

FINANCIAL ROLE IN SUPPORTING THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS IN ASEAN

ANANTACHOKE OSANGTHAMMANONT

International Institute for Trade and Development
and Fiscal Policy Research Institutes Staff, Thailand - aosang@fispri.org

(Received: May 31, 2018; Revised: July 26, 2018; Accepted: August 16, 2018)

ABSTRACT

Financial sector plays a crucial role in helping a country attaining the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) as Financial Means of Implementation (MoI) in the Addis Ababa Action Agenda (AAAA). This report seeks to study sources and uses of fund for the SDGs and evaluate whether the role of financial sector in ASEAN complies with the AAAA. The study shows that available sources of fund and the level of national incomes or the level of country's economic development are closely related. Overall, ASEAN give the highest priority to economic development, creation of innovation and infrastructure investment (SDG 8 and SDG 9), while environmental development and earth conservation appear to receive lower priority (SDG12- SDG15). Furthermore, low-income countries, such as CLMV countries, cannot afford to finance their SDGs initiatives and hence make slow progress in the SDGs. The per-capita SDGs fund, a proxy for quality of investment in sustainable development, is also differed by the level of country's incomes. The report also proposes a set of policy recommendations for the development of financial sector's role in the SDGs as well as possible innovative financing for development.

Keywords: Addis Ababa Action Agenda; ASEAN; Financing for development; SDGs; Sustainable Development Goals.

1. Introduction

The 17 sustainable development goals (SDGs) were adopted by the leaders of members of the United Nations (UN) during the UN summit in September 2015 (United Nations 2014, 2015c, 2015e, and 2016b). To achieve the SDGs by 2030, it is a tremendous challenge for ASEAN countries because sustainable development must balance all three dimensions: economy, society and environment. Financial sector clearly plays a critical role in achieving the SDGs because it can direct necessary resources to the SDGs related activities. Insufficient financing can easily derail the progress in SDGs.

This study examines the role of financial sector in promoting the SDGs in ASEAN. For each ASEAN country, the study investigates how the fund is sufficiently raised and properly allocated to the SDGs. To answer these questions, we compile a dataset on sources and

uses of fund by country and then map the uses of fund to the SDGs. We also follow the United Nations' definition to link SDGs, cross cutting issues in the Addis Agenda Action Agenda (AAAA) and 5Ps to propose an analytical framework for this study.

This study applies a set of indicators to make an assessment on the role of financial sector in supporting the SDG advancement and investigate whether the role of financial sector is consistent with the Addis Ababa Action Agenda (AAAA) (United Nations 2015a and 2016a). The gap analysis is performed to understand individual ASEAN countries' SDGs situation, compared to the top country and the consistency between the fund allocation of Asian countries and their progress in the SDGs. Then, several synthesized development strategies on financial sector are proposed as policy recommendations.

Our findings show that available sources

of fund and the level of national incomes or the level of country's economic development are closely related. Overall, ASEAN gives higher priority to economic development, creation of innovation and infrastructure investment (SDG8 and SDG9), followed by basic social needs and human development (SDG2-SDG4). The financial sector assessment reveals that ASEAN makes most progress in the area of no poverty and clean water and sanitation as well as delivering social protection and essential public for all. We also find that Singapore's financial sector is most likely to support the SDGs, while the rest of ASEAN needs to improve the role of their financial sector. The per-capita sustainable development fund, a proxy for quality of investment in sustainable development, is also differed by the level of country's incomes. Singapore has invested heavily in the SDGs and become a successful leader in sustainable development in ASEAN. Based on a holistic approach, our financial sector development strategies for Thailand and ASEAN are three-pronged: (1) Access to finance strategy (2) Capacity building and competitiveness enhancement strategy and (3) Social and environment strategy.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. The methodology and data used in this study will be explained in section 2. Next, section 3 discusses the highlighted findings of the study. Then, section 4 proposes key policy priorities for achieving the SDGs in Thailand and ASEAN. Lastly, we draw the conclusion in section 5.

2. Methodology and Data

This study starts with defining the scope of financial sector for further analysis. Then, we examine the role of financial sector in sustainable development using the Addis Ababa Action Agenda (AAAA). We analyze the sources and uses of fund available in each ASEAN country and how these countries direct their fund to satisfy the sustainable development goals (the SDGs). Next, we

evaluate the role of financial sector for the SDGs. We also conduct a gap analysis to determine the difference between the current situation and the targets of the SDGs and the disparity between the current role of financial sectors and the ideals proposed by the AAAA. Based on the gap analysis, we devise a strategy to improve the role of financial sector in the SDGs for Thailand and ASEAN.

Definition of financial sector

To scope our analysis better, we adopt the definition of financial sector presented in Financial Mean of Implementation (MOI), part of the AAAA. The financial sector can be classified into 3 groups: (1) Domestic public resources, (2) Domestic and international private business and finance and (3) International development cooperation (United Nations, Economic and Social Commission of Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) 2015a and 2015b).

Domestic public resources can be channeled through government budget, tax policies and government-owned financial institutions or specialized financial institutions (SFIs). Domestic public resources are considered an integral part for driving sustainable economic growth and creating macroeconomic stability. Moreover, they are the most important sources of fund for policy implementation. Sources of fund from government include government budget, tax revenue, and government financial institutions.

Domestic and international private business and finance have several available channels including commercial banks and other financial institutions, securities exchange, foreign direct investment (FDI), remittance from workers abroad and philanthropists. Private enterprises are considered as an important vehicle to drive production, innovation, economic growth and job creation. Furthermore, the long-term domestic and international investments of private enterprises are significant for sustainable development. Since this sector has

the largest source of fund, it has much potential to finance the SDGs in the future.

By contrast, international development cooperation is usually available through multinational development banks and international development agencies, generally in the forms of Official Development Assistance (ODA), i.e. concession loan, grant, or technical assistance. The fund available from this group depends on the economic situation of the ODA partners. Therefore, the size of fund is more limited and more uncertain.

Analysis of the Use and Source of Fund for SDGs in ASEAN

In this analysis, we are interested to know how the ASEAN countries raise their funds. We also want to examine how and how much these countries allocate these funds to achieve the SDGs. To do so, we need to compile a dataset containing the sources and uses of fund for each individual ASEAN country.

Source of Fund Estimation

To estimate the sources of fund for each country, we use 3-year average (2013-2015) data or the latest annual data available, pertaining to government budget, loans from government's SFIs, loans from commercial banks, capital from stock exchange, FDI, and ODA. The average data should reduce an impact from year-to-year fluctuation in data. Similarly, the uses of fund are estimated from the comparable sources of data.

Government data comes from individual ASEAN countries' budgetary data, excluding general administrative expenses, salary and wages of government officers, debt repayment and miscellaneous spending. Therefore, it mainly consists of investment budget. Loans from SFIs and commercial banks are computed by change in outstanding loans. New equity raised in the stock exchange can be estimated by either change in total equity of listed companies or change in market capitalization, depending on data availability. Thailand,

Cambodia, Lao PDR and Myanmar will follow the former approach of new equity estimation, while the rest of ASEAN countries will use the latter one (Asian Development Bank 2017b). We use annual data of net inflow of FDI and ODA directly.

Use of Fund Estimation

Based on sources of fund data, we then map the allocation of fund by sector to the SDGs. We track government budget allocation for the SDGs from objectives of budget usage. Likewise, we employ data on outstanding loans by sector of SFIs and commercial banks as their uses of fund. For new equity, we use the latest available data on the share of listed companies by sector in the stock exchange. In the case of FDI and ODA, their data on allocation by sector is used.

Data on sources and uses of fund

Government data can be found in the National Economic and Social Development Plan or ADB's Key Indicators for Asia and the Pacific 2016 (Asian Development Bank 2016). Data of SFIs comes from their financial statements and the Bank of Thailand, while that of commercial banks is collected from their financial statements. Change in total equity of listed companies is available from stock exchange in Thailand, Cambodia, Lao PDR and Myanmar, while change in market capitalization comes from World Development Indicators (World Federation of Exchanges database 2016 and Bank Negara Malaysia 2015 and 2016). We use FDI data from ASEAN Foreign Direct Investment Statistics Database, prepared by the ASEAN Working Group on International Investment Statistics (WGIIIS) (Association of Southeast Asian Nations 2015a and 2015b and Department of Statistics Malaysia 2016). For ODA, we rely on data from various sources such as ADB (Asian Development Bank 2016 and 2017a), the World Bank (World Bank Group 2013 and 2014h) and OECD (OECD 2007, 2015, and 2017).

In this study, data on budget allocation, SFI loans by sector and commercial bank loans by sector come from the same sources as those of fund data. On the other hand, data on new equity by sector is available from stock exchange and Data Stream 2013. FDI data by sector is provided by investment promotion agencies or the like of each country. We can find data on allocation of ODA by sector from ADB, the World Bank and OECD as well.

Evaluation of the Role of Financial Sector for the SDGs

As financial sector can play a crucial role in SDGs progress, this study wants to make an assessment whether ASEAN's financial sector support the SDGs implementation. Moreover, we want to examine if the role of financial sector complies with the framework of the AAAA. A country that makes good progress in the SDGs is supposed to have a well-functioned financial sector as well as good supporting policies. Therefore, the role of financial sector along with other related policies should be more supportive in a country with good progress in the SDGs. In other words, this is an indirect approach to make assessment of the role of financial sector.

We adapt the methodology employed in Bertelsmann Stiftung (2016) to evaluate the progress of the SDGs in ASEAN. The report was prepared by the Bertelsmann Stiftung and Sustainable Development Solutions Network to help countries realize where they currently stand with regards to progress in the SDGs in 2015. To do so, the report uses a set of 64 indicators to capture the progress in 17 SDGs, which are subsequently reclassified into 7 groups according to the AAAA's cross cutting issues. For each indicator, data will be normalized by transform it linearly into a scale of 0 to 1 using the following formula.

$$x' = \frac{x - \text{lower}(x)}{\text{upper}(x) - \text{lower}(x)}$$

where x' denotes to the rescaled value, x denotes an original value of indicator, $\text{upper}(x)$

denotes upper bound of the indicators, which is the best value, and finally $\text{lower}(x)$ denotes lower bound of the indicator, which is the worst value after dropping the bottom 2.5% as outliers. Then the rescaled score will be multiplied by 100 to make the scale of 0 to 100. This score will represent "the average initial placement" of the country, between the worst and best performance. For simplicity, we will use the best performance or score of 100 as the target for each SDG. For each SDG, we will use at least one indicator for the assessment. In the case of having more than one indicator for one SDG, we will use a simple average of those indicators to represent the current achievement on each SDG.

Next, the SDGs are transformed into the 7 cross-cutting issues in the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and use scores on the SDGs to calculate the scores for each cross-cutting issue in the same manner. Lastly, the overall SDG Index and the overall the AAAA Index of a country can be computed by taking a simple average of the country scores on each of the 17 SDGs and on each of cross-cutting issues respectively. The dataset used for computing the SDG index and the AAAA index is readily available at the report website (United Nations 2015c). Concerning with the different economic circumstance and level of development among ASEAN countries, this study compares sets of indicators employing data on the basis of per capita term while the use of all types of funds are evaluated by percentage of each country's GDP. The rational involves relative reflection of funding mobilization for sustainable development of each country. Countries with different levels of development may financially set different policy priority and demand for economic, social, and environmental development as to be consistent with the SDGs. In other words, lower-income countries might prioritize the budget and fund to reduce poverty and hunger, while higher-income countries might mobilize

their funds towards more quality goals such as peace, equality, environment, partnership, and social aspects. Moreover, grouping SDGs into 5Ps (People, Prosperity, Planet, Peace and Partnership) is useful when we explain our results:

The Linkage between the SDGs and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda

The policy implementations ultimately need sufficient sources of fund in order to drive successful SDG projects. The Addis Ababa Action Agenda (AAAA) has 3 targets which are: 1) To follow the commitments and progress of the 2002 Monterrey Consensus and the 2008 Doha Declaration in each country; 2) To adjust funding method for sustainable development and the actions under the Universal Post-2015 Development Agenda; and 3) To emphasize and upgrade the following methods of development funding progress. However, it includes new challenges such as the crisis of economy as well as financial, natural crisis, and epidemic of virus,

etc. The funding should be a corporation of stakeholders including government and private sector, which are the main targets of Cross-Cutting Issues from the AAAA.

The AAAA also includes the following Action Areas: 1) the Financial sector for sustainable development, 2) International Trade as an Engine for Development, 3) Debt and Debt Sustainability, 4) Addressing Systemic Issues and 5) Science, Technology, Innovation and Capacity Building. The financial sector is mainly divided into 3 parts, which are 1) Domestic Public Resources, 2) Domestic and International Private Business and Finance and 3) International Development Cooperation. The analysis finds that the AAAA emphasizes every Cross-Cutting Issues while the Sustainable Development Corporation is as well an important part to success target under cross-cutting issues. Moreover, the study also suggests that SDG10 and SDG17 should be included as a part of every Cross Cutting Issue (see Table 1).

Table 1

The linkage between Cross-Cutting issue of The Addis Ababa Action Agenda and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)

Cross-Cutting Issue	Definition	Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)	Definition
AAAA1	Delivering social protection and essential public services for all	SDG1	No Poverty
		SDG3	Good Health and Well-Being
		SDG4	Quality Education
		SDG6	Clean Water and Sanitation
		SDG7	Affordable and Clean Energy
		SDG8	Decent Work and Economic Growth
		SDG10	Reduced Inequalities
		SDG11	Sustainable Cities and Communities
		SDG17	Partnerships for The Goals

Cross-Cutting Issue	Definition	Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)	Definition
AAAA2	Scaling up efforts to end hunger and malnutrition	SDG2	Zero Hunger
		SDG10	Reduced Inequalities
		SDG12	Responsible Consumption and Production
		SDG17	Partnerships for The Goals
AAAA3	Establishing a new forum to bridge the infrastructure gap	SDG9	Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure
		SDG10	Reduced Inequalities
		SDG17	Partnerships for The Goals
AAAA4	Promoting inclusive and sustainable industrialization:	SDG9	Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure
		SDG10	Reduced Inequalities
		SDG17	Partnerships for The Goals
AAAA5	Generating full and productive employment and decent work for all and promoting MSMEs:	SDG8	Decent Work and Economic Growth
		SDG10	Reduced Inequalities
		SDG17	Partnerships for The Goals
AAAA6	Protecting our ecosystems for all:	SDG2	Zero Hunger
		SDG10	Reduced Inequalities
		SDG12	Responsible Consumption and Production
		SDG13	Climate Action
		SDG14	Life Below Water
		SDG15	Life on Land
		SDG17	Partnerships for The Goals
AAAA7	Promoting peaceful and inclusive societies	SDG5	Gender Equality
		SDG10	Reduced Inequalities
		SDG16	Peace and Justice Strong Institutions
		SDG17	Partnerships for The Goals

Sources: United Nations (2016) and the Research Team

Notes: AAAAi is Cross-Cutting issue i of the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, where $i = 1, 2, \dots, 7$ and SDGj is Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) where $j = 1, 2, \dots, 17$

The Linkage between the SDGs and 5Ps

The linkage between areas of critical importance 5 terms (5Ps) and the SDGs is not formally explained by the United Nations, so that the scope of 5Ps would vary depending on each organization. Hence, this study divides 5Ps and the SDGs following Lindiwe Dhlamini (2006), which *People* is associated with SDG1-SDG6; *Prosperity* is associated with SDG7-SDG11; *Planet* is associated with SDG12-SDG15; *Peace* is associated with SDG16; and *Partnership* is associated with SDG17.

Gap Analysis

The gap analysis shows how far we are now from our goal. We take two approaches to perform the gap analysis. The first approach takes the best performance for each SDG as a goal for that SDG. Therefore, the gap will be simply estimated by the difference between 100 and country's score for each SDG and overall SDG. The second approach looks at the gap or discrepancy between the current progress of the SDGs and the allocation of funds for the SDGs. For ASEAN countries, a country score, which is lower ASEAN average score for each SDG, should match with less allocation of fund. That is, larger discrepancy between the SDGs performance and fund allocation should imply larger gap in this analysis.

3. Results and Discussion

The highlighted results from the study mainly emphasize 2 issues: the role of financial sector in sustainable development in ASEAN, and evaluation and gap analysis of ASEAN financial sector in accordance with the Addis Ababa Action Agenda.

The Role of Financial Sector in Sustainable Development in ASEAN

The performance of mobilizing and financing for the SDGs in ASEAN countries may depend on many factors including level of development, level of overall education of its citizen, number of population, and annual incomes of a country. In this study, 10 ASEAN

countries are divided into 3 groups using GNI per capita to assess the sources of fund structure potential to finance the SDGs. The study shows that available sources of fund and the level of national incomes or the level of country's economic development are closely related. That is, higher incomes usually imply a wider range of financing options. The first group, which has annual GNI per capita below \$3,000 consisting of Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar, and Vietnam (CLMV), generally exhibits the main sources of fund largely came from government budget (30-70% share of total source of fund) followed by commercial banks and FDI respectively. The second group of ASEAN middle income countries, consisting of Malaysia, Thailand, Philippines, and Indonesia, mostly shows the source of fund structure which mainly came from government budget followed by listed companies and commercial banks respectively. The third group implies higher income per capita indicates different sources of fund structure. As presented by sophisticated financial system, the most important source of fund in Singapore comes from the listed companies. However, Brunei heavily relies on government budget (87% share) for its sustainable development. That is, Brunei is a special case. Despite her high incomes, her capital market is less advanced.

Regarding the analysis of the use of fund on the SDGs in ASEAN Countries, overall ASEAN give higher priority to economic development, creation of innovation and infrastructure investment (SDG8 and SDG9, i.e. Prosperity), followed by basic social needs and human development (SDG2 – SDG4, i.e. People). Environmental development and earth conservation appears to receive lower priority (SDG 12 – SDG 15, i.e. Planet). For disaggregated use of fund in ASEAN, distribution of government spending on the SDGs in ASEAN mostly ensure the basic need of citizen particularly on SDG 3 – SDG 4 (i.e. People), accounting for approximately 20-50%

of total use of fund in ASEAN, followed by economic development and infrastructure investment particularly on SDG 8 – SDG 9 (i.e. Prosperity), or 10-40% share of the total (World Bank Group 2016c). The overall funding from commercial bank loans in ASEAN essentially contribute to economic development (SDG 8 and SDG 9, i.e. Prosperity), accounting for 70-100% of the total. Finally, the overall funds in ASEAN received from ODA providing are highly distributed to SDG 8 and SDG 9 (i.e. Prosperity), accounting for 60-70% of the total, followed by SDG1 – SDG4 (i.e. People) (Aidflows 2014, Alesina, A. and Dollar, D. 2000, The Charities Aid Foundation 2014 and 2015, and UNITAID 2017). However, in order to maximize positive contribution to the SDGs, it is vital to view and monitor the effectiveness of financing intended for the SDGs in term of per-capita flows. The finding examined is also consistent across the region as the higher income countries, Singapore and Brunei, allocate the largest per capita funding in 2016 of \$41,133 and \$27,372 for the SDGs respectively. The middle income countries, Malaysia, Thailand and Philippines, involve per-capita SDG spending of \$3,706 \$1,534 and \$1,198 respectively, followed by Vietnam, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Cambodia and Myanmar which have per-capita spending contributed to the SDGs of \$1,067 \$892 \$499 \$473 and \$380 respectively.

Evaluation and Gap Analysis of ASEAN Financial Sector in accordance with The Addis Ababa Action Agenda

The evaluation results of policy implementation and overall performance of financing for development in ASEAN using indicators from SDG Index & Dashboards: A Global Report (July 2016), and then adjusted in accordance with AAAA, indicates that the

SDG1 (No poverty) is the best performed SDG in ASEAN (highest average scores of 87.50, or the lowest policy gap of 12.50), signifying that most population in ASEAN generate income above \$1.90 per day, as a result of fair accessibility to basic needs and resources provided by the government (See Table 2). The top three performers of SDG1 are Singapore (scores of 100), Thailand (scores of 99.91), and Malaysia (scores of 99.59). By contrast, the study shows SDG17 (Partnerships for the goals) is the lowest performance on ASEAN average (lowest average scores of 18.12, or the highest gap of 81.88), implying insufficient government resources or inefficient distribution to service public activities properly, such as an increase in the level of international partnership, support to achieve national development plan, and encouragement of international trade.

The evaluation results of policy implementation and overall performance of financing for development in ASEAN by cross-cutting issues of AAAA indicate that AAAA1 points out the highest average scores of 61.88 (the lowest policy gap of 38.12), implying that most ASEAN countries mainly emphasize policy implementation regarding improvement on quality of life (see Table 3). In the opposite, AAAA3 as well as AAAA4 seem to receive the lowest policy priority as represented by the lowest evaluation scores of 34.37 for both cross-cutting issues (or the highest policy gap of 65.63). This signifies by low average scores of related indicators including quality of overall infrastructure, mobile broadband subscriptions, internet use, R&D researchers and R&D expenditures (Asian Development Bank 2014, World Bank Group 2014a, 2014b, 2014c, 2014e, 2014f, 2014g, 2014i, 2015, 2016a, and 2016b and UNCDF 2016a, 2016b, 2016c, and 2017).

Table 2

Evaluation Results of Policy Implementation and Overall Performance of Financing for Development in ASEAN by SDG

SDGs	Cambodia	Indonesia	Lao PDR	Malaysia	Myanmar	Philippines	Singapore	Thailand	Vietnam	Avg.
SDG1 No Poverty	91.05	76.86	56.40	99.59	-	80.92	100.00	99.91	95.30	87.50
SDG2 Zero Hunger	52.70	51.77	54.21	64.89	55.58	53.11	70.92	57.88	66.08	58.57
SDG3 Good Health and Well-Being	52.50	53.74	46.23	69.73	44.82	57.77	85.26	62.96	64.18	59.69
SDG4 Quality Education	68.26	55.63	64.42	62.08	53.97	66.44	89.55	64.55	72.35	66.36
SDG5 Gender Equality	51.12	62.08	49.02	53.68	63.61	62.90	68.71	66.01	72.42	61.06
SDG6 Clean Water and Sanitation	61.52	76.10	72.41	97.09	78.87	83.03	100.00	94.69	89.21	83.66
SDG7 Affordable and Clean Energy	17.15	61.59	33.37	84.75	40.15	67.28	89.50	77.38	70.68	60.20
SDG8 Decent Work and Economic Growth	55.47	63.76	62.57	63.97	55.30	55.50	74.55	72.00	57.50	62.29
SDG9 Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure	12.50	21.60	15.30	46.67	2.52	17.27	80.50	35.61	32.62	29.40
SDG10 Reduced Inequalities	71.80	66.20	69.92	44.80	-	53.37	-	62.94	73.02	63.15
SDG11 Sustainable Cities and Communities	66.44	48.81	52.40	85.12	26.78	69.30	82.77	64.06	53.08	60.97
SDG12 Responsible Consumption and Production	0.00	46.05	44.34	40.92	46.79	46.49	86.71	42.34	34.03	43.08
SDG13 Climate Action	51.76	84.49	75.80	72.35	74.52	84.17	82.16	60.40	65.28	72.33
SDG14 Life Below Water	20.28	42.83	-	44.99	31.76	53.60	32.17	50.89	33.87	38.80
SDG15 Life on Land	30.18	29.76	39.06	14.04	46.50	34.99	46.63	55.80	29.76	36.30
SDG16 Peace and Justice Strong Institutions	39.79	59.43	52.96	57.86	43.38	52.56	80.49	49.22	52.66	54.26
SDG17 Partnerships for The Goals	19.04	8.69	17.56	26.00	8.27	12.97	25.07	29.29	16.17	18.12
Avg. of all SDGs	44.80	53.49	50.37	60.50	44.85	55.98	74.69	61.53	57.54	

Table 3

Evaluation Results of Policy Implementation and Overall Performance of Financing for Development in ASEAN by AAAA

The Addis Ababa Action Agenda (Cross-cutting issue)		Cambodia	Indonesia	Lao PDR	Malaysia	Myanmar	Philippines	Singapore	Thailand	Vietnam	Avg.
AAAA1	Delivering Social Protection and Essential Public Services for All	55.91	56.82	52.81	70.35	44.02	60.73	80.84	69.76	65.72	61.88
AAAA2	Scaling Up Efforts to End Hunger and Malnutrition	35.89	43.18	46.51	44.15	36.88	41.48	60.90	48.11	47.33	44.94
AAAA3	Establishing New Forum to Bridge the Infrastructure Gap	34.45	32.16	34.26	39.16	5.39	27.87	52.78	42.62	40.61	34.37
AAAA4	Promoting Inclusive and Sustainable Industrialization	34.45	32.16	34.26	39.16	5.39	27.87	52.78	42.62	40.61	34.37
AAAA5	Generating Full and Productive Employment and Decent Work	48.77	46.22	50.02	44.92	31.78	40.61	49.81	54.75	48.90	46.20
AAAA6	Protecting Our Ecosystems	35.11	47.11	50.15	44.00	43.90	48.39	57.28	51.36	45.46	46.97
AAAA7	Promoting Peaceful and Inclusive Societies	45.44	49.10	47.36	45.59	38.42	45.45	58.09	51.87	53.57	48.32
Avg. of all AAAA Cross-cutting issues		41.43	43.82	45.05	46.76	29.40	41.77	58.93	51.58	48.88	45.29

4. Key Policy Priorities for Achieving the SDGs in Thailand and ASEAN

The findings of this study can be further used to formulate a financial sector development strategy for Thailand and ASEAN. We can apply the SWOT analysis and TOWS matrix to derive key strategies, while setting priorities based on the gap in SDGs achievement and relevance to the national development plan (Bank Islam 2017, UNDP 2016a and 2016b).

Based on the above analysis, we can formulate a set of financial sector development strategies for Thailand and ASEAN, which looks beyond the financial sector. Since the study concentrates on a whole ecosystem of financial sector, the derived strategies are three-pronged: (1) Access to finance strategy (2) Capacity building and competitiveness enhancement strategy and (3) Social and environment strategy.

Highest-priority strategies

Access to finance strategy: This strategy aims to lower barriers to finance. For Thailand, the financial institution should be incentivized to finance targeted sectors and the interest rate spread should be managed properly for SMEs. The capital market such as stock exchange should be promoted as a reliable source of funds for SDGs. Financial literacy and access to IT infrastructure and equipment are the foundation of new financial platform, which promises to lower cost and better access to financial services. Moreover, financing innovation is a must. In the case of Thailand, philanthropist's donation has tremendous potential.

For ASEAN, we should focus on the cooperation among ASEAN countries. They can set up ODA for lower-income ASEAN countries and attract new ODA to the region (McGillivray, M. 2003). Furthermore, ASEAN should encourage the use of Fintech in business sector.

Capacity building and competitiveness

enhancement strategy: This strategy takes a long-term view of financial sector development. Essentially, the capacity of financing of a country is determined by its level of development. Thailand should shift her focus high quality and high tech products and attract more of innovation-and-high-tech investment. More importantly, Thailand must pursue capacity building of her human resource as well as moral consciousness and social responsibility. Cultural and natural tourism could be the future of Thai tourism. Moreover, Thailand should leverage on her cooperation with other countries to improve her R&D activities.

ASEAN should support the development of technology and innovation in the region. Also, ASEAN should build on existing intra-regional trade and investment to create a region-wide value chain, which benefits all participants. Capacity building of human resource, SMEs promotion and extensive urbanization should be among ASEAN's top priorities.

Social and environment strategy: This strategy serves as a stabilizer of the financial sector development strategy. Sustainable development must strike the balance between economic, social and environmental dimensions. Thailand should provide sufficient medical services to all groups. Private sector participation in large-scale investment and liberalized and transparent government procurement will help prevent corruption. Furthermore, Thailand should promote environment protection and the use of alternative and renewable energies.

Similarly, ASEAN should deter corruption through liberalized and transparent government procurement and public-private partnership. ASEAN should raise awareness for sustainable production and consumption. Finally, ASEAN should encourage the use of alternative energies in place of fossil fuels.

Innovative Financing

Since the criteria for investment of public and private sectors are different, private sector emphasizes on the return and risk of investment. For the most cases of countries in ASEAN, financial resource of private sector is normally larger than those of governments and ODA combined. Thus, innovative financing (United Nations 2009 and UNDP 2012) may help to induce more funding for sustainable development from private sector (Ketkar, S. and Ratha, D. 2009 and Navin Girishankar 2009). For instance, Diaspora bond (Rambarran, J. and P. Ramlakhan 2014 and Reuters 2016) can induce new group of investors which are people working in foreign countries; Education bond can help families to save their money for their children education. Moreover, the government can reduce public debt burden by using innovative financing such as Infrastructure Fund (Asian Development Bank 2015), Commodity and Stabilization Fund, as well as pooled institutional fund to enable economies of scale, and further adoption among smaller institutions, integrated structured financing solutions with a focus on more “investable sectors” – energy, infrastructure and water, agriculture and food, and healthcare.

For private sector, the innovative financing may be in various approaches (World Economic Forum 2017). For examples, private businesses join the project of RED products to improve their organization images of social responsibility, non-financial return. Another approach is reducing cost of private sector via Fintech such as Mobile-Banking, Branchless-Banking Blockchain, and Crowdfunding. The third approach is to reduce risk and increase investor confidence via guarantees from reliable organizations such as Social Impact Bonds (RAND 2015) issued by the United Nations. The last approach is to target special type of retail investors, called “impact investors” (C-Change and Sustainable Development Goals Charter 2016), in order to

mobilizing retail-oriented impact capital, such as Green bond (World Bank Group 2008 and 2014d) or Sustainability bond (Sustainalytics 2015), issuing to raise fund for reducing impacts of the climate change problem.

Moreover, at present social enterprises (Bugg-Levine, A., Kogut, B. and Kulatilaka, N. 2012), organizations directly involved in the sale of goods and services to a market, but that also has specific social objectives that serve as its primary purpose, may also play an important role in providing financial benefit with social goals to communities. The good examples include AfriKids, an organization established under Convention on the Rights of the Child, Alive and Kicking that manufactures sports balls to provide balls for children, create jobs for adults and promote health education through sport, ADUNA, an Africa-inspired health food brand and social business, and SocialGiver as they convert spare service capacity into social impact.

Policy recommendations

This study proposes the following policy recommendations to all stakeholders involving SDG development.

(1.) ASEAN members need to invest for sustainable development continuously, provided that the role of financial sector is always important. The related measures include: 1) integration of a sustainable development plan and a country’s long-term development strategy; 2) fiscal management skill development improve fiscal management skills in revenue collection, revenue and expenditure forecast, financing planning, ODA utilization and budgetary control; and 3) promotion of financing for sustainable development from private sector and international cooperation.

(2.) According to the framework of the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, SDG development should be holistic to increase the role of financial sector. The related measures include: 1) promotion of all stakeholders’

participation in the making of a country's development strategy from the beginning; 2) success rate improvement of policy implementation setting clear targets of country development with measurable KPIs properly reflecting the development targets; 3) efficiency improvement of relevant policy implementation executives and staffs; and 4) business sector's value chain development focusing on value added creation through business operation efficiency improvement, demand-driven technology creation or application, branding and marketing.

(3.) The public sector needs to expand its income base since public domestic resource is the most important source of fund for financing SDG projects, especially in the social and environmental aspects. The related measures include: 1) promotion of more rigorous budget review process; 2) efficiency enhancement in government's expenditure and procurement; 3) tax-based expansion and new tax imposition consistent with the global development; 4) trade liberalization in goods and services to allow for more competition in business; 5) promotion of technology usage in both public and private sectors; and 6) promotion of Thai entrepreneurs to take part in global value chain while building their own value chain.

(4.) Government should encourage blended finance by giving incentives to private sector and cooperate with foreign countries and international organization. The related measures include: 1) cooperation among government, non-profit organizations and domestic and international private funds; and 2) credibility and incentive enhancement for private investment relating sustainable development.

(5.) Financing for sustainable development for any financial sector must determine priority and objective clearly. Project monitoring and evaluation process is necessary. The related measures include: 1) establishment of an agency responsible for

sustainable development goals; and 2) establishment of Joint Committee among public, private, and social sectors responsible for sustainable development.

(6.) Due to the fact that source of fund options and financial allocation of each ASEAN member are different depending on income and development level of each country, each country should decide on appropriate source of fund for that country. The related measures include: 1) development of financial and capital markets including related infrastructures; 2) enhancement of fund raising ability of private enterprises and standards including management, selling, marketing, research and development, and accounting; 3) promotion of financial literacy to citizen across countries; and 4) promotion of foreign investors to invest in stocks and bonds markets.

(7.) Since there is limitation for financial cooperation among ASEAN members for sustainable development, and the members have different needs, financial cooperation should not affect sustainable development plan of each country. Each country needs investment in economic, social, and environmental developments continuously to improve capability and competitiveness of that country. The related measures include:

1) promotion of knowledge exchange among ASEAN countries; 2) full support for financial cooperation which already realized in ASEAN countries, such as ASEAN Financial Integration Framework (AIF) and The ASEAN Blueprint 2025; 3) promotion of sustainable development corporation among ASEAN countries, which share common interest, such as Neighbouring Countries Economic Development Cooperation Agency in CLMV countries; 4) explicit inclusion of sustainable development in main goals of the next ASEAN Blueprint consistent with the promises stated by the leaders of ASEAN countries (Asian Development Bank 2013 and ASEAN Secretariat 2015).

5. Conclusion

To achieve the SDGs in 2030, financial sector definitely plays a critical role in supporting this agenda as a crucial mean of implementation. This study examines whether the role of financial sector in ASEAN support the advancement of the SDGs. The findings of this study show that each ASEAN country raises and allocates fund to SDGs differently. Moreover, it indicates that the role of financial sector for SDGs in each ASEAN country is indeed important, but the effectiveness of financial sector is different.

The nature of fund raising and allocation is varied by the stage of development or level of income. A more developed country with higher income usually has more options of financing and hardly needs innovative financing. Moreover, the more developed country allocates their fund to build nation's long-term competitiveness as well as environment and has higher quality of investment (higher per capita spending) for the SDGs. For ASEAN, we clearly see that Singapore, which is the most developed country, fit the above description very well. On the other end of the spectrum, we have CLMV countries, especially for Cambodia, Lao PDR and Myanmar, which are completely opposite.

Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines and Thailand are somewhere in the middle, while Brunei is a special case in ASEAN – a high - income country with underdeveloped financial system.

This study shows that sustainable development is an on-going process. ASEAN countries must continue to invest for the SDGs. Domestic public resources is always the most important financial sectors for SDGs as it can overcome market failures in financial, social, and environmental SDGs, while private sector can provide more financing to economic SDGs as economy grows. While the long-term financial sector development depends on country's competitiveness, we need to attract more financing for the SDGs from the private sector and the government should provide incentives to align the interest of the public and private sectors. This is where innovative financing are much needed. Finally, due to different background of ASEAN countries, it is not easy to have cooperation in financing for development when each country has to compete for own resources. The existing financial cooperation is designed to fully support the SDGs. Therefore, there is much work to be done to have meaningful financial cooperation for the SDGs in ASEAN ■

References

- Aidflows (2014). Beneficiary View, sources and uses of ODA.
- Alesina, A. and Dollar, D. (2000). Who Gives Foreign Aid to Whom and Why? *Journal of Economic Growth*, 5, pp. 33-63.
- Asian Development Bank (2013). *The Road to ASEAN Financial Integration*. Philippines.
- Asian Development Bank (2014). *Asia SME Finance Monitor 2014*.
- Asian Development Bank (2015). *Local Currency Bonds and Infrastructure Finance in ASEAN+3*.
- Asian Development Bank (2016). *Key Indicators for Asia and the Pacific 2016*.
- Asian Development Bank (2017a). *Asian Development Bank and Thailand: Fact Sheet*.
- Asian Development Bank (2017b). *Thailand Funding Information*.
- ASEAN Secretariat (2015). *ASEAN Integration Report 2015*.
- Association of Southeast Asian Nations (2015a). *ASEAN Statistical Yearbook 2015*.
- Association of Southeast Asian Nations (2015b). *Foreign direct investment net inflows, intra- and extra-ASEAN*.

- Bank Islam (2017). 11th Malaysian Plan (2016-2020).
- Bank Negara Malaysia (2015). Liquidity Coverage Ratio.
- Bank Negara Malaysia (2016). Monthly Statistical Bulletin.
- Bertelsmann Stiftung (2016). SDG Index & Dashboards: A Global Report.
- Sustainable Development Solutions Network. July 2016.
- Bugg-Levine, A., Kogut, B. and Kulatilaka, N. (2012). A New Approach to Funding Social Enterprises.
- C-Change and Sustainable Development Goals Charter (2016). Building Highways to SDG Investing: Invitation to collaborate on a Dutch sustainable development investing agenda, December 2016.
- Department Of Statistics Malaysia (2016). Press Release Statistics of Foreign Direct Investment in Malaysia, 2015.
- Lindiwe Dhlamini (2016). Integrating agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) into regional and national development plans and strategies.
- Ketkar, S. and Ratha, D. (2009). Innovative Financing for Development.
- McGillivray, M. (2003). Aid Effectiveness and Selectivity: Integrating Multiple Objectives into Aid Allocations. *DAC Journal*, 4 (3), 23-36.
- Navin Girishankar (2009). Innovative Development Finance: From Financing Sources to Financial Solutions.
- OECD (2007). Subsidy Reform and Sustainable Development: Political Economy Aspects, OECD Sustainable Development Studies.
- OECD (2015). Agriculture sector flow by Official Development Assistance.
- OECD - DAC (2017). Aid at a glance by Thailand.
- Rambarran, J. and P. Ramlakhan (2014). Global Diaspora and Development.
- RAND (2015). Evaluating the World's First Social Impact Bond.
- Reuters (2016). Countries look to draw expatriate cash with 'diaspora bonds'.
- Sustainalytics (2015). Development Bank of Japan: Sustainability Bond Framework Overview and Opinion.
- The Charities Aid Foundation (2014). World Giving Index 2014, A Global View for Giving Trends.
- The Charities Aid Foundation (2015). World Giving Index 2015, A Global View for Giving Trends.
- United Nations (2009). Innovative financing for development, The I-8 Group, Leading Innovative Financing for Equity [L.I.F.E.], December 2009.
- United Nations (2014). Sustainable Development Goals, proposal, Open Working Group of the General Assembly on Sustainable Development Goals, 2014.
- United Nations (2015a). Addis Ababa Action Agenda on the Third International Conference on Financing on Development (Addis Ababa Action Agenda).
- United Nations (2015b). From Decisions to Actions, Report of the Secretary-General of UNCTAD to UNCTAD XIV. New York: United Nations.
- United Nations (2015c). Indicators and a Monitoring Framework for the Sustainable Development Goals, the Leadership Council of the Sustainable Development Solutions Network.
- United Nations (2015d). Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015 – 2030, UNISDR, Geneva, Switzerland: United Nations.
- United Nations (2015e). The Millennium Development Goals Report 2015. New York: United Nations.
- United Nations (2016a). Addis Ababa Action Agenda, Monitoring Commitments and Actions, Inaugural Report 2016 – Inter-agency Task Force on Financing for Development. New York: United Nations.
- United Nations (2016b). The Sustainable Development Goals Report 2016. New York: United Nations.

- United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) (2014). The Least Developed Countries Report 2014 Growth with structural transformation: A post-2015 development agenda.
- United Nations Economic and Social Council (2012). The 2012 triennial review.
- United Nations, Economic and Social Commission of Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) (2015a). Financing for Transformation: From Agenda to Action on Sustainable Development in Asia and the Pacific.
- United Nations, Economic and Social Commission of Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) (2015b). Sustainable Development Financing: Perspectives from Asia and the Pacific.
- UNCDF (2016a). Amret Awarded Grant to Expand Women's Financial Inclusion through Digital Finance Family.
- UNCDF (2016b). UNCDF provides support to Banque Franco Lao Ltd. in moving into digital financing of distribution chains to benefit small women-run businesses.
- UNCDF (2016c). Vi-Viet e-wallet by LienVietPostBank (Vietnam) to have 500,000 women financially included by 2018.
- UNCDF (2017). Using Digital Gamification for Enhancing Financial Literacy in Myanmar.
- UNDP (2012). Innovative Financing for Development: A New Model for Development Finance?.
- UNDP (2016a). Development Finance for the 8th National Socio-Economic Development Plan and the Sustainable Development Goals in Lao PDR.
- UNDP (2016b). UNDP Support to the Implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals.
- UNITAID (2017). Unitaid invests in better ways to prevent, diagnose and treat diseases.
- World Bank Group (2008). What Are Green Bonds?.
- World Bank Group (2013). Financing for Development Post-2015.
- World Bank Group (2014a). Automated Teller Machines (ATMs): per 100,000 Adults.
- World Bank Group (2014b). GDP per Unit of Energy Use (PPP per kg of oil equivalent).
- World Bank Group (2014c). Government expenditure on education, total (% of GDP).
- World Bank Group (2014d). Growing the Green Bond Market to Finance a Cleaner, Resilient World.
- World Bank Group (2014e). Health Expenditure, public (% of GDP).
- World Bank Group (2014f). Percentage of adults owning an account through a mobile money provide.
- World Bank Group (2014g). PPP Investment in infrastructure.
- World Bank Group (2014h). Revenue Excluding Grants: % of GDP.
- World Bank Group (2014i). Tax Revenue: % of GDP.
- World Bank Group (2015). Commercial Bank Branches per 100,000 Adults.
- World Bank Group (2016a). Percent of firms with a female top manager.
- World Bank Group (2016b). Private Participation in infrastructure Database.
- World Bank Group (2016c). The Worldwide Governance Indicators, 2016 Update.
- World Economic Forum (2017). Balancing Financial Stability, Innovation, and Economic Growth.
- World Federation of Exchanges database (2016). Market capitalization of listed domestic companies.