

Internationaler Peer Review 2018 zur deutschen Nachhaltigkeitsstrategie

Stakeholder - Umfrage 17. Oktober 2017 – 1. Dezember 2017

Im Auftrag der Bundesregierung unterstützt der Rat für Nachhaltige Entwicklung derzeit den internationalen Peer Review 2018 zur deutschen Nachhaltigkeitsstrategie.

Die internationale Expertengruppe unter Leitung von Helen Clark hat sich Ende September 2017 erstmals getroffen und sich auf zentrale Fragestellungen ihrer Untersuchung geeinigt. Themenbereiche, die für die Peers von besonderem Interesse sind, sind folgende: Konsum und Produktion, Digitalisierung, Klimapolitik als Hebel, Zukunft der Arbeit, Finanzmärkte, Dringlichkeitsgefühl und science/policy interface, soziale Ungleichheit, SDGs als business case, internationale Verantwortung Deutschlands.

Die Peer Gruppe hat den RNE gebeten, relevante nationale und internationale Akteure in Deutschland um ihre Einschätzung zur Nachhaltigkeitsstrategie und zu den politischen Perspektiven zu bitten.

Die Ergebnisse dieser Umfrage werden der internationalen Expertengruppe als Basis für die Erarbeitung eigener Hypothesen dienen. Ende Februar 2018 wird die Peer Gruppe eine Woche in Berlin tagen und ihre Hypothesen mittels Experten-Anhörungen sowie in Diskussion mit Akteuren testen, um dann anschließend ihre Empfehlungen für die Bundesregierung zu formulieren. Der Arbeitsprozess ähnelt dem, der schon 2013 sowie 2009 den Peer Reviews zu Grunde lag. Die Fragen sind nicht für alle Akteure gleichermaßen relevant, der Transparenz wegen legen wir sie aber offen. Wenn Sie sich an der Umfrage beteiligen möchten, beantworten Sie gegebenenfalls nicht alle Fragen.

Wir laden Sie herzlich ein, an der Befragung teilzunehmen. Hierzu füllen Sie bitte das untenstehende Formular aus. Wenn Sie mit der Veröffentlichung Ihrer Antworten auf der RNE-Website einverstanden sind, geben Sie das bitte im entsprechenden Feld an.

Frist für die Teilnahme an der Befragung ist der 1. Dezember 2017. Den Fragebogen senden Sie bitte ausgefüllt an: veronica.tomei@nachhaltigkeitsrat.de.

Schließlich noch eine Bitte: Da die Arbeitssprache des Peer Review Englisch ist, bitten wir Sie um Beantwortung auf Englisch, soweit Ihnen das möglich ist.

General Information	
Name and function:	Helmut Schulte, spokesman of "Lokale Agend21 für Feldkirchen-Westerham"
Answers on behalf of (name of your organization):	Lokale Agenda21 für Feldkirchen-Westerham
Which stakeholder do you represent or belong to (no ranking implied, multiple answers possible):	<input type="checkbox"/> a) politics, <input type="checkbox"/> b) administration, <input type="checkbox"/> c) enterprise or the business community, <input type="checkbox"/> d) the labour movement, <input type="checkbox"/> e) academia, <input type="checkbox"/> f) municipalities and associations, <input type="checkbox"/> g) youth, <input type="checkbox"/> h) gender interests, <input type="checkbox"/> i) migration groups, <input type="checkbox"/> j) the disabled movement, <input type="checkbox"/> k) the churches, <input type="checkbox"/> l) financial actors, <input type="checkbox"/> m) environment organization <input type="checkbox"/> n) development organization <input type="checkbox"/> o) "the Länder", <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> p) grassroots initiatives or local agenda groups, <input type="checkbox"/> q) other interests?
Have you sent in a contribution on the draft of the 2016 Sustainable Development Strategy?	no
Do you agree with the publication of your contribution on the RNE-website?	yes

1. The state of play of the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016

- 1.1 In your view, what are the general challenges and benefits for Germany concerning sustainable development? In that regard, have you identified significant gaps in the German Sustainable Development Strategy 2016?

challenge: climate change!

setting a world wide example not only in ending nuclear power and expanding renewable energy production, but also in fundamental reforms in the sectors of traffic/transportation and agriculture;

benefit: comprehension of developing countries; staying competitive as a high tech country;

gaps: too little integration of the (private) banking industry; fundamental changes in agricultural policy (Germany/EU) are missing (* no significant rise in eco-farming, * without reversal/turnabout in the EU especially Africa's ecological and economic suffering will persist and migration will rise enormously)

1.2 Have you identified strategic incoherencies within the German Sustainable Development policies? Would you have proposals to increase coherence and meaningful output?

All in all theory and knowledge is in full contrast to political and economical action:

99 percent of the decisions in daily politics prefer economic growth and shareholder profit ALTHOUGH obviously foiling SDGs and often defeating the purpose of measurements (i.e. CO2 emissions in traffic, Glyphosat vs. biodiversity --decision Nov 27th 2017);

a neglected field of incoherency: promotion of air traffic:

an indicator regarding air traffic is lacking completely; international air traffic is not even captured by CO2 emission indicators;

WHY are planning a 3rd runway at MUC-airport when increasing air traffic is not at all affordable thinking in terms of sustainability? see statement 2.4)

proposal: Being focused on the target and not on political strategies and tactics would help to achieve the target

1.3 Do you think the measurement and reporting mechanisms are adequate to implement the 2030 Agenda by Germany?

no, see key indicators (question 1.4);

measurements and even transparency regarding SDGs remained VOLUNTARY in the year 2016. The German government almost completely failed to implement OBLIGATORY SDG-reporting in corporate reporting during the transfer of EU-CSR-Directive into national law.

see DNS page 32: "Die Bundesregierung unterstützt den DNK als FREIWILLIGES Instrument, um die Nachhaltigkeitsidee weiter zu verbreiten und nachhaltiges Wirtschaften zu fördern."

1.4 Which off-track goals and targets (meaning those targets marked with "thunderstorm" or "overcast") in the German Sustainable Development Strategy do you think are the most important? According to you, why are they off track?

2.1.a: We are far too slow to implement this;
(better orientation would be: regional bound circular economy/closed loop)

2.1.b: ecological agriculture area (6.3% instead of 20%, 20% even being far too little)

3.2.a: Our political representatives don't take this seriously ("diesel gate")

6.1.a: too much fertilizer being one point, phosphor resources running short, this should cause fundamental change in agriculture NOW

6.1.b nitrate in groundwater being a problem almost all over Germany by now

7.1.b: If we want to reach the agreed CO2 target, we need a massive increase in power production of renewable sources and switch off the use of fossil energy sources

11.1.a increase of settlement and traffic area in Feldkirchen-Westerham, Rosenheim, Bavaria

11.2.a/b NO PROGRESS AT ALL: energy/CO2-emissions of goods and passenger traffic

12.1.b CO2 emissions of private consumption (convenience, rebound effects; see 7.1.b)

14.1.aa & 14.1.ab: see 6.1.a

15.1 loss in biodiversity (see 11.1.a; pesticides etc. should be reduced should be banned)

the ok-status is absurd in 17.1: expense in Development < 0.7% while not even mentioning the promise to increase military budget to 2.0%; Germany is world No.3 in military/armament export

2. The governance approach and structure

2.1 Are you satisfied with the institutions and the enabling environment both the government and the non-state actors have created so far?

no

2.2 According to you, is the sense of urgency as determined by science-based goals well understood and does it orient action (e.g. in your area)?

no, for example losing area by road building and new commercial zones is always low priority (see above 1.2)

2.3 As a partner or stakeholders do you feel enabled to actively participate in dialogue on and to contribute actions for sustainability?

in dialogue yes, in important decisions no;

2.4 Is the science-policy interface working? Do results of "science for sustainability" already make a difference?

in communicating sustainability yes, in political decisions hardly ever; thus the majority of accurately defined goals, indicators and measurements can be misused for PR purposes (only pretending to act consistently, "Green-washing")

3. New opportunities and challenges

- 3.1 Which new opportunities and challenges do you identify for Germany? Does the Sustainable Development Strategy help to address them? (Explanation: „new“ in the sense of: next, or not yet fully grasped, or appearing when you scan the horizon)

Germany should seriously take up the goal to become market leader in sustainable technologies, being the basis for economic success in the long run;
Challenge: finding ways to transfer (corporate and state) governance goals to everyday and strategic decisions

- 3.2 Are there areas where Germany can and must show leadership and set new standards?

yes:

(EU) agricultural policy;
full transition to renewable energy
sustainable mobility INCLUDING the reduction and replacement of air traffic (i.e. by rail traffic) (see 1.2)

- 3.3 Is the “fear of the future and transformation” a notion in society strong enough that you feel your organization and the Government will have to deal with it more carefully?

yes, need for transformation is not yet accepted - keeping up wealth is general orientation;
this is something we should focus on: transformation by design or by disaster

- 3.4 Is communication an issue?

yes! Even we - as "Agenda21"stakeholders since 1992.Rio/1997.Feldkirchen-Westerham - got no information about this sample/peer review; we got it by chance (Munich group of www.ecogood.org);
it has been no topic in news/media;
... and by the way: such an important assessment should be worth of being delivered with the questions translated (German). Especially grassroots and municipal stakeholders might not understand many important technical terms.

4. Do you have any other general message that you want to share with the Peers?

1. don't forget the responsibility of the banking industry
2. today the key sector EU-agricultural policy is still contrary to almost all SDGs: no fundamental change here --> no sustainability at all
3. CSR-reporting standards (German law) must be enhanced to an obligatory SDG-audit* for all business companies (more than 500 employees)

4. there is a fundamental contradiction in promoting projects to save peanuts while not taking care of projects dumping coconuts in the same sector, i.e. biodiversity in agriculture, mostly responsible for the loss of 75% of insects in two decades

*) [compare <https://www.ecogood.org/en/common-good-balance-sheet/>
and
<http://www.eesc.europa.eu/en/our-work/opinions-information-reports/opinions/new-sustainable-economic-models>
and
<http://www.eesc.europa.eu/en/our-work/opinions-information-reports/opinions/economy-common-good>]