United Nations University
Centre for Policy Research

Rewriting the Rules of Progress

Submission to the Intergovernmental Process on Beyond GDP

UNU CPR

United Nations University
Centre for Policy Research

Acknowledgements
This report would not have been possible without the generous contributions of knowledge and time from diverse experts across a spectrum of disciplines, geographies and experience who spoke with the authors for this report. The authors were Calder Tsuyuki-Tomlinson, Daouia Chalali, Nicole Goldin and Daniel Cash.

Disclaimer
The views and opinions expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the United Nations University.

About this paper
This paper is the UNU-CPR submission to the call for contributions to an Elements Paper for the intergovernmental process on Beyond GDP. The call was opened on 10 July 2026 by the Mission of Spain, as co-facilitator, and invited Member States and other stakeholders to respond to guiding questions under four themes, which structure this paper. It was submitted on 26 August 2026. The Elements Paper, a working document mapping the key themes and questions for discussion, was circulated to Member States on 4 September 2026.

ISBN: 97-892-808-6685-9 © United Nations University 2026.

All content (text, visualizations, graphics), except where otherwise specified or attributed, is published under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike IGO license (CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO). Using, reposting, and citing this content is allowed without prior permission.

Citation: United Nations University-Centre for Policy Research, *Rewriting the Rules of Progress: Submission to the Intergovernmental Process on Beyond GDP* (New York, United Nations University, 2026).

Contents

I. Political Vision, Strategic Direction and Normative Anchor 2

1. Overarching Objective and Long-Term Vision 2

2. Capturing the Multidimensional Nature of Sustainable Development 3

3. Complementing Existing International Frameworks 3

4. Roles of Stakeholders and National Ownership 4

5. Priority HLEG Recommendations for the IGP 4

II. Conceptual Framework, Measurement and Governance 6

1. The HLEG Conceptual Framework 6

2. Identifying, Validating and Reviewing Indicators 6

3. Institutional Arrangements 7

4. Balancing Global Coherence and National Flexibility 7

5. Headline Indicators and Emerging Dimensions 8

III. National Implementation 9

1. Integrating Beyond GDP Into National Policymaking 9

2. Institutional, Statistical and Governance Arrangements 9

3. International Cooperation and Capacity-Building 10

4. Cooperation Between Statistical Systems and Policymakers 10

IV. International Policy Applications 11

1. Informing International Policy Discussions 11

2. Informing International Decision-Making 11

3. Coherence Across International Initiatives 11

4. Outcomes of the Intergovernmental Process 12

I. Political Vision, Strategic Direction and Normative Anchor

1. Overarching Objective and Long-Term Vision

What should be the overarching objective of an intergovernmental process on Beyond GDP, and what long-term vision should guide its development?

The overarching vision of Beyond GDP should be the United Nations' (UN) effort to rewrite the norms of economic 'progress', in providing a robust and coherent statistical basis for policymaking to deliver equitable, inclusive and sustainable wellbeing for all. This means establishing the technical and enabling conditions for shifting national policymaking away from GDP-dominant decision-making, particularly concerning the management of trade-offs – including over longer, intergenerational time horizons – between economic, social and environmental dimensions. This also means informing the frameworks utilized within international and intergovernmental bodies – across the UN system, international financial institutions and civil society – to ensure that every country has equal ability to achieve sustainable development considering global challenges such as climate change.

The intergovernmental process (IGP) should aim for a self-contained outcome, while properly anticipating how it will put in place longer-term processes and/or mechanisms for implementation across different relevant registers, such as technical developments, capacity-building and governance. It also should anticipate how it will connect to ongoing and forthcoming processes related to sustainable development pathways, notably but not limited to the post-2030 process, the implementation of the Rio Conventions, the implementation of the Pact for the Future and its annexes, and the eradication of poverty and inequality.

The IGP should therefore achieve three main objectives:

Three Main Objectives for the IGP

a. In building upon, refining and completing the High-Level Expert Group on Beyond GDP (HLEG) recommendations, adopting a UN dashboard that will become a standard for all governments and relevant stakeholders to manage their economies in a way that delivers inclusive and sustainable wellbeing for current and future generations. The aim should be clear from the outset: this is not a mere symbolic shift, it is an institutional one – a new standard recommended for use across policymaking, notably in budgeting, lawmaking and public policy evaluation.

b. Adopting an implementation mechanism to support the corresponding update of national statistical systems across Member States, including financial support, development capacity and knowledge/technology transfer. This should notably entail the central use of the standardized indicators with corresponding progressive data-collection requirements for national statistical offices.

c. Adopting an implementation mechanism to encourage the updating of decision-making and operational guidance through Beyond GDP measures across UN agencies, international financial institutions (IFIs) and private financial actors (including credit rating agencies). The evaluation of public and private financial actors' policies and actions against a new framework for assessing progress should be possible utilizing these new indicators.

2. Capturing the Multidimensional Nature of Sustainable Development

How can a Beyond GDP framework better capture the multidimensional nature of sustainable development and respond to today's interconnected global challenges, including rising inequality, demographic change, environmental degradation, technological transformation and increasing vulnerability? How can it provide a coherent structure to conceptualize progress?

The overall direction proposed by the HLEG, including in its recommendations for further work, offers a practical way forward. Adopting a concise high-level framework through the IGP is essential to ensure the necessary stepchange in policymaking that the Beyond GDP agenda offers; the HLEG provides a strong conceptual and statistical framework from which to conceptualize and measure progress.

One dimension to underscore as paramount for capturing the multidimensional nature of sustainable development and responding to today's interconnected global challenges is to reevaluate economic growth so that it serves social and ecological outcomes, rather than treating it as a goal in its own right as current Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 8 implies; what actually matters is the concrete outcomes that economic growth generates (and for whom). Understanding the pursuit of economic growth in the context of a Beyond GDP framework will be critical for building a stronger framework for guiding long-term sustainable development within each country and among all countries.

Ensuring the measurement of social distributional qualities, as well as sustainability through natural capital, conflict or economic stocks, are essential. Similarly, capturing cross-border spillover effects, such that any national measures can be aggregated to measure progress against planetary boundaries across Earth systems such as climate change, biodiversity or nitrogen pollution, is essential for the framework's integrity in responding to global challenges.

Measuring the impacts of technological transformation on progress across social, environmental and economic registers is currently an underdeveloped dimension of the HLEG dashboard, and as per the recommendation in Para. 76(b), should be an added priority for the consideration of the IGP.

It will also be important to recognize that even within the economic dimension of wellbeing, incorporating other economic metrics would improve and balance GDP. And it is also important to recognize and measure subjective wellbeing alongside objective metrics, and identify gaps or disparities that policy and interventions could help address.

The IGP should mandate the UN Statistical Commission (UNSC) to be the custodian of the Beyond GDP framework: learning from experience and ensuring regular updates when necessary, as proposed by the group of high-level experts under the recommendation contained within Para. 76(b) of the HLEG report.

3. Complementing Existing International Frameworks

How should a Beyond GDP framework complement—rather than duplicate or replace—existing internationally agreed frameworks, including the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and other relevant United Nations processes ie. the Multidimensional Vulnerability Index and the Sevilla Commitment?

The 2030 Agenda: Half the indicators of the HLEG recommendations are from the SDGs; the remaining half complement and do not replace nor duplicate the SDGs. Any framework developed through the IGP should be mindful of a post-2030 process set to formally begin with the July 2027 HLPF, and work to provide the statistical foundation for a more coherent and economically-actionable framework to guide short- and long-term policymaking towards achieving sustainable development. This should include the ability for national-level assessments of progress in coherence with the carrying capacity of Earth-systems, as understood by relevant science-policy interfaces such as the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the

Intergovernmental Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES), and the Global Sustainable Development Report scientific committee.

The Multidimensional Vulnerability Index (MVI): It should be made clear to all that the MVI and the Beyond GDP framework are conceptually compatible and serve different purposes. The MVI helps assess a country's structural vulnerability and lack of resilience to external shocks, while the Beyond GDP framework aims at assessing key aspects of human well-being that an economy should serve. The MVI can help assess barriers to achieving Beyond GDP outcomes, and data collection can serve both purposes. The IGP must clearly define responsibilities in order to clarify respective contributions and applications – including for IFIs in particular.

Sevilla Commitment: Beyond GDP is one of the elements of the Commitment, so there is some risk of duplication. The IGP should further assess how Beyond GDP will create an enabling environment to deliver on the other pieces of the Commitment, including for example credit ratings. It should be seen as a way to prioritise implementation and institutionalization of other commitments to sustainability, not as a new standalone mandate.

Overall: It would be helpful that the IGP conducts an additional mapping of correspondences and synergies between the Beyond GDP framework and all other existing proposals or frameworks, including the Declaration on Future Generations, the Global Digital Compact, the Rio Conventions or the Roadmap on Eradicating Poverty Beyond Growth and WHO's Economics of Health for All. This would ensure that negotiations can move forward with the Beyond GDP framework being perceived as an enabling tool and not an additional burden.

4. Roles of Stakeholders and National Ownership

What role should the United Nations, Member States, international organizations, international financial institutions, national statistical systems and other relevant stakeholders play in advancing this agenda while fully respecting national ownership and differing national circumstances?

The success of a Beyond GDP framework will depend not only on the quality, utility and feasibility of its indicators, but also on the legitimacy of the governance arrangements through which they are developed, reviewed and applied. The framework should therefore distinguish clearly between those responsible for developing international principles, those responsible for implementation and those responsible for applying the framework within international decision-making.

The UN is well placed to act as the principal convener and guardian of the framework's legitimacy, bringing together Member States, international organizations, national statistical systems and other stakeholders to ensure broad participation and periodic review. Member States should retain ownership over national implementation, allowing the framework to reflect differing development priorities and institutional capacities while remaining anchored in internationally agreed principles. National statistical systems should safeguard methodological integrity, while international financial institutions and other users should apply the framework transparently rather than becoming de facto designers of its evolution through operational practice.

Ultimately, the governance of Beyond GDP should reflect the principles it seeks to advance. A framework intended to support inclusive, transparent and accountable decision-making should itself be governed through inclusive, transparent and accountable institutional arrangements.

5. Priority HLEG Recommendations for the IGP

Which recommendations contained in the report of the High-Level Expert Group could serve as priorities for this intergovernmental process and future intergovernmental work?

All the HLEG recommendations are relevant: the IGP should find a way to address them all, even if this means identifying ways forward and planning the work that is necessary for those that will require more technical maturity before they can be properly negotiated and decided upon. This could take the form of different workstreams or working groups within the IGP, for interested Member States to take leadership in exploring further these recommendations in consultation with relevant UN, intergovernmental, private sector and civil society stakeholders.

For the key missing recommendations (headline aggregate indicators, cross-border spill-over effects, comprehensive wealth accounting, planetary boundaries, and IFI applications), the IGP should quickly evaluate the feasibility of developing them in the short term. If it is identified that these topics will require more time than is considered feasible within the IGP, the IGP should ensure that adequate processes are established to develop them, as per the respective recommendations in Paras. 74(e), 76(d), 76(c), 76(a) and 74(d) of the HLEG report. They should remain central topics of discussions, and the IGP should identify how to gear and organize next steps to create such a political outcome. This could start in the short term by listing criteria for choosing these indicators, having rounds of proposals and identifying a selection process. Further steps could include an evidence-based process to refine proposals before they are negotiated and adopted by governments.

II. Conceptual Framework, Measurement and Governance

1. The HLEG Conceptual Framework

To what extent does the conceptual framework proposed by the High-Level Expert Group provide an appropriate basis for future intergovernmental discussions? Which elements warrant further consideration or refinement?

The three overarching pillars (current well-being, equity and inclusion, sustainability and resilience) and the framework's alignment with the SDGs is a strong starting point.

The connections with the fourth and foundational domain (that covers peace, human rights, and respect for the planet) should be extrapolated further, showing more clearly how indicators across domains connect to human rights, peace and respect for the planet. The temporal dimension could be strengthened further, in building upon the Declaration on Future Generations for ensuring intergenerational equity. The relationship between the sustainability and resilience pillar and respect for the planet principle, vis-a-vis actions that impact environmental quality and natural capital (e.g. net produced capital stock) should be strengthened. The applicability and coherence of these measures towards calculating discount rates will be an important measure of relevance of the Beyond GDP framework.

From a human rights perspective, it would be important to indicate more clearly how indicators across all domains are anchored in human rights standards and how they reflect the indivisibility and interdependence of rights. Similarly, gender dimensions could be strengthened within inclusiveness and equity.

Measuring the impacts of technological transformation on progress across social, environmental and economic registers is currently an underdeveloped dimension of the HLEG dashboard, and as per the recommendation in Para. 76(b), should be an added priority for the consideration of the IGP. Relatedly, the dashboard could consider systemic-level indicators, including around infrastructure and governance.

Revisiting indicator placement to ensure a coherent design should be a consideration of the IGP: loneliness, for example, sits under “social cohesion” in current wellbeing, while a conceptually related measure — ‘trust in others’ — sits under social capital in sustainability and resilience; greenhouse gas emissions (production-based) also sit in foundational principles rather than sustainability.

The HLEG acknowledges data availability was a key criteria for indicator selection, yet many of the suggested sources are outdated or incomplete. There is room to consider alternative data sources and collection methods (including those currently in the private sector domain) – for example, geospatial, machine learning, natural language processing or user/consumer data – to improve timeliness and coverage as well as to potentially allow for even more relevant and useful indicators of integrated wellbeing and progress.

Overall, the IGP should focus on outlining how the framework translates into governance — shaping policy, budgeting and accountability — and how to articulate its universal application and adaptability to national contexts.

2. Identifying, Validating and Reviewing Indicators

How should indicators be identified, validated, periodically reviewed and updated to ensure scientific robustness, policy relevance and international comparability?

Indicators should be identified, validated, periodically reviewed and updated through an expert group under the UNSC, as per recommendation Para. 76(b). This mechanism should be established with regular interfaces with relevant science-policy platforms across the UN system. This mechanism should serve to keep indicators scientifically robust, policy-relevant and comparable; using periodic reviews to strengthen decision-making and accountability, and avoid being a static or checkbox exercise.

This mechanism should integrate at least three domains of expertise: expertise on indicator reliability and validity; expertise on statistical correlation and dimensionality, to reduce redundancy and select representative headline indicators; and expertise on policy relevance and implementation. The expertise should be gathered from academic sources, policy practitioners, Indigenous peoples, local communities and all relevant stakeholders across civil society and the private sector. The integration of these diverse forms of knowledge could be inspired from established methods such as those developed by IPBES, for example. The potential of other complementary mechanisms, such as "citizen assemblies" at national and global levels, should also be assessed.

3. Institutional Arrangements

What institutional arrangements would be appropriate to oversee the continued development of the Beyond GDP framework, including the respective roles of the United Nations Statistical Commission and intergovernmental bodies?

The IGP should mandate the UNSC a central role for establishing methodological robustness, interoperability, statistical standards and capacity-building, building on the SDG indicator framework and strengthening social, demographic, environmental and human rights data systems.

The central role of the UNSC should also enable stronger alignment with the System of National Accounts (noting recommendation Para. 76(e) by the HLEG), the System of Environmental-Economic Accounting (SEEA) and the still-developing System of Population and Social Statistics/Accounts. The Framework for Inclusive and Sustainable Wellbeing (FISW) developed by the Expert Group on Wellbeing Measurements (EGWM) under the UNSC is also an anchor point that will be relevant following its expected agreement in 2027.

Throughout the IGP and any UNSC actions it will be critical that intergovernmental bodies provide political guidance on purpose and use on their respective intervention domains, to further ensure that Beyond GDP measures inform latest needs in policy, budgeting, financing and accountability. This would promote stronger uptake of a Beyond GDP framework across relevant institutions.

Establishing a mechanism for periodic review, peer learning and sharing of good practices to support continuous implementation and regular exchange/dialogue between technical experts, stakeholders and Member States will be essential, as per Para. 74(a) in the HLEG report. The OECD expert forums on implementation could serve as an example.

4. Balancing Global Coherence and National Flexibility

How should the framework balance the need for a globally coherent approach with sufficient flexibility to reflect different national priorities, capacities and development pathways?

The IGP should consider a dedicated working group to go through possible options and considerations on the matter of universality/interoperability and flexibility/national ownership, as establishing this balance will be critical for the robustness of any Beyond GDP framework emerging through the UN.

Three levels may be distinguished:

Three Levels of the Framework

1. **The overall conceptual framework, with the three pillars (current well-being, equity and inclusion, sustainability and resilience) and the three foundational principles (peace, human rights and respect for the planet):** this could be consistent across countries;
2. **The domains within each pillar (the dashboard structure):** they could be considered as a menu with a level of flexibility rather than a fixed prescription, particularly in light of the variability in data collection capabilities across the multi-tiered indicators as outlined by the HLEG;
3. **The specific indicators for each domain:** to some extent they could also be a menu, except when getting to the level of the details of how to measure things (e.g. how to measure life satisfaction or loneliness, or crime statistics): at this methodological level, it would be beneficial to have harmonization and detailed advice, such as the OECD has done with its guidelines on measuring subjective wellbeing. In summary: flexibility on which indicators to pick, but harmonized methodological guidance on how to measure each indicator.

5. Headline Indicators and Emerging Dimensions

Is there a need for headline indicators and if so, what criteria should guide the selection and development of headline indicators? How should emerging dimensions and less established measures—such as subjective well-being, social cohesion, cross-country spillovers, capital/wealth measures, planet boundaries—be incorporated where appropriate?

Headline indicators have an important role to play in communicating complex multidimensional concepts in a form that is understandable, comparable and useful for policymakers. Their selection, however, should not be driven solely by substantive importance. Because headline indicators inevitably shape political attention, institutional priorities and policy incentives, their selection is also a governance decision.

Headline indicators should therefore satisfy clear criteria, including scientific robustness, international comparability, conceptual clarity, transparency of methodology and periodic review. Equally important, there should be confidence that they command broad institutional legitimacy and are capable of supporting long-term international application.

Emerging dimensions, including subjective well-being, social cohesion and planetary boundaries, should be incorporated through a structured process that allows methodological development, international testing and periodic reassessment before becoming headline indicators. The objective should not be to create a static set of measures, but to establish a legitimate and transparent pathway through which new indicators can mature and acquire international acceptance.

Therefore noting the HLEG recommendation in Para. 74(e), the IGP should help generate the mandate for work establishing a small number of headline indicators (one to three) that are politically memorable, statistically representative of the domains they stand for, comparable across countries and endorsed by citizens, which could sit alongside a fuller dashboard for policy use. This may include adopting existing indicators (e.g. the Human Development Index and its Inequality-adjusted variant, the Social Progress Index, or the Inclusive Wealth Index, the Happy Planet Index, Multidimensional Poverty Index, Freedom in the World Index, Global Peace Index and Happiness Index) or adjusted-GDP indicators (e.g. value-, equity, or sustainability-adjusted GDP). The goal should be to ensure their policy applicability, where their technical and political buy-in should provide the enabling conditions to shift decision-making away from harmful outcomes that may emerge from GDP-centric policies.

III. National Implementation

1. Integrating Beyond GDP Into National Policymaking

How could Beyond GDP measures be integrated into national policymaking processes, including planning, budgeting, monitoring and evaluation, while remaining adaptable to national circumstances and priorities?

National statistical offices should coordinate data production, while finance, planning, information technology, social development or other relevant ministries, legislative bodies, national human rights institutions, equality bodies, data protection authorities, private sector, civil society and affected communities should be formally involved in indicator development, data governance, interpretation and communication.

Embedding Beyond GDP into existing planning, budgeting, monitoring and evaluation processes so it informs real decisions rather than functioning as standalone reporting; the goal should be incremental implementation and respecting national priorities while maintaining coherence through shared principles and standards.

Using 'Beyond GDP evidence scans' to set overarching government priorities, use of wellbeing budgeting methods, and integrating Beyond GDP frameworks into emerging national legislation, for example for intergenerational wellbeing, would stand as key actions to advance Beyond GDP policymaking.

2. Institutional, Statistical and Governance Arrangements

What institutional, statistical and governance arrangements would facilitate the effective use of multidimensional measures in national decision-making?

Institutional: embedding Beyond GDP measures and systems across finance, planning and cabinet/prime minister office functions, rather than isolating it in a statistical office or single sectoral ministry. Using interministerial committees and cross-government expert groups to translate indicators into workable policy. Pursuing legislative, legal or constitutional embedding alongside participatory processes to make the approach durable across changes in government — following models like independent commissions and auditors under a framework law, as in Wales or Canada — and showcasing good practice or aspirational country examples.

Statistical: using the HLEG's suggested set of roughly 31 indicators across four components to avoid indicator overload while preserving comparability. Building on national statistical offices' existing surveys, explicitly marking data gaps to fill over time. Disaggregating by gender, age, income, geography and other relevant dimensions. Sustaining funding for statistical capacity, methodological innovation and data infrastructure and digital systems, especially where data gaps are largest, including training, technical assistance and private sector partnerships and collaboration with regional and international statistical bodies.

Governance: providing Beyond GDP indicators political weight through explicit guidance for how they feed into decisions — thresholds that trigger policy review, wellbeing impact assessments for major laws and budgets, requirements for departments to work jointly toward wellbeing goals. Involving academia, civil society, private sector, local government and affected communities in adapting and interpreting indicators. Building regular, accessible public reporting — dashboards, citizen reports, visualisations, media engagement — to support electoral accountability, and using independent oversight (parliamentary committees, audit institutions, wellbeing councils or commissioners) to review progress and create a feedback loop between measurement and action.

3. International Cooperation and Capacity-Building

What forms of international cooperation and capacity-building would be most effective in supporting countries—particularly developing countries—in strengthening data systems and implementing Beyond GDP approaches?

Bridging statistical gaps and capacities will be accelerated through dedicated financing mechanisms as potentially established through the IGP, including through programmes developed through the UNSC and implemented through the UN Development System, including UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Frameworks. In light of growing capabilities, it will be important to ensure that the potential use of artificial intelligence in support of national statistical capacity is conducted responsibly, including through utilizing private sector services.

Leveraging expert networks and coalitions of the willing which can bring together knowledge, resources and communities of practice, such as the Global Alliance on Beyond GDP, the Coalition of Finance Ministers for Climate Action, or the OECD, will be critical for building capacity through platforms supporting international cooperation.

An important adjustment for developing countries – a majority of whom face significant debt pressures – would be IFIs reflecting Beyond GDP within their own policies and processes (including for example IMF's Debt Sustainability Assessment) – without that, the incentive or capacity for countries to invest in Beyond GDP approaches may be limited since creditor behaviour strongly shapes debtor behaviour under current arrangements.

4. Cooperation Between Statistical Systems and Policymakers

What model of cooperation between national statistical systems and policymakers would best support the development and implementation of these measures?

The most effective support combines country-led technical assistance, peer learning and long-term capacity-building. Capacity-building should not stop at data production. It should also help finance ministries, planners and sector ministries interpret and use the indicators in budgets, plans and policy assessments.

Building data and policy together could be done through iterative learning, regular review and engagement with wider stakeholders, including academia and civil society, so that multidimensional measures inform long-term governance, strategic planning and intergenerational decision-making.

Using a partnership or co-design model can serve as effective arrangements: national statistical systems produce and safeguard the quality of the measures, while policymakers define the decision points where those measures must be used. Transparency and public participation would be important for both points.

IV. International Policy Applications

1. Informing International Policy Discussions

What potential role could Beyond GDP measures play in informing international policy discussions, while ensuring transparency, fairness and broad international acceptance?

An overarching use case of Beyond GDP measures would be reframing international policy discussions around whether economic activities (often focused on GDP growth) are delivering progress for citizens – conceptualized as inclusive and sustainable wellbeing – within the means of the planet. Doing so would make visible inequalities, multidimensional vulnerability, environmental harms, care and support work, fiscal constraints and cross-border impacts, which GDP-based approaches often obscure.

Beyond GDP measures, developed through inclusive intergovernmental processes while being flexible enough for different national contexts, could be used as a common evidence base for international cooperation — helping countries identify shared challenges, exchange good practice and strengthen coherence across existing global frameworks. Establishing global- and national-level coherence in a Beyond GDP framework will help articulate the distributional balance of aggregate development pathways against planetary constraints – which may help inform the coherent implementation of relevant frameworks such as the Seville Commitment, Paris Agreement, the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

2. Informing International Decision-Making

Should Beyond GDP measures inform international decision-making processes relating to sustainable development, development cooperation, access to concessional finance, vulnerability assessments or other international policy frameworks? If so, under what conditions?

Beyond GDP measures have the potential to strengthen international decision-making by providing a richer understanding of development than economic output alone. Their use in areas such as sustainable development, development cooperation, concessional finance and vulnerability assessments should therefore be encouraged. However, their application should be understood as a significant governance transition as well as a technical extension of measurement.

Once evaluative measures begin informing resource allocation or international policy decisions, they exercise institutional authority as well as analytical value. Their legitimacy therefore depends not only on methodological robustness but also on transparent governance arrangements, periodic review, accountability and meaningful participation by Member States. The conditions for their application should include clear governance structures, publicly understood methodologies, and mechanisms that allow the framework to evolve as evidence, priorities and international circumstances change.

Beyond GDP should therefore inform international decision-making progressively and transparently, with governance arrangements developing alongside the increasing authority these measures exercise within international policy processes.

3. Coherence Across International Initiatives

How can future work on Beyond GDP promote greater coherence across existing international initiatives, including the Multidimensional Vulnerability Index, the Sevilla Commitment and other relevant processes, while avoiding fragmentation and duplication?

The proliferation of international initiatives reflects the growing recognition that development cannot be understood through economic output alone. Diversity of frameworks is therefore not, in itself, a problem. The greater challenge is ensuring that these initiatives remain coherent, mutually reinforcing and institutionally interoperable rather than creating parallel systems of evaluation.

Future work on Beyond GDP should therefore focus less on establishing another standalone framework and more on providing a new norm and common governance architecture through which existing initiatives can be interpreted, coordinated and periodically reviewed. This should include shared principles for transparency, methodological consistency, institutional dialogue and ongoing learning, while allowing individual frameworks to retain their distinct purposes and comparative advantages.

The objective should be greater coherence without unnecessary standardization. A successful Beyond GDP agenda should strengthen the collective capacity of existing international initiatives rather than compete with or duplicate them. The IGP could therefore produce a mapping of interconnections between Beyond GDP and other relevant frameworks and initiatives, to better understand opportunities for synergies and coherence and avoid duplication and fragmentation.

4. Outcomes of the Intergovernmental Process

What outcomes should emerge from the current intergovernmental process to provide strategic guidance for future work within the United Nations Development system?

Provided in list form, a few overarching outcomes which should emerge from the current IGP:

- Political momentum on the Beyond GDP agenda, including political directives and requests for action by Member States towards national bodies and all other relevant stakeholders, including international institutions and civil society;
- A normative, overarching framework anchored in intergenerational fairness, wellbeing and long-term governance, that is coherent with and supports the 2030 Agenda, with clear principles and normative guidance on how to apply the dashboard;
- A defined timeline of objectives and a roadmap of modalities for development of:
    - further refinements or development of technical indicators;
    - data architecture and infrastructure;
    - recommended implementation pathways across national and international planning, budgeting and financing decision-making bodies and frameworks (including e.g. UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Frameworks, and IFIs);
    - capacity-building and voluntary peer learning, including resource mobilization;
    - periodic review and reporting mechanisms (including e.g. Voluntary National Reviews).

United Nations University
Centre for Policy Research

About UNU-CPR

United Nations University Centre for Policy Research (UNU-CPR) is a think tank that carries out policy-focused research on issues of strategic interest and importance to the United Nations and its Member States. The Centre prioritizes urgent policy needs requiring innovative, practical solutions oriented toward immediate implementation.

UNU-CPR offers deep knowledge of the multilateral system and an extensive network of partners within and outside of the United Nations. The United Nations University Charter, formally adopted by the General Assembly in 1973, endows the Centre with academic independence, which ensures that its research is impartial and grounded in an objective assessment of policy and practice.

cpr.unu.edu

New York (Headquarters)
One Dag Hammarskjöld Plaza
885 2nd Avenue, 14th Floor
New York, NY 10017
United States
Tel: +1-646-905-5225
Email: comms-cpr@unu.edu

Geneva
Maison de la Paix
Chemin Eugène-Rigot 2E
Geneva, Switzerland.
Tel: +1-917-225-0199
Email: comms-cpr@unu.edu