The background of the entire page is a black field filled with numerous vertical columns of glowing green light. Each column consists of a series of small, bright green circles or dots that are slightly out of focus, creating a bokeh effect. The overall impression is that of digital data or a network of light points.

THE DANISH
INSTITUTE FOR
HUMAN RIGHTS

HUMAN RIGHTS
AND DATA

TOOLS AND RESOURCES FOR
SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

HUMAN RIGHTS AND DATA TOOLS AND RESOURCES FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

This paper is written by Birgitte Feiring, Francesca Thornberry and Adrian Hassler, with contributions from the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), Eva Grambye, Louise Holck, Hans-Otto Sano, Alan Miller, Allan Lerberg Jørgensen, Anja Møller Pedersen, Alison Hosie, Ayla-Kristina Olesen Yurtaslan and Marylynn Serwaah. Illustrations by Amanda Franklin-Ryan.

The Danish Institute for Human Rights is a member of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions (GANHRI). The current publication has been developed as an input to the dialogue in the upcoming World Data Forum.

© 2017 The Danish Institute for Human Rights
Denmark's National Human Rights Institution
Wilders Plads 8K
DK-1403 Copenhagen K
Phone +45 3269 8888
www.humanrights.dk

Provided such reproduction is for non-commercial use, this publication, or parts of it, may be reproduced if author and source are quoted.

At DIHR we aim to make our publications as accessible as possible. We use large font size, short (hyphen-free) lines, left-aligned text and strong contrast for maximum legibility. For further information about accessibility please click www.humanrights.dk/accessibility

CONTENT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	6
INTRODUCTION	9
1 ENSURING ACCOUNTABILITY THROUGH GLOBAL STATISTICS	11
1.1 THE HUMAN RIGHTS RELEVANCE OF THE INDICATORS	12
1.2 TYPES OF INDICATORS AND CORRESPONDENCE WITH TARGETS	13
1.2.1 STRUCTURE, PROCESS AND OUTCOME INDICATORS	13
1.2.2 PERCEPTION INDICATORS	16
1.2.3 MULTIDIMENSIONAL TARGETS	17
2 DATA DISAGGREGATION	20
2.1 LIMITED CAPACITY FOR DISAGGREGATION	20
2.2 NOT ALL DATA CAN BE DISAGGREGATED	22
2.3 REQUIREMENTS FOR DISAGGREGATION IN THE INDICATORS FRAMEWORK	23
2.4 SCOPE OF DISAGGREGATION	24
2.5 HUMAN RIGHTS BODIES' GUIDANCE FOR DATA DISAGGREGATION	25
3 ISSUES OF DATA AVAILABILITY	27
3.1 TIER CLASSIFICATION	27
3.2 DATA GAPS ON HUMAN RIGHTS	28
4 BUILDING A PLURALISTIC ECOSYSTEM OF DATA	31
4.1 PRINCIPLES FOR A HUMAN RIGHTS-BASED APPROACH TO DATA COLLECTION	32
4.2 STEPS TO DEFINE NATIONAL INDICATORS AND DATA COLLECTION INITIATIVES	34
4.3 CITIZEN-GENERATED DATA AND MONITORING	36
4.4 PRIVATE SECTOR REPORTING	38
4.5 INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS REPORTING AND MONITORING	40
4.5.1 THE UNIVERSAL PERIODIC REVIEW	41
4.5.2 TREATY MONITORING BODIES AND SPECIAL PROCEDURES	43
4.5.3 ILO SUPERVISORY BODIES	45

4.6	NATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS INSTITUTIONS AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT	47
	4.6.1 NHRIS AS AN INDICATOR OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT	49
	4.6.2 NHRI DATA ON MARGINALIZED GROUPS	50
	4.6.3 NHRIS AS DATA PROVIDERS	52
	4.6.4 NHRIS AND CLIMATE CHANGE	53
ANNEXES		56
ANNEX A: PROHIBITED GROUNDS OF DISCRIMINATION		56
END NOTES		57

ACRONYMS

ANNHRI	Arab Network of NHRIs
CEACR	Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women
CERD	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination
CRC	Convention on the Rights of the Child
CRPD	Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
DIHR	Danish Institute for Human Rights
ECLAC	Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean
FUR	Follow-up and Review
GANHRI	Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions
GRI	Global Reporting Initiative
HLPF	High Level Political Forum
HRBAD	Human Rights-Based Approach to Data
ICCPR	International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
ICESCR	International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
IAEG-SDGs	Inter-Agency and Expert Group on SDG Indicators
ILO	International Labour Organization
LGBTI	Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex
NHRI	National Human Rights Institution
NSO	National Statistical Office
OHCHR	Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
UNCTAD	UN Conference on Trade and Development
UNEP	UN Environment Programme
UNGPs	UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights
UPR	Universal Periodic Review
VNR	Voluntary National Review

SUMMARY

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development is explicitly grounded in international human rights treaties, and affirms that the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) seek to realize the human rights of all. The majority of SDG targets are linked to elements of international human rights and labour standards, and the pledge to leave no one behind reflects the fundamental human rights principles of non-discrimination and equality. Operationally, it is crucial that the human rights aspects of the SDGs are upheld and measured.

The overall aim of the Follow-Up and Review (FUR) mechanisms of the 2030 Agenda is to support accountability to citizens. Further, the implementation of the Agenda will be informed by “data, which is high-quality, accessible, timely, reliable and disaggregated by sex, age, race, ethnicity, migration status, disability and geographic location and other characteristics relevant in national contexts”.

This publication provides a human rights-perspective on the data needed to drive and guide the implementation of the 2030 Agenda. Overall, it assesses:

- The extent to which the generation of disaggregated statistical data based on global indicators is likely to ensure accountability, including for those furthest behind.
- The approaches, indicators and data needed to fill the data gaps.

While the collection of disaggregated statistical data against the 230 global SDG indicators potentially provides unprecedented opportunities for measuring development outcomes in a comparative manner across the globe, there are also challenges related to:

- The relatively limited aspects of states’ human rights obligations that are monitored through the global indicators (being mainly focused on long-term outcome), the challenges in measuring perceptions, and the reductionist effect of certain indicators.

- The limitations in the potential for data disaggregation related to the type of indicators, gaps related to disaggregation on the basis of grounds of discrimination in international law, and the limited capacity of National Statistical Offices (NSOs).
- The lack of conceptual clarity and/or limited data availability for many of the global indicators.
- The capacity constraints of many NSOs, and the limited resources available for capacity-building and data collection.

Realistically, data collection against some of the global indicators, and in particular those classified as Tier III, will remain largely aspirational in many countries for years to come. In this context, it is crucial to focus on the overall purpose of monitoring SDG implementation, and keep in mind that data is more than statistics and that more quantitative statistics do not necessarily lead to better decisions. Rather, there is a need for collaborative efforts to develop creative, innovative, efficient and cost-effective approaches to monitoring and data collection, which can supplement statistical data based on global indicators. By building a pluralistic ecosystem of data, based on the complementarity of national and global indicators as well as data from multiple sources, we can eventually “measure what we treasure”.

Such an ecosystem of data should depart from a mapping of what is already available in terms of statistical and other data, and use human rights monitoring information to identify the need for:

- Additional national indicators, benchmarks and related statistical data collection, including context-specific and collaborative initiatives to capture the situation of particular groups; and
- Inclusion of a variety of credible data sources, including the analysis, information and data produced through human rights monitoring mechanisms, citizen-generated data and private sector reporting.

In general, data collection must be guided by the Human Rights-Based Approach to Data (HRBAD) developed by the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, emphasizing the importance of the principles of self-identification, participation, disaggregation, transparency, privacy and accountability.

Human rights monitoring mechanisms at national and international levels constitute a crucial element of a pluralistic data ecosystem. Through institutionalised reporting and monitoring, they can provide qualitative information and context-specific analysis and advice, including by identifying particularly vulnerable groups, and providing information about sensitive issues that are hard to capture through common statistical data. At the same time, SDG monitoring can strengthen human rights monitoring by giving the impetus to improve data collection on some key human rights issues.

As states are already required to report regularly to key human rights and labour law mechanisms, there is a further advantage of using this information from an efficiency and cost-effectiveness perspective.

The Universal Periodic Review, treaty monitoring bodies and special procedures as well as the supervisory bodies of the International Labour Organization (ILO) are among the key human rights mechanisms that can contribute to SDG monitoring. In this context, it is worth highlighting indicator 8.8.2, which measures increase in national compliance of labour rights based on ILO textual sources and national legislation. It is the only global indicator that is directly linked to an existing human rights and labour standards monitoring mechanism, but it reaffirms the potential for using this approach for the range of SDG targets that are directly linked to international human rights and labour standards.

National Human Rights Institutions (NHRIs) can ensure national anchorage of SDG follow-up and review, and play a significant role in national monitoring processes. NHRIs are independent State bodies with a constitutional and/or legislative mandate to protect and promote human rights. As such, they can use their existing mandates to further the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, as data providers, facilitators of participatory data collection processes and by addressing human rights concerns related to particular SDGs, such as Goal 13 on climate change. The importance of NHRIs for the 2030 Agenda is further reaffirmed, as the 'existence of an independent NHRI' is one of the global indicators under Goal 16. Through the Global Alliance of NHRIs (GANHRI), NHRIs are collaborating and engaging in order to contribute to a human rights-based approach to implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, including by reporting to the High Level Political Forum on the human rights situation in the countries undergoing Voluntary National Reviews.

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

With the adoption of the complex, comprehensive and universal 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, states have committed to transformative goals of eliminating extreme poverty, reducing inequalities and securing jobs while ensuring environmental sustainability and addressing climate change.

The Agenda is explicitly grounded in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international human rights treaties, and affirms that the 17 SDGs seek to realise the human rights of all.¹ Further, the pledge to leave no one behind reflects the fundamental human rights principles of non-discrimination and equality.

Human rights are reflected throughout the SDGs and targets. Concretely, 156 of the 169 targets have substantial linkages to human rights and labour standards. The SDGs and human rights are thereby tied together in a mutually reinforcing way.² Operationally, the commitment to disaggregate made clear in the 2030 Agenda, is crucial to ensure that no one is left behind.

Following the celebratory moment of the adoption of the Agenda, the focus is now on devising strategies that will enable 193 different countries to actually reach the SDGs by 2030. A key component is to make sure that implementation departs from the right knowledge base and is guided by the right information and data flows to continuously drive and adjust the necessary change.

The overall aim of the **Follow-Up and Review (FUR)** mechanisms of the 2030 Agenda is to support accountability to citizens. The Agenda emphasises that **quality, accessible, timely and reliable disaggregated data** is key to decision-making, measurement of progress and to ensure that no one is left behind.³ To this effect, a framework of **230 global indicators** has been agreed, which should be complemented by **additional indicators** at national level.

This publication provides a human rights perspective on data, focusing on:

- **Ensuring accountability.** An assessment of what can realistically be achieved through the generation of statistical data based on global indicators in terms of ensuring accountability for progress towards the SDGs, including for those furthest behind.
- **Building a pluralistic ecosystem of data.** An identification of approaches, indicators and data that can be used to fill the gaps, including by building on the crucial contributions from existing human rights monitoring mechanisms as well as citizen-generated data.

In response to a recommendation outlined in the “A World That Counts”⁴ report, the UN Statistical Commission agreed that a **UN World Data Forum** would be the suitable platform for strengthening cooperation with relevant actors to address the data challenges presented by the 2030 Agenda. The first UN World Data Forum will take place in January 2017. This is an opportunity to foster dialogue among the wide range of different actors that can contribute to the necessary **ecosystem of data** that is required to guide strategies for sustainable development. This publication is a contribution to that dialogue, elaborated with the aspiration that data derived from human rights and labour rights mechanisms and processes become a prominent element of such an ecosystem.

CHAPTER 1

1 ENSURING ACCOUNTABILITY THROUGH GLOBAL STATISTICS

The **global indicators framework**⁵ was elaborated by the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on SDG Indicators (IAEG-SDGs) and agreed by the UN Statistical Commission in March 2016. It consists of 230⁶ individual indicators, which are intended to provide a **practical starting point** for measuring progress towards the 17 SDGs and their associated targets.

The IAEG-SDGs was faced with **multiple challenges** in the elaboration of the indicators. Many targets under the 2030 Agenda are **composite and multidimensional**, and reflect a variety of intentions and ambitions. In contrast, indicators need to be **specific and measurable** and **limited in number** in order to increase the feasibility of data collection. Given the universality of the SDGs, the indicators should also ideally be **universally relevant**, and generate **comparable data** across the globe.


The following analysis explores the potential and challenges associated with measuring the 2030 Agenda through statistical data based on global indicators in the following aspects:

- An analysis of the **human rights-relevance** of the global indicator framework;
- An overview of the different **types of indicators** included in the global framework; and
- An assessment of the **limitations** and **opportunities** implied in terms of **what they can measure**.

1.1 THE HUMAN RIGHTS RELEVANCE OF THE INDICATORS


From a human rights perspective, some parts of the indicator framework are more relevant than others. According to a qualitative analysis of the human rights aspects of the individual targets and the ability of the related indicators to measure these aspects, the Danish Institute for Human Rights (DIHR) estimates that:

- Half (49%) of the SDG indicators have the potential to yield data that is directly relevant for monitoring specific human rights instruments;
- Approx. 10% of the indicators will contribute data that has indirect human rights relevance, but can still be linked to the monitoring of specific human rights instruments; and
- Approx. 40 % of the indicators will generate contextual information that may be relevant for a broad analysis of factors that enable or limit the realisation of human rights.⁷



While the above analysis can provide a general estimation of the human rights-relevance of the global indicators, it can, of course, not determine the relevance of the individual indicators in a specific country context. This will depend on the specific human rights challenges in a given country, and thus require an additional level of analysis.

The directly human rights-relevant indicators are unevenly distributed across the 17 Goals, as follows:



This table clearly shows that the indicators that are directly human rights-relevant are most strongly represented under the goals that address fundamental social and economic rights, for example, under Goal 3 (health) and Goal 4 (education). Meanwhile Goals 1 (poverty eradication), 5 (gender equality) and 16 (peace, justice and strong institutions) also have a large proportion of directly human rights-relevant indicators associated with them.

In contrast, the table shows that there are few human rights-relevant indicators to measure in relation to, for example, Goal 6 (water and sanitation), Goal 9 (industry, innovation and infrastructure) and Goal 15 (life on land), although there are numerous human rights implications associated with these goals. This may give an indication of where additional human rights measurement may add value.

1.2 TYPES OF INDICATORS AND CORRESPONDENCE WITH TARGETS

1.2.1 STRUCTURE, PROCESS AND OUTCOME INDICATORS

Under international human rights law, States have **obligations to respect, protect and fulfil** human rights. The Office of the UN High Commissioner for

Human Rights (OHCHR) has developed comprehensive guidance for the design of human rights indicators⁸ to measure these obligations, as well as the outcomes or impact of efforts to secure and protect human rights. Overall, there are three types of human rights indicators:

- **Structural indicators** to measure states' **commitment** to human rights as reflected in, for example, the ratification of international treaties or the adoption of national laws and policies.
- **Process indicators** that measure states' **efforts** to transform human rights commitments into results, for example through budget allocations, establishment of institutions, coverage of social services and training of personnel.
- **Outcome indicators** that measure the actual **results** or **impact** of states' commitments and efforts in terms of the population's enjoyment of human rights, for example in the areas of educational attainment or access to safe drinking water by population group.


As these three types of indicators measure different aspects of states' human rights obligations, they should ideally be used **complementarily**.

Target 3.1 on maternal mortality, for example, has two complementary indicators that are both human rights-relevant:

- Indicator 3.1.2 is a **process indicator** that measures the proportion of births attended by skilled health personnel; and
- Indicator 3.1.1 is an **outcome indicator**, which measures the maternal mortality ratio.

However, to ensure feasibility of the global SDG indicators framework, it was agreed to keep the number of indicators as low as possible, and most targets have **only one** related indicator, which can at best only measure one aspect of states' human rights obligations or human rights outcomes.

An assessment of the 113 indicators that are directly human rights-relevant reveals that there are **only 5 structural indicators** (three under Goal 5, one under Goal 6, and one under Goal 13). Further, only **30** of the total number of indicators can be classified as **process indicators**, while the **majority (81)** can be classified as **outcome indicators**.



The vast majority of indicators thus focus on **outcome**. While this is highly relevant to ultimately measure whether the target has been reached, outcome is often the result of complex processes, influenced by multiple factors. Hence, outcome indicators consolidate the impact of various underlying processes over time, and are often **slow-moving** and less sensitive to capturing momentary changes than process indicators. Therefore, outcome indicators can have **limited potential** for measuring states more **immediate commitment and efforts** to reach the goals and targets.

Target 8.7 illustrates how indicators may also serve to shift the focus from process to outcome. The Target requires states to take measures against forced and child labour and trafficking, but the indicator makes no reference to the kind of “effective measures” undertaken, and refers to the ultimate outcome in terms of children involved in child labour (also leaving out the elements of forced labour and trafficking).

TARGET 8.7	INDICATOR 8.7.1
Take immediate and effective measures to eradicate forced labour, end modern slavery and human trafficking and secure the prohibition and elimination of the worst forms of child labour, including recruitment and use of child soldiers, and by 2025 end child labour in all its forms.	Proportion and number of children aged 5-17 years engaged in child labour, by sex and age.

To pursue a more **comprehensive monitoring** of SDG implementation, it may therefore be relevant to supplement global outcome indicators with additional national structural and process indicators with a shorter response time that can directly measure states' commitments and efforts. Moreover, complementarity can be sought with existing human rights monitoring information, which focuses considerably on structural and process elements. In turn, monitoring of global outcome indicators in the 2030 Agenda can contribute crucial data and information that can complement and enhance human rights monitoring.

1.2.2 PERCEPTION INDICATORS

Targets 10.3 and 16.b related to non-discrimination are among the few targets that require states to undertake structural measures such as the enactment of laws and policies. However, their associated indicators do not capture all aspects of the targets in question. For example, common Indicator 10.3.1 and 16.b.a is an assessment-based or subjective outcome indicator, measuring the perception of discrimination as expressed by individuals. The inclusion of such perception indicators is a valid and progressive innovation, in comparison to the MDGs, as it gives voice and potentially empowers those experiencing discrimination.

TARGETS	COMMON INDICATOR 10.3.1 AND 16.B.1
<p>Target 10.3. Ensure equal opportunity and reduce inequalities of outcome, including by eliminating discriminatory laws, policies and practices and promoting appropriate legislation, policies and action in this regard.</p> <p>Target 16.b. Promote and enforce non-discriminatory laws and policies for sustainable development.</p>	<p>Percentage of population reporting having personally felt discriminated against or harassed in the previous 12 months on the basis of a ground of discrimination prohibited under international human rights law.</p>

However, the indicator will not be capable of directly measuring the structural aspects related to promotion and enforcement of laws and policies. Also, it may be challenging to operationalise, as people are not necessarily aware of the principles of discrimination under international human rights law. Further, individuals' or groups' experiences of discrimination may reflect deeply ingrained

social, cultural, economic patterns that only change over long periods. This is another area where human rights monitoring information can add value to complete the picture.

The global indicators framework also includes perception indicators under Targets 1.4 (perceptions of land security), 16.1 (perceptions of safety) and 16.7 (perceptions of decision-making). In these cases, perceptions constitute one among several indicators, hence ensuring complementarity between fact-based and perception-based measurement. With the exception of indicator 16.1.4, all of these perception indicators are classified as Tier III (see section 3.1) thus making it uncertain when and how data collection will be undertaken.

1.2.3 MULTIDIMENSIONAL TARGETS

Many targets contain multiple elements related to human rights standards that should ideally be measured. There is a risk that indicators and statistical data, if not capable of capturing all the elements of the targets in question, can have a **reductionist effect** on the broader vision embedded in the 2030 Agenda. This risk is evident when assessing a number of key human rights-related targets and their related indicators, and represents another gap that existing human rights monitoring information can contribute to filling.

TARGET	INDICATOR	GAP/RISK PRESENTED
<p>10.2 By 2030, empower and promote the social, economic and political inclusion of all, irrespective of age, sex, disability, race, ethnicity, origin, religion or economic or other status.</p>	<p>10.2.1 Proportion of people living below 50 per cent of median income, by age, sex and persons with disabilities.</p>	<p>The target is a broad and human rights-based, but the measurement in the indicator is solely based on economic factors (income).</p>
<p>16.3 Promote the rule of law at the national and international levels and ensure equal access to justice for all.</p>	<p>16.3.1 Proportion of victims of violence in the previous 12 months who reported their victimization to competent authorities or other officially</p>	<p>The target refers to the broad principles of Rule of Law and equal access to justice. These outcomes are dependent on the existence of relevant legal frameworks and policies, and the implementation of</p>

	<p>recognized conflict resolution mechanisms.</p> <p>16.3.2 Unsented detainees as a proportion of overall prison population.</p>	<p>specific measures such as training of law enforcement and judicial authorities, which are absent in the indicators.</p>
--	--	--

There are also a number of instances in which targets and indicators are of relevance to vulnerable groups, and yet are too limited to enable a full understanding of the issues faced by these groups, the specific rights attached to them, or the challenges they face in relation to the achievement of specific goals and targets. A case in point is the situation of **indigenous peoples**. Two specific targets refer to indigenous peoples, and yet the associated indicators do not capture crucial aspects of their rights. Other indicators are of relevance to indigenous peoples, yet fail to capture the full range of situations that are relevant for indigenous peoples. For example:

TARGET	INDICATOR	GAPS
<p>1.4 By 2030, ensure that all men and women, in particular the poor and the vulnerable, have equal rights to economic resources, as well as access to basic services, ownership and control over land and other forms of property, inheritance, natural resources, appropriate new technology and financial services, including microfinance.</p>	<p>1.4.2 Proportion of total adult population with secure tenure rights to land, with legally recognized documentation and who perceive their rights to land as secure, by sex and by type of tenure.</p>	<p>Indicator of relevance to indigenous peoples but measurement method refers to individual tenure rights, whereas the recognised land rights of indigenous peoples are primarily collective rights.</p>
<p>4.5 By 2030, eliminate gender disparities in education and ensure equal access to all levels of education and vocational training for the vulnerable, including persons with disabilities, indigenous peoples and children in vulnerable situations.</p>	<p>4.5.1 Parity indices (female/male, rural/urban, bottom/top wealth quintile and others such as disability status, indigenous peoples and conflict-affected, as data</p>	<p>Indicator does not consider the specific challenges that indigenous peoples can face in relation to discrimination, access to education, or bilingual and culturally-</p>

	become available) for all education indicators on this list that can be disaggregated.	appropriate education.
--	--	------------------------

CHAPTER 2

2 DATA DISAGGREGATION

The 2030 Agenda vows to ‘leave no one behind’. This is in recognition of the role that discrimination and inequality play in influencing uneven development outcomes for different sectors of society. In order to achieve this, data collection must be capable of capturing the disparities in relation to vulnerable groups, as well as ensuring that the specific needs and rights of those groups can be captured and addressed. Data disaggregation is the main approach suggested in the Agenda to monitor unequal progress for different population groups.

From a human rights perspective, data disaggregation provides a series of opportunities and challenges that will be discussed in the following section.

These are:

- The capacity for disaggregation;
- The scope of disaggregation;
- The potential for disaggregation;
- The requirement for disaggregation; and
- The guidance from human rights bodies.

2.1 LIMITED CAPACITY FOR DISAGGREGATION

The collection of disaggregated data depends on the inclusion of relevant “identifiers” when collecting data through census and household surveys as well as administrative registers. While most **national statistical offices (NSOs)** regularly disaggregate data based on gender, age, and to some extent the rural/urban divide, the commitment to, and statistical capacity for disaggregation on other grounds varies greatly between countries and regions. Depending on the method of data collection, the quality of statistical data can potentially deteriorate with increasing level of detail due to small sample sizes, which becomes particularly challenging with a view to multi-dimensional disaggregation (e.g., child labour among poor urban females).⁹

Further, statisticians may face structural barriers due to existing laws and regulations that hinder them from collecting data needed for disaggregation, or due to confidentiality issues.

UN Regional Commissions play a key role concerning data collection and systematisation. The **Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean** (ECLAC), along with NSOs in the region, has made major advances in making disaggregated data available not only based on age and sex, but also on ethnic identity. For example, the Sistema de Indicadores Sociodemográficos de Poblaciones y Pueblos Indígenas (SISPPi) provides disaggregated data on indigenous peoples and afro-descendant communities from 15 countries in the region that have included an “indigenous identifier” in their censuses. This information is crucial for disclosing and addressing the severe socio-economic gaps that exist between these and other population groups.

Disaggregation is technically challenging and therefore requires a well-developed statistical system, which in many countries may only become available after significant capacity-building efforts. In addition, it is costly and will require a significant increase in resources.

In this context, the 2030 Agenda includes a specific target (17.18): *“By 2020 enhance capacity-building support to developing countries, including for least developed countries and small island developing States, to increase significantly the availability of high-quality, timely and reliable data disaggregated by income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other characteristics relevant in national contexts”*. Its associated indicator (17.18.1) will measure the “proportion of sustainable development indicators produced at the national level with full disaggregation when relevant to the target...”. This indicator is itself categorised as Tier III.

The adequate implementation of target 17.18 is key to enabling a systematic monitoring of the equality and non-discrimination dimensions of the entire 2030 Agenda. However, significant challenges remain in terms of building **sufficient**

statistical capacity to significantly enhance data disaggregation by 2020 while many countries are still struggling with the most basic statistics. For example, according to UNICEF, only 44% of sub-Saharan Africa’s children under-five years of age are registered today.¹⁰ Making progress towards greater disaggregation will nonetheless be critical for ensuring that no one is left behind, and to support measurement of key outcomes beyond the period of the 2030 Agenda. Opportunities should be pursued, however, for the incorporation of disaggregation (and a human rights-focused approach more generally) when developing statistical systems.

2.2 NOT ALL DATA CAN BE DISAGGREGATED

Not all indicators technically lend themselves to disaggregation. An example is indicator 5.a.2, which measures the proportion of countries where the legal framework (including customary law) guarantees women's equal rights to land ownership and/or control. This indicator is obviously relevant for equality but does not produce disaggregated data, as the unit of measurement is the State. Disaggregation of data requires measurement by either individuals or households.

Overall, DIHR has estimated that 100 SDG indicators (41.8%) technically allow for the collection of disaggregated data on the basis described above. The potential for disaggregation is unevenly distributed across the 17 Goals, being strongest under Goals 1, 3, 4, 5 and 16 (addressing poverty, health, education, gender and governance). Goals 11 (cities), 12 (sustainable consumption and production), 14 (life below water) and 15 (life on land) do not have any indicators that can be disaggregated. Interestingly, only 4 out of 11 indicators under Goal 10 (reducing inequalities) can be disaggregated. The table below shows the **number and percentage of indicators** under each goal that **has potential for disaggregation**.

GOALS	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
TOTAL	12	14	26	11	14	11	6	17	12	11	14	12	7	10	14	23	25
DISAG GRE GATION	8	6	24	19	10	2	2	8	3	4	0	0	1	0	0	15	2
%	66	43	92	91	71	18	33	47	25	36	0	0	14	0	0	65	8

2.3 REQUIREMENTS FOR DISAGGREGATION IN THE INDICATORS FRAMEWORK

Where the SDG indicators do lend themselves to disaggregation, an additional challenge is that the requirement for disaggregation is mentioned in an uneven manner - or not at all - across the proposed indicators, making the requirement for disaggregation ambiguous or unclear.¹¹

For example, the indicators under targets 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 require disaggregation according to different combinations of grounds of discrimination, yet exclude other crucial ones such as race and ethnicity. On the other hand, indicator 1.4.1 does not mention disaggregation at all.

TARGET	SUGGESTED DISAGGREGATION
1.1 By 2030, eradicate extreme poverty for all people everywhere, currently measured as people living on less than \$1.25 a day.	Sex, age, employment status and geographical location (urban/rural).
1.2 By 2030, reduce at least by half the proportion of men, women and children of all ages living in poverty in all its dimensions according to national definitions.	Sex and age.
1.3 Implement nationally appropriate social protection systems and measures for all, including floors, and by 2030 achieve substantial coverage of the poor and the vulnerable.	By sex, distinguishing children, unemployed persons, older persons, persons with disabilities, pregnant women, newborns, work injury victims and the poor and the vulnerable.
1.4 By 2030, ensure that all men and women, in particular the poor and the vulnerable, have equal rights to economic resources, as well as access to basic services, ownership and control over land and other forms of property, inheritance, natural resources, appropriate new technology and financial services, including microfinance.	No disaggregation suggested – only ‘proportion’ of the population.

It seems unrealistic that collection of disaggregated data can be differentiated as per the uneven requirements in the individual indicators, as illustrated above. Hence, most NSO will have to devise a more systematic approach to collecting

disaggregated data, focusing on the relevant population groups in the specific country context. In this process, human rights instruments and bodies can provide invaluable guidance.

2.4 SCOPE OF DISAGGREGATION

The 2030 Agenda specifies that its follow-up and review will be informed by data, which is “disaggregated by sex, age, race, ethnicity, migration status, disability and geographic location and other characteristics relevant in national contexts”.¹²

These categories for disaggregation reflect some of the **prohibited grounds of discrimination** under international law, namely race, ethnic origin, sex, age and disability. However, a number of **international human and labour rights instruments** contain grounds of discrimination that are broader than those enunciated in the 2030 Agenda. A summary of these grounds is provided in Annex A.

According to guidance of the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), full consistency with international law would also include a focus on displacement status, religion, civil status, income, sexual orientation and gender identity.¹³

Under international law, **discrimination** is generally defined as **any distinction, exclusion or preference based on specific grounds of discrimination that has the purpose or effect of nullifying or impairing an individual’s ability to enjoy their human rights**. Non-discrimination is a cross-cutting principle that applies to the application of international human rights instruments in their entirety.

In addition to the grounds specifically enunciated in international human rights law, international human rights bodies have also clarified that *other status* (referred to in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), Convention on the Rights of the

Child (CRC) and Migrant Convention) can include *age, nationality, marital and family status, health status, gender identity, place of residence, economic and social situation and other grounds*.

Further, specific international human rights provisions or instruments address specific groups or populations, including ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities (Article 27, ICCPR), and Indigenous Peoples (ILO Convention No.169). Ratification of these instruments implies specific State responsibilities to protect these specific groups.

Article 31 of the UN **Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities** relates specifically to statistics and data collection. It requires States Parties to collect appropriate information, including statistical and research data, to enable them to formulate and implement policies to give effect to the Convention, taking into account the need to comply with legally-established safeguards, including legislation on data protection, to ensure confidentiality and respect for the privacy of persons with disabilities. The Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) has on numerous occasions addressed the question of disaggregated data for persons with disabilities.

While the listed prohibited grounds of discrimination may not easily translate into operational definitions and characteristics, they can provide authoritative guidance for general data disaggregation considerations,¹⁴ and be supplemented by the country-specific guidance emanating from human rights bodies.

2.5 HUMAN RIGHTS BODIES' GUIDANCE FOR DATA DISAGGREGATION

In many cases, **guidance for relevant categories** for data disaggregation in the **national context** can be drawn from the analysis of human rights bodies. These bodies systematically highlight significant gaps in the availability of data on vulnerable groups, and identify further areas where data disaggregation is needed due to discrimination or the specific situation of certain population groups. Further, they can also provide guidance on laws, specific policies and regulations that would allow NSOs and other data producers to collect the data needed for disaggregation, in order to ensure that the key principles of a human rights-based approach to data collection are respected (see section 4.1).

An analysis of the supervision of international human rights standards by UN treaty bodies and ILO supervisory bodies, as well as of the recommendations of the Universal Periodic Review and UN Special Procedures reveals that in many cases, the requirements for data disaggregation in the SDG indicator framework may not be sufficient to capture the situation of a number of groups, their specificities and specific human rights and development challenges. The observations of these bodies can identify specific characteristics or grounds of discrimination that are relevant in national contexts, as well as pointing to challenges in the realisation of rights for these specific groups which may have an impact on the achievement of the 2030 Agenda at national level.

CHAPTER 3

3 ISSUES OF DATA AVAILABILITY

So far, the generation of statistical data based on the global indicators framework has been the main focus of attention to ensure adequate monitoring of SDG implementation. However, not all of the global indicators will immediately lead to data collection. There is a need to assess what can realistically be available in terms of statistical data, in order to subsequently assess what complementary approaches and data are needed. This chapter uses a human rights lens to assess:

- The **tier classification** of indicators; and
- **Data availability** against the global indicators and the **probability** of generating data.

3.1 TIER CLASSIFICATION

The IAEG-SDGs has classified the global indicators in **three Tiers** in accordance with their **conceptual clarity** and **data availability**, as follows:¹⁵

Tier definition	No. of indicators
Tier I: Indicator conceptually clear, established methodology and standards available and data regularly produced by countries.	83
Tier II: Indicator conceptually clear, established methodology and standards available but data are not regularly produced by countries.	59
Tier III: Indicator for which there is no established methodology and standards or methodology/standards are being developed/tested.	83
Multiple Tier Classification: different components of the indicator are classified into different tiers.	5

The fact that only 83 indicators (36%) are classified as Tier I, implies that for 147 of the indicators (64%), data are not regularly produced or not available yet. Moreover, while classification as Tier I indicates that data is regularly collected, many countries with weak statistical capacity are not yet collecting such data.

Further, countries' ability to collect data on Tier II and Tier III indicators will also vary considerably.

Initial assessments of **data availability** provide illustrative examples of what can currently be measured in selected countries.

- In **Denmark**, the National Statistical Office (NSO) has conducted an assessment of data availability, showing that data is readily available on 77 of the 230 indicators.¹⁶
- In **Bangladesh**, data is available for a total of 31 of the 169 targets. For another 17 targets, it is partially available. No official NSO data is available under the remaining 121 targets.¹⁷

These data gaps are an indicator of the challenge that lies ahead, given in particular that Denmark has one of the highest statistical capacities, and the statistical capacity of Bangladesh is rated above average in the South-East Asian region by the World Bank.¹⁸

It will require considerable time and resources before most countries can monitor most of the global indicators. Realistically, data collection against many of the global indicators, in particular those classified as Tier III, will remain largely **aspirational** in many countries. Data availability for SDG indicators could, however, be improved if multiple sources of data are used, and data partnerships established (see section 4).

3.2 DATA GAPS ON HUMAN RIGHTS

In order to analyse what the data gap implies from a human rights-perspective, the Tier classification of the indicators can be compared with the assessment of their human rights-relevance.

The table below shows the **distribution** of the **113 directly human rights-relevant indicators** across the three Tier categories.

	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III
Directly human rights-relevant indicators across all Goals	41	38	34

The table shows that 41 indicators are classified as both **directly human rights-relevant** and as **Tier I**. This gives an overall indication of the number of indicators

that will realistically generate human rights-relevant data in the foreseeable future.

The generic probability appears lower when comparing this with the actual data availability in selected countries.

- In **Denmark**, data is readily available on **34** of the 113 directly human rights-relevant indicators (30%).
- In **Bangladesh**, data is readily available on **37** of the directly human rights-relevant indicators, while no official NSO data is available on 53 of the indicators.

When combining the **different aspects of analysis** (human rights-relevance, Tier classification, possibility for data disaggregation and distribution across Goals), the gaps in the global indicators framework become evident, particularly from a human rights perspective. The table below shows the human rights-relevance, possibility for data disaggregation and tier classification of indicators under **Goal 16**.

INDICATOR	HUMAN RIGHTS RELEVANCE	POSSIBILITY FOR DISAGGREGATION	IAEG-SDG TIER CLASSIFICATION
16.1.1	Directly relevant		Tier I
16.1.2	Directly relevant		Tier III
16.1.3	Directly relevant		Tier II
16.1.4	Directly relevant		Tier II
16.2.1	Directly relevant		Tier III
16.2.2	Directly relevant		Tier II
16.2.3	Directly relevant		Tier II
16.3.1	Directly relevant		Tier II
16.3.2	Directly relevant		Tier I
16.4.1	Contextual		Tier III
16.4.2	Contextual		Tier II
16.5.1	Directly relevant		Tier II
16.5.2	Directly HR relevant		Tier II
16.6.1	Contextual		Tier I

16.6.2	Indirectly relevant		Tier III
16.7.1	Directly relevant		Tier III
16.7.2	Directly relevant		Tier III
16.8.1	Indirectly relevant		Tier I
16.9.1	Directly relevant		Tier I
16.10.1	Directly relevant		Tier III
16.10.2	Directly relevant		Tier II
16.a.1	Directly relevant		Tier I
16.b.1	Directly relevant		Tier III

In summary, the above table demonstrates that of **23 global indicators** under **Goal 16, 18** are directly human rights-relevant. Of **18 directly human rights-relevant indicators, 6** are classified as Tier I.

Goal 16 is crucial for addressing the range of civil and political rights that are embedded in the targets. However, monitoring Goal 16 solely through official statistics generated against the global indicators will be challenging.

This initial assessment shows that in areas of critical importance for human rights, it will take time for monitoring data becomes available. In countries with weak statistical capacity, data may take many years to generate, if at all.

CHAPTER 4

4 BUILDING A PLURALISTIC ECOSYSTEM OF DATA

In order to fulfil the promise of the 2030 Agenda to realise the human rights of all, and to leave no one behind, it is crucial to **uphold and monitor the human rights aspects of the SDGs** in the implementation processes. While the collection of statistical data against the global indicators provides some opportunities, the previous chapters have also revealed challenges related to limitations in the aspects measured by global indicators and the potential for data disaggregation, limited data availability and capacity constraints.

In general, it is necessary to have a **realistic assessment** of what can be monitored on the basis of the global indicators. If purely based on global indicators, monitoring will inevitably have a preference of quantitative data over qualitative; of global comparability over local relevance; and be data-driven rather than needs-driven.

In this context, it is crucial to focus on the **overall purpose** of monitoring SDG implementation, and keep in mind that data is more than statistics and that more quantitative statistics do not necessarily lead to better decisions.¹⁹

All of this points to the need for **collaborative efforts** to develop creative, innovative, efficient and cost-effective approaches to monitoring and data collection, which can supplement statistical data based on global indicators.

By building a **pluralistic ecosystem of data, based** on the synergies between national and global as well as quantitative and qualitative indicators and data, SDG monitoring can ideally “measure what we treasure”. Further, in order to respond to challenges in data collection, integrate technological innovation, and ensure relevance in the future, including from a human rights perspective, such a dynamic data ecosystem should be subject to continuous re-evaluation and fine-tuning at all levels.

Some of the key principles and strategies that can make such an ecosystem of data fit for purpose are:

- General principles for a **Human Rights-Based Approach to Data** collection (HRBAD) to be followed by all actors;
- Additional **national indicators** and **related statistical data collection**, including **context-specific initiatives** to capture the situation of particular groups; and
- Contributions from a **variety of credible data sources**, including the analysis, information and data produced through **human rights monitoring mechanisms**, **citizen-generated data** and **private sector reporting**. Establishment of targeted partnerships as necessary to this end.

In particular, **human rights monitoring mechanisms** can make a major contribution to SDG monitoring and implementation by providing qualitative information and context-specific analysis and advice as well as information about vulnerable groups and sensitive issues that are hard to capture through common statistical data. At the same time, SDG follow-up and review can also strengthen human rights monitoring by giving the impetus to improve data collection on some key human rights issues.

The following sections explore a range of issues pertaining to a pluralistic ecosystem of data:

- Principles for a human rights/based approach to data collection;
- Steps to define national indicators and data collection initiatives;
- Citizen-generated data;
- Private sector reporting;
- International human rights reporting and monitoring; and
- National Human Rights Institutions.

4.1 PRINCIPLES FOR A HUMAN RIGHTS-BASED APPROACH TO DATA COLLECTION

OHCHR has defined 6 main components of a human rights-based approach to data (HRBAD),²⁰ which should guide data collection in all circumstances.

- **Self-identification:** All identity categories must be developed through a participatory approach. The most personal identities (e.g. religious beliefs, sexual orientation gender identity and ethnicity) should be assigned through self-identification. The overriding human rights principle to “do no harm” must always be respected. Data collection should not create or reinforce discrimination, bias or stereotypes.
- **Participation.** Participation is central to a HRBAD, which should ensure free, active and meaningful participation of relevant stakeholders, in particular the most marginalized population groups. A participatory approach can enhance the reliability and relevance of collected data and should apply to the entirety of the data collection process. Participation can help address the specific concerns expressed by targeted population groups.
- **Disaggregation** on the basis of the grounds of discrimination enshrined in international human rights law is essential to reveal underlying disparities in the development process, and highlight the specific challenges that different population groups face, in particular vulnerable groups in a given context.
- **Transparency.** This principle is related to the right to seek, receive and impart information, enshrined in international human rights law. Ensuring transparency in the context of the HRBAD implies, among other things, access of civil society to data and reports on the monitoring and realisation of human rights.
- **Privacy.** Access to information must be balanced with the right to privacy. Data collected for statistical purposes must be strictly confidential. The right to privacy is an essential aspect of the HRBAD. Personal data such as information on sexual orientation, ethnicity and gender identity should be handled with the express consent of the individuals concerned. Data that reveals the identification of individual data subjects should not be publicly accessible. Further, data protection should be supervised by an independent body. Harm mitigation strategies with access to remedy and compensation should be in place.
- **Accountability.** In their capacity as duty-bearers, state institutions have a duty to ensure that they respect, protect and fulfil human rights in their conduct of statistical work. This includes ensuring the independence of statistical data gathering.

4.2 STEPS TO DEFINE NATIONAL INDICATORS AND DATA COLLECTION INITIATIVES

Complementary national indicators and data collection initiatives can help overcome some of the weaknesses inherent to the global indicators framework in terms of relevance, unequal progress for particular groups, concrete measurement of states' commitment and efforts, as well as feasibility of data collection.

Such complementary national measures could imply, for example, the development of indicators and participatory data collection initiatives to address the situation of specific rights-holders or vulnerable groups for which national data 'identifiers' are not commonly used, as well as the identification of indicators and intermediate benchmarks to measure state commitments and efforts towards expected outcomes under the SDGs.

Given the preference of outcome indicators in the global framework, complementary national indicators could **prioritise structural and process indicators** that can serve as intermediate benchmarks. This will also contribute to **efficiency and cost-effectiveness**, as structural and process indicators are often relatively easy to monitor, and lend themselves to participatory and qualitative assessment processes.

In general, the process to define complementary national indicators and data collection initiatives should depart from a **mapping** of what is already available nationally in terms of statistics and data, as well as the establishment of a **baseline** for monitoring progress. It is fundamental that these initial steps do not narrowly focus on available statistical data, but also explore what other potential data providers can contribute. Hence, the process should include a mapping of **existing reporting and monitoring mechanisms of** relevance to the SDGs, including reporting to and monitoring by **human rights bodies** at national, regional and international levels.

A challenge in this area relates to coordination. A significant amount of SDG-relevant data is produced by international organizations or NGOs, in some cases in coordination with NSOs but in other cases without coordination. There is a need to establish more effective partnerships in relation to national data collection to ensure that NSOs are aware of other data available, and play a role

in coordinating data collected across different sources. NSO can potentially provide resources and tools that assist non-state data collectors to collect quality data and also improve the comparability and usefulness of the resulting data.

In order to refine this analysis from a human rights-perspective, the following **practical steps** would assist in identifying the specific national indicators, data collection initiatives, and partnerships needed for the collection of required data:

1. **Review existing human rights obligations** applicable to the given country (i.e. what international human rights and labour standards instruments have been ratified by the given country);²¹
2. **Establish links** between existing human rights obligations and specific SDGs using tools such as the *Human Rights Guide to the SDGs*;²²
3. **Identify gaps in human rights compliance/SDG implementation.** Review **recommendations** provided by human rights bodies to the country in question, in order to detect **major gaps** that are related to the SDGs. The analysis should identify both **substantive priority areas** in the given country-context (e.g. housing, food, freedom of assembly) and **particular vulnerable groups** that may be subject to discrimination;
4. **Identify the priorities** to be addressed in complementary national indicators and data collection efforts, based on Identified gaps in human rights compliance/SDG implementation;
5. **Decide on additional indicators** by comparing national priorities to existing global and national indicators and identifying adequate and feasible complementary indicators. Give priority to **structural and process indicators** that can be monitored in a cost-effective and participatory manner, and can serve as intermediate benchmarks to measure states' commitment and efforts; and
6. Review the availability of **disaggregated statistical data** and/or the availability of **specific data for vulnerable groups** to assess data availability for the groups that are at risk of being left behind in the national context. Devise **strategies** for either disaggregating statistical data through the inclusion of relevant identifiers in national data collection, or undertake specific data collection initiatives to unveil the situation of specific groups. Monitoring information by international and national human rights bodies can help reveal specific categories for data disaggregation for vulnerable groups.

4.3 CITIZEN-GENERATED DATA AND MONITORING

Participatory data collection by civil society can generally help fill data gaps by ensuring collection of data among otherwise excluded groups; contribute to relevance and disaggregation of data, empowerment of rights-holders and vulnerable groups, and help resolve privacy concerns.

Such data collection initiatives also offer opportunities to capitalise on technological advance, for example, by employing mobile phones for data collection. Ideally, such initiatives would be undertaken in the form of partnerships between concerned citizens and population groups and NSOs. In addition, UN agencies, National Human Rights Institutions (NHRIs) and civil society organisations can be important partners by supporting the data collection process. NHRIs can also assist in vetting potentially sensitive data.

When considering the use of citizen-generated data in relation to the 2030 Agenda, it is important to consider that this may encompass a number of differing methodologies, means of verification and types of measurement, which need to be taken into account when considering whether and how to undertake such data-gathering efforts. Some key considerations are as follows:

- **Data gathering methodology.** Is the methodology clear and consistent and does it conform with the basic principles of a human rights-based approach to data (HRBAD) such as self-identification, transparency, participation, privacy and accountability,²³ in particular if it relates to sensitive issues or vulnerable groups?
- **Types of measurement used.** What are the types of measurement used and how can they be aligned with SDG data-gathering efforts?
- **Verification of data.** Can the data be adequately verified in accordance with key principles of data validation and verification? This is often the most significant challenge with citizen-generated data, and if the data cannot be verified, it may not be able to be used.
- **Digital divide.** If data is generated through, for example, internet-based or Information Communication Technology (ICT) applications, is there risk of creating unbalanced attention?
- **Capacity-building,** to ensure adequate data and methodological literacy of those collecting the data. This would include ensuring that a human rights-based approach to data collection is employed.

Since the adoption of the 2030 Agenda, a series of initiatives and partnerships have emerged to strengthen collaborative monitoring. Some of these include:

The Global Partnership for SDG Data,²⁴ which works on citizen-generated data, public use of citizen-generated data and private sector contribution of data. The initiative supports partners to develop Road Maps to 1) improve policies, 2) empower citizens and hold governments to account, and 3) promote an enabling environment for business.

The **Everyone Counts** initiative by Care,²⁵ which strives to ensure that data used to monitor the SDGs includes marginalized communities' voices. The initiative links existing citizen engagement projects to build aggregated data linked to specific SDG indicators, combining Information Communication Technology and social accountability.

The **Data Shift Initiative**²⁶ by CIVICUS aims to build the capacity and confidence of civil society organisations to produce and use citizen-generated data to monitor sustainable development progress, demand accountability and campaign for transformative change. Ultimately, the vision is people-powered accountability should drive progress on sustainable development.

The **Transparency, Accountability and Participation (TAP) Network**,²⁷ - a coalition of civil society organisations, that aims to promote and support the development of transparent, accountable and citizen-inclusive implementation and monitoring mechanisms and processes for the 2030 Agenda, and in particular SDG 16.

The Indigenous Navigator²⁸ is an example of participatory data collection by a particular group of rights-holders. It provides a framework and a set of tools for indigenous peoples to systematically monitor the level of recognition and implementation of their rights. It is designed to monitor:

- Essential aspects of the SDGs, including by collecting data for indigenous peoples related to the global SDG indicators as well as complementary indicators to capture indigenous peoples' rights and aspirations (for example, for bilingual and culturally-appropriate education, land rights and self-governance);

- The implementation of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples; and
- The outcomes of the World Conference on Indigenous Peoples.

4.4 PRIVATE SECTOR REPORTING

The 2030 Agenda generally acknowledges the major contribution that the **private sector** can make to sustainable development. It commits to fostering a dynamic and well-functioning business sector “while protecting labour rights and environmental and health standards in accordance with relevant international standards and agreements and other ongoing initiatives in this regard, such as the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights”.²⁹

The **UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights** (UNGPs) establish the corporate responsibility to respect human rights. This implies that companies must avoid infringing on the rights of others and address adverse impacts with which they are involved. Operationally, businesses must act with due diligence to identify, prevent, mitigate and account for how they address their impacts on human rights, including by communicating about such impacts. Moreover, in target 12.6 of the 2030 Agenda, states specifically commit to encouraging companies to undertake **Sustainability Reporting**.

TARGET 12.6.	INDICATOR 12.6.1.	CLASSIFICATION
Encourage companies, especially large and transnational companies, to adopt sustainable practices and to integrate sustainability information into their reporting cycle.	Number of companies publishing sustainability reports.	Indicator classified as Tier III. Custodian agencies: UN Environment Programme (UNEP) and UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD).

Sustainability Reporting has gained traction over past decades, in terms of scale as well as sophistication, and a range of guiding policy and operational frameworks exists at regional and global levels. These frameworks cover both environmental and social factors and may also include dedicated sections on **labour and human rights issues** as well as crosscutting issues such as **inequality**. Robust frameworks also support monitoring of practice, and address the development of management structures for due diligence.

Corporate commitment to Sustainability Reporting is **generally voluntary** and there is significant variation in terms of the stringency of reporting formats. However, **binding obligations** are emerging in an increasing number of countries. For instance, in 2007 Sweden established a legal requirement for state-owned companies to present sustainability reports based on the guidelines of the **Global Reporting Initiative (GRI)**.³⁰ In 2008, **Denmark** adopted a law requiring larger companies to include Corporate Social Responsibility factors in their annual reports.

The UN Conference on Trade and development (UNCTAD) and United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), in close collaboration with the GRI, have defined a **work plan** in order to elaborate **metadata** to measure indicator 12.6.1. As a first step, UNEP proposes to formulate the necessary definitions of terms in indicator 12.6.1 (such as providing a definition of “sustainability reports”).³¹

From a human rights-perspective, it is imperative that the definition of sustainability reporting adequately **encompasses human rights**, including the requirements under the UNGPs for companies to track and report on the **performance of management structures for due diligence**. Due diligence and human rights safeguards will also be necessary for public-private partnerships and blended finance initiatives, including through the international financial institutions.

Beyond sustainability reporting by the private sector itself, it will be crucial to identify complementary measurement of states’ commitments to the UNGPs, for example, by identifying complementary national and regional indicators to monitor the adoption and implementation of National Action Plans on Business and Human Rights. From an outcome perspective, it is possible to partially monitor respect for fundamental labour rights through the global indicators under, particularly under Goals 5, 8, 10 and 16. Additional measurement could, for example, address issues related to social conflicts related to private sector investments, which is already monitored by NHRIs in some countries.³²

4.5 INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS REPORTING AND MONITORING

The high degree of convergence between human rights and the SDGs points to the potential of using national, regional and international human rights mechanisms to:

- Assess and guide SDG implementation at national level;
- Collect key data in areas where the SDGs are most closely aligned with human rights; and
- Define approaches and indicators that are adapted to specific or cross-cutting issues that impact on sustainable development at national level.

The UN Secretary General's report on FUR³³ cautions against overburdening countries with national reviews - especially those countries with limited capacities and resources. The report notes that Member States are **already subject to reporting obligations** in many areas related to the SDGs, including through the Human Rights Council, treaty monitoring bodies and specialized agencies. The report concludes that FUR "should build on such existing reporting mechanisms as recommended by the 2030 Agenda. Fostering coordination at the domestic, regional and global level is therefore crucial".³⁴

As states are already required to report regularly to key human rights and labour law mechanisms, most have specific resources allocated for this purpose, as well as processes in place to undertake this work. There is thus an advantage of using the information fed into human rights bodies by states' reporting from an **efficiency and cost-effectiveness perspective**, as well as from the perspective of ensuring **national anchorage of SDG FUR**. In this regard, it will be important to build synergies between SDG reporting and human rights reporting processes of Member States.

Overall, human rights bodies can contribute by providing:

- Regular and systematised **qualitative analysis and data** aligned with principles of international and regional human rights law through institutionalised reporting mechanisms;
- Data that can contribute to measurement of **structural and process indicators** associated with the SDG framework;
- Analysis of the **key challenges** associated with the implementation of laws and policies related to specific rights and SDG targets;

- **Expertise and best practice** on peer review mechanisms, expert and thematic reviews;
- Information on **national specificities** in relation to data disaggregation;
- Guidance on a **human rights-based approach to data collection**;
- Information on **cross-cutting issues** of relevance to one or more of the SDGs;
- Revelation of **barriers** to the enjoyment of rights related to specific SDG targets by specific groups.

OHCHR's **Universal Human Rights index**³⁵ allows searches of Observations and Recommendations of UN treaty bodies, Special Procedures and the Universal Periodic Review (UPR). The Index is searchable in relation to key rights or groups of rights, countries and regions, and specific types of populations or population groups in accordance with grounds of discrimination enunciated in key international human rights instruments. Whereas most of the data that can be gleaned from human rights bodies is qualitative, as opposed to quantitative, it highlights key human rights issues that are directly related to the achievement of the SDGs. Hence, it helps identify national specificities to be addressed, and can also reveal broader regional or global patterns in relation to specific rights or SDG themes. Further, it can also reveal the linkages between different SDGs in relation to specific groups of rights, and enables the identification of specific population groups that are particularly affected by different types of rights violations, providing guidance for national data disaggregation efforts with a view to 'leaving no one behind'.

4.5.1 THE UNIVERSAL PERIODIC REVIEW

The **Universal Periodic Review** (UPR) is a peer mechanism under the Human Rights Council, reviewing the human rights performance of all UN member states at regular intervals. The UPR assesses states' human rights records and aims to address human rights violations wherever they occur, including by providing technical assistance to States, enhancing their capacity to deal effectively with human rights challenges, and share best practices.

The reviews are conducted by the **UPR Working Group**, consisting of the 47 members of the Human Rights Council. After the review, an **outcome report** is prepared, which provides a summary of the actual discussion, including the **recommendations** made and the **responses** by the reviewed State. During the adoption of the report, the reviewed State has the opportunity to make preliminary comments on the recommendations choosing to either accept or note them. During the subsequent review, the State is expected to **report on implementation** of the recommendations received during the first review.

UPR reports and recommendations can directly serve as input to identify priority areas for national sustainable development strategies, as well as contributing essential data in relation to the implementation of human rights-related SDG targets and indicators, as illustrated in the following examples:

- **Gender equality and governance.** An analysis of the 211 recommendations that **Nepal** received during its 2015 UPR review showed that gender equality (SDG 5) and institutional reform (Goal 16) represent the areas where immediate action is most warranted from a human rights perspective. Among others, the recommendations identify indigenous peoples, Dalits, and LGBTI as groups suffering from discrimination in the national context, thus pointing to possible valid grounds for disaggregation of national-level data as well as the need for special measures. Concrete recommendations suited to inform sustainable development policies include a call for the reform of national citizenship legislation to allow women to convey citizenship to their children (Goals 5 & 16), measures to eliminate child labour (Goals 4, 8 & 16), and concrete amendments to criminal legislation to combat domestic violence (Goal 5).
- **Education for sustainable development.** Issues of gender equality in education and education policy and legislation, as well as the mainstreaming of human rights in education have been addressed in the UPRs of a number of countries. These analyses can provide crucial data in relation to Indicator 4.7.1, which *inter alia* refers to the extent to which education for sustainable development, including gender equality and human rights, are mainstreamed at all levels within the educational system.

4.5.2 TREATY MONITORING BODIES AND SPECIAL PROCEDURES

The **human rights treaty bodies** are committees composed of independent experts that monitor the implementation of the core human rights treaties that are intrinsically linked to the SDGs. There are 10 such treaty monitoring bodies:

- The Human Rights Committee.
- The Committee of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR).
- The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD).
- The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW).
- The Committee against Torture (CAT).
- The Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC).
- The Committee on Migrant Workers (CMW).
- The Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD).
- The Committee on Enforced Disappearances (CED).
- The Subcommittee on prevention of Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman and Degrading Treatment or Punishment (SPT).

States that have ratified core human rights treaties have a legal obligation to ensure implementation and must submit **periodic reports** to the relevant treaty bodies. NHRIs, NGOs, UN entities and others can also submit information. Based on the information received, the treaty bodies issue **concluding observations** to the States concerned. Further, six of the Committees (CCPR, CERD, CAT, CEDAW, CRPD, and CED,) can, under certain conditions, receive complaints from individuals. The Committees also publish **general comments or general recommendations** on their interpretation of the thematic content of specific human rights provisions, which can, for example, guide national policies or programming. The **Treaty Bodies Database**³⁶, maintained by the OHCHR, makes information available by treaty, by state and by type of report, hence comprising a wealth of information to inform the implementation and monitoring of the SDGs in specific countries or regions.

RELEVANT TARGETS AND/OR INDICATORS	EXAMPLES OF TYPE OF DATA AVAILABLE
CEDAW	
<p>Indicator 5.1.1. Existence of legal frameworks that promote, enforce and monitor gender equality and non-discrimination on the basis of sex.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Country-specific recommendations for the improvement of legal frameworks on gender equality. • Information on gaps in legislation and its implementation (e.g., in relation to trafficking and violence against women, domestic work and family life). • Data on specific groups of women at risk of rights violations (for example, migrant workers, domestic workers). • Information on linkages between SDGs 5 and 10 (inequality) and 8 (sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work).
CERD	
<p>Target 10.3 Ensure equal opportunity and reduce inequalities of outcome, including by eliminating discriminatory laws, policies and practices and promoting appropriate legislation, policies and action in this regard</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highlights relationship between discrimination and other issues and Targets (for example, exploitative work (Target 8.7) and the rule of law (Target 16.3)).³⁷ • Highlights specific groups at risk from rights violations linked to discrimination.

The **special procedures** of the Human Rights Council are independent human rights experts with mandates to report and advise on human rights from a thematic or country-specific perspective. Some mandates address particular group of rights-holders, such as indigenous peoples and persons with disabilities. Others address issues such as human rights and business, the environment, food, safe drinking water and sanitation, violence against women and trafficking. The Special Procedures undertake a range of activities including: country visits; conducting thematic studies and convening consultations; engaging in advocacy; raising public awareness; and providing advice for technical cooperation.

Currently, there are 41 **thematic** and 14 **country-specific** Special Procedures mandates³⁸, all of which are related to certain aspects of the 2030 Agenda. Consequently, the Special Procedures have a huge potential for contributing to both country-specific and thematic implementation, monitoring and data-gathering processes.

4.5.3 ILO SUPERVISORY BODIES

Once ratified by Member States, Conventions of the International Labour Organization (ILO) are legally-binding. The ILO's 8 Fundamental Conventions address themes such as discrimination in employment and occupation³⁹, equal remuneration for men and women for work of equal value⁴⁰, freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining⁴¹, child labour⁴² and forced labour⁴³ that are firmly embedded in the 2030 Agenda. Further, a range of ILO **technical conventions** address more specific issues such as occupational safety and health, social security, indigenous peoples and migrant workers. As evidenced in the *Human Rights Guide to the SDGs*⁴⁴ a substantial number of SDG targets relate directly to ILO Conventions.

Hence, ILO supervisory comments and recommendations on these Conventions generate a wealth of information about structural and process factors bearing a direct relation to related SDGs.

States that have ratified ILO Conventions are required to report at intervals of 2 or 5 years on their implementation (depending on the Convention). The ILO **Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations** (CEACR) analyses these reports and presents Observations and Direct Requests to states, including recommendations on the implementation of the Convention in question. Often, the CEACR will highlight issues previously raised in relation to a given country, and provide further information on whether they have been addressed or remain outstanding. In cases of alleged non-compliance with ratified ILO Conventions, workers' or employers' organisations may also submit 'Representations'.⁴⁵

This allows for a systematic monitoring of the exercise of these rights and the associated challenges in specific countries on a regular basis, and at relatively short intervals. The fact that ILO supervisory bodies frequently refer to issues raised in previous years' examination of states' reporting also provides

measurement for whether or not compliance with these Conventions has improved over a given period of time.

SDG Indicator 8.8.2 measures increase in national compliance of labour rights based on ILO textual sources and national legislation, by sex and migrant status. It is classified as a Tier I indicator, which can **immediately be monitored**, based on the **existing reporting and monitoring** of ILO Conventions on Freedom of Association and Collective Bargaining (Conventions Nos. 87 and 98).

Indicator 8.8.2. is the only global indicator that is directly linked to an existing human rights and labour standards monitoring mechanism. This reaffirms the potential for making use of this approach for the range of other SDG targets that are directly linked to international human rights and labour standards.

All comments and recommendations of the CEACR as well as the reports of Representations procedures under all ILO Conventions are made public and can be found in **NORMLEX**,⁴⁶ the ILO's Information System on International Labour Standards. This constitutes an enormous resource for qualitative and context-specific measurement of implementation and progress towards the targets.

The ILO also conducts **General Surveys** on specific labour standards that can provide a global overview of statistics, legislation and implementation challenges in relation to key international labour standards. Some key issues on which General Surveys have recently been conducted are forced labour, social security and the right of association.

In particular, ILO supervisory bodies can provide a wealth of data in relation to **SDG 8** (economic growth, employment and decent work). However, they are also of direct relevance to **SDG 5** (Gender equality), **SDG 10** (inequality) and **SDG 16** (peace, justice and strong institutions). They can also reveal information about **specific population groups** such as indigenous peoples, migrant workers and other categories of workers.

For example, in relation to **Indicator 16.2.2** (Number of victims of human trafficking per 100,000 population, by sex, age and form of exploitation), a search of ILO supervisory body comments in relation to the **Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention** (No. 182) reveals specific statistics for various countries on trafficking of children, as well as structural (legislative and policy) and process (implementation) information in relation to the implementation of the Convention.

4.6 NATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS INSTITUTIONS AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

National Human Rights Institutions (NHRIs) are **independent State bodies** with a constitutional and/or legislative mandate to protect and promote human rights. The NHRI **mandate** typically includes research and advice, education and promotion, monitoring and reporting, investigation, conciliation and remedies, cooperation with national and international organisations, and interaction with the judiciary; functions that are all crucial for the adequate realisation of the 2030 Agenda on Sustainable Development.

Based on the internationally-agreed **Paris Principles**,⁴⁷ the independence, investigatory powers, mandate and capacity of NHRIs are regularly assessed by a Sub-Committee of the Global Alliance of NHRIs (GANHRI), in cooperation with the OHCHR.

Already in October 2015, GANHRI organised a Conference to discuss the potential role of NHRIs in the context of sustainable development. The Conference concluded with the adoption of the **Mérida Declaration**,⁴⁸ a historic landmark document, which encourages all NHRIs, to collaborate in mutual capacity building and sharing of experiences to contribute to a human rights-based approach to implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

NHRIs can play a significant role in both international and national SDG monitoring processes by using their existing mandate. Concretely, NHRIs are in a position to:

- Provide **advice to** national and local governments, rights-holders and others to promote a HRBA to implementation and measurement of the 2030 Agenda, for example, by assessing the impact of laws, policies, programmes,

national development plans, administrative practices and budgets, including through qualitative data.

- Promote transparent and inclusive processes of **participation and consultation** in the development of national and sub-national strategies to achieve the SDGs.
- Assist in the shaping of **national indicators** and sound **data collection systems**, including by building on existing international and regional human rights reporting and monitoring mechanisms.
- **Monitor progress** at the local, national, regional and international levels and disclose patterns of inequality and discrimination.
- Engage with, and **hold governments to account** for poor or uneven progress in the implementation, including by reporting on uneven implementation progress and obstacles to parliaments, the general public and national, regional and international mechanisms.
- Facilitate **access to justice, redress and remedy** for those who experience abuse and violation of their rights in the process of development, including by receiving and processing complaints, where NHRIs have such functions.

One specific area where NHRIs can contribute to country-specific indicators and monitoring of progress towards the SDGs at national level is through National Action Plans (NAPs). The United Nations and international human rights bodies recommend that countries adopt a National Action Plan for Human Rights.⁴⁹ Given the focus of NAPs, many of their goals will bear a direct relation to the SDGs. Making those connections explicit could help national governments to better understand the role of human rights in the SDGs as well as support their monitoring of progress towards the SDGs.



In 2013, Scotland’s National Action Plan for Human Rights (SNAP) was launched. Given the relevance of the SDG agenda to SNAP’s vision, a deliberate and explicit connection was made between SNAP’s long term (2030) outcomes, the SDGs and Scotland’s National Performance Framework (NPF). Integrating these three mutually supportive frameworks was seen as a key mechanism to put human rights at the heart of how Scotland assesses its national performance as a country. A working group including the Scottish Government’s NPF team, SDG team, Human rights team and the **Scottish Human Rights Commission** was convened and is currently exploring how the NPF could develop rights-based outcomes and indicators to monitoring national progress and the SDGs. This approach has the potential to greatly improve accountability for human rights, changing the way that progress is measured in Scotland. This will also improve the way Scotland fulfils its reporting obligations under international human rights treaties and the SDGs.



In December 2015, the UN General Assembly adopted a Resolution⁵⁰ that underlines the importance of effective, independent and pluralistic NHRIs for sustainable development. The Resolution calls for all relevant United Nations mechanisms and processes, including the High Level Political Forum, to further **enhance the participation** of NHRIs compliant with the Paris Principles. The Commission on the Status of Women became the first UN mechanism to build on this resolution, when it adopted its Agreed Conclusion in March 2016, with a paragraph on strengthening NHRI participation.

4.6.1 NHRIS AS AN INDICATOR OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

The importance of NHRIs for the 2030 Agenda was further reaffirmed in the context of the global indicators framework for monitoring progress on the SDGs, with the selection of the “**existence of independent National Human Rights Institutions in compliance with the Paris Principles**” as the global indicator for Target 16.a.



Goal 16 aims to promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels. Measuring the strength of NHRIs is a **multipurpose indicator** that provides an effective metric for assessing the strength of national institutions. Moreover, the existence of strong NHRIs will have a **catalytic impact** on the implementation and monitoring of the entire 2030 Agenda, as NHRIs address discrimination in all its forms, and promote the protection of civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights. Therefore, NHRIs are crucial elements of the **good governance and institutional accountability architecture** that is necessary for ensuring peaceful and inclusive societies and access to justice for all.

As of August 2016, there are 75 NHRIs accredited with an A status, 32 with a B status and 10 with a C status.⁵¹ With this **baseline**, the realisation of target 16.a should imply that by 2030, the vast majority of UN Member States count with independent NHRIs. Consequently, efforts to that effect should be reflected and prioritised in national, regional and global action plans to achieve the SDGs.

4.6.2 NHRI DATA ON MARGINALIZED GROUPS

A key role of NHRIs is to monitor and measure the national human rights situation against international human rights standards. NHRIs often prepare annual status reports on the general human rights situation as well as analysis and research on specific human rights topics. Many NHRIs have a strong focus on discrimination and inequalities, and monitor the situation of vulnerable and marginalised groups and particular rights-holders. Therefore, they can offer valuable guidance in identifying relevant groups for targeted monitoring.

For example, DIHR has developed a set of “**Gold Indicators**”⁵² in close collaboration with state authorities (including relevant ministries and the National Statistical Office) and civil society representatives to compare the

situation of people with and without disabilities in relation to key thematic areas. These indicators can serve to monitor not only the realisation of human rights, but also implementation of the SDGs, as illustrated by the following example:

- **Target 11.2** aims at providing access to safe, affordable, accessible and sustainable transport systems for all, with special attention to the needs of those in vulnerable situations, including persons with disabilities.
- **Gold Indicator 3** measures the percentage of persons with and without disabilities who, during the last week, have experienced problems of accessibility to public transport.

Furthermore, DIHR is collaborating with the **National Statistical Office** of Denmark, to develop methodologies to collect statistical data on equal treatment regarding gender. Building on a DIHR study that explored the use of disaggregated data in Danish municipalities, Statistics Denmark will in the future collect such data in a systematic and continuous way at the national level.⁵³

In 2015, DIHR also published a report on **Greenlanders in Denmark**, analysing the specific forms of disadvantage and discrimination that they face in Danish society.⁵⁴ The report builds on both qualitative interviews and a questionnaire survey and represents a rare source of data on this marginalised group, since Greenlanders are not captured separately in national statistics as they acquire Danish citizenship by birth. This kind of report provides data on specific groups that are discriminated against in the national context, highlighting where development strategies may have to be adapted to address their specific circumstances.

DIHR has also provided recommendations for Denmark on **disaggregation of data for specific groups** in relation to the SDGs. In relation to target 17.18, for example, DIHR recommends the Danish Government to:

- Adopt legislation obliging Statistics Denmark to collect and disseminate data disaggregated by gender to be available for public authorities, including the municipalities.
- Implement a systematic registration of the use of any alternative letting rules (udlejningsredskaber) to ensure the right to housing. It should be possible to aggregate data collection by social and economic status, disability, gender, and immigrants/descendants.⁵⁵

Other NHRIs have undertaken specific work on vulnerable groups, or on groups that are protected specifically by non-discrimination legislation.

In Australia, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and non-Indigenous health bodies, health professional bodies and human rights organisations operate the *Close the Gap* Campaign. The **Australian Human Rights Commission** provides a secretariat and reporting function for this campaign whilst the monitoring and data collection responsibilities for the Closing The Gap initiative are held predominantly by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) and the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW). This is an example of a collaboration between NHRIs, NSOs and civil society for a specific purpose. The Campaign's goal is to raise the health and life expectancy of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people to that of the non-Indigenous population within a generation: to close the gap by 2030. It aims to do this through the implementation of a human rights-based approach. The targets of the project are based on health data that are specifically focussed on aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders, providing comparative data between the indigenous and non-indigenous population in Australia on life expectancy, mortality (including child mortality) and in relation to a number of health conditions and diseases. Some data is also disaggregated by sex. Some of the data collected in this context puts in stark relief the disproportionality of health issues faced by indigenous peoples in Australia. Some of the findings include:

- Between 2008 and 2012, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people died from avoidable causes at three times the rate of non-Indigenous people.⁵⁶
- During this period, suicide was the leading cause of death due to external causes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people—accounting for 32% of such deaths, compared with 27% of all Australians.

4.6.3 NHRIS AS DATA PROVIDERS

Given their monitoring mandate, independent status and focus on the range of human rights that underpin the SDGs, NHRIs have a significant potential for serving as **credible third party data providers** for the monitoring of the 2030 Agenda, as well as for being key partners with other providers to contribute to a diverse ecosystem of data. This is particularly important given the huge data and knowledge gaps described in section 3.2.

At the first Session of the High-Level Political Forum (HLPF) in 2016, the Global Alliance of NHRIs (GANHRI) submitted a report on the (shrinking) **space for civil**

society in the 22 countries undergoing Voluntary National Reviews (VNR).⁵⁷ To inform the report, GANHRI conducted a survey among the NHRIs in those countries. The report highlights the crucial role NHRIs and broader civil society play for the implementation of the SDGs. It also presents key ingredients for an “enabling environment” essential for NHRIs and civil society to fulfil their role and outlines current trends with regard to their operating environments and level of participation in the 2030 Agenda and SDGs process.

In December 2016, the **Arab Network of NHRIs** (ANNHRI) convened a workshop on NHRIs role in monitoring and implementing the 2030 Agenda on Sustainable Development. A survey among the 14 participating NHRIs⁵⁸ revealed that:

- All 14 NHRIs undertake **law reviews** to detect discriminatory legislation;
- All 14 NHRIs have **detected national laws** that should be eliminated or amended; and
- All 14 NHRIs have formulated **recommendations** for such legal reforms.

The survey shows that NHRIs are **immediately ready** to contribute to the monitoring of targets 5.1., 10.3. and 16.b on the elimination of discriminatory legislation and the promotion of appropriate legislation, policies and action in this regard. NHRIs also have a key role to play in promoting human rights education (target 4.7) and are strategically positioned and technically equipped to take a lead in the promotion, implementation and monitoring of this target, including through operationalising the indicator at national level.

4.6.4 NHRIS AND CLIMATE CHANGE

Climate change is a global problem that poses an immediate and far-reaching threat to people and communities, and that has implications for the full enjoyment of human rights. Through **Goal 13**, the 2030 Agenda embeds the concern for climate change in a broader vision of universal respect for human rights and human dignity.⁵⁹

There are specific human rights risks inherent in the implementation of **actions to combat and adapt to climate change**, despite the existence of specific safeguards and the recognition of human rights in the **Paris Agreement on Climate Change**.⁶⁰ A number of climate-related mitigation and adaptation mechanisms come with **safeguards** that basically aim to uphold key human rights principles such as participation, and to minimize the risk of adverse impacts, for example on communities. Consequently, safeguard application cannot be

separated from human rights application and would benefit from the expertise, contribution and oversight by institutionalised human rights monitoring mechanisms such as NHRIs. The data challenges presented by this separation need to be addressed. Vulnerable groups are often among those that are most exposed to the effects of climate change, often inhabit areas where climate change mitigation projects, and related conservation initiatives are targeted, and may also be sidelined from consultation processes on these initiatives. The disaggregation of data on the situation of these groups, and a consideration of the potential challenges to their rights that such initiatives present, are crucial elements of the data challenges that NHRIs can provide guidance for.

In November 2015, the **Commonwealth Forum of National Human Rights Institutions** adopted the **St. Julian's Declaration on Climate Justice**.⁶¹ The group of Commonwealth NHRIs commit, *inter alia*, to:

- Take steps to increase their understanding of how human rights obligations inform better climate action by pursuing meaningful collaboration between national representatives in the UNFCCC and the SDGs;
- Encourage national and international climate change frameworks to integrate human rights into their policies and actions;
- Develop rights-based guidance, which provides both a legal and moral basis to climate change action, rooted in dignity and equality, through the realisation of human rights; and
- Develop a work programme on climate justice in order to monitor and evaluate efforts already made and still to be made to protect human rights within the context of climate action.

All of the above-mentioned NHRI functions are highly relevant for the implementation of SDG 13 on climate change. NHRIs can contribute to human rights-based monitoring of national climate change-related frameworks, advise governments on how to protect human rights in relation to climate change, and business, and can provide remedies for human rights violations.



In November 2016, in the context of the 22nd Conference of the Parties to the **UN Framework Convention on Climate Change** (UNFCCC), the **National Human Rights Council of Morocco** hosted a meeting for NHRIs from all over the world, to further discuss and reflect on their role in the implementation of the Paris Agreement on Climate Change.



On 22 September 2015, 20 typhoon survivors and 13 civil society groups delivered a petition to the **Commission on Human Rights of the Philippines** requesting for investigation of the responsibility of some 50 companies, referred to as the Carbon Majors. The allegation is that these companies knowingly contributed to the root causes of climate change and thus violated the human rights of Filipinos.⁶² The group requested that the Carbon Majors should be held accountable for violations or threats of violations of Filipinos' rights, including the right to life; to the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health; to food; to water and sanitation; to adequate housing; and to self-determination. This complaint is a landmark case, as it is directly framed as a human rights case submitted to an NHRI. The petition is still under consideration, but has already generated attention worldwide.

ANNEXES

ANNEX A: PROHIBITED GROUNDS OF DISCRIMINATION

INSTRUMENT(S)	GROUNDS OF DISCRIMINATION
INTERNATIONAL INSTRUMENTS	
Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR).	Race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.
International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (CERD).	Race, colour, descent, national or ethnic origin.
Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC).	Race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national, ethnic or social origin, property, disability, birth or other status.
International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women.	Sex.
International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families.	Migrant status, sex, race, colour, language, religion or conviction, political or other opinion, national, ethnic or social origin, nationality, age, economic position, property, marital status, birth or other status.
Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees.	Race, religion or country of origin.
ILO Convention on Discrimination in Employment and Occupation (Convention No. 111).	Race, colour, sex, religion, political opinion, national extraction or social origin.
UN Declaration on the Right to Development.	Race, sex, language or religion.

EUROPEAN INSTRUMENTS	
European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (ECHR).	Sex, race, colour, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, association with a national minority, property, birth or other status.
INTER-AMERICAN SYSTEM INSTRUMENTS	
American Convention on Human Rights.	Race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, economic status, birth or any other social condition.
AFRICAN INSTRUMENTS	
African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights (ACHPR).	Race, ethnic group, colour, sex, language, religion, political or any other opinion, national and social origin, fortune, birth or other status.

END NOTES

¹ UN General Assembly, 20th Session, 21 October 2015, *Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*, UN Doc., A/RES/70/1, Preamble.

² DIHR, *Human Rights Guide to the SDGs*: <http://sdg.humanrights.dk/en/targets2>

³ UN General Assembly, 20th Session, 21 October 2015, *Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*, UN Doc., A/RES/70/1, para. 87.

⁴ Report prepared at the request of the United Nations Secretary-General, by the Independent Expert Advisory Group on a Data Revolution for Sustainable Development, November 2014.

⁵ Official list of indicators here: <http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/indicators/indicators-list/>

⁶ Some of these 230 indicators are repeated under several targets, making the total number of indicators 241 if repetitions are counted.

⁷ Danish Institute for Human Rights, 2016, *Human Rights in Follow-up and Review of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*, pp. 52-54. Refer also to Annex A of this report, p. 56.

⁸ OHCHR, 2012, *Human Rights Indicators: a guide to measurement and implementation*. Available at www.ohchr.org.

⁹ “Leaving no one behind: from a statistical perspective”, presentation by Attila Hancioglu, UNICEF Data & Analytics Section, at the “International Seminar on SDGs: Data disaggregation, Seoul, 3-4 November 2016. “Leaving no one behind: from a statistical perspective”, presentation by Attila Hancioglu, UNICEF Data & Analytics Section, at the “International Seminar on SDGs: Data disaggregation”, Seoul, 3-4 November 2016. Available at: http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/meetings/sdg-seminar-seoul-2016/5_Hancioglu-LeavingNoOneBehindStatisticalPerspective.pdf

¹⁰ https://www.unicef.org/esaro/5480_birth_registration.html.

¹¹ “The Expert Group also agreed that indicators should cover the specific groups of the population and address other elements of disaggregation when these are specified in the targets. To the extent possible, indicators relevant to the specific groups mentioned in the targets have been included in the proposed list.” *Report of the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on Sustainable Development Goal Indicators*, 19 February 2016, UN Doc., E/CN.3/2016/2/Rev.1, Para. 27.

¹² UN General Assembly, 20th Session, 21 October 2015, *Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*, UN Doc., A/RES/70/1, para. 74(g).

¹³ OHCHR, 2016, *A Human Rights-based Approach to Data: leaving no one behind in the 2030 Agenda*, p. 6. Available at:

<http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/HRIndicators/GuidanceNoteonApproachtoData.pdf>

¹⁴ OHCHR, 2015, *SDGs Indicator Framework: A Human Rights Approach to Data Disaggregation to Leave No One Behind, Draft background note* (25.2.2015), p.3.

¹⁵ See the Tier classification as of 21 December 2016 at:

http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/meetings/iaeg-sdgs-meeting-04/Tier%20Classification%20of%20SDG%20Indicators_21%20Dec%20for%20web%20site.pdf

¹⁶ A total of 43 indicators were excluded because they require no statistical assessment, or because they are not relevant in a Danish context. The status is “unclear” on another 53.

¹⁷ DIHR analysis based on Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics, 2016, *Setting Priorities for Data Support to 7th FYP and SDGs: An Overview*, p.17. Available at:

http://bbs.portal.gov.bd/sites/default/files/files/bbs.portal.gov.bd/page/303f0460_e79c_40d2_8157_acfcf64845a8/7thFYP%20and%20SDGs.pdf

¹⁸ World Bank Statistical Capacity Indicator Dashboard at:

<http://datatopics.worldbank.org/statisticalcapacity/SCIdashboard.aspx>

¹⁹ Morten Jerven, 2014, *Writing about a data revolution: A critique in four venn diagrams*. Available at: <http://mortenjerven.com/writing-about-a-data-revolution-a-critique-in-four-venn-diagrams/>

²⁰ OHCHR 2016, *A Human Rights-based Approach to Data: leaving no one behind in the 2030 Agenda*. Available

at: <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Indicators/Pages/HRIndicatorsIndex.aspx>

²¹ For ratification information, see: <http://indicators.ohchr.org/> (for UN human rights treaties), and

<http://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=NORMLEXPUB:1:0::NO> (for ILO Conventions).

²² <http://sdg.humanrights.dk>

²³ The Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) has defined 6 main components of a human rights-based approach to data (HRBAD) collection, see OHCHR 2016.

²⁴ <http://www.data4sdgs.org>

²⁵ <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/partnership/?p=11910>

²⁶ <http://civicus.org/thedatashift/>

²⁷ <http://tapnetwork2030.org>

²⁸ www.indigenoustraveler.org

²⁹ UN General Assembly, 20th Session, 21 October 2015, *Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*, UN Doc., A/RES/70/1, para 79.

³⁰ <https://www.globalreporting.org/Pages/default.aspx>

³¹ *Work Plan for Tier III Indicators* at: <http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/meetings/iaeg-sdgs-meeting-04/Tier%20III%20Work%20Plans%202011.11.2016.pdf>

³² See for example: <http://www.defensoria.gob.pe/temas.php?des=3>

³³ UN General Assembly, 2016, *Critical milestones towards coherent, efficient and inclusive follow-up and review at the global level: Report of the Secretary General*, 15 January 2016, UN Doc., A/70/684.

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ <http://uhri.ohchr.org/>

³⁶ http://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/treatybodyexternal/TBSearch.aspx?Lang=en

³⁷ CERD's Article 5 enunciates a comprehensive list of rights in the implementation of which States Parties undertake to prohibit and eliminate racial discrimination. This list includes the right to just and favourable conditions of work, and the right to security of person and protection against violence. The relationships between these rights, and racial discrimination, have been examined both in the context of country reporting and at a general level in the context of a General Recommendation. See UN Committee on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, *General Recommendation No. 20 on Article 5 of the Convention*, Forty eighth Session, 1996, contained in UN Doc., A/51/18.

³⁸ See the full list of special procedures at:

<http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/SP/Pages/Welcomepage.aspx>

³⁹ Convention on Discrimination in Employment and Occupation, 1958 (No. 111).

⁴⁰ Equal Remuneration Convention, 1951 (No. 100).

⁴¹ Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87) and Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98).

⁴² Minimum Age Convention, 1973 (No. 138) and Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999 (No. 182).

⁴³ Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (No. 29) and Abolition of Forced Labour Convention, 1957 (No. 105).

⁴⁴ Danish Institute for Human Rights, *A Human Rights Guide to the SDGs*. Available at <http://sdg.humanrights.dk/>

⁴⁵ The Representations procedure is a form of complaint procedure governed by Article 24 of the ILO Constitution.

⁴⁶ <http://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=1000:1:::NO>

⁴⁷ The Principles Relating to the Status of National Institutions (the Paris Principles, Adopted by General Assembly resolution 48/134 of 20 December 1993), relate to the competence and responsibilities of national institutions vested with the competence to promote and protect human rights. The Paris Principles also govern the composition and guarantees of independence and pluralism relating to National Human Rights Institutions (NHRIS), as well as their methods of operation.

⁴⁸ The 2015 Mérida Declaration provides more details about the role of NHRIs in implementing the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. See:

<http://nhri.ohchr.org/EN/ICC/InternationalConference/12IC/Background%20Information/Merida%20Declaration%20FINAL.pdf>

⁴⁹ See [Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action](#), adopted in June 1993.

⁵⁰ Resolution adopted by the General Assembly: national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights, 10th February 2016, UN Doc., A/RES/70/163.

⁵¹ Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions (GANHRI), *Chart of the Status of National Institutions, Accreditation Status as of 5th August 2016*.

Available at:

<http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Countries/NHRI/ChartStatusNHRIs.pdf>.

⁵² For more information on the DIHR Gold Indicators, see:

<http://www.humanrights.dk/publications/gold-indicators>

⁵³ *Equality made measurable: Statistics as tool to promote equal treatment in municipalities* (in Danish), <http://menneskeret.dk/udgivelser/maalbar-ligestilling-statistik-vaerktoej-fremme-koensligestilling-kommunerne>

⁵⁴ "Equal treatment of Greenlanders in Denmark" (in Danish, with English summary),

http://menneskeret.dk/sites/menneskeret.dk/files/media/dokumenter/udgivelser/ligebehandling_2015/ligebehandling_groenlaendere_dk_2015.pdf

⁵⁵ DIHR, 2015, *SDGs and human rights monitoring: guidance for national implementation*. Available at:

http://www.humanrights.dk/files/media/dokumenter/sdg/sdgs_and_human_rights_monitoring.pdf

⁵⁶ Close the Gap, *Progress and priorities report 2016*. Available at:

<https://www.humanrights.gov.au/our-work/aboriginal-and-torres-strait-islander-social-justice/publications/close-gap-progress>

⁵⁷ See: http://nhri.ohchr.org/EN/News/Documents/GANHRI-BackgroundPaper%20-HLPF16-ShrinkingSpace_publ.com.pdf

⁵⁸ The participating NHRIs were: A status: Egypt, Jordan, Mauritania, Morocco, Palestine, Qatar. B status: Algeria, Bahrain, Iraq, Libya, Oman, Tunisia. No status: Djibouti, Sudan.

⁵⁹ DIHR, 2016, *Climate Change: a Human Rights Concern*. Available at:

http://www.humanrights.dk/sites/humanrights.dk/files/media/billeder/nyheder/final_dihr_hr_and_cc_paper_3_11_16.pdf

⁶⁰ http://unfccc.int/paris_agreement/items/9485.php

⁶¹ http://cfnhri.org/uploads/general/St_Julian_Declaration_FINAL.pdf

⁶²

http://www.greenpeace.org/seasia/ph/PageFiles/735232/Climate_Change_and_Human_Rights_Petition.pdf

THE DANISH
INSTITUTE FOR
HUMAN RIGHTS

