Summary of the roundtable with g7+ members in The Hague September 28 and 29th

Making SDG 16.3 work for the rule of law and access to justice - how 16.3 translates into national contexts and how a meaningful implementation can be achieved, particularly in g7+ states.

Target 16.3: Promote the Rule of Law at the national and international levels and ensure equal access to justice for all. Despite the multidimensional characteristics of the target, there are only two indicators (underreporting of violence and unsentenced prisoners) to measure this target based on the official IAEG global indicators for Goal 16.3. The g7+ countries have adopted three indicators to jointly monitor SDG 16, of which one is on 16.3 namely *16.3.2. Unsentenced detainees as a proportion of overall prison population*. **Countries are encouraged to develop their own indicators in addition to the official agreed upon ones**.

1. **The international accepted indicators do not connect well to the realities on the ground**. It is argued that indicators are often based on perception and can be biased. A key element is to keep a national focus and to ensure that data captured has legitimacy in the eyes of a country's citizens, hence make sure that measurements are tangible and accepted. This would require contextualization of the indicators and a common understanding on the definitions (e.g. access to justice has different meanings in different contexts and cultures). Data is also political and any results will need to be validated by national authorities because of national interest. At the same time, in order to validate the data from an international perspective, a certain level of harmonization is necessary. That would allow for comparison and accountability which in turn helps with directing resources where they are needed. Although the final goal remains the same, there is a mismatch between the international demands for monitoring and reporting on the SDG 16 peace and violence indicators and the specific contextualized priorities of g7+ countries (that deal with for instance security issues, terrorism, drugs) at the moment. The New Deal Framework with the fragility assessments seem to suit g7+ countries better.

2.**The capacity is lacking to focus on both international demands and national priorities**. Currently, National Statistics Offices are responsible for gathering the official data but NSO's in g7+ countries as well as many other countries currently do not have the necessary and sufficient technological, financial and human resource capacities to collect and analyse the data. Data for SDG 16.3, especially on victimization, can be collected through surveys but the challenge lies in the methodology and in selecting the right indicators. There are difficulties in comparing underreporting rates from different countries. Different rates could reflect cultural differences as well as a lack of trust in authorities. This includes a different understanding of what behaviour constitutes a crime or whether there is a culture of not reporting grievances. The methodology and the indicators need to be uniform and harmonized so it can be used nationally and be compared internationally. A balance of what is relevant for a country and the translation into an international standard can potentially be achieved by establishing factors on how data is verified and recorded and shared.

3. **The relevance and usefulness of the SDG agenda and any progress that can be measured and achieved depend for a great deal on how the current Fragility Assessments can inform the SDG agenda and give further guidance on priorities in relation to the national development plans and transition agenda's in various countries**. The integration of the agendas with the planning priorities and the deepening of the analysis – e.g. at subnational level – as well as greater collaboration and coordination between and within data ecosystems seem a good way forward but that will require increased analytical capacity, better coordination and political partnerships.

Identify 2-3 specific opportunities seized, challenges that can be overcome and challenges that remain in terms of 16.3 implementation and strategies therein applied within g7+ contexts. From this, identify 2-3 recommendations going forward.