

Sustainable Development Goals: Agenda 2030

“Leave No-one Behind “

Survey Report

September 2016

Submitted to Civicus

By

YOUTH FOR UNITY & VOLUNTARY ACTION (YUVA)

2016

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
LEAVE NO ONE BEHIND AGENDA	4
METHODOLOGY	5
FINDING AND ANALYSIS	6-13
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	14
BIBLIOGRAPHY	

Introduction

YOUTH FOR UNITY & VOLUNTARY ACTION (YUVA) is a voluntary development organisation established in 1984 in India. YUVA's engagements are derived from defending, promoting, restoring and creating the civil, political, social, economic and cultural rights of the marginalised and socially excluded communities at the individual and collective level. WNTA has a national reach and is linked to more than 4000 organisations. Created after the World Social Forum 2004 in Mumbai, it seeks to hold the Indian government accountable for all promises made to meet the objectives set in the UN Millennium Declaration (2000) and the National Development Goals in regard to end poverty, social exclusion and discrimination.

WNTA was the most active voice on behalf of the Indian Civil Society at the United Nations on Post 2015 Agenda. It has actively participated in various consultations and surveys to frame the 2030 SDGs Agenda. It also anchored the Action 2015 campaign in India in 15 states across the country. We are happy that key concerns of large scale citizens' consultations in building the SDG agenda, human rights, inequality and discrimination issues, peace and justice issues, gender and labour have found space in the Agenda 2030. The global indicators are set in place and the national government is currently building up implementation mechanisms and indicators. As a coalition of larger civil society network, WNTA has marked its presents at international, national and sub-national level by involving itself in different national and international process such as action 2015, CIVIL BRICS consultation and SDGs process at national and sub-national level, with an aim to reduce all forms of inequality and exclusion.

YUVA jointly with Wada Na Todo Abhiyan (WNTA) and several civil society organisations implemented the online survey on 'Leave No One Behind' supported by CIVICUS. We connected to around 200 organisations, working with the marginalised group at national and sub-national levels in the different states of India. The initiative aims to gather and collate the views of grassroots organisations/worker on SDGs goals and targets and also on agenda "*leave no one behind*".

The report presents data to understand the level of acceptance, awareness and the understanding of grassroots organisations/workers on SDGs, concept of inequalities and exclusions and ability to translate the SDGs mandate and agenda 'leave no one behind' into the reality realm. The report also covers information on the level of participation and impact/influence of marginalised groups on policy makers at various levels. An important dimension is the information about what are the priority areas in the SDGs identified by the organisation. The report is a useful guide to the understand that how can different stakeholders such as government, civil societies, academicians and practitioners engage in different process at different levels, given that the 2030 agenda will influence development strategies and efforts for the next 15 years at the national and global levels. It is of particular value to those engaged in the SDGs process at the global and national levels as well as for those who track the progress in their communities. We also hope it serves as a framework for civil society and various stakeholders to come together and collaborate in translating and achieving the SDGs and not just 'leaving no one behind', but empowering the most marginalised to achieve the targets.

Thomas Pallithanam, Annie Namala, AK Singh
Wada Na Todo Abhiyan

Roshni Nuggehalli
YUVA

Leave No One Behind?

In a just world, progress on poverty eradication and sustainable development should include everyone. What do we mean by 'leave no one behind'? While the 'leave no one behind' concept is implicit within the ambition to eradicate poverty in all its forms by 2030 and in a human rights-based approach to development, it has emerged as a specific call to action within the post-2015 development agenda. The 27-member, UN High-level Panel of Eminent Persons, set up to advise on the new global development framework, argued for a transformative shift in the following terms: We should ensure that no person – regardless of ethnicity, gender, geography, disability, race or other status – is denied universal human rights and basic economic opportunities.

What does 'Leave No One Behind' mean in the context of the post-2015 development agenda? From the UN High Level Panel to the Open Working Group to the recently released zero draft of sustainable development goals, presidents, prime ministers, UN envoys, civil society, and citizens around the globe have rallied around the call. In its broadest sense, the pledge to ensure no one is left behind means that all goals, targets and indicators will not be considered met unless they have been met for every person around the globe. Leave no one behind is a call to guarantee that the poorest and most marginalized have the opportunity to fulfil their potential. No person – regardless of income, gender, age, geography, ethnicity or other social or economic identity – should be denied basic rights and services.

Critically, the definition of Leave No One Behind should be based on outcomes for people, and not simply monetary inputs. Previous drafts of the outcome document for next month's Third International Conference on Financing for Development (FFD) had proposed a cost-based approach: a per capita spending figure that would indicate national achievement of a global social floor. This input-focused construction misses the point and risks continuing a pattern of development practice predicated on increasing the quantity of inputs as the first priority. But an increase in funds does not necessarily mean an increase in quality of outcomes.

Without further definition, Leave No One Behind will be nothing more than a slogan. What is needed is a core package of measurable outputs and interventions which no man, woman, or child should be left behind by 2030. This requires translating global-level goals into outcomes and outputs for individuals and measuring progress through disaggregated data that tracks the most vulnerable economic and social groups.

The core package we envision would form a global minimum, but the concept of Leave No One Behind is greater. The global floor can and should be supplemented by national ladders, specific country and local packages to ensure the most vulnerable and marginalized are empowered.

METHODOLOGY

The study is a kind of **Descriptive study** collected through the online mode by digitally designed questionnaire on SDGs: Agenda 2030 “leave no one behind” hosted by the survey monkey website.

Universe/sample

The sample is consisting of partner/networks organisations of WNTA Coalition, directly or indirectly working with the marginalised/vulnerable community at national, sub-national level and grassroots level.

Sampling Design

Universe	Type of Sampling	Number of Organisations
Organisations/Network/campaigns etc.	Random	212

Tools of data collection

Data is collected through digital means i.e. online survey form;the questionnaire is filled and submitted through the computers and android mobile phones. The respondent from different organisation belonging to the different states of India actively participated, and as per the need questionnaire tool is also translated in the local dialect and telephonic assistance was also provided by the WNTA follow-up team.


Analysis

Collected data is both qualitatively and quantitatively analysed to reflect each aspects of the study.

FINDINGS

Gender

Out of 212 total respondent of LNB Survey include 70% male, 28% female,1% other and there was only 1% who prefer not to speak about their gender. People across 23 States of India actively participated in this survey as shown below in the *Pie chart-1*



Pie Chart-1

Occupation

People from different occupation participated in the survey. Out of total 212 respondents consist of people working with Non-Governmental Organization (NGO), Grassroots organizations, International non-governmental organizations, development professional, Network, alliance, membership-based organization, Faith-based organization, Research institute / Think tank, Company, Cooperative, Philanthropic / Funding organization, Trade or professional association (including trade unions), University / Educational establishment, Cultural group/organization. The number respondents belonging to different professions are highlighted in the following *table 1*.

Working With	Response Percent	Response Count
Non-Governmental Organisation (NGO)	67.6%	144
Grass-roots organisation	10.3%	22
International non-governmental organisation (INGO)	4.7%	10
Network, alliance, membership-based organisation	4.2%	9
Other (please specify)	4.2%	9

Development Professional	3.8%	8
Research institute / Think tank	1.4%	3
Faith-based organisation	0.9%	2
Company	0.5%	1
Cooperative	0.5%	1
Cultural group/organisation	0.5%	1
Philanthropic / Funding organisation	0.5%	1
Trade or professional association (including trade unions)	0.5%	1
University / Educational establishment	0.5%	1
Media agency	0.0%	0

Table 1

Who are the most marginal groups?

According to the responses out of total 212 and on the basis of responses count, the social groups are arranged on the vulnerability scale, starting from the most vulnerable to least **Women at 79.50%, Children at 77.30%, Dalit at 69.30%, Girls at 64.80%**, Youth at 52.30%, Labourer/Unorganised Workers Group at 45.50%, Tribal at 44.30%, Migrants at 36.90%, Slum Dwellers at 33.50%, Unemployed at 31.30%, People with physical disabilities at 25.60%, Religious minority at 23.30%, People with communicable diseases (HIV, tuberculosis, etc.) at 17.60%, People with mental disabilities at 15.90%, Commercial Sex Workers at 15.30%, Ethnic groups at 14.80%, Older persons at 13.60%, Other at 12.60%, People that live in a certain area of the locality at 10.80%, People from the LGBTIQ community at 10.20%, Fishing/Fishermen Community at 9.70%, Religious groups at 9.70%, Workers in a particular trade at 8.50%, People that don't speak the primary language at 6.30% and People with non-communicable diseases (obesity, diabetes, etc.) at 4.00%. (See Table-2)

Most Marginalized	Response Percent	Response Count
Women	79.50%	140
Children	77.30%	136
Dalit	69.30%	122
Girls	64.80%	114
Youth	52.30%	92
Labourer/Unorganised Workers Group	45.50%	80
Tribal	44.30%	78
Migrants	36.90%	65
Slum Dwellers	33.50%	59
Unemployed	31.30%	55
People with physical disabilities	25.60%	45
Religious minority	23.30%	41
People with communicable diseases (HIV, tuberculosis, etc.).	17.60%	31

People with mental disabilities	15.90%	28
Commercial Sex Workers	15.30%	27
Ethnic groups	14.80%	26
Older persons	13.60%	24
Other	12.60%	22
People that live in a certain area of the locality	10.80%	19
People from the LGBTIQ community	10.20%	18
Fishing/Fishermen Community	9.70%	17
Religious groups	9.70%	17
Workers in a particular trade (please specify)	8.50%	15
People that don't speak the primary language	6.30%	11
People with non-communicable diseases (obesity, diabetes, etc.)	4.00%	7

Table-2

Factors of Marginalization

The respondents were asked about the factors that lead to marginalization, according to the responses the factors are as arranged from the highest to the lowest rating in the following table-3.

Factor Affecting marginalization (highest to lowest)	Response Percent	Response Count
Income/Poverty	70.90%	124
Gender	61.10%	107
Lack of Access to Physiological Need/Very Basic Needs (Food, Shelter, Clothes, Water & Sanitation)	53.70%	94
Social Identity (Such as caste, etc.)	53.10%	93
Level of education	50.90%	89
Unable to access Government Programme/Policy	41.10%	72
Migration	38.30%	67
Employment type	26.30%	46
Age	22.90%	40
Area of residence	22.30%	39
Displacement	20.60%	36
Natural Calamity	19.40%	34
Conflict	18.90%	33
Sexual orientation	18.90%	33
Religion	18.30%	32
Physical health	17.70%	31
Ethnicity	11.40%	20
Language	8.00%	14
Mental wellbeing	5.70%	10

Other	5.70%	10
Physical attributes and appearance	4.00%	7

Table-3

Primary forms of Marginalisation

Respondents were asked about the primary form of marginalisation, thus according to the responses following are the forms of marginalisation from highly rated to least count ratings. (See Table-4)

Primary Forms of Marginalization	Response Percent	Response Count
Access to basic needs (food, water, sanitation, shelter)	78.40%	134
Access to basic income (a job, social security, etc.)	70.80%	121
Access to education (school, vocational skills)	64.90%	111
Access to government services and programs	49.10%	84
Access to basic security and protection	34.50%	59
Access to information (media, government documentation, etc)	22.80%	39
Voting rights	9.90%	17
Access to technology (telephones, computers, etc)	9.40%	16
Movement restrictions	7.60%	13
Access to non-government bodies (trade bodies, charities, etc.)	6.40%	11
Access to religious institutions	4.70%	8
Other form of exclusion	3.53%	6

Table-4

Government aids/services that marginalized communities availing

As per the responses of total 212 respondents, the services or government aid which marginalized groups are availing, the most voted services arranged in the descending orders are; **Basic education programs at 80.00%**, **Clean water and sanitation services at 44.70%**, **Provision of food for those in need/Public Distribution System at 40.00%**, **Medical services at 38.20%**, **Vocational education programs at 37.10%**, Financial Assistance from government (Scholarship, Pension, Unemployment allowance, any other assistance to start business or building a house etc) at 32.40%, Electricity services at 28.20%, Shelter services at 21.80%, Social Security against riots, exploitation and exclusion at 21.20%, Security and police services at 18.80%, Telephone and communication services at 15.30%, Transportation services at 14.10%, as shown in the table-5 below.

What aid and/or government services do marginalised groups in your locality benefit from? (you may chose more than one)	Response Percent	Response Count
Basic education programs	80.00%	136
Clean water and sanitation services	44.70%	76
Provision of food for those in need/Public Distribution System	40.00%	68
Medical services	38.20%	65
Vocational education programs	37.10%	63
Financial Assistance from government (Scholarship, Pension, Unemployment allowance, any other assistance to start business or building a house etc)	32.40%	55
Electricity services	28.20%	48
Shelter services	21.80%	37
Social Security against riots, exploitation and exclusion	21.20%	36
Security and police services	18.80%	32
Telephone and communication services	15.30%	26
Transportation services	14.10%	24

Table-5

Necessary Needs of marginalized group


The respondents were asked to rate the basic needs (services) of marginalized group on the rating scale from 1-5 (1 being the least priority, 5 being the highest priority), according to the average ratings the needs are arranged on priority scale using highest rating to the lowest by the respondents in the following **table-6**

Services	Ratings	Priority
Basic education services	4.83	1
Clean water and sanitation services	4.71	2
Medical services	4.65	3
Food provisions	4.34	4
Vocational educational services	4.32	5
Electricity services	3.61	6
Shelter services	3.56	7
Security and police services	3.53	8
Transportation services	3.39	9
Telephone and communication services	3.08	10

Table-6

Understanding/awareness of respondents on United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals

Out of total 212 respondents, it is observed that **64% of them are aware about SDGs** and they are also aware of its purposes, **20% who heard about SDGs but they understand some of its purposes**, **13% heard about SDGs but they don't understand its purposes** and there are only **3% who never heard about SDGs**. As shown in the following *Pie Chart-2*.



Pie Chart-2

SDGs Goal on Priority Scale (average ratings)

According to the average rating on a scale of 1-9 where (1 indicates a lowest level of immediate impact and 9 indicates a highest level of immediate impact) the different goals of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) are arranged in the highest rating to lowest in the *table-6* below;


Ranking	Sustainable Development Goals		Average Ratings
1	Goal 1	End poverty in all its forms everywhere	6.91
2	Goal 2	End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture	5.93
3	Goal 5	Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls	5.82
4	Goal 4	Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all	5.38
5	Goal 3	Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages	5.27
6	Goal 16	Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels	4.83
7	Goal 8	Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full	3.40

		and productive employment and decent work for all	
8	Goal 10:	Reduce inequality within and among countries	3.29
9	Goal 13	Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts*	3.18
10	Goal 6	Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all	2.85
11	Goal 11	Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable	2.85
12	Goal 17	Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development	2.85
13	Goal 15	Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss	2.63
14	Goal 14	Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development	2.30
15	Goal 7	Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all	2.09
16	Goal 9	Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and foster innovation	2.09
17	Goal 12	Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns	1.87

Table-7

Respondents’ Participation in the development of Post 2015 Agenda


According to the data on respondents’ Participation in developing post 2015 agenda, it is found that out of total respondents, **36% were involved through workshop, 25% through consultations, 15% through surveys** and 6% respondents involve through any other way and rest **18% did not involved** in developing post 2015 agenda. (See *Pie Chart-3*)



Pie Chart-3

Organization plans regarding the SDGs


According to the responses different organizations planning to have their engagement in different SDGs processes such as **81.8 % organizations planning in creating awareness on SDGs**, **58.2 % is interested in the advocacy with government** and **38.8 % planning to get involved in monitoring & implementation process of SDGs**, while rest 6% chose to get involve through any other way. (See **Bar Chart-1**)



Bar Chart-1

Most Suitable Way to popularize SDGs


According to the survey the most suitable way to popularize SDGs amongst marginalized group is by **capacity building of grassroots NGOs / CBOs**, which most of the respondent i.e. **47% respondent** favoured and **by having Community level Consultation 44% of the respondent** agreed while only 9% think that there can be other ways for popularising it. (See **Pie Chart-4**)



Pie Chart-4

Influence of marginalized groups on policy maker


According to the total of 212 respondents, the level of impact/influence that marginalized groups has on the government/policy makers is low as due lack of participation at all levels, this can also be observed from the responses in the pie chart below, 39% of total rated very low impact, 23% rated low impact, 18% have moderate impact, 16% have No impact, 4% have high impact and no one very high impact i.e. 0%. (See **Pie Chart-5**)



Pie Chart-5

Significant efforts by Marginalized to create policy change at the various levels


From the total of 218 responses, the level of participation of marginalized groups at various level such as local, national, regional (sub-continental) and international, **The participation of marginalized group is highest at local level** and it decreases as we move to higher level of participation such as national regional (Sub-continental) and international level depicted in the *bar chart-2* below.



Bar Chart-2

The Highest Government actor to deliver the SDGs Mandate


According to the responses, majority of respondents i.e. **27.97%** think that the highest government body, responsible to implement SDGs in India is **Central Government**, 20.98% says NitiAayog is the highest Government body, 18.88% think Concern ministries, 6.99% think State Government, 6.29% think Prime Minister/PMO, 5.59% say Parliament/parliamentarian, 2.80% think Panchayat, 2.80% Department and Government Officials, 0.7% think NABARD and rest 6.99% don't know who is the highest Government body in India to deliver the mandate of SDGs. (See *Bar Chart-3* below)



Bar Chart-3

Highest Non- Governmental Body for SDGs


According to the responses **54.03%** respondents think that the highest Non-Governmental Body for SDGs process is NGOs, INGOs and CSOs coalition/Network/Campaign, **16.94%** said United Nation Organisations and UN Agencies, **5.65%** say Grassroots Organisation/Voluntary Organisations, People Association & Movement, 4.03% think Corporate through its Corporate Social Responsibilities, 0.81% said Faith based Organisations and Alliance, 0.81% think Media, 1.61 think that No one other than Government and rest 16.13% Don't Know who is the highest Non-Governmental Body for SDGs implementation in India. (See the *Pie Chart-6* below)



Pie Chart-6

Availability of network/networks at the district/state level working on the SDGs

According to the respondent, different networks are working in different districts and states on SDGs; out of total respondents **73%** said **yes**, there are networks working in their districts/states, **18%** said **no**, there is not any network working in their districts/states and there only **9%** **respondent** who don't know whether any network is working or not. (See *Pie Chart-7*)



Pie Chart-7

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

According to this survey, it is observed that the level of participations of the marginalise group is higher at very grassroots level and the same can also be observed that the most of the people from grassroots are getting involved in various process through the community level meetings and grassroots consultations, while participation decreases as the level get higher. Thus it is important for popularising SDGs amongst marginalised community at the grassroots level where their participation is higher.

Since popularising SDGs at grassroots level by the capacity building of grassroots organisations and by holding grassroots consultations are preferable ways but there can be many other innovative ways that can be explored and used by enhancing our work scope to the last person in the row or the most marginalised one.

The level of understanding of the most of organisations working at grassroots with marginalised section on SDGs is found to be pretty good, most of them have participated in workshops, consultation and surveys, most of the respondents involved in developing post 2015 agenda but our target is to reach those people/organisation who even don't know about SDGs and its purposes, even if they are very few in numbers, to ensure the participation of all in the SDGs process, it is important to ensure that no one left behind and to enhance the participation of all in all the processes of SDGs.

The concern of the community right from the economic poverty to the poverty in the basic necessities is high amongst the marginalised groups due to socio-economic constrains. SDGs have much potential to reduce inequality gaps, poverty and discrimination. Agenda 2030 along with the pledge *leave no one behind* together can be a powerful tool, awareness on SDGs and participation of all the communities is highly recommended at all level and at all stages of SDGs processes.