

# What is a Good Practice? A framework to analyse the Quality of Stakeholder Engagement in implementation and follow-up of the 2030 Agenda

## Application Examples

**COUNTRY / CONTEXT:** Partners for Review (P4R) study looking at the engagement practices of different stakeholders in the 2030 Agenda follow-up and review in 16 countries

**Contact(s) for more information:** Contact/s for more information: Jörn Geisselmann ([joern.geisselmann@giz.de](mailto:joern.geisselmann@giz.de))

### 1. The Background: What was the context, what were the objectives, at which level was the tool applied?

- **Partners for Review (P4R)** is a global multi-stakeholder network for government representatives and stakeholders from civil society, the private sector, academia and other non-state actors involved in follow-up and review processes of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. It was set up in 2016 by the German Government and is implemented by GIZ.
- The tool was used as part of a **study on stakeholder engagement practices** conducted by P4R. The study analysed **recent engagement experiences** of various stakeholders (CSOs, academia, business associations, local authorities and multi-stakeholder mechanisms) **involved in SDG follow-up and review**. It identified success factors and lessons learnt and presented **case studies from 16 countries**.

### 2. The Process: How was the tool used (e.g. as a conversation starter, fully to guide an analytical exercise), Who initiated it, who was involved? Was it a collective analysis or unilateral analysis?

- The tool's analytical framework was used to develop a **self-assessment** grid with guiding questions, reflecting the framework's key principles and criteria as well as the objectives of the study. It was also drawn on when **developing interview questions** and **structuring the analysis and presentation of the study's results and case studies**.
- In practical terms, the grid was shared with stakeholder representatives involved in the identified 16 case studies. Following the **self-assessments**, individual **interviews** or focus **group discussions** were conducted with these stakeholder representatives. A synthesis of all self-assessments was included in the study to compare the different perceptions of stakeholders, the dynamics between different stakeholder groups and their perceived attainment to the key principles/dimensions of the analytical framework.

### 3. **The experience:** What were challenges, what were success factors? What lessons, tips or recommendations would you like to share with others?

- As described above, we used the analytical framework as a **self-assessment** tool. Each resource person for the identified case studies was asked to answer the tool's questions. We found that **a few persons were reluctant** to fill out the self-assessment because they felt they could not speak on behalf of their institution or because they feared a possible conflict.
- We also encouraged at least the **discussion of the self-assessment with relevant peers** in the national context before finalising it. However, this required additional time and commitment from the participating resource persons.
- Considering the above, the analytical framework's added value would probably have been even greater if we could have assessed each engagement practice collectively with all concerned national stakeholder groups, as the User Guide recommends but such **collective assessment was not considered feasible** in the context of a global study.
- Finally, we found it **important to contextualize** the analytical framework before using it in different contexts/or for different purposes to make it specific and accessible enough, including in terms of language/terminology.

### 4. **The results:** What changed in terms of process and / or outcome? What role did the tool play in this?

The analytical framework generally **added rigour and coherence** to our analysis of engagement practices. It was also instrumental in developing the **idea to first ask interviewees to self-assess** their engagement practice before the interview.

### 5. **The tool:** Was the tool adapted? Which parts were particularly useful, which ones less? What was unclear / could be improved?

**Guiding questions were added** for each criterion and the language used to assess the different levels was amended to more adequately reflect the purposes of the study.

### 6. **Next Steps:** What will happen next? Is there a need for follow-up support?

The study and the individual case studies are available on the [P4R website](#): [study](#) / [case studies](#).

### 7. **Anything else you would like to share that could help improve or apply the tool?**

It would be **useful to share the different approaches** adopted to operationalise the analytical framework to increase awareness and understanding of different methods and experiences in applying the tool.