



## 7.3 Annex to section 7.1 – Detailed findings from the analysis of global-commission recommendations



Domain	Key findings
<p><b>Levers to bring about change</b></p>	<p>Many global commissions called for broad measures and mechanisms required to stimulate change, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Global summit-endorsed strategic framework – to establish a shared vocabulary and goals and to make strategic choices about near- and long-term priorities – and an accompanying program of action and accountability framework (or a UN Special Assembly), as well as regional summit-endorsed implementation plans</li> <li>• Voluntary measures, such as a code of practice, standards, guidelines, procedures, toolkits and ‘policy dialogues’</li> <li>• Monitoring and improvement approaches, such as indicators, benchmarks, targets, functional expenditure reviews, independent assessments, and profiling of high performers</li> <li>• Planning mechanisms, such as multi-sector budgeting and program planning</li> <li>• Technical and financial assistance, and partnership arrangements, that can be rapidly deployed when windows of opportunity open or crises hit</li> <li>• Funding mechanisms, such as funding for implementation or scale-up, funding that is conditional on activities or outcomes (i.e., incentives), a greater relative share of existing funding commitments, and a centralized mechanism for individual giving</li> <li>• New focal points within or involving existing institutions, such as a UN special representative (and possibly regional representatives and national envoys), a UN intergovernmental committee or inter-agency task force, a high-level body, and a global observatory, as well as complementary groups like a ‘coalition of champions’</li> <li>• Legally binding treaties, such as framework conventions</li> <li>• Elements drawn from a larger strategy               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ to support country action, such as a framework, implementation toolkit, selecting and building momentum in countries, creating national commitments and plans, leveraging specialized institutions, sharing best practices, and tracking progress</li> <li>◦ for climate action, such as clear global goals, a mechanism for making and ratcheting up national commitments, and a strong implementation framework</li> <li>◦ for pandemic preparedness and response, such as a framework, governance mechanism, engagement of existing institutions, ‘ever-warm’ capacity, global pooling, and swift pivoting and scale-up</li> <li>◦ for cross-institutional coordination and ‘leveling up,’ such as the UN Secretary-General, leaders of UN agencies, and presidents and shareholders of multilateral development banks aligning their institutions’ normative, advisory and investment actions</li> <li>◦ for leveraging existing institutional authority, such as the International Monetary Fund giving more attention to particular issues in its Article IV surveillance activities</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Chapter 2: Nature of societal challenges</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some global commissions called for <b>framing</b> a societal challenge in ways that are more likely to generate action               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ e.g., frame as a complex-adaptive systems problem (High-level panel for a sustainable ocean economy)</li> <li>◦ e.g., re-frame the SDGs as being for and about children, and greenhouse gas emissions as a threat to their future (WHO-UNICEF-Lancet Commission on a future for the world’s children)</li> <li>◦ e.g., conceptualize adolescent health more comprehensively so adolescents are centrally placed in existing and emerging agendas, as well as argue for the age of ‘second chances’ and the opportunity for ‘triple dividends’ (Lancet Commission on adolescent health and well-being)</li> <li>◦ e.g., frame the challenge in syndemic and systems terms to show the inherent connectedness and systemic origins, to justify platforms for collaborative work, and to drive attention to actions that are double-duty and triple-duty (Lancet Commission on the global syndemic of obesity, undernutrition, and climate change)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Some global commissions called for ways of <b>addressing</b> societal challenges so the actions are more likely to generate impacts               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ e.g., approach the challenge with an essential, integrated package of interventions (Guttmacher-Lancet commission on sexual and reproductive health and rights for all)</li> <li>◦ e.g., plan and sequence investments to increase benefits from interlinkages across sectors (High-level panel on water)</li> <li>◦ e.g., invest in great buys, good buys, and promising buys as determined by best evidence (Global education evidence advisory panel)</li> <li>◦ e.g., frame as a complex-adaptive systems problem requiring a mix of top-down and bottom-up approaches that can accommodate feedback loops and support adaptation and learning (High-level panel for a sustainable ocean economy)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• A few global commissions also called for foresight and innovations as domains that can complement evidence in addressing societal challenges</li> </ul>



### Chapter 3: Decisions and decision- makers: Demand for evidence

- Many global commission recommendations called for **government policymakers** to use specific policy instruments to address a societal challenge, although typically they were silent about how policymakers can or should use evidence in selecting or applying these policy instruments
  - e.g., information and education instruments, such as public reporting on progress and about impacts on health and the environmental (Global ocean commission) and on equity (e.g., Global commission on adaptation), as well as education to build various types of literacy (e.g., High level panel of experts on food security and nutrition) and digital platforms to deliver the education or campaigns (WHO independent high-level commission on noncommunicable diseases)
  - e.g., voluntary instruments, such as frameworks, guidelines (e.g., Global task force on cholera control), toolkits, partnerships with specialized institutions, and networks
  - e.g., economic instruments such as public expenditure, contracts, externality pricing and true-cost accounting (Food and land use coalition)
  - e.g., legal instruments, such as regulations to address standards (Global commission on the economy and climate), procurement (Global commission on internet governance), and disclosures of conflicts of interest and other factors (High level panel on access to medicines)
- Some global commission recommendations called for government policymakers to make use of specific structures and processes, although again typically they were silent about how policymakers can or should use evidence in selecting or applying these policy instruments
  - e.g., cross-sectoral decision-making mechanisms (Global commission for urgent action on energy efficiency) and initiatives to support policy coherence (Global commission on the future of work)
  - e.g., participatory policymaking processes (3-D Commission on health determinants, data, and decision-making)
  - e.g., independent audit and ombudsman offices (Lancet Commission on the global syndemic of obesity, undernutrition, and climate change)
  - e.g., national plans
- Fewer global commissions called for **organizational leaders** – especially business leaders – to use specific approaches to address a societal challenge, and when they did they were again typically silent about how leaders can or should use evidence in selecting or applying these approaches
  - e.g., commitment to principles such as the UN Global Compact principles and UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (Business and sustainable development commission) and the expanded environmental, social and corporate governance (ESG) principles (Global high level panel on water and peace)
  - e.g., use of innovative financial tools, such as externality pricing (i.e., pricing that reflects environmental and social externalities), blended-finance tools to support SDG investments (i.e., rewarding the achievement of environmental and social impacts alongside financial returns), sustainability-linked debt (i.e., pricing contingent on achievement of sustainability targets), and paying for environmental protection (payments for services that protect and manage nature) (Business and sustainable development commission), as well as public-private partnerships to lower the risk of investing (High level panel on internal displacement)
  - e.g., harnessing internal mechanisms, such as self-audits, setting hiring targets, and providing incentives to managers through performance reviews and compensation tied to targets (High level panel on women’s economic empowerment)
- One global commission called for an expectation that organizational leaders will “support sound science and make use of the results in setting science-based targets in their sector roadmaps” (Business and sustainable development commission)
- Few global commissions called for **professionals** to address societal challenges independently of their role in governments and organizations, although one called on professionals to promote evidence-based approaches (Global commission on drug policy)
- Few global commissions called for **citizens** to play a more active role in addressing societal challenges
  - e.g., inform themselves on their rights and entitlements, communicate their needs and preferences to service providers, and have both health and data literacy (Lancet Commission on high-quality health systems in the SDG era)
  - e.g., encourage fellow citizens acting as opinion leaders to play their role responsibly, and hold decision-makers to account (Global commission on drug policy)
  - e.g., develop the capacity to engage in policymaking (Global high level panel on water and peace)
- A few global commissions noted the roles that others can play in supporting citizens, including journalists (High level panel on internal displacement) and professionals like teachers, police officers, community workers, and health professionals (Lancet Commission on adolescent health and wellbeing)
- One global commission called for citizens to “press for greater social accountability through citizen report cards, community monitoring, social audits, participatory budgeting, citizen charters, and health committees” (Lancet Commission on high-quality health systems in the SDG era)



**Chapter 4:**  
Studies,  
syntheses and  
guidelines:  
Supply of  
evidence

- Many global-commission recommendations called for increasing data collection and sharing, which are a foundation for **data analytics** as a form of evidence, but:
  - gave little attention to the problem of parsimony in what's collected, the quality of the data and data analytics, and timeliness in sharing (with an exception in the Lancet Commission on high-quality health systems in the SDG era)
  - appeared to assume that robust data analytics will be undertaken and then presented in ways that can inform decision-making and support accountability, including by being attentive to equity considerations
  - didn't clarify the types of questions that data analytics can best answer or the forms of evidence that can answer the other types of questions needed to make decisions
- Some of these global-commission recommendations called for specific actions related to increasing data collection and sharing, and to balancing the benefits and harms of using artificial intelligence (although not necessarily in the context of data analytics)
  - e.g., harmonizing metrics, establishing monitoring systems, and sharing open-access data (Global commission on adaptation)
  - e.g., establishing a global data-sharing platform (Global ocean commission and Global zero) and a global observatory that can support cross-national comparisons (High-level panel of experts on food security and nutrition and UCL–Lancet Commission on migration and health)
  - e.g., regulating artificial intelligence (Global commission on the future of work) and ensuring it is designed in ways that enable actions to be explained and humans to be accountable for these actions (High-level panel on digital cooperation)
- When other forms of evidence were addressed, recommendations tended to call for increasing the flow of **new evidence**, such as new evaluations (G20 high-level independent panel on financing the global commons for pandemic preparedness and response), and not to call for
  - improving the signal-to-noise ratio in the flow of such evidence
  - better using the stock of existing evidence
  - combining multiple forms of evidence
- Some global commissions called for **evaluations**
  - e.g., evaluating what works (Education commission; Global commission on adaptation; WHO-UNICEF-Lancet Commission on a future for the world's children; Lancet Commission on high-quality health systems in the SDG era; Lancet Commission on adolescent health and well-being; and Lancet Commission on women and cardiovascular disease)
  - e.g., evaluating impacts across multiple domains (e.g., health, economic and environmental impacts) and time horizons (3-D Commission on health determinants, data, and decision-making)
  - e.g., pre-approving trial designs in preparation for health emergencies (Commission on a global health risk framework for the future) and having regional capacity for trials (Independent panel for pandemic preparedness and response)
  - e.g., evaluating products such as vaccines, diagnostics and therapeutics (Global health crises task force), albeit not the system-arrangements and implementation strategies that can get the right products to the people who need them
- Few global commissions called for **behavioural/implementation research**
  - e.g., leveraging behavioural insights and behavioural economics (Global commission for urgent action on energy efficiency; Global commission on the economy and climate)
  - e.g., using campaigns and other strategies to change behaviours such as food labeling (Champions 12.3), albeit with no explicit mention of the need for behavioural / implementation research
- Even fewer global commissions called for other forms of evidence, such as:
  - **modeling** (Champions 12.3 and Lancet Commission on the global syndemic of obesity, undernutrition, and climate change)
  - **qualitative insights**, in this case social-sciences research to support community engagement (Global health crises task force)
  - **evidence syntheses**, in this case about great buys, good buys, and promising but limited evidence (Global education evidence advisory panel)
  - **guidelines**, in this case evidence-based guidelines about the 'scheduling' of (illicit) drugs (Global commission on drug policy)
- One global commission called for the use of many forms of evidence (High-level panel of experts on food security and nutrition), while another called for mandatory publication of study protocols and findings, and mandatory sharing of anonymized individual patient data (High-level panel on access to medicines)



### Chapter 5: Role of evidence intermediaries

- Many global commissions called for the **UN system**, including its regional and country offices, to better harness its normative role (e.g., guidelines) and its advisory role (e.g., technical assistance to its member states), although evidence was rarely made explicit as a necessary underpinning of such roles (e.g., WHO-UNICEF-Lancet Commission on a future for the world's children)
- Some global commissions called for greater support to **other types of evidence intermediaries**, such as agriculture extension services that support farmers (Champions 12.3)
- Some global commissions called for the types of **strategies** that can be used by evidence intermediaries, although evidence was rarely made explicit as the focus of such strategies
  - e.g., sharing examples of outcomes and impacts achieved, such as through peer-to-peer education (Global commission on adaptation), mentorship (High-level panel of experts on food security and nutrition and (Lancet Commission on high-quality health systems in the SDG era), and communities of interest (Global commission on the stability of cyberspace)
  - e.g., auditing structures, processes and outputs to identify opportunities to improve (High-level panel for a sustainable ocean economy)
  - e.g., packaging information in understandable ways, with additional support to groups that are often marginalized, disadvantaged, and subject to discrimination (Guttmacher-Lancet Commission on sexual and reproductive health and rights for all)
  - e.g., combatting mis- and dis-information online, through fact-checking and through other efforts to counter claims that are not fact-based (UCL-Lancet Commission on migration and health)
  - e.g., maintaining platforms to share knowledge (High-level panel on internal displacement)
  - e.g., maintaining help desks to respond rapidly to requests (Highlevel panel on digital cooperation)
  - e.g., building capacity among decision-makers (Global high-level panel on water and peace), including different numeric and other types of literacy (Independent panel for pandemic preparedness and response)
  - e.g., convening national dialogues (Global commission on adaptation; High-level panel on water)
- One global commission called for separating the provision of advice from inputs (e.g., seeds) to strengthen the incentive for recommending approaches that reduce input costs and promote other goals (Food and land-use coalition)
- Another global commission called for holding leaders accountable for their collective-impact commitments, which will be necessary for evidence intermediaries working as part of a high-performing evidence-support system (High-level panel for a sustainable ocean economy)



### Chapter 6: Need for global public goods and equitably distributed capacities

- Some global commissions called for specific institutions to play a key role with respect to **global public goods** (e.g., World Bank, WHO, and the International Organization for Standardization, or ISO), although none addressed evidence-related global public goods
  - e.g., establish a new mandate and financing commitment for the World Bank, aimed at promoting development-related global public goods (High-level panel on the future of multilateral development banking)
  - e.g., articulate WHO's role with global public goods to support pandemic preparedness and response (Independent panel for pandemic preparedness and response)
  - e.g., encourage the ISO to develop and adopt an international standard (High-level panel on water)
- Some global commissions called for global public goods that could be relevant to evidence-related goods
  - e.g., internet (Global commission on internet governance)
  - e.g., primary and secondary education, communication infrastructure, new quality measures, and a global repository of such measures (Lancet Commission on high-quality health systems in the SDG era)
- Other global commissions called for measures that can be considered global public goods – even if they didn't use the language explicitly – and that could be relevant to evidence-related goods
  - e.g., convergence of regulatory processes and standards (Commission on a global health-risk framework for the future)
  - e.g., harmonizing standards (Global commission for urgent action on energy efficiency)
  - e.g., voluntary standards (Food and land-use coalition)
  - e.g., common digital learning platforms with certification of content appropriate for curricula and labour markets, as well as common skills-accreditation systems that support portability (Education commission)
  - e.g., digital platforms for risk-factor screening (Lancet Commission on women and cardiovascular disease)
- Some global commissions called for **distributed capacities**, although none addressed an appropriate division of labour (e.g., what the UN system, its regional offices and its country offices can each best do)
  - e.g., to benefit from the internet – open standards, public-access spots, affordable devices, accommodations for refugees and those with disabilities, and access metrics, as well as distributed capacities to govern, develop and use the internet safely (Global commission on internet governance)
  - e.g., to implement the International Health Regulations – self-assessments, periodic external assessments, public discussion of these assessments at the World Health Assembly, a costed approach to implementation supports, and a transition to a broader focus on health-system strengthening as capacities mature (Global health crises task force)
- Other global commissions called for a central body to support capacity building (Global commission on the stability of cyberspace) and for thinking in terms of learning pathways and lifelong learning (High-level commission on health employment and economic growth)