

Advancing Sustainable Governance: Integrating Monitoring, Evaluation and Accountability for Effective Public Administration

Nasir Ahmad Ganaie^{1,*}

¹Department of Political Science, University of Kashmir, Srinagar, Union Territory of Jammu and Kashmir, India.
nasirahmadganaie@gmail.com¹

*Corresponding author

Abstract: To meet the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) on schedule, strong Monitoring, Evaluation, and Accountability (MEA) systems are needed. Good governance requires effective MEA systems to track progress, quantify effects, and ensure transparent public management. This study emphasises the significance of MEA frameworks in enhancing governance structures, enabling policymakers and administrators to develop, implement, and refine sustainable public policies. The report highlights how MEA systems enhance accountability, reduce waste, and foster trust among communities and stakeholders within the government. We examine contemporary MEA frameworks, their structural aspects, and the challenges of integrating them into complex public administration systems, especially in developing nations. Case studies and global best practices demonstrate MEA's ability to measure outputs and outcomes and shape policy creation in a proactive, results-driven way. The research emphasises inclusive involvement, stakeholder engagement, and capacity building to overcome implementation issues. The results demonstrate that institutionalising MEA can establish a transparent, fair, and socially responsive governance structure that accelerates progress toward the SDGs. This essay concludes that MEA systems should be tools for compliance, learning, innovation, and long-term growth.

Keywords: Accountability and Adaptive Governance; Data-Driven Policy; Monitoring Frameworks; Participatory Governance, Public Administration; Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Cite as: N. A. Ganaie, "Advancing Sustainable Governance: Integrating Monitoring, Evaluation and Accountability for Effective Public Administration," *AVE Trends in Intelligent Technoprise Letters*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 85–93, 2025.

Journal Homepage: <https://www.avepubs.com/user/journals/details/ATITP>

Received on: 22/09/2024, **Revised on:** 25/11/2024, **Accepted on:** 10/01/2025, **Published on:** 07/06/2025

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.64091/ATITP.2025.000153>

1. Introduction

1.1. Defining the Imperative: Sustainable Governance in the Global World

Against this background, sustainable governance has emerged as a pressing concern for governments worldwide in an era where rapid globalisation, climate change, and ever-increasing socioeconomic inequalities necessitate more urgent interdependence [4]. The United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) are a comprehensive framework that outlines the linkages and targets related to poverty, health, education, environmental sustainability, and institutional integrity, all of which are to be realised by 2030 [32]. Comprehensively considering economic, social, and environmental outcomes and integrating them through this governance approach, sustainable governance is a conceptual and operational paradigm that encourages public institutions to develop holistic objectives that encompass economic, social, and environmental considerations [18].

Copyright © 2025 N. A. Ganaie, licensed to AVE Trends Publishing Company. This is an open access article distributed under [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/), which allows unlimited use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium with proper attribution.

First, sustainable governance is a balance between the immediate and distant, and where developmental policies do not prejudice future generations' ability to meet their own needs [38]. Public administration is the engine of sustainable governance, charged with planning, implementing, and overseeing the SDGs that will yield the most impact. In this context, Monitoring, Evaluation, and Accountability (MEA) mechanisms become crucial, as they are the 'tools of the day' used to measure progress, address policy inefficiencies, and keep governments transparent and accountable [19]. The purpose of this introductory paper is twofold: first, to establish a theoretical and empirical foundation for the role of MEA in sustainable governance, and second, to outline the role of MEA as a transformational vehicle in global sustainability [25]; [28].

1.2. Public Administration for Sustainable Development

Historically, public administration has played a central role in addressing societal challenges, including welfare, social equity, economic growth, and environmental protection [41]. Public administration, as a function of the SDGs, should adopt innovative approaches to formal administrative functions, particularly in light of contemporary sustainability challenges [46]. As governments work to address complex and highly intertwined issues worldwide, public administration is tasked with revising its frameworks to make policies more effective, equitable for the public, and sustainable in the long term. MEA integration in public administration frameworks represents a significant leap forward, enabling the sector to better respond to the growing demands for sustainable governance [29]. To achieve the SDGs, a new model of public administration is required that is based on participatory governance, resource efficiency, and the implementation of policy based on the achieved results. This model is based on Monitoring, Evaluation, and Accountability, which entails the use of structured methodologies to enable informed decision-making and to monitor how policies respond to evolving challenges. Thus, MEA systems play an indispensable role in the evolving role of public administration in managing sustainable development in an accountable and transparent manner [43].

1.3. Monitoring, Evaluation, and Accountability (MEA): Foundations and Frameworks

Thinking of Monitoring, Evaluation, and Accountability as a triadic framework that provides a framework for organising governance towards promoting sustainable development [27]. In turn, each component contributes to such a cycle of continuous improvement that creates a feedback loop for policymakers to adjust their strategies and optimise resource allocation. Monitoring is the process of regularly checking and measuring the progress of policy implementation, including tracking the achievement of set goals over time [31]. More in-depth analysis of policies and evaluation encompasses the impact, effectiveness, and relevance of policies over time [23]. In contrast, accountability provides measures of transparency and citizen engagement, undertaking to keep the government in check by making it liable to public expectations. The design and implementation of MEA frameworks vary significantly according to governance structure, resource availability, and institutional capacity [33]. Although MEA frameworks differ greatly, they all have certain common attributes: data accuracy, stakeholder inclusivity, and adaptability [21]. MEA can be institutionalised within public administration through mechanisms that ensure a higher level of accountability and responsiveness, thereby giving rise to governance structures that are both sustainable and equitable [12].

1.4. MEA in Governance: Theoretical Perspectives

MEA systems can be implemented within governance supported by several theoretical frameworks [17]. For example, Systems Theory emphasises the governance concept as an interconnected network of processes, actors, and feedback loops [5]. Within this framework, MEA serves as the regulatory mechanism that enables governance structures to respond to change and adjust their course if necessary. Accountability is also a subject of interest under the Principal Agent Theory concerning MEA. One theory that this paper highlights is the link between the government (as a principal to public institutions as agents), the latter being accountable to the government to help align its actions with the public interest [13]. MEA is further explained by Institutional Theory, which studies how organisational structures, norms, and practices affect policy outcomes [21]. This framework puts MEA at the heart of institutional norms to ensure transparency, inclusiveness, and efficiency. Together, these theories contribute to a more nuanced understanding of the role of MEA in sustainable governance, providing some grounds for analysing how MEA frameworks can be effectively implemented within the practice of public administration [20].

1.5. MEA and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs): Global Target Alignment

Specific targets are also set across many different domains (poverty eradication, gender equality, environmental protection, and sustainable cities, among others) for the SDGs. These goals can be achieved only if governance systems incorporate MEA frameworks, enabling the system to measure progress, identify bottlenecks, and adapt strategies [42]. Hence, aligning MEA processes with SDG targets is a critical issue for public administration, as it will sustain policies aimed at achieving sustainable outcomes [10]. Well-designed MEA frameworks enable the government to develop measurable indicators for each of the SDG targets, resulting in a structured policy implementation that offers the advantages of transparency and flexibility. Take, for

instance, SDG 13 on climate action, which involves monitoring carbon emissions and evaluating the impacts of climate resilience on policy [16]. Similarly, the importance of accountability mechanisms that promote inclusive and participatory governance, as well as SDG 16 on peace, justice, and strong institutions, is highlighted. Correspondences made by MEA with the SDG targets help the public administration approach governance with a results-oriented stance, thereby increasing both the efficiency and legitimacy of sustainable development efforts [3].

1.6. MEA Implementation in Sustainable Governance Challenges

The benefits of MEA in sustainable governance are widely acknowledged, but serious challenges inhibit their realisation. Furthermore, in the absence of MEA systems, resource constraints, especially in developing countries, prevent public institutions from establishing and sustaining their systems [1]. Barriers to data quality and availability also exist, as there is little infrastructure to accurately and timely record data in many regions. In governance contexts where bureaucratic inertia and corruption prevail, clearing away institutional resistance to transparency and accountability can undermine the efforts of institutions responsible for monitoring, evaluation, and accountability [7]. These challenges are surmounted by committing to capacity building, technological innovation, and the implementation of policies that institutionalise MEA practices at all levels of government. There are many roles that international organisations, including the United Nations and the World Bank, play in supporting the efforts of these countries to develop effective MEA frameworks. They offer technical assistance, funding, and knowledge-sharing platforms to countries that help them build their own effective MEA frameworks [44]. Ensuring that sustainable governance is more than aspirational involves addressing the challenges of MEA implementation.

1.7. Technology in Advancing MEA Frameworks

The landscape of the MEA has evolved with technological advances, enabling new tools and methodologies in data collection, analysis, and reporting. Real-time monitoring of SDG progress through Geographic Information Systems (GIS), big data analytics, and cloud platforms enables public institutions to make advances in both the accuracy and speed of MEA processes [34]. These technologies also help us develop more inclusive and participatory approaches to accountability by providing citizens with platforms for engagement and feedback [5]. Digital tools also facilitate cross-sectoral collaboration among public institutions by enabling them to share data and coordinate efforts with one another to achieve common sustainability goals. In this case, environmental monitoring systems collect data that can be used as input to both public health policies and urban planning initiatives, leading to an integrative governance of sustainability [9]. This represents a real opportunity to utilise technology in the development of MEA frameworks, as it can help increase institutional capacity, enhance transparency, and improve citizen engagement in sustainable governance.

1.8. MEA and the Future of Public Administration: A Paradigm Shift

Through its integration with MEA frameworks into public administration, governance has shifted from a traditional bureaucratic paradigm to an adaptive, results-oriented paradigm. This shift reflects a growing awareness of the centrality of making evidence-based policy by deriving insight from data to formulate sustainable development strategies [48]. MEA systems can enable public administration to transform its role in society from one where it merely provides services to one where it not only provides services but also serves as a steward of sustainability [2]. The second aspect of the paradigm shift towards MEA-driven governance also creates space for participatory governance, where citizens actively participate in monitoring and evaluating institutional performance, as well as engaging in accountability to citizens. This approach enables people to feel responsible for sustainable development activities and contribute to and benefit from sustainability [11]. Public administration must be innovative, inclusive, and move forward with unwavering dedication to accountability, as governance practices align with the SDGs' long-term vision.

1.9. Charting a path forward for the MEA in sustainable governance

Monitoring, Evaluation, and Accountability are essential to our work in sustainable governance, as MEA frameworks are necessary to measure progress, ensure transparency, and evolve policies in response to new challenges. As a key player in sustainable management, public administration should integrate MEA systems to support the SDGs, building a governance model that balances both resilience and responsiveness [26]. This introduction lays out the theoretical groundwork and the practical necessity of MEA, serving as the backdrop for a detailed discussion of MEA's role in realising SDG objectives. In the following sections, we analyse case studies of MEA system implementations and reflect on strategies for overcoming the challenges of MEA in the operationalisation of public administration. This paper contributes to the ongoing discourse on sustainable governance by drawing on these insights to provide recommendations for enhancing the effectiveness and accountability of public institutions working towards a sustainable future [8].

2. Monitoring in Sustainable Governance

2.1. Monitoring within Sustainable Governance Frameworks: Defining the Field

Sustainable governance monitoring involves a systematic and continuous evaluation of SDG-aligned initiatives and policies to assess their progress, efficiency, and effectiveness. The real-time tracking of performance indicators enables public administrators to adapt efficiently, thereby making resource utilisation more effective [15]. Quantitative indicators, such as reductions in greenhouse gas emissions or access to clean water, can be part of a monitoring framework, alongside qualitative indicators, including community satisfaction or policy relevance.

2.2. Monitoring for Public Administration

Monitoring is the foundational basis for gauging and iterating public administrative policy outcomes and governing. Through regular monitoring, public administrators can identify these patterns, measure resource distribution, and respond to problems before they escalate [16]. In sustainable governance, where the policies are complex and interrelated, this real-time feedback loop is critical.

2.3. Monitoring Technologies

Data analytics, Geographic Information Systems (GIS), and big data have revolutionised monitoring capabilities for the advancement. Theoretically, these tools enable public institutions to conduct more precise environmental and social impact assessments with high resolution [30]. Satellite imaging for environmental monitoring and mobile-based surveys for citizen feedback technologies are changing the way monitoring data is collected, analysed, and reported.

2.4. Effective Monitoring Systems Case Studies

In fact, some countries, including Finland and Germany, have established centralised monitoring systems that track their progress toward achieving SDG goals across multiple sectors. Sourced from both national and local data, these systems work to bring together all the pieces of the puzzle to understand how the SDG outcomes process works [14]. These examples can be used as a starting point to help public administration understand best practices for data integration, accuracy, and stakeholder collaboration.

2.5. Big Challenges Faced while Monitoring SDG Progress

The problems of data inconsistency, resource limitations, and institutional resistance remain even in the presence of monitoring frameworks. In particular, data quality is a significant issue, particularly in developing nations where infrastructure and technology gaps hinder adequate monitoring. To add value to sustainable governance, it is generally necessary to address these barriers.

3. Evaluation as a Catalyst for Adaptive Governance

3.1. Evaluation in the Context of Sustainable Development

It is a valuable tool for evaluating the relevance, efficiency, and impact of policies, thereby informing adaptive governance. Rigorous evaluations enable public administrators to identify effective strategies, pinpoint and eliminate inefficiencies, and reallocate resources as needed. Additionally, evaluation serves to improve policy outcomes and accountability by making sure that public resources are used responsibly.

3.2. Approaches to Public Administration Evaluation

Different types of evaluation models are used in sustainable governance, including formative, summative, and impact evaluation. Formative evaluations happen at an early stage of policy implementation and allow for adjustments; summative evaluations, however, assess the overall effectiveness of a programme [47]. Impact evaluations catch long-term effects, such as reductions in poverty or improvements in health outcomes, as mandated by SDG targets.

3.3. Mixed-Methods Approaches in Evaluation

Sustainable governance is inherently complex and thus requires a mixed methods approach, including metrics such as financial efficiency, reduction in emission levels, insights from stakeholder satisfaction, and cultural relevance. The use of mixed-method evaluations offers a fine-grained analysis of the multidimensional impacts of policies on heterogeneous communities.

3.4. The following are four Case Studies of Evaluation Best Practices

Evaluation frameworks that incorporate both quantitative and qualitative data were pioneered by countries such as Canada and Norway, both of which serve as precedents for what best practice looks like. Scientific metrics and community feedback are combined to evaluate policies in Canada, as seen in the government's environmental policy evaluation framework [39].

3.5. Barrier to Effective Evaluation Overcoming

There are many challenges, including resource constraints and data limitations, as well as bureaucratic inertia, that both hinder and help effective evaluation. Addressing these barriers requires investment in building capacity, reforming policy, and establishing public-private partnerships to facilitate the sharing of resources [37]. In particular, developing countries rely on international support to develop comprehensive evaluation frameworks, which enable them to effectively achieve their SDG targets.

4. Accountability Mechanisms in Sustainable Governance

4.1. Accountability in Public Administration

Accountability is a fundamental precept of democratic government. Democracy cannot function if public institutions are not open to having actions and decisions called to account by citizens. It is within the context of sustainable governance, however, that accountability mechanisms are an essential part of fostering trust, warding off corruption, and guaranteeing that SDG-related initiatives proceed transparently and successfully.

4.2. There are Types of Accountability Mechanisms

Social accountability encompasses public hearings, community scorecards, and other measures; legal accountability involves anti-corruption laws and transparency policies; and administrative accountability includes internal audits and performance reviews. These mechanisms provide various pathways for citizens and stakeholders to monitor public institutions, fostering a culture of openness and accountability [35].

4.3. Citizen Engagement, Social Audits

Through social audits and participatory governance models, they become an active part of the monitoring and assessment of public services. For example, social audits enable communities to directly evaluate the impact of government programs, highlight areas for improvement, and hold them accountable to reputable institutions [22]. Engagement of citizens enhances governance by representing a shared sense of responsibility for sustainable development.

4.4. Case Studies: Accountability Frameworks that Work Well

For example, India and Brazil have established successful accountability programs with the support of citizens for their governments [6]. Conversely, India's Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) includes provisions for social audits that allow communities to monitor programme implementation [40]. These frameworks provide a clear understanding of how public administration can promote accountability and transparency [45].

4.5. Challenges in Accountability Mechanisms

Although important, accountability mechanisms are frequently weakened by weak enforcement, lack of public awareness, and institutional resistance. Comprehensive legal reforms, public awareness, and partnership with civil society organisations can form the accountability frameworks necessary to strengthen the framework [36].

5. MEA Frameworks and Application to Public Administration in Sustainable Development

5.1. Governance Structures (Embedding MEA Processes in Governance Structures)

Particularly, integrating MEA into Public Governance structures involves integrating MEA processes into the fundamental functions of public administration. This integration enables evidence-driven policy decisions, aligns policies with the SDGs, and fosters accountability at all levels of the system.

5.2. MEA Integration: Policy Reforms

Public administration must initiate policy reforms to institutionalise MEA and requires that monitoring, evaluation, and accountability mechanisms be imposed in all government Programmes [24]. Such reforms also enable MEA practice to become a standardised practice that is consistent and coherent for the implementation of policy.

5.3. MEA Capacity Building and Training

The MEA integration relies on a skilled workforce to handle the complex data and interpret the evaluation results. To equip and support MEA functions, capacity-building initiatives, including training in data collection, analysis, and evaluation methodology, would be critical to public officials.

5.4. Mea Frameworks

Digital technologies, such as Big Data Analytics, Geographic Information Systems (GIS), and cloud-based platforms, enable organisations to adopt digital solutions that enhance MEA capabilities by providing a fast and easy way to collect, analyse, and report data more effectively. These technologies enhance the accuracy and timeliness of MEA processes, thereby underpinning evidence-based policymaking and accountability.

5.5. Integrated MEA Systems: Case Studies

Integrated MEA systems can be five to six times more efficient than conventional frameworks and are well-proven, e.g., in Sweden and South Korea. The real progress in SDG implementation came from embedding MEA in their governance structures, thereby setting a benchmark for best practices in governance in terms of sustainability.

6. Conclusion

6.1. Bridging Theory and Practice: MEA's Key Role as a Promising Governance Tool for Environmental Sustainability

The focus of this paper has been on the fundamental contribution of Monitoring, Evaluation, and Accountability (MEA) frameworks in realising sustainable governance for public administration practices aligned with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). We have demonstrated through a structured analysis that MEA mechanisms are indispensable for monitoring progress, measuring impact, and ensuring transparency and accountability in governance. MEA in public administration serves as a bridge between the theoretical aspirations of sustainable development and the real-world situations of policy implementation.

6.2. Barriers to MEA Implementation Overcome

Even with MEA frameworks as a means for creating transparent and effective governance practices, there are challenges in executing these systems. MEA may be constrained by limited resources, inadequate data, and resistance to transparency, which hinder its successful implementation in governance structures. To combat these challenges, governments must implement comprehensive policy reforms, invest in building capacity, and leverage technology that facilitates the efficient collection and analysis of data. However, reducing these barriers is crucial for creating durable governance systems that can adapt and function effectively within those social, ecological, and economic contexts.

6.3. Toward a Participatory and Adaptive Public Administration

A major lesson from this study is the transformational potential for MEA frameworks to encourage participatory and adaptive governance. Public administration, in particular, can institutionalise MEA processes, creating governance systems that are not only responsive to changing challenges but also inclusive of citizen voices. Social audits, digital engagement platforms, and participatory evaluation methods enable citizens to contribute to policy oversight and the practice of sustainable development. GeoTrac adapts to conditions, is grounded in evaluations and monitoring, and ensures this policy connects to SDG targets and remains relevant and effective.

6.4. Measures for Strengthening MEA in Governance Systems

To maximise the impact of MEA frameworks, this paper recommends that governments prioritise:

- **Embedding MEA in All Governance Levels:** To ensure that MEA processes are standard practice at the local, regional, and national levels.
- **Leveraging digital innovations:** Using technologies like big data analytics and Geographic Information Systems (GIS) to improve the accuracy and accessibility of the data.
- **Building Partnerships for Capacity Development:** Working with international organisations and civil society to strengthen institutional capacity for MEA.
- **Promoting Inclusivity and Transparency:** Encouraging participation through monitoring and accountability mechanisms that involve active citizens in the accountability process.

If public administration implements these recommendations, it will strengthen its position in sustainable governance, establishing a results-driven, inclusive, and transparent system to accelerate progress toward the SDGs.

6.5. Envisioning the Future: MEA as a Catalyst for Global Sustainability

MEA will play a crucial role in public administration as the deadline for achieving the SDGs approaches in 2030. This paper presents insights and strategies that demonstrate that MEA is not merely an assessment tool but a catalyst for transformative governance. Support for MEA processes can not only facilitate better policy outcomes but also support a governance culture that values sustainability, equity, and accountability as public institutions champion these processes. The continued integration of MEA within governance frameworks will be essential if we are to live in a sustainable, resilient, and inclusive global future.

Acknowledgement: As the sole author, I confirm that no external assistance, collaboration, or institutional support was involved in the preparation of this manuscript.

Data Availability Statement: This study uses a dataset focused on advancing sustainable governance through integrated monitoring, evaluation, and accountability in public administration. The dataset and supporting materials are available from the author upon reasonable request.

Funding Statement: This research was supported by the Indian Council of Social Science Research (ICSSR), New Delhi, under the Post-Doctoral Fellowship (2023–2025). The fellowship funds contributed to the development and completion of this paper.

Conflicts of Interest Statement: No conflicts of interest have been declared by the author. Citations and references are mentioned in the information used.

Ethics and Consent Statement: The consent was obtained from the organization and individual participants during data collection, and ethical approval and participant consent were received.

References

1. A. F. Silva, M. I. Sánchez-Hernández, and L. C. Carvalho, “Local public administration in the process of implementing sustainable development goals,” *Sustainability*, vol. 15, no. 21, p. 15263, 2023.
2. A. Lindstrand, E. Mast, S. Churchill, N. Rahimi, J. Grevendork, A. Brooks, E. Magnus, R. Nandy, and K. L. O’Brien, “Implementing the immunisation agenda 2030: A framework for action through coordinated planning, monitoring & evaluation, ownership & accountability, and communications & advocacy,” *Vaccine*, vol. 42, no. S1, pp. S15–S27, 2024.
3. A. M. Lennan and W. Y. Ngoma, “Quality governance for sustainable development?” *Prog. Dev. Stud.*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 279–293, 2004.
4. A. R. C. Silva and A. A. Martinez, “Migration: Challenges and opportunities from the perspective of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs),” *Retos-Rev. Cienc. Adm. Econ.*, vol. 8, no. 16, pp. 109–120, 2018.
5. C. Dusabe, M. Abimpaye, N. Kabarungi, and M. D. Uwamahoro, “Monitoring, evaluation, and accountability evidence are used for the design, adaptation, and scale-up of an early childhood development program in Rwanda,” *Front. Public Health*, vol. 11, no. 7, pp. 1–7, 2023.
6. D. Das, “Empowerment of rural women through MGNREGA: A study of MGNREGA implementation in Barpeta development block of Barpeta district of Assam,” *J. Crit. Rev.*, vol. 7, no. 7, pp. 334–339, 2020.

7. D. Leuenberger, "Sustainable development in public administration: A match with practice?" *Public Works Manag. Policy*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 195–201, 2006.
8. J. S. Mukombwe, A. Du Toit, and S. L. Hendriks, "Sustainable Development Goal 16: Peace, justice and strong institutions," *Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd*, Cheltenham, United Kingdom, 2024.
9. OECD Publishing, "E-government for policy integration," *OECD Publishing*, 2017. Available: <https://doi.org/10.18356/1a63be5d-en> [Accessed by 30/07/2024].
10. F. C. Caldatto, S. C. Bortoluzzi, and E. P. De Lima, "The role of public administration in sustainable development," in *International Business, Trade and Institutional Sustainability*, Springer, Switzerland, 2020.
11. F. Muhammad, "Leadership, governance and public policy implementation competencies in the broader public sector," *Eur. J. Bus. Manag.*, vol. 6, no. 36, pp. 66-74, 2014.
12. G. Bouckaert, R. Loretan, and S. Troupin, "Public Administration and the Sustainable Development Goals," *KU Leuven, Lirias Repository*, 2016. Available: <https://lirias.kuleuven.be/retrieve/389289> [Accessed by:24/07/2024].
13. I. B. Berceanu and C. E. Nicolescu, "Collaborative public administration—A dimension of sustainable development: Exploratory study on local authorities in Romania," *Admin. Sci.*, vol. 14, no. 2, p. 30, 2024.
14. J. A. Teixeira Da Silva, "The risk of abuse of environmental sustainable developmental goals (SDGs) by academia and publishers for cheap reputational gains," in *Mitig. Adapt. Strateg. Glob. Change*, vol. 28, no. 5, pp. 1-5, 2023.
15. J. O. Adeyemi and S. Oni, "Realising Sustainable Development Goal 4 in Nigeria: The challenge of digital divide," *Covenant Univ. J. Polit. Int. Aff.*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 121-132, 2021.
16. J. R. Bartle and D. Leuenberger, "The idea of sustainable development in public administration," *Public Works Manag. Policy*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 191–194, 2006.
17. J. S. Malkus and H. Riehl, "Methods of data collection and analysis," in *Cloud Structure and Distributions over the Tropical Pacific Ocean*. Univ. of California Press, Berkeley, California, United States of America, 1964.
18. J. Steyn and G. Johanson, Eds., "ICTs and Sustainable Solutions for the Digital Divide: Theory and Perspectives", *Information Science Reference*, Hershey, United States of America, 2010.
19. L. M. Fonseca, J. P. Domingues, and A. M. Dima, "Mapping the sustainable development goals relationships," *Sustainability*, vol. 12, no. 8, pp. 1–15, 2020.
20. M. Bisogno, B. Cuadrado-Ballesteros, F. M. Rossi, and N. Peña-Miguel, "Sustainable development goals in public administrations: Enabling conditions in local governments," *Int. Rev. Admin. Sci.*, vol. 89, no. 4, pp. 1223–1242, 2023.
21. M. Enenkel, K. Dall, C. K. Huyck, S. N. McClain, and V. Bell, "Monitoring, evaluation, accountability, and learning (MEAL) in anticipatory action—Earth observation as a game changer," *Front. Clim.*, vol. 4, no. 8, pp. 1–5, 2022.
22. M. Igbिनovia, "Libraries as a vehicle to sustainable developmental goals (SDGs): Nigerian's current status and outlook," *Libr. Hi Tech News*, vol. 33, no. 5, pp. 16–17, 2016.
23. M. Kryshтанovych, I. Kiyanka, V. Ostapiak, L. Kornat, and O. Kuchyk, "Modelling effective interaction between society and public administration for sustainable development policy," *Int. J. Sustain. Dev. Plan.*, vol. 18, no. 8, p. 2555, 2023.
24. N. Banik, B. Ghosh, and R. R. Choudhury, "Impact of MGNREGA on labour wage rate dynamics in India," *Reg. Stat.*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 1–25, 2021.
25. N. Subramaniam, S. Akbar, H. Situ, S. Ji, and N. Parikh, "Sustainable development goal reporting: Contrasting effects of institutional and organisational factors," *J. Clean. Prod.*, vol. 411, no. 7, pp. 1–14, 2023.
26. O. Bulla and J. R. Peneluppi, "Understanding governance policy concerning the sustainability of smart cities in China," *Govern. Soc. Rev.*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 181–197, 2023.
27. O. Holynska, T. Bieloshapka, H. Kuspliak, and M. Kholod, "Genesis of public administration of sustainable development in the field of environmental security," *Cuest. Polít.*, vol. 41, no. 76, pp. 592–610, 2023.
28. O. Malandrino, D. Sica, and S. Supino, "The role of public administration in sustainable urban development: Evidence from Italy," *Smart Cities*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 82–95, 2019.
29. O. Voronov, L. Kurnosenko, I. Bezena, N. Petryshyn, S. Korniiievskiyi, and B. Ilychok, "Public administration of planning for the sustainable development of the region in the context of total digitalisation," *Int. J. Sustain. Dev. Plan.*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 61–67, 2023.
30. P. Nakhate and Y. Van Der Meer, "A systematic review on seaweed functionality: A sustainable bio-based material," *Sustainability*, vol. 13, no. 11, p. 6174, 2021.
31. P. Owuori, "Relationship between monitoring, evaluation, accountability and service quality in water projects," *Afr. J. Emerg. Issues*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 83–97, 2022.
32. R. Sampedro, "The Sustainable Development Goals (SDG)," *Carreteras*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 8–16, 2021.
33. S. Burlacu, M. L. Popescu, A. Diaconu, and A. Sârbu, "Digital public administration for sustainable development," *Eur. J. Sustain. Dev.*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 33–40, 2021.
34. S. Dhal, "Enabling social rights through proactive public policy: An academic audit of education and health sectors in India," *Indian J. Public Admin.*, vol. 62, no. 1, pp. 75–100, 2016.
35. S. Garg, A. Patnaik, S. Dora, and S. H. Subba, "G20 Presidency," *Indian J. Community Fam. Med.*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 1–4, 2023.

36. S. Gupta, S. Anand, P. L. Thanmai, K. M. Reddy, and T. Ravisankar, "Spatial distribution of SDGs accomplished under MGNREGA beyond SDG1," *Int. J. Rural Manag.*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 1–19, 2023.
37. S. Hirani and S. Richter, "The capability approach: A guiding framework to improve population health and the attainment of the Sustainable Development Goals," *East. Mediterr. Health J.*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 46–50, 2017.
38. S. M. Rasoolimanesh, S. Ramakrishna, C. M. Hall, K. Esfandiar, and S. Seyfi, "A systematic scoping review of sustainable tourism indicators in relation to the Sustainable Development Goals," *J. Sustain. Tourism*, vol. 31, no. 7, pp. 1497–1517, 2023.
39. S. P. Sebhatu and B. Enquist, "Values and multi-stakeholder dialogue for business transformation in light of the UN Sustainable Development Goals," *J. Bus. Ethics*, vol. 180, no. 4, pp. 1059–1074, 2022.
40. S. Patwardhan and L. Tasciotti, "The effect of the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act on the size of outstanding debts in rural India," *J. Dev. Effect.*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 353–372, 2023.
41. S. Rusu and I. Partachi, "Implementation of the principles of effective public administration for sustainable development in Moldova," *J. Law Admin.*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 41–51, 2021.
42. T. Cherian, A. Hwang, C. Mantel, C. Veira, S. Malvolti, N. MacDonald, C. Steffen, I. Jones, and A. Hinman, "Global Vaccine Action Plan lessons learned III: Monitoring and evaluation/accountability framework," *Vaccine*, vol. 38, no. 33, pp. 5379–5383, 2020.
43. U. Kari and I. H. Mshelia, "Digitalising public administration for sustainable development," *Digit. Policy Stud.*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 32–50, 2023.
44. V. D. Pavaloaia, M. R. Georgescu, D. Popescul, and L. D. Radu, "ESD for public administration: An essential challenge for inventing the future of our society," *Sustainability*, vol. 11, no. 3, p. 880, 2019.
45. V. Kumar, "Economic empowerment of women through MGNREGA," *J. Res. Soc. Sci. Humanit.*, vol. 2, no. 10, pp. 1–12, 2023.
46. V. Shandryk, I. Zhebelev, A. Deliatynchuk, V. Maksymov, and V. Shelest, "Modern concepts of public administration in the context of sustainable development," *Econ. Aff.*, vol. 68, no. 4, pp. 2105–2117, 2023.
47. Z. A. Bhutta, K. M. Yount, Q. Bassat, and C. E. Moyer, "Sustainable development goals interrupted: Overcoming challenges to global child and adolescent health," *PLoS Med.*, vol. 18, no. 9, pp. 1–5, 2021.
48. Z. Shawky Younis and O. Mamdouh, "Sustainable development policy: A participatory approach to increase students' awareness of solid waste management," *Eur. J. Sustain. Dev.*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 1–14, 2021.