

Chapter 3

Means of Implementation (SDG 17)

3.1 Introduction

An array of public, private and civil society organisations have sought to utilise sport to contribute to sustainable development. The *2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*, and SDG17, similarly and more broadly recognise the need for collective approaches that bring together governments, the private sector and civil society in implementing the SDGs. Consequently, this guide gives strong priority to collective approaches to enhance the contribution of sport across the range of SDGs and to address a number of SDG 17 targets.

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, and SDG17, similarly and more broadly recognise the need for collective approaches that bring together governments, the private sector and civil society in implementing the SDGs.

Together, SDG targets 17.14 and 17.15 establish the significance of country-leadership for policy coherence across different development agendas and organisations. The associated importance of effective mobilisation of resources held by different organisations and co-operation in building human resource capacity, is emphasised through SDG targets 17.3 and 17.9, respectively. The importance of multi-stakeholder partnerships to sport-based approaches has previously been recognised in policy and practice, but further progress remains a priority with respect to specific SDG targets 17.16 and 17.17.

Policy implementation can draw upon different configurations and partnerships of public, private and civil society organisations. Oriented by preceding analysis of those SDG 17 targets identified above, this chapter identifies a framework of approaches to enhance the collective contribution of sport to sustainable development. This framework encompasses implementation approaches that are government led; are structured through formal partnerships between public and private or civil society organisations; enhance mutual support through complementary actions; and draw on the autonomous contributions of different organisations.

This chapter identifies a framework of approaches to enhance the collective contribution of sport to sustainable development.

The analysis and framework presented in this chapter underpins specific policy options that are identified subsequently in this guide in respect of specific SDGs.

Recognition of the possibilities and implications of this framework enables policy-makers to consider context-specific approaches to using sport to contribute to sustainable development. As such, the analysis and framework presented in this chapter underpins specific policy options that are identified subsequently in this guide in respect of specific SDGs.

3.2 Analysis of sport and specific SDG targets

Target 17.14 Enhance policy coherence for sustainable development.

Target 17.15 Respect each country's policy space and leadership to establish and implement policies for poverty eradication and sustainable development.

Country-leadership offers the potential to enhance policy coherence, in order to strengthen the contribution of sport to sustainable development.

Country-leadership offers the potential to enhance policy coherence, in order to strengthen the contribution of sport to sustainable development. Diverse public, private and civil society organisations may support, fund and deliver sport-based approaches that seek to contribute towards sustainable development. Articulation of national policy priorities can enable these various sport and development organisations to work collectively towards identified and shared goals (SDPIWG 2008; Lindsey 2016). Furthermore, the qualities of flexibility and innovation that can serve to enhance the contribution of sport can be most effectively harnessed through country-leadership that recognises the specific socio-cultural context of sport and its relationship to national development priorities. Appropriately decentralised policy leadership can ensure that planning for sport and development takes full account of local conditions and the particular needs and assets of intended beneficiaries (Kay and Dudfield 2013).

The potential contribution of sport is also best realised through multi-level alignment and integration with policy developments in other sectors, such as education, health and economic development. Achieving this level of policy coherence may be challenging in some contexts (Keim and de Coning 2014) and requires a substantial measure of mutual understanding and adaptation across the range of policy actors. Greater flexibility

for the recognition and incorporation of sport-based approaches may especially be required where national policy frameworks in other sectors are already well established (Lindsey and Banda 2011). Equally, sport policy stakeholders may assess the national and local development objectives to which sport-based approaches can most effectively contribute, in order to prioritise integration with identified sectors, rather than dilute and diversify impact (Coalter 2010).

Enhancing policy coherence also requires recognition of complexities associated with different priorities within the sport sector. There is great potential in achieving within-sector synergies between grass-roots, elite sport and Sport for Development and Peace, but policy impetus may be required to balance and, where possible, reconcile interests associated with different areas of sport (Nicholson *et al.* 2010). Systematic and highly focused strategies for the development of competitive, high-performance sport do not automatically align with decentralised approaches that can best realise benefits derived through participation in sport and other forms of physical activity (Hayhurst and Frisby 2010). Greater synergies may be encouraged through demonstrating how addressing issues of relevance to sport and development, such as inequalities in participation, may also bring benefits to sport federations and other established sport stakeholders.

Enhancing policy coherence also requires recognition of complexities associated with different priorities within the sport sector.

The increasing influence of globalisation across many aspects of sport also presents opportunities and challenges for efforts to enhance national policy coherence. The potential for policy learning and transfer across countries has been well-realised in respect of high-performance sport, and many transnational opportunities for sharing sport and development practice have also been created (see, for example, the International Platform on Sport and Development, www.sportanddev.org). Funding available from international organisations has also significantly contributed to aspects of sport and development provision, especially in countries with significant resource constraints. International funding can be best utilised within the frames provided by country-led policies to address concerns that sport-based approaches have been undermined by funders' top-down implementation of standardised approaches to practice and accountability (Kay 2012; Darnell 2014).

Promoting the role of sport in national development in Zambia

Zambia

Bessie Malilwe Chelemu
 Director of Sport
 Ministry of Youth, Sport and Child Development
 Government of Zambia

Young people below the age of 35 make up 82 per cent of the Zambian population. This kind of population distribution presents challenges for promoting social and economic development, particularly for meeting the needs of young people. Sport can play a role in addressing these issues if supported by the implementation of appropriate development-orientated sport policy.

Zambia's second National Sports Policy, developed in 2006 and amended in 2012, took into consideration emerging issues such as gender, anti-doping and the commercialisation of sport. Recognising that sport can make a broader contribution to national and international sustainable development priorities, and in order to identify how best to maximise this potential, the Ministry of Youth, Sport and Child Development undertook a review of the national sport policy in 2016.

In working to align sport policy direction with the country's development priorities, the following emerging policy objectives, not included in the 2012 National Sports Policy, were identified and are important to help create an enabling environment to ensure that sport can make a meaningful contribution to national development.

- Enhancing the role of sport in improving physical and mental health and well-being and promoting social cohesion and social integration at both the community and national levels.
- Recognising the role of sport in creating opportunities for young people, improving employability and generating income and thus mobilising human, financial and physical resources to increase the viability, sustainability and growth of the sport sector to enhance its contribution to gross national product.
- Encouraging educational institutions to develop and implement innovative and appropriate courses of study that support the sport industry, and creating awareness through public education campaigns. Of particular note is the certification of non-traditional and emerging careers in sport to provide more formal recognition of the transferable skills young people develop volunteering or working in Zambia's well-developed sport NGO sector.
- Strengthening the governance of sport in the country to create an environment in which both sports organisations and the broader community can effectively engage with sport as a tool for social and economic development.

In identifying these priorities, the Zambia Government's intention was to provide clearer strategic focus and policy direction for all stakeholders on the development priorities that sport can contribute to in the country. A specific goal was to strengthen alignment with national development priorities, in particular Zambia's Vision 2030 and the Seventh National Development Plan, which was developed in 2016.

(Continued)

Promoting the role of sport in national development in Zambia (cont.)

A number of the key objectives of this national development plan impacted on the sport policy revision process, notably the need to enhance the role of sports in promoting economic diversification and job creation, enhancing Zambia's human capital and creating a conducive governance environment in the country. A focus on reducing development inequality, and an emphasis on mainstreaming gender issues and protecting the rights of children and people with a disability were particularly important reference points. Efforts to align the revised sports policy to the National Development Plan aligns with SDG target 17.4, which highlights the need to enhance policy coherence for sustainable development.

A key challenge will be for the Zambia Government to work in partnership with sporting organisations, the private sector and civil society to ensure the envisaged policy direction can be implemented and policy coherence and programme co-ordination is achieved. To do this, further resource mobilisation, partnerships and the robust monitoring and evaluation of results achieved will be priorities for the Zambia Government moving forward.

Target 17.3 Mobilise additional financial resources for developing countries from multiple sources.

Target 17.9 Enhance international support for implementing effective and targeted capacity-building in developing countries to support national plans to implement all the Sustainable Development Goals, including through North–South, South–South and triangular co-operation.

Effective and enhanced marshalling of financial and human resources is vital to maximising the contribution of sport to the SDGs. The emergence of many sport-based initiatives has been driven by a committed, diverse and geographically spread base of activists, often working within stringent funding constraints (Kidd 2008; Giulianotti 2011a). In many countries, resources are insufficient to fully scale sport-based approaches, and government funding is often stretched over multiple priorities within and beyond sport. Among these priorities, elite sport may often be most adequately resourced at the national level (Dudfield 2014; Nicholson *et al.* 2010). Further analyses of the distribution of sport funding can often indicate additional inequities associated with gender, class, disability and geography.

The emergence of many sport-based initiatives has been driven by a committed, diverse and geographically spread base of activists, often working within stringent funding constraints.

For international and in-country NGOs that are often at the forefront of the implementation of sport-based initiatives, funding is a particularly prominent and ongoing issue. There are significant variations in the resource base across the

Well-established policy frameworks can be helpful to SDG NGOs in working towards developing a more sustainable funding base.

diversity of sport and development NGOs (Giulianotti 2011a; Lindsey 2016). Some have successfully and innovatively diversified their funding sources and, in so doing, have managed to cement and expand their sport and development operations. Others operate under more precarious funding conditions, and in-country NGOs, especially, have faced challenges in attempting to diversify and strengthen their resource base when broader economic conditions are restrictive (Giulianotti 2014; Lindsey 2016). Well-established policy frameworks can be helpful to such NGOs in working towards developing a more sustainable funding base which, in turn, can alleviate recognised problems associated with dependency and mission drift (Coalter 2010; Darnell 2014).

Especially given the issues with respect to the scale and nature of financial resources, priority must continue to be given to recruiting individuals to lead and deliver sport-based approaches, and to developing the skills that they require to do so. Capacity-building has been especially prominent in many North–South sport and development initiatives, although there are fewer examples of similarly focused South–South partnerships as yet (Darnell and Huish 2015). Across sport and development, various documented resources and models now exist to guide training programmes (Cronin 2011), and a number of initiatives have built capacity among cohorts of in-country trainers who can then cascade training locally to those who may be involved in leading the delivery of specific sport-based activities. The planning and design of all such capacity-building initiatives is significantly enhanced when undertaken collaboratively with local practitioners who have significant expertise and knowledge of sport and development delivery (Wright *et al.* 2016).

Addressing constraints that limit the scale and sustainability of capacity-building may also enhance the long-term contribution of sport to sustainable development. Many capacity-building initiatives are narrowly, if pragmatically, targeted and focused towards volunteers and young people. The suitability of sport as a potential environment for youth development and leadership has been particularly well realised (Schulenkorf *et al.* 2016). Placing significant responsibility on young volunteers to sustain sport-based provision can present difficulties. Especially in resource-constrained environments, expectations for young people to contribute materially to their families can inhibit

long-term volunteering (Hasselgård and Straume 2015). In isolation, few sport-based initiatives have, as yet, been effective in establishing varied and comprehensive progression routes that are suitable for a range of young leaders to follow across different transitions in their lives.

Target 17.16 Enhance the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development, complemented by multi-stakeholder partnerships that mobilise and share knowledge, expertise, technology and financial resources, to support the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals in all countries, in particular developing countries.

Target 17.17 Encourage and promote effective public, public-private and civil society partnerships, building on the experience and resourcing strategies of partnerships.

At all levels of policy and practice, there is consistent recognition of, but also further scope to realise, the significant potential of cross-sectoral partnerships that can support the contribution of sport to development outcomes. This is vital given that the wide variety of sport stakeholders is often matched by similar diversity across associated development sectors. Existing sport and development partnerships have taken multiple forms and have been oriented by different purposes (Lindsey and Banda 2011; Sanders *et al.* 2014). However, duplication and unnecessary competition has hindered the collective effectiveness of sport and development in a number of contexts (Giulianotti 2011b; Kidd 2011). Limitations of partnerships across international, national and local stakeholders can contribute to inefficiencies in the use of resources and can hinder the implementation of contextually relevant sport-based provision (Black 2010).

Numerous, discrete examples of sport and development partnerships are readily identifiable, many of which are instigated to support specific sport-based initiatives. International and in-country NGOs have commonly worked in partnership to enhance resources for locally led sport-based provision. Sport federations at different levels have joined with other sport and development organisations to contribute to particular initiatives. Partnerships between sport-oriented organisations and those from other development sectors have also enhanced the delivery of initiatives through the utilisation of different skills, knowledge and expertise (Lindsey and Banda 2011). There is not, however, uniform involvement of all sport and development organisations

At all levels of policy and practice, there is consistent recognition of, but also further scope to realise, the significant potential of cross-sectoral partnerships that can support the contribution of sport to development outcomes.

across the range of identified partnerships. Some newer and smaller NGOs may not be well linked into networks through which partnerships can be developed, and such NGOs may also lack the capacity required for partnership instigation and development (Lindsey 2016). Furthermore, the time-limited nature of some sport-based initiatives can lead to difficulty in sustaining associated partnerships in the longer term.

There can be particular benefits but also specific challenges in developing and engaging in partnerships with a wider scale, membership or scope than those associated with specific sport-based initiatives. In a number of Commonwealth countries, commitments have been made to instigate partnerships across a broad representation of governmental and non-governmental stakeholders involved in sport and development (see, for example, Department Sport and Recreation South Africa 2011; Lindsey 2016, in respect of Ghana and Tanzania). Such multi-stakeholder partnerships can involve significant complexities as a result of the different capacities of the stakeholders involved, and the need to balance co-operation with organisational independence. As a result, moving from dialogue within sport and development networks to develop deeper integration and synergies has, in some instances, proved a challenging aspiration (Lindsey 2016). Likewise, structural constraints that can, for example, create competition for funding may need to be addressed to enable greater integration of sport agencies into multi-stakeholder partnerships instigated to enhance co-ordination within other development sectors.

3.3 Enhancing collective impact: A framework for sport and development policy options

A diverse array of public, private and civil society organisations – both within and outside the sport sector, and working at levels from the international to local – can make important contributions towards the SDGs.

The advent of the *2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development* and the importance accorded to the associated means of implementation provide an important opportunity for policy development that is aligned with the possibilities – and also the challenges – identified in the preceding analysis. Again, a diverse array of public, private and civil society organisations – both within and outside the sport sector, and working at levels from the international to local – can make important contributions towards the SDGs. Disparate individual interventions by any agency can enable positive change, and yet greater potential resides in enabling collective contributions towards commonly


recognised and prioritised goals. Approaches across different agencies can mobilise resources in ways that are collectively effective and efficient. Collective approaches to implementation can be more sustainable than isolated initiatives. Developing policy coherence at levels from the national to local can both enhance and be enhanced by collective approaches within the sport sector and across the development sectors associated with particular SDGs.

The principle of collective endeavour towards shared goals is therefore appealing, but it would be naive to expect a wide range of agencies from different sectors to marshal their resources of money, people and ideas in an entirely unified way. Likewise, it may be detrimental if public institutions attempt to structure, manage or procedurally constrain autonomous agencies that independently foster positive change. Policy responses to these complexities need to be carefully considered if they are to encourage collective contributions towards common objectives. To support policy-makers in this task, Table 3.1 identifies a framework of four approaches to collective implementation, with associated sport and development examples, that may be enacted to harness sport in the service of making the fullest possible contribution to the SDGs.

Collective approaches to implementation can be more sustainable than isolated initiatives.




It may be detrimental if public institutions attempt to structure, manage or procedurally constrain autonomous agencies that independently foster positive change.

Table 3.1 Framework of approaches to collective implementation

Approach	Description	Examples
Government-led implementation 	<p>Independent government-led implementation may include direct provision of services and independent regulation of non-governmental actors operating within the government's legitimate spheres of influence. Such interventions can have the potential to operate at scale, ensure equity across different populations or mitigate harmful practices. Achievement of stated objectives depends largely upon the capacity and capability of national, regional or local public-sector institutions that are responsible for government-led implementation. Conversely, there are risks of harm to existing non-governmental provision if ambitions for government-led implementation outstrip the means available to enact them</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of physical education across all state schools • Enforcement of anti-corruption, child protection or labour laws within sport

(Continued)

Table 3.1 Framework of approaches to collective implementation (cont.)

Approach	Description	Examples
Structured implementation partnerships 	<p>Structured partnerships are formal relationships, usually with support and/or funding from government, within which configurations of public, private or civil society agencies can collectively contribute to improved policy co-ordination and the delivery of services to achieve specific agreed objectives. The success of such partnerships remains dependent upon government's capacity to generate sufficient resource and/or frame approaches to practice that can produce the stated objectives. Unless provision is universal and alternative provision is prohibited through legislation, there is a likelihood that non-government agencies may also deliver initiatives that continue alongside structured implementation partnerships</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public funding for national sport federations and other sport-based organisations to deliver specific agreed objectives Development of common quality standards for aspects of sport-based provision
Complementary implementation 	<p>Complementary implementation can involve agencies from the public, private and civil society sectors where common goals can be, in some meaningful way, collectively achieved, and where initiatives are co-produced or delivered semi-autonomously to achieve commonly recognised outcomes. Complementary implementation can draw on agencies' different mandates and varied human and financial resources in mutually supportive ways. Arrangements for complementary implementation are necessarily entered into voluntarily and require reciprocal relationships which are underpinned by dialogue and measures of mutual trust and confidence</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specific initiatives to build capacity across public, private and voluntary sector agencies Contributions of sport-based organisations to implementation of specific initiatives within other development sectors, such as public health or education
Autonomous implementation 	<p>Autonomous implementation operates through self-determined initiatives developed by private or civil society agencies. Ideally, such initiatives align with policy objectives instituted or recognised by governmental agencies. Positive contributions of varying scales can be made by diverse private or civil society agencies bringing their own resources to bear and working independently. The potential of such initiatives is enhanced when agencies working in the same field operate in such a way as to ensure that they do not directly compete with, duplicate or disrupt the activities of other agencies</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community development approaches enacted by in-country sport and development NGOs International civil society support for the development of sport facilities or initiatives, especially where government has identified gaps in existing provision

Just Play: Enhancing the contribution of sport to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development

Evidence shows that 49 per cent of school-aged children in the Pacific region are overweight or obese by 13 years of age, and only 29 per cent participate in regular physical education classes. Meanwhile, children with disabilities often experience barriers to wide acceptance, and girls can be marginalised in education, decision-making and access to health services. Around 80 per cent of children have experienced some form of direct violence or abuse.

Just Play, delivered by the Oceania Football Confederation with the support of government partners and donor agencies, recognises the important role sport can play in supporting children's holistic development.

Targeting girls and boys, children with and without disabilities and children living in urban and rural communities, Just Play is a critical entry point to engage children aged 6-16 years in a positive and meaningful way. Children learn through active participation by means of social messages on health and wellness, gender equality, social inclusion and child protection.

Using a holistic approach and engagement with multiple stakeholders, Just Play is contributing to the achievement of four of the SDGs.

SDG 3: Health and Well-being: Children are motivated to learn to associate physical activity with fun. This positive association makes them more likely to continue to engage in some form of recreation throughout their lives. Just Play sessions also help children choose healthier food options. Together, these interventions contribute to SDG target 3.4 aimed at reducing premature mortality from non-communicable disease.

Over 90 per cent of children in the programme say sport makes them happy and they want to continue participating. Over two-thirds eat two fruit and three vegetable servings a day.

SDG 4: Quality Education: Just Play sessions enhance Ministry of Education learning outcomes. Children learn to develop healthy lifestyle habits, respect each other, understand the importance of handwashing and safe drinking water, support the inclusion of everyone, and keep themselves and their friends safe.

Eighty per cent of participants acknowledge and celebrate their differences. A total of 4,034 teachers and community members have improved capacity to deliver quality sports sessions, enhancing the quality of the education environment and relevance of the learning outcomes for all children, the focus of SDG target 4.1.

SDG 5: Gender Equality: Just Play promotes girls and boys to engage as one team. Girls and boys learn to respect each other and develop tolerance and understanding, which will be crucial in achieving SDG target 5.1, which aims to end all forms of discrimination against all women and girls everywhere. Just Play also promotes the development of female role models and offers girls and women the ability to acquire skills, in order to help them make a meaningful contribution to their communities.

Seventy per cent of boys say that they enjoying playing football with girls, and 95 per cent recognise that girls can play football. Eighty-nine per cent of children say that they enjoy having a female coach.

(Continued)

Just Play: Enhancing the contribution of sport to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (cont.)

SDG 17: Partnerships for the Goals: Working directly with government ministries and key stakeholders, such as ministries of education, ensures wider reach and programme scalability. Cross-cutting partnerships support the upskilling of teachers and community volunteers to ensure quality sporting interventions in and out of school. Through engagement with teachers and schools during class time, Just Play supports the delivery of a 16-week programme. The 34-week community based programme is delivered after schools with the support of community based stakeholders.

The programme's multi-sectoral approach (across health and wellness, gender, social inclusion and child protection) engages actors at the local, regional and country levels. The partnerships central to Just Play contribute to SDG target 17.9, focused on capacity building, SDG target 17.4 on policy coherence, and SDG targets 17.16 and 17.7 on multi-stakeholder partnerships.

The programme has had impacts on 238,478 children in 11 Pacific countries since its inception in 2009; 43 per cent of child participants are girls and 54 per cent of the teachers and community volunteers supporting the programme are women.

For more information on the programme please visit: www.justplayofc.org

The four identified approaches are sufficiently flexible to encompass and enable cross-sectoral relationships and initiatives, as well as those that encourage collective implementation within the sport sector.

3.4 Concluding implications for policy-makers

The framework indicates that relationships may be configured in different ways to enable collective implementation and development. The four identified approaches are sufficiently flexible to encompass and enable cross-sectoral relationships and initiatives, as well as those that encourage collective implementation within the sport sector. This flexibility also enables alignment between the framework and the use of different policy instruments, including the distribution and re-distribution of funding, the setting and enforcement of regulation, and the collation and distribution of various forms of information.

Furthermore, the different approaches within the framework are not mutually exclusive. There is a strong likelihood that specific public, private and civil society organisations will contribute within different approaches to collective implementation concurrently. For example, international NGOs may operate autonomously in some working environments and in complementary or structured relationships in others. Similarly, relationships between public, private and civil society organisations can be fluid and subject to change, and in so doing can develop across different approaches to collective implementation over time.

Policy-makers must also be particularly mindful of the levels of capacity required to pursue different approaches to collective implementation. Similarly, recognition of the scale of intervention required to work towards particular policy goals is a further relevant consideration. Above all, these factors point to the importance of employing the approaches to collective implementation that are most relevant to the specific contexts and policy goals to which they are directed. The need for the means of implementation to be tailored according to context-specific analysis of development needs and possibilities will inform the subsequent application of this four-fold framework across each of the specific SDGs considered in the chapters that follow.

References

- Black, D. R. (2010), 'The ambiguities of development: implications for development through sport', *Sport in Society*, Vol. 13, 121–129.
- Coalter, F. (2010), 'The politics of sport-for-development: Limited focus programmes and broad gauge problems?' *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, Vol. 45, 295–314.
- Cronin, Ó. (2011), *Comic Relief Review: Mapping the Research on the Impact of Sport and Development Interventions*, Orla Cronin Research, Manchester, available at: <http://www.sportanddev.org/en/connect/userprofile.cfm?3096/Comic-Relief-Research-Mapping>
- Darnell, S. (2014), 'Critical Considerations for Sport for Development and Peace Policy Development', in Dudfield, O. (Ed.), *Strengthening Sport for Development and Peace: National Policies and Strategies*, Commonwealth Secretariat, London.
- Darnell, S. C. and R. Huish (2015), 'Cuban sport policy and South–South development cooperation: an overview and analysis of the Escuela Internacional de Educación Física y Deporte', *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, Vol. 7, 123–140.
- Department of Sport and Recreation South Africa (2011), *National Sport and Recreation Plan*, available at: <http://www.srsa.gov.za/MediaLib/Home/DocumentLibrary/Nasional%20Sport%20and%20Recreation%20Plan%20-%20Draft%202020.pdf>
- Dudfield, O. (2014), 'Sport for Development and Peace: Opportunities, Challenges and the Commonwealth's Response', in Dudfield, O. (Ed.), *Strengthening Sport for Development and Peace: National Policies and Strategies*, Commonwealth Secretariat, London.
- Giulianotti, R. (2011a), 'The sport, development and peace sector: a model of four social policy domains', *Journal of Social Policy*, 40 issue 4, 757–76.
- Giulianotti, R. (2011b), 'Sport, transnational peacemaking and global civil society: exploring the reflective discourses of "Sport, Development, and Peace" project officials', *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, Vol. 35, 50–71.
- Giulianotti, R. (2014), 'Sport for Development and Peace Policy Options in the Commonwealth', in Dudfield, O. (Ed.), *Strengthening Sport for Development and Peace. National Policies and Strategies*, Commonwealth Secretariat, London.

- Hasselgård, A. and S. Straume (2015), 'Sport for development and peace policy discourse and local practice', *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, Vol. 7, 87–103.
- Hayhurst, L. M. C. and W. Frisby (2010), 'Inevitable tensions: Swiss and Canadian Sport for Development NGO perspectives on partnerships with high-performance sport', *European Sport Management Quarterly*, Vol. 10, 75–96.
- Kay, T. (2012), 'Accounting for legacy: Monitoring and evaluation in sport in development relationships', *Sport in Society*, Vol. 15, 888–904.
- Kay, T. and O. Dudfield (2013), *The Commonwealth Guide to Advancing Development through Sport*, Commonwealth Secretariat, London, available at: <http://assets.thecommonwealth.org/assetbank-commonwealth/action/viewAsset?id=23162andindex=3andtotal=11andview=viewSearchItem>
- Keim, M. and C. de Coning (Eds) (2014), *Sport and Development Policy in Africa: Results of a Collaborative Study of Selected Country Cases*, SUN Press, Stellenbosch.
- Kidd, B. (2008), 'A new social movement: Sport for Development and Peace', *Sport in Society*, Vol. 11, 370–380.
- Kidd, B. (2011), 'Cautions, questions and opportunities in Sport for Development and Peace', *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 32, 603–609.
- Lindsey, I. (2016), 'Governance in Sport-for-Development: Problems and possibilities of (not) learning from international development', *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, available at: <http://irs.sagepub.com/content/early/2016/01/05/1012690215623460.abstract>
- Lindsey, I. and D. Banda (2011), 'Sport and the fight against HIV/AIDS in Zambia: A "partnership" approach?', *International Review of Sociology of Sport*, Vol. 46, 90–107.
- Nicholson, M., R. Hoye and B. Houlihan (Eds) (2010), *Participation in Sport: International Policy Perspectives*, Routledge, Abingdon.
- Sanders, B., J. Phillips and B. Vanreusel. (2014), 'Opportunities and challenges facing NGOs using sport as a vehicle for development in post-apartheid South Africa' *Sport, Education and Society*, Vol. 19, 789–805.
- Schulenkorf, N., E. Sherry and K. Rowe (2016), 'Sport for Development: An integrated literature review', *Journal of Sport Management*, Vol. 30, 22–39.
- Sen, A. (Ed.) (2011), *Peace and Democratic Society*. Open Book Publishers / Commonwealth Secretariat, London.
- Sport for Development and Peace International Working Group (SDPIWG) (2008), *Harnessing the Power of Sport for Development and Peace: Recommendations to Governments*, available at: http://www.un.org/wcm/content/site/sport/home/unplayers/memberstates/sdpiwg_keydocs
- Wright, P. M., J. M. Jacobs, J. D. Ressler and J. Jung (2016), 'Teaching for transformative educational experience in a sport for development program', *Sport, Education and Society*, Vol. 21, 531–548.