From Reporting to Governance. Benchmarking Central Public Administration Capacity for Sustainable Development in Romania, Portugal and France (2030 Agenda Perspective)

Cristiana PINTILEI[1]

Abstract

Sustainable development strategies are widely adopted across Europe, yet public administrations do not always use them to guide policy implementation and resource allocation. This article examines the capacity of central public administrations to govern sustainable development and addresses a gap in comparative research, which has focused more on policy outcomes than on the institutional capacity behind them. It develops a comparative framework based on four dimensions: strategic coordination at the centre of government, policy coherence, data infrastructure, and alignment of resources with implementation priorities. The framework is applied to Romania, Portugal and France through a comparative analysis of strategic documents, national reports and country profiles. The findings indicate differences in the maturity of governance arrangements and suggest that strategies and reporting mechanisms alone do not ensure the integration of sustainable development into public management. The article shifts attention from indicator performance to the administrative capacity that supports implementation. Its framework can help identify institutional bottlenecks and inform reforms to strengthen sustainable development

Keywords: *Sustainable Development Goals; central public administration; governance capacity; benchmarking; meta-governance; whole-of-government; policy coherence.*

JEL classification: H11, H83, Q01

DOI: 10.24818/RMCI.2026.4.795

1. Introduction

In many administrative contexts, sustainable development is treated primarily as a normative and reporting framework, materialised in national strategies, action plans and indicator sets, without being fully transformed into an instrument of continuous public management. This limited orientation towards compliance and reporting raises questions regarding the maturity of the governance infrastructure required to sustain interministerial coordination, cross-sectoral policy integration and the meaningful use of data for decision-making (OECD, 2020;

[1] Cristiana Pintilei, Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Romania, Cristiana.Dima @Mediazoom.ro

Meuleman, 2019). In the absence of robust institutional mechanisms at the centre of government, sustainable development objectives risk remaining largely declarative, with limited impact on the actual processes of public policy formulation and implementation (Bouckaert, Peters, and Verhoest 2016; OECD, 2021).

The scholarly literature has emphasised the importance of whole-of-government approaches and policy coherence for addressing complex and cross-cutting challenges such as sustainable development (Christensen and Lægreid, 2007; OECD, 2019). However, existing comparative analyses focus predominantly on states' performance in relation to outcome indicators, devoting comparatively less attention to the administrative capacity that enables the transformation of strategic frameworks into functional systems of governance (Howlett and Ramesh, 2014; Pierre and Peters, 2020). In this context, the question of how central public administrations build the institutional infrastructures necessary to move from progress reporting towards the effective governance of sustainable development remains insufficiently explored.

This article seeks to address this gap through a comparative analysis of the capacity of central public administration to govern sustainable development in three European Union member states: Romania, Portugal and France. The selection of these cases allows for the identification of relevant variations in institutional maturity within a shared European normative framework shaped by the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (United Nations, 2015) and the EU's sustainable development governance architecture (European Commission, 2020), ranging from an emerging capacity case to a consolidated administrative capacity case.

The research question guiding the analysis is as follows: How can the capacity of central public administration to transform sustainable development from a reporting exercise into a process of continuous public governance be assessed?

By proposing an institutional capacity benchmarking instrument, the article aims to offer both a theoretical contribution to the literature on sustainable development governance and practical reference points for administrative reforms oriented towards strengthening the state's governance capacity (OECD, 2023; Peters, 2015).

2. Literature review

The concept of benchmarking was initially introduced in the management literature as a method for the systematic comparison of organisational performance and practices, aimed at identifying best practices and supporting continuous improvement (Camp, 1989). Subsequently, benchmarking was taken up and adapted in the public sector, where it has been used for the comparative assessment of institutional performance and administrative capacity (Ammons, 2001; Bovaird and Löffler, 2003). In the context of public administration, benchmarking is not

oriented exclusively towards ranking performance, but rather towards organizational learning and the transfer of good practices across institutions and administrative systems (Pollitt and Bouckaert, 2017).

The literature on administrative capacity emphasizes that public policy performance is conditioned by institutional resources, organizational competences and the state's governance architecture (Painter and Pierre, 2005; Fukuyama, 2013). State capacity is defined as the ability of public institutions to formulate and implement policies in a coherent manner, to coordinate multiple actors and to manage complex processes (Besley and Persson, 2009). In comparative studies, administrative capacity has been analyzed through indicators such as interministerial coordination, the professionalization of the civil service, institutional stability and the quality of implementation processes (Christensen and Lægreid, 2007; Peters, 2018).

With regard to sustainable development governance, the literature has highlighted the cross-cutting and complex nature of the objectives associated with the 2030 Agenda, which require whole-of-government coordination mechanisms and the integration of sectoral policies (Meadowcroft, 2007; Kanie and Biermann, 2017). Whole-of-government and metagovernance approaches are frequently invoked as conceptual solutions for addressing sustainable development objectives, emphasizing the role of the centre of government in orchestrating interministerial action and ensuring public policy coherence (Christensen and Lægreid, 2007; Jessop, 2011). In parallel, the literature on policy coherence for sustainable development shows that the absence of formal institutional mechanisms for coordination and for analyzing policy interdependencies constitutes a major obstacle to the coherent implementation of sustainable development (Nilsson et al., 2012; OECD, 2019).

A complementary strand of research focuses on data infrastructure and evidence-based governance, which are considered essential conditions for transforming sustainable development objectives from normative frameworks into operational instruments of public management (Janssen et al., 2017). Although indicator sets associated with sustainable development are widely used for monitoring and reporting purposes, many authors underline that the use of data in decision-making processes remains limited, and that their integration into policy formulation and review cycles is often fragmented (Head, 2016).

Nevertheless, the scholarly literature does not provide a unified benchmarking framework for assessing administrative capacity for sustainable development implementation. Existing studies either focus on performance measured through sustainable development outcome indicators (Sachs et al., 2020) or analyse isolated governance dimensions, such as policy coherence or interministerial coordination, without integrating them into a coherent comparative model for evaluating institutional capacity. The literature on sustainable development governance currently lacks a consolidated conceptual and methodological framework for assessing states' administrative capacity to implement the 2030 Agenda. The absence of a standardised instrument for

measuring institutional infrastructure limits the ability to conduct comparative analyses of how central public administrations transform sustainable development objectives from formal reporting into effective public management (Nilsson et al., 2012; OECD, 2019; Sachs et al., 2020).

Based on this synthesis of the literature, the need emerges for the development of a benchmarking framework for assessing the capacity of central public administration to govern sustainable development, integrating the dimensions of strategic coordination, policy coherence, data governance and resource alignment. Such an instrument would enable not only systematic cross-country comparison, but also the identification of institutional bottlenecks and transferable good practices, thereby contributing to the strengthening of state governance capacity in the context of implementing the 2030 Agenda.

3. Methodology

This study adopts a mixed-methods research design, combining qualitative document analysis with a comparative benchmarking approach in order to assess the capacity of central public administrations to govern Sustainable Development Goals beyond formal reporting practices. The research focuses on three European Union member states, namely Romania, Portugal, and France, selected as contrasting cases that reflect different levels of socio-economic development, administrative capacity, and performance in international SDG rankings. The comparative logic follows a most-different systems design, allowing the identification of structural governance patterns and institutional capacity gaps across diverse administrative contexts.

The primary research method consists of a structured qualitative content analysis of official policy documents, national sustainable development strategies, voluntary national reviews submitted to the United Nations, governmental coordination frameworks, and institutional arrangements related to SDG implementation at the centre-of-government level. This approach is complemented by a systematic desk review of international policy reports and governance assessments produced by international organizations. The document analysis follows established methodological approaches in comparative public administration and policy studies, which emphasize the use of official texts and institutional frameworks to assess administrative capacity and governance arrangements (Pollitt and Bouckaert, 2017; Peters, 2015).

Building on the literature on whole-of-government and meta-governance approaches, the study operationalizes administrative capacity through a benchmarking framework designed to capture the ability of central governments to transform SDGs from reporting obligations into instruments of strategic public management (OECD, 2015; Jessop, 2016; Christensen and Lægreid, 2011). The benchmark is structured around four analytical roles of the centre of government in SDG governance: strategic coordination, data and monitoring infrastructure, policy integration and coherence, and resource mobilization and budgetary alignment.

For each role, a set of qualitative indicators was developed based on prior research on policy coherence for sustainable development and institutional capacity for SDG implementation (Nilsson et al., 2012; OECD, 2019; Sachs et al., 2020).

The main research hypotheses guiding the empirical analysis are as follows. First, countries with more consolidated centre-of-government coordination mechanisms and clearer mandates for interministerial steering are more likely to move from SDG reporting towards continuous SDG management. Second, the existence of integrated data infrastructures and standardized SDG monitoring systems enhances the capacity of central administrations to use SDGs as operational policy instruments rather than as symbolic commitments. Third, higher levels of policy coherence mechanisms and budgetary alignment with sustainable development objectives are associated with stronger administrative capacity for SDG governance. These hypotheses are derived from the broader literature on policy integration, whole-of-government reforms, and meta-governance in complex policy domains (Peters, 2015; OECD, 2015; Jessop, 2016).

The benchmarking exercise employs a qualitative scoring scale ranging from 0 to 3 for each indicator, where 0 indicates the absence of institutional arrangements, 1 reflects ad hoc or fragmented arrangements, 2 denotes partial institutionalization, and 3 represents consolidated and operationalized governance mechanisms. This scoring system is used to construct comparative profiles of Romania, Portugal, and France across the four analytical roles. The purpose of the scoring is not to rank countries in absolute terms, but to identify relative strengths and weaknesses in governance capacity and to highlight structural gaps that hinder the transition from SDG reporting to SDG management.

The research design follows a comparative case study approach widely used in public administration to analyse institutional variation and governance performance (Yin, 2018). Data triangulation was ensured through the use of multiple sources, including national policy documents, international monitoring reports, and publicly available institutional data. Given the qualitative nature of the indicators and the focus on governance arrangements rather than numerical performance metrics, no advanced statistical software was required. The analytical framework and comparative matrices were developed using qualitative analysis techniques and spreadsheet tools to systematize indicators, scores, and institutional evidence.

To operationalize the SDG Governance Capacity Benchmark, a set of qualitative indicators was developed for each analytical role of the centre of government. For strategic coordination (R1), the indicators captured the existence of formal centre-of-government coordination mechanisms for SDG governance, the clarity and stability of mandates and responsibilities across ministries, and the availability of common steering instruments such as national SDG roadmaps, policy–SDG matrices, and implementation calendars with follow-up mechanisms. For policy coherence (R2), the indicators focused on the presence of formal procedures for assessing SDG impacts in policy-making, the degree of integration of SDGs into sectoral strategies and policy documents, and the existence of

mechanisms for managing cross-sectoral trade-offs. For data governance and management capacity (R3), the indicators assessed the existence of national SDG indicator sets aligned with EU and UN frameworks, the level of interoperability and traceability of data across public institutions, and the extent to which SDG-related data is used in decision-making processes through managerial dashboards and feedback loops. Each indicator was scored on a qualitative scale from 0 to 3, based on evidence from official documents and institutional arrangements, allowing for a comparative assessment of governance capacity across countries.

This methodological approach allows for both analytical generalization, by linking empirical observations to existing governance theories, and practical relevance, by generating actionable insights for strengthening centre-of-government capacity for sustainable development governance.

4. Results and discussion

The comparative benchmarking exercise reveals significant differences in the capacity of central public administrations in Romania, Portugal, and France to move from SDG reporting to SDG management. Although all three countries have formally adopted the 2030 Agenda and developed national strategies, the degree to which sustainable development objectives are operationalized within centre-of-government steering mechanisms varies considerably.

At the level of strategic coordination, France displays the most consolidated institutional architecture. The Interministerial Committee for International Cooperation and Development and the Delegation for Sustainable Development under the Prime Minister's authority provide a stable coordination framework for SDG implementation, ensuring horizontal policy coherence across ministries. This finding is consistent with the country's strong performance in international SDG rankings and with the emphasis placed on policy coherence for sustainable development in its Voluntary National Reviews (Government of France 2023). Portugal also demonstrates a relatively advanced coordination model, with SDG governance anchored at the centre of government through the Presidency of the Council of Ministers and supported by interministerial coordination mechanisms. The OECD Policy Coherence Scan of Portugal highlights the institutionalization of SDG coordination and the integration of sustainable development objectives into central policy planning processes (OECD 2023). In contrast, Romania exhibits a more fragmented coordination architecture. While the Interdepartmental Committee for Sustainable Development formally brings together all ministers and is chaired by the Prime Minister, multiple evaluations underline the persistence of coordination challenges and limited strategic steering capacity at the centre of government (Government of Romania, 2018; Government of Romania, 2023). This confirms the first research hypothesis, according to which formal coordination bodies do not automatically translate into effective steering capacity without stable operational mechanisms and strong mandates.

Regarding data and monitoring infrastructure, all three countries rely on national statistical systems aligned with the global SDG indicator framework. France benefits from a relatively mature system of data production and monitoring coordinated by the national statistical institute, with SDG indicators integrated into policy evaluation processes and public reporting platforms (Government of France, 2023). Portugal has developed a coherent SDG monitoring framework, with the National Statistical Institute coordinating indicator reporting and linking SDG monitoring to national development planning (Government of Portugal, 2023). Romania has made substantial progress in aligning national indicators with Eurostat and global SDG indicators, with 99 national indicators overseen by the National Institute of Statistics (Government of Romania, 2023). However, empirical evidence suggests that data is predominantly used for reporting purposes, with limited integration into decision-making and policy steering processes. This finding aligns with OECD assessments that emphasize the risk of data being used primarily for compliance and reporting rather than as an instrument of strategic governance (OECD, 2019). The results support the second hypothesis, highlighting that data infrastructure alone is insufficient in the absence of institutional mechanisms that embed SDG indicators into policy cycles.

In terms of policy integration and coherence, France and Portugal exhibit more advanced mechanisms for mainstreaming SDGs into sectoral policies. France explicitly frames SDGs as a reference framework for national public policies and regularly assesses policy coherence in relation to sustainable development objectives (Government of France, 2023). Portugal's national governance framework similarly emphasizes cross-sectoral integration of SDGs, supported by policy coherence mechanisms highlighted in the OECD Policy Coherence Scan (OECD, 2023). Romania has undertaken important steps through the adoption of the National Sustainable Development Strategy 2030 and the National Action Plan for its implementation, yet sectoral evaluations indicate uneven integration of SDGs across ministries and limited use of SDGs as operational criteria in policy design (Government of Romania, 2022; Government of Romania, 2023). This pattern resonates with findings in the literature that identify policy coherence as a persistent challenge in SDG governance, particularly in countries with fragmented administrative traditions (Nilsson et al., 2012; OECD, 2019).

Resource mobilization and budgetary alignment represent the weakest dimension across all three cases, albeit to varying degrees. France has made progress in linking public spending to sustainable development objectives through green budgeting and sustainability impact assessments, although challenges remain in systematically tracking SDG-related expenditures across policy domains (Government of France, 2023). Portugal has initiated efforts to align public investment frameworks with SDG priorities, yet budgetary tagging of SDG-related expenditures remains partial (OECD, 2023). Romania shows limited evidence of systematic alignment between budgetary planning and SDG targets, with most financial linkages remaining implicit and project-based, particularly through

externally funded programs (Government of Romania, 2022). These findings partially validate the third research hypothesis, indicating that budgetary alignment is a critical but underdeveloped lever for transforming SDGs into management tools.

The comparative results are synthesized in Table 1, which illustrates the SGCB scores for each country across the four analytical roles and their associated indicators. The table highlights France's relatively higher level of institutional consolidation, Portugal's intermediate position characterized by strong coordination but partial operationalization, and Romania's progress in formal governance frameworks coupled with limited managerial use of SDGs. These patterns are consistent with international assessments of SDG implementation, which show that despite formal commitments, most countries struggle to translate SDGs into operational governance mechanisms (Sachs et al., 2023).

From a theoretical perspective, the findings support whole-of-government and meta-governance approaches, which emphasize the centrality of coordination, coherence, and steering capacity in complex policy domains (Christensen and Lægreid, 2011; Jessop, 2016; Peters, 2015). The SGCB framework complements existing performance-oriented SDG indices by shifting the analytical focus from outcomes to governance capacity, thereby addressing a gap identified in the literature on SDG implementation and policy coherence. In practical terms, the results suggest that strengthening centre-of-government mandates, embedding SDG indicators into policy and budgetary cycles, and institutionalizing interministerial steering mechanisms are critical steps for moving from SDG reporting to SDG management.

Overall, the empirical evidence confirms that the governance of sustainable development remains predominantly oriented towards reporting and coordination rhetoric, rather than towards continuous strategic management. This finding echoes global assessments by the United Nations, which indicate that progress towards the 2030 Agenda is off track and that implementation gaps are primarily institutional and governance-related rather than purely technical (United Nations, 2024).

Table 1. SDG Governance Capacity Benchmark (SGCB): Comparative assessment of central government capacity in Romania, Portugal and France (2022–2024)

INDICATOR	WHAT WAS ASSESSED (institutions / mechanisms) scoring criteria	ROMANIA score	PORTUGAL score	FRANCE score
SGCB ROLE* - R1. Strategic coordination				

INDICATOR	WHAT WAS ASSESSED (institutions / mechanisms) scoring criteria	ROMANIA score	PORTUGAL score	FRANCE score
R1.1. Formal SDG coordination mechanism at central level	Existence of a whole-of-government structure (committee/council/CoG unit), explicit SDG coordination role, interministerial participation	2	2	3
Institutional mechanisms / Evidence Romania. formal architecture in place: high-level interministerial committee + coordination structures within the Government General Secretariat/Department for Sustainable Development; functioning primarily oriented towards reporting and procedural coordination. Portugal. CoG mechanism for the 2030 Agenda; interministerial coordination described in VNRs; solid institutionalization, but managerial steering capacity varies. France. consolidated CoG mechanism; SDG coordination integrated into core planning and governing functions.				
R1.2. Clear mandate and defined responsibilities	Formal mandate (government decision/strategy) - leadership, execution, reporting roles; allocation of responsibilities across ministries	2	2	3
Romania. mandate and architecture defined in the National Sustainable Development Strategy and National Action Plan; responsibilities assigned to the Department for Sustainable Development and the ministerial network. Portugal. mandate defined in the national 2030 Agenda framework; interministerial responsibilities specified in official documents. France. clear, stable mandate with recurring operational responsibilities.				
R1.3. Common steering instrument (roadmap, matrix, implementation calendar)	Existence of a transversal instrument: SDG–policy matrix, implementation calendar, action plan with follow-up mechanisms	2	2	3
Romania. National Action Plan in place; SDG matrices and indicator tools exist; managerial follow-up remains partial. Portugal. National implementation instruments exist; coherence is good but managerial uniformity is limited. France. Steering instruments integrated into the core governance cycle (planning, evaluation, reporting).				
SGCB ROLE* - R2. Policy coherence (whole-of-government)				
R2.1. Formal procedure for SDG policy coherence checks	Existence of methodology/guidelines/procedure: SDG impact checks, PCSD screening, transversal ex-ante assessments	1	2	2
Romania. Recommendations and intentions exist, but no systematic and uniform procedure is evident in practice. Portugal. Instruments and guidance for policy coherence exist; application is more consistent than in Romania. France. Coherence mechanisms exist, but transversal application and trade-off management remain challenging.				
R2.2. Integration of SDGs into sectoral policies and strategies	Explicit references in sectoral strategies; policy–SDG mapping; coherence across ministries	2	2	3

INDICATOR	WHAT WAS ASSESSED (institutions / mechanisms) scoring criteria	ROMANIA score	PORTUGAL score	FRANCE score
Romania. Network of ministerial hubs and mapping tools; integration remains uneven across sectors. Portugal. Relatively consistent integration into sectoral policies. France. Advanced and more standardized integration across sectoral policies.				
R2.3. Trade-off management mechanisms	Existence of formal forums/analytical tools for reconciling objectives (e.g. energy–climate–industry	1	2	2
Romania. Trade-offs are often managed ad hoc; formal mechanisms lack systematic application. Portugal. More functional coordination and coherence mechanisms. France. Capacity exists, but trade-offs remain difficult to govern even in mature systems.				
SGCB ROLE* - R3. Data infrastructure for management (data governance)				
R3.1. National SDG indicator set	Existence of official indicator set; responsible statistical authority; alignment with EU/UN indicators	3	3	3
Romania. National indicator set managed by the National Institute of Statistics; aligned with EU/UN. Portugal. National indicator set managed by the statistical authority; aligned with EU/UN.France. Consolidated national indicator set aligned with EU/UN.				
R3.2. Interoperability and traceability of data across institutions	Data-sharing protocols, cooperation agreements, quality standards, institutional data flows.	1	2	3
Romania. Limited interoperability; cooperation agreements between the National Institute of Statistics and institutions are emerging; consolidation projects ongoing. Portugal. Improved interoperability; more functional data coordination mechanisms. France. Mature data infrastructure and institutionalized use.				
R3.3. Use of SDG data in decision-making (managerial dashboard)	Existence of decision-makers' dashboards; use in steering meetings; feedback loops.	1	2	3
Romania. Data robust for reporting, but managerial use as a recurrent steering tool is still emerging. Portugal. More advanced use (monitoring plus elements of management). France. Robust managerial use (monitoring plus decision support).				
SGCB ROLE* - R4. Resource alignment and implementation capacity				
R4.1. Budget–SDG alignment (tagging, programmetarget mapping)	SDG budget tagging mechanisms, mapping of investments to targets, expenditure reporting	1	2	2
Romania. Initiatives exist (e.g. linking funding to SDGs in projects/guidelines), but no generalized budgetary system. Portugal.More consistent mapping and alignment practices. France. Mechanisms exist, but comprehensive SDG tagging remains challenging				

INDICATOR	WHAT WAS ASSESSED (institutions / mechanisms) scoring criteria	ROMANIA score	PORTUGAL score	FRANCE score
R4.2. Traceability of public expenditure towards SDGs	Reports linking expenditures/projects to SDGs; expenditure tracking methodology	1	2	2
Romania. Partial traceability (mainly in funds and projects), not yet a comprehensive system. Portugal. Better traceability in programmes and reporting. France. Relatively good traceability, though not uniform.				
R4.3. Institutional capacity and competencies	Dedicated structures; expert networks; training programmes; stabilized roles	2	2	2
Romania. Network of hubs and training programmes; professionalization ongoing. Portugal. Functional structures and training. France. High administrative capacity; consolidated training and structures				
R4.4. Implementation monitoring and corrective mechanisms	Existence of review cycles (annual reviews), lessons learned, policy adjustment mechanisms	1	2	2
Romania. Monitoring and reporting exist; managerial correction mechanisms remain limited. Portugal. More consistent review cycles. France. Mechanisms exist, but SDG complexity limits full control.				

Note: Scores range from 0 (absent) to 3 (consolidated and operationalized).
*SGCB - SDG Governance Capacity Benchmark.

Source: Authors' own research, based on national SDG strategies and action plans, Voluntary National Reviews to the UN HLPF, OECD Policy Coherence for Sustainable Development assessments, and country profiles from the European Sustainable Development Network for Romania, Portugal, and France (2018–2024).

5. Conclusions

This paper has examined the capacity of central public administrations in Romania, Portugal, and France to move from Sustainable Development Goals reporting towards Sustainable Development Goals management, using a novel benchmarking framework focused on centre-of-government governance roles. By shifting the analytical focus from outcome-based SDG performance to the institutional and governance capacities that enable effective implementation, the study addresses an important gap in the existing literature on sustainable development governance and policy coherence.

The comparative analysis highlights that formal adoption of the 2030 Agenda and the existence of national strategies are necessary but insufficient conditions for transforming SDGs into operational instruments of public management. While France and Portugal display more consolidated coordination mechanisms and stronger integration of SDGs into central governance processes,

Romania illustrates the persistence of an implementation gap between formal governance architectures and their practical use for strategic steering. These findings reinforce the relevance of whole-of-government and meta-governance approaches in complex, cross-cutting policy domains such as sustainable development and confirm that centre-of-government capacity plays a critical role in enabling policy coherence, data-driven steering, and cross-sectoral integration.

From a practical perspective, the proposed SDG Governance Capacity Benchmark offers a diagnostic tool that can support governments in identifying structural bottlenecks in SDG governance and in prioritizing institutional reforms. The framework can be applied by central coordination units to assess coordination mandates, policy coherence mechanisms, and data governance arrangements, thereby informing targeted capacity-building measures and reforms aimed at strengthening the strategic management of sustainable development. Moreover, the benchmark can be adapted for longitudinal assessments, enabling governments to track institutional progress over time rather than relying solely on static performance indicators.

Several limitations of the present research should be acknowledged. First, the benchmarking exercise relies primarily on qualitative assessments of governance arrangements derived from official documents and publicly available sources, which may not fully capture informal practices or variations in implementation across policy sectors. Second, the scoring system, while structured and theoretically grounded, involves a degree of interpretative judgement that may be influenced by data availability and the level of transparency of national governance frameworks. Third, the study focuses on three European Union member states, which limits the generalizability of the findings to other administrative contexts with different institutional traditions or levels of development.

Future research could extend the proposed framework to a larger sample of countries and complement document-based analysis with interviews or surveys of senior public officials involved in SDG coordination. Further work could also explore the relationship between governance capacity, as measured by the benchmark, and actual SDG outcomes over time, thereby providing empirical insights into the effectiveness of different centre-of-government governance models in advancing sustainable development.

References

1. Ammons, D. N. (2001) “Municipal benchmarks: Assessing local performance and establishing community standards.” Sage Publications.
2. Besley, T. and Persson, T. (2009) “The origins of state capacity: Property rights, taxation, and politics,” *American Economic Review*, 99(4), 1218–1244. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.99.4.1218.
3. Bouckaert, G., Peters, B. G. and Verhoest, K. (2016) “Coordination of public sector organizations: Shifting patterns of public management.” Palgrave Macmillan.

4. Bovaird, T., and Löffler, E. (2003) "Evaluating the quality of public governance: Indicators, models and methodologies," *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 69(3), 313–328. https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852303693002.
5. Camp, R. C. (1989) "Benchmarking: The search for industry best practices that lead to superior performance." ASQC Quality Press.
6. Christensen, T. and Lægreid, P. (2007) "The whole-of-government approach to public sector reform," *Public Administration Review*, 67(6), 1059–1066. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2007.00797.x
7. Christensen, T. and Lægreid, P. (2011) "The Ashgate research companion to new public management." Ashgate.
8. European Commission (2020) "European governance: Supporting the implementation of the 2030 Agenda." Publications Office of the European Union.
9. Fukuyama, F. (2013) "What is governance?," *Governance*, 26(3), 347–368. https://doi.org/10.1111/gove.12035.
10. Government of France (2023) "Voluntary National Review on the Implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development." United Nations High-Level Political Forum.
11. Government of Portugal (2023) "Voluntary National Review on the Implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development." United Nations High-Level Political Forum.
12. Government of Romania (2018) "National Strategy for Sustainable Development of Romania 2030." Government of Romania.
13. Government of Romania (2022) "National Action Plan for the Implementation of the National Strategy for Sustainable Development 2030. Government of Romania.
14. Government of Romania (2023) "Voluntary National Review on the Implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development." United Nations High-Level Political Forum.
15. Head, B. W. (2016) "Toward more "evidence-informed" policy making?," *Public Administration Review*, 76(3), 472–484. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12475.
16. Howlett, M. and Ramesh, M. (2014) "The two orders of governance failure," *Policy and Society*, 33(4), 317–327. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polsoc.2014.10.002.
17. Janssen, M., Charalabidis, Y. and Zuiderwijk, A. (2017) "Benefits, adoption barriers and myths of open data and open government," *Information Systems Management*, 29(4), 258–268.
18. Jessop, B. (2011) "Metagovernance." In: M. Bevir (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of governance* (pp. 106–123). Sage.
19. Jessop, B. (2016) "The state: Past, present, future." Polity Press.
20. Kanie, N. and Biermann, F. (2017) "Governing through goals: Sustainable Development Goals as governance innovation." MIT Press.
21. Meadowcroft, J. (2007) "National sustainable development strategies: Features, challenges and reflexivity," *European Environment*, 17(3), 152–163.
22. Meuleman, L. (2019) "Metagovernance for sustainability: A framework for implementing the Sustainable Development Goals." Routledge.
23. Nilsson, M., Griggs, D. and Visbeck, M. (2016) "Policy: Map the interactions between Sustainable Development Goals," *Nature*, 534(7607), 320–322. https://doi.org/10.1038/534320a.
24. OECD (2015) "Public governance of infrastructure investment: A framework for analysis." OECD Publishing.

25. OECD (2019) “Policy coherence for sustainable development 2019: Empowering people and ensuring inclusiveness and equality.” OECD Publishing.
26. OECD (2020) “Governance for sustainable development: Five OECD lessons.” OECD Publishing.
27. OECD (2021) “Building resilience to the COVID-19 pandemic: The role of governance.” OECD Publishing.
28. OECD (2023) “Policy coherence for sustainable development: Portugal country scan.” OECD Publishing.
29. Painter, M. and Pierre, J. (2005) “Challenges to state policy capacity: Global trends and comparative perspectives.” Palgrave Macmillan.
30. Peters, B. G. (2015) “Advanced introduction to public policy.” Edward Elgar.
31. Peters, B. G. (2018) “The challenge of policy coordination,” *Policy Design and Practice*, 1(1), 1–11.
32. Pierre, J. and Peters, B. G. (2020) “Governance, politics and the state” (2nd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.
33. Pollitt, C. and Bouckaert, G. (2017) “Public management reform: A comparative analysis – Into the age of austerity” (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.
34. Sachs, J. D., Kroll, C., Lafortune, G., Fuller, G. and Woelm, F. (2023) “Sustainable Development Report 2023.” Cambridge University Press.
35. United Nations (2015) “Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.” United Nations.
36. United Nations (2024) “The Sustainable Development Goals Report 2024.” United Nations.
37. Yin, R. K. (2018) “Case study research and applications: Design and methods” (6th ed.). Sage.