REPORT

WAYS FORWARD ON MONITORING SDG16+

Global Alliance
Reporting Progress on Peaceful,
Just, and Inclusive Societies

THE DANISH
INSTITUTE FOR
HUMAN RIGHTS

Contents

Executive Summary

In recent years, following the adoption of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), several initiatives have emerged to support UN Member States in their monitoring and reporting efforts on issues related to Peace, Justice and Inclusion (SDG 16+). Some initiatives support countries in including SDG 16+ in their Voluntary National Reviews (VNRs), while others help them focus on monitoring SDG 16+ at the national level within different reporting mechanisms. In parallel, given the significant linkages between the content of SDG 16+ and human rights standards, there are also ongoing efforts to support Member States to better coordinate their national mechanisms and processes for the SDGs with their National Mechanisms for Reporting and Follow-ups (NMRFs) on human rights obligations. These efforts aim at increasing accountability for the SDGs through leveraging the legally binding nature of human rights and the wealth of SDG-relevant guidance provided by its monitoring bodies.

To date, however, only a few countries and statistical offices have experience in producing governance data or in establishing the type of inclusive data ecosystems needed to monitor and report on SDG 16+. There is also a vast missed opportunity to use data and information produced for other relevant reporting processes, including for human rights mechanisms, to report on issues related to peace, justice, and inclusion. While the 2019 VNRs generally provided more data analysis and included a more comprehensive list of data sources than the ones in previous years, a lack of data – especially pertaining to SDG 16+ – remained a challenge for Member States.[1]

There is an evident need to identify, highlight and share specific progress on monitoring stakeholder engagement and partnerships, as well as details on challenges, shortfalls, needs and plans of action to implement and monitor SDG 16+ targets. Moreover, the links between the SDG and the human rights communities need to be further strengthened to accelerate action towards the 2030 Agenda to ensure no one is left behind. Improving coordination between these communities will require new ways of working together and new opportunities to exchange knowledge, tools and relevant information that can help build capacities and foster the collaborations needed.

In response to these challenges, the Global Alliance for Reporting Progress on Peaceful, Just and Inclusive Societies and the Danish Institute for Human Rights convened a global technical workshop entitled 'Ways Forward on Monitoring SDG 16+' and held 5-7 February 2020 in Copenhagen (see Agenda). Over 70 participants (see List of Participants) from all regions and diverse sectors (United Nations, civil society organizations, private sector, governments, national statistics offices and national human rights institutions) engaged in substantive discussions on thematic and cross-cutting SDG 16+ monitoring issues such as the nationalization of indicators; alignment of human rights and SDG implementation, monitoring and reporting; data collection and disaggregation; alternative data sources; stakeholder engagement; and institutionalization of monitoring mechanisms.

> **SDG 16+** is known as the group of 36 SDG targets covering the 2030 Agenda aspects related to peace, justice, and inclusion. The Pathfinders for Peaceful, Just and Inclusive Societies elaborated on the concept: see here.

Ways Forward on Monitoring SDG16+: Workshop Overall Findings

After the first thematic review of SDG 16 and the conclusion of the first cycle of SDG review in July 2019, it became evident that progress towards targets related to SDG 16+ is gravely lagging. Given the cross-cutting importance of peace, justice, inclusion, and participation in the 2030 Agenda, this impediment has and will continue to have dire consequences for those most vulnerable. Key challenges of SDG 16+ relate to its wide scope and complexity and to the disconnect between SDGs and other existing relevant processes, including with the human rights system. It also relates to critical data gaps (see Visualization of SDG16+ Monitoring Initiatives) and to an insufficient use of existing data to monitor and accelerate progress.

Key highlights of challenges for SDG 16+ monitoring from the workshop:

♦ Many countries are still far from achieving SDG 16+ and have not made significant steps to fulfil the pledge to leave no one behind.

♦ Monitoring progress of SDG 16+ presents persistent challenges:
(1) there are data gaps against global indicators, with a significant number of Tier II and Tier III indicators covering SDG 16+;
(2) there are indicator gaps where global indicators do not cover essential components of the targets (which is where the ambition of the 2030 Agenda is reflected), and
(3) existing data often does not represent all segments of the population (e.g., lack of data disaggregation and community-specific data).

♦ Because of the flaws in its monitoring, VNR reporting on SDG 16+ and monitoring of SDG 16+ at the national level are still weak.

Key recommendations to move forward:

♦ There is need to **connect existing and emerging monitoring initiatives and institutional structures** (e.g., SDG coordination mechanisms and national mechanism for reporting and follow-up on human rights (NMRFs)) to avoid duplication, enhance efficiency and coherence in delivery of countries' international commitments, reduce reporting burden and improve efforts to accelerate change. The pledge to build on such synergies underlines the linkages between SDG 16+ and SDG 17, which focuses on partnerships and policy coherence.

♦ Make better use of the **wealth of information from existing and emerging data sources**, which are critical to **complement the statistical monitoring of SDG 16+** with relevant quantitative and qualitative data (see Repository). Examples include data from: national oversight bodies (e.g., national human rights institutions, supreme audit institutions), UN relevant bodies and agencies (e.g., OHCHR, Human Rights Council and monitoring mechanisms, International Labour Organisation), civil society (e.g., citizen-generated data, community data, data from NGOs and labour unions) and the private sector (e.g., internal operational data, offshore operations, big data).

♦ National, subnational and global SDG 16+ monitoring efforts can benefit from **establishing institutionalized mechanisms to enable and coordinate a pluralistic ecosystem of data (SDG 16+ data web)**, creating guidelines and providing capacity-building to allow for a consistent, complementary and useful data collection, analysis and dissemination with the participation of all relevant actors.

Moving from Monitoring to Action: Considerations from the Workshop

Data can guide our drive and push for the change needed. Here are a few tips from participants on how to step up the game from traditional data collection to leverage the power of data for transformative action:

♦ **Understand your data needs:** Select priorities for data generation based on users' needs. Moving from data collection and monitoring to action requires a clear understanding of what data is needed and how it should be communicated to bring about the needed policies, programmes, budgets, and legislations.

♦ **Improve communication:** SDG 16+ messages must be relatable with everyday language to help people understand what is at stake. Make it exciting and turn that excitement into collective action.

♦ **Leverage the media:** The media can play a key role in effectively 'translating' and communicating SDG data to the public – find your allies in the sector and educate them on the subject.

♦ **Focus on the quality of data:** Policy and programme makers, as well as report writers (including of VNRs and national reports) must adopt an inclusive approach towards data usage, focusing on the quality of the available data rather than on the source of data.

♦ **Challenge the HLPF**: Support the reform of the High-Level Political Forum (HLPF) towards a more inclusive, participatory, and accountable model, inspired by, for example, UN human rights monitoring mechanisms.

♦ **Use human rights bodies to increase SDG accountability:** They provide country-specific guidance and recommendations that are relevant for SDG implementation: find the links, use human rights data, and report to human rights monitoring bodies.

♦ **Peer pressure**: Seek support from Member States with good practices (e.g., those using information from spotlight reports and enabling meaningful participation) to promote peer-pressure in global/regional forums.

SDG 16+ Monitoring Community: Recommendations for Collective Follow-Up Actions

Participants highlighted the importance of having a space for peer exchange and for showcasing SDG 16+ initiatives to boost coordinated action, improve synergies and increase awareness of the interlinkages with each other's work. To enable better coordination moving forward, participants demonstrated interest in finding the adequate channel to maintain a constructive dialogue with others in the SDG 16+ community. Based on their feedback and suggestions, the following are the highlighted opportunities for future collaboration.

As a starting point and immediate follow-up from the workshop, the Global Alliance and DIHR have:

Community of Practice	Facilitated the creation of a virtual Community of Practice on Monitoring and Reporting on SDG 16+: to continue and expand the discussions initiated during the workshop, the SDG 16+ community is hereby invited to come together on a virtual Community of Practice to follow up on the findings of the workshop and collaborate for SDG 16+ monitoring. Join the Copenhagen Community of Practice here.

Repository of SDG 16+ Initiatives	Compiled a Repository of SDG 16+ Initiatives from participants: to highlight available resources that can support countries on monitoring SDG 16+ at country level (see Repository).
Visualization of SDG16+ Monitoring Initiatives)	Produced a map of SDG 16+ data and monitoring initiatives: a compilation of data availability and initiatives measuring peace, justice, and inclusion in the 2030 Agenda (see Visualization of SDG16+ Monitoring Initiatives).

With these and other resources available, and using the virtual Community of Practice, the SDG 16+ community can identify priorities and strategize to improve key areas of concern as proposed by the workshop participants, including to:

♦ Bring key messages from the workshop to regional and international events such as the HLPF, Partners for Review meetings and the regional forums on sustainable development including through learning labs, side events, training-learning events, speaking engagements, etc.;

♦ Explore how to strengthen engagement and accountability of the private sector vis-à-vis SDG 16+;

♦ Foster partnerships between NSOs and NIHRs for SDG 16+ monitoring and showcase good practices at the World Data Forum and other relevant forums;

♦ Conduct a data gap analysis and identify priority areas for additional measurement and initiatives;

♦ Undertake a review of alternative data sources available for SDG 16+, communicate them effectively and foster partnerships to close data gaps (building on inventory emerging from this workshop);

♦ Strengthen networks of SDG 16+ monitoring initiatives and leverage them to collectively push for action.

Key Resources:

♦ Workshop Agenda
♦ Workshop Concept Note
♦ Workshop List of Participants
♦ Repository of SDG16+ Initiatives
♦ Visualization of SDG16+ Data and Monitoring Initiatives

Thematic Discussions

1. Leveraging the Human Rights Systems for the Realization and Monitoring of SDG 16+

More than 90 percent of the SDG targets reflect core international human rights instruments and labour standards (visit the Human Rights Guide to the SDGs to find the links between SDGs and human rights).

The three main types of UN human rights monitoring mechanisms (Universal Periodic Review (UPR),[2] UN Treaty Bodies[3] and Special Procedures[4]) conduct thorough and individualized examination of thematic or individual states' human rights obligations and produce recommendations to guide states' compliance. Considering the high degree of convergence between human rights and the SDGs, these recommendations constitute a wealth of information that is relevant to guide SDG implementation at country level (visit the SDG - Human Rights Data Explorer to link human rights recommendations with the SDGs). In addition, each of these bodies allows for participation and inclusion of state, civil society and other actors, and for consideration of information from different sources in their proceedings that can serve as inspiration to SDG processes.[5]

There is enormous untapped potential for employing information and recommendations from national, regional and international human rights systems to monitor and realize SDG 16+. Leveraging human rights monitoring and reporting mechanisms will reduce the reporting burden on states and will contribute to implementation, follow-up and review of SDG16+ by providing:

- ♦ Systematized qualitative analysis and data through institutionalized reporting mechanisms by states, UN bodies, NHRIs, and civil society;
- ♦ Identification of specific and systemic implementation challenges, as well as recommendations and guidance to address them adequately;
- ♦ Identification of societal groups most at risk of being left behind and concrete measures to abolish discrimination and promote equality;
- ♦ Best practices on systematic engagement of stakeholders in monitoring, reporting and follow-up, guided by the human rights principles of accountability, transparency, and access to information;
- ♦ Expertise on developing national monitoring systems that are aligned with global standards, and best practice on peer review mechanisms, expert, and thematic reviews.

Yet, there is still much to improve in building on the synergies between the human rights and the SDG systems and in applying their mutually reinforcing nature in practice. At the global level, the international human rights system (based at the UN Office in Geneva) is already using its monitoring bodies to complement accountability for the SDG system (based at the UN Headquarters in New York), but much can still be done to improve this dialogue. Likewise, at national and subnational levels the challenges to integrate SDGs and human rights in implementation, monitoring, follow-up, and reporting efforts are enormous.

Key challenges and recommendations highlighted during the workshop	
Challenges	**Recommendations**
◆ In general, there is little or no coordination between key human rights and SDG actors at national and subnational levels; ◆ Government structures reporting on human rights are usually different from the government structures reporting on SDGs, and they don't communicate; ◆ There are persistent silos between the 'development/SDGs' and the 'human rights' communities; and ◆ National human rights institutions (NHRIs) are not consistently invited to take part in national SDG monitoring and implementation.	◆ Continue to foster the synergies between SDGs and human rights systems and step up efforts to highlight the relevance of human rights to SDGs in the proceedings of the HLPF; ◆ Disseminate available tools and build capacity of all relevant actors to add a human rights-based approach to SDG planning, implementation, monitoring and review; ◆ Build capacity of civil society organizations and rights-holder groups for deeper understanding of how to utilize the human rights monitoring systems to improve SDG accountability. ◆ Include an SDG focal point and an NSO representative in National Mechanisms for Reporting and Follow-up (NMRF) on human rights and include a representative of the NHRI in national SDG coordination mechanisms.

Key resources to facilitate an integrated approach to SDGs and human rights
The **National Recommendations Tracking Database** (OHCHR) can help states to align the follow-up and review of human rights recommendations with SDG implementation.
The **SDG - Human Rights Data Explorer** (DIHR) links country-specific recommendations and observations from the international human rights system to the Goals and targets of the 2030 Agenda.
The **Human Rights Guide to the SDGs** (DIHR) identifies the linkages between the SDGs and universal human rights, labour standards and key environmental instruments that are applicable to a country.
OHCHR prepared **country-specific briefings** to help states integrate human rights data, analysis and approaches in the preparation of the 2020 VNRs. These are useful resources not only to reduce states' reporting burden but particularly to provide a more comprehensive overview of a country's challenges, gaps and ways forward vis-à-vis its international SDG and human rights commitments.
A **handbook on national implementation of the SDGs** will provide key stakeholders in SDG implementation and monitoring at national level with a practical handbook containing examples of practice, tools and resources to support their engagement or design of a human rights-based approach to the SDGs at national level (forthcoming, DIHR).

Measuring progress on issues related to peace, justice, inclusion, and governance in the context of sustainable development has proven to be challenging. For example, discrimination is a persistent and often unaddressed barrier to the monitoring of critical issues: in countries where LGBTI people or other groups of rights-holders are denied rights, they will probably not want to self-identify as such in official data collection exercises. Likewise, political barriers might also threaten measuring key governance issues, e.g., governments that are corrupt will rarely want to collect data on their own corruption. Further, the development of international methodology and standards for data collection for many of the SDG 16+ indicators is happening at a slow pace. As a result, there are considerable gaps at national level relating to data availability, data disaggregation and capacity constraints to collect adequate data.

> ### Key resources on SDG 16+ Data
>
> While NSOs are stepping up work on governance statistics (possibly, encouraged by SDG 16+), there is a need to upgrade capacity and increase resources for this issue. In March 2020, the Praia City Group on Governance Statistics,[6] established in 2015 by the UN Statistical Commission, launched the **Handbook on Governance Statistics**. This resource is a collaborative effort of national statistical offices, the UN, other international organizations and civil society organizations. The purpose of the Handbook is to provide a foundation for the development of international statistical guidance and standards in all areas of governance statistics. It takes stock of existing practices in governance data collection and proposes guidelines for the improved production and compilation of governance, peace, security, human rights and rule of law indicators. It is intended as a guide for those wishing to understand, produce and analyse governance statistics, and is primarily targeted towards NSOs.
>
> OHCHR's guidelines **Human Rights-Based Approach to Data** (HRBAD) provide general guidance, recommendations and good practices on how to apply human rights principles to data collection and disaggregation. Complementarily, the **Human Rights Indicators: A Guide to Measurement and Implementation** describes the conceptual and methodological framework for human rights indicators and provides concrete examples, practical tools and illustrations to support the monitoring and realization of human rights at all levels. The application of the HRBAD helps bring together relevant data stakeholders and develop communities of practice that improve the quality, relevance and use of data and statistics consistently with international human rights norms and principles.

2.1. Data Availability and the Use of Alternative Data Sources

An analysis of the SDG 16+ targets shows that, of the 36 targets, only seven have global indicators that are capable of measuring all relevant aspects of peace, justice and inclusion (Tier 1 indicators). For the remaining 29 targets, the global indicators either don´t measure the relevant aspects or are classified as Tier 2 or 3, which means that there might not be an established methodology for data collection (Tier 3) or that data is not systematically collected for that indicator (Tier 2). See Visualization of SDG16+ Monitoring Initiatives for an overview.

This analysis unveils critical gaps in the official global monitoring of SDG 16+. In practice, these gaps can lead to the establishment of policies and programmes that are not evidence-based, which generates incorrect identification of priorities and risks not addressing the most pressing needs of those already being left behind. While challenges to collect data from official sources persist,

countries could benefit from leveraging data produced by, e.g., civil society, private sector, and oversight bodies, including NHRIs and supreme audit institutions.

There are numerous initiatives (see Repository) related to community-generated data, citizen-driven data, human rights data, NGO-led data, and big data that can already contribute to monitoring progress of SDG 16+. There are great advantages but also significant challenges in making alternative data systematically usable and useful to NSOs and for consideration in policy- and programme-making. Understanding the added value of using alternative data to complement monitoring efforts and taking practical steps to address the related challenges is imperative to building a dynamic and pluralistic ecosystem of data that can effectively monitor peace, justice and inclusion in the 2030 Agenda.

Advantages of using alternative data:

- ♦ Helps to close data gaps
- ♦ Can offer qualitative data for a more robust analysis of existing quantitative data
- ♦ Unveils the reality of those furthest behind and those difficult to reach with official statistics
- ♦ Improves transparency and accountability

Recommendations to improve data availability and use alternative data	
Need for quality data	NSOs can work together with data producers to develop commonly accepted guidelines and methodology for data collection. NSOs can also train partners to ensure that the data collected will comply with the required quality standards. It is also important to acknowledge that alternative data sources can offer robust methodologies and quality tools for data collection.
Scalability and representativeness of data	While scalability and representativeness of data are important to tell the full story and draw general conclusions, community-specific data can still be very relevant for SDG monitoring, particularly to provide in-depth information on those who are left behind. Donors can help overcome technical challenges and capacity for data collection by supporting such initiatives.
Building a plural ecosystem of data	Investing time and resources in building an adequate and plural ecosystem of data in the country can enable a more complete overview for SDG monitoring. → Through an inclusive and participatory process, identify which governmental and non-governmental sources can contribute with data collection, analysis and dissemination. These might include, for example, NSOs, government institutions, CSOs, NHRIs, private sector, media. → Define clear roles, clarify processes, build capacity of relevant actors for quality data collection and identify the needs of final users to make the data more relevant.
Building trust in the data ecosystem	Building trust between official and alternative data producers and users is key, particularly in countries with limited civic space. NHRIs, for example, can facilitate spaces for open dialogue between the parties and can help

	create a transparent and conducive process to define clear roles and coordinate contributions from all relevant actors.
Communication and usage of data	Identify and work with key infomediaries (e.g., media, civil society, academia) to analyse, digest and disseminate the data in accessible and useful format for users (e.g., policymakers, SDG coordination mechanisms, the general public).

Key resources and good practices to help address challenges of data availability and use of alternative data

CEPEI, a think tank based in Colombia, joined efforts with four organizations to carry out the initiative 'Unidos por los ODS: El aporte de nuestras empresas' (United by the SDGs: contributions from our companies), a project that sought to measure the contribution of companies for the SDGs by making visible the initiatives and actions of companies but also providing information for decision-making within the organizations. The initiative analysed data from 21 companies of seven economic sectors and produced a report on 16 out of the 17 SDGs. They shared anonymized information with the national government on five SDGs connected to environmental topics for the VNR presented by Colombia in 2018.

The Leave No One Behind project is a partnership of 12 international civil society organizations that uses community-driven data to fill knowledge gaps in local level SDG monitoring and better understand local drivers of vulnerability and marginalisation. In 2018, the partnership set up national coalitions in five pilot countries (Bangladesh, India, Kenya, Nepal, and Vietnam), bringing together national NGOs and civic platforms, as well as community-based organizations.

Transparency International (TI) developed a Methodology for Shadow Reporting that helps assess progress of and report on implementation of three SDG targets with Tier 2 and 3 indicators, linked to anti-corruption and government transparency: 16.5 and 16.10 (Tier 2) and 16.4 (Tier 3). As of today, 43 national TI chapters developed such reports.

The platform UK data for Sustainable Development Goal indicators is an open data website developed by the UK Office for National Statistics (ONS) to facilitate access to SDG data to citizens, analysts and other concerned actors. Countries interested in developing a similar platform can find guidance on their website and "create a copy of it" for free. Alternative data is welcome on the website and, at the time of writing, the UK ONS is creating quality criteria for accepting data from alternative sources.

The Global State of Democracy Indices depict democratic trends at the country, regional and global levels across 28 aspects of democracy, since 1975 (updated annually). Managed by International IDEA (Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance), the indices measure the democratic performance of 158 countries around the world and help monitor progress on eight of the 17 Sustainable Development Goals. The indices are aggregated from 97 indicators, drawn from 11 different datasets.

The Indigenous Navigator[7] is a participatory data collection project that seeks to provide quality data on indigenous peoples' human rights and development situation. The framework is aligned with the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and the Sustainable Development Goals to inform policymaking processes in these areas and to ensure that indigenous peoples are not left behind in the implementation process.

2.2. National Data Partnerships: Good Practices in Denmark and Kenya

DENMARK

Statistics Denmark (the National Statistical Office, NSO) has adopted a collaborative approach to monitoring progress on the SDGs and regularly convenes a broad range of stakeholders to contribute with new perspectives on SDG monitoring. Civil society organizations, rights-holders, the National Human Rights Institution (DIHR) and others, have also been invited to contribute with the development of national SDG indicators to complement Denmark's monitoring efforts.

Non-governmental actors are calling on the NSO to improve use of data from alternative sources in SDG monitoring, including data produced by civil society on, e.g., issues related to civil space, participation and equality. On the other hand, the NSO is striving to ensure agreement on the criteria for data collection and use, including on quality of data, comparability and continuity of the data being collected. To mention a concrete example of collaboration, in the elaboration of Denmark's 2017 VNR, DIHR submitted data on human rights education (SDG 4.7); on the existence of a Paris Principles-Compliant NHRI (indicator 16.a.1); and on the situation of people living with disability to complement existing aggregated data on selected indicators under Goals 8, 10, 11 and 16. All available SDG data is displayed at Denmark's SDG Data portal.

KENYA

In 2016, innovative discussions began on potential cooperation between the Kenya National Commission on Human Rights (KNCHR) and the Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS). These discussions led to an initial workshop in 2017, organized by the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), with participation from KNBS and KNCHR and technical advice from DIHR. Among other things, one of the key aims of the workshop was to identify key data gaps and opportunities for further collaboration.

Concentrating on Goals 10 and 16, the workshop participants agreed on the relevance and on the possibility to focus on specific indicators where there are gaps, as well as coming up with a list of 26 groups in Kenya at risk of being left behind in SDG implementation. The workshop resulted in the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between KNCHR and KNBS in July 2017 for purposes of strengthening data collection, disaggregation, dissemination and analysis in light of human rights and the 2030 Agenda. Currently, the work under this MoU has two main strands:

1. Development of a methodology for data collection, disaggregation and dissemination related to four indicators of Goal 16, in compliance with international statistical and human rights standards and methodologies. The indicators in focus are 16.1.1, 16.1.3, 16.3.1 and 16.10.1.
2. Collection of disaggregated data on specific groups in Kenya – notably persons with albinism and intersex persons.

To cite a specific example – there are many different data sources for gathering data that is relevant for monitoring the violence aspects of SDG 16 in Kenya, including official data, data from KNCHR and data from the media and civil society. The NSO only recognizes data generated with a methodology it can approve, and this is a challenge in the NSO-NHRI collaboration. However, in Kenya, there has been a shift from 'Who collects the data?' to 'How the data is collected?'.

As part of the national picture, the Kenya SDG Forum – a coalition of civil society and other organizations – has a specific project aimed at generating an overview of the SDGs data ecosystem in Kenya, focusing on data produced by selected county governments as well as civil

society organizations. This includes data collected by official and non-official data producers, tools and methodologies used for data collection and the main data producers (and users) of the data. Based on this mapping, the Forum is developing a set of recommendations on how to build an integrated multi-stakeholder approach to SDGs monitoring in Kenya.

2.3. Data Disaggregation and Measuring Equality and Non-Discrimination to Leave No One Behind

Leaving no one behind requires going beyond the aggregated numbers to assess the situation of those who are often hidden (invisible) behind the average numbers of aggregated data. It requires being specific about population groups and their vulnerabilities, which also means measuring the multiple and intersecting forms of inequality and discrimination that affect their lives.

The global SDG indicators reflect an overall lack of understanding on how to measure equality and discrimination, which is key to ensuring peaceful, just and inclusive societies and to leaving no one behind. For example, the structural elements of measuring equality (which could measure e.g., the existence and quality of laws, policies and processes to enforce existing equality-laws and policies) are not measured in SDG 16.b and SDG 10.3, which address critical issues of discrimination in the 2030 Agenda and have great impact on efforts to leave no one behind.

Monitoring SDG 16+ from an equalities and non-discrimination perspective can offer significant advantages to understanding which groups being left behind, what the structural constraints preventing them from moving forward are and what needs to be done to remove existing barriers. Most SDG indicators are outcome indicators and, indeed, it is easier to measure equality of outcome than discrimination itself. For the purpose of measuring equality of outcome, data disaggregation is the principal method. To that end, it is crucial to collect adequate disaggregated data, as well as to use human rights data and recommendations to help identify those who are not part of official data records (i.e., refugees and asylum-seekers).

International human rights law offers a framework for doing this. Human rights standards provide guidance concerning disaggregation of data as they outline several 'prohibited grounds of discrimination' that go beyond the suggested areas of disaggregation in the 2030 Agenda. The recommendations from human rights supervisory bodies also point to gaps in the availability of data for specific groups that are effectively left behind and make recommendations for addressing those gaps. This can help make SDG monitoring data more pertinent to feed constructively into policy and programming responses.

The [Equal Rights Trust](#) is developing a tool to measure aspects of equality in the 2030 Agenda, particularly for SDG 16.b and SDG 10.3, with a view to leave no one behind (forthcoming).

Measuring discrimination is complex and the indicator for 16.b.1 is not necessarily adequate to measure discrimination. Some statistical offices (e.g., in the UK) are using proxy indicators such as 'victims of hate crime' to produce data for this indicator, but it does not cover the full scope of what should be measured. Measuring the perception of discrimination is extremely difficult and cannot provide a full measurement of discrimination.

Another challenge of measuring equality and non-discrimination in the global indicator framework is the lack of structural and process indicators. The existence of adequate structures (legal frameworks) and processes (programmes, training, budgets, etc.) is crucial. Addressing

discrimination is very complex and takes a lot more than just legislating. Again, human rights recommendations can provide detailed guidance in this regard.

Good Practices on Data Disaggregation
As a practice, the **UK Office of National Statistics** (UK ONS) ensures that people or groups concerned by the characteristics and/or grounds of discrimination in question are consulted when relevant surveys are being designed and tested. The UK ONS is also engaged in ongoing partnerships with other countries to support the development of action plans to improve the level of data disaggregation to leave no one behind. Their open source website (see here) offers instructions and methods on how to collect disaggregated data and helps country displaying the information online.
Kenya National Commission on Human Rights (KNCHR) and the Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS) have worked on disaggregated data to measure the situation of specific groups at risk of being left behind in Kenya. At a joint OHCHR-KNBS-KNCHR workshop in 2017, participants identified a total of 26 groups in Kenya at risk of being left behind. For example, noting the vulnerabilities of intersex children, children from indigenous communities, and those who were stateless, the KNCHR asked that they were included in the census. For the first time, the census tool included a third category of gender as opposed to the usual two of male of female: intersex.

Key challenges and recommendations identified by the participants to data disaggregation and to measuring equality and non-discrimination to leave no one behind	
Difficulties to measure perception of discrimination	The concept of discrimination is not always clear to those being surveyed. Therefore, instead of using the word "discrimination" in surveys, it might help to ask people to self-identify and ask questions about preferential treatment in their own context.
Methodologies and capacity for disaggregation	There is no shortage of civil society-led monitoring and data collection tools, as well as of robust methodology for data collection. Those must be recognized by states and UN custodian agencies in their efforts to reach those furthest behind and, whenever needed, actors must work together to bring this data to standards to leverage civil society's specific knowledge of and access to vulnerable communities for quality and disaggregated data collection.
States have limited capacity to assess equality and non-discrimination	International human rights law organizations, NHRIs and civil society track states' implementation of international norms and standards related to equality and non-discrimination and are valuable sources of information to guide states to ensure no one is left behind. Use them!
Scale at which data is collected and disaggregated	Collaborations need to be in place to support statistical authorities to extend reach to marginalized communities that they do not usually reach. Samples size of data collection for smaller organizations means that data cannot be representative, which is an issue if you want to extrapolate

	from this to draw general conclusions. Need to supplement data with smaller scale surveys and qualitative information to explain the statistics
Accuracy of disaggregated data	Stigmatized and criminalized population groups (e.g., LGBTI, ethnic minorities) might be reluctant to self-identify in data collection. Data protection rules and other safety measures must apply to safeguard the affected populations against further discrimination and danger due to the collection of disaggregated data.
New technologies	Provided that there are clear rules for data protection and clear methodology for data analysis, there is potential in exploring the use of technology for data collection to, for example, help track discrimination online: e.g., by using an algorithm to track hate speech; and using crowd-sourced text for reporting.

2.4.   Nationalization of SDG 16+ Indicators

Measuring progress of the 2030 Agenda with only global indicators is not sufficient; countries need to nationalize the SDG indicators according to their national contexts. Global indicators were a political consensus – in many cases, the lowest common denominator. Through the process of nationalization, other elements could be included and prioritized. National indicators need to be technically valid, sustainable and based on transparent methodology, with focus on outcome, structure and process.

NSOs can play an important role in maintaining sustainability of the monitoring framework at the national level and in securing an adequate combination of global and national indicators to ensure that all-important aspects of SDG 16+ achievement are adequately measured. Building ownership in the indicator nationalization process is essential.

> Good Practice on Nationalization of Indicators

> **'Our Goals' project in Denmark** aims to define national indicators by June 2020. Through an inclusive process and with consultative workshops in different regions of Denmark, a wide range of stakeholders – including citizens, civil society, the private sector and researchers – is invited to collectively bring the SDGs to the Danish context. The project, managed by Statistics Denmark, has been created by the independent "2030 Panel", which advises and helps members of the Danish Parliament in their work with the SDGs.

Countries are facing different challenges and taking specific approaches to the nationalization of SDG indicators in their own context, but there is no overview of these experiences. While there is need for a comprehensive systematization of good practices and more opportunities to exchange experiences on this, here is a brief overview from participants' exchange on this topic:

♦ In Tunisia, the legal framework creates barriers to using global indicators in relation to, for instance, gender equality and inheritance rights.

- Kenya established its priorities for national indicators based on available methodology, resources and data. For example, they are limited by the lack of resources and expertise in relation to perception surveys.
- Cape Verde is challenged by its broad territory, which is spread over 10 islands. This requires special skills to develop nationally relevant indicators and increases the cost of data collection.
- Sweden has developed national indicators but faces key challenges to elaborate questions and determine what can be asked/collected in relation to, e.g., sexual orientation.
- In Korea, the municipalities have stepped up in the localization of the Agenda even before the national SDG Working Group concluded a nationalization process.
- Senegal is currently starting the nationalization process and is striving to find balance between priorities from central government and from municipalities. UNDP supported the integration of SDG guidance in all ministries and then moved to the local level.
- Serbia conducted a survey (The World We Want) to identify the SDG priorities for the country. They found a divide between priorities from northern and southern area and have decided to work with the respective priorities in each region, instead of imposing a national view.

Key highlights related to the process of nationalizing SDG indicators	
Global versus national indicators	There is no battle between global and national indicators – they complement each other. What matters is that the countries have good and relevant indicators for the national context.
Indicator baskets	It can be strategic to create "indicator baskets" (a set of related complementary indicators measuring different aspects of the same target) for a more complete overview of progress.
Measure what you treasure	Countries are encouraged to prioritize in order to make the SDGs meaningful to their context, and the same applies to national indicators. Furthermore, efforts must be made to measure what is important, not just what is available.
Outcome, process and structural indicators	Most global indicators focus only on outcome; nationalization processes create an opportunity to complement the monitoring frameworks with indicators that measure the existence, adequacy and effectiveness of structures and processes to achieve the expected outcomes.[8]
Perception indicators	Some SDG targets are measured with perception indicators. As revolutionary as they can be, is it important to acknowledge that they are shaped by the cultural conditions and the level of knowledge and education of respondents. Not only do the survey questions need to be carefully designed to capture the best level of information, but they need complementary indicators to measure process, structure and objective outcomes.

3. Institutionalization of National SDG 16+ Monitoring:

An assessment from OHCHR shows that there are no global standards on how countries institutionalize their SDG coordination mechanisms for implementation, monitoring, reporting and follow-up. The lack of institutionalized structures can hinder the performance of inter-institutional coordination and can be confusing and overwhelming for relevant stakeholders from governmental and non-governmental institutions to engage.

	Tips to improve the institutionalization of SDG 16+ monitoring
✔	Create spaces for robust inclusive dialogues and peer learnings around the preparation and follow-up of Voluntary National Reviews (VNRs), with clear rules and procedures, as well as agreed roles and responsibilities for participating actors;
✔	Build on synergies and improve coordination with existing monitoring mechanisms to leverage data, reduce the reporting burden and establish coherent priorities in the country, e.g., building on human rights recommendations; → National Mechanisms for Reporting and follow-up on human rights (so-called NMRFs) deserve attention due to the high degree of convergence between SDG 16+ and international human rights obligations. → National human rights recommendations tracking databases, when aligned with the SDGs (such as the National Recommendations Tracking Database developed by OHCHR or the SIMORE Plus developed by Paraguay with assistance from OHCHR), can help states follow up and review the implementation of human rights and SDGs in a coherent and simplified manner.
✔	Establish institutionalized structures to follow up on the VNRs, acknowledging the roles of governments, civil society, and other actors in addressing the identified monitoring gaps and implementation challenges. This might include joint reviews of the indicator frameworks, with baselines and progress, and joint formulation of policy and programme responses;
✔	Consider institutionalizing a periodic tracking of progress on SDG 16+ based on open and accessible data reporting platforms (periodic scorecards).

4. Voluntary National Reviews

VNRs are labour-intensive, but it is a beneficial process, for it brings the policy and statistics communities together. If done well, the VNRs are an instrument to help build relations across government.

4.1. Overview of Current Status of SDG 16 Reporting in VNRs

An analysis conducted by TAP Network and GIZ provides an overview of how countries have been reporting on SDG 16 in their VNRs. The preliminary findings show that countries recognize the overall importance of SDG 16 in VNRs and most countries refer to measures that are relevant to

SDG 16 (e.g., institutional changes, reform processes etc.). Nonetheless, official reports tend to hold on to using only official data (which are insufficient), and strategic approaches to report on SDG 16 are rare.

It has been observed that VNRs are increasing reference to SDG 16 data, though they often focus on procedural aspects and snapshots. Further, most countries that reported on SDG 16 were in fragile situations and it remains a challenge to motivate other countries to conduct a thorough report on SDG 16 issues. In summary, the overall challenges to reporting on SDG 16 include low statistical capacity in official statistical offices; limited financial and human resources; and insufficient inclusion of complementary data sources.

4.2. Key Observations Related to VNR Reporting

♦ The VNR system at the HLPF is not conducive for accountability. Countries rarely follow the VNR guidelines and report on selected issues at a time, making it difficult to compare progress between different generations of VNRs from a country. There must be continuity between VNRs;

♦ In addition to showcasing accomplishments, VNRs must focus on challenges, gaps, and steps forward;

♦ Government must build/strengthen partnerships with civil society, private sector and NHRIs to address data gaps in VNRs;

♦ When relevant and possible, VNRs should acknowledge and incorporate content of civil society reports; at a minimum, the VNRs should reference spotlight reports;

♦ Member States need support to understand how reporting on SDG 16+ links to their other existing reporting obligations;

♦ The revised UN Secretary General's Voluntary Common Reporting Guidelines on VNRs emphasize the need for broad participation and for alignment with human rights reporting. These guidelines complement the Global Alliance Guidance on SDG 16 reporting;

♦ There are encouraging examples of how civil society is engaging in VNR processes nationally and how its views and recommendations are reflected in reports, presentations, and policies. As a result, spotlight reports tend to be more positive where governments have involved civil society in the VNR process;

♦ Civil society also faces challenge of self-coordination and it needs to improve its collective action to meaningfully contribute to VNR process.

5. Engaging Stakeholders: A Recollection of Tools & Practices

Key Highlights	
Tool: Analytical framework to measure stakeholder engagement by the UNDP Oslo Governance Centre	The UNDP Oslo Governance Centre is developing an analytical framework to measure stakeholder engagement, both from the perspectives of the government and of civil society. It could be used either as an accountability tool (holding others to account) or a self-assessment tool (assessing an organization's own efforts).[9]
Consultative Council of Budget and Public	The Consultative Council of Budget and Public Expenditure of the Mexican state of Yucatan monitors the government's expenditure, with representation of civil society. It ensures a participatory and

Expenditure of Yucatan, Mexico	representative decision-making process in the management of public finances of the state by including in the discussion different sectors of society (government, entrepreneurs, academy, civil society organizations). It also monitors the data of the public finances and the way it takes part in the Result-Based Budgeting model.[10]
Stakeholder engagement in Bangladesh	In Bangladesh, the government has assigned responsibility for each SDG to the relevant public entities and agencies. Each of them holds consultations with key stakeholders' groups, including CSOs, and correlates its inputs for programming and VNRs. The identification of key stakeholders is, though, still a challenge: the process is channelled through political and religious groups, which might not recognize certain marginalized groups in their consultations (e.g., religious groups will not consult with LGBTI+ groups). Transparency and accountability for the stakeholder engagement process must be strengthened to ensure that the principle of leaving no one behind in the national consultations is fully upheld.
Commitment to human rights improves private sector contribution to the 2030 Agenda	Like many other companies, Novo Nordisk (NN) has committed to follow the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (UNGPs). According to the 2030 Agenda, this is key to protect labour rights and environmental and health standards, while fostering businesses' creativity and innovation to solving sustainable development challenges. NN undergoes external evaluation to identify gaps and receive recommendations on how to best live up to its commitments, which has resulted e.g., in developing an internal Labour Code of Conduct. To enhance accountability, NN publicizes its internal data (e.g., gender disparity in management), and it is currently working on linking its UNGPs commitments with the SDGs to facilitate assessments of its impact and contribution to the 2030 Agenda.

6. Highlights from Working Group Discussions on Selected SDG 16+ Targets

6.1. Monitoring Responsive, Inclusive, Participatory and Representative Decision-Making

Key Highlights	
Indicators of SDG 16.7 do not reflect all the aspects of participation and civic space	The conditions for civic space are deteriorating around the world, with only 3 percent of the world's population living in countries where civic space is completely open. It is vital to be able to measure if the enabling conditions to achieve participation and open civic space are in place. Structural and process indicators are key for that, and there is various guidance for developing such indicators, including from human rights bodies and civil society.

	→ CIVICUS and IDEA have databases related to civic space, participation that can be used to fill some of the existing monitoring gaps.
Space for alternative views at the UN and in the VNRs	The HLPF is still seen by most governments as a 'showcase', which is partially supported by the fact that VNRs lack space for critique and constructive participation from actors other than governments. It is imperative that the HLPF offer a consistently inclusive format, particularly in VNR presentations. The UN human rights monitoring mechanisms have good examples[11] to offer and can guide the HLPF and other UN processes towards more inclusive and participatory processes.
Discrimination	Understanding how discrimination impacts on participation is key to understanding the formal and informal barriers faced by some groups. For example, one cannot expect LGBTI groups to participate in disaggregated data collection efforts in a country were homosexuality is criminalized. Likewise, persons with disabilities cannot participate in SDG meetings if the appropriate tools for accessibility are not made available to them.
Resource	CIVICUS Monitor tracks the situation of civic space across the globe. According to this resource, only 3 percent of the world's population live in countries where civic space is open, while 40 percent live where the civic space is repressed and 27 percent live where the civic space is closed.

6.2. Monitoring Violence

Key Highlights	
Peaceful societies	There is not enough dedication to SDG 16+ in VNRs, particularly for issues related to peaceful societies and multi-stakeholder approaches. Further, the global indicators covering these aspects in the 2030 Agenda are in its majority still Tier II or III (of the 14 targets related to peaceful societies, only one (5.3) has Tier I indicators (see Visualization of SDG16+ Monitoring Initiatives).
Youth engagement	Engaging youth and recognizing their role as change-makers is key to reducing violence and monitoring achievements in this area. This can be done through education, awareness-raising and local initiatives. Online tools have a high potential for effective engagement of youth.
Alternative data	Alternative data based on sound indicators and survey methodologies has a high potential for generating meaningful conversations with governments around sensitive issues that are otherwise hard to discuss openly and constructively at local and national levels.

	Developing scorecards of progress on implementation of peaceful societies can help make the data more visible and considered by governments.
Disaggregated data	Data disaggregation is needed. For example, there is a huge spectrum of different forms of violence experienced by different categories of LGBTI people, including physical, psychological and medical violence.

6.3.   Monitoring Corruption

Key Highlights	
Underlining challenges	Corruption is a complex issue difficult to capture in traditional data, e.g., some practices considered corrupted are not against the law, which challenges data collection. It needs objective and subjective indicators to measure issues of trust (perception) and experiences (reality). Due to its complexity, the data must be treated with a degree of caution – reported numbers on corruption and perception-based measures can be misleading.
Gap in data collection	Data on corruption often does not reflect the challenges of data collection (and the consequences of this reality) involving the most vulnerable parties who cannot or do not feel comfortable sharing information.
Good practice	Tunisia's plan for national action on corruption is based on a study from a business think tank that showed that the four most corrupt sectors are police, customs, health and local authorities. Using the "islands of integrity approach", they hope to reduce corruption by focusing on specific sectors and looking at the perception of citizens on quality of the services rendered.
Resource	→ Monitoring corruption can be overwhelming for NSOs. Further, due to gaps in data available, governments cannot be the only ones responsible for reporting. Civil society organizations, e.g., Transparency International, offer robust data and standards that provide critical contributions to the matter. See Corruption Perception Index and Corruption Perception Barometer. → The Sustainable Development Through Human Rights Due Diligence tool from DIHR has a list of salient human rights issues relevant in SDG implementation and monitoring. The tool includes real examples and good practices of company actions to address tax and anti-corruption in their practice.

6.4. Monitoring Access to Information and Fundamental Freedoms

Key Highlights	
Relevance of access to information	Public access to information (SDG 16.10) is an essential requirement to achieve the 2030 Agenda pledge for effective, accountable and inclusive public institutions. Nonetheless, there is an increasing imbalance between 1) the data that is collected about citizens by private and public actors and 2) the ability of citizens to access and use that information and data themselves.
Using the human rights system to complement monitoring of fundamental freedoms	The global indicators do not always translate the full ambition of the targets. Fundamental freedoms extend far beyond the two indicators of SDG 16.10 and must include measuring the levels of freedom e.g., of expression, religion and belief, assembly and association. This is key issue for the human rights system and efforts to monitor SDG 16.10 can benefit from the guidance, knowledge and data produced by it. → Make use of output (monitoring) and input (stakeholder participation) functions of human rights system: (re-)use stakeholder reports from SDG context for consultation procedures under Human Rights Council (HRC); and use human rights monitoring info to feed and/or contest VNRs.
Good practices: Voces del Sur	Civil society organizations play a key role in monitoring safety of journalists. → Voces del Sur is a project of CSOs from 10 countries in Latin America promoting and protecting freedom of expression and access to information in the region. They developed standard indicators for data collection on 12 relevant aspects of SDG 16.10, covering issues related to violence, legislation, and judiciary systems. → The report 'Road to 2030: Access to Information in the driver's seat"' seeks to measure progress on the implementation of access to information laws, based on a CSO's approach. The report analyses the VNRs from 10 countries and the process included consultative multi-stakeholder meetings in five countries and the use of a CSO-driven methodology to gather and analyse data on access to information to document progress of public authorities on SDG target 16.10.
Resource	UNESCO, the custodian agency for 16.10.2 and contributor to 16.10.1, publishes an annual report on the status of, and additional research on, access to information and the situation of journalists.

7. Observations About Key Actors in the Implementation and Monitoring of SDG 16+

The vast scope and complex nature of SDG 16+ call for concerted action among governments, NSOs, NHRIs, civil society, the private sector and the UN in its implementation and monitoring. While each actor has specific roles to play, accelerated change can only be achieved through seeking and developing synergies.

7.1. Governments

Governments are the main duty-bearers under SDG 16+, including regarding adequate and accurate reporting.

Need for leadership: Understanding that SDG 16+ is central to achieving the 2030 Agenda pledge to leave no one behind through participatory, accountable, inclusive, transparent and effective institutions, it is imperative to have strong political vision and leadership to bring implementation and monitoring of SDG 16+ to global priority. We need pioneers among governments. Can Global Alliance Member States take the lead?

Coalitions: There is an opportunity to explore synergies with other initiatives of like-minded states (e.g., Group of Friends on Human Rights and the 2030 Agenda under the Human Rights Council, the Community of Democracies and others). It would be useful to develop and strengthen coalitions of pioneer states in SDG 16+ implementation and monitoring.

7.2. National Statistical Offices

NSOs play a central role in monitoring SDG 16+, including by scaling up the production of governance statistics. NSOs require institutional strength, resources and independence to stand up for data.

Expanding role of NSOs: NSOs are not only the producers of data; they can also act as conveners, curators and capacity-builders of the data ecosystem that is needed to adequately monitor SDG 16+. NSOs play a quality assurance and clearinghouse role with regards to including alternative data in official data repository.

Institutional support: There should be more donor funding for NSOs as well as specific statistical offices in each of the lead ministries pertaining to SDG 16.

Positive examples: There are encouraging examples of NSOs facilitating platforms to present data, including alternative data (e.g., the UK), establishing data partnerships with NHRIs (through Memorandum of Understanding) and civil society, with UN support (e.g., Kenya and Denmark), and stepping up for governance statistics (e.g., Cape Verde) and data on corruption (e.g., Tunisia).

7.3. National Human Rights Institutions

NHRIs play a unique role in the integrated implementation and monitoring of human rights and SDGs. They can bridge national and international dimensions, as well as government and civil society. Further, some NHRIs handle individual complaints, allowing them to be early warning mechanisms on conflict prevention, and to be effective redress mechanisms and data sources for sustainable development.

HRBA to SDGs: NHRIs can provide a human rights-based approach to the SDGs, creating an environment for social inclusion and helping states increase coherence and efficiency in the delivery of their international commitments.

NHRIs as data providers: NHRIs can contribute with data on e.g., civic space, discrimination, inequality, fundamental freedoms, and violence.

NHRI and indicators: If there is capacity, some of the indicators that do not 'politically' survive global and national processes and that can be relevant to monitor human rights-related aspects of the SDGs, could be taken up by NHRIs.

Catalytic institutional indicator: The existence of an independent NHRIs in compliance with the Paris Principles is an indicators for strong institutions (16.a.1) and speaks to the catalytic effect of NHRIs for the implementation of the entire 2030 Agenda. Currently, there are 76 A-status NHRIs in the world.

7.4. Civil Society

Since the moment of its conceptualization, civil society has been a driving force for the 2030 Agenda. Without civil society, we could not aspire to achieve SDG 16+. Civil society brings an enormous contribution to SDG 16+ implementation and monitoring and it plays a crucial role in holding governments to account vis-à-vis their international obligations and commitments. This is particularly necessary when it comes to measuring government/state performance – which is at the essence of SDG 16+.

The power of engagement: Engagement is an invaluable contribution to strengthening accountability. There is tremendous value in the discussion itself – in the engagement of people, communities, and institutions from all walks of life having their voices heard, being empowered through self-assessment and realizing their contribution to the sustainable development of their countries. Perhaps there lie some elements for long-lasting change.

Civil society coordination: Shadow and spotlight reports are entry points for civil society to take action. There needs to be more sharing and learning from each other. It could be useful to have harmonized guidance and tools, as well as a go-to platform compiling all these resources, which would facilitate the sharing of good practices.

→ Resource: TI has developed a parallel reporting tool for SDGs 16.4, 16.5, 16. 6 and 16.10 (page 10)

→ Resource and good practice: TAP Network developed the SDG Accountability Handbook, a practical resource for civil society to improve SDG implementation, monitoring and accountability. TAP also collects and showcases civil society Spotlight reports on SDG 16.

Engaging with parliaments: The buy-in of parliaments is key to ensuring relevant policies and legislations. It may be a good strategy for civil society to engage directly with parliamentarians, central governments, and line ministries.

Youth: Engaging youth and recognizing their role as change-makers is key to change. We need less petrified mind-sets and more open dialogue.

7.5. Private Sector

Though companies have great impact on the direct implementation (or hindering) of the 2030 Agenda and on its financing, the involvement of business in SDGs processes is a persistent challenge. Among other things, companies need to look at their practices to ensure that they do no harm (e.g., by following the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights) and that they play a role in ensuring that countries around the world recognize the importance of civil society and enable civic space.

Win-win: It is useful to improve understanding of tangible benefits for the private sector as a result of engaging with the SDGs.

→ **Positive example:** In Uganda, the engagement with up to 30 companies to improve internal disparities (e.g., equal gender representativeness in senior management and in the work force) has

proven to contribute to productivity levels. In turn, these companies are now more proactive in engaging in discussion/initiatives around the SDGs, but only after having realized its relevance for their own internal needs.[12]

Trust and engagement: Building trust between the private sector and other SDG actors (e.g., governments and civil society) is necessary.

→ **Tip:** Leverage organizations and networks of private sector (e.g., the UN Global Compact, the Chamber of Commerce) to build on the relationship with companies and their willingness to work within global guidelines and contribute with global goals.

→ **Tip:** A way to engage local private sector entities is, if it is multinational, to approach their headquarters so they can either encourage or assist the national branches to engage.

Idea: Why not produce business reporting for the HLPF (as a kind of parallel reporting) to measure impact and contribution of private sector to the SDGs, as well identify challenges faced by the sector in its implementation? Data from businesses can be used for their own reporting but should also feed into VNRs.

→ **Positive example:** Unidos por los ODS (page 10)

7.6.   The United Nations

There are numerous examples of UNDP, OHCHR, UNSD and UNODC providing guidance, opening spaces and facilitating dialogue at national, regional and global levels on monitoring SDG 16.

Various UN agencies act as custodian agencies for SDG 16+ indicators, developing metadata for indicators and helping countries to collect data. UNDP is the custodian agency for indicators 16.6.2 (satisfaction with public services), 16.7.1 (proportion of positions in the public service and the judiciary) and 16.7.2 (inclusive and responsive decision-making). OHCHR is in the lead on indicators 10.3.1, 16.b.1 (discrimination), 16.1.2 (conflict-related deaths), 16.10.1 (violence against journalists, trade unionists and human rights advocates) and 16.a.1 (NHRIs). UNODC is responsible for 16.1.1 (intentional homicide), 16.1.3 (violence), 16.1.4 (feeling safe), 16.2.2 (human trafficking), 16.3.1 (reporting victimization), 16.3.2 (unsentenced detainees), 16.4.1 (illicit financial flows), 16.4.2 (illicit arms), 16.5.1 (personal corruption) and 16.5.2 (business corruption).

The Global Alliance for Reporting Progress on Peaceful, Just and Inclusive Societies is a coordinating platform for UN Member States, private sector, civil society, and UN agencies to promote and strengthen evidence-based reporting, monitoring and measurement of SDG 16. The co-facilitation secretariat consists of seven UN agencies, hosted by UNDP along with OHCHR, UNODC, UNESCO, UNHCR, UN Women and the UN Global Compact. Several important partnership initiatives that fall under the umbrella of the Global Alliance hope to make a significant impact in the monitoring of SDG 16.

→ How to monitor SDG 16 in an inclusive and sustained manner at the country level is a question that many countries continue to grapple with. The Global Alliance is working with more than 14 countries directly to make sure the monitoring of SDG 16 includes key stakeholder groups, including a diversity of data producers. The Global Alliance continues to harness best practices from local, subnational and national dialogues to the global level, as was done with the Global Alliance SDG 16+ report.

→ The Global Alliance is updating its VNR Guidance on reporting on SDG 16+ to support Member States in taking a whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach to the VNR process through the lens of SDG 16 and encourages its use in national development planning processes.

→ UNODC, OHCHR and UNDP as SDG 16 custodian agencies are developing an SDG 16 questionnaire covering 12 SDG 16+ global survey-based indicators. To ease the task of national statistics offices having to monitor these survey-based indicators as part of their reporting on SDG 16, the SDG 16 survey provides for dedicated modules to be included in ongoing data collection programmes of household surveys. The modules have been developed by building on the expertise of the UN agencies and measurement experts from civil society. The SDG 16 survey also includes a module on access to justice to enable countries to readily report on the new indicator 16.3.3 (Proportion of those who experienced a legal problem in the last two years who could access appropriate information or expert help and were able to resolve the problem). Countries can run the full questionnaire or select add on modules.

→ The Global Alliance is building a stronger multi-stakeholder network between those involved in monitoring elements of SDG 16+ and using this network to collectively push for action.

Key highlights:

Leading by example: In the context of UN reform, Regional Coordinators and UN Country Teams have been given more responsibility and made more accountable for joint action. This may be an entry point to enhance UN-system coordination.

→ **Tip:** Align UN programming with states' human rights obligations and SDG commitments, using recommendations of human rights mechanisms to define SDG priorities. The recommendations can be used as an entry point for the UN System collectively to support governments on VNR reports.

Expanding data sources: The UN can coalesce different data creators with government to help connect the data gaps.

Endnotes

[1] Global Alliance, "White & Case Review of the 2019 Voluntary National Reports and SDG 16 (VNRs)", Summary Report https://www.sdg16hub.org/content/global-alliance-white-case-review-2019-voluntary-national-reports-vnrs-summary-report

[2] Learn more about the UPR: https://www.ohchr.org/en/hrbodies/upr/pages/uprmain.aspx

[3] Learn more about the Treaty Bodies: https://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/Pages/TreatyBodies.aspx

[4] Learn more about the Special Procedures:
https://www.ohchr.org/en/hrbodies/sp/pages/welcomepage.aspx

[5] Read more at https://www.daghammarskjold.se/publication/leveraging-human-rights-mechanisms-to-improve-global-sdg-follow-up/

[6] http://ine.cv/praiagroup/

[7] The data portal is currently undergoing redevelopment and will be up and running again towards the end of 2020. Meanwhile, the methodology, indicators and other info can be explored at https://navigator.humanrights.dk

[8] Read more at Indicators and Data for Human Rights and Sustainable Development:
https://www.humanrights.dk/publications/indicators-data-human-rights-sustainable-development

[9] Presentation by Julia Kercher (UNDP Oslo Governance Centre) at the Workshop.

[10] Presentation by Jonathan Jiménez Mendoza (Yucatán State Government, Mexico) at the Workshop.

[11] Leveraging Human Rights Mechanisms to Improve SDG Follow-up and Review:
https://www.daghammarskjold.se/publication/leveraging-human-rights-mechanisms-to-improve-global-sdg-follow-up/

[12] Presentation by Francesca Akello (UNDP Uganda) at the Workshop.