



Strategic Frameworks for the Realisation of Sustainable Development Aims: Emphasis Focused for the State of Nagaland

Dr. Rishikesh Singh Faujdar

Assistant Professor of Law, Department of Law, Nagaland University, (A Central University) HQRS-Lumami, Nagaland

Abstract

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development obliges every tier of governance, national, State, and local, to translate seventeen global goals into locally meaningful outcomes. This article examines the trajectory of Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) implementation in the State of Nagaland, a constitutionally distinctive frontier State in India's North-East governed under the special protections of Article 371A of the Constitution of India. Combining doctrinal analysis of the constitutional, statutory, and policy architecture with an original empirical survey of eighty respondents drawn from across the State, the study evaluates Nagaland's progress using the United Nations' five-pillar (5 Ps) framework: People, Planet, Prosperity, Peace, and Partnership. The article argues that Nagaland's record is best described as institutionally promising but unevenly realised: government schemes and constitutional protections have produced measurable gains in education, health infrastructure, and gender indicators, yet unemployment, unreliable infrastructure, corruption perceptions, and weak inter-departmental coordination continue to constrain outcomes. The article further contends that the customary governance institutions protected under Article 371A, Village Councils, Village Development Boards, and indigenous ecological knowledge, are not peripheral to the SDG project but central to its success in a State where land, forests, and natural resources remain substantially outside direct State control. The article concludes with a set of legal and policy recommendations, including a dedicated State SDG statute, for reconciling formal and customary governance in pursuit of the 2030 Agenda.

Keywords: Sustainable Development Goals; Nagaland; Article 371A; Customary Governance; 5 Ps Framework; SDG Localisation; Indigenous Knowledge

1. Introduction

Sustainable development has travelled from a contested idea in international environmental diplomacy to a binding organisational logic of contemporary governance. Its modern formulation traces back to the Brundtland Commission's 1987 report (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987), *Our Common Future*, which defined development as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. That formulation crystallised, nearly three decades later, into the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, adopted

by the United Nations General Assembly in Resolution A/RES/70/1, which set out seventeen Sustainable Development Goals, 169 targets, and 232 indicators to be achieved by 2030 (United Nations General Assembly, 2015). Unlike the Millennium Development Goals that preceded them, the SDGs are explicitly universal: they bind developed and developing economies alike and rest on the normative commitment to 'leave no one behind.'

India's engagement with this Agenda is coordinated nationally by NITI Aayog, which tracks State-wise performance through the SDG India Index and the

Voluntary National Review process (NITI Aayog, 2024). Yet the Agenda's own architecture anticipates that national commitment is insufficient without sub-national 'localisation,' since the everyday texture of poverty, health access, environmental stress, and governance quality is set at the State and village level. This article examines that localisation problem through a single, constitutionally unusual case: the State of Nagaland, which became India's sixteenth State on 1 December 1963 and today occupies roughly 16,579 square kilometres between Myanmar and the States of Assam, Manipur, and Arunachal Pradesh (Government of Nagaland, n.d.-a). Nagaland's SDG trajectory cannot be read off national indicators alone. Article 371A (Constitution of India, 1950, art. 371A) of the Constitution of India confers on the State a distinctive protection for Naga religious and social practices, customary law and procedure, and, critically, ownership and transfer of land and its resources meaning that a large share of the forests, water bodies, and agricultural land relevant to the Planet and Prosperity pillars of the SDGs sit outside direct State control and inside customary, village-based governance. Any credible account of SDG implementation in Nagaland must therefore treat customary institutions, Village Councils, Village Development Boards, tribal bodies, and churches as co-implementers of the Agenda rather than as background context.

This study is guided by four objectives: first, to trace the evolution of sustainable development thinking and its constitutional and statutory anchoring in India and Nagaland; second, to examine the strategies through which Nagaland pursues its own Vision 2030; third, to assess, through an original empirical survey, citizen-level awareness, participation, and perceived progress across the five pillars of the 2030 Agenda; and fourth, to identify the legal, administrative, and structural gaps that constrain implementation and to propose reform pathways. The hypothesis is that the path of SDG implementation in Nagaland has progressed significantly but remains constrained by socio-economic and infrastructural limitations, such that further advancement depends on collective effort among policymakers, increased funding, and local capacity-building, delivered in partnership with, rather than substitution for, customary governance.

2. Legal and Policy Framework for SDG Implementation

Although the Constitution of India does not use the phrase 'sustainable development,' the concept is now firmly read into the Fundamental Rights, the Directive Principles of State Policy, and the Fundamental Duties. Judicial interpretation of Article 21's (Constitution of

India, 1950, art. 21) guarantee of the right to life has progressively incorporated environmental protection, ecological balance, and intergenerational equity, giving the SDG Agenda constitutional traction even in the absence of a dedicated SDG statute (Constitution of India, 1950, art. 21). At the institutional level, NITI Aayog functions as the principal coordinating body for SDG monitoring and review at the Union level, while State governments are expected to translate national targets into localised indicators, plans, and delivery mechanisms. Nagaland's position within this architecture is distinctive because of Article 371A (Constitution of India, 1950, art. 371A). The provision protects Naga customary law and procedure, the administration of civil and criminal justice involving customary law, and, most consequentially for the environmental and economic pillars of the SDGs, ownership and transfer of land and its resources. Unlike most Indian States, where forests and mineral resources vest substantially in the State, a significant proportion of land and forest in Nagaland is owned and managed by individuals, clans, villages, and tribal communities under customary law (Ao, n.d.). The Nagaland Village and Area Councils Act, 1978, gives statutory recognition to Village Councils while preserving customary practice, and the Village Development Board, introduced in 1980, operates under Village Council supervision to plan, implement, and monitor village-level development, embodying the participatory governance the SDGs themselves prescribe (Nagaland Village and Area Councils Act, 1978; Karmakar & Banerjee, 2008).

Since 2015, the State has begun to localise the Agenda through the Nagaland SDG Vision 2030, prepared with the Department of Planning and Coordination, and through the establishment of an SDG Coordination Centre that anchors State-level monitoring within a Planning and Transformation Department mandate (Department of Planning and Coordination & United Nations Development Programme, 2021; Government of Nagaland, SDG Coordination Centre, n.d.). Sector programmes such as the Nagaland State Rural Livelihood Mission address SDG 1, SDG 5, and SDG 8; the Jal Jeevan Mission and Swachh Bharat Mission (Gramin) advance SDG 6; and the Nagaland State Biodiversity Board, established under the Biological Diversity Act, 2002, together with People's Biodiversity Registers prepared at the village level, advance SDG 13 and SDG 15 through community documentation of biological resources (Nagaland State Biodiversity Board, 2022; Sethi et al., 2017). Village Conserved Areas and Community Conserved Areas, which have emerged voluntarily from local initiative rather than statutory compulsion, similarly advance the Planet pillar through indigenous ecological governance.

The principal weakness in this framework is not an absence of policy but an absence of binding law. The SDGs themselves are a political commitment adopted by the U.N. General Assembly rather than a source of international legal obligation (United Nations General Assembly, 2015), and Nagaland, like most Indian States, pursues them through policy instruments, Vision documents, coordination centres, and executive programmes, rather than through a dedicated State statute that fixes departmental responsibility, timelines, and accountability. The SDG India Index rewards good performance reputationally but carries no legal consequence for underperformance (NITI Aayog, 2024). This doctrinal gap, shows that SDG implementation in Nagaland today rests on executive coordination and customary cooperation rather than on enforceable legal entitlement, a structural feature that shapes every empirical finding that follows.

3. Socio-Economic and Environmental Context

Nagaland's SDG trajectory must be read against a socio-economic base that is simultaneously a source of resilience and of constraint. The State's population remains predominantly rural and tribal, with seventeen major recognised tribes each retaining distinct customary institutions, languages, and resource-management practices. Agriculture and allied activities continue to employ over sixty per cent of the population and, per the Nagaland Economic Survey 2025–26, contribute 23.37 per cent of Gross State Value Added, making rural livelihoods acutely sensitive to climatic variability and market fluctuation (Directorate of Economics and Statistics, 2026). The State recorded a Gross State Domestic Product of approximately ₹51,014 crore in 2025–26, with a growth rate of 10.33 per cent and a per capita income of ₹1,92,280, alongside a Labour Force Participation Rate of 56 per cent and an unemployment rate of 16.07 per cent, of which roughly thirty-five per cent had been without work for more than three years (Directorate of Economics and Statistics, 2026).

Ecologically, Nagaland retains approximately 12,222.47 square kilometres of forest cover, some 73.72 per cent of its geographical area, one of the highest proportions in India, sustained in significant part by customary and community-based conservation rather than State forestry administration (Directorate of Economics and Statistics, 2026). Infrastructurally, the State has expanded its road network to over 10,000 kilometres and achieved 100 per cent Functional Household Tap Connections in 1,145 villages under the Jal Jeevan Mission, alongside 2,734 educational institutions and a primary Gross Enrolment Ratio of 102.55 per cent as of 2024–25 (Directorate of Economics and Statistics, 2026). On the

SDG India Index itself, Nagaland's composite score rose from 51 to 63 between successive assessments, moving the State into the 'Performer' category and reflecting genuine, measurable institutional progress (Directorate of Economics and Statistics, 2026). Yet mountainous terrain, dispersed settlement patterns, and limited industrial diversification mean that the tertiary sector alone accounts for 66.64 per cent of Gross State Value Added against 10.60 per cent for the secondary sector, continuing to constrain the translation of macro-level growth into uniformly felt improvements in welfare, a tension that the empirical findings below substantiate in granular terms.

This socio-economic and ecological base carries three implications for the analysis that follows. The first is that any SDG strategy premised on centralised, State-directed delivery will struggle in a State where the underlying resource base is customarily rather than statutorily held. The second is that Nagaland's tribal and linguistic diversity, seventeen major recognised tribes, each with distinct customary practices, means that a single, uniform State policy risks being locally inappropriate even where it is nationally sound, reinforcing the case for decentralised, village-responsive implementation. The third is that the very traits that appear, on a narrow economic reading, as constraints—dependence on agriculture, difficult terrain, limited industrial base—are, on the ecological and cultural reading, also the source of Nagaland's comparative strength in the Planet and Partnership pillars.

4. Research Methodology

This study adopts a mixed-methods socio-legal design. The doctrinal component examines the constitutional, statutory, and policy framework governing SDG implementation in India and Nagaland, drawing on legislation, NITI Aayog documents, State government reports, and case law. The empirical component tests how that framework is experienced on the ground through a structured questionnaire survey administered online via Google Forms to citizens of Nagaland aged eighteen and above, drawn through purposive and convenience sampling across the State without restriction to a particular district. Eighty valid responses were received from a socio-demographically heterogeneous pool of students, government and private-sector employees, farmers, self-employed persons, professionals, and homemakers; respondent educational attainment skewed toward graduate (45 per cent), postgraduate (31 per cent), and doctoral (14 per cent) qualifications. The questionnaire was structured around the United Nations' 5 Ps framework, People, Planet, Prosperity, Peace, and Partnership, first articulated at the adoption

of the 2030 Agenda as an accessible summary of its seventeen goals (United Nations, 2015; United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia, n.d.). Items combined closed-ended and Likert-scale formats covering awareness of the SDGs and the 5 Ps, perceived government and institutional performance, and perceived socio-economic, infrastructural, and administrative constraints. Quantitative responses were analysed descriptively, with frequencies, percentages, and cross-tabulations, with comparison across rural and urban respondents, and were triangulated against secondary data drawn from the Nagaland Economic Survey 2025–26, the SDG India Index, the Nagaland SDG Vision 2030 document, Voluntary National Review reports, and peer-reviewed literature. While a purposive online sample of eighty respondents is not statistically representative of Nagaland's population and should not be read as such, it offers a credible empirical window onto lived perceptions of SDG implementation that purely doctrinal or statistical accounts cannot supply on their own.

5. Findings: SDG Implementation Assessed through the 5 Ps

The 5 Ps are not five independent silos but an interconnected structure in which progress on one pillar shapes advancement on the others; the key findings are:

5.1 People: Poverty, Health, Education, and Gender

The People pillar, corresponding to SDGs 1 through 6, showed the clearest evidence of institutional progress alongside persistent access gaps. A majority of respondents, roughly fifty-nine per cent, considered government poverty-alleviation programmes effective, consistent with official data showing 791 Self-Help Groups extended ₹17.42 crore in bank credit during 2025–26 under livelihood missions (Directorate of Economics and Statistics, 2026). Health access was more sharply divided: 51.3 per cent of respondents rated local healthcare facilities adequate against 42.5 per cent who rated them poor, a split that tracks the persistence of difficult terrain, thin transport infrastructure, and specialist staff shortages in remote districts despite the expansion of the Chief Minister Health Insurance Scheme and Ayushman Bharat (Government of Nagaland, n.d.-b). Drinking water access followed a similar pattern: although 1,145 villages have achieved full Functional Household Tap Connections under the Jal Jeevan Mission, 42.5 per cent of respondents reported only intermittent access to clean water and a further 21.3 per cent described it as a frequent challenge, indicating that infrastructural completion has not yet translated uniformly into continuous supply.

Education presented the strongest indicators, with near-universal primary enrolment and a respondent pool skewed toward higher qualifications, though rural respondents in particular flagged inadequate infrastructure, limited internet connectivity, and shortages of qualified teachers as continuing barriers to learning quality rather than access. Gender equality data revealed the study's most striking disjuncture between macro-indicators and lived experience: Nagaland ranks first nationally on the SDG India Index sub-score for SDG 5 and records female labour-force participation of roughly 64.3 per cent, well above the national average, yet approximately sixty-five per cent of respondents reported no direct benefit from any government scheme targeted at women's empowerment, suggesting a substantial outreach and awareness deficit rather than a design failure in the schemes themselves.

5.2 Planet: Environment, Climate, and Agricultural Sustainability

The Planet pillar, mapped to SDGs 6, 12, 13, and 15, revealed a State with genuine ecological assets under mounting strain. Forest cover, community reserves, and customary conservation give Nagaland a strong ecological base, but waste management emerged as a sharp weakness: nearly 68.8 per cent of respondents reported that plastic waste is commonly burned in their locality, against only 11.3 per cent who reported organised collection for recycling, evidencing a scientific waste-management deficit that government afforestation and biodiversity programmes have not yet addressed. Climate perception was near-universal: roughly sixty-five per cent of respondents noticed occasional changes in local climate patterns and a further 26.3 per cent noticed them frequently, aligning with scientific findings on intensifying climatic stress across the Eastern Himalayan and North-Eastern belt.

Traditional agricultural practice showed measured resilience rather than displacement: half of all respondents considered practices such as jhum cultivation, herbal healing, and customary forest use to be only partially replaced by modern alternatives, and forty per cent considered them still widely in use, suggesting that indigenous ecological knowledge continues to coexist with, rather than yield entirely to, modernisation.

5.3 Prosperity: Growth, Employment, and Infrastructure

The Prosperity pillar, corresponding to SDGs 8, 9, and 11, showed the clearest gap between macroeconomic performance and citizen-level opportunity. Official growth and per-capita income gains have not translated into commensurate employment: thirty-six per cent of respondents reported no meaningful skill-development opportunity in their locality and a further thirty-five

per cent reported very limited opportunity, against an official unemployment rate of 16.07 per cent and long-term joblessness among over a third of the unemployed. Infrastructure told a similar story of uneven completion: while the State has expanded its road network past 10,000 kilometres, nearly forty-six per cent of respondents rated electricity supply unreliable, a constraint that depresses both household welfare and the digital and industrial activity on which economic diversification depends. With the tertiary sector accounting for two-thirds of Gross State Value Added against a tenth for the secondary sector, the study finds limited industrial diversification to be a structural, not merely cyclical, constraint on inclusive prosperity.

5.4 Peace: Governance Quality and Institutional Trust

The Peace pillar, anchored in SDG 16, is where Nagaland's dual governance structure, statutory institutions operating alongside customary bodies recognised under Article 371A, is most consequential. Respondents expressed considerable confidence in community-level institutions: churches, Village Councils, and community organisations were consistently identified as the most active promoters of social welfare and sustainable development. At the same time, seventy per cent of respondents (56 of 80) identified corruption as a persistent problem in the delivery of public programmes, and most respondents characterised local community involvement in government decision-making as moderate rather than extensive. This combination, high trust in customary and community institutions alongside persistent concern about administrative corruption and limited consultative depth, indicates that governance reform in Nagaland cannot be pursued through statutory institutions alone but must actively channel the legitimacy that customary bodies already possess.

5.5 Partnership: Collaboration, Women, and Youth

The Partnership pillar, corresponding to SDG 17, produced the study's most unambiguous finding: 82.5 per cent of respondents (66 of 80) rated government-community partnerships as at least 'somewhat effective,' the single strongest positive result across all five pillars, and identified churches, Village Councils, and community organisations as the primary vehicles for awareness-raising and welfare delivery. Set against this strength, 62.5 per cent of respondents (50 of 80) reported never having participated in any formal training programme on sustainable development or environmental protection, revealing a capacity-building and structured-engagement gap, particularly for women and youth, that risks leaving Nagaland's strongest asset, community trust, under-leveraged for want of investment in participatory skill-building.

Taken together, the five pillars support a more precise version of the study's hypothesis than a simple 'progress with challenges' conclusion would suggest. The People and Prosperity pillars show the widest divergence between official statistical achievement and citizen-level perception, indicating that the principal constraint in Nagaland is not policy design but the last-mile delivery of otherwise sound schemes. The Planet pillar shows the reverse pattern: citizen perception of environmental stewardship and climate change is, if anything, more acute and more scientifically literate than official reporting fully captures, suggesting an under-utilised public constituency for stronger environmental policy. The Peace and Partnership pillars, read together, reveal the study's central structural finding: public trust in Nagaland is not low in absolute terms; it is simply invested disproportionately in customary and community institutions rather than in statutory administration, a distribution of trust that SDG delivery mechanisms have not yet been redesigned to exploit.

6. Role of Indigenous Knowledge and Community Governance

The empirical findings above cannot be fully understood without situating them within Nagaland's distinctive institutional inheritance under Article 371A, which permits customary governance systems to coexist with, rather than be subordinated to, formal State administration. Indigenous knowledge in Nagaland functions as a living resource-management system rather than a heritage artefact: village communities have long designated sacred groves, protected forest patches, and community conservation areas where resource extraction is customarily restricted, and these practices materially underpin the State's 73.72 per cent forest cover (Directorate of Economics and Statistics, 2026; Thomas et al., 2024). Because forest and land tenure in Nagaland remains substantially community-held rather than State-owned, community forest management is not a supplementary conservation strategy but the primary one, directly advancing SDG 13, SDG 15, and, through its stabilising effect on water sources and soil, SDG 6 (George & Yhome, n.d.).

Customary institutions perform a second, less visible function: they generate social accountability for sustainable resource use through consensus-based decision-making among elders and clan representatives, and through informal sanctions rather than formal litigation, thereby lowering the administrative burden of environmental governance (Fogerite et al., 2018). This participatory, consensus-driven mode of governance is, in substance, the inclusive decision-making the SDGs themselves prescribe, arrived at independently through

indigenous practice rather than through transplanted international design. The Hornbill Festival and Nagaland's emerging eco-tourism sector, spanning sites such as Dzukou Valley, Japfu Peak, and the Khonoma Nature Conservation and Tragopan Sanctuary, further illustrate how cultural heritage and community-managed natural assets can be converted into livelihood opportunities for artisans, homestay operators, and, increasingly, women entrepreneurs operating through Self-Help Groups, without displacing the resource base on which conservation depends (Kinny & Lanusosang, 2016).

At the same time, customary governance faces its own pressures: market integration, youth migration to urban centres, and the shortening of traditional jhum fallow cycles under population pressure are each, independently, eroding the ecological buffer that longer fallow periods once provided (Jagannath et al., 2025). The policy implication is not to romanticise customary institutions as self-sufficient, but to recognise, as this study's respondents implicitly did in rating community organisations as their most trusted development partners, that formal SDG implementation in Nagaland will succeed or fail depending on whether it is designed to work through these institutions or around them.

7. Challenges, Gaps, and the Way Forward

Read together, the doctrinal and empirical findings above resolve into a consistent pattern: institutional intention has outpaced institutional delivery. Across every pillar, official data recorded programmatic progress that citizen-level perception only partially confirmed. This section consolidates the resulting gaps under five headings before turning to legal and policy gaps:

People-related gaps: Public awareness of the SDGs as an integrated framework remains shallow even where awareness of individual issues, health, education, environment, is comparatively strong; social media has become the dominant information channel, which risks widening rather than narrowing rural-urban disparities given uneven internet access; and community participation in planning and monitoring remains largely consultative rather than collaborative, with 62.5 per cent of respondents never having received structured training on sustainable development.

Planet-related gaps: Scientific waste management lags well behind conservation achievement, agricultural systems face mounting climate variability without adequate policy support for climate-resilient practice, and coordination between government departments, customary institutions, and civil society on environmental governance remains ad hoc rather than institutionalised.

Prosperity-related gaps: Youth unemployment, thin vocational and digital-skill training, an underdeveloped secondary sector, unreliable electricity, and constrained access to credit for small entrepreneurs together indicate that infrastructural investment has not yet been matched by an equivalent investment in human capital and enterprise support.

Peace-related gaps: Persistent perceptions of corruption, limited transparency in beneficiary selection and expenditure, administrative ambiguity where customary and statutory jurisdiction overlap, and thin grievance-redressal mechanisms each erode the public trust on which effective governance depends.

Partnership-related gaps: Interdepartmental coordination remains fragmented, information about scheme eligibility is inconsistently communicated beyond digital channels, and women and youth remain under-represented in formal planning and decision-making bodies despite their demonstrated centrality to community-level implementation.

The most consequential gaps, however, are legal rather than administrative. First, Nagaland has no comprehensive State SDG legislation: the Vision 2030 document and the SDG Coordination Centre are policy instruments without statutory force, leaving departmental roles, timelines, and accountability undefined in law (Department of Planning and Coordination & United Nations Development Programme, 2021; Government of Nagaland, SDG Coordination Centre, n.d.). Second, inter-departmental coordination on cross-cutting SDG targets remains structurally weak, producing duplication and delay. Third, monitoring, evaluation, and public reporting mechanisms are underdeveloped, limiting evidence-based course correction. Fourth, existing law provides no systematic mechanism for consulting Village Councils, civil society, and women's and youth groups before development policy is finalised. Fifth, policy support for climate resilience and sustainable resource management remains uneven in its translation from State policy to village-level practice.

8. Conclusion and Recommendations

This study set out to evaluate the path of SDG implementation in Nagaland by combining doctrinal analysis of its unique constitutional position under Article 371A with an original empirical survey structured around the 5 Ps framework. The evidence supports the study's working hypothesis: implementation has progressed significantly, reflected in a rising SDG India Index score, expanding health and education infrastructure, and near-universal Jal Jeevan Mission coverage, but remains constrained by uneven service quality, unemployment, infrastructural unreliability, and governance concerns

that fall disproportionately on rural and geographically remote communities. The single most important finding, however, is structural rather than statistical: Nagaland's customary institutions and indigenous ecological knowledge are not a constraint on modernisation but a functioning parallel infrastructure for sustainable development, one that the formal SDG apparatus has yet to fully integrate into its design. On this basis, the study proposes five reform pathways.

First, the Government of Nagaland should enact a comprehensive State SDG law or binding policy framework that fixes departmental responsibility, measurable targets, and a common monitoring and evaluation mechanism, insulating implementation from shifts in executive priority.

Second, employment generation should be pursued through expanded vocational education, digital literacy, and entrepreneurship support targeted at tourism, agro-processing, information technology, and handicrafts, sectors in which Nagaland already holds a comparative advantage.

Third, environmental policy should formally integrate indigenous ecological knowledge with scientific waste management and climate-adaptation planning rather than treating the two as parallel tracks.

Fourth, interdepartmental and inter-institutional coordination mechanisms, linking statutory departments with Village Councils, Village Development Boards, churches, and civil society, should be formalised at village, district, and State levels.

Fifth, sustained investment in public awareness and structured capacity-building, particularly for women and youth, is required to convert Nagaland's demonstrated reservoir of community trust into active, collaborative participation in SDG delivery.

Nagaland shows that the Agenda 2030 is not working on a national level, but rather by its explicit recognition of the local constitutional and customary realities. The State's improving SDG index score, resilient forest cover, and trust and confidence in Village Councils and community practice demonstrate a path of development that is largely underway. What is left is the legal and administrative intent to formalise this partnership, to make it more sustainable and accountable and to drive the State towards 2030 with indigenous institutional strength.

References

- Ao, M. (n.d.). *Naga customary law interface the contemporary State Government of Nagaland policies on petroleum and other minerals*. https://www.academia.edu/7125066/Naga_Customary_Law_Interface_the_Contemporary_State_Government_of_Nagaland_Policies_on_Petroleum_and_other_Minerals
- Constitution of India, (1950), arts. 21, 371A.
- Department of Planning and Coordination, Government of Nagaland, & United Nations Development Programme. (2021). *Nagaland SDG Vision 2030: Leaving no one behind*.
- Directorate of Economics and Statistics, Government of Nagaland. (2026). *Nagaland economic survey 2025–26*. https://statistics.nagaland.gov.in/storage/statistical_data/2026/4951778140435.pdf
- Fogerite, J., Hill, J. J., & Makury, A. (2018). *Land and forest governance in the Naga village republic*. Resource Rights for the Indigenous Peoples.
- George, J., & Yhome, K. (n.d.). *Community forest management: A case study of Nagaland, India* [Unpublished manuscript]. <https://dlc.dlib.indiana.edu/dlcrest/api/core/bitstreams/8c4b5d9d-49ff-4fed-9ace-f176f8766519/content>
- Government of Nagaland. (n.d.). *About the State*. <https://nagaland.gov.in>
- Government of Nagaland. (n.d.). *Chief Minister Health Insurance Scheme (CMHIS)*. <https://cmhis.nagaland.gov.in/pages/cmhis>
- Government of Nagaland, SDG Coordination Centre. (n.d.). *About us*. <https://sdgcc.nagaland.gov.in/html/about.html>
- Jagannath, P., Dutta, S., Jamir, C., & Chatterjee, S. (2025). Drivers of shifting cultivation in Nagaland: Crop cycles, crop selection, and management. *International Journal of Anthropology and Ethnology*, 9, Article 9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41257-025-00131-z>
- Karmakar, K. G., & Banerjee, G. D. (2008). *Village Development Boards (VDBs) in Nagaland*. FinDev Gateway. https://www.findevgateway.org/sites/default/files/publications/files/mfg-en-paper-village-development-boards-vdb-in-nagaland-2008_0.pdf
- Kinny, A., & Lanusosang, T. (2016). Exploring the potentials for ecotourism and sustainable tourism development in Nagaland India. *International Journal of Applied Research*, 2(9), 156. <https://www.allresearchjournal.com/archives/2016/vol2issue9/PartC/2-8-109-988.pdf>

- Nagaland State Biodiversity Board. (2022). *Revised Nagaland State Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan*. <https://nsbb.nagaland.gov.in/wp-content/uploads/2023/10/Revised-Nagaland-State-Biodiversity-Strategy-Action-Plan.pdf>
- Nagaland Village and Area Councils Act, (1978). Nagaland Act No. 1 of 1979.
- NITI Aayog. (2024). *SDG India Index 2023–24*. Government of India. https://www.niti.gov.in/sites/default/files/2024-07/SDG_India_Index_2023-24.pdf
- Sethi, P., et al. (2017). *A people's biodiversity register (PBR) of Village Ghukhuyi, Zünheboto, Nagaland*. The Energy and Resources Institute. <https://www.teriin.org/sites/default/files/2018-03/people-biodiversity-nagaland-report.pdf>
- Thomas, N., Mey, A., & Koren, T. (2024). Conservation practices and the integration of traditional ecological knowledge among the Nagas. *Gateway International Journal of Innovative Research*, 3.
- United Nations. (2015). *Consensus reached on new sustainable development agenda to be adopted by world leaders in September*. Department of Economic and Social Affairs. <https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/blog/2015/08/transforming-our-world-document-adoption/>
- United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia. (n.d.). *The 5Ps of the Sustainable Development Goals*. https://www.unescwa.org/sites/default/files/inline-files/the_5ps_of_the_sustainable_development_goals.pdf
- United Nations General Assembly. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development* (A/RES/70/1).
- World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). *Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our common future* (U.N. Doc. A/42/427).