al. 2014, 21–22*) and, at a more fundamental level, the method assumes social benefits that are not traded on the market should indeed be given a monetary value (*Mertens, Xhaufclair, and Marée 2015*).

9.0 United Nations 2030 Agenda to achieve Social Solidarity Enterprise(SSE)

The UN 2030 Agenda presents a "transformational vision" which not only aims to minimize the social and environmental costs of growth but also address (i) the structural underpinnings of unsustainable and exclusionary development related to inequality, high carbon growth and imbalances in power relations and governance systems; (ii) the impact of digitalization and artificial intelligence on employment and the world of work; (iii) the importance of decent work; and iv) resilience in contexts of recurring shocks associated with financial crises and climate change.

Policy makers and international organizations are paying far greater attention to the role of SSE enterprises and organizations in inclusive and sustainable development. This interest derives largely from perceived attributes related to employment generation, the provision of affordable social services, the SDG principle of "leaving no one behind", democratic governance, women's economic empowerment and the growing number of youths committed to the SSE as a model of socio-

economic development and transformation. Much of the evidence related to SSE performance, however, remains anecdotal or assumes that the same yardsticks used to measure corporate sustainability performance or conventional forms of investment can or should be applied to SSE. Undifferentiated social impact measurement measures are increasingly applied to SSE enterprises and organizations. Moreover, important characteristics of many types of SSE organizations, for example, in the production of goods (and not only services), or the role of collective action in economic and political empowerment, are often ignored.

It is worth noting that the rapid growth of the importance given to social enterprise, social entrepreneurship and its impact investing in recent years. The landscape is complex. In many cases, social enterprises are largely associated with work insertion; in other cases, they primarily provide services. In still others, they produce goods and/or services but are defined by their social and/or environmental goals. Questions regarding disengagement by government, privatization and contracting out arise in certain contexts, particularly for those social enterprises selling services previously provided by the public sector. The confluence of these new business models and forms of investment with the SSE is noteworthy, as it marks a departure from traditional ways of doing business. Therefore, SSE today must be situated in this context. Most important, however, is the growing pressure to develop social impact indicators often requiring the quantification and/or monetization of social activities and goals, in many cases. As social enterprise and impact investing and other hybrid forms of doing business assume the role of service provider, this presents challenges, including the increased risk of losing investors and/or funders, should targets not be met because they are inherently complex and cannot be subject to homogenous criteria, timelines, and so on.

Impact investing, a term that was first coined in 2007 by the Rockefeller Foundation to describe direct investment in enterprises/initiatives/organizations pursuing blended value objectives to solve some of the world's most pressing challenges, has grown exponentially since, generating a global market. It is pertinent to note that there is a long history of social and ethical banking and a more recent history of social finance that predate the current surge in impact investing and apply hybrid lending and investing criteria. Today's trends include venture philanthropy as foundations increasingly participate in the impact investing market.

An additional confluence is what may be called the parallel development of numerous macro indicators and indexes in response to the well-known limitations of GDP. The Stiglitz-Sen-Fitoussi Commission, established in 2008, marked a critical turning point in that regard (*Stiglitz, Sen, and Fitoussi 2009*). However, the call to evaluate and measure progress "beyond GDP" has generated debates and new indicators over several decades. To name a few recent examples such as the "Genuine Progress Indicator", the Social Progress Index, the Better Life Index. Recent publications by the OECD demonstrate some of the progress that has been made in that regard.

In recent years, the demand for systems of measurement and indicators that could more rigorously assess and demonstrate SSE's contribution to social and environmental objectives such as the

SDGs has grown, to some extent because of the forces noted above but also because of the growth of SSE itself and its historically rooted objectives. And so, enterprises and organizations in the SSE are increasingly obliged to apply social impact measurement, drawing upon methodologies established over several decades in various fields such as program evaluation, environmental and social impact assessment, social audit, reporting and accounting, international aid, philanthropy and impact investing, among others (*Bouchard 2009; Salathé-Beaulieu 2018*). The incentive comes both from the SSE organizations themselves wishing to assess their effectiveness in meeting their goals as well as from funders and investors requiring these assessments.

This study identifies numerous tools to measure the impact and performance of social and solidarity economy organizations. It also addresses what role indicators may play in determining the contribution of SSEs to the SDGs.

10.0 Key initiatives related to Social Impact Measurement and the SSE Sector

The key initiatives are viz;

- a) initiatives developed mostly for the specific needs of SSE organizations themselves;
- b) initiatives developed mostly for the needs of private social enterprises and organizations financing them.

Social and solidarity economy organizations, by their nature, have always tried to achieve social and environmental objectives. Various initiatives assessing their progress towards these objectives, although likely to be considered on the fringe when compared to assessment and reporting initiatives, have existed for decades. The entire field of social accounting, reporting and auditing (3.2.1), is a good example of this long tradition. The cooperative world, in particular, has relied on this framework to assess its performance and adherence to essential principles (3.2.2). In France, the evaluation of *utilité sociale* (social usefulness) also has a long tradition (3.2.3) while SSE networks in Spain are currently developing their own tool, the Balance Social (3.2.4). Finally, the Sustainable livelihoods framework offers interesting insights for assessing poverty reduction related strategies (3.2.5).

11.0 Evaluation of *utilité sociale*(social usefulness)

The notion of *utilité sociale* (social usefulness) was developed in France to distinguish activities that are primarily beneficial to society as whole from those that are beneficial to individuals or specific groups. According to *Rodet (2008)*, the concept of *utilité sociale* was also developed to justify public subsidies in certain instances. The evaluation of *utilité sociale* does not refer to a specific method but rather to an approach to the assessment of “social value”.

An important feature of *utilité sociale* is its resolutely constructivist stance. Social value is constructed and collectively defined by actors, rather than assessed from an external and “objective” point of view. Stakeholders are not merely consulted or included in the discussion; they determine what has social value. *Utilité sociale* evaluation is therefore a political project (*Gadrey 2005*), designed to identify the

added value SSE contributes to its community compared to conventional private sector activities (*Branger et al. 2014*).

12.0 Balance Social

The “Balance Social” is an evaluation tool mostly applied to SSE organizations in Spain. It was initially designed by the Xarxa d’Economia Solidària (XES) around 2007 (Alquézar Crusellas and Suriñach Padilla 2019). First designed in Catalan, it is becoming increasingly popular in Spain and was translated to Spanish, Basque and Galician. In 2018, about 200 enterprises in Catalunya and 450 in all in Spain were using it (*XES 2019*).

The basic version of the questionnaire covers around 50 indicators divided in various sections such as financial aspects, democracy, environmental sustainability, social commitment and labor conditions. The complete version covers the same sections but contains about 100 indicators (*XES 2018, 8*).

13.0 Sustainable Livelihoods Framework

The sustainable livelihoods framework is meant to be a “holistic, asset-based framework for understanding poverty and the work of poverty reduction” developed in the 1990s by *Chambers & Conway (1992)* and adapted by UK’s Department for International Development (DFID).

This approach is mostly used in a development context, although there are instances of its use in developed countries as well. It was not designed to assess an organization’s specific extra-financial performance from a micro perspective, but it has been done on some occasions.

It was specifically designed to assess the progress and results of an intervention aimed at reducing poverty and developing “human capital”. It is people-centered and makes connections between the specific resources an individual has (micro) and the larger context in which he or she lives (macro) (*GLOPP 2008*).

The notion of livelihood is directly connected to the idea of sustainability:

A livelihood comprises the capabilities, assets and activities required for a means of living. A livelihood is sustainable when it can cope with and recover from stresses and shocks and maintain or enhance its capabilities and assets both now and in the future, while not undermining the natural resource base (*DFID 1999*).

Key elements of the Sustainable livelihoods framework (SLF) include:

- (i) vulnerability context – characteristics and risks within the person’s environment ;
- (ii) livelihood assets—the person’s specific assets categorized under human, social, natural, physical and financial capital;
- (iii) policies, institutions and processes influencing the person’s context and assets;
- (iv) livelihood strategies—activities undertaken by the person to achieve their livelihood

goals;

- (v) livelihood outcomes—the results of these activities such as increase in income, well-being, food security, etc.

A counter movement that addresses systems change from a macro perspective is led by UNEP, which calls for an “impact-focused ecosystem” involving all stakeholders. “It’s time for the growing impact movement to accelerate more coordination and collaboration between stakeholders”, underscoring the inability to achieve SDGs in isolation. Impact analysis ought to focus on how to move the entire economy forward, on systemic objectives, involving all levels of government and social and economic actors, without which transformation is not possible (*UNEP Finance Initiative 2018*). Emerging issues identified by UNEP include justice, integrity and security of persons and strong institutions and stability beyond those generally included in social impact measurement.

The enabling role of government has been at the heart of the SSE in many contexts as well as the co-design of public policy by government and SSE organizations or networks (*Mendell and Alain 2015*). This is missing in the social impact discourse that can more easily be read as corresponding with disengagement by government. The call for systems analysis brings back the critical role of government.

14.0 Key Findings

14.1 Measuring impact as a burden for SSE organizations

The interest in the assessment of social performance and impact is rooted in several trends viz.;

- Governments, under financial constraints and inspired by new public management, increasingly want to allocate funds efficiently and generate measurable and tangible results. They therefore ask the organizations they partner with for this type of information, potentially making it a condition of funding.
- Foundations and impact investors, inspired by a similar trend, also want the best “value for money” and seek impact and performance data to maximize the social impact of their investments. Increasingly, small donors and the general public are also sensitive to those issues.
- Corporations, social enterprises and eventually SSE increasingly see either a necessity to conform to these expectations or a market advantage in becoming a leader in the field.

When done for the purpose of understanding, improving, communicating and eventually maximizing impact, social impact assessment can be desirable for SSE organizations, their stakeholders and society.

When these practices are imposed upon SSE organizations, they can become counterproductive. The imposition of such practices could be the result of a lack of knowledge or comprehension of the realities of social and environmental challenges, namely the importance of underlying local contexts. There is also a deep cultural divide that informs the pressure by investors and funders of

civil society enterprises and organizations to professionalize their practices by importing certain management techniques. It also ensues from the misunderstanding that money, management and measurement, though necessary, are not sufficient to solve deeply rooted social and environmental issues. The tendency to privatize the public good, often at the cost of not exploring innovative partnerships between the private, public and growing number of businesses with a social purpose, whatever form they take, also presents a risk.

As expectations increase, the burden becomes greater for every social purpose organization and especially for the smaller ones that do not have the resources to carry out the assessments required.

15.0 Financing SSE: Learning from past experiences

The recognition of the contribution of SSE to the 2030 SDGs is growing. The pioneering work of institutions engaged in social finance committed to the transformation of the lives of people and communities and their endogenous assessment tools provide invaluable examples for today's concern with social impact indicators. There is, however, a tendency to overlook what has existed, what has worked, how these can be adapted today, and so on.

As impact investing, for example, and the wide-ranging hybrid enterprises captured by the term "social enterprise" grow and assume a greater presence and role in the economy and in society, pressure to evaluate their activities should yield to pressure to better understand their diversity and complexity. Even those initially championing impact investing by foundations now argue for a combination of donations and investing. The need for credit enhancements without which organizations and enterprises cannot leverage capital and decrease their vulnerability remains, thus nuancing the trend by foundations to increase the use of their mission related investing portfolios, for example, to replace donations. Situations often require a combination of both.

The call for "private capital for social good" is fuelling the impact investment market and the demand for social impact measurement, onboarding private investors, foundations, pension funds, etc. In some cases, pay for performance or evidence-based funding is driving government decisions to co-finance initiatives and programs with private partners that demonstrate or promise impact. While this conforms with government retrenchment more generally, in fact, it does not necessarily result in a reduction in public spending in the short run, as it entails high transaction costs (*Pandey et al. 2018*), nor in the long run, as increase in performance is not maintained once financial incentives disappear (*Campbell et al. 2009*). Instead of investing in the public good, governments repay the initial investment, reward private investors with attractive rates of return and assume the many overhead and management costs associated with the pay for performance initiative. This raises many issues. What is important to note, however, is the transfer of public commitment to private interests and the concomitant need for evaluation tools and indicators that comply with investor expectations, which can lead to negative side-effects on service providers, operations and outcomes (*Edmiston & Nicholls 2018*).

SSE is a variegated landscape ranging from the informal, popular or solidarity economy to collectively owned enterprises producing goods and services in all sectors. There is no clear demarcation of market and non-market activity in the SSE. Too often, SSE is narrowly associated with social service provision or work insertion, missing its vision and mission to democratize the economy.

Mapping the SSE internationally reveals the numerous initiatives, organizations, enterprises committed to social, environmental and economic transformation, to capacity building of people and communities to achieve these goals. It is committed to democratic governance and participatory decision making.

16.0 Policy Issues : Standard Global Social Policy issue in times of COVID-19

The Corona pandemic adds another layer of complexity alongside a serious communicable disease, and policy responses that bring immense economic and social costs, as there are challenges to global human solidarity revealed in actions from the distrust of migrants to attacks on the WHO. Thus, the crises of the past decades now merge in unprecedented ways (*Bozorgmehr et al., 2020b*). Collapsing healthcare systems and a stronger focus on the national state and domestic population are more likely to throw us back than move forward in the search for better and more just ways of realizing human rights to health for everyone. The medium and long-term consequences for official development aid, extra-budgetary contributions to the work of international organizations and remittances remain to be seen the deeper the economic crisis that emerges from the COVID-19 responses, the higher the chance that development aid will decline as donor countries struggle with the impact of the crisis measures. While in the initial stages, there was still some international sense that ‘nobody was responsible for causing the crisis’ justifying higher levels of solidarity, this has to some extent shifted to a discourse of blame whether for the origins of the virus in China or towards WHO for their management of the crisis. Currently, one does not observe convincing global approaches to address this truly global crisis.

The remittances are projected to decline sharply, according to a World Bank brief as many migrant workers have lost jobs or face decreasing incomes among other things (*Ratha et al., 2020*). These impacts will all add further to continuing trends of rising global inequality reported in ‘*Global Social Policy Digest*’; the latest issues of a number of reports viz; United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Human Development Report, the International Labour Organization (ILO), World Employment and Social Outlook, United Nations Department of Social Affairs (UNDESA) World Social Report among other voices all speak to this trend, and that was even before COVID-19 entered the picture.

Whether the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) will still have a chance to guide more than health and social crisis management at the most basic level remains to be seen. The challenges of this ambitious development agenda is the subject of an edited collection by *Dalby et al. (2019)* that

discusses global governance for achieving the SDGs. However, given the diverse perspectives and different SDGs, primarily it is observed that ‘there are no easy answers as to how to improve global governance to accomplish the SDGs’, and that there is still a long and hard way to go to realize truly transformative changes. One of the international organizations promoting social justice, including advocacy for redistributive mechanisms, is the ILO thoroughly discussed in *Maul’s (2019), ‘The International Labour Organization: 100 Years of Global Social Policy’*, Maul illustrates how the ILO has attempted to create ‘global social policy’ and explores how it has sought to influence global social policy discourses. Furthermore, it also studies the practical contributions of the ILO for improving working conditions and promoting social policies. Last, but not least, structural differences and historical legacies remain an important element shaping any country’s abilities to introduce social protection mechanisms with or without crisis situations.

17.0 Global Social Policy Formulation

Global social policy formation and implementation has never been more important in our history than it is at this moment. The world in recent decades has metamorphosed into a global village. As part of a large body of the United Nations, bad policies in developing countries not only impact these countries negatively, a multiplying effect of this situation also negatively impact developed nations. Consequently, we have to mitigate against lopsided development around the world. Migration influxes from third world countries to developed countries, increase in poverty, increase in crime rates, etc. are some of the problems we face if we do not act in unison. The aim is to propose a pragmatic public policy model that would encourage Western countries, “the global North” to actively take part in the process of policy formation and execution through international bodies like the G7, UNESCO, UNICEF, UNFPA, etc.

18.0 Social Policy making process

The ways social policies are formed depend on some factors which include how national government responds to the demands of transnational and other knowledge-based organization (*Hulme and Hulme, 2008*). Policy process is much more a political art rather than rational science. It is not a linear and straight forward process as *Hogwood and Gun (1984)* states. To Hogwood and Gun (1984) the policy process involves five stages namely identification of problems, formulation, legitimation, implementation and evaluation. The policy process is not a reality but an ideal as argued by *Bridgman and Davis (2003)* where they identified eight stages of policy cycle. This includes identification of issues, policy analysis, policy instruments, consultation, coordination, decision, implementation and evaluation.

19.0 Achieving SDG 10 : A Global Review of Public Service Inclusion Strategies for Ethnic and Religious Minorities

Social inequalities are intensifying globally and widening divisions are linked to civil unrest. Disadvantaged ethnic and religious groups experience poor access to, representation in and outcomes from public services such as healthcare and education. As mechanisms for social participation and

citizenship, public services are key to inclusive and sustainable societies.

The focus is on four public service areas: education, health, local government and police services and identify evidence gaps. The overall aim is to raise awareness and provoke debate, reflection and subsequently action towards the inclusion of disadvantaged ethnic and religious minorities within public services. Social exclusion is a global challenge which cuts across the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) that have guided the global development agenda since January 2016 and that promote an agenda for more inclusive societies. Goals 1, 4, 5 and 10 focus on eradicating poverty, equitable quality education, gender equality and reduced inequalities respectively. Furthermore, aspirations for universal access to essential services (for example, health and education) and the alleviation of poverty and hunger (Goal 1) all underline the importance of equity as a key aspect of this agenda for sustainable development.

The SDGs were developed in the context of growing acknowledgement that social inequalities are intensifying within countries and globally (*Sachs 2012*) and that sustainable development, particularly within low and middle-income countries (LMICs) can only be ensured through equity (*Das et al. 2013*). Failure to reverse inequities during periods of rapid economic growth has led to widening divisions between rich and poor and between diverse ethnic and religious population, often leading to civil unrest. Social sustainability is therefore a key national and international policy priority, which shapes economic sustainability through the inclusion of all population groups in development initiatives and in access to public services, regardless of gender, age, religion or ethnicity.

Progressive universalism is a key principle of the SDGs, encapsulated in the words: “no one will be left behind and we will endeavor to reach the furthest behind first.” The need for rigorous evidence disaggregated by “race, ethnicity, migration status and geographic location” among other relevant characteristics has been highlighted as essential in achieving this principle (*United Nations 2015a*). In practice, the focus in this respect has, for the most part, centred on poverty, women and young people, however, and discussions of SDG 1 and 10 have paid little in-depth attention to ethnic and religious exclusion despite the overrepresentation of ethnic and religious minorities among the poorest communities (*Ostry et al. 2014; Roser and Ortiz-Ospina 2018*). Intersectionality, that is, the experience of exclusion at multiple levels, as experienced by women, young people and migrants from minority, ethnic and religious groups, has received little attention in studies on gender, age and migration (*World Bank 2012; Shah et al. 2015*) and within the SDG monitoring framework (Sustainable Development Solutions Network 2015). Yet, it could be argued that inter-sectionality is a key concept for interpretations of SDG 10, given that poverty, youth and gender are specifically addressed in Goals 1, 4 and 5.

20.0 Global Institutions of Importance : Global Institutions and Global Governance

The global institutions are established international organizations for the ordered pattern of the world. One need to understand what “institutions” means to understand the concept of global institutions. There are many definitions of institutions (*Young, 1986; Keohane, 1989; Hodgson,*

2006) but one thing that is common to all of them is that institutions are established patterns of social relationship which direct and shape the activities of its members. Institutions can also be viewed as meeting needs and providing solutions to problems. The institutions that would be kept in mind are the global institutions whose space goes beyond national borders. It is important to distinguish global institutions or international organizations based on their level of governance. Based on this, there are “international governmental organizations (IGO)” and “International non-governmental organizations (INGO)” (Yeates, 2012).

Deacon and Stubbs (2013) stated that the presence of global structures and actors in shaping national social policy and the patterns of 3Rs (Redistribution, Regulation and Rights) of global social policy, therefore shows the depth of global social policy. They note that the focus on global social policy is not to downgrade national social policy but a way to understand the contribution of global players on national social policy. For instance, global context has been adapted to diverse national contexts in terms of promoting human welfare, rights and capabilities especially in order to attain “human development paradigm” (Alkire, 2010). In shaping global social policy, it is not only the global institutions like the UN, World Bank and so on those do this, but there are still some organizations that are extension of national organization that perform this role. These include consultants, INGO experts, think-tankers, policy entrepreneur, global knowledge elites and so on (Deacon and Stubbs, 2013).

Yeates (2007) elaborated on the impact of globalization in questioning the national frame of social policy. He argued that the national framing of social policy makes us to think of social policy as something that took place within the national space without reference to global surroundings or association with other countries or learning from other countries. It is therefore not appropriate to remove wider global geo-political order from national social policy (Yeates, 2007).

21.0 Challenges facing global institutions in shaping global social policy

There are a lot of challenges facing global institutions in shaping global social policy. One of these is that they lack centralized government to carry out its obligations worldwide which made the achievement of their objectives difficult (Yeates, 2012). Unlike, the national government with a specified boundary and shape, global institutions lack this. This makes it difficult to discharge their duties. They also lack independent revenue raising power and are mainly dependent on members for survival (Yeates, 2012). This dependency on members has implications on their policy making role. The major donors like the United States and United Kingdom are likely going to influence the policy of the global institution like UN to favor their national social policies.

Based on the challenges facing these global institutions, people have argued that new global institutions are needed (Yeates, 2008a). Either we need new institutions or not, what need to be done is that the powerful nations should be fair in their dealings with less powerful ones.

22.0 Findings and the Way Forward

Based on the perceived influence of global institutions in the social policy making process, providing them independent source of funding perhaps from global taxes could strengthen them in the discharge of their duties. This will also reduce the extent to which some nations will control them to pursue their own selfish interests. Also, people working in the global institutions should reflect global status by ensuring that every region or possibly every country has representative in the global institution like the United Nations (UN) for instance.

There is the need for the enablement of easy participation in these global institutions of Global South by the Global North. This is based on the perceived power of Global North to influence policy of Global institutions. This power can also be used to make sure that policies are favorable to the Global South and developing countries as well.

Another proposal is to change the international financial system i.e. private and public towards developmental goals, by restricting short-term capital flight, enabling the access of low income countries to medium-term capital via better access to bond markets or conversion of the IMF into a development fund, reducing the debt burden of countries, and ensuring that aid supports human well-being (*White, 2001; Stiglitz, 2002*).

Conclusion and Policy Implications

Global institutions play a significant role in the social policy making process. They shape and coordinate the affairs of national social policy by showing that power and politics still matter. This is because some countries like the United States and the United Kingdom are able to influence the social policy of global institutions by virtue of their strong economic power. This does not mean that national social policy is irrelevant. National social policy is not only relevant but also helps in the design of global social policy. In order to evaluate the roles played by global institutions, it is pertinent to look at how fair the national social policy is to global social policy. This means that as long as one can understand global social policy by looking at national social policy, one can also understand national social policy by looking at global social policy. The regional social policy also matters and it affects the global social policy through national social policy in the long run and cannot be sidelined. Therefore, the national, regional and global institutions are all interrelated and interdependent which in turn affect global social policy and global governance.

Although, globalization is the major reason for global social policy studies the current form of globalization is under serious attack because of its perceived problems of creating inequality especially between the Global North and Global South. There is the need to make the formulation of social policies that are compassionate and have a human face. In fact, there need to be collective responsibility for the mitigation of inequality inherent from globalization, and global governance should aim at win-win outcome through adoption of global social policy.

References

1. Achieving SDG 10 : A Global Review of Public Service Inclusion Strategies for Ethnic and Religious Minorities, UNRISD(United Nations Research Institute for Social Development), Occasional Paper, January 2020.
2. How to introduce a 'Standard Global Social Policy issue in times of COVID-19; Alexandra Kaasch, Bielefeld University, Germany, Global Social Policy, 2020 Vol.20(2) pg 137-142, SAGE Publications.
3. Focusing on Policy Coherence to achieve UHC : The Social Protection Floor approach ; Xenia Scheil-Adlung, Global Social Policy 2020 Vol. 20(2) pg 225-230, Health Law Institute, Switzerland, SAGE Publications.
4. Measuring Corporate Sustainability Towards Accounting Fit for the SDGs, UNRISD, April, 2020.
5. Protecting and Supporting Vulnerable Groups Through the COVID-19 Crisis, UNRISD Survey Report July, 2020.
6. Implementing the Sustainable Development Goals: What Role for Social and Solidarity Economy ? UNTFSSSE International Conference, UN Inter-Agency Task Force on Social and Solidarity Economy, TFSSE, October 2019.
7. Sustainable Development Impact Indicators for Social and Solidarity Economy (State of the Art); Working Paper 2019-4, UNRISD, October, 2019, Gabriel Salathe-Beaulieu & Marie J.Bouchard and Marguerite Mendell prepared for the UNRISD Project Sustainable Development Indicators.
8. Articulating a Global Social Policy : The Role of International Organizations ; Adewole Lawal, University of Sheffield, UK, Modern Research Studies; An International Journal of Humanities & Social Sciences; December 2018.