National Consultation on Monitoring Implementation of Sustainable Development Goal 16 in South Africa

Report

Johannesburg, South Africa
6 - 7 June 2017

1. Introduction

On 6 and 7 June 2017, the African Policing Civilian Oversight Forum (APCOF) with support from the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), hosted a national consultation on measuring the implementation of Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 16 in South Africa. Goal 16 is aimed at promoting peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, providing access to justice for all and building effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels. The purpose of the national consultation was to bring together relevant experts to discuss each target area for Goal 16, including the current formulation of the draft national indicators for South Africa, and potential sources of data for measurement.

Representatives from the following entities and organisations attended the meeting: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP); African Policing Civilian Oversight Forum (APCOF); Gun Free South Africa; Legal Resources Centre (LRC); Save the Children International; Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR); the Centre for Justice and Crime Prevention (CJCP), National Alliance of Non Governmental Organisations in South Africa (NANGOSA); Statistics South Africa (Stats SA); Stats SA Council; Informed Solutions to Economic Crime in Africa (ISECA); Interchurch Local Development Agency; University of Pretoria - Open Scholarship; Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME); Institute for Security Studies (ISS); University of Pretoria- Sustainable Development Hub; African Centre from Migration and Society (ACMS); National Alliance for the Development of Community Advice Offices (NADCAO); Kempton/Tembisa Advice Office; Tembisa Hospital; South African Liaison Office (SALO); University of Cape Town: Children's Institute; Legal Aid South Africa; Department of Public Service and Administration (DPSA); Open Democracy Advice Centre (ODAC); Step Up Association; South African Medical Research Council (MRC); South African Human Rights Commission (SAHRC); and the Community Law Rural Development Centre (CLRDC).

An attendance list is attached as ***Annexure 1***.

2. Presentations

2.1. Introductory presentations

Mr Bongani Matomela of UNDP South Africa provided an overview of the UNDP project in South Africa. He explained that South Africa is one of the countries selected for the pilot project on the domestication of Goal 16, which has amongst its key objectives the establishment of reliable, objective and independent monitoring systems of Goal 16 indicators. He explained that Stats SA is leading the process of developing the domestic indicator framework for South Africa and that the national consultation was a strategic platform for government entities, other institutions and Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) to collaborate on the agenda.

Ms Louise Edwards from APCOF explained that the objective of the consultation was to provide an opportunity for CSOs to contribute to the development of domestic indicators; to develop networks amongst key stakeholders; and to identify opportunities for strengthening participation by civil society in monitoring domestication of Goal 16.

Ms Kelly Stone from APCOF gave an overview of the global indicator framework and a review of the reporting architecture, known as Follow-Up and Review (FUR), for monitoring the implementation of the SDGs. She explained that FUR is a 3-tiered reporting architecture, which focuses on the national, regional and international level, and that the backbone of implementation of the SDGs is focused at the national level. National FUR mechanisms should involve iterative cycles of planning and programming, monitoring and review, and that civil society should play a central role in each phase to ensure that implementation is focused on the spirit of the SDGs, rather than the successful delivery of specific Targets.

Ms Stone introduced the Goal 16 targets:

- Target 16.1 - Significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere;
- Target 16.2 - End abuse, exploitation, trafficking and all forms of violence against and torture of children;
- Target 16.3 - Promote the rule of law at the national and international levels and ensure equal access to justice for all;
- Target 16.4 - By 2030, significantly reduce illicit financial and arms flow, strengthen the recovery and return of stolen assets and combat all forms of organized crime;
- Target 16.5- Substantially reduce corruption and bribery in all their forms;
- Target 16.6 - Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels;
- Target 16.7 - Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels;
- Target 16.8 - Broaden and strengthen participation of developing countries in the institutions of global governance;
- Target 16.9 - By 2030, provide legal identity for all, including birth registration;
- Target 16.10 – Ensure public access to information and protect fundamental freedoms, in accordance with national legislation and international agreements;
- Target 16.A - Strengthen relevant institutions, including through international cooperation, for building capacity at all levels, in particular in developing countries, to prevent violence and combat terrorism; and
- Target 16.B - Promote and enforce non-discriminatory laws and policies for sustainable development.

Dr Kasonga from Stats SA outlined the process of domesticating Goal 16 in South Africa. He explained that the domestication of all SDG goals, including Goal 16, was done at the same time and that the guidelines for the domestication process were reflective of the needs of all communities bearing in mind the motto of leaving no one behind. He explained that the domestication process was integrated with other existing measuring exercises in South

Africa, such as the National Development Plan and Medium Term Strategic Frameworks. Dr Kasonga also highlighted that a Sector Working Group for governance peace and security had been established to assist in the development of national-level indicators for Goal 16. In closing, Dr. Kasonga called upon the experts in the room to consider whether the proposed national-level indicators were realistic and effective for monitoring Goal 16.

2.2. Target specific presentations

The introductory presentations were followed by inputs from different experts focusing on the specific targets of Goal 16. The experts discussed the global indicators in general and proposed national indicators developed for each target suggesting changes that could be made in order to ensure that the indicator framework is responsive to the needs and priorities of the country, and provides an accurate measurement of achievement towards Goal 16. Each target is discussed below with some of the key recommendations highlighted.

A detailed analysis of each of the proposed national indicators, based on the feedback received from the experts and the literature review completed by APCOF prior to the consultation, is attached to this report at *Annexure 2*.

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

Expert input was received from Ms Megan Prinsloo, from MRC and Mr Gareth Newham from ISS. Ms Prinsloo highlighted that the common sources of mortality data in South Africa is Stats SA and the South African Police Service (SAPS). She explained that the way that the data is collected affects its reliability, for example, the misclassification of causes of death is a common problem, and that the category of 'other unintentional causes' is where some relevant data is lost. She also explained that information on the manner of death is often missing on the death notification form due to restrictions in law that forbid forensic pathologists from identifying the cause of death because of potential prejudice it may cause in criminal cases. She recommended that: additional sources of data should be used such as mortality studies; the improvement of cause of death data reported by Stats SA and that the Death Notification Form must be amended to include manner of death and that all deaths are registered. In conclusion she stated that it is important to bear in mind that data collected can be used to reduce violence and also map out high violence areas as well as track progress.

Mr Newham explained that in relation to the proposed national indicator, *Number of victims of intentional homicide per 100,000 population, by sex and age*, the sources of data do not adequately represent the risk to specific categories of people in particular poor people and the high risk localities for murder. He went on to explain that the data on murders by sex and age and other categories of disaggregation is captured by the SAPS and should be made available to the public. Mr Newham recommended that the National Injury and Mortality Monitoring System data could supplement SAPS data and that there was a need to differentiate between 'interpersonal violence related deaths' and 'criminal behaviour related deaths' as broad non-conflict categories. In terms of proposed sources of data to be

used to measure the proposed national indicators for 16.1.2 *Conflict-related deaths per 100,000 populations, by sex, age and cause* Newham stated that the SAPS data was limited as it only focused on murder excluding of law enforcement officials and farm murders, murder of law enforcement officials, and murders on farms and smallholdings. He recommended additional SAPS sub-categories to be included and adding labour related, civil action and public order policing related incidents to the current proposed national indicators. In terms of the proposed national indicator *Number of sport for development and peace initiatives by South Africa* for 16.1.1, Mr Newham stated that South Africa needs indicators of initiatives that can be proven to result in reduction in murders and suggested changing the indicator to ***Number of empirically based violence prevention interventions that have demonstrated impact on reducing deaths or violence.***

Target 16.2: End abuse, exploitation, trafficking and all forms of violence against and torture of children

Expert input was received from Dr. Shanaaz Mathews from the UCT Children's Institute and Mr Patrick Burton from CJCP. In relation to the first global indicator, *Proportion of children aged 1-17 years who experienced any physical punishment and/ or psychological aggression by caregivers in the past month,* Dr Matthews explained that in South Africa only 1 in 3 children report sexual violence & physical abuse and that this would present challenges in relying on the proposed data sources as some of the perpetrators are caregivers, relatives and teachers. She explained that it would be useful to look at the Optimus Study, which contains national estimates on violence against children as an additional source of information. In terms of the second global indicator, *Number of victims of human trafficking per 100 00 population, by sex, age and from of exploitation* she recommended that this indicator should specifically refer to children. In terms of the proposed national indicators for SDG 16.2.2 she highlighted that it is important to set the indicators nationally instead of limiting it to one province. She highlighted that it would be useful overall to indicate the age, as the indicator is specific to children. With regard to the proposed national indicator, *Number of Missing persons per 100 000 population by sex and age (GP)* she stated that it overlooks the fact that persons go missing for various other reasons apart from trafficking and exploitation for example as a result of murder and fatal child abuse. With regards to the global indicator 16.2.3, *Proportion of young women and men aged 18 – 29 years who experienced sexual violence by the age of 18*, she explained that the proposed national indicators are weak and need to be revised to be more specific.

Mr Burton from CJCP stated that the proposed sources of data to measure the target present a lot of challenges. He explained that SAPS data is not disaggregated and only reflects reported incidents, that the Department of Social Development data is often incomplete, is not readily accessible and conveys only reported incidents, that the Department of Justice and Constitutional Development specialized courts focus only on those cases reaching prosecution and that Helpline or Victim Support lines only convey reported incidents. With regards to the first proposed national indicators under 16.2.1, *Proportion of children aged 0-17 who have experienced physical abuse* he recommended providing a clear definition physical abuse. He also explained that it is important to revise

the proposed national indicators under 16.2.1 to include specific timeframes for example per month or per year. He highlighted that the proposed national indicators under 16.2.2 make various assumptions, require specific definitions and fail to take into account the capacity of service providers. He stated that the proposed national indicator *Number of reported victims of human trafficking placed in rehabilitation programmes* fails to take into account that trafficking is done for various reasons for example labour exploitation; body parts, adoptions; and that there is internal trafficking and external trafficking. Mr Burton recommended the following as additional sources of data: research/surveys; population-based studies; service delivery studies; government/Stats SA; qualitative data; surveillance data; agency and administrative data and registers.

Target 16.3. Promote the rule of law at the national and international levels and ensure equal access to justice for all

Expert input was received from Mr Gareth Newham, ISS and Ms Louise Edwards, APCOF. In terms of the first global indicator 16.3.1, *Proportion **of victims of violence in the previous 12 months who reported their victimization to competent authorities or other officially recognized conflict resolution mechanisms,*** Mr Newham explained that one cannot use SAPS data for this indicator in the national context as it is highly unreliable because of the differences in the seven sub-categories for the "total contact crime". He also mentioned that there are differences between Stats SA figures and SAPS with Stats SA recording almost 8,5 times the number recorded by the SAPS for house robberies. He explained that if SAPS annual data on 'total contact crime' is to be used, there is a need for definitions. Mr Newham recommended the use of victimisation survey results on individuals and household experiences of violent crime as an additional source. In terms of sexual assaults and reporting rates, he explained that that there is an absence of reliable national level data produced annually and that SAPS total sexual crimes consists of over 70 different crime categories and does not distinguish between rape and indecent exposure. He stated that there are a number of measures that can be used for assessing the performance of the criminal justice system in responding to violent crime and that SAPS annual data on 'total contact crime' if used, need to be clear on the definition (% of cases reported vs cases prosecuted).

Ms Edward's presentation focused on measuring remand detention, *16.3.2 Unsentenced detainees as a proportion of overall prison population.* She explained that the management and care of remand detainees in South Africa is not solely within the purview of the Department of Correctional Services (DCS) but also involves at variety of role players across the criminal justice system, requiring significant coordination, communication and cross-sectoral support. She stated that the performance of SAPS in terms of timeous and thorough investigations of crime have a significant effect on the ability of the National Prosecuting Authority (NPA) and the courts to ensuring an accused person's right to a speedy trial. She highlighted the findings of a baseline study undertaken by APCOF in collaboration with the National Development Committee of the Justice, Crime Prevention and Security Cluster (JCPS) (Dev Com), to review South Africa's current system for arrest, police custody and remand detention against the Guidelines on the Conditions of Arrest, Police Custody and

Pre-Trial Detention in Africa. She then recommended two indicators for measuring remand detention under Goal 16: *Remand detainees as a proportion of the total prison population* and *Average length of time spent in remand detention*). She emphasized that disaggregation will be key to ensure that no one is left behind, and recommended the following categories to be included: demographic (age, race, nationality, gender, disability), geographical (national, province, police station/correctional institution), and by type of offence (e.g. priority crime; minor offences).

Target 16.4. By 2030, significantly reduce illicit financial and arms flow, strengthen the recovery and return of stolen assets and combat all forms of organized crime

Expert input was received from Mr Charles Goredema from ISECA and Ms Adele Kirsten, from Gun Free South Africa. Mr Goredema explained that there is a need to conceptualise Illicit Financial Flows (IFFs) and determine what is being prioritized. He explained that global indicator *16.4.1 Total value of inward and outward illicit financial flows (in current United States dollars)* seems disconnected from the goal, that the multi-dimensional nature of IFFs requires the use of a number of indicators which will point to alternative or additional sources of data. He highlighted that one of the challenges in relation to this goal is the type of sources of information whether both private and public sources should be used. With regards to the proposed national data sources for this indicator he explained that it was important to investigate whether it is realistic to expect timeous and reliable data from such sources. He recommended that the following additional sources be used: for Trade mispricing - trade monitoring organizations and data repositories, international financial institutions such as International Monetary Fund, African Development Bank, and Comtrade, the industry sector - specific organizations on comparative value of services and intangibles International Bar Association, Pan African Lawyers Union, Law Society of South Africa, and from Civil society -research formations – Action Aid, Tax Justice Network. For the Tax Gap - South African Revenue Services (SARS), asset management community, real estate sector. For smuggling -SARS, World Wildlife Fund, and for Asset values - the NPA - Asset Forfeiture Unit, would be useful sources of information and data.

Ms Adele Kristen explained that Goal 16 matters because of the prevalence of firearms and the recognition that reducing violence is a key element to achieving sustainable development. In order to measure and keep track of the illicit flows of firearms and ammunition, it is important to adopt a systemic approach to the recovery and seizure of illegal weapons. This means putting in place controls (and indicators) across the life cycle of a firearm from the point of manufacture to the point of destruction. She proposed three key points of intervention: (1) *Good record-keeping*, which includes records kept on legal stocks that is firearms and ammunition from point of manufacture, import, commercial sale, possession, loss and theft, and destruction; (2) *Good crime recovery and intelligence operations,* which requires capturing information about the type of illicit weapons recovered/seized as well as the circumstances of the recovery/seizure - data should be disaggregated and analysed to determine if any new patterns of trade are emerging (such as geographic transfer patterns) or if new types of weapons are entering the illicit market; and (3) *Stockpile management*, which involves developing criteria for the safe storage of firearms

after recovery or confiscation and prior to destruction, and requires that all illicit firearms to be publicly destroyed within a reasonable period after recovery so as to reduce the risk for diversion back into the illicit market.

Target 16.5 - Substantially reduce corruption and bribery in all their forms

Expert input was received from Dr. Isabelle Schmidt from Stats SA. She highlighted that this goal was included in the SDGs based on the premise that peace, stability, human rights and effective governance based on the rule of law are important conduits for sustainable development. She outlined the domesticated indicators for the target and explained that the United Nations Convention Against Corruption is a useful technical tool for quantitative measurement or assessment of corruption and that it provides practical anti-corruption measures for prosecutors and investigators. She also raised the point that monitoring this type of data is difficult because the nature of corruption is secretive, and that we should expand indicators to look at corruption within the private sector as well.

Target 16.6 – Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels

Expert input was received from Ms Gabriella Razzano from ODAC. She explained that accountability speaks to both transparency but also to recourse. With respect to global indicator 16.6.2 *Proportion of the population satisfied with their last experience of public services,* she explained that in the national context it is more strategic to look at perceptions of corruption. She explained that there is a need to explore supplementary indicators that focus on the process being used and that the effectiveness of the Information Regulator, SAHRC, and Department of Public Service and Administration (DPSA) can also be included as an indicator. She recommended that data should come from departments that are easily integrated which focus on compliance.

Target 16.7 – Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels

Expert input was received from Lungile Kubheka from NADCAO. She emphasized the need to ensure that there are strategic and seamless linkages that connects communities at grassroots level with local, provincial national and ultimate global processes and actions in order to achieve the goal. She highlighted that there are structured, organised regulated community based institutions that can play a key role in achieving this goal. With regards to global indicator: 16.7.1 *Proportions of positions (by sex, age, persons with disabilities and population groups) in public institutions (national and local legislatures, public service, and judiciary) compared to national distributions*, Lungile indicated that there are existing programmes/initiatives tools and policies to enable and promote inclusiveness in South Africa and one of the options would be to review current actions and use the gaps identified as a baseline. She also explained that it is important to look at the legislative framework that exists to enable and promote inclusivity and how effective it is as well as reviewing accessibility, quality, and effectiveness of platforms to access and engage government. With

regards to 16.7.2 *Proportion of population who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive, by sex, age, disability and population group* she highlighted that an optional source for the baseline would be to review existing initiatives by both government and private institutions that investigates perceptions and attitudes of the South African population on inclusivity. She highlighted the need for a comprehensive indicator that looks into structural, process, and progress outcomes.

Target 16.8 - Broaden and strengthen participation of developing countries in the institutions of global governance

Expert input was received from Ms Kelly Stone, from APCOF whose preliminary observations of the national level indicator *16.8.1.1 - Level of participation in the International Community (GP)* where as follows: that it is not clear what exactly is being measured; that the definitions of key terms would be helpful in guiding implementation and reporting: that levels of disaggregation will help identify how strong South Africa's participation is in institutions of global governance; and that additional sources of data may assist with measurement. Ms Stone explained that terms such as level of participation and international community would need to be defined to ensure that data is consistently collected, and accurately analysed. With respect to disaggregation Ms Stone suggested the following categories: type of institution whether its global, regional, sub-regional and levels of participation in these institutions. She also suggested the following as additional sources of data: National Human Rights Institutions; CSOs /CBOS; and reports of Institutions.

Target 16.9 – By 2030, provide legal identity for all, including birth registration

Expert input was received from Ms Tina Power from the Legal Resources Centre (LRC). Ms Power explained that there are flaws in the system being used in South Africa currently since not every birth is recorded and not every parent is able to meet the legal requirements for the registration of birth in particular asylum seekers, stateless persons and children staying with their grandparents. She therefore suggested that it could be important to also look at how many applications for birth registration the Department of Home Affairs (DHA) receives as opposed to the actual birth registration. She also explained that the following data would be important to capture: information about parents; age at time of registration; geographic location and sex of the child. She emphasised that birth registration provides the necessary data required to inform effective planning for social and economic development; provide evidence needed to monitor development progress and advocate for policy change.

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

Expert input was received from Ms Gabriella Razzano from ODAC. In considering the proposed national indicator *Existence of national bodies that adopt and implement constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees for public access to information (GP)* she explained that this indicator may not measure what the specific target seeks to achieve as the existence of such guarantees do not necessarily ensure access to information. She

explained although South Africa's access to information legislation, the Promotion of Access to Information Act (PAIA), is consistent with the model law on access to information, compliance levels by both public and private entities is very low. Surveys have shown that, in practice, citizens struggle accessing information from public bodies, for example budgets and strategic plans, which should already be in the public domain, and that access to information is often contingent upon people having access to a lawyer. Ms. Razzano identified the Office of the Information Regulator (IR) and the South African Human Rights Commission (SAHRC) as key sources of data for this specific indicator, and that the performance and effectiveness of these institutions should be incorporated as process indicators in achieving Target 16.10.

Target 16.A - Strengthen relevant institutions, including through international co-operation, for building capacity at all levels, in particular in developing countries, to prevent violence and combat terrorism

Expert input was received from Commissioner Chris Nissen from the SAHRC who highlighted that the SAHRC has the mandate to promote and protect the human rights related to achieving this target. He also highlighted that other Chapter 9 institutions also have a key role to play with regards to preventing violence and crime and they need to consider how the data they collect changes the lives of ordinary South Africans, and the importance of taking into account how the international treaties and conventions signed by the institutions influence the realisation of this target. However, when it comes to look at capacity building for the prevention of terrorism, Commissioner Nissen advised that South Africa should prioritise its efforts on the prevention of crime.

Target 16.B – Promote and enforce non-discriminatory laws and policies for sustainable development

Expert input was received from Mr Willem Fourie from the University of Pretoria- SDG Knowledge Hub. Mr Fourie highlighted that in order to effectively measure this target reliable data that is consistent and sustainable is required and it has to be valid data that captures the underlying concept it purports to measure. He explained that it is important to also consider the question whether people feel the law is discriminatory against themselves as well as different sources of law.

2.3. Role of civil society in reporting under the MDGs and SDGs

Mr Desmond Booysen from Stats SA presented on the role of civil society in reporting under the Millennium Development Goals (MDG's) to the SDGs. He stated that 200 CSOs where involved in the MDG process and a task team was formed with structures at a logistic and international level. Mr Booysen highlighted that with respect to the SDG's a Technical Working Group; a Report Drafting Group and a Sectoral Working Group has been established. He also explained that Stats SA would be updating the different databases that already exists and consolidate them so as to incorporate more sources of information. He

highlighted that the challenge is how to involve other organisations and ensure their involvement.

3. Plenary discussion

Mr Sean Tait facilitated a discussion on the role of CSOs in monitoring the domestication of Goal 16 in South Africa. During the discussions it was mentioned that there are some CSOs already working on the domestication of the SDG's, for example, African Monitor, and that it would be strategic for organisations to coordinate their efforts in monitoring and reporting on Goal 16. In terms of ensuring the co-operation of CSOs, it was emphasised that the involvement of CSOs from the very beginning is vital and that there are existing structures already established at the grassroots level, which have to be taken into account for example the Community Advice Centres.

On the topic of involving CSOs in the domestication of the SDGs, a point was raised about the importance of distinguishing between CSOs that are composed of researchers and technical experts, and CSOs with strong ties in the communities and that are well positioned to sensitize people to Goal 16 and disseminate information. In this regard, distinguishing between the different types of CSOs not only strengthens public participation by civil society, but also creates opportunities for technical experts from civil society to influence the way in which information and data is measured and reported, to ensure that everyone has a role to play in domestication of the SDGs.

With regards to involving CSOs that are community-based and well-positioned to raise awareness of the SDGs, the prospect of creating an accessibility tool was discussed. It was decided that the accessibility tool should take the form of a training guide for CSOs to use as part of their awareness-raising campaigns to identify the relevance of Goal 16 in their communities, and opportunities for getting involved. Organisations such as NADCAO would be a useful mechanism for disseminating this information into the community through their community advice offices. It was also recommended that the tool be translated into the 11 official languages and to use social media platforms to ensure that information around Goal 16 and its connection to the MDGs and NDP is widely disseminated.

With regards to increasing involvement by CSOs with technical expertise on each of the Goal 16 Targets, Stats SA invited presenters and technicians to influence monitoring processes by getting involved in the Sectoral Working Group (SWG) for Goal 16. The head of the SWG committed to setting up a DropBox account for people to place relevant documents, and requested each presenter to draft one-page summaries of their feedback on the draft monitoring framework to include in Stats SA's report back to the National Coordinating Committee (NCC) on 15 June 2017. Stats SA explained that activation of the SWGs would begin in July and that SWG members will begin scrutinizing the quality of data as well as the data sources, in preparation for the report to be signed off by the President in September 2017. In this regard, increased involvement by civil society in the SWG between July and September was welcomed by Stats SA and identified as a prime time to ensure the monitoring template accurately measures South Africa's achievement towards Goal 16.

4. Way Forward

Questions raised during the presentations and discussions related largely to the process of domesticating Goal 16, and the current structure and sources provided in the indicator framework developed by Stats SA. These questions were clarified by most of the presentations and will inform the next steps to be undertaken in refining the indicator framework. It was recommended that under each target of Goal 16 it is important to identify whose conduct and whose performance is being assessed and to what extent this relates to the sources cited. It was also recommended that that there is a need for additional sources and clear definitions for the terminology used. It was agreed that the presenters submit their suggested changes to the specific indicators that they had provided expert input on to enable Stats SA to incorporate these.

A revised template will be made available on 19 July 2017 where a draft of the accessibility tool would be introduced for comments.

5. Closure

The UNDP Country Director, Mr. Waleed Badawi, delivered the vote of thanks and highlighted that this was the beginning of a process, which UNDP hoped would be successfully implemented.