



THE 2030 AGENDA AND THE SDGs IN CURITIBA: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF PUBLIC POLICIES AND SOCIAL PERCEPTION (2021–2024)

Rodrigo José Gomes

Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina - UFSC

Antonio Lucas de Oliveira Lima

Universidade Federal do Paraná - UFPR

Ariane Domborovski

Universidade de São Paulo - USP

Elder Semprebon

Universidade Federal do Paraná - UFPR

ABSTRACT:

This study analyzes the relationship between the Curitiba City Government's priorities for the period from 2021 to 2024 regarding the implementation of the 2030 Agenda and the public's perception of these actions. The research adopts a quantitative, descriptive, and sample-based approach, using secondary data from the Curitiba City Government website and primary data obtained through a survey of 225 respondents, conducted via Google Forms between May and June 2024. Public policies were classified according to the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), based on keywords identified in the literature. The results show that, among 7,029 mapped actions, there was a greater concentration on SDGs 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth), 4 (Quality Education), and 2 (Zero Hunger and Sustainable Agriculture), while environmental SDGs had a lower number of initiatives, especially SDGs 13 and 14. In contrast, the population indicated higher priority for SDGs 4, 6, and 3, highlighting greater concern for education, water and sanitation, and health and well-being. Despite the high number of actions implemented, respondents demonstrated low perception of significant progress in the municipality's implementation of the SDGs. It is concluded that there is a partial misalignment between government priorities and the demands perceived by the population, in addition to weaknesses in public communication regarding the actions undertaken.

KEYWORDS: 2030 Agenda; SDGs; public policy; Curitiba.



1 INTRODUCTION

In September 2015, the United Nations (UN) established and released the 2030 Agenda. This agenda consists of a set of goals and visions that have been translated into 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The main objective of these SDGs is to promote dignity and quality of life for all human beings, while ensuring the preservation of the environment. The 2030 Agenda is recognized as a crucial policy instrument, offering an opportunity for renewal and guidance for public policies at the global level (Nilsson; Weitz, 2019).

Kamphof and Melissen (2018) argue that each country bears primary responsibility for its own economic, social, and environmental development, with this responsibility being shared among states and their municipalities. In the form of practices and standards originating from government agencies, public policies generate institutional changes to meet external expectations, highlighting the need for local government action to address these issues at the development level (Annesi et al., 2021).

Sustainability in urban areas has become a central issue on the agendas of Brazilian municipalities, particularly with regard to the implementation of constitutional provisions on urban policy, as outlined in Law No. 10,257 of 2001, which addresses Articles 182 and 183 of the 1988 Federal Constitution. This topic has attracted critical attention from both public officials and the general population, who are increasingly involved in the development and implementation of sustainable urban planning (Gomes; Zambam, 2018).

The overall objective of this research is to compare the priorities of the Curitiba City Government (2021–2024) in fulfilling the 2030 Agenda with the needs of the population. The specific objectives are: a) To identify which SDGs were priorities for the Curitiba City Government during its current term (2021–2024); b) To investigate the perception of Curitiba's population regarding the Curitiba City Government's efforts to meet the goals of the UN 2030 Agenda.

This study is necessary in a context where external actors, such as the population itself, need to monitor how international goals are translated at the national level into public policies (Gonçalves & Nascimento, 2021). Furthermore, it is essential to improve impact assessment, taking into account the multiple interactions of global, national, and local engagement (Nilsson; Weitz, 2019).

Conducting an impact assessment of local public policies focused on the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) is of paramount practical importance. This approach enables not only the effective implementation of policies but also the development of monitoring and evaluation research. Such continuous monitoring is essential for tracking progress toward the SDGs at the municipal level (Annesi et al., 2021).

2 THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

2.1 UN 2030 AGENDA: GOALS AND TARGETS

Sustainable development began to gain traction in discussions in the mid-1960s, specifically in North America, though initially it focused solely on environmental degradation. The Brundtland Report, published in 1987, introduced various discourses related to sustainability, drawing attention to economic and urban planning issues (Acseirad, 1999).

Redclift (2006, p. 67) defines sustainable development as “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their



own needs.” In addition, Elkington (1994) expands on this definition with three pillars: Environmental, addressing natural resources; Economic, related to investment direction; and Social, addressing human needs.

In 2015, the international agenda was developed to align with the SDGs established that same year (Gomes & Zambam, 2018). To complement this alignment, Nilsson and Weitz (2019) add that this agenda plays an essential role in measuring sustainable development across its three pillars: social, economic, and environmental.

The 2030 Agenda comprises 17 goals and 169 targets, integrating diverse global and national contexts and realities, taking into account specific levels of development, and respecting the policies and priorities of various countries. This represents a decentralized and democratic approach, with each political actor able to decide how the 17 SDGs, presented in Figure 1, should be incorporated into their management and planning processes, public policies, and national planning strategies.

Figure 1. Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) of the 2030 Agenda.



Source: United Nations (2015).

With the 17 SDGs defined and described, the United Nations 2030 Agenda calls on all stakeholders to support the implementation of these goals, relying on the support of governments, the private sector, and other actors, and mobilizing all available resources (Kamphof & Melissen, 2018).

In this regard, Souto and Batalhão (2020) highlight the importance of promoting territorial planning that respects municipal particularities and ensures a fair distribution of the burdens and benefits of the urbanization process, thereby contributing to the design of sustainable cities. Furthermore, the authors emphasize that it is not enough for government officials to simply conceptualize public policies to achieve urban sustainability. For these policies to be effective, greater engagement of the local community in decision-making and in defining a political agenda is crucial (Gonçalves; Nascimento, 2021).

2.2 PUBLIC POLICIES FOCUSED ON THE 2030 AGENDA

Reflection on the 2030 Agenda and its relationship with public management calls for the consolidation and adaptation of public policies toward the SDG goals. These policies impact social, professional, and academic life (Ferreira et al., 2024). At the governmental level, there is recognition of the need to provide an enabling environment that supports the SDGs. (Kamphof; Melissen, 2018).

Targets to meet the 17 goals may be set annually or every four years, depending on the national context. Anessi et al. (2021) emphasize the importance of reformulating these public policies, providing an operational framework to guide government actions.

Highlighting the value of implementations at two levels of ambition: the first is the existence of sustainable development systems that respect its pillars; the second is ensuring policy consistency that is well accepted by the community (Nilsson; Weitz, 2019; Glass; Newig, 2019).

Bringing the discussion to the national level, De Oliveira (2021) emphasizes the need for the Brazilian government, at all federal and institutional levels, to strengthen its public policies. This action is crucial to ensuring the effective implementation of the SDGs, which, in turn, promotes development from the inside out.

The author (2021) further adds that the setting of SDG goals and targets should be carried out by each state and society, in accordance with their actual sustainable development needs. It is emphasized that "...the centrality of actions, which ensures substantial equality of opportunity in a cooperative and collaborative manner, interconnects all 17 goals..." (Zeifert; Cenci; Manchini, 2020, p. 48).

One way to relate public policy actions to the 17 SDGs is through the work of Ferreira et al. (2024). The authors (2024) illustrate the public policies implemented in the municipality of Itabaiana in Sergipe, contextualizing them with the 17 SDGs. This information can be viewed in Table 1.

Table 1. Keywords of public policies related to each of the SDGs

SDGs	RECORDING UNITS
01 - Eradication of Poverty	Crisis, Inequality, Floods, Housing, Digital Inclusion, Social Inclusion, Opportunities, Poverty, Income, Vulnerable
02 - Zero Hunger and Sustainable Agriculture	Pesticides, Malnutrition, Hunger, Water Supply, School Meals, Nutrition, Organic, Smallholder Farmers, Food Security
03 - Health and Wellness	Arboviruses, Well-being, Chikungunya, Contamination, Coronavirus, Dengue, Addiction, Traffic Safety Education, Sewage Systems, Pregnancy, HIV/AIDS, Homicides, Older Adults, Longevity, Mortality (Neonatal, Maternal, Infant), Pandemic, Sports, Vaccination, Zika
04 - Quality Education	Literacy, Educational Inequalities, Education, Environmental Education, Basic Education, Early Childhood Education, Teaching, School Dropout, Continuing Education, Age/Grade Level, Inclusion, Research, University
05 - Gender Equality	Childcare, Discrimination, Empowerment, Employment, Sexual Exploitation, Femicide, Gender Equality, Leadership, Mothers, Prevention, Social Protection, Women's Health, Violence, Sexual Violence
06 - Water and Sanitation	Drinking Water, Well-being, Sewers, Water Sources, Springs, Wells, Sanitation
07 - Affordable and Clean Energy	Clean Energy, Solar Energy, Lighting, Street Lighting, LED, Energy Mix, Solar Panel, Social Tariff
08 - Decent Work and Economic Growth	Agriculture, Trade, Growth, Culture, Unemployment, Economic Development, Economy, Employment, Fair, GDP, Labor, Child Labor, Tourism



09 - Industry, Innovation, and Infrastructure	Resilient Structures, Industry, Infrastructure, Innovation, Technology, Telecommunications, Transportation
10 - Reducing Inequalities	Illiteracy, Disability, Inequality, Sports, Ethnicity, Exclusion, Inclusion, Leisure, Sexual Orientation, Wealth, Suburbs, Race, Religion, Income, Housing
11. Sustainable Cities and Communities	Green Spaces, Rural Development, Urban Development, Housing, Planning, Master Plan, Quality of Life, Recycling
12 - Responsible Consumption and Production	Recyclable Waste Collection, Consortium (CPAC), Waste, Landfill, Waste Residues, Waste, Solid Waste, Volume of Waste
13 - Action Against Global Climate Change	Carbon Credits, Climate Crisis, Environmental Disasters, Forest Management, Climate Change
14 - Life in Water	Water Pollution, Riparian Forest, Streams, Canals
15 - Life on Earth	Afforestation, Biodiversity, Hunting, Desertification, Ecosystem, Exotic Species, Extinction, Fauna, Flora, Forests, National Park, Conservation Area
16 - Peace, Justice, and Effective Institutions	Corruption, Security, Citizens, Trafficking, Transparency, Violence
17 - Partnerships and Means of Implementation	Cooperation, Inter-institutional, Cross-sectoral, Partnership

Source: Ferreira et al. (2024).

By considering public policies—including initiatives, decrees, and ordinary and supplementary laws—implemented by the government of the municipality under study as units of context, the study can be organized into categories of analysis.

3 METHODOLOGICAL PROCEDURES

With the aim of comparing the priorities of the Curitiba City Government (2021–2024) in implementing the 2030 Agenda with the needs of the population, this study employs a quantitative method. Specific quantitative data are collected, including numbers, means, standard deviations, etc., allowing for an objective analysis and the application of statistical techniques to draw conclusions (Marzouk, 2024).

To describe characteristics or phenomena, the descriptive method is used without manipulating the data, describing the priorities of the two samples through descriptive and inferential statistics (Sousa, 2024). The study also employs the sampling method, working only with a significant portion of a larger population, using a random and representative sample, which allows for generalization to the population with a higher degree of confidence.

The research subjects are divided into two groups: the first consists of public policies focused on the SDGs implemented by the Curitiba municipal government during its most recent term, specifically between 2021 and 2024. The second group comprises the population of the city of Curitiba itself.

The research data are also divided into two categories: the first consists of secondary data extracted from the Curitiba City Government website, specifically public policies aimed at the 17 SDGs implemented during the most recent period (2021–2024), using the keywords described in Table 1.

The second data set consists of primary data, collected via a survey using self-administered questionnaires on the Google Forms platform between May and June 2024. The questions were developed by the authors based on the literature reviewed in the previous section.

The data were statistically analyzed using frequency distributions, measures of dispersion, and measures of central tendency, and tables were created to illustrate the results.



4 ANALYSIS OF THE RESULTS

4.1 POLÍTICAS PÚBLICAS VOLTADAS PARA OS ODS EM CURITIBA (2021-2024)

The data presented in Table 1 show the number of public policies related to the SDGs published on the Curitiba City Hall website between 2021 and 2024. It should be noted that the website serves as a transparent and accessible platform for communication between municipal public actors and the population (Ferreira et al., 2024).

In this context, 7,029 actions carried out during the period were collected and categorized by their respective SDGs (Table 1).

Table 1. Public policies focused on the SDGs in the municipality of Curitiba (2021–2024)

SDGs	Public policies
01 - Eradication of Poverty	257
02 - Zero Hunger and Sustainable Agriculture	1049
03 - Health and Wellness	323
04 - Quality Education	1310
05 - Gender Equality	259
06 - Water and Sanitation	125
07 - Affordable and Clean Energy	104
08 - Decent Work and Economic Growth	1685
09 - Industry, Innovation, and Infrastructure	353
10 - Reducing Inequalities	584
11 - Sustainable Cities and Communities	365
12 - Responsible Consumption and Production	47
13 - Action Against Global Climate Change	20
14 - Life in Water	15
15 - Life on Earth	195
16 - Peace, Justice, and Effective Institutions	131
17 - Partnerships and Means of Implementation	207
Total	7029

Source: Prepared by the authors (2024).

Considering the distribution of initiatives related to the SDGs during this period, it is evident that SDG 14 (protecting marine life) was the goal with the fewest public policies implemented by the city government, likely because the city does not have a coastline.

SDG 8 accounted for the highest concentration of actions during this time frame, totaling 1,685 public policies. There is a clear focus on actions related to markets and commerce in the city, representing 56.14% of the public policies targeting such activities under SDG 8. In previous administrations, the population, particularly those with low purchasing power, faced difficulties in shopping at markets due to high prices and their remote location on the outskirts of the city (Bezerra et al., 2022).

The authors further note that the niche of organic markets and commerce, as a policy for food supply and health promotion, aligns with other goals, such as SDGs 2, 3, and 10. This demonstrates the government's concern with addressing workers' difficulties in accessing public services, as well as in producing and ensuring food security within their families (Leite; Leite, 2022).

SDG 4 is also a priority for the current administration, with 1,310 actions implemented during this period. Public policies exist at all educational and institutional levels, encompassing



initiatives related to curriculum, operations, organizational culture, student participation, community engagement, and research partnerships (Bauer et al., 2020).

With increased investments in education and research, the municipality is seeing growing development of teaching and learning practices within the school's political sphere, valuing social representations in these lived spaces and building a relationship between the school and the population that constitutes the city's history (De Souza et al., 2021).

The environmental pillar of sustainability is not a priority for the current administration, accounting for only 20 and 47 public policies in SDGs 13 and 12, respectively. This reflects a reluctance toward Pamukçu's (2020) idea, according to which countries, at different regional levels, should base their actions on equity, efficiency, cost-effectiveness, applicability, incentives for innovation, and ethics to foster a global regime of climate change mitigation and responsible production.

4.2 PERCEPTION OF THE POPULATION OF CURITIBA

When assessing public perception, concerns regarding the pillars of sustainability are evident, as shown in Table 2. There is a greater concern regarding the social and economic dimensions (average of 4.36).

Table 2. Public priorities regarding the pillars of sustainability

Pillar	N	Average	Standard Deviation	Asymmetry	Curtosis
Environmental	225	4,32	0,792	-0,898	0,008
Social	225	4,36	0,795	-1,211	1,359
Economical	225	4,36	0,755	-1,008	0,529

Source: Prepared by the authors (2024).

The public's concern regarding the economic pillar (SDG 8, SDG 9, SDG 10, and SDG 12) justifies the implementation of economic plans aimed at fair and well-distributed growth across generations, leading to improved growth indicators that can reflect a population's true growth (Gomes & Ferreira, 2018).

The social pillar (SDG 1, SDG 2, SDG 3, SDG 4, SDG 5, SDG 7, SDG 11, and SDG 16) encompasses education as a right—a challenge that must be addressed and effectively developed through public policies, transforming the entire landscape over the years. A need that the population views as a priority in schools and student care regarding infrastructure and incentives (Freitas, 2016).

As for the environmental pillar (SDG 6, SDG 13, SDG 14, and SDG 15) shows the least concern among the population. Gomes and Ferreira (2018) observe that there is a paradigm of merely making nature sufficient to develop and serve humanity—an arduous task that requires many sound choices to be properly achieved and understood with balance. This is reflected in public policies, which receive lower scores and are perceived less favorably by the population.

When asked about the population's priorities regarding the SDGs, Table 3 illustrates the results in balanced statistics at first glance, with a nearly proportional ranking across various SDGs (Table 3).



Table 3. Public priorities regarding the SDGs.

SDGs	N	Average	Standard Deviation	Asymmetry	Curtosis
SDG 1	225	4,37	0,775	-1,154	0,918
SDG 2	225	4,36	0,834	-1,411	1,827
SDG 3	225	4,42	0,758	-1,300	1,742
SDG 4	225	4,58	0,671	-1,673	2,753
SDG 5	225	4,09	1,078	-1,063	0,407
SDG 6	225	4,55	0,784	-1,977	4,146
SDG 7	225	4,37	0,820	-1,180	0,643
SDG 8	225	4,30	0,827	-1,082	0,843
SDG 9	225	4,06	0,960	-0,789	-0,062
SDG 10	225	4,24	0,875	-1,022	0,488
SDG 11	225	4,17	0,892	-0,881	0,327
SDG 12	225	4,16	0,956	-1,046	0,571
SDG 13	225	4,28	0,901	-1,259	1,350
SDG 14	225	4,14	0,951	-0,938	0,221
SDG 15	225	4,11	0,910	-0,787	-0,047
SDG 16	225	4,13	0,943	-0,873	0,105
SDG 17	225	3,74	1,168	-0,731	-0,214

Source: Prepared by the authors (2024).

The population has already expressed concern about education within the social pillar, as shown in Table 2, and reinforces its priority at the SDG level, once again recording the highest average compared to the other goals. Next comes concern regarding SDG 3. In a study, Paschoalotto et al. (2022) describe the inequalities perceived by the population regarding socioeconomic conditions and the performance of public health policies.

Extending the discussion to other SDGs, such as 1, 10, and 5, it is observed that the first two are major concerns for the population, while the latter is not considered as relevant. This contradicts Gomes et al. (2022), who link health performance to inequalities in poverty and gender, emphasizing the need for close attention from the population and the government to balance access to healthcare.

Another major concern for Curitiba residents is the focus on SDG 6, which involves subsidies for water supply, sanitation, and water resource management. Binda (2021) describes the government's full responsibility for water supply in urban and rural areas, as well as for addressing deficiencies in the sewage system to prevent untreated sewage from being discharged.

One concern regarding the SDGs is the population's lack of interest in SDG 17, which encompasses issues such as cooperation, inter-institutional and intersectoral collaboration, and partnerships. This can be explained by a lack of understanding of the goal, which is often fragmented and reduced to partnerships alone—an approach that may not be well-received by the public (Banejee; Murphy; Walsh, 2022).

4.3 PRIORIDADES DA POPULAÇÃO E DO GOVERNO DE CURITIBA (2021-2024)

With regard to the public's perception of the city government's public policies aimed at the 17 SDGs, the results are unfavorable, with an average score of 2.99 indicating that the public does not perceive the progress that has already been made (Table 4).



Table 4. Public perception of the implementation of the SDGs.

	N	Average	Standard deviation	Asymmetry	Curtosis
Do you believe that the city of Curitiba is making significant progress in implementing the Sustainable Development Goals?	225	2,99	1,12	-0,27	-1,02

Source: Prepared by the authors (2024).

Given the government's concrete actions on public policies aimed at the SDGs, the public does not perceive any progress in their implementation. Neves and Euzébio Filho (2021) argue that efforts are focused solely on addressing specific demands rather than bringing about a real change in the perception of end users.

Gonçalves and Nascimento (2021) add that it is pointless for political actors to implement the SDGs if they do not contextualize their community with the work being done; after all, they are the end users of the service they are tasked with delivering. Even with some of the goals aligned between the current city administration and the population, such as SDGs 4 and 8, there are always new challenges and demands to be addressed to achieve a perceived alignment on both sides (Ferreira et al., 2024).

Another point to consider is the lack of understanding regarding the SDGs, a shortcoming observed among both public officials and the general population of Curitiba. Banejee, Murphy, and Walsh (2022) argue that until the SDGs are aligned with all stakeholders, it will be impossible to achieve sustainable development that is widely recognized.

5 CONCLUSION

The 2030 Agenda encompasses economic, social, and environmental goals aimed at sustainable development, working through 17 SDGs that span its three pillars to ensure decent living conditions on a planet with reduced environmental impact. At the regional level, the 17 SDGs are translated into public policies designed to provide the population with the same conditions.

In this regard, Gonçalves and Nascimento (2021) emphasize that the effectiveness of these actions lies not only in implementation but also in the need for engagement and care from the local community in decision-making and the definition of a political agenda. Ferreira et al. (2024) add that a relationship between the different SDGs is necessary to address a greater number of needs within the community itself.

More than 7,000 public policies have been implemented in the city of Curitiba in support of various SDGs, many of which relate to social needs, such as Goals 4 and 8; however, when asked, the public does not perceive the government as being committed to achieving these goals. Banejee, Murphy, and Walsh (2022) challenge policymakers to invest in greater communication that brings together the SDGs, the public, and the government itself in a single narrative.

Therefore, regarding the goals under discussion, there are more than 7,000 public policies addressing the 17 SDGs, with an emphasis on Goals 8, 4, and 2. The population requires greater attention regarding Goals 4, 6, and 3, with Goal 4 being the only one aligned



between the city government and the population. Regarding the population's perception of the actions taken for the 17 SDGs, there is a finding of the city government's lack of engagement in the eyes of its own community, which can be explained by the lack of communication among stakeholders.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To the Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (CAPES), which awarded scholarships to authors.

REFERENCES

Acセルrad, H. (1999). Discursos da sustentabilidade urbana. *Revista Brasileira de Estudos Urbanos e Regionais*.

Annesi, N., Battaglia, M., Gragnani, P. & Iraldo, F. (2021). Integrating the 2030 Agenda at the municipal level: Multilevel pressures and institutional shift. *Land Use Policy*, 105, 105424. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2021.105424>

Bauer, M., Niedlich, S., Rieckmann, M., Bormann, I., & Jaeger, L. (2020). Interdependencies of culture and functions of sustainability governance at higher education institutions. *Sustainability*, 12(7), 2780. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12072780>

Banerjee, A., Murphy, E. & Walsh, P. P. (2022). *National partnerships for the sustainable development goals: Multi-stakeholder partnerships in Ireland*. In Partnerships and the Sustainable Development Goals (pp. 85-94). Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-07461-5_7

Bezerra, I., Rigon, S. D. A. & Cassarino, J. P. (2022). Feiras Orgânicas enquanto política de abastecimento alimentar e promoção da saúde: um estudo de caso. *Saúde em debate*, 46, 542-554. <https://doi.org/10.1590/0103-11042022E236>

Binda, T. E. D. L. T. (2021). *Objetivos de desenvolvimento sustentável (ODS) como política pública: estudos de caso do município de Serra-ES* (Trabalho de Conclusão de Curso). Instituto Federal do Espírito Santo, ES, Brasil.

Brasil. Capítulo, I. (2001). LEI Nº 10.257, DE 10 DE JULHO DE 2001 Regulamenta os arts. 182 e 183 da Constituição Federal, estabelece diretrizes gerais da política urbana e dá outras providências.

De Souza, R. G. S., Correia, S. L. C. P. & Riscaroli, R. (2021). Políticas Públicas, cotidiano escolar e currículo praticado: entrelaçando experiências com o espaço vivido. *Facit Business and Technology Journal*, 1(29).

Elkington, J. (1994). Towards the sustainable corporation: Win-win-win business strategies for sustainable development. *California Management Review*, 36(2), 90-100. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41165746>



Felipe, A. S., Marini, M. J., Perondi, M. Â. & Santos, G. D. (2020). A importância do planejamento urbano para o desenvolvimento sustentável: uma revisão de literatura. *Revista Brasileira de Planejamento e Desenvolvimento*, 9(2), 171-191. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3895/rbpd.v9n2.9172>

Ferreira, M. M., Henrique, V. H. O., Barbosa, A. M. F., Mendonça, D. M. F. D. & Meiado, M. V. (2023). Public Policies to Implement the Sustainable Development Goals in Itabaiana, Sergipe. *Ambiente & Sociedade*, 26, e0191. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1809-4422asoc2022191r1vu2023L4OA>

Freitas, J. (2012). *Sustentabilidade: direito ao futuro*. 3ed. Belo Horizonte: Fórum.

Glass, L. M. & Newig, J. (2019). Governance for achieving the Sustainable Development Goals: How important are participation, policy coherence, reflexivity, adaptation and democratic institutions?. *Earth System Governance*, 2, 100031. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esg.2019.100031>

Gomes, D. & Zambam, N. J. (2018). Sustentabilidade do espaço urbano: novas tecnologias e políticas públicas urbanístico-ambientais. *Revista de Direito da Cidade*, 10(1), 310-334. <https://doi.org/10.12957/rdc.2018.29866>

Gomes, D. D. F., Teixeira, E. R., Sauthier, M. & Paes, G. O. (2022). Restrição de políticas públicas de saúde: um desafio dos transexuais na atenção básica. *Escola Anna Nery*, 26, e20210425. <https://doi.org/10.1590/2177-9465-EAN-2021-0425pt>

Gomes, M. F. & Ferreira, L. J. (2018). Políticas públicas e os objetivos do desenvolvimento sustentável. *Direito e Desenvolvimento*, 9(2), 155-178. <https://doi.org/10.25246/direitoedesenvolvimento.v9i2.667>

Gonçalves, P. C. & do Nascimento, B. D. (2021). A ONU e a difusão do desenvolvimento sustentável: o caso brasileiro. *Monções: Revista de Relações Internacionais da UFGD*, 10(19), 187-214. <https://doi.org/10.30612/rmufgd.v10i19.13085>

Kamphof, R. & Melissen, J. (2018). SDG s, Foreign Ministries and the Art of Partnering with the Private Sector. *Global Policy*, 9(3), 327-335. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1758-5899.12563>

Leite, M. L. D. S. & Leite, J. F. (2022). (In) segurança alimentar e agricultura familiar: políticas públicas como estratégia de superação da fome. *Revista Katálisis*, 25(3), 528-538. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-0259.2022.e86341>

Marzouk, O. (2024). Benchmarks for the Omani higher education students-faculty ratio (SFR) based on World Bank data, QS rankings, and THE rankings. *Cogent Education*, 11(1), 2317117. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2317117>

Neves, A. & Euzébios Filho, A. (2021). Olhares de Profissionais da Defensoria Pública do Estado de São Paulo: análise das demandas e da atuação com a população em situação de rua. *Revista Gestão & Políticas Públicas*, 11(1), 98-115. <http://dx.doi.org/10.11606/rgpp.v11i1.190965>



Nilsson, M. & Weitz, N. (2019). Governing trade-offs and building coherence in policy-making for the 2030 agenda. *Politics and Governance*, 7(4), 254-263. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17645/pag.v7i4.2229>

Oliveira, M. V. X. D. (2021). O Direito ao Desenvolvimento e os Objetivos de Desenvolvimento Sustentável (ODS). O princípio da interdependência como parâmetro para a criação e manutenção das políticas públicas. *Revista de la Secretaría del Tribunal Permanente de Revisión*, 9(17), 14-30. <https://doi.org/10.16890/rstpr.a9.n17.p14>

ONU - Organização das Nações Unidas. (2015). *Sobre o nosso trabalho para alcançar os Objetivos de Desenvolvimento Sustentável no Brasil*. Brasil.

Pamukcu, K. (2020). Implementation of Sustainable Development Goals Through the Equimarginal Principle and Circular Economy. *İstanbul İktisat Dergisi*, 70(2), 267-286. <https://doi.org/10.26650/ISTJECON2020-804635>

Paschoalotto, M. A. C., Passador, J. L., Passador, C. S. & Endo, G. Y. (2022). Regionalização da saúde no Brasil: desigualdades socioeconômicas e na performance em saúde. *Gestão & Regionalidade*, 38(113). <https://doi.org/10.13037/gr.vol38n113.7017>

Redclift, M. R. (2006). Sustainable development (1987-2005): an oxymoron comes of age. *Horizontes Antropológicos*, 12, 65-84. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0104-71832006000100004>

Zeifert, A. P. B., Cenci, D. R. & Manchini, A. (2020). A justiça social e a agenda 2030: políticas de desenvolvimento para a construção de sociedades justas e inclusivas. *Revista Direitos Sociais e Políticas Públicas–Unifafibe*, 8(2), 30-52. <https://doi.org/10.25245/rdspp.v8i2>