# REPORT OF THE EXPERT MEETING ON AN ACCOUNTABILITY FRAMEWORK FOR CONFLICT, VIOLENCE, GOVERNANCE AND DISASTER AND THE POST-2015 DEVELOPMENT AGENDA



*( Photo: Neil Palmer/CIAT)*

Glen Cove, New York, 18-19 June 2013

# Table of Contents

## Executive Summary

On 18-19 June 2013, in Glen Cove, New York, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO), and United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) collaborated with the Institute for Economics and Peace (IEP) and the World Bank (WB) to hold an Expert Meeting on creating an accountability framework for conflict, violence, governance and disaster within the context of the Post-2015 Development Agenda.

The meeting focused on the question of how conflict, violence, governance and disaster outcomes can be effectively designed and measured in the context of development. Almost 65 experts, including statisticians, political analysts and monitoring and evaluation specialists, attended the meeting. Also present were representatives from Member States, national statistical offices and international organizations. The meeting was convened as a follow-up to the UN Development Group's *Global Thematic Consultation on Conflict, Violence and Disaste*r and the *Global Thematic Consultation on Governance*; meetings that are part of the [UN Global Thematic Consultations](#) on the Post-2015 Development Agenda and through which the UN is facilitating a worldwide conversation on new development priorities.

With regards to the *Accountability Framework for Conflict, Violence, Governance and Disaster in the Post-2015 Development Agenda* meeting that took place in Glen Cove, the following conclusions emerged:

1. While universality is a must in the Post-2015 development framework, 'national' metrics that allow for geographic, temporal, and demographic disaggregation are also important. While goals and targets should be universal, indicators need to be shared and the timeframe and steps for reaching targets should be adjusted according to the country context.

2. Significant progress has been made in recent years with reference to measuring stakeholder success in mitigating violence and disaster. In spite of this a number of states continue to suffer from administrative deficits in collecting, analyzing and managing information. This is because while the appropriate capacities for measuring progress are in place, they simply need to be further developed.

3. Participants noted that there is an abundance of new technologies that are available to capture data at the global and national levels, as well as the existence of a wide range metrics that are capable of measuring progress related to conflict, violence and governance.

4. When measuring progress towards addressing conflict and violence, changes in capacity are not the same as "better outcomes." Better outcomes are not enough unless they generate confidence amongst all social groups, and no single indicator can tell the full story about progress achieved. Because of this, peace-related commitments outlined in the new framework will need to be monitored using *baskets* of indicators. These *baskets* should combine several indicators in order to address a) the problem, b) the 'objective' situation and c) public perception in relation to whether progress is being made.

5. Horizontal inequalities are a significant driver of conflict and violence, and can be addressed as a cross-cutting issue through the use of specific targets and the maximum disaggregation of indicators. For example: groups with disabilities and religious, racial and ethnic minorities are often over-represented amongst the poor. In cases such as these, indicators should be provided at a disaggregated geographical level (be it according to sub-national vs. regional or urban vs. rural areas) or according to income and/or consumption level (e.g. quintiles). Doing this will provide more information about how progress is distributed and it will also provide an incentive for stakeholders to focus on the groups that are being left behind.

6. There is a need to develop indicators to track differences between the national average and the rates for specific social groups or regions. These indicators should be comprised of several targets, particularly those that are survey-based.

7. National statistical offices require support to coordinate data collection and analysis.

8. Indicators related to peacebuilding, conflict, violence and disaster should not only be confined to one or two goals in the Post-2015 Development Framework; these elements should also cut across all of the various goals and targets.

In order to develop a framework of potential targets and indicators, participants were divided into five thematic groups: Conflict and Violence; Justice and Rule of Law; Governance; Disasters; and Social and Economic Development Aspects of Conflict and Violence. In view of the recent release of the High Level Panel of Eminent Persons Report, groups were encouraged to be mindful of its framework and to consider questioning and/or modifying suggested indicators. What emerged following several working sessions was a comprehensive set of recommended targets that aligned with or cut across several potential goals. The following targets were prioritized:

**Conflict and Violence**
- Reduce and prevent violent deaths per 100,000 people and eliminate all forms of violence against children, women and other vulnerable groups.

- Reduce external drivers of violence and conflict, including illicit flows of arms, drugs, finance, natural resources and human trafficking.

**Justice and Rule of Law**
- Enhance the capacity, professionalism and accountability of security, police and justice institutions.

- Ensure law enforcement and justice systems that are accessible, impartial, non-discriminatory and responsive to the needs and human rights of individuals and social groups, and which respect due-process rights.

**Governance**
- Enhance equity and social cohesion, and ensure adequate formal and informal mechanisms are in place to

manage disputes peacefully.

- Ensure all people enjoy freedom of speech, association, religion, and peaceful protest.

- Ensure all people can participate and influence decision-making in formal and informal public institutions at all levels, including the selection of political representatives.

- Guarantee the public right to government and corporate information, as well as access to independent media.

- Strengthen citizen's trust in public decision-making bodies through fairness and diversity of representation.

- Eliminate bribery and corruption, and hold public and private perpetrators to account.

- Enhance state capacity, transparency, and accountability regarding control of national resources.

- Peacefully resolve divisions within society by negotiation among stakeholder groups.

**Disasters**
- Reduce mortality related to natural and hydro-metrological hazards.

- The economic and social impact of natural hazards is reduced by 50% by 2030.

- Capacity for prevention, where all countries have a clearly articulated and operational institutional and legislative system for risk sensitive development planning in place by 2030.

**Social and Economic Development Aspects of Conflict and Violence (cross-cutting)**
- Ensure citizens have equitable access to a safe education that is free from discrimination and violence.

- Increase equitable citizen access to services, economic opportunity and responsive and accountable governance and justice, with a focus on the most disadvantaged and excluded.

- Reduce inequalities across all social groups and regions within countries.

## Background

The UN Global Thematic Consultations developed a compelling narrative, evidence-base and common understanding for the inclusion of conflict, violence, governance and disaster themes in the Post-2015 Development Agenda[1]. Out of these consultations have come several commitments to reduce violence and insecurity, mitigate drivers of conflict, foster disaster resilience and drivers of peace, and build institutions that are measurable, and that can be monitored and operationalized. It has also been recommended that additional work be undertaken to define a common understanding of the targets and indicators that are used to measure and track progress towards agreed-upon goals on peace and security, governance and disaster risk reduction (DRR) or that can be mainstreamed into other development goals.

Participants at the Expert Meeting did not intend to articulate an overarching goal, as they assumed that the development of an autonomous goal on preventing and reducing violence and conflict would be possible as long as it was framed correctly and oriented towards promoting safety and peace. The key objective of the meeting was to set out specific targets on peace and security, governance, effective institutions, and disaster risk reduction, and to set additional benchmarks and indicators that specified real and perceived changes toward possible goals.

In preparation for the Expert Meeting, the co-chairs commissioned a number of background papers that were shared in advance,[2] and stakeholders were able to take part in online discussions. The two-week long online consultation not only allowed participants to map out the dimensions of conflict, violence, disaster, and governance (including how they could be measured), but it also assisted organizers in creating a detailed agenda.

The goals, targets and indicators proposed by the High Level Panel (HLP) Report were an important reference point for the Expert Meeting.[3] Participants felt the HLP offered an illustrative framework that was closely aligned with the recommendations of the global thematic consultations. The HLP called for a focus on personal security, access to justice, freedom from discrimination and persecution, along with transparent, accountable, and responsive governance institutions. Two out of the twelve goals[4] set specific targets and indicators on creating stable and peaceful societies and fostering good governance

---

[1] See *Synthesis Report The Global Thematic Consultation on Conflict, Violence and Disaster, and the Post-2015 Development Agenda* at www.worldwewant2015/conflict, and *Final Report – Global Thematic Consultation on Governance and the Post-2015 Development Framework* at www.worldwewant2015/goveranance

[2] Brinkman, Henk-Jan (June 2013): *Background paper on criteria for targets and indicators*; Muggah, Robert (June 2013): *Monitoring Violence and Conflict: Reflections on goals, targets and indicators* at www.worldwewant2015.org/conflict, and the Saferworld briefing report (June 2013): *Addressing conflict and violence from 2015 – From the High Level Panel report to an accountability framework*, at http://www.saferworld.org.uk/downloads/pubdocs/From-the-High-Level-Panel-report-to-an-accountability-framework.pdf.

[3] The Expert Meeting built on efforts by the World Bank, UN and other international and regional organizations. A prominent example is the "Peacebuilding and Statebuilding Goals and Indicators" developed by the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding.

[4] **Goal 10:** *Ensure good governance and effective institutions* through the following targets: free and universal legal identity; safeguarding citizen's rights to freedom of speech, association, peaceful protest and access to independent media and information; increasing public participation in political processes; guaranteeing the public's right to information in political processes; guaranteeing the public's right to information and to access governmental data, and reducing bribery and corruption.

and effective institutions,[5] while a third goal, poverty, includes a target dedicated to "building resilience and reducing losses to disaster."

## Opening Session

The meeting opened with introductory remarks by Ms. Judy Cheng-Hopkins, Assistant Secretary-General for Peacebuilding Support, and Mr. Jordan Ryan, UNDP's Assistant Administrator and Director of the Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery. Following the remarks, participants took part in an interactive panel discussion on 'the politics of goal setting' that addressed the political sensitivities of incorporating conflict, violence, governance, and disaster issues into the central development framework and current intergovernmental debates.

### Remarks

Noting that goals and targets should be universal, Ms. Cheng-Hopkins underlined the importance of tailoring indicators to the national context. These indicators should also be easily communicated, understood and measurable over time. She warned that the road to 2015 would not be easy, explaining that targets and indicators involve technical work, and because they are tools for measuring social change they will be subject to political conviction. Ms. Cheng-Hopkins also highlighted the importance of keeping the momentum on the process itself and strengthening the targets and indicators proposed in the HLP report.

When the Director for BCPR, Mr. Jordan Ryan, took the floor he spoke in detail about three myths that are likely to dominate future discussions and ought to be dispelled. The first is that incorporating conflict, violence and governance in development frameworks is simply a "trend" that will distort development efforts. He reminded participants that the majority of countries (in which the UN supports development efforts) already have governance, peacebuilding, institutional reform and disaster resilience written into in their UN Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAF), and evidence suggests that socio-economic development results could not have been achieved without progress on these issues.

The second myth revolves around the ideas that incorporating conflict, violence, inequalities and governance in development efforts compromises national sovereignty, and that international support – in relation to security issues – should only be invoked under exceptional circumstances mandated by the UN Security Council. Mr. Ryan argued that while 'reducing violence and peacebuilding' are indeed state responsibilities, so are reducing maternal mortality, enhancing access to education and focusing on any issue that enhances peace and prosperity at the local, national and regional levels. Global development frameworks simply feed into national priority areas and they assist stakeholders in focusing on the issues that matter the most. Mr. Ryan also explained that issues of conflict and violence should be *addressed through structural development response first* (not security) before they are placed on the

---

[5] **Goal 11**: *Ensure stable and peaceful societies* including targets: reduction of violent deaths; ensuring justice institutions are accessible, independent, and well-resourced, and respect due-process rights; reducing external factors that lead to conflict, such as organized crime; and improving the quality and accountability of security forces, the police and the judiciary.

Security Council agenda. Addressing these issues through development programming means they will not have to spend time on the Security Council agenda; a financial burden that costs the international community millions of dollars. These types of actions are what the spirit of prevention is about.

The third myth in the global debate is that "peace, resilience, and governance are too difficult to measure." Though indicators to measure conflict and violence prevention are relatively new compared to other socio-economic indicators, and few states have the capacity and knowhow to measure outcomes, there are a number of on-going initiatives, tools and mechanisms that operationalize metrics for the purpose of capturing, analyzing and disseminating data. "Though our experience with measuring these outcomes is limited," Mr. Ryan explained, "the fact that *they are measurable* should be beyond dispute. Technology has advanced enough that we can enhance our capacity to measure these outcomes."

In conclusion, Mr. Ryan challenged participants to pay particular attention to five critical questions/assumptions:

1. Targets and indicators for conflict, violence, inequalities, governance and disaster should be politically acceptable and operationally feasible.

2. Member States have to be on board to build the right institutions, technology, and human capital that can monitor, and account for (in real time) results on these themes.

3. The need to ensure accurate and transparent monitoring.

4. Targets and indicators should appeal to the sustainability agenda.

5. The need to build an acceptable and fair global accountability mechanism that will measure the performance of the international community in addressing factors that influence conflict, violence, governance and disaster at the local, state and global levels.

## Interactive Panel Discussion: 'The Politics of Goal Setting'

The positive contribution of the HLP Report was underscored as it has integrated aspects of the global thematic consultations to place conflict, violence, justice, security, and governance (along with other critical global issues) at the core of development efforts. Given the different constituencies represented by the panel's 27 members, it was encouraging that the members of HLP could come to a consensus with regards to framing these issues. The need to adopt a universal framework for advancing peace and security was deemed highly progressive, and in practice it would mean using language that appeals to all member states and by paying careful attention to the specificities of particular contexts.

Participants stressed the need to outline a strategic approach and entry points for advocating the inclusion of this agenda in the Post-2015 Framework. Elements of a strategic approach and entry points include:

1) Taking advantage of opportunities such as the General Assembly's (GA) High-level Special Event on the MDGs in September 2013[6], and the Secretary-General's report on achieving the MDGs and the achieving the Post-2015 Agenda.[7]

2) Engaging with the intergovernmental Open Working Group (OWG) on sustainable development goals. When the OWG was established following the 2012 UN Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20) the agenda did not include peace and security elements. In the wake of this a session on "conflict prevention, post-conflict peacebuilding and the promotion of durable peace and rule of law and governance" is planned for February 2014. In addition, a session on climate change and disaster risk reduction will be held in January 2014.

3) Identifying who – beyond OECD states, the G7+, and the UN (to a certain extent) – the other stakeholders might be and having an understanding of the possible trade-offs.

4) Influencing the AU-mandated African Common Position on the Post-2015 Development Agenda – noting the importance of Africa.

5) Furthering work with civil society and national organizations to adopt a strategic, coordinated and collaborative approach to influencing Member States.

6) Advocating at the national level (not only UN HQ) to keep countries open to the adoption of this agenda.

In light of these elements, it was noted that the following should be taken into account:

*Credibility:* In order to be persuasive in moving policy dialogue forward there is a need for a set of targets and indicators that participants believe in (and not targets they think are politically acceptable). Stakeholders should not settle for what they think can be agreed on and should instead focus on getting accurate measurements of the right things.

*Sensitivity*: Notwithstanding accurate measurement, targets and indicators should be framed universally and in a positive manner. It was stressed that disempowering words like "fragility" and "democracy," should be avoided and it would be advisable to conduct an open global policy dialogue with skeptical states on their experiences and perspectives on peacebuilding.

*Universality*: Underscored was the idea that there should be a single universal framework, with underling facets that can address difficult political issues related to context sensitivity.

*Political progress versus capacity development*: Sensitivity to politics aside, it was stressed that one should avoid making peace-related targets acceptable by agreeing to monitor capacities alone.

*Progress against a baseline*: Also emphasized was that conflict-affected, post-conflict and least developed countries (LDCs) will require more time to achieve peace, security, justice and governance-related goals. To this end, indicators should measure progress and give credit for the level of effort being made to work towards improved security, good governance and effective institutions.

---

[6] At the Special Event the UN General Assembly will assess progress made and make recommendations for next steps to accelerate progress towards achieving the MDGs and looking beyond 2015.
[7] This report will be delivered to the UN GA ahead of the Special Event.

*Who Measures Progress?* The question of 'who owns the accountability framework?' has implications for its legitimacy and acceptability. While country ownership and buy-in is important, there are consequences linked to impartiality, sensitivity and the ethics of data gathering. A balanced approach with checks and balances to ensure independence, impartiality and sensitive handling of confidential information are needed. Furthermore, it was also noted that many existing indicator sets are implemented and upheld by research organizations funded by traditional donors. To attract global interest at the political level, these methods and capacities for measuring the themes under discussion will need to be standardized and legitimized under the auspices of the UN and other international and regional organizations. They will also have to be linked more effectively to sustainable country level capacities of monitoring and implementation. The question of how resources will be mobilized to measure such indicators was also raised.

*How to Measure Progress:* It was stressed that when it comes to measuring progress towards lasting peace, indicators can only work well if three aspects of a target are measured: the capacity to address the issue at stake; the 'objective' change in society, and the perceptions of all social groups on security, justice, rule of law, governance and other peace-related issues. For example, when measuring progress on security, increased capacity of the police (such as higher numbers of officers that cover a homicide) show that an effort is being made to work towards improved security.

While this is a strong step forward there is also a need to make improvements involving 'objective' situation indicators, such as the number of violent deaths that occur per 100,000 individuals. It was noted that statistics on violent deaths vary in reliability, they may be manipulated (by increasing the official estimate of the country's population), or possibly reduced through the use of heavy-handed approaches that jeopardise human security and are cause for concern with regards to human rights/conflict prevention. Therefore, an indicator showing how safe the public actually *feels* can validate trends in capacity development and 'objective' situation indicators, thereby illustrating whether the ultimate aim of security provision – increasing public security – is actually being attained.

*Public Perception:* In a Post-2015 Accountability Framework it was noted that some stakeholders might assume public-perception-based indicators are not credible because official statistics can be weak and easy to manipulate. To tackle this issue the HLP report called for use of crowd sourcing to see whether the right outcomes have been attained in the eyes of the public.

*Credibility of Data:* National statistical offices should be the main owners of data and related indicators.[8] It is extremely important that the activities of national statistics offices are independent and free of any political interference that could influence their work and/or the results. Not only do users need to perceive data collection results as an unbiased representation of the society, but they also have to be credible to inform the articulation of targets and indicators. Mexico's National Institute of Statistics and Geography (INEGI) was cited as a positive example of how to separate statistics from politics and centralize data collection. Before INEGI's creation, data collection and analysis were undertaken by different entities that were biased, vulnerable to political interference and inaccurate. For a country afflicted by violence, economic crisis and other tribulations, collecting good quality data plays a vital role

---

[8] The existence of other relevant (based on sound methodology) indicators outside the scope of traditional statistical offices, such as other government agencies, civil society organizations and international organizations, should be taken into account.

in supplying objective information for a detailed understanding of the problems and solutions that can address any sensitive and political dimensions of the issue.

*Criteria:* On of the greatest challenges in translating Post-2015 aspirations into a succinct and manageable set of goals, targets and indicators, is the need to prioritize and reach an agreement on a clear set of criteria. Adherence to a clear set of agreed upon criteria promotes a culture of transparency, public participation and necessary trade-offs, which strengthens the legitimacy of both the process and its outcomes[9] (See Annex I).

*Human rights:* The real test and measure of success in the Post-2015 Development Agenda will be the ability to meet the demands of a growing global population in enhancing their dignity and the degree to which they are able to live their lives free from fear and want, and without discrimination. It was noted that one of the strongest and most consistent demands from the Global Thematic Consultations on the Post-2015 Development Agenda is that the new plan be grounded explicitly in internationally recognized human rights, a sentiment that is echoed in the HLP Report. This means targets and indicators will have to be consistent with the agreed norms in human rights treaties.

Furthermore, civil and political rights that were almost categorically excluded from the MDGs should feature prominently in the new framework. Their measurement is now a field of inter-disciplinary innovation, from which it is possible to build on in cooperation with national statistics offices and independent national and international human rights mechanisms.  It was noted that human rights are an ally of robust statistics (rights relating to data confidentiality and protection provide safeguards in compiling trustworthy official statistics). It was suggested that further piloting and dissemination of existing human rights indicators would be extremely useful to this end.[10]

## Working Groups

Participants were organized in five working groups to discuss and identify three targets and develop indicator options for these targets around five specific thematic areas: 1) Conflict and Violence; 2) Justice and Rule of Law; 3); Governance; 4) Disasters; and 5) Social and Economic Development Aspects of Conflict and Violence. In view of the release of the High Level Panel Report, groups were encouraged to keep in mind the HLP framework as they discussed and modified suggested indicators. Following several sessions of group work, a comprehensive set of recommended targets emerged that aligned with or cut across potential goals. The targets are outlined in the sections below and tables under each heading summarize working group outputs.

### Conflict and Violence

Participants agreed that the targets in the HLP Report served as a good starting point and they underscored that it was important to remain ambitious and to account for both positive and negative targets and indicators in spite of political realities.  The group revised two targets from the HLP: one on violence reduction and the other on the capacity, professionalism and accountability of security, police

---

[9] See http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/WhoWillBeAccountable_summary_en.pdf for an example of criteria outlined for goals, targets and indicators (p. 91-93).
[10] See http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Indicators/Pages/HRIndicatorsIndex.aspx.

and justice institutions. The group also added a target on the need to enhance equity and social cohesion, and ensure that adequate formal and informal mechanisms are in place to manage disputes peacefully. The inclusion of informal institutions was deemed a critical point important, and a final target on external drivers of violence was also revised.

Participants emphasized that one of the main targets is "to reduce and prevent violent deaths per 100,000 people by x amount and eliminate all forms of violence against children, women and other vulnerable groups."[11] Participants agreed that all types of violence should be included, both collective, as well as interpersonal. They also debated the meaning of prevention and elimination and highlighted the need to be aspirational and conform to agreed international language.

Other challenges, such as the need to build the national capacity of some countries so reliable data could be gathered was underscored. For example, homicide data is often missing and/or unreliable in many countries and few nationwide data sets exist – with the exception of the Uppsala Conflict Data Program – on the number of deaths that occur during an armed conflict. Participants stressed that it may be possible to build on existing initiatives like the *Every Casualty* initiative by the Oxford Research Group,[12] the piloting of indicators by the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding,[13] or the development of the Global Burden of Armed Violence reports by the Geneva Declaration (which draw on a number of other important existing sources).[14]

With regards to developing a target on violence, participants noted that citizen feedback and perception surveys are often the *only* instruments that can be used to generate the necessary data. Demographic and health surveys data on child mortality was deemed the best example for producing robust, policy-relevant statistics. This type of data is drawn from nationwide population surveys that share common methodologies and questionnaires, and are undertaken in all developing countries that do not have access to national health statistics. Survey data clearly shows substantial decades-long declines in under-five mortality, even in countries of conflict.

Participants stressed that while surveys are often the *only* way to generate data to track security and other changes in most developing countries, there are also real, but not insurmountable, coordination and data problems. Participants also acknowledged challenges on setting global indicators to follow progress on priorities that are genuinely universal.

Participants noted that displaced people were given little attention from the HLP and so they added a target on creating a sage and secure environment and include these issues under targets for social cohesion and violence.

With reference to regional initiatives in the Post-2015 Development Agenda, it was suggested they should take into account existent regional processes in order to apply and validate indicators, as in the case of the Central American Regional Security Initiative (CARSI), the Central American Security Strategy (ESCA), and the Central American Integration System (SICA). Participants also noted that regional

---

[11] Percentage agreed upon by national governments. States may give consideration to a global target.
[12] See http://www.oxfordresearchgroup.org.uk/rcac.
[13] See http://www.pbsbdialogue.org/documentupload/03%20PSG%20Indicators%20EN.pdf.
[14] See the Geneva Declaration, 'Methodological Annexe' in *Global Burden of Armed Violence*, (June 2012): http://www.genevadeclaration.org/fileadmin/docs/GBAV2/GBAV2011_Methodological_Annexe.pdf.

organizations such as the African Union (AU), SICA, Union of South American Nations (UNASUR), Caribbean Community (CARICOM), European Union (EU) and others could play an active role in defining an interim indicator framework while countries develop their own national statistical capabilities.

Participants also acknowledged the need to standardize and adopt common definitions of concepts such as "violence" and "security" within the UN system, and to also reduce the external drivers of violence and conflict, including illicit flows of arms, drugs, finance, natural resources and human trafficking.

## Goal: Ensure a Safe and Peaceful Society

| Targets | Indicators | Source / Data Issues |
|---|---|---|
| **Target 1:** Reduce and prevent violent deaths per 100,000 people by x and eliminate all forms of violence against children, women and other vulnerable groups.[15] | 1a. Intentional homicide rate per 100,000. | Disaggregated by age, sex, social groups, time, region, and income. |
| | 1b. Direct deaths from armed conflict per 100,000. | Capacity needs to be built to produce reliable measurement. |
| | 1c. Suicide rate per 100,000.[16] | |
| | 1d. Violent injury per 100,000.[17] | |
| | 1e. Percentage of citizens who feel safe. | |
| | 1f. Number of children recruited by armed forces and non-state armed groups. | |
| | 1g. Rape and other forms of sexual violence per 100,000. | |
| | 1h.Rate of child maltreatment.[18] | |
| **Target 2:** Enhance the capacity, professionalism and accountability of security, police and justice institutions.[19] | 2a. Percentage of the population who express confidence in police and justice institutions.[20] | Perception survey. Disaggregated by age, sex, social groups, time, region, and income. |
| | 2b.Degree of civilian and parliamentary oversight of security institutions and budgets that are public. | Expert survey. |
| | 2c.Percentage of security, police and justice personnel prosecuted over the total number of reported cases of misconduct. | Administrative data. |
| | 2d.Number of police and judicial sector personnel (qualified judges, magistrates, prosecutors, defense attorneys) per 100,000 and distribution across the territory.[21] | Administrative data. |
| | 2e. Ratio of formal cases filed to cases resolved per year.[22] | |

---

[15] Percentage agreed upon by national governments. States may give consideration to a global target.

[16] Possibly belongs under public health targets. Disagreement existed on whether to include this indicator.

[17] There are serious data limitations and differing definitions (inclusive political difficulties) across countries. Participants recommended strengthening the statistical capacity to create a data revolution.

[18] Participants stressed difficulties in practical measurement and the need to strengthen data collection capacities.

[19] In line with lessons learned from some of the existing MDGs, concern was expressed about framing this target in terms of capacities that are assumed to lead to a desired outcome, rather than the outcome itself. The outcome should be public safety/security, and developing the capacity, professionalism and accountability of security, police and justice institutions. This should be measured alongside indicators that measure public security and confidence. Definitions of security institutions will vary among countries.

[20] The International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding indicators were used as a starting point.

[21] Identifying targets or appropriate levels by countries may be necessary.

[22] Some participants suggested the need to focus this indicator on the achievement of justice outcomes by looking at the ratio of persons convicted by due against the total number of perpetrators (as measured by victimization surveys).

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Target 3:**<br>Enhance equity and social cohesion and ensure adequate formal and informal mechanisms are in place to manage disputes peacefully. | 3a. Degree of equitable access to, and resourcing of, outcomes from public services. | Perception and administrative data. |
| | 3b. Level of trust and tolerance within society. | Disaggregated by age, sex, social groups, time, region, and income. |
| | 3c. Perceptions of discrimination. | |
| | 3d. Degree to which there are effective formal or informal mechanisms and programs in place to prevent and resolve disputes peacefully. | |
| **Target 4: [23]**<br>*(To be placed under HLP Goal 12 – focused on global enabling environment)*<br><br>Reduce external drivers of violence and conflict including illicit flows of arms, drugs, finance, natural resources and human trafficking. | Indicators could be related to illicit flows of, inter alia, arms, drugs, finance. For example:<br><br>4a. To what extent does organized crime (mafia-oriented racketeering, extortion) impose costs on businesses in your country? | 4a. WEF-GCR |
| | 4b. If someone in your community wanted to obtain an illegal small arm, how easy would this be? / How would you describe the number of illegal weapons in your community? | 4b. Source: unknown, adapted from UN CASA International Small Arms Control Standard 05.10) |
| | 4c. Prevalence of drug use among general population. | 4c. UNODC |
| | 4d. Volume of illicit financial flows. | 4d. Global Financial Integrity |
| | 4e. Global volume of money laundering. | |
| | 4f. Extractive industries transparency status: compliant, candidate, suspension. | 4.e. UNODC |
| | 4g. Anti-money laundering index score. | 4f. Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative |
| | 4h. Adherence to the Arms Trade Treaty/Incidence of involvement of countries' officials, companies or citizens in arms transfers in violation of UNSC arms embargoes in last 5 years. | 4g. Basel Institute on Governance<br><br>4h. Review of UN documents |
| | 4i. Homicide by firearm rate per 100,000 population over homicide rate per 100,000 population. | 4i – o. UNODC |
| | 4j. Drug seizures/laboratory seizures over prevalence of drug use among general population. | |
| | 4k. Drug-related crime per 100,000 population. | |
| | 4l. Estimated number of drug-related deaths and rates per million people aged 15-64. | 4p. Economist Intelligence Unit |
| | 4m. Profits generated by trafficking in cocaine. | 4.q. Review of UN Documents |
| | 4n. Global criminal proceeds. | |
| | 4o. Global volume of money laundering. | 4s. Review of Egmont Group documents |
| | 4p. Ease of access to weapons for minors. | |
| | 4q. Ratification of the Arms Trade Treaty. | 4t. Review of Kimberley Process Data |
| | 4r. Active participation in Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEGT) or equivalent illicit logging control initiative. | 4u. Biting the Bullet Red Book / review of UN documents |
| | 4s. Active participation with the Egmont Group of Financial Intelligence Units | 4v. Interpol |
| | 4t. Active participation in the Kimberley process. | |
| | 4u. Active participation in the UN Programme of Action on SALW. | |
| | 4v. Active co-operation with Interpol. | |

---

[23] Indicators agreed at the working groups on 'Conflict and Violence' and 'Governance in relation to Conflict, Violence and Disaster'.

## Justice and Rule of Law

Participants agreed that targets and indicators for this theme could build on those proposed by the HLP report, but they would need to illustrate outcomes rather than simply changes in the capacity of the justice system. Participants noted that some of the targets in the HLP report are framed as process targets, which is possibly an attempt to overcome political sensitivities as to how justice should be included and defined in a global development framework. Because of this there is a need to build consensus amongst Member States on the importance of justice, both as an enabler of development and as an end in itself, and to agree on an operational definition that universal targets can uphold – within a framework of international standards and values – while respecting diverse conceptualisations of justice around the world.

Also discussed was how the Post-2015 agenda needs to build people's trust in the rule of law. This means measuring success according to the extent that rule of law institutions respond to people's needs and demands for justice. Targets should focus on the performance and responsiveness of institutions (delivery of quality, professional and accountable law enforcement/justice services), as well as on enhancing their capacities. It was highlighted as a particularly important aspect in post-conflict societies where there is often a trust deficit between the state and citizens.

In light of the discussion on horizontal inequalities, participants used 'social groups' to reflect the fact that some social groups are excluded from access to justice as a group. This reveals the need to take into consideration horizontal inequalities in the Post-2015 Development Agenda, which included the need for a target on women's access to justice.

Participants noted that in order for the Post-2015 framework to be comprehensive it must engage with both informal and formal legal systems, and the state should not abdicate its responsibilities to women, indigenous peoples, minorities, children, religious groups, the poor and marginalized who are the most common users of informal systems of justice. In spite of the challenges that exist in measuring informal justice systems (the many forms of non-state institutions, poor or non-existent record keeping, the unwillingness of clients to share their experiences), engaging with informal justice systems will help to reduce horizontal inequalities and ensure justice for all. To include traditional justice systems in the framework, the group used the term 'justice systems' in the target formulation.

Participants agreed that rule of law and human rights were intrinsically linked and that there cannot be the rule of law without a full respect of human rights. In discussing related goals and targets, reference was made to adhering to the notion of maintaining 'consistency with international law' as adopted by Member States at the Rio+20 summit. In this context, an indicator on treaty ratification (including human rights, rule of law and governance treaty ratification) was deemed relevant background information for cross-cutting concerns. However, the indicator was not considered amenable to the formulation of a specific target in the Post-2015 Development Agenda. Moreover, the group underlined the need to limit the number of indicators and consider more 'outcome' oriented indicators in the agenda. Indicators on issues like extrajudicial killings, disappearances, arbitrary detention, torture and other ill treatment, were seen as outcome indicators that are relevant from a rule of law, human rights

and sustainable perspective; however, issues of data availability and political obstacles were pointed out. Given these challenges, the group saw the need for further methodological and consultation work in these fields and recommended developing an indicator to measure the effectiveness of national institutional frameworks that protect and promote rule of law, governance and human rights, as well as the existence of an independent national Human Rights institution, which is in compliance with the Paris principles (OHCHR).[24]

Participants debated at length whether conditions of detention and the accountability of public officials should be included as key targets. To address these concerns, legal and administrative frameworks that review government decisions (due challenge/administrative review) were deemed important as is measuring the 'accountability of public officials' by opening the administrative system to external scrutiny and involving civil society to take a closer look at issues of accountability and power.

It was proposed that the following targets and indicators on justice and rule of law should be streamlined into other development goals proposed by the HLP:

- GOAL 1B: With reference to "Increase by x% the share of women and men, communities, and business with secure rights to land, property, and other assets," participants strongly recommended that *natural resources* ought to be included as well.

- GOAL 2: For **"Empower Girls and Women and Achieve Gender Equality,"** an indicator relating to women's access to justice should be included.

- GOAL 8: Under the headline "Create Jobs, Sustainable Livelihoods, and Equitable Growth," participants suggested including an indicator on "*percentage of enterprises reporting high degree of confidence that legal contracts can be enforced in courts.*"

- GOAL 11c: With regards to "Stem the external stressors that lead to conflict, including those related to organized crime," the group agreed this should be changed to *"stem the stressors that lead to violence and conflict"* or *"stem the risk factors associated with violence,"* as opposed to including just one example (in this case "organized crime").

---

[24] The Paris Principles were adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in 1993. See pages 146-148 of the document: http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Countries/NHRI/1950-UNDP-UHCHR-Toolkit-LR.pdf.

| Goal: Ensure Secure and Just Societies | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Targets** | **Indicators** | **Source/Data Issues** |
| **Target 1:**<br>Achieve full trust and confidence in law enforcement and justice systems. | 1a. Percentage of people who develop trust in the police. | Survey for the general population, disaggregated by sex, age and social groups. |
| | 1b. Percentage of people who develop trust in the courts. | Survey for the general population, disaggregated by sex, age and social groups. |
| | 1c. Percentage of victims (of certain types of crimes) who tried to report these crimes to the police. | Victimization survey, disaggregated by sex, age and social groups. |
| **Target 2:**<br>Ensure law enforcement and justice systems are accessible, impartial, non-discriminatory and responsive to the needs and rights of individuals and social groups. | 2a. Percentage of reported homicides in a given year that resulted in a prosecution within 12 months. | Police and court data. |
| | 2b. Percentage of reported homicides in a given year that resulted in court adjudication within 24 months. | Police and court data. |
| | 2c. Existence of an independent national Human Rights institution in compliance with the Paris Principles. | OHCHR |
| **Target 3:**<br>Strengthen the capacity of states to investigate, prosecute and sentence perpetrators of crimes. | 3a. Percentage of the general population with birth registrations. | Birth registration records and population census. |
| | 3b. Existence of a legal framework for challenging the decisions of public officials. | |
| | 3c. Percentage of defendants in criminal cases who are represented by legal counsel. | Court data. |
| | 3d. Ratio of conviction rates (violent crimes) for impoverished defendants who are provided with free legal representation vs. conviction rates for defendants with legal representation of their own choosing. | Court data |

## Governance in Relation to Conflict, Violence and Disaster (CVD)

Participants agreed that targets and indicators for this theme could build on those proposed by the HLP report. A general discussion resulted in a common understanding of the scope and dimensions of governance in relation to CVD, and how target-setting and indicator formulation should be approached. Because the group noted that several peace and security issues overlapped with governance (which another group was working on), it was suggested that these multifaceted targets/indicators be included under the governance framework where possible. Participants also noted that targets and indicators for CVD related to governance should be developed using change model(s).

Participants reflected on the terms "good" vs. "democratic" governance and their complicated relationship to both CVD and development. The group noted that peace and development are often correlated with each other and with better governance. It was also highlighted that specific aspects of democracy, such as elections, should be treated carefully in post-conflict/fragile settings, since elections without necessary institutions and a stable political culture may precipitate conflict in the short term. Also underscored was the need to use existing concepts of collective decision-making and leadership, and engaging in political participation outside of the liberal construct of democratic governance.

Participants highlighted that stable and functional democracies could include elements of organized violence and fragility. Participants agreed that, mindful of possible CVD change models, targets would need to include state-citizen relations, requirements for state building and the capacity to ensure both citizens' security and state sovereignty within specified territories or boundaries. Regarding service delivery and CVD, it was felt that could be covered by other goals such as education and health. Governance, if possible, should encompass a broader level of the capacity framework and include aspects of delivery and impact.

Participants utilized the four facets of the HLP's stand-alone goal on good governance and effective institutions as a foundation for target and indicator formulation, keeping the adjacent stand-alone goal on stable and peaceful societies in place, while improving CVD-sensitivity, precision and other missing elements. It was highlighted that political and economic rights were not sufficiently addressed by the HLP and that governance targets needed to cover this gap.[25]

Participants revisited, modified and strengthened the HLP's original governance indicators to apply them to CVD. For instance, given the high salience of corruption in many countries, it was felt that bringing perpetrators to account should be emphasized and this should include both the private and the public sectors.

In addition to the four proposed targets in the HLP report, participants identified two additional ones: the first involved focusing on the characteristics of intergroup conflicts in CVD settings, and the importance of having inclusive tools to resolve or manage these skirmishes. The other target involved the notion that many CVD conflicts arise from, or are exacerbated by, disputes over natural resources

---

[25] A separate working group was considering socio-economic issues laterally, across all goals.

and tax revenues. Both of these were formulated as targets, including possible sensitivities, and carried over into the discussion of indicators.

Once the targets were modified, participants noted the necessary criteria for indicators in the background documentation and stressed that "triangulation" between the three main indicators (indicators of capacity, indicators of the 'objective situation', and survey-based/respondent indicators) was desirable. This would ensure indicators could be measured on both capacity and outcome. With regards to indicators, several other considerations were flagged:

- The technical soundness and impartiality of sources;
- Indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age and other relevant criteria (e.g. social groups, region);
- The need to scale-up pilot projects;
- The utilization of more locally-based sources;
- The utilization of experience and attitude-type survey data, as opposed to administrative sources; and,
- Additional reflection on accountability levels (regional, country) for targets and indicators.

Participants agreed to use existing indicators from organizations such as Transparency International, SaferWorld, World Bank, IDEA, the Institute for Security Studies, Accord and UN Women.  Group members sought indicator alignment across all targets, and they revised and extended the governance targets, as well as associated compilations of indicators and sources.

## Goal: Ensure Global Governance and Effective Institutions

| Targets | Indicators | Source/Data Issues |
|---|---|---|
| **Target 1:**<br>Provide all people with free legal identify documentation, such as birth registration cards. | 1a. International Organizations or conflict-affected areas. | UNHCR<br>National administrative data |
| **Target 2:**<br>Ensure all people enjoy freedom of speech, association, religion, and peaceful protest. | 2a. Signatory to relevant treaties; submission of requisite reporting. | |
| | 2b. Constitution/laws prescribe all citizens should enjoy same level of civil liberties' (de jure) regardless of language, ethnicity, religion, race, sexual orientation, gender identity, region, disability or caste. | Treaty bodies |
| | 2c. Number of registered CSOs per 100,000 inhabitants. | National NGO reporting |
| | 2d. Combined score: the cost of social organization, how easy it is for individuals to form group associations and the likelihood of collective action. | ISS-ISD |
| | 2e. Level of civil liberties. | Freedom House's *Freedom in the World* survey |
| | 2f. Level of political rights. | |
| | 2g. Enabling space/environment score. | CIVICUS *Civil Society Index* |
| | 2h. Freedom of opinion and expression is effectively guaranteed. | World Justice Project |
| | 2i. Combined scores: freedom of speech, freedom of assembly & association, electoral self-determination. | Cingraneli-Richards (CIRI) database |
| | 2j. Proportion of requests for holding demonstrations accepted by administrative authorities. | |
| | 2k. Number of opposition candidates/parties arrested/prosecuted. | |
| | 2l. Use of libel laws to suppress dissent. | |
| | 2m. Civic activism. | Institute for Social Studies Indices of Social Development (ISS-ISD) |
| | 2n. Combined scores: civil liberties' and political participation. | Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU) Political Democracy Index |
| | 2o. Number and types of attacks on human rights defenders and journalists. | Press Freedom Barometer |
| | 2p. Number of people who have signed a petition, joined in boycotts, attended peaceful demonstrations, joined strikes or any other protest. | Polity |
| | 2q. Ability to express political opinion without fear. | Gallup World Poll |
| | 2r. 'In this country, how free are you to say what you want?' | |
| | 2s. 'In this country, how free are you to join ay political organization you want?' | Afrobarometer |
| | 2t. 'In this country, how free are you to choose to vote for without feeling pressured.' | |
| **Target 3:**<br>Ensure all people can participate and influence decision-making in formal and informal public institutions at all levels, including the selection of their political representatives. | 3a. Existence of institutions for public participation. | Institutional Profiles Database |
| | 3b. Percentage of voting age population registered to vote. | Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA) |
| | 3c. Voting and party information score. | Global Integrity Index |
| | 3d. Electoral process. | Freedom House – *Freedom in the World* |
| | 3e. Accountability of public officials. | Economist Intelligence Unit |
| | 3f. Election integrity. | Global Integrity Index |
| | 3g. Voice and accountability score. | World Bank Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI) |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | 3h. Percentage of voter turnout in national and local elections.[26] | IDEA |
| | 3i. Combined scores: electoral process, pluralism and political culture. | EIU Political Democracy Index |
| | 3j. 'How would you rate the fairness of the last national election?' | Afrobarometer/Arab Barometer |
| | 3k. Confidence in honesty of elections. | • Gallup World Poll <br> • Legatum Foundation's *Legatum Prosperity Index* |
| | 3l. How would you rate the freeness and fairness of the last national election? | • Afrobarometer <br> • Arab Barometer <br> • Barometer/World Governance Survey <br> • Afrobarometer |
| | 3m. 'How do elections enable voters to remove from office leaders who do not do what the people want?' | |
| | 3n. 'Did you participate in a government-organized meeting, consultation, etc.'? | |
| | 3o. 'Overall, how satisfied are you with the way democracy works in your country?' | |
| | 3p. During election campaigns, how much do you personally fear becoming a victim of political intimidation or violence?' | |
| **Target 4:** Guarantee public right to government and corporate information and access to independent media. | 4a. Right2info.org. | OSI and Access info Europe |
| | 4b. Internet users per 100 people. | World Bank World Development Indicators (WBI) |
| | 4c. National Administrative data on proportion of info requests supplied. | |
| | 4d. Media Concentration/Ownership. | Freedom House |
| | 4e. NGO's public information and media score. | Global Integrity Index |
| | 4f. Freedom of the press index score. | Reporters Without Borders |
| | 4g. Press Freedom Index. | • Reporters Without Borders <br> • Article 19 |
| | 4h. Number of journalists killed, imprisoned, missing or in exile. | • Committee to Protect Journalists <br> • Reporters Without Borders <br> • Press Freedom Barometer |
| | 4i. Number of blocked online sources and websites. | Google Transparency Report |
| | 4j. % of journalists that are women. | |
| | 4k. Proportion of people satisfied with system for processing information requests. | Transparency International |
| **Target 5:** Eliminate bribery and corruption, and hold public and private perpetrators to account. | 5a. National reports. | Convention Against Corruption |
| | 5b. Regulatory Framework for Political Finance and/or Political Finance Database. | IDEA |
| | 5c. Open budget index score. | International Budget Partnership |
| | 5d. Quality of budgetary and financial management. | World Bank CPIA |
| | 5e. Quality of public administration. | |
| | 5f. Regulatory quality source. | WGI |
| | 5g. Combined score on government conflict-of-interest safeguards, checks and balances, public administration and professionalism, government oversight and controls, anti-corruption legal framework. | Global Integrity Report |
| | 5h. There is an open and transparent bidding process for receiving public contracts. | Piloted by Vera Institute of Justice |
| | 5i. The government publishes the results of all procurement decisions. | |
| | 5j. Quality of public financial management and internal oversight mechanisms. | |
| | 5k. A percentage of corruption cases are prosecuted. | National Administrative Data |
| | 5l. Asset declaration requirement and wealth made public. | Open Government Partnership and WB |
| | 5m. Absence of corruption score. | World Justice Project |
| | 5n. 'Level of corruption'. | Institutional Profiles Database |
| | 5o. Reported rates of sexual coercion in accessing public services. | |
| | 5p. Transparency, accountability and corruption in public sector. | World Bank CPIA |
| | 5q. Control of corruption score. | World Bank Worldwide Governance Indicators |
| | 5r. Volume of illicit financial flows. | Global Financial Integrity |

---

[26] Sex disaggregation is an extremely important aspect that was also proposed by IDPS.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | 5s. Percentage of firms identifying corruption as a major constraint. | World Bank Enterprise Survey |
| | 5t. 'Do you think government is doing enough to fight corruption?' and 'Is corruption the same, lower or higher than five years ago?' | Gallup |
| | 5u. Reported rates of bribery (individual experience) in basic public services. | Public opinion surveys (e.g. Afrobarometer) |
| | 5v. 'In your opinion, how often in this country do officials who commit crimes go unpunished?' | Afrobarometer |
| | 5w. Was there at least one instance in the last 12 months when you had to give a bribe/present? | Gallup World Poll Alternative: Bribe Payers' Index Score (TI) |
| | 5x. Is the government effective in the fight against corruption? | TI Global Corruption Barometer |
| **Target 6:** Strengthen trust in public decision-making bodies through enhancing fairness and diversity of representation. | 6a. Breakdown of representation in selected institutions. | |
| | 6b. Breakdown of representation in parliament. | IPU on gender |
| | 6c. Breakdown of representation in senior public administration posts. | |
| | 6d. Equity of public resource use score. | CPIA/WB |
| | 6e. Fairness of government decision-making. | WEF Global Competitiveness Report |
| | 6f. Proportion of CSO managers (and members) who are women. | UN Women |
| | 6g. Confidence in honesty of elections. | Gallup World Poll/Legatum Foundation's Legatum Prosperity Index |
| | 6h. 'During election campaigns, how much do you personally fear becoming a victim of political intimidation or violence?' | • Public perception surveys • Trust in public institutions |
| | 6i. 'In your opinion, how often does competition between political parties lead to violent conflict?' | • Afrobarometer • World Attitude • Barometers |
| **Target 7:** Enhance state capacity, transparency and accountability regarding control of national resources. | 7a. Signatory to relevant treaties and submission of requisite reporting. | |
| | 7b. Fairness in decisions of governance officials. | WEF Global Competitiveness |
| | 7c. Quality of public administration. | WB |
| | 7d. Self-assessment by parliaments as oversight bodies. | IPU |
| | 7e. National self-assessments. | UN Convention Against Corruption |
| | 7f. Quality of budget and financial management. | WB |
| | 7g. Level of government budget transparency. | Open Budget Index of international Budget Partnership |
| | 7h. Thresholds of public procurement reform. | MAPS |
| | 7i. Open contracting initiative. | WB |
| | 7j. Open and transparent bidding process, government publication. | Vera Institute of Justice |
| | 7k. Tax Revenue as % of GDP. | |
| | 7l. Extractive Industries transparency status: compliant, candidate, suspended or other. | Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative |
| | 7m. Equity of public resource use. | WB CPIA |
| **Target 8:** Ensure justice institutions are accessible, independent, and well resourced, and respect due-process rights. | 8a. Signatory to relevant treaties, submission of requisite reporting. | |
| | 8b. Independence of judiciary. | CIRI Human Rights Database |
| | 8c. Judicial Independence. | WEF Global Competitiveness Report |
| | 8d. Confidence in the judicial system | Gallup World Poll |
| | 8e. 'In your opinion, how often are people in this country treated unequally under the law?' | Afrobarometer |
| | 8f. 'How much do you trust the courts of law?' | |
| | 8g. 'In your opinion, how often do officials who commit crimes go unpunished? | |
| | 8h. 'How often has your group been treated fairly by the government?' | |
| | 8i. 'Do laws, policies, and practices guarantee equal treatment of various segments of the population?' | Freedom House |
| | 8j. Conviction rate (number of persons convicted per recorded/perceived crime). | UNODC |
| | 8k. Physical integrity rights score (composite index on levels of extrajudicial killing, disappearance, torture and political imprisonment). | CIRI database |
| | 8l. Criminal justice score (including effectiveness, timeliness, impartiality, corruption, due process and rights of the | World Justice Project |

| | accused). | |
|---|---|---|
| | 8m. Deaths in police custody | Piloted by Vera Institute of Justice |
| | 8n. Percentage of policy complaints resolved | |
| | 8o. Suspension or arbitrary application of the rule of law and widespread violation of human rights score | Fund for Peace |
| | 8p. Number of judges per violent death | UNODC |
| | 8q. Judicial Independence score | WEF-GCR /Bertelsmann Transformation Index (BTI) |
| | 8r. Ability of poor people to appeal judicial decisions in serious offense cases | Piloted by Vera Institute of Justice |
| | 8s. Property rights & rule-based governance | World Bank CPIA |
| | 8t. Ability of poor people to appeal judicial decisions in serious offence cases | Piloted by Vera Institute of Justice |
| | 8u. Separation of powers | Legatum Foundation's Legatum Prosperity Index |
| | 8v. Property rights & rule-based governance | World Bank CPIA |

| **Goal: Ensure Stable and Peaceful Societies** | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Target X:** Resolve divisions within society peacefully. | X1. People can access and afford civil justice. | World Justice Project |
| | X2. ARDs are accessible, impartial, and effective. | |
| | X3. Informal justice core (including effectiveness, timeliness, impartiality and respect for fundamental rights). | |
| | X4. Inter-group cohesion score. | ISS-ISD |
| | X5. People do not resort to violence to resolve personal grievances. | World Justice Project |
| | X6. Number of days taken to resolve disputes. | World Bank *Ease of Doing Business* |
| | X7. Reconciliation of conflicts between groups within society, or of contradictions between formal and informal systems of security and justice. | |
| | X8. Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you must be very careful in dealing with people? | <ul><li>Afrobarometer</li><li>Gallup World Poll</li><li>Alternative: extent to which individuals in society feel they can rely on those whom they have not met before.</li></ul> |

## Disaster Risk Reduction

Participants agreed to propose targets and indicators that could be placed worked into several development goals beyond poverty eradication. The group agreed to not to be limited by the lack of baselines and existing data and instead consider the areas where it would be possible to construct baselines easily. There was clear consensus that rather than have one exclusive target, there is a need for a combination of outcome, output, input and impact-based targets and indicators. The framework would be most effective if it included a combination of targets on reduction of losses and different sectoral interventions. It was further agreed that intermediate targets would be useful to track progress.

Suggestions were made to cluster targets according to sectors or thematic issue and participants focused their discussion on *impact-based targets* (with the aim of reducing the impact of disaster on human development, and *capability-based targets* (creating enabling conditions and overall resilience to prevent and manage disasters). The main challenge the group identified was in terms of setting the actual targets:  would be more suitable to use specific numbers or percentages, and should the targets be in line with existing trends or set more ambitiously (e.g. 2030)?

Some participants felt that it was important to reflect the conflict-disaster interface where each target related to socio-economic factors has an impact in relation to natural and human made disasters. In the area of capacity building, it was determined that the main focus should be on ensuring that governance and institutional frameworks are in place, including a dedicated budget, to ensure risk sensitive development planning.

Participants discussed the inclusion of a potential target on the conflict-violence interface: "*Incidents of conflict and violence resulting from natural hazards reduced to zero.*"   However, given the exercise guidelines to limit the number of targets to three, participants felt it was more suitable to focus on the specific targets related to disaster risk reduction and management.

The reliability and availability of disaggregated data (according to geography and demography) was identified as a key challenge. This concern was raised in a discussion on the national and local capacity to collect and convey this information. Concerns were also expressed in terms of the heterogeneity of sources, as data may be collected from the global, regional, national and local levels, and from governmental, as well as non-governmental sources. Participants expressed concern with regard to the attribution of specific hazards when measuring impact and progress.

| Development Goals | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Targets** | **Indicators** | **Source/Data Issues** |
| **Target 1:**<br>Reduce mortality related to natural and hydro-metrological hazards. | 1a. Crude mortality rates and counts from hydro-metrological hazards. | National statistical offices, International agencies and EMDAT/CRED. |
| | 1b. Expected mortality from geophysical hazards. | |
| **Target 2:**<br>The economic and social impact of natural hazards is reduced by 50% by 2030. | 2a. Number of people whose livelihoods are lost due to natural hazards (and conflict/violence). | |
| | 2b. Number of private and public infrastructure destroyed by natural hazards (and conflict/violence. | |
| | 2c.Total number of years/months of education lost as a result of natural hazards (and conflict/violence). | |
| | 2d. 2% decrease in disaster-related diseases in the affected area (to be further refined). | |
| | 2e. Direct economic losses as a percentage of GDP. | |
| **Target 3:**<br>Capacity for prevention, where all countries have a clearly articulated and operational institutional and legislative system for risk sensitive development planning in place by 2030. | 3a. % of budgetary allocations for DRR in national development planning (not a monotonic measure). | |
| | 3b. All countries have operational DRR plans at the national, sub-national and local levels that are reviewed annually. | |
| | 3c. Number of national development plans that are "risk informed." | |
| | 3d. % of "at risk" communities with access to DRR information and resources. | |
| | 3e. Number of countries where exposure to natural hazards resulting from new development projects are measured and communicated. | |

**Challenges:**
- Attribution to specific hazards.
- Lack of availability of disaggregated data by geography and demography.
- Reliability of data.
- Heterogeneity of sources (global, regional, national, governmental, non-governmental).

## Economic Aspects of Conflict and Violence: Infusing Conflict/Peace Concerns Within the Post-2015 Development Agenda

This working group came to the conclusion that conflict and peace concerns should not be confined to specific goals. Rather, and in agreement with the HLP report, the group upheld the principle that peacebuilding, conflict, violence prevention and social cohesion must cut across all development goals.

Participants recognized that mainstreaming these issues across development goals does not come without challenges related to methodology, as well as political, ideological and capacity issues. In spite of this, working group members were clear on the rationale that the inclusion of thee issue into all development goals reflects a growing consensus in the international community that *all* development practice should be conflict and peace sensitive.

As seen in the expert meeting debates, some participants wanted to act ambitiously by developing new targets and indicators, while others – those concerned about the challenges of building a policy within the UN and amongst Member States – lobbied for working closely within the HLP targets and indicators. The latter approach was pursued in the end; however, many targets and indicators were modified and new phrasing/terminology was used to buttress the overall relevance and impact of each indicator. Narrative guidance was also suggested to ensure that attention was placed on the ways in which a particular indicator interacted with others in a given context (and in conflict-sensitive ways).

Participants grappled with, to some degree, coming to a consensus on targets and indicators for the goal 'end poverty'. There were strong feelings amongst participants that inequality (specifically horizontal inequality) needed to be articulated throughout the targets. Some thought that the poverty goal should be rewritten to include these concerns given its important links with conflict and violence, while others thought that this would be too controversial and dilute the overall aim of 'ending poverty'. In the end, participants agreed that the first target would include relevant language.

Regarding horizontal inequalities, it was underscored that is a need to include indicators across all targets that can track differences between the national average and rates for specific social groups or regions. Furthermore, it was highlight that in order to safeguard conflict and context sensitivity in and across indicator development and assessment, policy makers should take into account:

| Fairness | Participation | Equity | Inclusivity | Cohesion | Considering how conflict divers interact with other development goals. |
|----------|---------------|--------|-------------|----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|

| Goal 1: End Poverty | |
|---|---|
| **Targets** | **Indicators** |
| **Target 1: (changes from HLP Report are in *bold italics*)** Bring the number of people living on less than $1.25 a day to zero; reduce by x% the share of people living below their country's 2015 national poverty line, **and reduce inequalities across social groups and regions within countries.** | Reduce income differences between the national average and the rates for specific social groups or regions. |
| **Target 2: (changes from HLP Report are in *bold italics*)** Increase by x% the share of women and men, communities and businesses who have secured rights, **including customary rights**, to land, property and other natural resources. | Percentage of the population that is aware of land rights and/or has access to land titles. Institutional mechanisms in place for land dispute resolution. |

| Goal 2: Empower Girls and Women and Achieve Gender Equality |
|---|
| **Narrative guidance**: <br>• Relationship between 2D (eliminate discrimination against women in political, economic, and public life) and 2A (prevent and eliminate all forms of violence against girls and women) should be made explicit, so that when addressing 2D (gender equality), 2A (subsequent rise in violence against women) is accounted for. <br>• Draw on the expertise of UN Women to further develop targets and indicators, particularly in relation to engendered relations. |

| Goal 3: Provide Quality Education and Lifelong Learning | |
|---|---|
| **New target:** Ensure citizens have access to safe education, free from discrimination and violence. | N/A |
| **Target 3d: (changes from HLP Report are in *bold italics*)** Increase the number of young and adult women and men who have **skills for life**, including technical and vocational professions, by x% (re-phrased and language added to target 3d. of the HLP Report). | Programs that address non-cognitive skills such as nonviolence, conflict resolution, peacebuilding, etc. |

| Goal 4: Ensure Healthy Lives | |
|---|---|
| **New target:** Ensure universal, affordable, and safe access to health, including mental and physical wellbeing, with a focus on the most disadvantaged and excluded citizens. | N/A |

| Goal 5: Ensure Food Security and Good Nutrition | |
|---|---|
| **Target 5a: (changes from HLP Report are in *bold italics*)** End hunger and protect the right of all citizens, **regardless of circumstance,** to have access to sufficient, safe, affordable, and nutritious food. | Percentage change in food prices over 3 months. |
| **Target 5c: (changes from HLP Report are in *bold italics*)** Increase agricultural productivity by x%, with a focus on sustainably increasing smallholder yields and access to **sustainable** irrigation. | N/A |

| Goal 6: Achieve Universal Access to Water and Sanitation | |
|---|---|
| **Target 6a: (changes from HLP Report are in *bold italics*)** Provide **universal and affordable** access to safe drinking water at home and in schools, health centers, and | N/A |

| refugee camps, ***with a focus on the most disadvantaged and excluded.*** | |
|---|---|
| **Goal 7: Secure Sustainable Energy** | |
| **Target 7b:** (changes from HLP Report are in ***bold italics***)<br><br>Provide universal and ***affordable*** access to modern energy services ***with a focus on the most disadvantaged and excluded.*** | N/A |
| **Goal 8: Create Jobs, Sustainable Livelihoods, and Equitable Growth** | |
| **Target 8a:** (changes from HLP Report are in ***bold italics***)<br>Increase the number of good, decent, *and safe* jobs and livelihoods by x, ***with a focus on the most disadvantaged and excluded.***<br><ul><li>Narrative guidance: Include note that in many post/conflict contexts informal employment is often a necessary short term solution to employment issues and should be recognized in any indicator used for target 8a.</li><li>Narrative guidance: Include note that indicators should include reference to sustainable livelihoods in rural areas, slums, etc.</li></ul> | N/A |
| **Target 8b:** (changes from HLP Report are in ***bold italics***)<br>Increase the number of young people in education, employment, training, and/or service by x%. | N/A |
| **Goal 9: Manage Natural Resource Assets Sustainably** | |
| **Target 9a:** Ensure fair, transparent, and sustainable management of natural resources, including land, at the community and national levels. | <ul><li>Publication and use of economic, social, and environmental accounts within all governments and major companies.</li><li>Number of revenue sharing agreements that include mechanisms for wealth sharing to communities in resource producing areas.</li><li>Perceptions of income disparity and equity in the community/society.</li><li>Percentage of major infrastructural projects above x amount that include social and environmental safeguards.</li></ul> |
| **Goal 12: Create a Global Enabling Environment and Catalyze Long-Term Finance** | |
| **New target:** Provide enhanced support for highly vulnerable states and Least Developed Countries to address structural challenges. | <ul><li>Percentage of Post-2015 indicators produced on a regular basis within each country.</li><li>Number of statistical capacity building initiatives for the bottom quintile of countries on previous indicators.</li></ul> |

## Conclusions and Ways Forward

The expert meeting on developing an *accountability framework for conflict, violence, governance and disaster* reinforced that these issues are intrinsically linked to development and they should, and can, be measured. A comprehensive list of targets and indicators that allow for geographic and demographic disaggregation centered on around conflict, violence, governance, peacebuilding, and disaster risk reduction was proposed.

Basic standard methodologies have been developed[27] and there has been ongoing development on data collection methods in relation to governance (election statistics, transparency, corruption and business climate). In spite of these gains however, much more work needs to be done to identify appropriate numerical targets for areas such as security, violence, crime and criminal justice.

The five working groups came to the conclusion that significant investments need to be made to build states' capabilities to measure progress towards the right indicators. Given the multi-year process of building national statistical capacity, participants called on international organizations, regional banks and civil society to collaborate in strengthening the capacity of stakeholders in member countries and to facilitate the sharing of data, tools, standards and analysis to improve statistics for monitoring development outcomes. Having access to timely and better statistics is the basis for understanding the social, economic and political circumstances in which people live, and this serves to enable governments to put in place better policies and programmes.

Regional organizations have an important role to play in this process as they can coordinate data collection and dissemination in their regions and ensure that national statistical offices are involved in the process. This will help resolve any discrepancies between data produced by national statistical offices and/or regional and international organizations, and will also serve to improve overall coverage and comparability. This will also allow for the regional perspective to be absorbed into the global framework, taking into account statistical aspects that result from the policy needs, cultural specifics and statistical expertise within the region. Furthermore, participants recommended leveraging regional organizations to take on the responsibility of measuring related targets and indicators via an agreed population survey methodology, as these are often the only means of generating nationwide baseline data on critical development, security, governance and justice issues.

In addition, participants highlighted the value in convening a follow-up expert group meeting to look at the challenges of generating data to populate indicators in developing countries where administrative data is missing and national statistical offices are weak, as well as identify short-term options.

Inputs from the *Accountability Framework* meeting in Glen Cove will feed into the OWG of the General Assembly on Sustainable Development Goals, as well as the GA's high-level Special Event on the MDGs in September 2013 and will be used to support UN deliberations with Member States. This report will be made available to the public via www.worldwewant2015.org.

---

[27] These methodologies include victimization surveys, as well as surveys that measure rates of violence against women, homicide, mortality statistics (cause of death), human rights, and rule of law.

## Annex I: DOCUMENTATION

**Considerations for framing goals, targets and indicators (Based on a paper by Henk-Jan Brinkman, with additions from Mac Darrow of OHCHR through an on-line discussion)**

Characteristics of goals vs. targets vs. indicators:

- Goals: aspirational, inspirational, broad, generic, abstract.
- Targets: more specific, timeframe, numerical target.
- Indicators: to measure progress against target.

| Key criteria for targets | Key criteria for indicators |
|---|---|
| Universal (across countries) | SMART (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound) |
| Outcome-focussed (not means) | Methodologically sound (agreed, robust etc.) |
| Simple (and communicable) | Feasible to measure (cost, capacity, etc.) |
| Measurable (and easy to interpret) | Disaggregation (sex, region, age etc.) |
| Democratically legitimate, consistent with law, ambitious but achievable | Absent of perverse incentives |

**Data sources:**

- Household, perception and experience surveys;
- Administrative data, incident reports, document review;
- "Expert" assessments.

## Annex II: AGENDA

**Facilitator: Cedric de Coning**

| TIME | AGENDA ITEM | PRESENTER(S) | MATERIALS |
|---|---|---|---|
| 8:30 – 9:00AM | Official opening | • Jordan Ryan (UNDP)<br>• Judy Cheng-Hopkins (PBSO) | |
| 9:00 – 9:30AM | Introductions<br>Key outcomes of consultations<br>Expert meeting expectations<br>Overview/Process | • Facilitator<br>• James Rogan (UNICEF) | |
| 9:30 10:30AM | Panel discussion on the politics of goal setting | 1) Vanessa Wyeth<br><br>2) Larry Attree<br><br>3) Nicolas Fasel<br><br>4) Edgar Guerrero | • Background paper on the politics of goal setting'<br>• Summary report of governance consultation<br>• Key messages conflict, violence and disaster consultation |
| 10:30 – 11:00AM | *Break* | | |
| 11:00-11:30AM | Setting parameters for working groups through background review (existing global frameworks; criteria and targets identified in e-discussion) | Facilitator and Mark Orkin | • Muggah background paper<br>• Background paper on criteria for targets and indicators<br>• MDGs targets and indicators<br>• HLP Report (goals and targets)<br>• Sustainable development solutions network report (goals and targets)<br>• ODI paper on targets and indicators for DRR<br>• Extract from meeting report of OHCHR/UNDP expert consultation |
| 11:30 – 1:00PM | Participants break into working group to discuss key targets:<br>1. Conflict and Violence<br>2. Justice and Rule of Law<br>3. Governance<br>4. Disasters<br>5. Social and Economic Development Aspects of Conflict and Violence | Designated Facilitators (TBD) | Same as above |
| 1:00 – 2:00PM | *Lunch* | | |
| 2:00 – 3:30 pm | Working groups resume | | |

| TIME | AGENDA ITEM | PRESENTER(S) | MATERIALS |
|------|-------------|--------------|-----------|
| 3:30 – 4:00PM | *Break* | | |
| 4:00 – 6:00PM | Report back from working groups and discussion | Designated Rapporteurs from the five working groups | |

## DAY 2: WEDNESDAY 19 JUNE

| TIME | AGENDA ITEM | PRESENTER(S) | MATERIALS |
|------|-------------|--------------|-----------|
| 8:30 – 8:35AM | Summary of day 1 | Facilitator | |
| 8:35 – 9:30PM | Discussion of Targets Proposed on Day 1 | | |
| 9:30– 1:00PM | Working groups on indicators | Same facilitators as day before | • Background paper on criteria for targets and indicators<br>• MDGs targets and indicators<br>• International Dialogue Peacebuilding and Statebuilding interim indicators |
| 1:00 – 2:00PM | *Lunch* | | |
| 2:00 – 3:30PM | Presentation of working groups results | Designated Rapporteurs | |
| 3:30 – 3:45PM | *Break* | | |
| 3:45 – 5:00PM | Conclusion and next steps | • Cedric de Coning<br>• Henk-Jan Brinkman<br>• Samuel Doe<br>• Serge Kapto | |

# Annex III: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

| NAME | TITLE | AFFILIATION | EMAIL |
|------|-------|-------------|-------|
| **Albuquerque, Nazaré** | Senior Policy Consultant, Global Thematic Consultation on Conflict, Violence and Disaster | UNDP/BCPR | nazare.albuquerque@undp.org |
| **Alradi, Ellen** | | Department of Political Affairs | alradi@un.org or alradie@un.org |
| **Attree, Larry** | Head of Policy | Saferworld | lattree@saferworld.org.uk |
| **Basnyat, Aparna** | Programme Specialist (Access to Justice and Rule of Law) | UNDP/BDP | aparna.basnyat@undp.org |
| **Baaser, Sharif** | Child Protection Specialist | UNICEF | sbaaser@unicef.org |
| **Borgeaud, Martin** | Programme Specialist | UNDP/BCPR RoL | martin.borgeaud@undp.org |
| **Bottigliero, Ilaria** | Director, Research and Policy | IDLO | ibottigliero@idlo.int |
| **Breslauer, Michelle** | US representative | Institute for Economics and Peace, Australia | mbreslauer@economicsandpeace.org |
| **Brinkman, Henk-Jan** | Chief, Policy, Planning and Application Branch | United Nations/PBSO | brinkman@un.org |
| **Buluma, Robert** | Chair | National Bureau of Statistics, Kenya | rbuluma@knbs.or.ke |
| **Cano, Ignacio** | Senior Lecturer | State University of Rio de Janeiro | ignaciocano62@gmail.com |
| **Cerecina, Mila** | Senior Researcher | Harvard Kennedy School of Government | mila_cerecina@hks.harvard.edu |
| **Cheng-Hopkins, Judy** | Assistant Secretary-General for PBSO | United Nations PBSO | |
| **Cilliers, Jakkie** | Executive Director | Institute for Security Studies, South Africa | cilliers.jakkie@gmail.com |
| **Coleman, Peter** | Director Columbia University | Int. Center for Cooperation and Conflict Resolution | kmazzaro@ei.columbia.edu |
| **de Coning, Cedric** | Head, Peace Operations and Peacebuilding, and Peacekeeping and Peacebuilding Advisor | NUPI (Norway) and ACCORD, South Africa | cdc@nupi.no |
| **de Carvalho, Gustavo** | Peacebuilding Coordinator | ACCORD, South Africa | gustavo@accord.org.za |
| **de Martino, Luigi** | Coordinator | Geneva Declaration on Armed Violence and Development | luigi.demartino@genevadeclaration.org |
| **Doe, Samuel** | Policy Advisor and Team Leader | UNDP/BCPR | samuel.doe@undp.org |
| **Fagan, Craig** | Policy Manager, Research and Knowledge Group | Transparency International | cfagan@transparency.org |
| **Fasel, Nicolas** | Chief, MDG section | OHCHR | nfasel@ohchr.org |
| **Michele Ferenz** | Director of the Food-Water-Energy Nexus | East West Institute | mferenz@ewi.info |

| | | Program | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Fracalossi, Rodrigo** | Senior Researcher | The Institute for Applied Economic Research (IPEA), Brazil | rodrigo.moraes@ipea.gov.br |
| **Goetz, Anne-Marie** | Chief Advisor, Governance Peace and Security | UNWomen | anne-marie.goetz@unwomen.org |
| **Gordillo, Juan Pablo** | CPR Citizen Security Specialist | UNDP Regional Center for Latin America and the Caribbean | juan.gordillo@undp.org |
| **Grahn, Hanna** | Policy Officer | UNDP/BCPR | hanna.grahn@undp.org |
| **Guerrero, Centeno Edgar** | Senior Consultant | INEGI, Mexico | edgar.guerrero@inegi.org.mx |
| **Gutierrez, Francisco** | Lecturer | Universidad Nacional de Colombia | gutiers2002@yahoo.com |
| **Hyslop, Daniel** | Research Manager | Institute for Economics and Peace, Australia | dhyslop@economicsandpeace.org |
| **Jenkins, Robert** | Professor | Hunter College | rjenk@hunter.cuny.edu |
| **Kapto, Serge** | Programme Specialist (governance) | UNDP/BPD | serge.kapto@undp.org |
| **Khanna, Shivani** | DRR Consultant | | shivanik10@hotmail.com |
| **Karlen, Marie-Thérèse** | First Secretary | Permanent Mission of Switzerland to the United Nations | marie-therese.karlen@eda.admin.ch |
| **Kishore, Kamal** | Senior Policy Advisor | UNDP/BCPR | kamal.kishore@undp.og |
| **Laberge, Marie** | GP&S Specialist | UNDP Senegal | marie.laberge@undp.org |
| **Mack, Andrew** | Director | Human Security Research Group, Canada | andrewmack@telus.net |
| **Malby, Steven** | Drug Control and Crime Prevention Officer | UNODC | steven.malby@unodc.org |
| **McCandless, Erin** | Consultant | Civil Society Platform on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding representative on the New Deal Indicator Working Group | erin.mccandless@gmail.com |
| **Milante, Gary** | Economist | WB | gmilante@worldbank.org |
| **Ñungo, Iván Darío** | Investigador Proyecto | Instituto Cisalva, Universidad del Valle, Colombia | ivanopol@gmail.com |
| **Orkin, Mark** | Organizational and Social Research Consultant | South Africa | mark.orkin@gmal.com |
| **Piza-Lopez, Eugenia** | Senior Policy Advisor and Team Leader | UNDP/BCPR | eugenia.piza-lopez@undp.org |
| **Ryan, Jordan** | ASG and Director BCPR | UNDP | Jordan.ryan@undp.org |
| **Rego, Loy** | Senior Consultant | | regoloy@gmail.com |
| **Ribeiro, Ludmila** | Consultant | Forum Brasileiro de Seguranca Publica | ludmila.ribeiro@gmail.com |
| **Ricigliano, Rob** | Director | Institute of World Affairs, University of Wisconsin | robr@uwm.edu |
| **Rogan, James** | Chief, Peacebuilding and Recovery Section | UNICEF | jrogan@unicef.org |
| **Selous, Edric** | Director | Rule of Law Unit, EOSG | selous@un.org |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Santos, Vanda** | | UNDP | Vanda.santos@undp.org |
| **Sharma, Sudhindra** | Executive Director | Interdisciplinary Analysis, Nepal | sudhindrarajsharma@gmail.com |
| **Smith, Alan** | Professor, UNESCO Chair | University of Ulster, Northern Ireland | a.smith@ulster.ac.uk |
| **Solmirano, Carina** | Senior Researcher | SIPRI | solmirano@sipri.org |
| **Spalton, Anthony** | DRR Specialist | UNICEF | aspalton@unicef.org |
| **Surjan, Akhilesh** | Associate Professor | Kyoto University, visiting Professor UN University | surjan.akhilesh.5m@kyoto-u.ac.jp |
| **Tanja, Vikki** | Advisor, Conflict and Governance | MOFA, Finland | tanja.viikki@formin.fi |
| **Tommasoli, Massimo** | Permanent Representative | IDEA | m.tommasoli@idea.int |
| **Ulich, Oliver** | Head, Partnerships Team, Division of Policy, Evaluation and Training | DPKO | ulich@un.org |
| **van Beijnum, Mariska** | Deputy Head, Conflict Research Unit | Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael' | mbeijnum@clingendael.nl |
| **Vilalta, Carlos** | Professor | Portland University | carlos.vilalta@cide.edu |
| **Walter, Marius** | Consultant on Governance Assessments/OGC | Oslo Goverance Center | marius.walter@undp.org |
| **Ward, Elizabeth** | Professor, medical epidemiologist | University of West Indies, Jamaica | ward@kasnet.com |
| **Wyeth, Vanessa** | Governance and Peace-building | Global Partnerships Division, OECD | hawkinsvanessa@gmail.com |
| **Zakharia, Zeena** | Assistant Professor | University of Massachusetts, Boston | zzakharia@gmail.com |