



MEETING BRIEF

Innovation in Partnerships How to Measure Peace? For What? For Whom?

The 2030 Agenda provides an opportunity to measure the drivers of peace and conflict. There are many organizations currently developing indicators from both official and unofficial datasets to measure peace more accurately and holistically. On the margins of the 2017 High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development, the Permanent Mission of Bangladesh to the United Nations, the SDG 16 Data Initiative, One Earth Future, and the International Peace Institute co-organized a workshop on “How to Measure Peace? For What? For Whom?” in New York on July 20, 2017, as part of the **Innovation in Partnerships** series. The following are the key takeaways from the event:

1. The global indicators provide a universal framework to measure peace. However, peace is dynamic and perceived differently within and across countries and regions. **Additional indicators may therefore be needed** in order to address the specific needs and priorities at the national and local levels. Qualitative data on the perception of peace should also be taken into account.
2. Why is it important to gather data? When properly utilized, data collection can foster change, spread awareness of current challenges and gaps, and catalyze potential action and solutions. In many states, however, the **institutions tasked with data collection and disaggregation currently lack the necessary funding and expertise to make a significant impact**. Indeed, many national statistical offices lack the capacity, human capital, or technological resources to measure the full range of tier-one global indicators. Moreover, civil society in many countries also lack proper tools to provide independent assessments.
3. Participants identified the need to **build stronger bridges between “track-one” official data from governments and “track-two” data from civil society organizations**. Building trust between track-one and track-two actors remains a challenge that must be addressed, perhaps by convening workshops and exploring mechanisms that help incorporate track-two data into official reporting. Colombia’s method of vetting and integrating civil society data into official sources serves as one example of how states can work with civil society while retaining data sovereignty.
4. **The 2030 Agenda should usher in a “data mindset” in which everyone is encouraged to share their datasets**, including academia, the private sector, and others. Currently there are a number of international initiatives collecting and analyzing data on Goal 16. These initiatives vary in who is aware of them, their data sources, and whom they are working with. Participants suggested an exercise to map existing mechanisms in order to avoid duplicative efforts, identify gaps, and increase communication between the different initiatives. To take advantage of the political momentum around the 2019 Summit that will review SDG 16, a multi-stakeholder coalition should be formed around a common goal to achieve greater impact.
5. **A platform for greater peer-to-peer learning should be established** among institutions engaged in data collection for SDG 16. Regional commissions can play a pivotal role in organizing working groups that share best practices and methodologies. Countries should also be encouraged to present comprehensive datasets on SDG 16, with both track-one and track-two sources, during their voluntary national reviews.