

Multi-stakeholder Consultation on Human Rights Indicators for the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development

5-6 September 2017
Conference Room 1.16, Palais Wilson
Geneva, Switzerland

Meeting Report

Background and meeting objectives

On July 6, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted the global indicator framework developed by the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on SDGs (IAEG-SDGs) and earlier endorsed by the UN Statistical Commission (UNSC). The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) is the custodian agency of four indicators under Goals 10 (Reduce inequality within and among countries) and 16 (Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels):

- 16.a.1 Existence of independent NHRI in compliance with the Paris Principles
- 16.10.1 Number of verified cases of killing, kidnapping, enforced disappearance, arbitrary detention and torture of journalists, associated media personnel, trade unionists and human rights advocates in the previous 12 months
- 10.3.1 and 16.b.1 Proportion 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
- 16.1.2 Conflict-related deaths per 100,000 population, by sex, age and cause

Except for indicator 16.a.1, all indicators have been classified by the IAEG-SDG under Tier III (i.e. indicators for which methodology and data collection are not yet fully available). As custodian agency, OHCHR started developing the methodology of the indicators in accordance with the work plans for Tier III Indicators submitted to the IAEG-SDG. OHCHR is collaborating with the Praia Group on Governance Statistics, created by the UNSC, and with

UN and other organisations serving as data partners for specific indicators. Given the centrality of human rights in the 2030 Agenda, Member States have committed to implement the Agenda in a manner consistent with rights and obligations under international law, and to leave no one behind (A/RES/70/1). To support this commitment OHCHR has developed guidance on a Human Rights-Based Approach to Data (HRBAD).

OHCHR is also looking into the role that National Statistical Offices (NSOs), National Human Rights Institutions (NHRIs) and civil society organisations (CSOs) can play in terms of measuring human rights indicators at national level. As underscored in the Merida Declaration adopted during the 12th Conference of the International Coordinating Committee of National Human Rights Institutions (ICC) in Mexico, NHRIs are well positioned to contribute to a human rights-based approach to implementation and measurement of the 2030 Agenda, given their mandate to monitor human rights violations in their respective countries. At the same time, the UNSC has decided that the “compilation of global indicators will be based to the greatest extent possible on comparable and standardized national official statistics provided by countries to the international statistical systems and that when other sources and methodologies are used, these will be reviewed and agreed by national statistical authorities and presented in a transparent manner.”

Against this background, OHCHR convened a multi-stakeholder consultation to address technical issues surrounding the proposed conceptual, definitional, and methodological framework for the three Tier III indicators. The meeting was also conceptualised as the starting point of a global platform to validate, enhance, promote and disseminate these indicators. The target participants of the meeting were senior-level experts from National Statistical Offices (NSOs) and National Human Rights Institutions (NHRIs) in charge of data collection and disaggregation and dissemination of information relevant to the events and issues that the three indicators seek to measure. The meeting also brought together representatives of international human rights mechanisms, civil society organisations (CSOs), UN agencies and other international organisations.

The programme, list of participants and background materials are annexed to the report.

Opening

The consultation was opened by Ms. Peggy Hicks, Director of the Thematic Engagement, Special Procedures and Right to Development Division at OHCHR. In her remarks, she emphasized the important contribution of international human rights standards to the measurement of the SDGs. She called on stakeholders to use human rights norms and standards as a lens in order to see behind any statistic, the men, women, children, persons with disabilities, migrants, ethnic minorities born free and equal in dignity and rights. Addressing NSOs and NHRIs in the group, Hicks noted the existence of international standards that guarantee the independence of both types of institutions and called on them

to play a lead role in the identifying and measuring groups that may be left behind, and in the development of SDG indicators sensitive to human rights. Ms. Francesca Marotta, Chief of the Methodology, Education and Training Section (METS) at OHCHR welcomed the participants and introduced the objectives of the consultation.

Session I – Human Rights Based Approach to Data to Leave no-one behind in the 2030

Agenda

OHCHR presented an overview of the background, key concepts and principles underpinning a Human Rights Based Approach to Data (HRBAD). OHCHR's guidance note on HRBAD was developed in response to recurrent recommendations from international human rights mechanisms on the need to use statistics to promote and protect human rights. It was also a response to unanimous calls to "leave no one behind", "reach the furthest behind first", "eliminate discrimination" and "reduce inequality" in the process of implementing the SDGs. The SDG target 17.8 already commits to data disaggregation by income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other relevant characteristics. However, NSOs and custodian agencies need to work together, and with other stakeholders in order to identify groups at risk of being left behind and devise effective means to include them in relevant data collection efforts.

Participants shared their experiences and practices in operationalizing the principles outlined in HRBAD at country level. In Kenya, the Kenya National Commission on Human Rights (KNCHR) and the Kenya National Bureau of Statistics signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to mainstream HRBAD in official statistics. KNBS and KNCHR, for the first time, have jointly identified the population groups at risk of being left behind in Kenya, which resulted in a list of 26 such groups. These groups will participate in a planning process to develop relevant modules and specialised survey instruments (e.g. inclusion of relevant modules on census and surveys, conducting specialized surveys such as victimization survey and survey of the homeless, etc.). Both institutions will also establish a national strategy for the development of statistics for these groups and will share information more systematically and with international organizations serving as custodian agencies for Tier III indicators.

The ensuing discussions showed general agreement on the relevance, both from a legal and practical perspective, of the HRBA to Data (HRBAD). Participants reiterated the consistency of the HRBAD with the Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics (FPOS) (A/RES/68/261). They also underlined its role in furthering the implementation of the FPOS and related good practices, specifically in terms of empowering NSOs and NHRIs to respond jointly to the significant demand for data disaggregation and address related prioritization issues. HRBAD could potentially serve as a platform for national institutions to develop effective working

relationships and approaches in response to different challenges. Some of the issues identified concerned:

- *The right to know.* Participants saw the potential of HRBAD in operationalizing citizens' entitlement to public information, including official statistics, as laid down in Principle 1 of FPOS. States refer to human rights standards and principles to determine what falls under the right to information and to ensure access to such information.
- *Cultural barriers.* In many cases cultural beliefs impede the effectiveness of surveys but communicating the connection between being counted and being able to enjoy one's social and legal entitlements, can be a way to counteract this and ensure participation.
- *Do no harm.* Participants highlighted associated risks to counting ethnic minorities, undocumented migrants, and other potentially disadvantaged groups, and appreciated HRBAD's explicit reference to the "Do no harm" principle. They affirmed that national institutions have the duty to monitor discriminations without leaving the affected individuals and groups worse off.
- *Balancing national, regional and international obligations.* Aligning national data collection and disaggregation approaches with international human rights law helps ensure their clarity, consistency and comparability.
- *Prioritization and contextualization.* HRBAD could enable NSOs, working with NHRIs, to address human rights challenges using data, for example, by mapping recommendations from the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) to existing data sets, NSOs can identify priority data sets. Therefore, HRBAD should be seen as a framework that allows tailored-fit approaches to a diverse range of human rights and data challenges.
- Participants agreed that relationships between NHRIs and NSOs could play a key role in operationalising the human rights-based approach to data, and could yield value for both parties. Benefits identified included mutual information sharing and capacity building, which could result in increased institutional trust for both organisations. NHRIs can play a critical role in assisting NSOs to understand and engage with population groups who are at risk of being left behind, and both parties can contribute to building the capacity of representative organisations to engage with statistical processes.

In summary, participants recognized that the ultimate purpose of all data collection efforts is not filling new tables, but to help improve peoples' lives and fulfil their right to information. The call for data disaggregation in the 2030 Agenda brings concrete opportunities, as well as risks, to human rights. Participatory processes are necessary to identify the groups at risk of being left behind and engage in meaningful data collection efforts. This entails exploring the use of non-traditional data sources and furthering cooperation between NSOs, NHRIs and CSOs. To this end, the following capacity building needs were identified:

- Strengthening the knowledge of statisticians on human rights norms, standards and principles;

- Transmission of recommendations of international human rights mechanisms concerning data needs to NSOs, and ensuring the relevance of these recommendations to identifying the groups left behind;
- Improving the knowledge of human rights practitioners on existing/future data availability and collection; and
- Supporting further cooperation between NSOs and NHRIs, including adoption of memoranda of understanding to institutionalize collaboration at country level.

The discussions likewise confirmed that NHRIs collect relevant data and could potentially act as providers and compilers of human rights and related SDG indicators; build bridges with CSOs as other potential data providers; and reach out to groups that are left behind and hard-to-count.

Considering the need for further promotion and implementation of the HRBAD, both at national and international level, OHCHR committed to continue providing support to national stakeholders and facilitating the review and exchange of good practices on HRBAD, data disaggregation and relevant SDG indicators.

Session II – SDG Indicator 16.b.1/10.3.1

Target 16.b *Promote and enforce non-discriminatory laws and policies for sustainable development*

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*

Indicator 16.b.1/10.3.1 *Proportion 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*

OHCHR presented the indicator development approach. This includes the drafting of a standard survey instrument and accompanying methodological guidance for potential state and non-state data collectors. The survey materials would be a resource for states that are not currently collecting population prevalence data on discrimination and harassment. The proposed approach represents a necessary compromise between thorough data collection and anticipated resource limitations for data collectors. The participants supported OHCHR's approach, with some specific areas identified for further discussion and revision. Issues that had been previously considered in the development phase by OHCHR were raised in more detail during this session, and their importance was confirmed:

Scope of the indicator:

- Tensions around collecting data on discrimination grounds that are not addressed by national anti-discrimination legislation;

- The need to clearly communicate the scope of the indicator, in particular the implicit (or effective) exclusion of people who don't feel discriminated against (internalized prejudice);
- The need to clearly communicate the use of the resulting data to understand population prevalence as opposed to prevalence within sub-populations of interest;
- Exclusion of hate crimes from the scope of the indicator alongside the inevitable inclusion of incidents that would constitute criminal offenses. The indicator is not designed to capture all criminal acts motivated by prejudice, so at a conceptual level, the scope of the indicator design excludes hate crimes and hate speech. However, it is expected that some respondents may include these insofar as they constitute episodes of harassment (or discrimination); and

Conceptual and definitional issues:

- The importance of specifying that the data collection relates to discrimination that has a negative impact;
- Experiences of discrimination where an individual is perceived to have characteristics or attributes relevant to grounds of discrimination; and
- Simultaneously, differing contexts around grounds of discrimination and a need to address common issues like race in consistent ways.

Complementary data that could be collected through additional survey modules and/or data sources:

- Respondents' avoidance of particular activities or places, or self-censorship, because they anticipate discrimination;
- The effectiveness of the indicator for measuring progress toward the two targets (10.3 and 16.b) and the possibility of proposing supplementary indicators that could consider more structural and procedural efforts toward addressing discrimination and harassment;
- Concerns around the ability and intention of the proposed survey materials to standardize data collection in this area. OHCHR clarified that a range of approaches to collecting data on discrimination and harassment are anticipated, and that the proposed materials are expected to be used only by states who do not already have an appropriate data collection methodology to service the indicator, and who decide not to develop their own approach;
- Some NSOs advised that they would support a more detailed core module for collecting and calculating national level prevalence. Where possible and feasible, OHCHR would support the most comprehensive data collection possible in order to provide detailed information for analysis, advocacy and reporting in addition to higher-level SDG reporting;

Participants also highlighted the need to ensure the indicator remains in the official SDG indicator set, and to work toward its reclassification (as a tier 2 indicator) as soon as possible.

Participants asked about the indicator's utility for the purposes of comparison. It is anticipated that states will use a range of approaches to collecting the data for indicator reporting. Further, the conceptual basis of many of the grounds of discrimination prohibited by international human rights law will vary across (even within) countries. The ongoing indicator development work will consider these issues while working toward data collection approaches that meet the requirements established for measuring progress within the 2030 Agenda. Related indicators and targets were also discussed, noting that discrimination and harassment are addressed in other ways throughout the SDG indicators work. Limitations of collecting data on discrimination and harassment through household surveys were noted.

Participants were supportive of the inclusion of selected grounds in the core question wording for the purposes of informing analysis, advocacy and policy responses. They emphasized in particular that it is important that the core module provide data that can assist states in formulating policy analysis and responses. Participants were generally supportive of the idea of states selecting grounds that are appropriate for their individual contexts. There was also some enthusiasm for a set of 'core' grounds that should be included in all data collections, with additional grounds added by states, and taking into account the characteristics for data disaggregation listed under SDG target 17.18. OHCHR noted a number of legal, definitional, methodological and country-level policy issues making the selection of one unique/short list of core grounds applicable in all contexts unfeasible in practice. However, the need for detailed guidance on selection of grounds was noted. The selection of grounds through participatory processes at the national level is a key example of the principles of a human rights-based approach to data in practice.

It was also highlighted that in some regional/country contexts data collection was more effective when expressing the grounds, for the purposes of the question wording, more descriptively than it may be in a terminology favoured in human rights instruments.

Participants gave some specific inputs on the operational definition and lead-in text that will help refine the materials developed. These related to issues of discrimination on the basis of 'real versus perceived' characteristics or attributes; defining or not both discrimination and harassment before the first question; aspects of discrimination beyond 'treatment'; and approaches to reduce *telescoping*¹.

Implementation of the indicator was also discussed. It was agreed that a critical piece of work following the finalisation of the core module formulation is for OHCHR to pursue opportunities to have the module included in existing household survey programs. OHCHR

¹ Telescoping refers to a phenomenon commonly observed in survey data collection in which respondents include incidents that occurred outside the reference period in the responses.

will examine opportunities to partner with UN agencies and other custodians of large scale surveys in the implementation of the indicator. A final outcome of this work will also be that the survey instrument and accompanying materials are available to individual data collectors at the country level, including, but not limited to, National Statistics Offices.

Session III – SDG Indicator 16.10.1

Target 16.10 *Ensure public access to information and protect fundamental freedoms, in accordance with national legislation and international agreements*

Indicator 16.10.1 *Number of verified cases of killing, kidnapping, enforced disappearance, arbitrary detention and torture of journalists, associated media personnel, trade unionists and human rights advocates in the previous 12 months*

OHCHR presented the definitional, methodological and data collection considerations for the development of SDG indicator 16.10.1. The following elements of the overall approach were emphasized in the presentation:

- Definitions of the elements of the indicator which were developed using an interdisciplinary approach that bridges international legal and statistical standards;
- Use of publicly available administrative records generated by global, regional and national human rights mechanisms as data sources for the indicator, to be expanded sequentially starting with existing data sets from OHCHR , UNESCO and ILO;
- Events-based victim counting where one verified case concerns one victim, and the application of “the most serious offense” rule commonly used in the field of crime statistics and in keeping with data availability considerations;
- Verification standards based on OHCHR’s human rights monitoring and investigation methodology that encompasses a minimum set of required data for each case to be included in the global database; and
- Need to develop strong and broad partnerships between OHCHR, ILO and UNESCO and different data sources to ensure widest possible data coverage, quality and comparability.

Likewise, the meeting discussed proposed refinements to the current formulation of the indicator, including omitting the term “associated media producers” for being redundant with the term “journalists” and changing the term “human rights advocates” to “human rights defenders” in accordance with current practices and normative standards at international level. It was also proposed that the sequence of violation types be re-ordered in terms of descending gravity or seriousness to facilitate the application of the most serious offense rule; and add “other harmful acts” to align more closely the events covered by the indicator with the scope of fundamental freedoms under Target 16.10.

UNESCO and ILO are key data partners in the work on this indicator; representatives of each presented the data sources for journalists and trade unionists, respectively. It was noted that the 2015 and 2016 global progress reports on the SDGs have included the data series on the list of killings of journalists condemned by the UNESCO Director General. A message of support for the indicator from the UN Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders (SRHRD), Mr. Michel Forst was conveyed and is annexed to the report.

In the discussion that followed, participants acknowledged that existing international mechanisms would serve as the initial data sources of the indicator and expressed support for the refinement of the current formulation of the indicator. Refinements will be proposed in order to clarify its scope and tighten its alignment with normative standards and the SDG target itself, which is the protection and promotion of fundamental freedoms. The inclusion of “other harmful acts” in the revised formulation also garnered support, however, it was recognized that there was a need to clarify further the type of acts to be captured as the indicator will be subject to further development. The participants likewise endorsed the minimum data requirement, counting unit/method, and verification standard. NHRIs affirmed their mandate and capability to monitor attacks against journalists, trade unionists and human rights defenders. NSOs underlined their mandate and capability to harmonize/coordinate national data collection methods/efforts and ensure implementation of data quality standards for the purposes of international reporting. NHRIs and NSOs committed to work together to accelerate the implementation of the indicator at national level and one NSO suggested looking also at a complementary approach based on survey techniques, highlighting however related data confidentiality challenges. It was also suggested that OHCHR and its data partners (ILO and UNESCO) should support further capacity building activities to facilitate the compilation of the indicator by relevant stakeholders at national level.

Session IV – SDG Indicator 16.1.2

Target 16.1 *Significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere*

Indicator 16.1.2 *Conflict-related deaths per 100,000 population, by sex, age and cause*

OHCHR presented the proposed definitions of concepts, methodology and data collection for the indicator. NGOs, NSOs and UN agencies presented their related work, mandates and provided feedback on the proposed approach, including in terms of their possible contributions to the continuation of the development of the methodology and data collection. The following topics and issues were discussed:

Proposed definitions of concepts and methods of measurement:

- Definition of ‘**armed conflict**’ as understood in International Humanitarian Law (IHL)

- Identification of armed conflict in practice based on an exhaustive reading of publicly available reports and assessments issued by the United Nations and other relevant bodies and organizations;
- Definition of conflict-related deaths, including direct, indirect deaths, and the nexus requirement to the conflict;
- For documented direct deaths, the minimum data requirement includes the status of the victim [factual categories of civilians, members of armed forces, fighters or other protected persons, unknown]; name of the victim [legal name/s, alias or assumed identity]; sex of the victim [male, female, unknown]; age of victim [adult, children, date of birth, age range, unknown]; status of alleged perpetrator(s) [factual categories of members of armed forces, fighters, other actors, unknown]; location of death [city, province, country, unknown] and date of death [month, year]; cause of death [types of weapon(s), other means and methods, unknown];
- The indicator to be disaggregated by sex, age and cause of death as per the request made in the internationally agreed formulation of the indicator;
- Need for the compilation of the indicator and for OHCHR to assess available data sources and compile data from a range of potentially relevant sources, including government agencies, national statistical offices, national human rights institutions, non-governmental organizations, media and other civil society sources;
- Need for data source/provider to ensure that verification standards are met through documentation of a set of relevant information on a particular death, providing the reasonable grounds to believe that the death occurred and was conflict-related;
- Relevance of lawful/unlawful categorisation and related coding to uphold international humanitarian and human rights law in the development of the indicator.

Proposed concentric approach to the counting of conflict-related deaths:

- *First circle - counting first documented direct deaths.* The deaths to be counted include deaths caused by the use of weapons and by other means and methods used by parties to the conflict; deaths of civilians [in priority]; and deaths of members of armed forces, fighters and other protected persons [depending on data availability]. The minimum data requirement will be used to harmonize data for compilation and global reporting.
- *Second circle - estimating undocumented direct deaths.* Statistical surveys and techniques may be used to estimate undocumented direct deaths.
- *Third Circle – estimating indirect deaths.* Administrative data, statistical surveys and other relevant sources and methods may be used to estimate indirect deaths.
- *Related following steps for OHCHR:* finalization of the proposed methodology; consolidation of the list of identified situations of ‘armed conflict’; mapping and assessment of available data sources; piloting the methodology in selected situations of conflict; coordination with data partners; consultation on and hopefully submission of results of pilot to IAEG-SDGs to request possible tier reclassification.

There was an overall agreement on the proposed approach and its main components. The participants supported the definitions of the main concepts presented; the proposed identification and operationalisation of the legal definition of armed conflict; the concentric approach; and the minimum data requirements to harmonize data on documented direct deaths. The participants supported the work plan outlined by OHCHR to finalize the methodology based on the inputs received as part of the consultation. There was agreement on the need to clarify the concepts of conflict related deaths versus intentional homicide and in particular on identifying the existing overlap between the two indicators. The need for continued collaboration with UNODC was also stressed. Regarding the follow-up, participants, in particular from directly concerned countries and organizations involved in related data compilation, all conveyed their willingness to continue the collaboration on the development of the indicator, including by sharing further data and resources. There was also support for a regular meeting of the various stakeholders or producers of data.

There were additional issues discussed during the meeting that will need to be further considered in the development of the indicator. UNODC emphasized the importance of continuing the work on the lawful/unlawful categories of violent deaths, consistent with the International Classification of Crime Statistics (ICCS), so that consistent measures of conflict deaths and intentional homicides can be developed. Some participants also called for cross fertilization with indicator 16.10.1 by including the occupation of victims (e.g. human rights defender, journalist, trade unionist, health care worker, other, unknown) as minimum data requirement. The limitations of the indicator in measuring and revealing the full impact of conflicts should be adequately communicated in the metadata accompanying the indicator. It was also suggested that the data collection include the place of death using data on geolocation (e.g. street address, municipality, etc.); and that collection and compilation of metadata among data providers be promoted to help assess data reliability.

Summary conclusions/recommendations and next steps

At the conclusion of the consultation, Ms. Marotta gave a summary of the discussions as well as an outline of proposed steps to progress work on the HRBAD and the three human rights-related SDG indicators.

Regarding **Session I**, the participants agreed to further promote and implement the HRBAD, both at national and international level, share their experiences and good practices with others, and provide further comments and suggestions on the HRBAD guidance note. OHCHR committed to continue providing support to national stakeholders and facilitate review and exchange of good practices on HRBAD and data disaggregation of human rights and SDG indicators. OHCHR plans to publish an updated version of the HRBAD document in late 2017. As part of the support provided to national stakeholders, the Office will circulate a draft standard memorandum of understanding and encourage further formalisation of the

cooperation between national statistical offices and national human rights institutions, and other relevant data providers and users at national level.

In Session II on indicator 16.b.1/10.3.1, **it was agreed that** OHCHR would proceed with the preferred core module formulation discussed at the meeting, incorporate changes raised in the discussion, and undertake further consultations in refining the materials developed. Specifically, the next steps from OHCHR's perspective are to incorporate the changes discussed to the operational definitions and proceed with a two-question option (for the core module) that includes a selection of prohibited grounds of discrimination to be identified at national or regional levels through a process consistent with the HRBAD. OHCHR will develop guidance to support the identification and contextualisation of the formulation of the grounds, drawing on international human rights law and recommendations from international human rights mechanisms. OHCHR will also seek further advice about specific operational questions, and consult further with participants and other stakeholders, such as other members of the Praia City Group on governance statistics, on topics raised during the consultation. OHCHR plans to share the results of its mapping of surveys and initiatives pertaining to data collection and compilation relevant to the indicator. Input from stakeholders is welcome and will contribute to OHCHR's ongoing identification of good practices. It will also circulate the data item list to inform stakeholders on content proposed for optional modules and seek inputs; and circulate draft content for the methodological guidance for feedback.

Session III, the meeting participants agreed with the following steps to be taken by OHCHR on the development of indicator 16.10.1. OHCHR will proceed with the finalization of the draft metadata and methodological guidance note and move towards the submission of a refinement/reclassification request to the next IAEG-SDGs. It will produce the data for global reporting with 2015 as baseline and starting with data on killings of journalists, trade unionists and HRDs. OHCHR will develop further methodological guidance, in collaboration with the Global Alliance of NHRIs (GANHRI) and its WG on SDGs, on how NHRIs can work with NSOs, CSOs and other national stakeholders to implement the indicator, and explore possible complementary measurement approaches at national level. OHCHR will also continue its related engagement with the Praia City Group and its members.

Session IV on indicator 16.1.2, the participants agreed on the proposed concentric approach and definitions of main concepts and methods of measurement discussed during the meeting. Based on the feedback received, OHCHR will further develop the methodology and consolidate its identification of situations of 'armed conflict'. It will continue its mapping and assessment of available data sources and engage in further coordination with potential data partners. OHCHR will conduct pilot testing on the proposed methodological approach, including its minimum data requirement in situations of conflict. The pilot would also test the feasibility of lawful/unlawful categories when estimating conflict-related deaths. OHCHR will continue coordination with UNODC in order to ensure consistent measurement of

intentional homicides and conflict-related deaths. Additional consultations with the group and other relevant stakeholders will be undertaken and OHCHR will share information on the progress, including results of its pilot testing, with the Praia City Group and the IAEG-SDG.



This meeting was convened with the financial assistance of the European Union and the Government of Finland.
