Key points

- Key findings from indicators report
    - o Reiterate G16 – and peace – can be measured
    - o Examples of how being done already p7
    - o Wanted to measure all the key dimensions of the G16 targets and so identified 19 indicators for 7 targets . More indicators that targets because:
        - ▪ Many targets are trying to do multiple things (arms, IFFs, organised crime)
        - ▪ Some issues like access to justice are best measured using a basket of indicators
    - o Our indicators tried to draw on existing data sets where possible, including from third parties: 12 have relatively comprehensive global data, five have existing data but require more coverage and two are feasible but new indicators.
    - o Also identified further 18 promising indicators: 7 have comprehensive data, six require widening of coverage and five are new.

Stress: we are not talking about indicators here. The key issue needs to be for the international community to agree on the best global indicators. Although it will of course be a consideration, who provides the data for these can be decided afterwards.

Make absolutely clear we understand that NSOs will play a central role.

Summarise the reasons why other people see NSOs as playing a key role:

- NSOs have more experience than others in gathering data that is relevant for the SDGs and Goal 16, including for example on administrative issues.
- Data on the development of our societies is a public good: it makes sense that public bodies produce it and that we build their capacity to do so.
- NSOs potentially more sustainable over the long-term, they're around for the long-term
- NSOs follow the highest methodological standards. They're staffed by professional statisticians.
- Data about a country should be produced and owned by that country. This ownership increases the legitimacy of the data – and the likelihood of its use by policymakers.
- The state will play a central role in driving national-level progress towards meeting the SDGs. Officials require data to guide their policy making, official bodies should be responsible for gathering it.

However, there are drawbacks to a model that overly relies on NSOs, and a number of reasons why their efforts to measure the SDGs should be complemented by third parties – which we see as including intergovernmental organisations, UN agencies, NGOs,

think-tanks, companies and, using new technologies, potentially citizens themselves in the future.

- **Filling data gaps:** Many NSOs don't have enough capacity to monitor the 169 proposed SDG targets – far from it in many parts of the world. This is why the number of global indicators is being restricted, which risks undermining the integrity of the whole framework if only some of the global targets are globally monitored. While one solution might be to consolidate the number of targets, by using data from third parties we can take the burden off NSOs. We can thus ensure that we're measuring all the issues member states have agreed should be included.

- **Applying multi-stakeholder principles consistently:** The private sector is being called upon to help finance the SDGs. UN agencies and civil society groups are being called up for help to implement them. Why should this multi-stakeholder approach not apply to monitoring?

- **Driving innovation:** We desperately need innovation to deepen, widen and cheapen data availability. Innovation will be richest when it involves a diverse range of actors working together as part of an open and dynamic ecosystem of data production. NSOs cannot **deliver such a data revolution** on their own.

- **Methodological rigour:** If third parties follow exactly the same methodological standards as NSOs – and are open to similar levels of scrutiny – then there is every reason to view their data as equally valid. *Important point to stress as Gallup etc not always perceived to be as open.*

- **Broad ownership of data:** Country ownership is about much more than state ownership. Pluralistic data production means data ownership across society. Furthermore, in some countries NSOs are not as impartial as international principles demand that they should be; they're often influenced by political pressure. Concentrating control over the production of data in the hands of state bodies is a particular risk in a world in which we know that some people are persecuted for who they are – especially when this data is disaggregated by social identity. (*Recognise that this is not only an argument in favour of third parties, but is an argument in favour of supporting the independence and autonomy of NSOs. Clear international and regional guidelines on best practice, intl community should support it and be cautious of building capacity where international standards are not being met*)

- **Accountability:** Policymakers not only need data to make decisions, but civil society, opposition politicians, activists and the media need it to hold them to account.

Third party data offers a crucial check and balance that can help ensure that official data portrays the genuine reality within society. More broadly, especially when it comes to issues like justice, the rule of law or human rights, should official bodies be given the sole responsibility for monitoring state performance? Use of a balanced range of sources could be important to build public trust and credibility in the SDGs and how they are being monitored.

- **Public data:** If data produced by third parties is being funded by public finance then it should be open to the public. So can be just as public and open as third parties.

- **Sensitive issues:** Linked to above issue, people *may* be less worried about being honest on some issues when responding to surveys from a non-state actor. E.g. when asked about whether they have paid a bribe or not *(though people often worried about telling third parties too).*

- **Comprehensive approach and central management of global data:** If there is a third party at international level collecting data for one indicator then they will ask the same question and use the same methodology across different countries. If it is each individual NSOs then risks that they do things slightly differently (*although recognise this can be addressed through*

forums like UNSC, Praia Group, etc who are trying to develop common methodologies and approaches)

Ultimately, if a third party can provide data for an indicator which is of equal rigour of NSO, equal impartiality, equal openness to methodology, equal cost, equal sustainability, then why should we not use it?

There may be some specific indicators where third parties should produce some or all of the data instead of NSOs.

For practicality: These include for transnational issues as NSOs can't provide transnational data. E.g. 16.3 (international rule of law), 16.8 global governance and especially 16.4 – e.g: So using its own data, IMF or Global Financial Integrity could calculate illicit financial flows, UNIDIR on arms flows, UNODC on transnational organised crime. Also cases where we might want expert opinion – in which case should be a centralised single actor doing this, for consistency.

Also for politically sensitive issues: corruption (16.5), accountability and openness (16.6), political participation (16.7), human rights and freedoms (16.10) are all target areas that could merit from using data from third parties.

But stress we are simply putting these issues on the table for debate – recognise there are pros and cons of

both approach. Third parties and NSOs have own strengths and weaknesses, but more important is for us to recognise that they face many of the same challenges.

Furthermore, we are facing a situation where supply of data will not meet demand. Further still, public data on development is a non-rival good: NSOs and third parties should be sharing it and working together on it, not competing with one another.

All this means that instead of saying it should be one or the other, and framing the debate along these lines, we should be approaching this whole issue as an issue of partnerships and greater trust between NSOs and third parties.

Could be several dimensions to these partnerships – simply some ideas for discussion:

Filling the gaps in the short-term: where a third party already has (or easily can) produce comprehensive global data for an indicator then let's use it to fill gaps while NSO capacity is being built. UN Stats could go to third parties directly to inform global monitoring reports, or each national NSO could go to the third party for their country's data, and then pass this on to UN Stats in New York.

Innovation in data: NSOs and third parties could work together to come up with cheaper, faster ways of producing data for indicators. Can also work together to come up with new indicators for use at national and - perhaps in the future - global levels.

Co-production of data: NSOs can help third parties scale up their data production when the third party has the idea but the NSO has the infrastructure. Furthermore, third parties can help NSOs take more participatory approaches to data collection.

Capacity building and skills sharing: third parties may have approaches to specific types of data or indicators which NSOs can learn from. At the same time, NSOs can build the capacity of third parties to for example work at scale – and help ensure their work meets minimal standards.

Validate one another: If both NSOs and third parties are very open about their approaches, methodologies, etc then they can validate one another's data. This will increase public confidence in the data.

Again, all of these are ideas. We – and many others – want to put these on the table as we feel that the process risks overlooking this discussion.