Vol. 4(1), 1-8

Journal of Energy & Environmental Policy Options

Measuring Progress Toward Sustainable Development Goals Through Legal Integration and Policy Guidance

Yann Zhang[a]

Abstract

The concept of sustainable development was formally adopted during the political process leading up to the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, marking a significant milestone in global efforts to coordinate and guide spontaneous development processes. Since then, numerous initiatives have been undertaken to implement this concept by embedding it into legal frameworks and by shaping the development objectives of societies worldwide. This paper explores these two key areas—legal integration and development goal-setting—by examining how countries can assess their progress toward achieving sustainable development. The focus is on developing a methodology for measuring the distance to sustainable goals, offering a practical tool for evaluating and guiding national policies and initiatives. The paper proposes a novel approach to measure how far countries are from their sustainable development targets. This approach not only provides a clear metric for assessing progress but also offers insights into the specific areas where further efforts are needed. By quantifying the distance to sustainability goals, this methodology can help policymakers identify gaps, set priorities, and allocate resources more effectively to areas where they are most needed. The proposed measurement tool aims to provide at least a partial response to the challenges of operationalizing sustainable development within the complex and varied contexts of different nations. It is designed to be adaptable, allowing for its application across diverse legal and socio-economic environments, and to serve as a benchmark for continuous improvement. The paper contributes to the ongoing discourse on sustainable development by offering a practical solution for measuring progress toward sustainability. This tool has the potential to enhance the effectiveness of sustainable development policies and strategies, enabling countries to move closer to their sustainability goals in a more coordinated and targeted manner.

Keywords: Sustainable Development, Legal Integration, Policy Measurement, Progress Evaluation
JEL Codes: Q01, K32, O21

1. INTRODUCTION

The concept of sustainable development gained prominence following the definition provided in the Brundtland Report, which framed it as "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs" (Brundtland, 1987). This definition shifted the focus from purely economic growth to a broader understanding that integrates social and environmental dimensions. The idea was further institutionalized through political commitments at the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, where sustainable development became a foundational principle guiding global environmental and development policies. The strength of this concept lies in its flexible interpretation, which allows it to be applied across various disciplines and policy contexts. While the original formulation emphasizes balancing current and future needs, its interpretation has evolved to include specific concerns like climate change mitigation, social equity, biodiversity conservation, and economic sustainability. This versatility has contributed to its widespread acceptance, but it also leads to challenges in establishing universally accepted standards or metrics for sustainable development. Consequently, sustainable development remains a dynamic and evolving concept, shaped by ongoing global environmental, social, and economic challenges.

The idea of sustainable development, while powerful in shaping development policy, indeed suffers from vagueness that complicates its practical application. Its broad scope, encompassing economic, social, and environmental dimensions, allows for a wide range of interpretations and strategies, leading to different priorities and actions. This flexibility makes it adaptable but also raises critical questions about whether current efforts are truly guiding societies toward the intended goals. When asking, "Are we going in the right direction?" and "What is the right direction?" the answers are not always clear. Measuring progress toward sustainable development involves complex trade-offs and conflicts between immediate economic growth and long-term environmental sustainability, or between social equity and resource use. For instance, economic growth may sometimes come at the expense of environmental degradation, even if poverty reduction and job creation are achieved in the short term.

Defining the "right direction" requires consensus on what sustainable development outcomes should look like and how they should be measured. While global frameworks like the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) provide specific targets and indicators, the challenge remains in aligning national policies and local actions with these global objectives, taking into account the varying contexts of different regions and communities. Therefore, while sustainable development serves as a guiding framework, its ambiguity requires a more nuanced approach that balances competing

[a] Puey Ungphakorn Institute for Economic Research, Bangkok, Thailand

interests, sets clear priorities, and ensures that policies are adaptable to changing circumstances. Only then can it serve as a truly effective pathway for fostering development that is equitable, inclusive, and environmentally sound. Indeed, the extensive discussions, debates, and initiatives around sustainability, including the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), might give the impression that the pathway to sustainability is clearly defined and universally accepted. However, the reality is far more complex, and these efforts, while significant, do not necessarily guarantee that current and long-term policies of individual countries are genuinely aligned with sustainable goals. The SDGs and other global frameworks provide a valuable blueprint, but translating these broad goals into actionable and context-specific policies presents challenges. Countries often face conflicting priorities where economic, political, and social interests may override sustainability considerations. For instance, short-term economic gains, political stability, or the need to address urgent social issues may push sustainability down the list of priorities. This can lead to policies that claim to support sustainable development but, in practice, fall short of integrating the necessary balance across economic, social, and environmental dimensions. Moreover, there is considerable variation in how countries interpret and implement sustainability. Factors such as levels of economic development, governance structures, cultural values, and resource availability shape national approaches to sustainability. As a result, what is considered a sustainable policy in one context might be seen as insufficient or even counterproductive in another. This inconsistency underscores the need for a deeper assessment of whether policies are genuinely aimed at achieving sustainable development or merely pay lip service to the concept. Therefore, it remains essential to critically evaluate and question whether current strategies truly lead toward a sustainable future. The existence of international frameworks and the popularity of sustainability discourse do not automatically ensure that the actions taken are effective or that they address the underlying structural issues that hinder sustainable development. In essence, there is a continuous need for vigilance, accountability, and adaptive strategies to ensure that sustainability efforts are genuinely driving toward the desired long-term outcomes.

Sustainable development can be understood by breaking down its core aspects to clarify how it applies to different economies. This approach revolves around three interconnected dimensions: economic, social, and ecological. Together, they provide a framework for understanding how development strategies should be shaped to achieve sustainability in a comprehensive way. The economic aspect involves pursuing growth and development in ways that do not deplete natural resources or undermine the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. This dimension emphasizes efficient resource use, innovation, and promoting inclusive growth that benefits everyone. For individual economies, this might mean adopting sustainable production practices, investing in green technologies, and building resilient infrastructures that can withstand economic shocks. The social aspect focuses on ensuring equity, justice, and the well-being of all people. This means improving the quality of life, reducing poverty, and ensuring equal access to services like education and healthcare, while also fostering social cohesion. In practice, this can involve policies aimed at reducing income inequality, ensuring fair labor practices, supporting marginalized groups, and building social safety nets to protect vulnerable populations.

The ecological aspect is concerned with protecting and preserving ecosystems, biodiversity, and natural resources. It emphasizes reducing environmental degradation, limiting pollution, and mitigating climate change. For economies around the world, this could translate into stricter environmental regulations, adopting renewable energy sources, conserving natural habitats, and promoting sustainable land and resource use. Balancing these three aspects is crucial to achieving sustainable development, though how this balance is struck will vary depending on each economy's circumstances. For instance, a developing country may prioritize social development and poverty reduction, while a highly industrialized economy may focus on transitioning to a low-carbon economy and reducing its ecological footprint. Understanding sustainability through these dimensions allows countries to better align their policies with sustainable development goals, creating a clearer and more attainable path toward achieving these objectives. In essence, sustainability can be likened to standing on three interconnected pillars, which applies to both the macro level (society as a whole) and the micro level (individual organizations). For any entity or organization to truly be sustainable, it must pursue a set of objectives that go beyond just economic considerations. It is not enough to simply focus on financial growth; there must also be attention to social responsibility and environmental protection. These goals should be integrated in a way that helps the organization achieve its own sustainability while also contributing to the sustainable development of the broader society.

At the macro level, sustainability involves creating policies and strategies that support long-term social, economic, and ecological well-being. Governments and international bodies need to consider how their decisions impact all three dimensions of sustainability, ensuring that economic growth does not come at the cost of social equity or environmental health. This could involve legislation aimed at reducing carbon emissions, improving access to quality education, and promoting economic inclusion. The idea is that if societies as a whole are built on these three pillars, they are more resilient and better equipped to face future challenges, such as climate change, economic recessions, or social unrest. At this macro level, sustainability is not just a theoretical ideal; it becomes a practical framework for shaping public policy, guiding economic planning, and influencing social development initiatives. By aligning with this approach, the aim is to ensure that growth and development today do not undermine the ability of future generations to enjoy similar levels of prosperity and well-being. To assess whether our society is on the right path toward a sustainable future, we must examine the three dimensions of sustainability—economic, social, and environmental—and gauge success in each area. Achieving sustainable development means creating an economic system that operates in a way that meets the needs of all people, eliminating unsustainable social conditions that hinder well-being, and preserving the ecosystems and biodiversity that provide essential goods and services for future generations. While this may sound idealistic, it serves as a valuable

roadmap for progress rather than a call for utopia.

In the economic dimension, a sustainable future entails not just growth but also equitable distribution of resources, where economic activities are carried out within the planet's ecological limits. The focus would be on creating an economy that is inclusive and resilient, with a reduced reliance on non-renewable resources and a shift toward more sustainable production and consumption patterns. On the social front, sustainability requires addressing disparities in access to essential services such as healthcare, education, and housing. It involves fostering social cohesion, eliminating poverty, and ensuring that all individuals have the opportunity to lead fulfilling lives. The aim is to create social conditions that empower people to thrive, with respect for human rights and social justice at the core of development efforts. The environmental leg focuses on the preservation and restoration of ecosystems, preventing over-exploitation of natural resources, and protecting biodiversity. It includes transitioning to renewable energy sources, implementing sustainable agricultural practices, and reducing pollution. This dimension emphasizes the need to balance human activities with the capacity of nature to regenerate and sustain life. While the ideal of reaching perfect sustainability in all three dimensions may seem ambitious, it provides a guiding framework for policies and actions. It sets a direction for society to move toward a more sustainable future by addressing current challenges and making continuous improvements. The roadmap acknowledges the complexity and interdependence of these dimensions, encouraging a balanced approach to progress.

The use of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) as a measure of societal welfare has long been a central practice in economics. As the main macroeconomic indicator in the System of National Accounts (SNA), GDP captures the total monetary value of goods and services produced within a country over a specified period. It is widely interpreted as an indicator of economic growth and an increase in overall welfare. When GDP rises, it is often hailed as a sign of progress and prosperity, while a decline prompts concern and even alarm among economists and policymakers.

However, it is worth questioning whether this traditional view is entirely justified. Does an increase in GDP necessarily translate into a corresponding rise in the quality of life and well-being of society? The relationship between GDP growth and prosperity is not always straightforward, and using GDP as the sole measure of welfare has several limitations. While GDP growth indicates increased economic activity, it does not account for the distribution of wealth, inequality, or the non-market factors that contribute to human well-being. GDP measures economic output but overlooks social and environmental factors that are crucial to the quality of life. For instance, a country may experience significant GDP growth while still facing issues like rising income inequality, poor health outcomes, environmental degradation, and social unrest. Economic growth may boost aggregate income but does not guarantee that the benefits are evenly distributed or that they contribute to sustainable development. GDP growth driven by activities that harm the environment or exploit natural resources can actually undermine long-term welfare.

Moreover, GDP does not account for the informal economy, volunteer work, or unpaid domestic labor, all of which contribute to the well-being of society. It also ignores negative externalities like pollution, resource depletion, and social costs. Activities that involve cleanup efforts after natural disasters or healthcare spending due to increased pollution can actually increase GDP, even though they may not improve overall welfare. For a more accurate assessment of societal welfare, other indicators—such as the Human Development Index (HDI), Genuine Progress Indicator (GPI), or measures of social and environmental sustainability—are necessary to complement GDP. These alternative measures aim to provide a more holistic view of well-being by considering factors like health, education, environmental quality, and income distribution. While GDP growth remains an important indicator of economic activity, it should not be the sole measure of a society's welfare or progress. The limitations of GDP as a measure of well-being and progress are becoming more widely recognized. While GDP captures the total economic activity within a country, it fails to distinguish between activities that enhance quality of life and those that may harm it. Economic activity that boosts GDP may also contribute to negative outcomes, such as environmental degradation, health issues, and social inequalities, leading to a misleading picture of actual progress.

For example, industries that generate income through activities that degrade the environment, such as the extraction of fossil fuels or the production of chemical fertilizers, contribute to GDP growth. However, this growth does not necessarily correlate with an improvement in quality of life. Instead, it may result in negative externalities like pollution, loss of biodiversity, or deterioration of soil and water quality. Likewise, an increase in GDP due to higher income from the tobacco, alcohol, or automotive industries may reflect consumption patterns that do not inherently signify progress. More consumption of tobacco or alcohol, for example, can lead to health issues that decrease overall well-being. Furthermore, growth in GDP from the medical industry could indicate rising healthcare costs or a higher demand for medical services, which may not necessarily reflect a healthier population. In fact, it could signal an increase in illness or a healthcare system strained by preventable diseases. The income generated in these sectors boosts GDP, but it does not capture the underlying issues that might be driving these expenditures.

Similarly, lifestyle changes, such as a shift from preparing meals at home to eating out, can inflate GDP without reflecting an actual improvement in quality of life. The activity is simply recorded differently in economic terms, as the value of meals prepared at home is not captured in GDP, while spending in restaurants is. Although eating out may offer convenience, it does not inherently mean that people are better off; the quality of nutrition, food safety, and social aspects associated with family meals might even decline. In all these cases, GDP growth fails to account for the broader social, environmental, and cultural dimensions of well-being. While it provides a snapshot of economic output, it does not reveal the underlying quality or sustainability of that growth. The assumption that higher GDP equates to better living conditions is an oversimplification. Therefore, a more nuanced approach is needed—one that integrates other indicators to assess progress more comprehensively, such as measures of environmental sustainability, health outcomes, social equity, and

life satisfaction. The growing awareness of GDP's shortcomings has led to calls for alternative or complementary indicators that better reflect true progress and well-being. Metrics such as the Genuine Progress Indicator (GPI), which adjusts economic activity by taking into account social and environmental costs, or the Happy Planet Index (HPI), which combines well-being, life expectancy, and ecological footprint, aim to offer a more holistic view of prosperity. Moving beyond GDP as the sole measure of progress could help societies aim for sustainable and equitable growth that genuinely improves quality of life. The critique of GDP's limitations has indeed led to the development of alternative indicators that aim to provide a more accurate assessment of societal welfare. Among these proposals, one significant contribution is the Index of Sustainable Economic Welfare (ISEW), developed by Professors Herman Daly and John Cobb in 1989. This measure attempts to address some of the key shortcomings of GDP by including various social and environmental factors that affect quality of life. The ISEW builds on the idea that economic activity should not just be about increasing production and consumption but should also consider the well-being of individuals and the sustainability of the environment. Unlike GDP, which primarily tracks market transactions and output, the ISEW adjusts economic activity by factoring in aspects such as income distribution, environmental degradation, depletion of natural resources, and the value of unpaid household labor. It aims to capture both the benefits of economic activity and the costs associated with negative externalities like pollution and resource depletion. One key feature of the ISEW is its effort to account for the social costs of economic growth. For example, while increased consumption may contribute to higher GDP, it can also lead to negative consequences such as environmental damage or social inequality. The ISEW tries to quantify these costs and subtract them from the economic benefits to give a more balanced picture of actual progress. It reflects the idea that not all economic growth is beneficial for society as a whole and that some growth may come at the expense of long-term sustainability.

By incorporating factors like environmental health, social equity, and the value of non-market activities, the ISEW represents a more comprehensive approach to measuring welfare. It recognizes that true progress involves more than just expanding economic output; it also requires maintaining the natural environment and ensuring fair distribution of resources. The measure has gained attention as part of the broader movement towards redefining how we assess economic success and societal well-being. The development of indicators like the ISEW reflects a growing recognition in the field of economics that traditional measures such as GDP are insufficient for capturing the complexities of sustainable development. This approach aims to provide a more nuanced understanding of how economic activities impact the quality of life and long-term prosperity. Indeed, while GDP remains a widely used and convenient measure of economic activity, it falls short as an indicator of sustainable development or comprehensive societal well-being. Its simplicity and standardization make it attractive for policy makers, but this very simplicity overlooks crucial aspects of welfare, such as environmental sustainability, social equity, and the quality of life. GDP only measures market transactions and the total output of goods and services, which can obscure significant negative externalities, such as environmental degradation or growing social inequality. Modifying GDP to account for social and environmental factors can offer partial insights into these dimensions. For example, adjustments can be made to subtract the costs associated with pollution, resource depletion, or social issues, providing a more holistic picture of economic activity's true impact. However, even with modifications, GDP-based measures cannot fully capture the multifaceted nature of sustainable development. Relying solely on economic output as a gauge for progress ignores non-economic factors that contribute to societal well-being.

The misuse of GDP as a proxy for welfare is particularly problematic when policy makers focus on economic growth targets without considering the broader implications for sustainability. When GDP growth is pursued at the expense of natural resources, environmental health, or social cohesion, the long-term costs may outweigh the short-term economic benefits. For instance, policies aimed solely at boosting GDP may encourage overexploitation of natural resources or neglect social disparities, thereby undermining sustainability goals. As Chimiak and Fronia (2012) point out, measuring sustainable development using GDP alone is a narrow approach that fails to address the broader objectives of sustainability. Sustainable development encompasses economic, social, and environmental dimensions, each requiring distinct metrics that reflect progress in those areas. For a more comprehensive assessment, indicators like the Human Development Index (HDI), the Environmental Performance Index (EPI), or the Genuine Progress Indicator (GPI) can be used alongside GDP to provide a fuller picture of a society's progress towards sustainable development. While GDP is a useful measure for tracking economic activity, it should not be equated with welfare or sustainability. To genuinely assess sustainable development, a multidimensional approach is needed that includes social and environmental indicators in addition to economic metrics. This broader perspective would help ensure that policies aim not just for economic growth, but for balanced and sustainable progress that benefits society as a whole.

2. DISCUSSION

The Human Development Index (HDI) offers a more holistic approach to measuring a society's progress compared to GDP alone, as it integrates social and economic dimensions of sustainable development. The HDI was created to assess not only the economic output of a country but also the well-being and quality of life of its people. By combining three critical indicators—GDP per capita (adjusted for purchasing power parity), life expectancy at birth, and education (adult literacy rates and school enrollment ratios)—the HDI provides a broader view of human development. It goes beyond economic activity, capturing important aspects of life that contribute to the social sustainability of a society. The HDI addresses some of the shortcomings of GDP by emphasizing life expectancy and educational attainment as fundamental measures of human conditions. Higher life expectancy reflects better healthcare and living conditions, while increased literacy and education levels indicate greater access to knowledge and opportunities for personal development. These

aspects contribute to a more comprehensive picture of the quality of life in a country, thus making the HDI a valuable tool for assessing social and economic sustainability. The goal set by the United Nations, where a score of 0.8 or above on the HDI indicates decent living conditions, provides a benchmark for evaluating development progress. Countries reaching or exceeding this threshold are considered to have relatively high standards of human development. This benchmark encourages governments and policymakers to focus on not just economic growth, but also on improving health, education, and overall well-being. However, while the HDI represents a significant step forward in measuring development, it also has limitations. For instance, the index does not account for environmental sustainability directly, nor does it address inequality within a country. A high HDI score may mask disparities in income distribution or access to resources, leading to an incomplete understanding of social sustainability. Additionally, using GDP per capita as one of the components still ties the HDI to economic output, albeit in a more balanced framework. To improve the HDI's ability to assess sustainability comprehensively, some modifications and complementary indicators have been suggested. For example, the Inequality-adjusted HDI (IHDI) takes into account the distribution of each dimension within a population, providing a more nuanced picture of development. Similarly, including measures of environmental sustainability or social inclusiveness could enhance the HDI's capacity to reflect the true well-being of societies. The HDI is a valuable tool for measuring development, as it captures important aspects of human well-being that GDP alone cannot. By integrating social and economic factors, it provides a more comprehensive assessment of a country's progress towards sustainable development. However, to fully embrace the multidimensional nature of sustainability, the HDI should be used alongside other indicators that measure environmental impacts and social inequalities, ensuring a more holistic approach to evaluating the well-being of societies.

Aggregated indices like the Human Development Index (HDI) offer a simplified, synthetic view of complex phenomena by combining various measures into a single score. This aggregation serves as both a strength and a limitation. The strength lies in providing an overall snapshot that can be easily understood and used to compare different countries. However, the limitation is that aggregated indices obscure the individual contributions of their components, making it difficult to discern which factors are driving changes in the overall score. For instance, if a country's HDI score increases, the index does not reveal whether the improvement is due to a rise in GDP per capita, better life expectancy, or higher literacy and educational attainment. Without breaking down the index into its component parts, it remains unclear which specific dimension of human development has improved. This lack of transparency can hinder policymakers' ability to target the areas that need the most attention. If the improvement is primarily due to economic growth while education and health remain stagnant, the aggregated HDI might present an overly optimistic view of development progress. Decomposing the HDI to examine its individual components allows for a more detailed analysis of which aspects are contributing to the change. By looking at GDP per capita, life expectancy, and education separately, one can identify strengths and weaknesses in a country's development strategy. For example, a country might show significant economic growth without a corresponding improvement in education or health, indicating that income gains are not translating into broader social development.

This decomposition is crucial for policymakers aiming to design effective interventions. Understanding which component is lagging allows for targeted efforts to address specific issues, such as improving healthcare systems or expanding access to education. Conversely, if the gains are primarily driven by education improvements, this might suggest that economic opportunities are not expanding in tandem, indicating a need for policies that enhance job creation and income growth.

Thus, while aggregated indices like the HDI provide valuable insights, their real utility comes from being used alongside a disaggregated analysis. Breaking down the components offers a clearer picture of where progress is being made and where challenges persist, enabling more nuanced and effective policy decisions. The idea of correcting GDP to incorporate ecological aspects highlights the recognition that economic activity must be assessed alongside its environmental impacts to provide a more comprehensive view of sustainability. While the Index of Sustainable Economic Welfare (ISEW) offers one approach to integrating ecological considerations into economic measurement, there are also other methodologies aimed at understanding and quantifying our environmental impact. The Carbon Footprint, for example, measures the total greenhouse gas emissions caused directly or indirectly by an individual, organization, event, or product. It is often expressed in terms of the amount of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO_2e) emissions generated. This approach helps in identifying key sources of emissions and enables targeted actions to reduce them.

Similarly, the Water Footprint assesses the volume of freshwater used to produce goods and services consumed by people or produced by companies. It considers both direct water use (e.g., household consumption) and indirect water use (e.g., water required for production processes). This metric is crucial for understanding the pressure on water resources and guiding efforts toward sustainable water management. A more holistic approach is taken by the Ecological Footprint concept, which synthesizes multiple aspects of environmental impact. It reflects the amount of biologically productive land and water area required to produce the resources a population consumes and to assimilate the waste it generates. This calculation helps illustrate the balance (or imbalance) between human consumption and the Earth's ecological capacity. The global availability of biologically productive space, estimated at 11.5 billion hectares, provides a benchmark for assessing sustainability. Given the current human population, this translates into approximately 1.8 global hectares (gha) of "environmental space" per person. However, many societies exceed this limit, placing a greater demand on Earth's resources than what is considered sustainable. For instance, a lifestyle typical of a high-income country often requires more than 1.8 gha per person, leading to ecological overshoot, where the demand for resources exceeds the planet's capacity to regenerate them.

Using the Ecological Footprint as a metric helps highlight the unsustainable nature of current consumption patterns. It

provides a clear visualization of humanity's pressure on natural systems, making it easier to communicate the urgency of ecological sustainability. Moreover, this approach can guide policymakers in prioritizing actions that reduce the footprint, such as shifting towards renewable energy sources, improving resource efficiency, and promoting sustainable consumption. Incorporating ecological considerations into economic measurements like GDP is essential for capturing the true costs of economic activity. Traditional GDP fails to account for resource depletion, environmental degradation, and the loss of ecosystem services, leading to a misleading picture of progress. By integrating metrics like the Ecological Footprint, we can better understand the trade-offs between economic growth and environmental sustainability, helping society move toward a development path that respects the planet's limits. The growing Carbon Footprint, primarily driven by increased CO2 emissions, has indeed become a central factor contributing to the rising Ecological Footprint. As climate change gains prominence as the main ecological and political issue today, it's evident that the emission of greenhouse gases, especially CO2, plays a significant role in shaping the sustainability challenges we face. However, another crucial factor that often doesn't receive the same level of attention is population growth. Over the decades, the Earth's average bio-capacity per person has decreased significantly, dropping from 3.7 global hectares per capita to 1.8 global hectares per capita. This decline is largely due to the increasing world population, which continues to grow, putting additional pressure on the planet's limited resources. As more people inhabit the planet, the demand for resources such as land, water, and energy increases, leading to higher levels of CO2 emissions and other environmental impacts. The relationship between population growth and CO2 emissions is complex. While more people generally mean higher consumption levels, the rate of increase in emissions is also influenced by other factors such as economic growth, technological development, lifestyle changes, and energy consumption patterns. The higher the population, the greater the potential for increased production and consumption, which, in turn, leads to more significant environmental degradation if sustainable practices are not adopted.

Addressing climate change without considering the implications of population growth may limit the effectiveness of sustainability efforts. The discourse around sustainability should, therefore, incorporate discussions on population dynamics alongside other factors like economic development and energy use. Population growth impacts resource availability, land use, waste generation, and energy demands, making it a fundamental factor in achieving sustainability. While measures such as renewable energy adoption, carbon taxes, and efficiency improvements are vital for reducing CO2 emissions, a comprehensive approach that also tackles the challenges posed by population growth is necessary. This can involve promoting family planning, improving education (especially for women), and encouraging policies that address consumption patterns alongside demographic factors. The connection between population growth, CO2 emissions, and the shrinking per capita bio-capacity underscores the need for integrated strategies that consider both ecological and social dimensions of sustainability. These strategies should aim not only to mitigate climate change but also to enhance the resilience of natural systems in accommodating the growing human population without exceeding the Earth's capacity.

The disparity in the Ecological Footprint across different regions closely aligns with the global economic divide, highlighting the significant environmental burden imposed by wealthier continents, such as Europe and North America. These regions have a disproportionate share in the overconsumption of resources, which exceeds the planet's ecological capacity. Meanwhile, much of the world's population, living in conditions below those found in richer countries, aspires to improve their material standard of living. This aspiration is natural and understandable, as poverty is inherently unsustainable due to its adverse effects on health, well-being, and long-term social stability. However, as developing countries strive to raise their living standards, the environmental impact is likely to increase, particularly through higher CO2 emissions and other forms of resource consumption. The drive to escape poverty, coupled with economic growth in emerging economies, will inevitably put more pressure on the environment. This trend poses a challenge for sustainability efforts because while economic development is necessary for improving human welfare, it often comes at the cost of increased environmental degradation.

Addressing these challenges requires a holistic approach to sustainable development that integrates economic, social, and environmental dimensions. To navigate towards a sustainable future, the matrix for analysis should consider all three dimensions simultaneously. This multi-dimensional framework provides a comprehensive view of sustainability, allowing policymakers to assess progress and trade-offs between economic growth, social well-being, and environmental preservation. However, to simplify the analysis, a two-dimensional space can be employed, combining the social and economic dimensions, as they are often interrelated in many indicators, such as the Human Development Index (HDI). The HDI itself encapsulates aspects of economic wealth (through income), social conditions (via education), and well-being (using life expectancy). By mapping out economic and social progress on one axis and environmental sustainability on the other, we can create a simplified yet effective framework for assessing a country's position in sustainable development. Neumayer's assertion that "welfare and sustainability are entities much too complex that they could be dealt with by a single indicator" reminds us that no single measure can fully capture the intricacies of sustainable development. Thus, while two or three-dimensional frameworks can help visualize trends and guide policy decisions, they cannot encompass the full spectrum of factors influencing sustainability. Multiple indicators must be used in tandem to understand the broader picture, including ecological footprints, CO2 emissions, economic growth rates, social inequality measures, and resource consumption patterns. To achieve a sustainable future, it is crucial to promote cleaner technologies, support sustainable development practices, and encourage lifestyle changes that reduce environmental impacts. This includes transitioning to renewable energy sources, improving energy efficiency, adopting sustainable consumption practices, and fostering international cooperation on environmental standards. As populations continue to

grow and more countries aim for higher living standards, the global community must ensure that development pathways are aligned with ecological limits to safeguard the planet for future generations.

3. CONCLUSION

A sustainable development policy must indeed be based on a holistic approach that encompasses the interconnected dimensions of economic, social, and environmental development. Each of these dimensions involves complex, interrelated factors that influence the well-being of societies and the health of ecosystems. To ensure that such a policy is genuinely effective, it is crucial to monitor a variety of measures and indicators that capture the progress and trade-offs in each area. The economic dimension focuses on ensuring growth that is inclusive and equitable, providing jobs and raising living standards while also considering the efficient use of resources. This requires indicators like GDP growth, income inequality, employment rates, and investments in sustainable technologies. The social dimension aims to address issues like education, health, social equity, and human rights. Indicators such as the Human Development Index (HDI), poverty rates, life expectancy, and access to education can provide insights into how well societies are meeting the needs of their citizens. The environmental dimension emphasizes the need to protect natural ecosystems, reduce pollution, and sustainably manage resources. Indicators such as carbon emissions, biodiversity loss, air and water quality, and the Ecological Footprint help assess the environmental impact of economic and social activities. A holistic policy of sustainable development must integrate these various indicators to understand the interplay between economic growth, social well-being, and environmental protection. It requires not only setting targets but also continuously monitoring progress and adapting strategies based on data. Since each dimension can affect the others, improvements in one area might have unintended consequences in another, making it challenging to create a clear picture of the overall situation. Therefore, an effective policy will use a combination of quantitative and qualitative measures to provide a comprehensive view. While quantitative indicators can measure tangible outcomes, qualitative assessments can offer insights into the quality of policies, public satisfaction, and the effectiveness of governance. Ultimately, the goal of sustainable development is to find a balance that allows societies to thrive economically and socially while maintaining the ecological systems on which life depends. This balance is dynamic, requiring ongoing efforts to refine policies, adapt to changing circumstances, and address emerging challenges. The paper provides a framework for obtaining a synthetic view of sustainable development policy by integrating various measures from the economic, social, and ecological dimensions and assessing how close or far countries are from established sustainable goals. One key challenge in sustainable development is achieving a high level of Human Development Index (HDI), specifically aiming for a value above 0.8, which indicates decent life conditions, without exceeding an average ecological footprint of 1.8 global hectares per person. This 1.8 gha represents the available global bio-capacity per capita, which is essential to maintain a sustainable ecological balance. By combining these indicators—HDI for social and economic development and the Ecological Footprint for environmental sustainability—it becomes possible to track countries' progress toward a comprehensive sustainable development objective. The approach can reveal whether nations are improving in terms of both human welfare and environmental sustainability or if gains in one area are coming at the expense of the other. However, this approach is not without methodological challenges. Simplifying sustainability into two measures—HDI and Ecological Footprint—can obscure some nuances. Each of these indicators aggregates complex factors, and the relationship between them may vary depending on country-specific contexts, such as economic structure, energy use, and cultural preferences. Additionally, the HDI and Ecological Footprint do not capture all aspects of economic inequality, social justice, or biodiversity, which are also crucial to sustainable development. Despite these limitations, measuring the distance from these goals can offer valuable insights into how countries are progressing towards sustainability. It can provide an indication of whether a nation is moving closer to achieving high social and economic standards without compromising ecological limits, or if there is a need for policy adjustments to address any imbalances. This kind of measurement could help policymakers identify priority areas for intervention, highlight the need for sustainable consumption and production practices, and ultimately guide more effective strategies for achieving sustainable development objectives globally.

REFERENCES

Brundtland, G.H. (1987). *Our Common Future.* World Commission on Environment and Development. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cabello, J.J., Garcia, D., Sagastume, A., Priego, R., Hens, L., & Vandecasteele, C. (2012). An approach to sustainable development: The case of Cuba. *Environment, Development and Sustainability, 14*(4), 573–591.

Chimiak, G., & Fronia, M. (Eds.). (2012). *Globalizacja a rozwój: Szanse i wyzwania dla Polski.* Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR.

Cobb, C.W., & Cobb, J.B. (1994). *The Green National Product: A Proposed Index of Sustainable Economic Welfare.* Lanham: University Press of America.

Daly, H.E., & Cobb, J.B. (1989). *For the Common Good.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Ecological footprint and biocapacity, 2007 (2010). Results from National Footprint Accounts 2010 edition.

Fiedor, B., & Kociszewski, K. (2010). *Ekonomia rozwoju.* Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego.

Global Footprint Network webpage. Accessed October 13, 2016.

Guenno, G., & Tiezzi, S. (1998). The Index of Sustainable Economic Welfare (ISEW) for Italy.

Human Development Report 2015. (2015). *Work for Human Development.* United Nations Development Programme. New York: UN.

Lawn, P.A. (2003). A theoretical foundation to support the Index of Sustainable Economic Welfare (ISEW), Genuine Progress Indicator (GPI), and other related indexes. *Ecological Economics, 44*, 105-118.

Neumayer, E. (1999). The ISEW: Not an index of sustainable economic welfare. *Social Indicators Research, 48*(1), 77-101.

Roselé, Chim P. (2007). *Développement déséquilibre durabilité: Contexte des pays en développement d'Amérique.* Editions Publibook.

Soubbotina, T.P. (2004). *Beyond Economic Growth: An Introduction to Sustainable Development.* Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.

Woodward, D., & Simms, A. (2006). *Growth Isn't Working: The Unbalanced Distribution of Benefits and Costs from Growth.* London: New Economics Foundation.

World Economic and Social Survey 2013. (2013). *Sustainable Development Challenges.* New York: Department of Economic and Social Affairs, United Nations.