

Annex C: Post-2015 On-the-Ground Shared Framework Team Narratives

Each country team and the Global Advocacy Team were asked to prepare their own short narratives describing their experiences engaging in the Post-2015 On-the-Ground Shared Framework. They were given the following questions as a prompt:

- (1) What specific goals for the work did you have at the outset of the shared framework? How did these goals change, if at all, in 2015? (Please refer to your 2014 and 2015 strategies)
- (2) To what extent do you feel that you accomplished your goals? What supported you in accomplishing these goals (examples: strong civil society partners, key government allies, etc.)? What were your major barriers?
- (3) What surprised you the most as you carried out this work? Knowing what you know now, if you could go back in time, what would you have done differently?
- (4) To what extent did the shared framework change the way you work? How, if at all, have these changes affected your strategy for 2016?

Teams were given leeway to draft these narratives in their own voice and therefore the format between each differs.

Global Advocacy

Team Members: Betsy Apple (OSJI), Aidan Harris (OSJI), Peter Chapman (OSJI); Sumaiya Islam (OSJI); Lotta Teale (OSJI); Zaza Namoradze (OSJI); Vera Mshana (FGP); Michael Sosa (FGP)

The Global Advocacy Team of the Post-2015 On-the-Ground Shared Framework, primarily comprised of Justice Initiative and Fiscal Governance Program staff, sought to bring justice, good governance, and public safety directly into the Post-2015 agenda, ideally through a standalone justice goal. Global Advocacy Team (GAT) members connected the New York process to OSF's priorities on the ground (represented by nine country teams) in various ways: by bringing local actors (OSF Foundations, partners and grantees) both physically and virtually into the global advocacy sphere; by showcasing their work at global and regional forums to illustrate the need and potential for justice, governance and safety to transform the development agenda; by bringing information about the New York and global processes to the national level, and supporting domestic actors as they sought to engage their own governments at home; and by demonstrating in New York the power of local action to both create and satisfy demand for justice. We developed and executed a high-level global advocacy strategy in New York and in global forums (e.g. at the Financing for Development meeting in Addis Ababa) advancing justice. We collaborated with country teams by providing advice, information, and strategic assistance, including identifying and helping to realize opportunities for local advocates to inform the New York process. Finally, we participated extensively in the global measurement debate by providing our own submissions and marshaling technical expertise to bring into the Post-2015 indicators process.

High-Level Advocacy

Given that OSF is uniquely positioned to access and influence important decisions both at global and national level, our goal was to identify key stakeholders in governments, the UN system, and other relevant institutions, and build or strengthen relationships characterized by trust and credibility. We did so primarily in two ways: through individual bilateral contact, and through carefully crafted events. We organized strategic events that generated important conversations—between local advocates and development advisors, judges and ambassadors—to influence the thinking of the skeptics and opponents, and to stiffen the spines of allies. The UN calendar largely revolves around official meetings, and using those opportunities to create alternative narratives or to challenge misconceptions (e.g. that justice can't be measured, that sustainable development is confined to certain issues) was both welcomed and expected by governments. Our ability to bring pertinent voices from the ground, and to speak authoritatively about the conceptual elements of justice, governance and safety, gave OSF credibility as an influential resource in the Post-2015 process. The events consumed significant available resources, but were nevertheless invaluable in establishing our place as an authoritative voice on our priority issues.

As the process unfolded, we learned several important lessons. First, gaining political intelligence, mapping power and influence, and developing meaningful relationships in the UN sphere is not a part-time job; it requires dedication, consistency, and focused attention. Second, the meetings and events

we organized—whether small, private gatherings of very high-level people, or public side events on the margins of the UN’s official calendar—became occasions where diplomats and government officials expected to hear new and unusual voices and gain information otherwise unavailable to them in New York, and we needed to deliver on those expectations without fail. Third, the dynamics amongst actors at the UN are entrenched and one way to break the logjam is to take them out of the UN. To that end, a meeting we held at the Greentree Foundation as well as private gatherings hosted by George Soros proved to be among the most effective and well-received. Fourth, governments are not monolithic, and mapping their internal dynamics (and identifying allies and reformers even within recalcitrant states) is essential. We had to sort out contradictory messages between government officials in capital and their New York missions to understand when we could rely on statements of UN representatives and when we had to identify the locus of decision-making in capital. To add further complexity, in several cases, a change in government (or the possibility of such a change) prevented us from gaining a significant toehold with our advocacy. Strategic anticipation of such interruptions and the development of contingency planning might have helped us to better manage these challenges. Finally, in the early days of the New York process, we sought to generate “global buzz” around the Post-2015 agenda and justice in particular, which was largely unavailing because (unsurprisingly) the Post-2015 agenda did not ignite the global public imagination. We adjusted by encouraging OSF country teams to solicit local media at important moments.

National Level Advocacy

The GAT worked closely with Shared Framework country teams to deepen and expand relationships with local partners. We supported the country teams’ work by linking them to the global process, making their existing activities targeted and relevant to the concerns of their governments, and providing the pipeline for a two-way flow of information. At the same time, the activities and expertise of our local partners greatly enhanced our ability to deliver real world examples of impact to an otherwise dry and bureaucratic negotiations process. By engaging with country teams, we were able to identify strong and reliable champions that could advocate compellingly for justice, governance and safety at both the global and national level. Unsurprisingly, our participation in national level work was primarily through interlocutors, leading sometimes to administrative disconnects between OSF’s and our partners’ requirements (for example, the lead times in processing an OSF contract against the partner’s rapid need for funds, or our reliance on our partners’ ability to travel at short notice to participate in newly announced events in New York.)

Our relationship – and specifically that of the Justice initiative – to Namati raised persistent questions. As the institutional home of the Global Legal Empowerment Network, the Justice Initiative’s relationship with Namati was a key part of our strategy from the outset. However, it was not clearly defined and varied considerably over the duration of the project. We initially relied excessively on Namati’s on-the-ground presence through its membership, possibly at the cost of optimizing OSF’s own resources through national foundations. Furthermore, both organizations at times assumed that we were entirely aligned on Post-2015 goals and a common strategy, which was not the case. The Shared Framework articulated interest in three interrelated but nonetheless thematic issues, whereas Namati’s focus lay

more narrowly and entirely in promoting legal empowerment in the agenda. While our relationship with Namati was an essential and fruitful part of our strategy, we would have benefitted from a clearer understanding of where we converged and diverged in our approach.

Given the scale of the task, the GAT concentrated on harnessing existing enthusiasm rather than attempting to win over national partners that showed less interest or capacity. On balance, this approach yielded positive and valuable results. The Shared Framework created a structure for us to engage with other parts of the OSF Network to the Post-2015 agenda that otherwise might have not existed. For example, the Shared Framework provided incentive for US Programs to address the sustainable development goals, and this, in turn, provided the GAT with evidence of the universality of justice in the development agenda.

Technical Engagement

Our final focus of activities concerned technical engagement, with the aim of advocating for suitable measurement mechanisms, thereby challenging claims that these themes are inherently unmeasurable and unsuitable for inclusion in the agenda. After the Open Working Group endorsed Goal 16 in its recommendations, we turned to developing indicators that would measure progress. Some countries expressed a strong desire to demonstrate their own progress in this area, and we were able to bring examples of measurement from South Africa, Nepal, Indonesia, Serbia, and Mexico to New York. The indicators work posed (and continues to pose) considerable challenges. The work of finding politically palatable and technically feasible measures, while capturing the broad range of outcomes required by of Goal 16 targets in a single comprehensive dataset, continues. Despite our persistent and credible work (which enabled us to facilitate a virtual network discussion around Goal 16 indicators which fed into the official process), the indicators process, which will continue beyond the Shared Framework and well into the first phase of Agenda 2030 implementation, has proved disappointing. Current suggested indicators for Goal 16 targets are conservative, narrowly construed, and do not take a people-oriented approach. The Justice Initiative hopes to continue to access to influence this process through 2016.

Conclusion

The Global Advocacy Team helped to achieve the shared framework goal of including justice, good governance, and peace prominently in the Sustainable Development Goals. Our activities contributed to raising the profile of justice as a core component in development globally as well as on the ground in key countries. Engagement with the United Nations in a landmark intergovernmental negotiation process marks a new departure for the OSF's work. In a short space of time, we established credibility in this forum and were seen as the leading advocate for justice and governance in the Post-2015 agenda. Our leadership allowed us to help shape the debate away from an exclusively institutional focus towards a more people-oriented and service-based approach. By bringing examples from the field to the negotiations in New York, we helped ground an otherwise disconnected global process in peoples' every day realities, while we also provided access to the rarified world of the UN to our colleagues outside of New York.

We can point to a few important signs of progress already that emerged as a result of the process itself: the US government's establishment of a comprehensive roundtable comprised of nearly twenty departments and required to report regularly to the White House on progress made toward access to justice for poor people; the Kenyan commitment to justice through new legislation; the promising new engagement by the South African Human Rights Commission in implementing Goal 16. These developments suggest that the very global negotiations process, by itself, may yield meaningful impact. However, given the monumental scale of the challenges, if not for the prospect of another shared framework on legal empowerment, which the Justice Initiative (at least) sees as a tool for implementing the Post-2015 agenda, the success of the Global Advocacy Team might feel incomplete.

Brazil

Team Members: Pedro Abramovay (LAP); Vonda Brown (LAP); Heloisa Griggs (LAP); Luc Athayde-Rizarro (LAP); Betsy Apple (OSJI); Mary Miller Flowers (HRI); Mark De La Iglesia (FGP)

Team Coordinator: Luc Athayde-Rizarro (LAP) (from February 2015); Catesby Holmes (LAP)

“Forget about this issue”. These were the first words that Brazilian Ambassador to the United Nations, Antonio Patriota, said to OSF’s Director for Latin America & the Caribbean, Pedro Abramovay, during their initial conversation about the Brazilian position on Goal 16 of the Post-2015 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The conversation was the first step of a long process to convince the Brazilian government that public safety, governance and access to justice were important issues to sustainable development globally and nationally.

For most of 2014, Brazil played an obstructionist role in SDGs discussions related to the inclusion of public safety, governance and access to justice targets in the Post-2015 Agenda, which threatened the adoption of Goal 16 as a whole. Early on, the Brazilian government’s position on this issue reflected several concerns, among them that a) public safety, governance and access to justice were not strictly related to sustainability or poverty; and b) that the SDGs were a northern agenda being imposed on the global South. Brazil’s substantial influence over other Latin American countries, its key role in the discussions about the Post-2015 Agenda at the United Nations, and the centrality of the issue to OSF justified the adoption of a complex work plan by the Brazil Post-2015 SDGs SF Team to change the country’s position on Goal 16.

In early 2014, we identified an opportunity to begin this work in the national context. Sources on the ground indicated that the Brazilian government’s resistance lay primarily in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and that other government bodies did not necessarily share the same approach to the issue. In this context, the Brazil team’s first overarching goal was to take advantage of this disconnect and, by carrying out high-level advocacy activities in Brazil and in New York, influence different Brazilian government bodies to adopt a favorable position on the inclusion of public safety, governance and access to justice targets on Goal 16.

In May 2014, OSF President Chris Stone and Pedro Abramovay held several meetings on the ground in Brazil with civil society partners and key government officials. During this time, both identified another central challenge to our work under the Shared Framework: the apparent detachment of national and local civil society organizations from the SDGs discussions taking place at the UN. In this context, the Brazil Team adapted its work plan to include a second overarching goal: to mobilize civil society, through grantmaking and the use of communications tools, to discuss the Post-2015 agenda and pressure for the inclusion of public safety, governance and access to justice targets on Goal 16 of the SDGs. In this regard, the Brazil Team planned to build a broad portfolio of projects to generate evidence proving that goals and targets were an important tool for advancing public policies on criminal justice, good governance, and public safety.

This dual strategy involving high-level advocacy and grantmaking was a challenge in itself. LAP Program Coordinator and Brazil Team Coordinator (until February 2015) Catesby Holmes pointed out that “When we started this work, the grantmaking portion of the strategy seemed to be more obvious and familiar to me than the advocacy part, because we did not have a tradition of advocacy with government on these kind of issues. We did not have this experience in the Latin America Program”.

Additionally, the advocacy part of this body of work was not the only challenge. The shared framework as a method was new throughout the network, and it took time until the people involved started to feel comfortable with this new approach, if at all. In this regard, evaluating the methods and dynamics of the work, Holmes considered the format of the shared framework as major barrier: “there was a lack of understanding of how to collaborate better across the network. There was no tradition of using shared frameworks when we started. People did not know how to make a grant outside of their program strategy, there were other task besides the usual ones, the continuous presence of a consultant was another new addition, and people had to talk and work with persons that they did not know, among other things”. Human Rights Initiative Associate Director for Justice Mary Miller Flowers analyses, “I think a challenge was coordination and the team actually functioning like a team instead of individual programs. At a certain point we also stopped having periodic calls and informing each other of the work. (...) So it’s hard to really know what the learning is.”

In July 2014, the Brazil Team started to undertake high-level advocacy work nationally and before the Brazilian Mission to the United Nations. Pedro Abramovay and on-the-ground consultant, Janaína Penalva, held many meetings in Brasília with Ministers and other key government officials, and continued to have ongoing conversations with Ambassador Patriota. Abramovay mobilized actors in Brazilian media and civil society to publish articles and op-eds on the Post-2015 Agenda and Goal 16, which were disseminated and generally received in a positive way. We also identified some areas in which the Brazilian government had already made substantial advances and could act as a regional and global leader, such as access to justice. The effects of these interventions were a first surprise for the Brazil Team: “I did not expect the level of interaction that we got with the Brazilian government in Brazil and how this provided us with important information to design the strategy before the Brazilian Mission in the UN. (...) We did it. This direct interaction with the government was done by us, not by civil society”, remarked Pedro Abramovay.

At the same time, consultant Penalva held meetings with all major OSF grantees in Brazil in order to try to identify how each of them could work on the Post-2015 Agenda and demonstrate the connection between the global discussions and the local level work on public safety, governance and access to justice. That was a period of intensive work, when the team was very active to try and overcome the two main barriers identified early on: the Brazilian government’s resistance to the inclusion of Goal 16 and civil society’s apparent disconnect to the Post-2015 discussions.

In just few months, Brazilian civil society became more engaged on the issue. We believe this was a result of not only the existing connection of issues of public safety, governance and access to justice to their work, but also because of the possibility of financial support in that moment or in the future. “This is a good opportunity to have more OSF resources in Brazil. Not just now but in the next years”, was

heard by consultant Penalva from some organizations. As Abramovay pointed out, “We used grantmaking to engage them”. This engagement in turn had a significant impact in changing the Brazilian government’s position on Goal 16. Analyzing this shift in civil society involvement, Abramovay commented: “Many organizations engaged deeply in the discussions about the Sustainable Development Goals, and the SDGs are now a priority for them. This really surprised me.”

LAP Senior Program Manager Vonda Brown was surprised on this point too: “The organizations started working for the Post-2015 agenda even when we did not give them specific financial support for it. Article 19 is a good example. (...) And we discovered that other organizations had more capacity to work at the international level than we could identify in the beginning of the Shared Framework. Rede Nossa São Paulo is a good example of that. They received a grant to work for the Post-2015 agenda, but we did not initially expect them to work at the international level, which they ended up doing.” Knowing what we know now about the capacity of some organizations, we could have supported them earlier on the process and at a higher level than we did. This could have maximized the effects of their participation.

Our advocacy and grantmaking efforts contributed to set the stage for a quick and substantial change in the Brazilian government’s position on Goal 16 at the end of 2014. At the UN level, Ambassador Patriota became a key ally for the inclusion of public safety, governance and justice targets in the Post-2015 SGDs. At the national level, Minister of Justice José Eduardo Cardoso and Supreme Court Justice Luis Roberto Barroso also became strong OSF allies on Goal 16. Both of them were featured in the video “Access to Justice: Brazil”, produced by the Brazil Team to show good practices and the importance of access to justice, governance and public safety to sustainable development (civil society grantees Nossa São Paulo and Article 19 also participated in the video).

This scenario of rapid change surprised all the members of the Brazil Team. By the end of 2014, the Brazilian government seemed to be convinced not just about the importance of justice, governance and safety to sustainable development but to also that the country could be a regional and global leader on these issues. The strategy that led to this substantial change in the Brazilian position could be seen as a lesson and good practice for similar efforts in the future: “early on, we took the time to analyze the context and the main challenges and concluded that Brazil should be seen as a potential partner, and not as an enemy to be neutralized”, said Abramovay.

Responding to this new context, the 2015 strategy was more conservative and less hands on. It was necessary to maintain our achievements and not disturb the favorable scenario leading up to the UNGA. In this regard, the main focus of the Brazil Team’s strategy in 2015 shifted away from high-level advocacy efforts and towards expanding the existing portfolio of projects that would help to: a) provide concrete examples in Brazil of the use of indicators and targets to measure questions related to justice, governance and security, which could be used as inputs in discussions at the UN, and (b) generate evidence that goals and targets are an important tool for advancing public policies on justice, governance, and safety.

During this second year, the Brazil Team identified some additional challenges. Contrary to our expectations, the grantmaking work proved at times to be more difficult than the advocacy portion of

our strategy. LAP in particular faced some important challenges on the work around access to justice issues, since the LAP's strategy does not focus on this theme specifically, which diminished LAP overall's capacity to engage with organizations in this field. "Developing new projects and relationships with organizations focusing on access to justice was a challenge, since this has not been a thematic focus of LAP's strategy. Additionally, considering the success of the SF's advocacy strategy, the work around grantmaking on access to justice became less of a priority over time. This caused some delays, which impacted the work." said LAP Program Coordinator and Brazil Team Coordinator (as of February, 2015), Luc Athayde-Rizzaro. "In the future, it might be helpful to reflect if it is productive for a program to get involved in parts of a shared framework that revolve around themes that do not closely align with that program's strategy (as was the case of LAP on access to justice issues). If the program does decide get involved, it might be important to strategize on how to effectively engage on these less-familiar issues, especially when they are central to the shared framework, like access to justice was to the work of the Brazil Team", Athayde-Rizzaro complements.

Another challenge looking forward will be assessing and monitoring the medium and long-term impact of projects developed under the Post-2015 SF, since many of them constituted one-time grants that were only made possible by the shared framework. A good example of this is a LAP grant to POLOS, a new grantee working to measure and address access to justice challenges in a small community in the state of Minas Gerais. Miller Flowers analyses, "I think one challenge will be implementation and using the grants we've made to support changes on the ground. Will the consultant stay on and follow up? How will the work be coordinated after the end of the SF?" Concrete answers to questions on monitoring and on any form of continuation for this work remain unclear.

The two years of the Post-2015 SDGs Shared Framework presented both significant challenges and opportunities for the Brazil Team. As this work comes to a close, much of its impact, particularly with respect to the projects aimed at the implementation of the now adopted Goal 16 of the Sustainable Development Agenda, remain unclear. That being said, we can already identify significant short-term accomplishments by the Brazil Team. These include successfully engaging Brazilian civil society in discussions on the Post-2015 SDGs, and advocating before different parts of the Brazilian government to ultimately change its initial opposition to the adoption justice, public safety and governance targets into broad acceptance of their inclusion in Goal 16. As outlined in this short document, the Brazil Team's diverse set of efforts and strategies carried out over the past two years could provide important lessons learned and good practices for similar undertakings by different OSF programs and in the development of future shared frameworks.

South Africa

Team Members: Natalie Jaynes (OSF-SA), Lorenzo Wakefield (OSF-SA)

Team Coordinator: Natalie Jaynes

(1) What specific goals for the work did you have at the outset of the shared framework? How did these goals change, if at all, in 2015? (Please refer to your 2014 and 2015 strategies)

We commenced our involvement in the Post-2015 shared framework quite late in the process, and so only really began our work in August 2014. As such, we retained the same lens in 2015 as we used in 2014. In 2014, we identified three goals to focus our involvement in the shared framework:

1. *Show that it is possible to measure justice*
2. *Shape the Post-2015 agenda from a southern hemisphere perspective*
3. *Support legal empowerment as provided by paralegals and community advice offices.*

In 2015, we retained these three goals and also decided that there was one additional area of work that we needed to incorporate. Namely, the need to inform public discourse on the links between justice and development. So we added a fourth goal:

4. *Build public awareness of the links between justice and development*

(2) To what extent do you feel that you accomplished your goals? What supported you in accomplishing these goals (examples: strong civil society partners, key government allies, etc.)? What were your major barriers?

At a general level, we are satisfied that we made good progress towards advancing our goals. We had not done any prior work on the SDGs, so given this low baseline, we can confidently say that we have made important gains in terms of promoting awareness of and support for SDG16. We discuss each of the goals below, and note the important role that different partners have played. It must also be noted that all of our work was significantly bolstered by the supportive role of the Global Advocacy team. The team helped us to conceptualise how best we might pursue the shared framework in country, and then helped us to give effect to our plans.

The most significant barrier has been the South African government's relative disinterest in the process. We anticipated this at the outset and hence deliberately crafted our goals accordingly. Our final assessment is that we did make some progress to get government officials on board. However, it remains unclear as to whether or not this support will maintain momentum. This is discussed in more detail below, along with each of the other goals that we set for our shared framework involvement.

1. *Show that it is possible to measure justice*

One of the most common critiques against the inclusion of justice as part of the SDGs has been the contention that it is impossible to measure. While this will remain a vexing question, at least philosophically, we are satisfied that our grant making has gone some way to counter this critique. We have tried to do this through three interventions.

Firstly, we supported capacity building and technical assistance with the Eastern Cape Provincial Department for Community Safety. We saw an opportunity to advance our shared framework agenda by strengthening the ability of the department to monitor their manifold efforts to promote community safety in South Africa's most under-resourced province. We contracted external consultants to work with the department's "Provincial Crime Prevention Strategy Committee (PCPS)". The terms of the consultancy agreement are to equip the participants with the necessary skills to monitor and evaluate their project activities; and then to assist the PCPS to record and document their M&E process and share the data and learnings as part of the SF process. We see this intervention as providing a useful and accessible example for other local government entities of how they can measure their safety and justice interventions.

The second area of intervention that we pursued in order to show that it is possible to measure justice is the use of social audits . We have used our involvement in the shared framework to build on OSF-SA's existing work in this area to highlight the role and contribution that social audits can play as a way to measure access to justice. Specifically, we have focused on building the crucial link between access to information and the success of community-led social audits. We have used our convening power to kick-start a social audit network to solidify these links.

Thirdly, we have commissioned five case studies to showcase and profile our partners who are already demonstrating that it is possible to increase access to justice, and measure this process . We have drawn on a cross-section of partners who promote access to justice through direct legal support, community mobilisation, national and local advocacy and applied research. These profiles complement the existing communication strategy that has been pursued through the SF short films.

2. Shape the Post-2015 agenda from a southern hemisphere perspective

In 2014 we worked with our partners to bring together a south-south collaborative dialogue which took place in South Africa in late February 2015. The meeting provided a helpful springboard for Southern hemisphere countries to strategize a joint approach to the SDGs. As follow up to this meeting we have focused our attention in 2015 on working locally to ensure that the South African civil society community is actively engaging relevant government counterparts to shape the implementation of Goal 16.

Our key implementing partner has been the Southern African Liaison Office (SALO). We opted to work with SALO because we identified that we needed a partner that would be able to engage in high level diplomatic interactions. Our assessment is that SALO has successfully leveraged all available avenues to integrate the SDG16 agenda into existing policy directives. Through SALO's behind the scenes "soft advocacy", both the Departments of Justice and Social Development have made the links between their existing portfolios and the aspirations of SDG 16.

While we may have been able to ease the perception that the SDGs are a northern hemisphere driven mechanism, we remain alive to the scepticism that still characterises the South African government's approach to the implementation of the SDGs. We have made one important inroad by securing a commitment from the South African Human Rights Commission to implement SDG 16 through their national access to justice campaigns and activities.

3. *Support legal empowerment as provided by paralegals and community advice offices*

This goal has been approached by way of grants to organisations that work as 'intermediaries' and provide a bridge between the legal profession and multiple local communities. During 2014 we made grants to the Association of University Legal Aid Institutions Trust (AULAI), the Rhodes University Law Clinic (RULAC) and the Legal Resources Centre (LRC). In 2015, we have made similar grants to ProBono.org, and to the Dullah Omar Institute at the University of the Western Cape.

4. *Build public awareness of the links between justice and development*

When we reviewed our 2014 progress we decided that we needed to complement the shared framework activities with some additional emphasis on the broader public awareness of the SDG 16 and its aspirations. We decided that the best way to do this was through the lens of socio-economic inequality as this carries significant public currency. On 5 June 2015 we hosted a public event entitled 'Reckoning with Inequality'. The panellists included international experts Kate Pickett and Richard Wilkinson who co-authored best-selling book 'The Spirit Level: Why Equality is Better for Everyone' (2009). Over 60 people attended the convening, including a high number of student leaders from the #RhodesMustFall movement. While the broader impact of one event is obviously limited, we are pleased that the discussion did succeed in getting SDG16 on the agenda of one of the most progressive and influential political movements in South Africa.

(3) What surprised you the most as you carried out this work? Knowing what you know now, if you could go back in time, what would you have done differently?

If we could go back in time, I would absolutely make it a priority to get involved as early on as possible in any shared framework discussion. We entered the shared framework at a fairly late stage, and so missed a lot of the early discussions. For example, we did not attend the charette meeting. I wouldn't have thought that this would pose much of a problem, but I was surprised by how much conceptual "catch-up" was required. This was no doubt aggravated by this being my first experience of a shared framework.

In retrospect, I would also have asked for more guidance from the Strategy Unit and would have asked that they present the concept of shared frameworks to our entire office and local Board. I probably did not do a good enough job of explaining the modalities of a shared framework and this then led to some problematic misunderstandings. For example, the shared framework became seen as another funding stream rather than as a specific endeavour with niche goals and priorities. While a completely understandable position to arrive at, I fear that in the long term this has not served the vision of shared

frameworks. This has already been rectified by ensuring that the Executive Director of OSF-SA attend the Legal Empowerment charette. In future, I might even suggest that the Board Chair attend charette.

I would also be far more vigilant about the kind of activities that we include in a shared framework work plan. If I am honest, most of our work has not strictly advanced the goals of the shared framework, but has rather aligned with the goals. This is a subtle, but important distinction, and certainly something that I think we should keep in mind for future shared frameworks.

(4) To what extent did the shared framework change the way you work? How, if at all, have these changes affected your strategy for 2016?

Our involvement in the shared framework has influenced our future work both at a substantive and procedural level.

At a substantive level, we embraced the shared framework as an opportunity to test out how we might add value to the community advice office sector. The grant making that we did under the banner of the shared framework has been extremely beneficial in helping us see how we could potentially scale up support for this severely under-resourced sector. Also, we have used the success of these grants to make the case to our Board that we should continue to support this sector. We have also used our involvement in the shared framework to revisit OSF-SA's role in the Open Government Partnership. We will continue to pursue this in our 2016 strategy and link South Africa's OGP commitments to domestic commitments in respect to access to information and access to justice.

At a process level, we have learnt a great deal through our involvement in the shared framework. One of the challenges that we encountered on the shared framework status update calls was that some colleagues were unable to link up via bluejeans. While every effort was made to ensure optimal participation, the reality was often that the only "African" voice on the call was mine (a white South African). This has reinforced the imperative to find inclusive ways of managing multi-party projects. We have tried to build this in to our 2016 work plans by making it a requirement for any Board docket that we show consultation with colleagues at OSISA.

Our overarching experience being part of the shared framework has been enriching and extremely positive, and we are therefore looking forward to being part of more in the future.

Nepal

Team Members: Hari Sharma (ASD); Neetu Pokharel (ASD); Som Niroula (ASD); Brittin Alfred (APRO); Sumaiya Islam (OSJI)

Team Coordinator: Neetu Pokharel

Strategy

Alliance for Social Dialogue (ASD) with Open Society Justice Initiative (OSJI) initiated OSF's Post-2015 On-the-Ground Shared Framework in Nepal for mainly two reasons: First, to increase the likelihood that justice and governance targets would play a central role in the development framework of Nepal. Second, to demonstrate to a global, Post-2015 audience that legal identity, justice services and development are fundamentally linked and can be incorporated in a global development framework. Our advocacy efforts in Nepal, a post-conflict and 'fragile' state, intended to also highlight to a global audience the relevance, measurability and impact of justice goals in different geographic, political and socioeconomic contexts. Thus The Nepal Country team committed to contribute to an advance mainly the following goals of the shared framework:

- I. Achieve actual progress on the ground in the areas of justice, governance, and security by supporting projects that make effective use of indicators in those areas and engage in national-level advocacy to alter/amplify countries' negotiating positions and get them to include justice, governance, and security goals in their national implementation plans.*

- II. Achieve actual progress on the ground in the areas of justice, governance, and security by supporting projects that make effective use of indicators in those areas and use evidence from the country and advocacy teams to press for the inclusion of these goals as UN negotiations continues.*

Based on these goals, ASD's Post-2015 shared framework in Nepal was divided into three strands of work: a) institutionalizing civil society and government partnerships in developing a shared access to justice strategy as part of national development planning; b) support CSOs to mobilize community paralegals to show a demonstrative effect of delivering legal identity services to communities with a particular focus on women through collaboration with local government; and, c) regional and international advocacy to showcase Nepal's experience of integrating and prioritizing justice targets and the partnerships it requires.

We realized that we needed to dedicate a lot more staff time to develop sustainable models of community based justice services that focused on access to legal identity. Our goals shifted from just generating evidence - by collecting data from the CSOs who were already working on citizenship issues - towards building partnerships at the local level so that the paralegals could remain in the community as a resource. We also learned that a lot more work and engagement is required to develop standards for paralegal services in Nepal so that they are more impactful.

We did not expect to find strong champions in the government. However, when we discovered motivated actors in the government, we grew ambitious. Our goal shifted from just working with civil society on advocating for access to legal identity to creating and institutionalizing a government-led initiative on access to justice that includes civil society as a key partner.

Progress:

Based on the strategy of 2014 approved by the International Governance team of the Post-2015 On-the-Ground Shared Framework for Nepal, ASD and OSJI implemented a shared strategy of advocacy and evidence building. Activities included: a) national civil society consultations to consolidate ‘asks’ for the inclusion of justice in the national position on Post-2015; b) regional consultations in Istanbul and Kathmandu to firm the National Planning Commission’s commitment on access to justice and civil society-state partnerships; c) support to the National Planning Commission to conduct research to set the benchmarks and indicators for legal identity and access to justice in the forthcoming multi-year development plan; d) articulate the need for an impact assessment of legal identity on development outcome, in collaboration with the national grantees and researchers, for national and international advocacy ; e) grant to national grantee LACC to develop models of partnerships with local governments to ensure access to legal identity documents.

In 2014, we laid the groundwork to ‘deploy’ key government actors as advocates for justice in the Post-2015 framework and in the national planning process. We also, laid a strong ground at the community level of justice actors i.e. civil society organizations/members and community paralegals. At the beginning of the program, our main effort was centered on how to build a strong coalition amongst the government, civil society members, academia and the donors who can own the agenda for justice and legal identity, advocate at the national and international level for SDG Goal 16, and integrate justice indicators in the Development plans/policies. Highlights of our engagements include:

- *Strengthening National and Regional Advocacy:*
 - In collaboration with the NPC, we organized a South Asian consultation on access to justice as a development priority on November 17-18, 2014. The NPC took a lead role in this program and invited government representatives, civil society practitioners, lawyers and experts of the justice sector in South Asia. The concluding recommendations of the program were carried forward by NPC to its SAARC government meeting on November 26-27, 2014. As a result, the SAARC statement included the issues of rule of law and the Post-2015 development agenda in its declaration.
 - The participation of civil society organizations and key government actors in the Istanbul Workshop on Access to Justice Organized by OSJI helped immensely to own the agenda of Goal 16 and Access to Justice by the country team who accelerated their initiatives further.
 - National and local advocacy has been strengthened through participating and collaborating in different campaigns and convenings such as campaign on citizenship

rights of women, people's South Asian Regional Convergence, People's SAARC, etc. We organized a thematic discussion on 'The issues of Statelessness in South Asia' in collaboration with UNHCR and local partners. The recommendations of this event have been included in the declaration of People's SAARC which was submitted to SAARC secretariat as an input document to the SAARC government.

- *Developing a National strategy on Goal 16 and Access to Legal identity:*
 - The Planning Commission, with our operational support, led the formation of an inter-ministerial steering committee that includes members of civil society and academia. This steering group commissioned a baseline study on access to legal identity in Nepal. We supported a team of researchers to collect on the ground evidence and integrate civil society data and studies into the baseline review. As a result, the baseline study makes specific policy recommendations on ensuring access to legal identity for all, including the need for the state to document denial of legal identity documents, establishment of an independent administrative body to review denials and a comprehensive policy framework on legal aid services. The Planning Commission as the chair of the committee intends to use the study to integrate access to justice targets in the country's long-term national development plans in 2016.
 - We believed that there was not sufficient evidence on how vulnerable groups could acquire and activate their legal identity documents particularly to access public services. As part of our grant making strategy, we supported local groups to test out models. The most noticeable part of our grant making at the community level is: generating the evidences of legal identity services, empowering community paralegals and mobilizing them to increase people's access to justice/legal identity documents through collaboration with the local government. We intend to use these pilot projects as a demonstrating tool for policy advocacy at the national level.
 - A solid movement from the national level to the community level has been created for addressing SDG Goal 16 in a national position paper to the UN and for its integration into national policy. A vibrant and strong civil society has come forward to advocate on this agenda.
 - The government, particularly the NPC, has become our key allies in this process. As a result of our advocacy work, the NPC and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs have included justice and its indicators in Nepal's Position paper on Goal 16 which was submitted to UN recently.
 - The community paralegals have been trained and capacitated to facilitate community people for their access to legal identity and public services. There is an increased commitment from the donors like UNDP, DFID and Plan International for the community justice of the marginalized people: women, Dalit, and disabled.

Accomplished Activities

- On April 24th, the Permanent Mission of the Federal Democratic Republic of Nepal to the United Nations and the Open Society Foundations co-hosted a panel event to reaffirm the

crucial link between access to justice and sustainable development, and the ways in which innovative partnerships might advance both. This event was held alongside the April 21-24th intergovernmental negotiations (on Means of Implementation and Global Partnership for Sustainable Development) for the Post-2015 Sustainable Development Agenda. H.E. Mrs. Sewa Lamsal Adhikari, Deputy Permanent Representative of Nepal to the United Nations, gave welcoming remarks, and four panelists from government and civil society gave brief presentations: Dr. Diani Sadia Wati, Director of Law and Regulation, Ministry of National Development Planning, Indonesia; Ms. Nomboniso Maqubela, Director, National Alliance for the Development of Community Advice Offices (NADCAO), South Africa; Ms. Maha Jweied, Deputy Director (Access to Justice Initiative), Department of Justice, United States; and Mr. Sushil Pyakurel, Chair, Alliance for Social Dialogue, Nepal.

- Legal Aid and Consultancy Center (LACC), with operational and financial support from ASD and Justice Initiative, piloted a demonstration paralegal project that focuses on improving women's access to legal identity in 2 districts in early March 2015. This is the first time the Local government is partnering with civil society to improve access to public services. In total 2435 women/people (mostly women), who were previously unable to, have acquired citizenship certificates with the help of 61 trained community based paralegals. The cases are being traced at the district level and a new case management system has been launched to improve the data analysis produced by LACC at the national level. The empowerment of community-based paralegals through capacity building has been proved effective to enhance the access of poor and marginalized group in the community.
- The National Planning Commission of Nepal, with support from ASD and JI, institutionalized a national-level interagency steering committee on access to legal identity and development planning that includes representatives from civil society that has been meeting on a bi-monthly basis this year. A baseline study on the state of legal identity, supported by OSF, was presented to the committee in June with recommendations on the need to integrate civil society data to track progress. Despite the devastating earthquake, the steering committee has continued its meeting and discussion for 4 times this year. The policy brief of the report is in the process of finalization by the committee, which reveals the fact that that a noticeable number of populations lacks legal identity documents, there is no systematic data management/track system of legal identity documents, no mechanism to review the cases of denials. It suggest to address such gaps and also recommends to include the indicators of justice in National development plans and to establish a national coordination committee to monitor the plans of justice
- The data collection for a 'socio-economic impact assessment study of legal identity and role of community-based paralegals' has been completed and the research team is currently working on data analysis. Initial findings suggest that a large number of people who acquire citizenship certificates use it to enroll into scholarship programs, get SIM cards, access health services and rely on community-based paralegals for information on how to access public services making explicit the linkages between access to legal identity and

development outcomes. Women and members of vulnerable groups particularly rely on targeted outreach programs to acquire and activate citizenship certificates.

- Based on discussions of the steering committee, findings of both the report of legal Identity and Socio-Economic Impact, the NPC has included the targets of access to justice in its country goals for SDG in Goal no: 16 to be submitted in UN.

Major Barriers

Though we made our full effort in collaborating with the NPC, civil society and grantees, we felt that it takes a long time and process to make the government own the agenda raised by civil society even if it is utmost for the government policy. This experience is mostly related with the steering committee of the NPC, where all the members from different ministries were not equally cooperative and collaborative. While the NPC was very cooperative, the Home Ministry was less so. Also, the frequent changes in the bureaucracy of the same institution created an environment of uncertainty leading the time to build the rapport and re-reiterate the same issue with different government authorities.

From the middle of 2015, our campaign at the national level could not remain as vibrant as it was in 2014 because of the devastating earthquake followed by the political unrest particularly at the time of the promulgation of the new constitution. Before and after the constitution promulgation, the country has been experiencing protests and violence in different parts of the country, which has lessened the priority placed on the Post-2015 agenda by the government.

Despite the hope to reintegrate legal identity and its indicators in the national development plan, still there is the lacuna in the constitution, which does not address the equal rights of women related to legal identity and others. Therefore, there is uncertainty to accomplish the government's commitment on legal identity for all.

What Surprised Us Most?

This process helped us rethink the role of OSF in Nepal. ASD did not cultivate an institutional relationship with the government rather we relied on personal interactions at different times. This process helped us understand the value and limitations of working with the government while responding to the concerns raised by our civil society partners. We also realized how meaningful our work can be if the thematic and national programs can work together rather than in isolation.

What Would We Have Done Differently?

For a shared framework to be most successful, we feel it is useful to dedicate a staff member from each of the programs involved and make sure the staff are involved from the very beginning of the process. We would probably now identify how the shared framework links with and advances our strategy first and then building a four-year plan around it. We also did not start out by mapping all the actors thoroughly given the time pressure and we would probably do that first going forward with a new issue.

Strategy in 2016

We previously did invest in legal empowerment work in a systematic manner in Nepal, but the shared framework opened up possibilities of not only strengthening the civil society approach but to develop a national policy framework on access to justice so that public and donor funding could be directed towards legal empowerment work.

We are also considered key actors now in the justice sector of Nepal and we see a key opportunity to engage and shape state and donor strategies on access to justice.

Though the devastating earthquake of April 2015 and post constitution violence has affected our activity at the national level in 2015, particularly with the government that the steering committee still has not endorsed the report on Legal Identity, there is no major change from our 2014-2015 strategy. Building on our previous strategy, at the national level, we also plan to engage more with other different government agencies i.e. the Ministry of Justice and Law, Ministry of Women, Children and Social Welfare Council, Supreme Court. As there was the least engagement of other donors in 2015, we have a strategy to approach other multiple donors on this issue i.e. DFID, UNDP, Plan International and Care Nepal.

Mexico

Team members: Betsy Apple (OSJI), Eszter Filippinyi (HRI), Mark De La Iglesia (FGP), Heloisa Griggs (LAP), Vonda Brown (LAP); Angelica Zamora (LAP); Lauren Kimball (LAP)

Team coordinators: Angelica Zamora and Lauren Kimball

1. What specific goals for the work did you have at the outset of the shared framework? How did these goals change, if at all, in 2015? (Please refer to your 2014 and 2015 strategies)

The Mexico team's overarching goals for the Post-2015 Shared Framework were: 1) to increase information about the Post-2015 SDGs on-the-ground and to identify new actors; 2) to connect actors on-the-ground to global debates; and 3) to link state and civil society efforts in the national area. In order to achieve these goals, we developed the following two-year work plan:

In 2014, the Mexico team focused on two principal areas: strengthening the existing emphasis of the Mexican government on governance issues related to the Post-2015 Development Agenda, as well as on starting a conversation regarding the importance of including public safety issues. The Mexico team saw several strategic opportunities in Mexico, as it was the chair of the Open Government Partnership and a regional leader on issues related to the right to information. While governance and transparency in the Post-2015 Agenda generated some interest and attention, public safety issues were not a focus for the Mexican government or local civil society actors. In the first year of the shared framework, the Mexico team identified new initiatives seeking to make the right to information more effective and to increase efforts to draw attention to public safety issues and their connection to development, while linking their work to their own programs' broader strategies in the country.

In 2015, after mapping actors in the field and identifying government allies, we developed a more detailed work plan. In the right to information area the Mexico team planned to: a) use the case studies on RTI, an initiative to take a closer look at work that LAP and HRI supported in Mexico from 2010 to present, that are being compiled by GESOC (Mexican civil society organization) to support advocacy nationally and internationally on the use of indicators; b) continue to highlight the connections between work on the Open Government Partnership platform (OGP) and the Post-2015 agenda for both government officials and civil society as Mexico was the OGP co-chair and was responsible for leading the initiative and hosting the international OGP meeting in October 2015; and c) together with GESOC, the Office of the President, and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, took advantage of an opportunity support a series of workshops to discuss these issues and develop indicators that could be used to monitor the SDGs. In the public safety area, the Mexico team planned to focus on: a) increasing the number of actors generating constructive and proactive dialogue by pressing for goals to reduce violence and tools to monitor and evaluate its progress; b) supporting initiatives that develop tools and technical capacity to help make lasting homicide reduction and forced disappearances an attainable policy target for Mexico, linking these efforts with the Latin America Program's strategy on prioritizing homicide reduction through Latin America; c) engaging key civil society organizations, experts, and private sector actors in broader conversations regarding security challenges and their relevance to the development agenda; d) support civil society organization developing evaluating indicators for the

justice system reform process and crime reduction and linking this process to the debates in Mexico on defining the new sustainable development goals; and e) partner with organizations in Mexico to organize a series of workshops to discuss indicators to measure public security in the development agenda.

2. *To what extent do you feel that you accomplished your goals? What supported you in accomplishing these goals (examples: strong civil society partners, key government allies, etc.)? What were your major barriers?*

We believe we achieved significant results regarding the first goal, related to **increasing information about the Post-2015 SDGs on the ground and identifying new actors**. Through a series of strategic alliances with Mexican NGOs and government officials, the team contributed to increasing the number of players in Mexico now involved in the Post-2015 process. For example, through a grant to Mexico Evalua, a well-respected Mexican organization dedicated to evaluating the impact of public policies in Mexico, the team added a valuable player to the field of those that advocated for the inclusion of the issue of justice in the new SDGs. Before the conversations between the team and Mexico Evalua, the organization was not involved in Post-2015 issues. As part of its work on measuring safety and justice policies, Mexico Evalua is now developing indicators to measure the quality of the justice system and frequently publishes articles that discuss the links between justice and sustainable development. Another example is a grant provided to Animal Politico, an important independent media outlet in Mexico, to develop a series of investigative journalism articles that discuss how the lack of security in Mexico is affecting sustainable development on several fronts (e.g., economy, education, health). They are developing nine investigative pieces that will be rolled out over the course of the next few months on their website. This initiative was launched in November of 2015.

Regarding the second goal, related to **connecting actors on-the-ground to global debates**, the Mexico Team created some important opportunities to raise awareness among civil society and government actors on the importance of right to information and public safety for sustainable development. During the first stages of the negotiation process, the Mexican government had held some informative sessions with a limited group of civil society groups in Mexico. Our assessment is that we helped to create a more fluid and diverse consultation process. The Mexico Team and the Global Advocacy Team helped to generate dialogue among civil society representatives and Mexican government officials to i) ensure the Mexican government's support for the inclusion of governance, public safety and justice issues in the agenda; ii) discuss national level implications of the global agenda, the need to define more concrete targets and indicators at the national level, and the need to establish systems and data to measure SDG goals; and, c) link the global development agenda as an opportunity to prioritize national policies to reduce violence, improve public security, increase access to justice and promote more effective, transparent and accountable institutions of governance. The Mexico Team sponsored and/or participated in several panels and events about the Post-2015 Agenda, including the participation of Betsy Apple in a workshop that took place in Mexico City in March of 2015, organized by the UK and Mexican governments, and the participation of Damaso Luna, from the Mexican Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and Alejandro Gonzalez, from GESOC, in a side event organized by OSF in June 2015 during intergovernmental negotiations at the UN.

Additionally, the Mexico Team focused on strengthening the capacities of local organizations to participate in the SDG process and to create indicators and tools to monitor at the national level the implementation of Goal 16. In addition to supporting Mexico Evalua's efforts to develop indicators to measure the quality of the justice system, we started supporting Consejo Civico, a civil society platform for 70 organizations in the Nuevo Leon state, to use Goal 16 as a guide to establish goals, indicators and monitor programs for violence reduction and institutional transparency. Mexico Evalua is now an important partner for the Latin America Program's (LAP) work in the citizen security field and for advancing its homicide reduction strategic concept priority. Consejo Civico is a promising partner for the program's transparency and accountability work.

Regarding our third goal, **linking state and civil societies' efforts in the international arena**, we believe that we have contributed to national actors' understanding of the convergence between the SDG and the OGP process, and we capitalized on the Mexican government's leadership position in the OGP to both strengthen its commitment to the inclusion of Goal 16 in the development agenda, and to influence the position of other Latin America countries. The Team engaged with GESOC, whose director is the civil society co-chair for the OGP, to take advantage of this role as a civil society leader and Mexico's leadership position in the Open Government Partnership platform. The Mexico Team and GESOC pushed to explore the linkages between this platform and the Post-2015 process. Thank to this strategic partnership, the links between these two platforms have been discussed in several forums, including last November's OGP Regional Summit that took place in Costa Rica, and was the primary focus of October 2015 OGP global summit in Mexico City. GESOC has been a key player and advocate of using the OGP's agreements and its platform to promote the inclusion of Goal 16 in the Post-2015 Agenda.

The biggest barrier to carrying out the planned work was finding civil society organizations in Mexico that were both aware of and interested in engaging in the Post-2015 Agenda process. Even though we identified many organizations working on issues related to Goal 16 - public safety, justice, transparency, and accountability - very few of them are aware of the Post-2015 process, and some either showed no interest in being involved or did not consider the Post-2015 Agenda a priority for Mexico's national agenda or their own organization's strategy. Additionally, the link between on-the-ground work in Mexico and the international agenda has not been entirely clear. Many of the organizations working on these issues see this as additional work and, given that many are understaffed, could not see the value added by integrating the Post-2015 agenda into their strategies. Also, most of the interested organizations are national-level organizations, and it has been a big challenge finding local or grassroots-level organizations looking to participate and influence the Post-2015 process. Finally, given Mexican civil society organizations' stronger capacity to work on access to information and transparency when compared to citizen security, we struggled to find partners with the interest and capacity to link public safety and development issues.

Another challenge for the team has been the volatile and fragile context in Mexico. After last year's disappearance of 43 students in Ayotzinapa, there have also been several major corruption scandals that have resulted in political crisis in the country. This has created an even deeper environment of mistrust and organizations have been unwilling to work together with the government. Organizations

have been focused on issues at the top of the public agenda, including forced disappearances, cooptation of the security forces, and anticorruption issues, and were unable to devote much attention to the Post-2015 agenda.

3. *What surprised you the most as you carried out this work? Knowing what you know now, if you could go back in time, what would you have done differently?*

The main thing that surprised us as we carried out this work was the profound institutional crisis that developed in Mexico. The context changed quickly and dramatically, resulting in many actors and organizations changing their priorities to work on the issues of disappearances and corruption. This context also led to a sharp disconnect between the Mexican government's international discourse, in which it emphasized its commitment to the Post-2015 SDGs, transparency and accountability, and its domestic discourse, which was necessarily about the crises that the country was facing. As we searched for new actors to involve in this process, we assumed that Mexican organizations and think tanks working on development issues would be possible partners for this work and would be interested in pushing for a more comprehensive development agenda, establishing national goals and monitoring mechanisms; however, we were surprised by the little interest and ability of these organizations to work on these issues.

There are two things that we would have done differently if we could go back in time. The first is that we would have thought of ways to engage the Mexico Country Team in deeper ways. One way that we might have done this would have been to hold an in-person meeting of the Mexico Country Team and possibly plan a joint visit to Mexico. This would have gotten us all on the same page from the very beginning and allowed us to begin mapping exercises together and find connections to our programs' priorities. Additionally, it would have provided us with the opportunity to meet many of the same actors and develop our strategy with more informed input from all of our team members. Our work could have benefitted from the input from our colleagues about how to seek out new opportunities in Mexico.

The second thing that we would have done differently would have been to develop a better and more efficient work plan that responded to the level of work that the shared framework required. For example, while the consultant we hired was very useful, we would have hired a consultant with more experience and that was living inside of the country. This may have provided us with more opportunities to make connections to senior-level government officials and to expand our contacts and opportunities. It may have also given us a more refined understanding of how to work within the changing context to advance our work.

4. *To what extent did the shared framework change the way you work? How, if at all, have these changes affected your strategy for 2016?*

The Latin America Program's (LAP) work on this topic stimulated our thinking about working with new partners and pushed us to start new relationships and deepen others. For example, LAP is working with Mexico Evalua on generating interest among mayors and governors about the need to design and evaluate homicide and violence reduction programs in Mexico, as this is one of the pillars of the

program's strategy. The shared framework also led to closer relationships with the main actors in the field, including LAP grantee GESOC, who has proved key in demonstrating the links between the Open Government Partnership and the Post-2015 Agenda. LAP also began working with an independent media outlet in Mexico, Animal Politico, to highlight stories related to the Post-2015 Agenda. They may continue to be a partner in the future but on other topics, such as homicide reduction. Lastly, this work led to LAP seeking out organizations working at the local level in Mexico. We are supporting Consejo Civico and the Institute for Peace and Economics from Monterrey in the state of Nuevo Leon. The project will establish links and generate spaces for collaboration between government and civil society to construct public institutions that are responsible and transparent. We believe that this project can contribute to lessons learned on targets and indicators that could be useful not just for other cities within Mexico but also in the region for LAP's work on transparency, accountability and reducing violence.

Serbia

Team Members: Miodrag Milosavljevic (OSF Serbia); Srdjan Djurovic (OSF Serbia); Dragan Kremer (OSF Serbia); Dusan Sabic (OSF Serbia); Jadranka Jelincic (OSF Serbia); Kersty McCourt (OSJI)

Team Coordinators: Miodrag Milosavljevic and Srdjan Djurovic

(1) What specific goals for the work did you have at the outset of the shared framework? How did these goals change, if at all, in 2015? (Please refer to your 2014 and 2015 strategies)

The OSF Serbia joined the Shared Framework with a simple idea – to utilize its work on measuring progress on effectiveness of institutions, good governance and access to justice in the EU integration process to support OSF global advocacy for introduction of access to justice and good governance to the list of Post-2015 Development Goals.

OSF Serbia team contributed to three SF objectives: a) work on the ground to develop and pilot “targets and indicators” to demonstrate the measurability and concrete impact that justice, safety, and governance programs have on poverty eradication and sustainable development and b) to conduct domestic advocacy to persuade the Government of the importance of such programs. The set objectives have been put in service of the global advocacy focused on influencing the outcomes of the UN-based SDG process, culminating in the new Post-2015 agenda adopted at the September 2015 UN General Assembly session.

Regarding the first objective, the OSF Serbia team produced the methodology for measuring effectiveness of institutions and developed principles of localization of the methodology. Upon completion of that task, the team applied produced indicators in cooperation with six independent state bodies so as to demonstrate and showcase the results of application of produced indicators. In order to ensure sustainability of the results, the OSF Serbia has been involved in persuading the Government (through the Ministry for Public Administration and Local Self-Government and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs) to apply indicators for measuring its effectiveness as well as to establish a structure capable of streamlining of SDGs into the national policies.

The second objective was accomplished quite early in the course of the SF implementation capitalized in the statement of the Serbian Ambassador to the UN. This fact enabled the extension of the scope of the team’s work in that respect by further involvement in promoting the same attitude in the Western Balkan region.

Finally, putting indicators to use in international advocacy efforts and showcasing the measurability is also high on the OSF Serbia’s agenda. The OSFS engaged with international actors such as International Association of Judges and Prosecutors (MEDEL), International Ombudspersons Association, Association of European Ombudspersons and Association of Mediterranean Ombudspersons in order to advocate and promote the inclusion of justice, governance and safety as central to their understanding of development as defined by the Post-2015 SF. It has done so by sharing products such as indicators, principles of localization, experiences of measuring as well as by participating in global and regional forums (or initiating them) to advocate for the set goals. In cooperation with the Serbian Ombudsman a

conference of 60 European and Mediterranean ombudspersons was held in Belgrade discussing the Ombudspersons role of these institutions in implementation of SDGs. Participating in Global Advocacy Team efforts and events provided material for strengthened international efforts with concrete examples from Serbia.

Upon adoption of the SDGs we moved towards preparations for implementation in terms of identification of key stakeholders and their powers and obligations in this process. Additional activities have been undertaken to serve the purpose of mainstreaming the SDGs through the policies and strategies already in place. Accomplishment of the initially set goals by September enabled the switch in activities aimed at the sustainability of achieved results of the SF and the overall implementation of the 2030 Sustainable Goals in Serbia. Since the EU agenda is dominating public discourse in Serbia, mainstreaming of SDGs is dominantly conducted through the framework of the EU integration process. However, several other frameworks with significant potential are employed as well, such as the Open Government Partnership.

(2) To what extent do you feel that you accomplished your goals? What supported you in accomplishing these goals (examples: strong civil society partners, key government allies, etc.)? What were your major barriers?

The goals pursued by the OSF Serbia are part of the overall goals of the SF. Accomplishment of overall goals clearly indicate accomplishment of set specific goals. OSF Serbia accomplished abovementioned goals and set a few new goals for the final phase of the project aimed at increasing the sustainability of achieved results. Clarity of the idea and set goals largely contributed to such result.

The OSF Serbia built a strong network of partner organizations and independent state institutions to enable implementation of the envisaged activities. A number of experienced civil society organizations were tasked to support OSF Serbia work on developing specific indicators to measure effectiveness of selected institutions (Commissioner for Information of Public Importance, Equality Commissioner, Ombudsman, Anti-Corruption Agency, State Audit Institution and Commission for the Protection of Rights in Public Procurement Procedures). Teams consisting of the OSF Serbia team member, representative of each of the selected institutions and representative of partner organization jointly developed the methodology and set of indicators for each institution, tested them and applied.

Even though the OSF Serbia strategy has been built on the long-term experience in the field, the team faced several unforeseen challenges and barriers.

2.1. The most significant challenge OSF Serbia's team had to overcome was lack of (almost any) knowledge on SDGs by the six independent institutions which were designated as partners in developing methodology and indicators for measuring their effectiveness. This problem was accompanied with another challenge – a strong hesitance by several of those six institutions to be subject to measuring. It was most likely rooted in fear of possible results of measuring and public resonance if such results are published but also in a lack of culture of self-assessment. The partner institutions had to be persuaded that development of methodology for measuring their effectiveness and its application would not harm their reputation but set a basis for improvement of their performance and increase public trust and output legitimacy (especially by making their work more open and inclusive). The OSF Serbia team had

to put significant additional resources into the knowledge building of institutions by producing briefs and promotion materials explaining the process and their roles and meeting representatives of institutions.

2.2. A knowledge gap between the OSF Serbia team and CSOs was another challenge to deal with. CSOs in Serbia and the Western Balkans in general were not informed on the process of drafting SDGs nor on the main debates taking place globally on the new development agenda. The OSF Serbia took additional efforts to educate, explain and promote SDGs as a niche for active engagement of CSOs in reform processes in the Western Balkans. This has been done by organizing meetings and workshops in Serbia and regional capitals, conferences, establishing a network of CSOs formally engaged in the SF, showcasing OSFS own work as an example and as a motivator. The OSF Serbia was engaged in persuading different stakeholders engaged with drafting new national strategies in the course of 2015 to streamline the SDGs and respective targets through these strategies (e.g. the new Strategy for Roma). Another way to tackle this problem was engagement with regional CSOs networks dealing with issues falling under SDGs, especially under Goal 16 (networks providing free legal aid, dealing with transparency and anti-corruption etc.).

2.3. The EU integration process in Serbia and the WB overshadows all other reform and development processes, and other processes and strategic frameworks such as SDGs (except in some very narrow or specific issues such as poverty reduction in Serbia) remain overlooked. That fact appeared to be another important challenge. The OSFS invested significant resources to tackle this problem through promotion the SDGs universality and its common features with the EU integration process and other regional or global initiatives. To this effect the OSFS promoted the “highest standard prevalence” rule in cases in which different international frameworks envisage different standards levels.

Another challenge emerged upon the merger of the goals 10 and 11 of the High Panel Proposal into the single Goal 16 of the SDGs. Merging the access to justice and effective institutions into a single goal and all together set as a development factor requires joint or coordinated approach by different CSO communities not really used to working together. To overcome this problem the OSF Serbia promoted joint efforts of these actors.

(3) What surprised you the most as you carried out this work? Knowing what you know now, if you could go back in time, what would you have done differently?

Certain barriers such as hesitance by some independent institutions to cooperate as well as a lack of knowledge among civil society organizations and state institutions (with the exception of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs) on the process of adoption of the new development agenda in the UN was a surprise to our team. The project could have been implemented more smoothly if additional capacity building component for institutions and CSOs had been envisaged in the project.

Most of the stakeholders are still locked in the MDG framework which was transferred into Serbian context almost exclusively through the Poverty Reduction Strategy adopted in 2003. That is the main reason why the SDGs are still considered among stakeholders as the poverty reduction framework rather than development agenda. Even though the OSF Serbia, in cooperation with partners, put a lot of

efforts to tackle this problem through spreading the word and producing briefs targeting different audiences, there is still much to do to have stakeholders embrace the totality of SDGs.

Another surprise was the role played by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Serbia. In the beginning the MFA surprised us by embracing the idea of the good governance and access to justice as stand-alone goals in the new UN development agenda. Not that it just embraced the idea, but became one of its prominent promoters taking proactive position in all relevant UN forums. However, the Ministry didn't score at home missing the opportunity to introduce the SDGs properly and inform other ministries and institutions on their duties and responsibilities in taking over parts of the SDGs falling under their competences. The Ministry also failed to connect SDGs with the EU integration agenda which could have improved Serbia's score in aligning with the EU foreign policy which is integral part of the accession process.

On the level of SF implementation it took us some time until we realized that it is a polycentric endeavor and that there will be no guidance on issues we are interested in until we propose it and call others to follow or oppose. In the beginning of Shared Framework implementation we felt all teams were slow to realize the points of connection and opportunities for collaboration with other country teams. As the work on Shared Framework progressed, particularly since January 2015, the first instances of collaboration have arisen generating more and more opportunities for joint work.

(4) To what extent did the shared framework change the way you work? How, if at all, have these changes affected your strategy for 2016?

The Post-2015 SDGs-on-the-Ground SF became a building block of the OSF Serbia's 2016 action plan. OSF Serbia developed important tools for measuring effectiveness of institutions through the SF and plans to apply it independently, in cooperation with state institutions or even transfer it to the institutions to apply it on their own. The Ministry of Public Administration and Local Self-Government is interested in adopting produced methodology for regular assessment of the performance of public administration. To support such practice in 2016 the OSF Serbia will: a) develop a toolkit for assessing the level of inclusiveness of institutions in Serbia; b) work with the community of "accountpreneurs" through the "Democracy Hub" in order to strengthen the constituency which shares the understanding that inclusiveness is a trait of accountability and is skilled to keep on spreading such an approach.

United States

Team Members: Andrea Batista-Schlesinger (USP); Erica Teasley Linnick (USP); Maya Tessema (USP); Elizabeth Guernsey (USP); Nathan McKee (USP)

Team Coordinator: Maya Tessema

The experience of participating in the Post-2015 Sustainable Development Goals shared framework was ultimately a positive one for U.S. Programs, though one in which we learned a fair amount about how best to participate in such collaborations. Specifically, we were challenged to leverage a small infusion of funds to advance change in areas where we may or may not have current commitments or a well-developed strategy. What we did gain, though, was insight into a global process that otherwise would've escaped our view, the opportunity to collaborate with our colleagues (specifically the Justice Initiative and the Latin American Program) and new lenses through which to view our existing efforts.

The Post-2015 MDG team approached U.S. Programs late in the game to participate in the shared framework. Our first challenge was simply to get up to speed. We appreciated the opportunity to join, but our participation was initially sought out for the fact of it; in other words, it was driven by the idea that the USP "should" participate so that we didn't replicate patterns of developed countries telling developing countries what to do without turning the mirror on themselves. This means that the goals of the shared framework weren't reflective of U.S. Programs priorities, though we did have substantive interest in two of the three. Further, because of the direct involvement of USJI in influencing the delegation from the United States, it also became clear fairly quickly that our job, unlike other programs/foundations, would not be to influence our delegation to support our three goals of homicide reduction, inclusive governance and access to justice. It then took us a bit of time to find our focus, which became preparing the various fields of civil justice and inclusive governance/participatory democracy to be ready for the eventual adoption of Goal 16. Rather than influencing adoption, we were focused on implementation.

One early challenge was also that we had no idea of the scale or size of the resources that would be available to us. When we were asked to submit our plans, which we did after consultation with U.S. Programs staff about what would really make a difference in these fields, we significantly over-estimated the budget that would be available to us. In the future, it would really be of great help to indicate to programs how much money they will have available to them so that they can focus their ideas and strategy. We also dropped participation in the third element, reducing homicides, fairly early after an early promising collaboration with the Latin American Program didn't yield fruit; this was likely for the best as it didn't advance core U.S. Programs strategy.

In short order, however, and with the support of the shared framework team, initially from Latin American Program, we established our strategy of influencing the access to justice and inclusive governance fields by raising awareness of the SDG's and then challenging them to think about how the US could comply with these goals once they were passed. It was fairly surprising how completely disconnected even the most respected authorities on these topics domestically were from this global debate. Through our participation we believe we made a difference in advancing the discourse in the

United States and on lining up actors who have already begun to organize their partners and reach the public to agitate for the U.S. to adopt Goal 16.

Erica Teasley Linnick, Senior Program Officer for the Democracy team, led the access to justice efforts. Andrea Batista Schlesinger, Deputy Director of U.S. Programs, led the inclusive governance component. We each speak in our own voices below.

1. What specific goals for the work did you have at the outset of the shared framework? How did these goals change, if at all, in 2015? (Please refer to your 2014 and 2015 strategies)

Access to Justice: We laid out ambitious plans for our access to justice work—plans to work with both new and existing grantees and engage government officials, advocates and academics to secure US commitment to Goal 16. One major goal was to connect existing Judicial Independence portfolio grantees from the fair courts field with the access to justice field and the origins of the portfolio itself. (The portfolio was previously called Law and Society and included access to justice efforts with funding for legal services programs.) The idea being that the field’s efforts toward fair and impartial courts were in large part to improve access to justice for those most marginalized. That goal did not change this year, but funding and timing did not allowed for the work to get done at the level or timeliness originally intended—it is on-going.

Inclusive Governance: Within the inclusive governance area, our goal was to prepare the disparate fields that care about this issue—the civic tech people, deliberate democracy organizations, government practitioners, and researchers into participatory decision-making—to come together to understand how Goal 16 could be leveraged at the local level. More specifically, our initial stated goals were to:

- Influence the outcomes of the SDG negotiations to maximize its potential impact to deepen inclusive governance in the US
- Generate broader interest and discussion around SDG announcements in the fall
- Help frame a larger field of “inclusive governance in the US
- Build a network of engaged practitioners and researchers invested in working together to move the agenda forward.
- Build the tools that these fields could use, including models and approaches to metrics

By 2015, per the above in the introduction, we adjusted our strategy away of attempting to influence the outcomes of the negotiations to focusing on preparing the fields for the eventual result.

2. To what extent do you feel that you accomplished your goals? What supported you in accomplishing these goals (examples: strong civil society partners, key government allies, etc.)? What were your major barriers?

Inclusive Governance: In the civil justice arena, we were able to plant the seeds to accomplish our goals. Our most important step was to make grants to the work of New America Foundation Fellow Hollie Russon Gilman, who formerly served as Open Government and Innovation Advisor at the White House

Office of Science and Technology Policy, helping to formulate the Obama Administration's second term Open Government agenda. Dr. Gilman produced research for us into models of inclusive governance and a framework for how Goal 16 could be used to advance such policies and projects in the future. Excerpts from that work have been published in the Stanford Social Innovation Review, and the paper will be produced in its entirety by Harvard in the spring. We hosted a gathering of practitioners that included representatives from government, innovative participatory decision making models, philanthropy, academia, and civic tech at OSF in June 2015. The group in attendance had never had the opportunity to network together and to learn about Goal 16, and to bring the message about what is possible back to their organizations and communities. This network has engaged since, and we expect them to play a role going forward in advancing new models and policies under the umbrella of compliance with Goal 16. Dr. Gilman has also produced pieces for a more popular audience in outlets like Vox and Huffington Post. She is currently engaged along with Sabeel Rahman of the Roosevelt Institute to produce case studies that can inspire localities to embrace Goal 16. Future activities include providing technical assistance to local governments wishing to launch participatory decision-making efforts and presentations to gatherings over the next 12 months of city leaders and civil society on the SDG's and Goal 16. OSF also produced a video with Wondros that focused on inclusive governance and that we have worked with the members of this informal working group to disseminate widely. In these ways, we have laid the groundwork for raising awareness, uniting disparate fields, and helping equip those who want to use Goal 16 for leverage with models and case studies. However, the task of transforming U.S. local government, dominated by the culture of expertise and in a context of diminished civic participation in the tradition means of decision-making, is profound, and considering how disconnected the US is from such global deliberations, it remains uncertain whether we can create a groundswell of attention that will make a measureable difference.

Access to Justice: Our association with Risa Kaufman of the Columbia Law School Human Rights Institute (HRI) and David Udell of the National Center for Access to Justice enabled us to reach many of our targets for the work—government officials, advocates, academics. Originally working under contract as consultants, Udell and Kaufman developed a comprehensive list of recommended activities after interviewing over two dozen development experts, human rights advocates, current and former government officials, UN experts, access to justice activists, and leading academics on the potential relevance of the SDGs, as part of their landscape scan. Their relationships in the legal profession, human rights/United Nations community, with access to justice advocates and with leading researchers in the field proved invaluable. They planned and/or attended critical and high profile convenings and conferences where they could convey the importance of the establishment and implementation of Goal 16 and produced related writings. Udell has been tapped to participate in discussions establishing indicators.

The initial interviews and landscape scan made clear that the SDGs were in need of enthusiastic leadership from officials in government in order to ensure meaningful domestic implementation. We like to think (and have been told) that OSF grantees' efforts helped enrich the environment, together with the Department of Justice's Office of Access to Justice, for the establishment of the White House Legal Aid Interagency Roundtable (LAIR). Obama's September Presidential Memo charged LAIR's 20

federal agency members with reporting on progress in implementing Goal 16 in the United States to increase access to justice and “lift Americans out of poverty.” Announced by Roy Austin Jr., Deputy Assistant to the President for Urban Affairs, Justice and Opportunity and Ambassador Samantha Power, U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations, the LAIR initiative signals commitment to Goal 16 at the highest levels of the US Government.

Jl’s Pete Chapman was also a critical partner in our USP work due to his location in DC and related connections with government allies at the Department of Justice, as well as his familiarity with US NGOs. Our collaboration with Pete put the “shared” in shared framework for USP. Although this was not a cross-country or cross-region collaboration, it was a cross-program one that will continue.

I have yet to see if the Judicial Independence/Fair Courts advocates piece will be successful since it took longer to get off the ground. We were able to bring advocates together at the July 2015 Fair Courts State Summit for the opportunity to learn how the UN Sustainable Development Goals can help advance fair courts and access to justice reforms. The Eligibility Assessment process slowed progress down a bit as we worked to get two EAs approved for both HRI and Voices for Civil Justice. For good or bad, we made some choices based on who already had eligibility.

Additionally, we were unable, with the funds available, to do the scope of access to justice work in Puerto Rico as originally outlined and desired. Espacios Abiertos, USP’s Open Places Initiative in Puerto Rico, had long identified access to justice as one of its top priorities and had outlined a menu of access to justice projects that they wanted to pursue including researching unmet legal needs and justice system dysfunction and hosting a convening in Puerto Rico to bring “mainland” access to justice advocates together with Puerto Ricans to discuss research and advocacy opportunities. We ultimately were able only to support one of the related goals—to contribute to Puerto Rico’s inclusion in the National Center for Access to Justice’s Justice Index.

3. What surprised you the most as you carried out this work? Knowing what you know now, if you could go back in time, what would you have done differently?

Access to Justice: I would have done more research on the SDGs and tried not to rely as heavily on our consultant experts for substantive information. I was unfamiliar with the particulars of the UN Sustainable Development Goals, the UN players and the related US government officials. I also needed to move more quickly on completion of eligibility assessments, but I had to get to know a relatively new organization (Voices for Civil Justice), and another, current grantee that I had not worked with previously (Columbia Law’s Human Rights Institute) which naturally made the process take longer.

Inclusive Governance: On the inclusive governance front, I was surprised at how few people knew about the SDG deliberations. I felt fortunate to have found Dr. Gilman, but I rushed too quickly to make a grant to the Humanities Action Lab for their collective memory project on criminal justice. Considering the small budget, I might have organized a network sooner, and then challenged them to bring others to the table. I might have asked others to contribute via crowdsourcing to our case studies, complementing the work of Dr. Gilman. But most of all, I would’ve engaged our current grantees, including think tanks and especially constituency/membership organizations, in a discussion about the relevance of Goal 16 to

their work. Ultimately, they are the ones who will have the power to force localities to comply with Goal 16, and this work must engage them, not just the small field of people involved in civic tech or deliberative democracy. Doing this would have required engaging my colleagues across USP more intentionally, which, to be frank, I didn't do because I viewed this part of the project as an "extra" since it didn't fit exactly under any colleagues' portfolios. I remain torn about whether this was the right decision. This is perhaps a lesson for participation in shared frameworks; does it make sense only to do when a staff member is already deeply involved in the issues at stake?

4. To what extent did the shared framework change the way you work? How, if at all, have these changes affected your strategy for 2016?

Access to Justice: I was unclear about what benefit we were getting from our association with the shared framework other than desired additional funding for Goal 16-related access to justice work. As the shared framework progressed, I developed a working relationship with the Justice Initiative team and spoke with former OSF grantmakers responsible for what is now referred to as the judicial independence or fair courts portfolio to inform my thinking. Going forward, I will be using more of an "access to justice lens" for my work, will encourage fair courts grantees to investigate how their work is related to Goal 16, and hope to continue to fund accordingly.

Inclusive Governance: Participation in the shared framework hasn't changed the way we work on issues of democratic practice, though there is strong interest on the part of Andrea and Laleh Ispahani, director of the Democracy team, in inclusive governance models. Laleh spent time in Finland last summer examining highly effective models of democratic engagement. There is a possibility that we might see whether there is some area where OSF has insight and an opportunity to advance work here. In the main, however, our strategy here was to make short-term investments to raise awareness and unite actors who would take it from there.

Nigeria

Team Members: Mikang Longjan (OSIWA); Jude Ilo (OSIWA); Joseph Amenaghawon (OSIWA); Afia Asare-Kyei (OSIWA); Chidi Odinkalu (OSJI); Ibrahima Aidara (OSIWA); Zaza Namoradze (OSJI)

Team Coordinator: Mikang Longjan

1. What specific goals for the work did you have at the outset of the shared framework? How did these goals change, if at all, in 2015? (Please refer to your 2014 and 2015 strategies)

In 2014, the choice of these objectives were premised on on-going engagement with the justice sector reinforcing its importance, measurability and the potentials of Nigeria to influence conversations on the Post-2015 agenda. Therefore, at the outset of the shared framework, the specific goals were as follows to:

1. To ensure progress on the ground in the areas of justice, governance, and security by supporting projects that make effective use of indicators in those areas.
2. Engage in the National-level advocacy to alter/amplify countries' negotiating positions and get them to include justice, governance, and security goals in their national implementation plans.

However, in 2015, taking into account current realities including events leading to and after the 2015 general elections; the existing insecurity in Nigeria particularly in the North East, inadequate access to justice as well as from extensive consultations with CSOs, government and the public we realized that the situational context of Nigeria in 2014 had changed in 2015 as a result the 2015 goals were modified to address these issues. The specific goals in 2015 like those in 2014 were to:

1. Increase awareness-raising among the stakeholders and the general public on the benefits of inclusion of access to justice in the final set of Post-2015 development agenda to Nigeria.
2. Advance policy advocacy towards ensuring Nigeria's support for the inclusion of justice in the final set of Post-2015 development agenda by engaging with policy makers and major stakeholders.

2. To what extent do you feel that you accomplished your goals? What supported you in accomplishing these goals (examples: strong civil society partners, key government allies, etc.)? What were your major barriers?

OSIWA did achieve levels of success in the implementation of the shared framework. During implementation, OSIWA set out to increase the general public's awareness on the inclusion of justice in the final set of the Post-2015 development agenda through various platforms including media engagement and public events.

Through OSIWA's continued collaboration with the Office of the Special Adviser to the President on the MDGs (OSSAP-MDGs) and the United Nations Millennium Campaign (UNMC) relevant Nigerian policy makers, government agencies, officials and major stakeholders were sensitized to support the inclusion of justice in the final set of the Post-2015 development agenda.

OSIWA organized a two-day conference with the theme, 'Governance Beyond 2015: Setting an Agenda for Inclusive and Sustainable Development in an Era of Change' to chart a course for the new Nigerian government that is in line with the SDGs. The UNMC and the Office of the Senior Special Assistant to the President on MDGs (OSSAP-MDGs) helped organize and facilitate the conference, which was attended by over 140 civil society leaders, academics, professionals, and government and development partners.

Through OSIWA and UNMC's intervention, Nigerian CSOs contributions to the government of Nigeria's during negotiations at the second session of the inter-governmental negotiations for the Post-2015 agenda ensured the Nigerian government supported the inclusion of access to justice in the final set of the Post-2015 development agenda.

Several reports and articles focused on key benefits of access to justice in the Post-2015 SDGs have been published. We are currently in the process of developing three policy briefs as follows:

1. Integration of justice into the national implementation of the SDGs.
2. Role of accountable and inclusive institutions in the implementation and achievement of the SDGs.
3. CSO engagement with the SDGs to inform/educate CSOs on the SDGs and identify roles for CSOs in the SDGs agenda.

Building on the participatory nature of the Post-2015 process, Nigerian CSOs have an added opportunity to engage effectively with the process of popularizing and domesticating the SDGs. It is important that CSOs in Nigeria receive the benefit of a strategic direction to guide their engagement with the implementation of the SDGs. There is the need to establish a working mechanism to guide civil society engagement with the SDGs in Nigeria and to pool together opportunities for partnership and resources for effectively engagement with the SDGs process in Nigeria. In this regard, OSIWA and the UNMC convened a CSO Strategic Group on the SDGs November 17th. The main objective of the CSO Strategy Group was to develop an over-arching CSO engagement strategy for the SDGs in Nigeria and to serve as a voice for civil society in the efforts of government to domesticate the SDGs in Nigeria.

In accomplishing these goals, OSIWA received strong support from the UNMC and the Office of the Special Adviser to the President on the MDGs (OSSAP-MDGs); through this partnership, OSIWA and UNMC have collaborated on almost all activities which has further ensured multi-stakeholder's buy-in of Goal 16. Additionally, OSIWA's efforts have been rewarded with the close involvement of civil society organizations in developing Nigeria's position in the Post-2015 negotiations and helping to build a network of CSOs and other critical stakeholders working in this area. On their own part, CSOs in Nigeria have seized the opportunity of the participatory nature of the Post-2015 processes to make their

contributions through participation in the consultative processes as well as the formation of coalitions to mobilize citizens on the Post-2015 agenda. Nigerian civil society organizations have also influenced Nigeria's presentations at the Intergovernmental Negotiations in various forums that have been convened by OSIWA and UNMC.

Major barriers we experienced in the course of implementation included:

- *New Government-* The new government will be charged with addressing the myriads of development and governance challenges facing Nigeria. While a major task of the new administration will be the integration of the new SDGs into its development agenda as well as medium and long term economic policies. As it is ministers were sworn-in in November while federal legislative committees were also announced in November. We are working to ensure the effective buy-in of the new administration. Specifically, we will seek to target close collaboration with the office of the Minister of Budget and Planning to enhance coordination and integration of the SDGs into planning
- *Late Rollover Approval-* Due to the time it took for the 2014 rollover to be approved, some key activities that should have been implemented earlier in the year had to be postponed.
- *Partner Scheduling Delays-* programmatically, we have had to collaborate with the UNMC in order to effectively promote discussions on the inclusion of justice with key government institutions, CSOs and other relevant stakeholders which has subsequently resulted in some delays in implementing activities due to conflicting schedules.

3. What surprised you the most as you carried out this work? Knowing what you know now, if you could go back in time, what would you have done differently?

One of the key lessons from the implementation of the MDGs in Nigeria has been the negative impact which the absence of development enablers such as transparency and accountability, rule of law and access to justice had on the implementation and the attainment of the targets.

A big surprise has been the low level of awareness from CSOs and government on Goal 16 and its linkage to access to justice issues in Nigeria. As a result, in interacting with justice focused CSOS, government and the public we have had to embark on innovative advocacy strategies. Moving forward, a lot of intervention and advocacy will be required to ensure the effective implementation of Goal 16.

The only thing, we would have done differently, would have been to have started these interventions earlier. There is now the need for civil society and other stakeholders including the development community to support the process of advocacy and mobilisation to ensure that the new administrations at state and national levels are acquainted with the Post-2015 process/SDGs and to also begin the process of developing an implementation framework.

4. To what extent did the shared framework change the way you work? How, if at all, have these changes affected your strategy for 2016?

The shared framework has provided some useful insights into how best to collaborate with key stakeholders. This has been an opportunity for OSIWA to effectively build sustainable relationships with relevant stakeholders.

Due to this intervention, OSIWA is looking ahead to see whether other opportunities will exist after the shared framework has ended.

Indonesia

Team Members: Tanti Budi Suryani (Tifa); Ari Aryani (Tifa); Sumaiya Islam (OSJI); Mark De La Iglesia (FGP)

Team Coordinators: Tanti Budi Suryani, Sumaiya Islam

The first portion of this narrative comes from the participants based in the Tifa Foundation.

Context:

When Tifa began working on this issue at the High Level Panel in Bali 2011, we were very positive that justice and governance would be one of the stand-alone goals in SDGs. However, at the end of Soesilo Bambang Yudhoyono's governance period, the Government of Indonesia (GOI) position on justice and governance was not clear on whether they would be a strong supporter on these issues especially to as a stand-alone goal. The position of Indonesia in intergovernmental sessions at the UN were similar with their troika (China and Kazakhstan) that more focused on the social, economic, and environmental issues. The GOI position on justice and governance was more as an enabler rather than putting those issues as the stand-alone goal. In terms of the support of SDGs issues in Indonesia, Tifa is one of the local donors that has the significant role under the Democracy and Development Unit, and the focus of support is more on the civil society side especially for resources to advocate for the goals related to governance and justice issues. Under the new government, Indonesia is more focused on the domestic agenda and that the state must be present for people. The implication in the international diplomacy, the focus is more on the bilateral agenda rather than the global agenda such as SDGs or OGP. This made it quite challenging for the Indonesian CSOs Coalition to endorse the GOI as the country's supporter of Goal 16. The effort for advocating for Goal 16 used also the potential of OGP to strengthen the argument that governance and justice are important as a goal for implementing SDGs. On December 2014 until February 2016, OSF gave the first grant of the Post-2015 Shared Framework to INFID through Tifa as the continuation of the first additional activities on SDGs advocacy in 2013. From the three of goals in the shared framework, this grant mostly focused on two goals: 1) To formulate tangible and measurable indicators for advocating for the Post-2015 development agenda in national and local government; 2) To build proper a mechanism of accountability of Post-2015 development that includes OGP principles. Another goal was adoption of Goal 16 in the SDGs, and this grant focused more on strengthening the position of Indonesia to be a strong supporter of its adoption in UN.

Assumptions and Ambitions

Our ambitions were to ensure that Indonesia will be a strong supporter of Goal 16, along with efforts to formulate tangible and measurable indicators for advocating for Post-2015 development agenda in national and sub-national levels. The projects also aimed to build a proper accountability mechanism of Post-2015 Development Agenda, especially in local and national level.

Our assumptions were:

Justice and governance are an enabling environment that can be set as a stand-alone goal and part of the means of implementation in SDGs agenda.

Recent progress has shown positive trends since many member states reiterated the importance of an open, transparent, and inclusive follow up and review framework for the delivery of the Post-2015 development agenda.

While the development agenda will be addressing inequality among countries, voices of developing countries remains weak, from both government and CSOs.

Indonesia has a great opportunity to influence global development agenda, since SBY –Indonesia’s president at that time—was one of the High Level Panel members. But the voice of Indonesia –as representative of south and middle income countries need to be strengthened. Indonesia as a country initiator of OGP, was potentially able to bring other country members to support Goal 16 adoption in SDGs.

Ensuring CSOs participation is also important. Most global development agreements, including the MDGs, did not involve CSOs from the beginning. Most importantly, CSOs in developed country played more dominant roles, rather than CSOs in developing countries. Ensuring Indonesia’s CSOs could participate in determining Post-2015 global agenda was crucial.

As a normative bench marking and creating the ownership of SDGs, it is important to mainstream the Post-2015 development agenda and translate it into national and sub-national agenda, along with its accountability mechanism.

Every country needs a right means and tools for an implementing or enforcing accountability mechanism. In the Indonesian context, at least there are 3 main steps that need to be done, 1) Mainstreaming Post-2015 in development agenda, 2) Monitoring and national-regional and global review, 3) Multi-stakeholder partnership. The government of Indonesia believes good governance and capable institutions are important enablers to implement SDGs, and it is shown in the Indonesia’s current National Action Plan for the next 5 years. The accountability mechanism will be one of key components in achieving successful implementation of the Post-2015 Development Agenda. Nevertheless, how the accountability mechanism will work at the global, national and local level will become its own challenge. There are several prerequisites that will be needed remembering the non-binding characteristic of Post-2015 Development Agenda

Our Place

Tifa is one of the donors, besides Ford and UNDP that played a crucial role in advocating for the SDGs in Indonesia. Tifa itself has been a constant funder for SDGs advocacy since 2013. In addition to what Tifa had funded, OSF through the shared framework came on board to complement the initiative that had been done in 2014.

Year	Tifa (USD: approximately)	OSF Shared Framework
2013	IDR 740 447 147.00 (USD 74,448)	-
2014	IDR 940 875 000.00 (USD 94,087)	IDR 896 133 257.00 (USD 89,614)
2015	-	IDR 1 776 800 000.00 (USD 177,680)

At the beginning Tifa support was aimed at strengthening the participation and voice of Indonesian CSOs both in Indonesia and at the global level in voicing aspiration for Post-2015 global development agenda. And follow by advocating agenda especially Goal 16 and goal 10. Tifa partnered with INFID, since INFID is a wide consortium of CSOs that had been constantly advocating for human rights and social justice. INFID has shown outstanding performance during the HLP Meeting in Bali, where the results had been a main reference in SDGs advocacy globally. Additionally, INFID shows unique competencies that they are able to influence government to start discussing co-governance as the model for an accountability mechanism in the SDGs and at the same time they have expertise in the issues of SDGs itself, so they can substantially contribute in operationalization of the SDGs.

Our Work

Promoting adoption of Goal 16 as stand-alone goal in SDGs.

- Tifa-INFID and CSOs Coalition of SDGs has targeted its advocacy at changing the position of the Indonesian government on the Post-2015 Development Agenda, with a focus on inequality, justice and governance. The advocacy interventions began during the Open Working Group (OWG) process, when the Indonesian government did not support the OWG discussions, and the interventions included the preparation of briefing papers on governance and access to justice in the Indonesian context. These papers were prepared by members of the Indonesian Civil Society Organization (CSO) Coalition for the Post-2015 Development Agenda and brought into expert meetings on Goal 16 that were attended by representatives from the government and several CSOs. The meeting concluded that governance and justice are national issues worthy to be brought into international discourse, though discussion continues as to whether Indonesia will serve as an example for other member states. However, it was agreed that the Post-2015 process and consultation should be made participatory for civil society groups.
- In the side event on UNGA adoption of SDGs, INFID attend the meeting of the OGP High Level Panel that discussed how OGP can contribute as the tool for achieve the SDGs target in 2030, and INFID together with the YLBHI had the side event on the Goal 16 piloting countries conducted by UNDP headquarter.

- Tifa Foundation and the International NGO Forum on Indonesian Development (INFID) together held several meetings that aimed to integrate advocacy for the Post-2015 Development Agenda and the Open Government Partnership (OGP). The first meeting was held in November 2014, during which a network of civil society organizations (CSOs) was formed to work on both agendas. A Steering Committee made up of CSO representatives was also created. This meeting was followed by a strategy meeting in January 2015 to discuss the next steps for advocacy for the Post-2015 Agenda within the OGP.

Promoting the mainstreaming SDGs agenda on local and national government

- In February 2015, INFID and the Indonesian Legal Aid Foundation (YLBHI) brought together government officials and CSOs at a workshop on the formulation of justice indicators in the Post-2015 Development Agenda. Attendees agreed on the importance of justice in the Post-2015 Agenda and made plans to develop a justice index to measure progress in justice areas.
- As part of its efforts to ensure accountability for the Post-2015 Agenda, INFID is continuing to develop its Social Barometer Index, which will measure government performance in social services based on public assessments gathered in 2014. Collected data will come from the responses of 2500 individuals and the quality review of 50 experts. The results of the index are expected in the coming months.
- Since November 2014, with support from OSJI and the Indonesian Legal Aid Foundation (YLBHI), the Planning Ministry of Indonesia (BAPPENAS) is promoting a multidimensional approach to integrating and tracking progress on access to justice targets as part of its mid-term national development plan. YLBHI and BAPPENAS have been meeting bi-monthly to develop a shared plan to strengthen country's justice data management and planning system.
- TIFA and OSJI are working with YLBHI, the largest and oldest network of legal aid providers in Indonesia, to strengthen their case management system and improve the quality of data they produce. YLBHI and the Ministry of Justice have agreed to develop a national coordination mechanism to institutionalize support from local government budgets for basic justice services and promote good practices. A national consultation will take place in October 2015.
- OSJI is organizing a 2-day workshop in December, in collaboration with the BAPPENAS and the International Development Law Organization (IDLO), on 'Evidence-based Justice Policy and Service Delivery'. The workshop will provide a Netherlands and Indonesia centered focus on the rapidly changing legal aid and community-based justice services policy framework, to allow for knowledge exchange between stakeholders in the funding, availability and delivery of public legal and justice services and measuring and tracking progress on Goal 16. The workshop will bring together policy makers, implementation agencies, researchers and civil society groups from Indonesia and the Netherlands to discuss country-specific approaches to meet the justice needs of poor and vulnerable populations. Participants will get an opportunity to share and discuss experiences of measuring access to justice, fairness and scaling up of basic justice services.

Building the accountability mechanism of SDGs

- Ford Foundation, INFID, and Tifa held a side event on “Translating the SDGs into national and local agenda” at the Ford Foundation Office in New York. The event was attended by representatives of the Indonesian government, civil society groups, and UN agencies. Speakers included the Indonesian President’s Special Envoy, and the Deputy Permanent Representative to the UN from South Korea, Indonesian Ministry of Health, Indonesian Ministry of Planning, a UK Parliament member, World’s Best News, Center for Economic and Social Rights, Save the Children, and representative from OGP. In this discussion, they also discussed how to use co-creation for the accountability mechanism of SDGs by using the OGP as the model.
- The CSO Coalition for the SDGs, coordinated by INFID, continues to advocate for collaboration and inclusive governance in the implementation of the SDGs in Indonesia. These efforts aim to ensure that the SDGs’ implementation will allow as much participation as possible from CSOs and donor or private philanthropy groups. For the initial step, the Coalition has asked for the creation of a joint secretariat between CSOs and the Government and has asked for drafting a presidential decree that will give more space for inclusive participation on SDG implementation.

What We Have Learned

- Identification of a good CSO partner is very important. The process of negotiation of the SDGs at the global level is also important because it will impact the GOI commitment to SDGs and at the same time must tie up the process in the national level. It needs the competencies of partners that can work to monitor the process and substantially give input. One of the problems of MDGs implementation in Indonesia was the lacking of participation from CSOs or the people of Indonesia. This program also wants to empower the CSOs on how they can participate meaningfully to monitor and prepare the new collaboration with the GOI.
- Partners, not just funders, should be involved. It means always discuss the progress, substance, and expanding networks and be flexible. This is the model Tifa used. After being very intensively involved in SDGs advocacy in 2014, it decreased in 2015 because Tifa has minimal program personnel to work on these issues. OSF support for more collaborative works was also lacking, and Tifa just worked on its own project.
- The substance of the SDGs has changed how CSOs perceive justice and human rights. In other words, CSOs started learning that there are inequality problems that need to be addressed, something that never been on discussed among justice and human rights NGOs.
- OGP found their meaning since OGP is not only opening access to information but also access to rights. For Tifa, since it is transitioning, the strategy will remain the same as 2015. It also makes harder to put SDGs agenda since the unit that used to work in that area no longer exists. However it should be possible for Tifa to do it again in 2017.

What We Have Achieved

- We succeeded in changing the Ministry of Foreign Affairs position from justice and governance as an enabler to justice and governance as stand-alone goal, which is Goal 16. In the intergovernmental consultation in January 2015, MoFA stated the position of Indonesia was a strong supporter of Goal 16, and represented the opinion of the G77. Before the G77 meeting, MoFA cordially invited INFID

to discuss Indonesian positions on justice and governance. And it was many more intensive lobby meetings that quite influenced the position of GOI, for example for the UNGA meeting in September 2015, INFID worked closely with the Vice President's Office to ensure that the co-governance between CSO and GOI in SDGs will be possible in implementation phase.

- Active participation as co-chair along INFID, YLBHI and Bappenas, in piloting countries of Goal 16, which delivered the indicator of Goal 16 that will be brought to the UNGA meeting on SDG indicators in March 2016 by UNDP.
- INFID has been a main supporter for OGP to include SDGs in their agenda, since INFID's Director is one of the steering committee members of OGP. OGP itself has started to discuss SDGs in their Summit. Although it is quite general how OGP discussed the SDGs, INFID also brought several networks to intensively work with the OGP. And we put the principle of Co-governance of CSOs and GOI on implementing SDGs by using the model of OGP that put CSOs equal position with the Government.
- Tifa, INFID and the CSOs Coalition for SDGs is known to be the persistent promotor of the participation of CSOs in the SDGs implementation. This is something that less considered by UNDP Indonesia as the conservative approach of MDGs to be as government heavy as the key player that proved the main problem of the MDGs achievement of Indonesia. Although in the headquarters the representative from UNDP is quite progressive and even put OGP is the one of model to be implement the SDGs.

Where We Have Fallen Short

- Limited capacity of CSOs that understand the substance, so they are less able to contribute to the indicator development of each goal. In Indonesian CSOs this SDGs was understandable in general but the capacity that we need on implementation must be on more specialist in terms of monitoring each goal. So far there is only goal 10 and Goal 16 where many CSOs have capacity. Other groups such as migrant workers group, they are just starting to discuss it. They need more support to build their capacity for monitoring Goal 8.
- Using OGP to promote SDGs is not enough, since OGP was only able to contribute to Goal 16. OGP itself served more on principles of co-governance rather the operationalization of indicators.
- CSOs still using "old-fashioned" approached in digging aspirations, while there are a lot of more edgy and creative approaches that we can use, such as using index and survey.
- Tifa's restructuring process has impacted a lot in how the support was delivered. Prior to restructuring, Tifa's support was not only funding but also substance and technical aspects including networking with OSF. During the restructuring, the support has fallen short due to limited human resources and lack of coordination within Tifa itself. OSF trust and support has been decreased and it makes networking even harder.
- As noted by INFID, OSF itself does not provide strong support other than funding.
- INFID is still not able to maximize the use of media, especially TV, in promoting the SDGs. As a consequence, the SDGs are not well known among the public. It has become harder to find innovation at the local level, since the public has limited knowledge on this.

- SDGs issues are still centralized in Jakarta, and how to reach the subnational level become our next homework. In the government itself, the knowledge of SDGs is only concentrated in several units such as Presidential Office, Bappenas, and Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The following narrative represents the experience of the team participants from the Justice Initiative.

1. What specific goals for the work did you have at the outset of the shared framework? How did these goals change, if at all, in 2015? (Please refer to your 2014 and 2015 strategies)

When we began, we had two goals:

- Advocate for the prioritization of justice and governance targets in Indonesia's position on Post-2015 in NY by engaging with national actors
- Advance the implementation of justice targets nationally

With the change of the government last year, our ability to engage with government at the highest level was limited. The new President was less invested in Global processes and the Mission in NY appeared to be more interested in political bargaining rather than promoting the positions that the Ministry of Justice and Ministry of Development and Planning (our key government partners) were suggesting. Even in important international processes like the Open Government Partnership, where Indonesia had played an important role as a founding actor, we have seen the new leadership take no interest. The National Development Planning Agency (Bappenas) has played an important role in keeping the initiative alive in Indonesia.

However in the second half of 2014, we saw increased opportunity to advance national level conversations on justice and development planning. Indonesia was in the process of developing its next five year development plan. We redirected some of our resources to engage national justice organizations in the development of the long term plan to Advance new statutory, policy, and practice changes that support development of quality indigent defense and civil legal aid delivery systems at the state and federal level;. We also increased our efforts to encourage the govt. to conceive a new structure of governance and establish a new National Secretariat to coordinate and oversee the Open Government programs in Indonesia as well as preparing the steps for developing the next action plan.

Assumptions:

- There will be some continuity in Indonesia's stated position on SDGs at the international level event when the government changes.
- That it would require less resources to connect the conversations between the capital and the Indonesian Mission in NY
- That there will be dedicated staff at TIFA to advance the shared framework at the country level

2. To what extent do you feel that you accomplished your goals? What supported you in accomplishing these goals (examples: strong civil society partners, key government allies, etc.)? What were your major barriers?

We have seen more success nationally. Our key civil society partner, Indonesian legal aid foundation have prioritized investigation into public spending on access to justice as a result of our engagement and is restructuring its own data collection systems to generate evidence on the justice needs of people across Indonesia. In January 2016, the 5 year national development plan will be officially launched. Access to Justice has been prioritized thematically and the concept of an access to justice index as a measure of progress has also been introduced with an initial commitment to include access to justice questions in the annual national household surveys. The Planning Ministry has also formed a working group on justice that includes civil society actors with the mandate of advancing policy and practice that supports development of quality community based justice services at the state and local levels. We identified two key directorates (1 in Ministry of Justice and 1 in Ministry of Planning) in the government from the very beginning and worked closely with them. They turned out to be key allies even when the political leadership changed. Instead of engaging multiple justice organizations, we worked with Indonesian legal aid foundation and encouraged them to participate in planning discussions. An Asia workshop we organized last year in Istanbul was a game changer. We brought together civil society actors, government allies and academics from Nepal, Indonesia and Bangladesh. After the workshop, both Nepal and Indonesia established interagency working groups on access to legal identity and access to justice respectively to drive a national conversation on targets and indicators that were more nuanced and comprehensive than they were at the global level.

We were less successful at leveraging the national discourse and impacting the global context. This was partly the political changes in Indonesia, but also because of internal capacity issues at OSF. While our colleagues in NY were actively following the political bargaining in NY, we could have done a better job of bringing some of those reflections back to Jakarta. Initially Indonesia played a leading role in the consultations and we (JI and TIFA) organized a formal side event in Bali on the sidelines of the High level Panel meeting in March 2013 to frame the initial justice targets (that were also capture high level panels report). With the President's departure we lost a key ally. Language capacity of the civil society partners was also a major challenge – at times when the global advocacy team was looking for a speaker, our partners did not make the cut because of their English language capacity.

3. What surprised you the most as you carried out this work? Knowing what you know now, if you could go back in time, what would you have done differently?

Things we would do differently

- Spend more time building a shared understanding of the framework with the national foundation; instead of separating our work on justice and governance, this could have been a good opportunity to bring the different actors together and pursue something collectively
- Invest more in civil society capacity to frame 'asks' at both national and international levels.
- Our government ally in the Planning Ministry was quick to see the value of the global process in pushing things forward nationally. We could have done a better job of bringing together similar minded govt. actors from different countries to give them a greater voice in this international process. She would have been also a good person to recommend for the IAEG.
- We also felt that we did not have enough conversation across countries. The Serbia retreat was the first time we were actually sharing strategies and lessons learnt. It would have been great to do something similar with all of our strategic partners in the room.

4. To what extent did the shared framework change the way you work? How, if at all, have these changes affected your strategy for 2016?

The shared framework helped us rethink the value of trying to shape the public investment framework for justice services. There is a great momentum now to increase public funding for access to justice work in Indonesia and we will be working closely with the relevant Ministries and Indonesian legal aid foundation to shape that. The shared framework is a great way to build a social movement as a network.

United Kingdom

Team Members: Lotta Teale (OSJI); Jonas Rolett (Office of the President); Neil Campbell (OSEPI); Vera Mshana (FGP); Aidan Harris (OSJI)

1. What specific goals for the work did you have at the outset of the shared framework? How did these goals change, if at all, in 2015? (Please refer to your 2014 and 2015 strategies)

At the start of the shared framework, we had more ambitious goals, in two distinct strands.

Under strand 1, we were seeking to provide support to ongoing advocacy by CSOs both in the UK and EU to continue to monitor the extent to which the UK adopts and meaningfully implements policy proposals that it champions internationally, such as the disclosure of beneficial ownership of all legal vehicles, and that it applies equal pressure on its onshore and offshore tax havens to minimize their harmful impact on other jurisdictions, particularly low income countries. In doing so, we envisioned a role assessing existing research, moving public discussion onto the impact of commitments in the UK, analyze the impact of OGP, identify areas of discordant policy between the UK's international and domestic policy.

Under strand 2, we focused on indicators in the UK, and sought to identify what indicators were currently being used to measure progress on access to justice, taxation and citizenship in UK domestic policy. In this way, we sought to show what indicators would be relevant for the UK, and in this way demonstrate to Southern countries that the 2015 agenda was also important in the UK, and that UK policy would need to shift to improve against these indicators. We hoped this could then be used in international advocacy to demonstrate good indicators in the global discussions, and to encourage the UK government to think more about the relevance of the 2015 agenda to domestic policy. In doing so, we also hoped to promote access to justice, citizenship and tax justice in the sustainable development goals, through advocacy.

By 2015, we had become less ambitious. We were unable to find an appropriate consultant who was qualified to take up both strands. We decided to work with the Bingham Centre on Rule of Law on the report under strand 2, but we didn't find an appropriate center or individual to take forward strand 1, and the UK team were not in a position to take it up themselves, so we decided to move ahead with strand 1 only. The Bingham Centre advised that it would also be important to focus on more specific areas, so we decided to focus on tax justice and access to justice only. For the 2015 strategy we added to the initial goal by setting out how we hoped to use the report. We envisioned a gathering of UK civil society and government in London to discuss findings and raise discussion about what UK actors thought should be included in the Post-2015 agenda to improve access to justice and governance in the UK. We also envisioned discussing the report in New York with other shared framework countries on the sidelines of other 2015 events, and one-on-one advocacy with individuals within the British government.

2. To what extent do you feel that you accomplished your goals? What supported you in accomplishing these goals (examples: strong civil society partners, key government allies, etc.)? What were your major barriers?

On strand 1, we made little progress. It was challenging to find a suitable person to lead it. One of the barriers was that no-one who was focused on this strand was based in the UK, or programmatically focused on the UK.

On the indicator work, we achieved what we were hoping to do, to a large extent. We have an interesting report comprising the key indicators used by the UK government on access to justice, and it was striking how little experiential data is used to track change, which is important when we come to discussions trying to move states away from administrative data. There was very little data under access to justice on people's experience of justice. One problem however, was that, despite consistent feedback from us emphasizing its importance, the researchers failed to interview stakeholders specializing in basic legal services, including the Citizens Advice Bureaux, and as such it fails to capture data on how such systems are measured. Now realizing the importance of this, Bingham is now carrying on doing their own independent research into this area, which, while out of time for our purposes, may still be useful in as much as they are now continuing to create discussion among civil society in the UK on how justice is measured in the UK, independently of us.

We held a meeting with UK government and UK CSOs on 9th June 2015 entitled 'Lessons for the Post-2015 Process: Measuring Policy on Access to Justice and Taxation in the UK', and also did one-on-one advocacy with individuals within DFID. We were told by DFID staff that it was useful in flagging where there are currently gaps in the UK, and in giving DFID staff ideas on what indicators they could propose elsewhere in justice programming. Bingham has since been invited to UK government meetings to reflect on what indicators would work in the UK, and is well placed to feed into such discussions having already done the research.

We did not however hold a meeting in New York as planned, because we didn't feel that the report would assist with advocacy at the stage it had got to, which had moved away from discussion of indicators. In some ways, the useful time for the information is now, when indicators are back under discussion, and national indicators are likely to be developed.

3. What surprised you the most as you carried out this work? Knowing what you know now, if you could go back in time, what would you have done differently?

We were interested to find that the UK measures access to justice in quite a traditional way, collecting court data etc, but little in the way of experiential data, and that little is done to collect non-conventional sources of data, for example through solicitors. This suggested that changes need to be made in the UK to collect more experiential data, such as whether people feel able to access legal information and assistance, and how they do so before accessing legal aid, or if they fail to access legal aid. Research that has been done to this effect has so far been non-governmental and not taken on as an indicator by the government to make progress against.

4. To what extent did the shared framework change the way you work? How, if at all, have these changes affected your strategy for 2016?

The UK team brought together people who were not working on the UK domestically, so it has not affected the way we operate in any significant way.

Bingham has since been invited along to a meeting hosted by the UK to start to reflect on what indicators would work in the UK, and is well placed to feed into such discussions having already done the research. The office of national statistics has also undertaken a 'pilot' on measuring Goal 16, with undp, seeing what baseline material is available: we have been told by dfid that it will be useful to know more about UK measurement, from the Bingham report, to be able to feed ideas into this pilot.