LOCALIZING HUMAN RIGHTS IN THE UNITED STATES THROUGH THE 2030 SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AGENDA

Risa E. Kaufman[*]

INTRODUCTION

Global challenges manifest in local realities. Across the United States, communities confront racial and gender injustice, lack of affordable health care and housing, barriers to employment and education, rising maternal mortality rates, contaminated water, and the impacts of climate change, among other human rights concerns. Local governments are often on the front lines in tackling these issues. Increasingly, many draw on human rights framing and strategies in doing so.[1] The recent adoption of the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda offers new opportunities and tools for state and local governments to bring human rights home.

The 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda was adopted in 2015 by the United Nations as an ambitious universal vision for

---

    1.   See, e.g., Martha Davis, Thinking Globally, Acting Locally: States, Municipalities, and International Human Rights, in BRINGING HUMAN RIGHTS HOME: A HISTORY OF HUMAN RIGHTS IN THE UNITED STATES 258 (Cynthia Soohoo, Catherine Albisa & Martha F. Davis eds., 2009) (discussing examples of state and local government use of international human rights praxes); JoAnn Kamuf Ward, From Principles to Practice: The Role of US Mayors in Advancing Human Rights, in GLOBAL URBAN JUSTICE: THE RISE OF HUMAN RIGHTS CITIES 81 (Barbara M. Oomen, Martha F. Davis, & Michele Grigolo eds., 2016); COLUM. LAW SCH. HUMAN RIGHTS INST., BRINGING HUMAN RIGHTS HOME: HOW STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS CAN USE HUMAN RIGHTS TO ADVANCE LOCAL POLICY (2012), https://web.law.columbia.edu/sites/default/files/microsites/human-rights-institute/files/Bringing%20Human%20Rights%20Home.pdf.

eradicating extreme poverty around the globe.[2] Pledging to leave no one behind,[3] the Agenda's Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) promise to mobilize the "data revolution" to respond to a broad range of social, economic, and environmental challenges faced by all countries, including the United States.[4] The seventeen goals and 169 associated targets attempt to address concerns including health, housing, food security, gender equality, environmental and economic development, access to justice, and equality within and between countries.[5] Though critiqued for lacking a strong accountability mechanism,[6] the SDGs are nevertheless guided by a vision of "universal respect for human rights and human dignity,"[7] and grounded explicitly in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and international human rights treaties.[8]

While the current political climate leaves the fate of national U.S. implementation of the Goals unknown,[9] the Goals maintain

---

2.   G.A. Res. 70/1, Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (Sept. 25, 2015).

3.   *Id.* at 1.

4.   *See* U.N. SECRETARY-GENERAL'S INDEP. EXPERT ADVISORY GRP. ON A DATA REVOLUTION FOR SUSTAINABLE DEV., A WORLD THAT COUNTS: MOBILISING THE DATA REVOLUTION FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT 5 (Nov. 2014), http://www.undatarevolution.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/A-World-That-Counts2.pdf.

5.   The SDGs have been popularized as the 17 Global Goals and include: (1) no poverty; (2) zero hunger; (3) good health and well-being; (4) quality education; (5) gender equality; (6) clean water and sanitation; (7) affordable and clean energy; (8) decent work and economic growth; (9) industry, innovation, and infrastructure; (10) reduced inequalities; (11) sustainable cities and communities; (12) responsible consumption and production; (13) climate action; (14) life below water; (15) life on land; (16) peace, justice, and strong institutions; and (17) partnerships for the Goals. *See* THE GLOBAL GOALS FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT, http://www.globalgoals.org/ (last visited Sept. 17, 2017).

6.   *See infra* notes 56–59 and accompanying text.

7.   G.A. Res. 70/1, *supra* note 2, ¶ 8.

8.   *Id.* ¶ 10; *see also* President of the Human Rights Council, Inputs from the President of the Human Rights Council to the 2016 HLPF: The Work of the Human Rights Council in Relation to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, ¶ 6 (June 6, 2016), http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/MDGs/Post2015/Contribution2016HLPF.pdf.

9.   At the date of this writing, the current administration has not made explicit public comment on its views regarding U.S. implementation of the SDGs. Nevertheless, since its earliest weeks, the current administration has considered taking action to curtail U.S. funding for the United Nations and reexamine the United States' participation in international agreements, including human rights treaties. Max Fisher, *Trump Prepares Orders Aiming at Global Funding and*

strong relevance, particularly at the local level. This Article is premised on the understanding that the SDGs, with their explicit grounding in human rights, offer new opportunities for localities and advocates within the United States to advance human rights at the local level.[10] Based on this understanding, the Article suggests three process-oriented principles to guide cities and states in implementation, follow-up, and review of the SDGs, as a means of deepening respect for human rights at the local level.[11]

Part I of this Article offers a brief history and overview of the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda, including the trajectory from the predecessor Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) to the SDGs, and related human rights critiques and concerns. Part II explores the particular role of localities in implementing the SDGs and how some cities in the United States are implementing the SDGs locally. Drawing on the human rights critiques of the MDGs and SDGs discussed in Part I, Part III suggests three principles to guide localities in implementing the SDGs in a way that advances human rights at the local level.

I. ORIGINS AND EARLY IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SDGS

The 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda embraces a holistic set of objectives: economic development, social inclusion, and environmental sustainability, undergirded by good governance in the public and private sector.[12] As described by economist Jeffrey Sachs, sustainable development is both a normative framework for

---

Treaties, N.Y. TIMES (Jan. 25, 2017), https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/25/us/politics/united-nations-trump-administration.html.

    10.   In doing so, this Article acknowledges other efforts to guide countries' domestic implementation of the SDGs. *See* OPEN SOC'Y JUSTICE INITIATIVE, THE 2030 AGENDA: FIVE PRINCIPLES FOR EFFECTIVE NATIONAL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS (2015).

    11.   This Article is premised on the assumption that human rights are both a relevant and useful conceptual framework for development and a significant set of commitments underlying the SDGs. A full exploration of the discourse on the right to development, and on the differences and similarities between the human development and human rights approaches is beyond the scope of this Article. For a collection of essays providing more nuanced discussion, see HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEVELOPMENT: TOWARDS MUTUAL REINFORCEMENT (Philip Alston & Mary Robinson eds., 2005). *See also* Mac Darrow, *The Millennium Development Goals: Milestones or Millstones? Human Rights Priorities for the Post-2015 Development Agenda*, 15 YALE HUM. RTS. & DEV. J. 55, 93–106 (2012) (discussing the relevance of human rights to development discourse and policy-making).

    12.   JEFFREY D. SACHS, THE AGE OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT 45 (2015).

addressing economic, social, and environmental objectives, as well as an analytical framework for examining interrelated economic, social, environmental, and political systems.[13]

The 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda signals a further evolution in the approach to global poverty embraced by the Millennium Declaration, adopted in 2001 as a means of eradicating poverty in the developing world by the year 2015.[14] The Millennium Declaration shifted the global development focus away from primarily economic growth and performance and towards human well-being.[15] The Millennium Declaration set forth eight goals, the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), which addressed poverty and hunger, education, gender equality, child mortality, maternal health, HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases, environmental sustainability, and the need for global partnerships.[16]

The MDGs served as the central organizing principle for global development policy and planning from 2000–2015, and many consider the MDGs to have achieved important success. Commentators have noted that the MDGs expressed an international

---

13.   *Id.* at 6–7.

14.   G.A. Res. 55/2, at 5 (Sept. 8, 2000). The MDGs were intended as a road map for implementing the U.N. Millennium Declaration. *Id.* The Millennium Declaration embraced a conceptual approach to "people-centered and inclusive development," grounded in both human development and human rights. Sakiko Fukuda-Parr, Alicia Ely Yamin, & Joshua Greenstein, *The Power of Numbers: A Critical Review of Millennium Development Goal Targets for Human Development and Human Rights*, 15 J. HUM. DEV. & CAPABILITIES 105, 107–08 (2014) (discussing the dual grounding of the Millennium Declaration, as well as the differences and relationship between a human development and human rights approach). For a comprehensive chronological account of the conferences and processes that led to the MDGs, see David Hulme, *The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs): A Short History of the World's Biggest Promise* (Brooks World Poverty Inst., Univ. of Manchester, BWPI Working Paper No. 100, 2009).

15.   *See* Sakiko Fukuda-Parr, *Millennium Development Goals: Why They Matter*, 10 GLOBAL GOVERNANCE 395, 395 (2004) (noting that the MDGs "put human development—poverty and people and their lives—at the center of the global development agenda for the new millennium, a shift away from growth as the central objective of development").

16.   U.N. Secretary-General, *Road Map Towards the Implementation of the United Nations Millennium Declaration: Rep. of the Secretary-General*, U.N. Doc. A/56/326, annex (Sept. 6, 2001). Specifically, the MDGs aimed to: (1) eradicate extreme poverty and hunger; (2) achieve universal primary education; (3) promote gender equality and empower women; (4) reduce child mortality; (5) improve maternal health; (6) combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases; (7) ensure environmental sustainability; and (8) develop a global partnership for development.

consensus that poverty is a global concern, encouraged international and national priority-setting, and focused attention on specific poverty-related challenges.[17] The MDGs placed positive peer pressure on countries to address critical development concerns and mobilized stakeholders across different communities, including civil society, the scientific community, donor organizations, and governments, to address global poverty and monitor progress towards achieving specific Targets and Goals.[18] The MDGs were seen to "harness the power of numbers" to set global benchmarks, enable cross-country comparisons, and improve data collection and monitoring.[19]

Indeed, by some measures, the MDGs contributed to significant poverty reduction. The United Nations' final report on progress under the MDGs credits the MDGs with halving the number of people living in extreme poverty and dramatically increasing the number of girls receiving primary education.[20]

It was widely recognized, however, that notwithstanding these successes, the MDGs also fell short in many respects. First, the MDGs focused almost exclusively on "developing" countries.[21] Accordingly, the MDGs tended to "ghettoize the problem of development and locate[] it firmly in the third world."[22]

Second, the MDGs left intact significant inequalities. Indeed, the United Nations' final report on the MDGs acknowledges this.[23] Scholars and advocates have criticized the MDGs in particular for

---

17.   *See* Mary Robinson, *The MDG–Human Rights Nexus to 2015 and Beyond*, 41 IDS BULL. 80, 80 (2010); Fukuda-Parr et al., *supra* note 14, at 115; Darrow, *supra* note 11, at 56–57.

18.   SACHS, *supra* note 12, at 490–513; Fukuda-Parr, *supra* note 15, at 397.

19.   Darrow, *supra* note 11, at 58.

20.   U.N. DEP'T OF ECON. & SOC. AFFAIRS, U.N. SECRETARIAT, THE MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS REPORT 14–15, 29 (2015), http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/2015_MDG_Report/pdf/MDG%202015%20rev%20%28July%201%29.pdf.

21.   G.A. Res. 55/2, *supra* note 14. Only Goal Eight, which included a number of donor commitments involving, inter alia, aid, debt relief, and trade, was aimed at developed countries. *Id.* ¶¶ 29–30.

22.   Ashwani Saith, *From Universal Values to Millennium Development Goals: Lost on Translation*, 37 DEV. & CHANGE 1167, 1184 (2006); *see also* U.N. Office of the High Comm'r for Human Rights, *Claiming the Millennium Development Goals: A Human Rights Approach*, at 4, U.N. Doc. HR/PUB/08/3 (2008) (stating that "MDGs have possibly shifted too much focus away from poverty that persists in many developed countries, as well as middle-income States that can more easily meet the MDGs").

23.   DEP'T OF ECON. & SOC. AFFAIRS, U.N. SECRETARIAT, *supra* note 20, at 8–9.

failing to address inequalities within and between countries,[24] and for aiming too low, more generally.[25]

While the Millennium Declaration included an explicit commitment to human rights,[26] commentators have noted that the

---

24.   As Mac Darrow, the former Chief of the MDGs Section of the U.N. Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights has noted:

> The global MDGs provide global assessments of human development progress based on "average" outcomes. As a result, the MDGs may inadvertently occlude analysis of differential outcomes for populations in the upper versus the lower income quintiles, or overlook the particular barriers faced by women, children, indigenous peoples, minorities, persons with disabilities, and other groups who may face discrimination. Taken literally, the MDGs may be easily achieved in many countries without any effort to reach the most marginalised populations. In the worst cases, this can divert attention disproportionately to the "lowest hanging fruits" and populations that are easiest to reach, thereby exacerbating existing inequalities.

Darrow, *supra* note 11, at 66; *see also UN Millennium Development Goals: Human rights must not be marginalized in post-2015 agenda*, AMNESTY.ORG (Sept. 23, 2013), https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2013/09/un-millennium-development-goals-human-rights-must-not-be-marginalized-post-agenda/ (noting that "top-line figures mask regional differences and inequalities and disparities between various groups and minorities"); Robinson, *supra* note 17, at 80 (claiming that "progress is overshadowed by the numbers of those left behind and by rising inequalities within and between nations"); Malcolm Langford, *The Poverty of Rights: Six Ways to Fix the MDGs*, 41 IDS BULL. 83, 87 (2010) (asserting that the MDG approach encourages states to "cherry-pick the relatively well-off among the poor and ignore long-suffering and excluded minorities."); Gay McDougall, *Tackling Poverty and Inequality Globally*, 40 HUM. RTS. MAG. 23, 23–24 (2014) (attributing the MDGs' failure in addressing inequality to aggregate reporting permissions and a paternalistic approach to developing countries); Saith, *supra* note 22, at 1184–85 (describing MDGs proponents' willful disregard of rising inequalities).

25.   *See* Thomas Pogge, *The First UN Millennium Development Goal: A Cause for Celebration?*, 5 J. HUM. DEV. & CAPABILITIES 377, 379 (2004) (noting that the MDGs based the goal of reducing poverty upon poverty levels in 1990, rather than at the time of their adoption in 2000, allowing the MDGS to claim success based on earlier reductions, particularly in China, and thus making the MDGs more easily achieved and less ambitious); *see also* Darrow, *supra* note 11, at 62–63 (finding that the MDGs' definition of "feasible" progress is unambitious); *UN Millennium Development Goals: Human rights must not be marginalized in post-2015 agenda*, *supra* note 24 (suggesting that "a proportionate, rather than absolute, reduction [of extremely poor people] is less ambitious given the effects of population growth").

MDGs themselves did not align with human rights standards or integrate human rights into their targets and indicators.[27] The Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) also criticized the MDGs for failing to align with human rights principles.[28] For example, OHCHR noted that Goal 2 of the MDGs, which called for universal primary education, failed to align with the human rights requirement of free and compulsory primary education of a certain quality.[29] And some have argued that the targets set by the MDGs themselves contributed to rights violations. For example, scholars and advocates have noted that some countries engaged in slum clearance and committed other housing-rights violations as a measure towards achieving Target 7(D), which called on countries to achieve significant improvement in the lives of slum dwellers.[30]

---

26.   G.A. RES. 55/2, *supra* note 14, ¶¶ 24–25; *see also* U.N. Secretary-General, *supra* note 16, ¶¶ 195–224 (elaborating on human rights goals alongside the MDGs).

27.   Gillian MacNaughton, *Human Rights Education for All: A Proposal for the Post-2015 Development Agenda*, 24 WASH. INT'L L.J. 537, 538 (2015); Ved P. Nanda, *Human Rights Must Be at the Core of the Post-2015 International Development Agenda*, 75 MONT. L. REV. 1, 9–10 (2014); Langford, *supra* note 24, at 85; *see also* Philip Alston, *Ships Passing in the Night: The Current State of the Human Rights and Development Seen Through the Lens of the Millennium Development Goals*, 27 HUM. RTS. Q. 755, 792–96 (2005) (noting the paucity of national MDG reports taking account of human rights or integrating human rights into operation of the MDGs); Darrow, *supra* note 11, at 68 (noting that, "in certain cases, the specific formulation of MDGS may conflict with or undermine international human rights treaty standards"); AMNESTY INT'L, FROM PROMISES TO DELIVERY: PUTTING HUMAN RIGHTS AT THE HEARD OF THE MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS 15–28, AI Index IOR/41/012/2010 (2010) (exploring ways in which the MDGs fail to align with international human rights standards in the areas of gender equality, maternal health, and slums).

28.   U.N. Office of the High Comm'r for Human Rights, *supra* note 22, at 4.

29.   *See* U.N. Office of the High Comm'r for Human Rights & Ctr. for Econ. & Soc. Rights, *Who Will be Accountable? Human Rights and the Post-2015 Development Agenda*, at 2, U.N. Doc. HR/PUB/13/1 (2013); *see also* U.N. Office of the High Comm'r for Human Rights, *supra* note 22, at 4 (stating that "Goal 2 ignores the requirement of free primary education, essentially reducing it to a strategy").

30.   Mac Darrow, *Master or Servant? Development Goals and Human Rights, in* THE MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS AND HUMAN RIGHTS: PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE, at 67, 88 (2013); Darrow, *supra* note 11, at 70; *see also* Marie Huchzermeyer, *"Slum" Upgrading or "Slum" Eradication? The Mixed Message of the MDGs, in* THE MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS AND HUMAN RIGHTS: PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE 295, 305–10 (Malcolm Langford, Andy Sumner & Alicia Ely Yamin, eds., 2013) (exploring how miscommunication and misinterpretation of Target 7(D) led to target-driven slum eradication in South Africa and Kenya).

Another major critique of the MDGs focused on the absence of any accountability mechanisms to ensure that international institutions, states, and the private sector met their commitments and goals.[31] The MDGs lacked any formal means for civil society participation, including in creating the goals and monitoring progress.[32] And the MDGs were given insufficient attention by U.N. human rights mechanisms, which failed to substantively integrate the MDGs into their analysis and review.[33]

The MDGs were criticized as well for their failure to address the full range of issues contributing to global poverty, including civil and political issues, such as governance, free expression, climate change, and unemployment.[34] They were also criticized more generally for being reductionist in scope and impact, and for diverting attention from other critical issues.[35]

---

31.   *See* U.N. Office of the High Comm'r for Human Rights & Ctr. for Econ. & Soc. Rights, *supra* note 29, at 10–16 (discussing core components of human rights accountability in the context of the development goals, namely responsibility, answerability, and enforceability); Nanda, *supra* note 27, at 10; Robinson, *supra* note 17, at 80–81; *see also* Alston, *supra* note 27, at 813 (providing that "[i]nstitutionalized arrangements for monitoring processes and outcomes and for establishing some form of accountability are indispensable in any human rights context and they are equally relevant and necessary in relation to MDGs"); U.N. Office of the High Comm'r for Human Rights, *supra* note 22, at 4 (explaining that "the international accountability mechanisms for the MDGs are particularly weak").

32.   Nanda, *supra* note 27, at 10; U.N. Office of the High Comm'r for Human Rights, *supra* note 22, at 4–5.

33.   Alston, *supra* note 27, at 816–19, 821.

34.   *See* Saith, *supra* note 22, at 1188–89; Mac Darrow, *Master or Servant? Development Goals and Human Rights*, *in* THE MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS AND HUMAN RIGHTS: PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE, *supra* note 30, at 67, 86–87; Fukuda-Parr et al., *supra* note 14, at 9.

35.   As Professor Sakiko Fukuda-Parr has stated:
           [S]implicity's downside is reductionism, which can lead to
           neglect and distortion. It is now acknowledged that the MDGs
           were too narrow in scope, and left out many priorities, such as
           employment, climate change and reducing inequality and
           discrimination, all of which are among today's challenges in
           virtually all countries, rich and poor. Reductionist goals can
           distort planning and programming of resources and
           development efforts, and lead to agendas that do not reflect
           national priorities.
     Sakiko Fukuda-Parr, *MDGs: Facing Up to the Limitations of Global Goal Setting*, GUARDIAN (May 20, 2013), https://www.theguardian.com/global-development-professionals-network/2013/may/20/millennium-development-goals-targets-global-development; *see also* Fukuda-Parr et al., *supra* note 14, at 11.

The looming expiration date of the MDGs inspired a robust conversation about what a more comprehensive and holistic set of goals to eradicate poverty might look like.[36] Scholars and human rights advocates, in particular, urged a universal approach to poverty reduction that more comprehensively embraced human rights.[37] Many called for the inclusion of a human rights frame in the post-2015 development agenda to ensure more equitable and inclusive progress towards poverty eradication[38] and to integrate human rights into development policy.[39] They also urged the inclusion of a human rights framework to ensure a focus on social inclusion[40] and civil society participation,[41] as well as the adoption of a wider range of interrelated goals and targets, including climate change and access to justice.[42] Relatedly, human rights experts underscored the need to

---

36.   Gillian MacNaughton & Diane F. Frey, *Decent Work, Human Rights and the Sustainable Development Goals*, 47 GEO. J. INT'L L. 607, 641–43 (2016) (explaining how discussions for the SDGs revolved around the "lack of universality, participation, transparency, equality and nondiscrimination, and accountability" in the MDGs); *see also* Ved P. Nanda, *The Journey From the Millennium Development Goals to the Sustainable Development Goals*, 44 DENV. J. INT'L L. & POL'Y 389, 401–02 (2016) (explaining that while the MDGs achieved "substantial progress . . . significant disparities and gaps remain[ed], with the unfinished agenda left for the successor SDGs").

37.   MacNaughton & Frey, *supra* note 36, at 641–43. International human rights groups, led by the Center for Economic and Social Rights, Amnesty International, the Association for Women's Rights in Development (AWID), and Center for Reproductive Rights, formed a post-2015 Human Rights Caucus and developed a human rights "litmus test" for the SDGs. *Human Rights for All Post-2015: A Litmus Test*, CTR. FOR ECON. & SOC. RIGHTS, http://www.cesr.org/sites/default/files/HRsinSDGsLitmusTest-eng.pdf (last visited Sept. 10, 2017).

38.   *See* Robinson, *supra* note 17, at 81; McDougall, *supra* note 24, at 24. *But see* Jan Vandemoortele, *The Limits of the MDGs' Design: Six Caveats for Human Rights, in* THE MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS AND HUMAN RIGHTS: PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE, *supra* note 30, at 49, 55–64 (cautioning against a rights-based framework for development goals in favor of an "equity-adjusted" approach).

39.   Darrow, *Master or Servant? Development Goals and Human Rights, in* THE MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS AND HUMAN RIGHTS: PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE, *supra* note 30, at 67, 109.

40.   Robinson, *supra* note 17, at 81.

41.   *See id.*; Darrow, *Master or Servant? Development Goals and Human Rights, in* THE MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS AND HUMAN RIGHTS: PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE, *supra* note 30, at 67, 85.

42.   *See* Robinson, *supra* note 17, at 81 (arguing both that climate change should be prioritized in international development because addressing it is beyond the power of any individual government and that access to justice was not sufficiently addressed by the MDGs); *see also* U.N. SYS. TASK TEAM ON THE POST-2015 U.N. DEV. AGENDA, TOWARDS FREEDOM FROM FEAR AND WANT: HUMAN

develop strong human-rights-based accountability mechanisms and processes—at the global, national, and subnational levels—to ensure that countries and other stakeholders (including the private sector) meet their commitments.[43] A number of human rights, development, and environmental organizations formed a human rights caucus and developed a human rights "litmus test" to assess proposals for the post-2015 development goals.[44]

   After significant negotiation, in September 2015, the U.N. member states adopted *Transforming our World: the 2030 Agenda for*

RIGHTS IN THE POST-2015 AGENDA (2012) (calling for the post-2015 agenda to align with international human rights standards and mechanisms, and include meaningful ways to measure and assess whether countries meet their commitments under the MDGs).

   43.   Darrow, *Master or Servant? Development Goals and Human Rights in* THE MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS AND HUMAN RIGHTS: PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE, *supra* note 30, at 89, 95, 108; U.N. Office of the High Comm'r for Human Rights & Ctr. for Econ. & Soc. Rights, *supra* note 29, at 70–71; Dan Seymour, *Integrating Human Rights and Equality: A Development Agenda for the Future, in* THE MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS AND HUMAN RIGHTS: PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE, *supra* note 30, at 408, 419. A group of seventeen U.N. special procedures mandate-holders recommended that the post-2015 agenda incorporate goals on inequality and a human rights-based approach to social protection, and include mechanisms or processes at the national and international levels to hold governments accountable for making progress towards the Goals. Statement by 17 Special Procedures Mandate-holders of the Human Rights Council on the Post-2015 Development Agenda, *Grounding Development Priorities in Human Rights: Incentives to Improve Equality*, SOC. SEC. & ACCOUNTABILITY (May 21, 2013), http://newsarchive.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID= 13341&LangID=E. The Chairpersons of the U.N. Human Rights Treaty Bodies called for a post-2015 development agenda that integrates human rights obligations through human rights indicators, engages with national and international human rights mechanisms, and strengthens accountability overall. Chairpersons of the U.N. Human Rights Treaty Bodies, *Joint Statement on the Post-2015 Development Agenda* (May 2013), http://www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=15505.

   44.   *Human Rights for All Post-2015: A Litmus Test, supra* note 37 (explaining that the eight-factor test evaluated whether proposals applied universally; framed goals and targets consistently with human rights; ensured transparency and meaningful participation of all people; ensured accountability for all development actors, including the private sector; focused on combatting inequality and ending all forms of discrimination; supported women's rights; and secured a minimum floor for core economic and social rights); *see also UN Millennium Development Goals: Human rights must not be marginalized in post-2015 agenda, supra* note 24 (describing Amnesty International's statement made prior to U.N. talks regarding progress under the MDGs that "[w]orld leaders risk deepening inequalities, discrimination and injustice if human rights remain side-lined in the post-2015 development agenda").

Sustainable Development.[45] The Agenda contains seventeen Goals and 169 Targets focused on economic, social, and environmental aspects of sustainable development.[46] Noting that it is guided by a vision of "universal respect for human rights and human dignity,"[47] the Agenda textually grounds itself in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and international human rights treaties.[48] Commentators have noted that the scope of the issues covered by the SDGs extends beyond previous MDG priorities of health, education, and food,[49] to include explicitly crosscutting and interdependent goals that touch on environmental and economic objectives, peaceful societies, and access to justice.[50]

Universal in scope, the Goals apply to all countries[51] and are intended to be implemented at the national level, primarily through the creation of national-level indicators.[52] Likewise, under the SDGs, national governments hold primary responsibility for follow-up and review of progress towards implementation of the Goals and Targets.[53] The Agenda anticipates, however, that the SDGs will be implemented at all levels of government, including at the local level.[54]

Notwithstanding its improvements over the MDGs, human rights advocates and scholars have noted that the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda, too, has significant shortcomings. Central among these concerns is the lack of meaningful global indicators and

---

45.   G.A. Res. 70/1, *supra* note 2.

46.   *Id.* Preamble.

47.   *Id.* ¶ 8.

48.   *Id.* ¶ 10; *see also* President of the Human Rights Council, *supra* note 8, at 1 (stating that the 2030 Agenda "commits to leave no one behind" and adopts a "human rights-based approach to addressing inequality and discrimination among and within countries").

49.   *See* U.N. Secretary-General, *supra* note 16.

50.   *See* CHAITANYA KANURI ET AL., SUSTAINABLE DEV. SOLUTIONS NETWORK, GETTING STARTED WITH THE SDGS IN CITIES 18 (July 2016), http://unsdsn.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/9.1.8.-Cities-SDG-Guide.pdf.

51.   G.A. Res. 70/1, *supra* note 2, ¶ 5; *see also* MacNaughton, *supra* note 27, at 568 (explaining that human rights education as a goal applies universally to high and low-income states).

52.   G.A. Res. 70/1, *supra* note 2, ¶¶ 75, 78–79.

53.   G.A. Res. 70/1, *supra* note 2, ¶ 47.

54.   G.A. Res. 70/1, *supra* note 2, ¶ 45 (providing that "[g]overnments and public institutions will . . . work closely on implementation [of the Goals] with regional and local authorities [and] subregional institutions"); *see also* KANURI ET AL., *supra* note 50, at 1, 12 (providing that "[c]ities and human settlements will be key to achieving the global SDGs" and that concentrating SDG efforts in "cities is not only a practical imperative, it's also . . . strategic").

a robust accountability mechanism to oversee and ensure countries' implementation of the SDGs.[55] The Agenda anticipates that the U.N. High Level Political Forum (HLPF) will facilitate periodic, voluntary, state-led country reviews, as well as thematic reviews, as a means of sharing lessons learned and best practices within countries and regions and with those implementing sustainable development policies.[56] In contrast to the purely voluntary HLPF, which lacks a means to compel reporting by states and no other real mechanism for peer or other review, advocates had proposed more robust monitoring and review systems, including a comprehensive peer-review modeled on the Universal Periodic Review (UPR).[57] In the absence of such a mechanism, human rights experts and advocates have urged that the existing U.N. human rights mechanisms, including the human rights treaty bodies, the U.N. special procedures, and the UPR, play a strong role in examining countries' progress towards achieving the SDGs.[58]

The United States actively participated in the negotiations over the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda.[59] At the adoption of the SDGs, President Obama pledged the United States to model meaningful implementation of the Goals, in an effort to address

---

55.   *See* REFLECTION GRP. ON THE 2030 AGENDA FOR SUSTAINABLE DEV., SPOTLIGHT ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT, REPORT BY THE REFLECTION GROUP ON THE 2030 AGENDA FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT 141 (2016); Kate Donald & Sally-Anne Way, *Accountability for the Sustainable Development Goals: A Lost Opportunity?*, 30 ETHICS & INT'L AFF. 201, 201–13 (2016).

56.   G.A. Res. 70/1, *supra* note 2, ¶¶ 82, 84–85.

57.   CTR. FOR ECON. & SOC. RIGHTS, ACCOUNTABILITY FOR THE POST-2015 AGENDA: A PROPOSAL FOR A ROBUST GLOBAL REVIEW MECHANISM 1–2 (2015), https://www.reproductiverights.org/sites/crr.civicactions.net/files/documents/Post2 015%20Global%20Review%20Proposal%20PDF.PDF.

58.   DANISH INST. FOR HUMAN RIGHTS, HUMAN RIGHTS IN THE FOLLOW-UP AND REVIEW OF THE 2030 AGENDA FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT 33–35 (May 2016), https://www.reproductiverights.org/sites/crr.civicactions.net/files/documents/Post2015%20Global%20Review%20Proposal%20PDF.PDF; CTR. FOR ECON. & SOC. RIGHTS, FROM DISPARITY TO DIGNITY, TACKLING ECONOMIC INEQUALITY THROUGH THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS 38, http://archive.cesr.org/downloads/disparity_to_dignity_SDG10.pdf.

59.   *See* U.N. DEP'T OF ECON. & SOC. AFFAIRS, *United States of America*, SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT KNOWLEDGE PLATFORM, https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/csd/index.php?page=view&type=6&nr=52& menu=139 (last visited Sept. 27, 2017) (providing manifold links to U.S. statements pertaining to the Sustainable Development Agenda).

pressing challenges of domestic poverty and inequality.[60] After adoption of the Goals, senior Obama administration officials stated that the SDGs largely track domestic policy goals[61] and reiterated President Obama's pledge to implement the Goals within the United States.[62] Under the Obama administration, the United States took initial steps towards developing national indicators for a small number of specific Goals, including Goal Sixteen, which calls upon all countries to ensure equal access to justice.[63] In the aftermath of the

---

60.   The Obama administration acknowledged the SDGs' critical focus on inequality as a means of addressing poverty in all countries, including the United States. At the adoption of the SDGs, President Obama stated:

> Development is also threatened by inequality. . . I just want to be clear, this is not something from which the United States is immune to. Every country has to grapple with this issue. . . When poor children are more likely to get sick and die than children in wealthier neighborhoods just across town; when rural families are more likely to go without clean water; when ethnic and religious minorities, or people with disabilities, or people of different sexual orientations are discriminated against or can't access education and opportunity -- that holds all of us back. And so, in all of our countries, we have to invest in the interventions that allow us to reach more people -- because no one should be left behind just because of where they live or what they look like.

President Barack Obama, Remarks by the President on Sustainable Development Goals (Sept. 27, 2015), https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2015/09/27/remarks-president-sustainable-development-goals.
    61.   *See What Will America Do Differently Once it Adopts the SDGs – Podcast with Tony Pipa*, CTR. FOR GLOBAL DEV. (Aug 31, 2015), https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=i9dB0OOu9Wk.
    62.   *See* Ambassador Samantha Power, U.S. Permanent Representative to the U.N., Remarks at a U.N. Event on Access to Legal Aid as a Measure of Access to Justice (Feb. 24, 2016), https://2009-2017-usun.state.gov/remarks/7149.
    63.   On the eve of the United Nations' adoption of the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda, President Obama issued a Presidential Memorandum, establishing the "White House Legal Aid Interagency Roundtable" ("LAIR"), and charging it with implementing Goal Sixteen in the United States. Memorandum on Establishment of the White House Legal Aid Interagency Roundtable, 2015 DAILY COMP. PRES. DOC. 643 (Sept. 24, 2015). The Presidential Memorandum calls on the Department of Justice's Office for Access to Justice, in particular, to support LAIR agencies in implementing Goal Sixteen. *Id.* at 3. The LAIR developed a Working Group on Access to Justice Indicators and Data Collection to identify national access to justice indicators for Target 16.3, and in September 2016, held a consultation with civil society access to justice stakeholders to discuss what national indicators it might adopt for measuring Target 16.3. WHITE HOUSE LEGAL AID INTERAGENCY ROUNDTABLE, WORKING GROUP ON ACCESS TO JUSTICE INDICATORS & DATA COLLECTION, EFFORTS TO IDENTIFY NATIONAL INDICATORS ON ACCESS TO JUSTICE 2 (Jan. 2017), https://www.justice.gov/atj/file/

2016 presidential election, it is unclear what role, if any, the United States will play in modeling domestic implementation of the 2030 Agenda, particularly given the new administration's stance on U.S. engagement with the U.N. system.[64] At the time of this writing, the process for U.S. national implementation and review of the SDGs was still in development.[65] Regardless of federal implementation efforts, there is a strong movement towards local implementation of the SDGs, both in the United States and globally, as discussed more fully in the following section.

II. LOCAL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SDGS

The SDGs are meant to be implemented at every level of government, including at the subnational level. With rapid urbanization throughout the world,[66] the importance of cities, in particular, to achieving sustainable development was explicitly

---

926686/download; Press Release, Bill Baer, Principal Deputy Assoc. Att'y Gen., The White House Legal Aid Interagency Roundtable and Goal 16 – One Year On (Sept. 21, 2016), https://www.justice.gov/archives/opa/blog/white-house-legal-aid-interagency-roundtable-and-goal-16-one-year; *see also* Risa E. Kaufman & David Udell, *Access to Justice Indicators, Recommended by Experts to US Government Officials, New Resource, Now On-Line*, NAT'L CTR. FOR ACCESS TO JUST. BLOG (Dec. 2, 2016), http://ncforaj.org/2016/12/02/access-to-justice-indicators-recommended-by-experts-to-us-government-officials-new-resource-now-on-line/ (providing additional information and context on LAIR and Goal 16).

    64.   *See* Max Fisher, *Trump Prepares Orders Aiming at Global Funding and Treaties*, N.Y. TIMES (Jan. 25, 2017), https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/25/us/politics/united-nations-trump-administration.html.

    65.   In late 2016, the federal government launched a website to provide for national reporting on the SDG global indicators. *U.S. National Statistics for the UN Sustainable Development Goals*, GLOBAL GOALS FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT, https://sdg.data.gov/ (last visited Sept. 10, 2017). The website was developed at the end of the Obama Administration as a collaboration of the U.S. Office of Management and Budget, the U.S. Department of State, the U.S. General Services Administration, and the U.S. Office of Science and Technology Policy. *Id.* This early effort indicates that the Department of State has a coordinating role in implementing the SDGs within the United States, and the U.S. Office of Management and Budget has primary responsibility both in establishing national-level SDG indicators and in receiving data for transmission to the U.N. Office of Statistics for global reporting. It is unclear at the time of this writing to what extent the new Administration will maintain and further develop the site.

    66.   As of 2008, over half of the world's population lived in cities. SACHS, *supra* note 12, at 355.

recognized during the formulation of the SDGs.[67] The 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda includes a specific stand-alone goal focused on cities: Goal 11 calls for inclusive, safe, resilient, and sustainable cities. Local implementation is required in order to realize most of the other Goals as well; municipal and state governments are expected to foster compliance with the Goals by adapting them to the local context and monitoring their implementation.[68]

Early implementation of the SDGs has focused on localization. Indeed, a particular theme throughout the first High-level Political Forum ("HLFP") presentations and country reports in 2016 was the need to engage local authorities in SDG implementation.[69] Switzerland, for example, touted its commitment to engaging with local governments to ensure local implementation of the SDGs.[70] Mexico indicated that at least two local districts had already incorporated the SDGs into their local planning.[71] Colombia, too, reported that it was working closely with municipal authorities in planning and implementing the SDGs.[72] In 2018, the United

---

67.   For example, the report of the High Level Panel of Eminent Persons for the Post-2015 Development Agenda noted that "cities are where the battle for sustainable development will be won or lost." HIGH-LEVEL PANEL OF EMINENT PERSONS ON THE POST-2015 DEV. AGENDA, A NEW GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP: ERADICATE POVERTY AND TRANSFORM ECONOMIES THROUGH SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT 17 (2013), www.post2015hlp.org/the-report.

68.   G.A. Res. 70/1, *supra* note 2, at 11 (providing that "[g]overnments and public institutions will . . . work closely on implementation [of the Goals] with regional and local authorities, [and] subregional institutions"); KANURI ET AL., *supra* note 50, at 1, 12 (asserting that "[c]ities and human settlements will be key to achieving the global SDGs" and that concentrating SDG efforts in "cities is not only a practical imperative, it is also a strategic choice").

69.   U.N. DEP'T OF ECON. & SOC. AFFAIRS, DIV. FOR SUSTAINABLE DEV., SYNTHESIS OF VOLUNTARY NATIONAL REVIEWS (2016) 33–36, https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/126002016_VNR_Synth esis_Report.pdf.

70.   SWITZ., SWITZERLAND'S INITIAL STEPS TOWARDS IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2030 SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AGENDA 10 (Swiss Confederation ed.) (July 2016), https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/10617Full% 20Report%20HLPF%202016_Switzerland_EN%20fin.pdf.

71.   GOV'T OF MEX., IMPLEMENTING THE 2030 AGENDA AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS IN MEXICO 9 (July 2016), https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/10762Brochure%20on% 20SDGs%20implementation%20in%20Mexico.pdf.

72.   U.N. DEP'T OF ECON. & SOC. AFFAIRS, DIV. FOR SUSTAINABLE DEV, *supra* note 69, at 35.

Nations' HLFP will include a specific focus on global progress towards Goal 11.[73]

To aid in the development and implementation of the SDGs, including localization of the Goals, the U.N. Secretary General created the Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN), which advises the United Nations and stakeholders.[74] Consistent with its mandate, the group develops resources to facilitate cities' ability to adapt, implement, and monitor the SDGs at the local level, and it works with a number of cities around the world to model local SDG implementation.[75]

Several U.S. cities, including Baltimore, San Jose, and New York City, have been early enthusiasts of local SDG implementation, serving as pilots for local U.S. implementation and using the SDGs as a roadmap for local sustainability planning.

Through SDSN's USA Sustainable Cities Initiative, the city of Baltimore partnered with the University of Baltimore and the U.N. Sustainable Solutions Network to model local SDG implementation within the United States.[76] In March 2017, following community engagement and consultation, the effort yielded a set of fifty-six recommended indicators to track the city's progress towards implementation of the SDGs.[77] Proposed Baltimore indicators include locally-relevant measures, such as the percentage of Baltimore residents earning a living wage, the percentage of households for

---

73.   *High Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development*, SUSTAINABLE DEV. KNOWLEDGE PLATFORM, https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/hlpf (last visited Oct. 2, 2017).

74.   SACHS, *supra* note 12, at 486.

75.   *See* KANURI ET AL., *supra* note 50. The SDSN guide for local implementation suggests four steps to localization of the SDGs. These include (1) initiating an inclusive and participatory process; (2) translating the SDGs into an agenda tailored to local context; (3) engaging in goal-based planning; and (4) monitoring and evaluation. *Id.* In 2017, SDSN issued a U.S. Cities SDG Index, ranking the 100 most populous U.S. cities on their performance in achieving the SDGs. MIHIR PRAKASH ET AL., SUSTAINABLE DEV. SOLUTIONS NETWORK, THE U.S. CITIES SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS INDEX 2017: ACHIEVING A SUSTAINABLE URBAN AMERICA, http://unsdsn.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/US-Cities-SDG-Index-2017.pdf (last visited Oct. 2, 2017).

76.   *Sustainable   Cities   Initiative*,   UNIV.   OF   BALTIMORE, http://www.ubalt.edu/about-ub/sustainable-cities/ (last visited Sept. 17, 2017).

77.   UNIV. OF BALTIMORE & SUSTAINABLE DEV. SOLUTIONS NETWORK, BALTIMORE'S SUSTAINABLE FUTURE: LOCALIZING THE UN'S SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS, STRATEGIES AND INDICATORS 4 (Dec. 2016).

whom water service is unaffordable, and the percentage of residents living in a food desert.[78]

In 2015, New York City adopted OneNYC, a sustainability plan setting forth over two hundred initiatives and related targets and indicators for the city.[79] The plan explicitly embraces the SDGs' framework of addressing social, economic, and environmental challenges.[80]

In partnership with the SDSN, the city of San Jose, California recently took its first steps towards evaluating its sustainability initiatives and aligning them with the SDGs.[81]

Notwithstanding these early efforts, local and state governments face challenges in implementing the SDGs. As a general matter, local governments may lack fiscal resources, institutional capacity, and the requisite knowledge and partnerships to develop appropriate local indicators and engage in the necessary reporting, follow up, and review required for meaningful SDG implementation.[82] As with state and local implementation of the United States' human rights treaty commitments, the federal government could play a greater role in providing the necessary resources and building capacity for subnational SDG implementation.[83] It is unclear to what

---

78.   *Id*. at 6, 19, 27.
79.   *One New York: The Plan for a Strong and Just City*, ONENYC, http://www.nyc.gov/html/onenyc/downloads/pdf/publications/OneNYC.pdf   (last visited Sept. 17, 2017).
80.   *Id*. at 40.
81.   *See* SAN JOSE STATE UNIV. & SUSTAINABLE DEV. SOLUTIONS NETWORK, SAN JOSE: IMPLEMENTING THE UN'S SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS AT THE LOCAL LEVEL (2016), http://www.sjsu.edu/sustainable-cities/docs/sci-reports-sanjose-final.pdf.
82.   PRAKASH ET AL., *supra* note 75, at 66.
83.   A growing body of scholarship explores the role of the federal government in ensuring subnational implementation of human rights. *See, e.g.*, Risa E. Kaufman, *"By Some Other Means": Considering the Executive's Role in Fostering Subnational Human Rights Compliance*, 33 CARDOZO L. REV. 1971, 2030 (2012); Tara J. Melish, *From Paradox to Subsidiarity: The United States and Human Rights Treaty Bodies*, 34 YALE J. INT'L L. 389, 456–61 (2009); Catherine Powell, *Dialogic Federalism: Constitutional Possibilities for Incorporation of Human Rights Law in the United States*, 150 U. PA. L. REV. 245 (2001); Johanna Kalb, *Dynamic Federalism in Human Rights Treaty Implementation*, 84 TUL. L. REV. 1025, 1055, 1064 (2010); Robert B. Ahdieh, *Foreign Affairs, International Law, and the New Federalism: Lessons From Coordination*, 73 MO. L. REV. 1185 (2008). Under the Obama administration, the United States made improvements in its outreach to state and local officials regarding their international human rights obligations, for example, communicating the U.S. human rights treaty

extent the federal government under the present administration will encourage or support robust, local human rights implementation, including local implementation of the SDGs. Nevertheless, even in the absence of federal guidance and support, state and local governments can take up localization of the SDGs and do so in ways that advance human rights.

III. TOWARDS LOCAL IMPLEMENTATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS THROUGH LOCALIZATION OF THE SDGS IN THE UNITED STATES

States and localities can advance human rights in the United States through local implementation of the SDGs. Informed by the human rights critiques of the MDGs and human rights experts' and advocates' present concerns about the SDGs, this section suggests three operational principles to guide states and cities in implementing the SDGs in a way that furthers human rights. What follows is not intended as a comprehensive "how to" for local implementation of the SDGs. Rather, these principles are intended to reinforce and supplement recommendations for localization of the SDGs offered by other commentators and experts, as a means of strengthening the human rights promise of the SDGs.

A. Ensure Meaningful Participation by Communities Impacted by Human Rights Concerns

In implementing the SDGs, states and localities can further human rights at the local level by ensuring the meaningful participation of civil society and, particularly, the participation of vulnerable and marginalized communities in indicator formation, data collection, monitoring, and review.

Much has been written on the importance of the participation principle in the development context and the principle of

---

commitments directly to state and local human rights commissions and state attorneys general, making presentations on U.S. human rights treaty commitments at national conferences of state and local officials, and inviting local officials, including mayors, to participate in official U.S. delegations for periodic U.N. human rights treaty reviews and the UPR. *See, e.g.*, Mary McLeod, Acting Legal Adviser, U.S. Dep't of State, *The Role of State, Territorial, and Local Government in Promoting, Respecting, and Defending Human Rights* (Feb. 25, 2015), https://www.humanrights.gov/dyn/2015/02/the-role-of-state-territorial-and-local-government-in-promoting-respecting-and-defending-human-rights/.

participation as a human right.[84] As the OHCHR noted in its 2008 assessment of the MDGs, "participation . . . is a fundamental element to achieve economic, social, and cultural rights, as well as the right to development."[85]

Consistent with the SDGs' grounding in human rights, the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda explicitly articulates the importance of the participation principle in implementation of the Goals, noting for example that the follow up and review process should be "open, inclusive, participatory and transparent for all people and . . . support reporting by all relevant stakeholders."[86] Commentators have noted the importance of civil society participation in the process of indicator formation, monitoring and evaluation, as a means of holding countries accountable for their SDG commitments.[87]

Former U.N. Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty Magdalena Sepulveda Carmona has articulated the core components for ensuring rights-based participation for people living in poverty: respect for dignity, autonomy, and agency; a focus on non-discrimination and equality; transparency and access to information;

---

84.   *See, e.g.*, Mac Darrow & Amparo Tomas, *Power, Capture, Conflict: A Call For Human Rights Accountability in Development Cooperation*, 27 HUM. RTS. Q. 471, 506–10 (2005) (discussing the many advantages of participation to development as well as explaining that the "'right' to participate is strongly grounded in international treaty law, and to varying degrees in national constitutions and legal systems").

85.   U.N. Office of the High Comm'r for Human Rights, *supra* note 22, at 11; *see also* U.N. Office of the High Comm'r for Human Rights, *The Human Rights Based Approach to Development Cooperation: Towards a Common Understanding Among UN Agencies*, HRBA PORTAL (2003), http://hrbaportal.org/the-human-rights-based-approach-to-development-cooperation-towards-a-common-understanding-among-un-agencies (noting that all U.N. agencies should be promoting participation-based human rights in their programs).

86.   G.A. Res. 70/1, *supra* note 2, ¶ 74(d). Paragraph 79 of the Agenda encourages member states, in conducting their reviews of progress at the national and sub-national levels, to "draw on contributions from indigenous peoples, civil society, the private sector and other stakeholders." *Id.* ¶ 79.

87.   Sakiko Fukuda-Parr, *From the Millennium Development Goals to the Sustainable Development Goals: Shifts in Purpose, Concept, and Politics of Global Goal Setting for Development*, 24 GENDER & DEV. 43, 51 (2016) ("The onus falls on civil society groups to leverage the SDGs as course correction by putting pressure on governments and other powerful actors to account for the commitments made."); *see also* Statement by 17 Special Procedures Mandate-holders of the Human Rights Council on the Post-2015 Development Agenda, *supra* note 43 (discussing independent accountability and monitoring through civil society participation).

measures to ensure accountability; and an ultimate objective of empowerment for people living in poverty.[88] Human rights advocates and scholars have noted that human rights principles require states to go beyond mere token participation; the human rights framework calls for genuine participation of people living in poverty in the meaningful planning, implementation, and monitoring of development goals.[89] And genuine participation requires realizing other human rights, including the rights to freedom of expression and association.[90]

        With these components in mind, states and localities can deepen human rights within communities by ensuring that the SDGs are implemented through the genuine and robust participation of people directly impacted by human rights concerns. In developing local implementation plans, state and local officials should engage in meaningful and wide consultation with individuals from marginalized communities and people living in poverty to develop locally relevant indicators and inclusive review processes.[91] In implementing the SDGs locally, state and local governments should also draw on data that is devised and collected by communities, organizations, and service providers working closely with people living in poverty and other marginalized groups.[92] Finally, state and local governments should develop a monitoring and review mechanism with ample space for civil society to offer perspectives on whether and how the government is making progress towards achieving the SDGs.[93]

        The Baltimore SDG initiative shows the potential for community participation to advance human rights through the SDGs.

---

88.   Magdalena Sepulveda Carmona, *Report of the Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights*, U.N. DOC. A/HRC/23/36 (March 11, 2013).

89.   AMNESTY INT'L, *supra* note 27, at 10–11.

90.   *See id.* at 10.

91.   Philip Alston has noted the importance of clearly articulating what is required for "meaningful participation" in the context of the MDGs. Alston, *supra* note 27, at 812.

92.   *See* U.N. Office of the High Comm'r for Human Rights, *supra* note 22, at 12 (urging that countries create effective accountability mechanisms to enable people to claim and enforce their rights under the MDGs); *see also* AnnJanette Rosga & Margaret L. Satterthwaite, *The Trust in Indicators; Measuring Human Rights*, 27 BERKELEY J. INT'L L. 253, 313–14 (2009) (discussing the importance and promise of ensuring participation of people directly impacted by human rights concerns in the development of human rights indicators).

93.   U.N. Office of the High Comm'r for Human Rights, *supra* note 22, at 14 (urging that countries create an effective accountability mechanism to enable people to claim and enforce their rights under the MDGs).

In Baltimore, as across the United States, recent police shootings of Black men have sparked local outrage over law enforcement practices and accountability.[94] Tapping into this community engagement, the USA Sustainable Cities Initiative partnered with the Baltimore Neighborhood Indicators Alliance, which had been working within the city to develop metrics and reports around local concerns such as health, education, and crime, to conduct community outreach and develop a process for facilitating input into locally relevant indicators for the SDGs. The initiative held a "Baltimore Data Day," inviting local residents to vote and provide feedback on draft indicators, which were incorporated into the initiative's draft indicator report.[95] Responsive to particularly strong community concerns around access to justice, the resulting proposed indicators for Goal 16, which calls for "equal access to justice for all," include measures of state and local funding for legal aid, the length of time defendants spend in pretrial detention, and the ratio of civil legal aid attorneys to people living in poverty.[96] Such engagement is a starting point towards ensuring that the SDGs address community concerns and advance human rights locally.

B. Develop Robust Local Human Rights Indicators and Track Recognized Human Rights Concerns

The 2030 Sustainable Agenda offers state and local governments the opportunity to advance human rights locally by developing meaningful and locally relevant human rights indicators.

The SDGs are premised on the understanding that data can be harnessed to help address social, economic, and environmental challenges.[97] Through the creation of global, national, and local indicators, the SDGs are intended to yield data that governments can use to set benchmarks, guide decision-making, and measure needs, challenges, and progress towards achieving each of the seventeen Goals.[98] By developing human rights indicators, state and local

---

94.   Carey L. Biron, *How Baltimore is using the Sustainable Development Goals to make a more just city*, CITISCOPE (Mar. 9, 2017), http://citiscope.org/story/2017/how-baltimore-using-sustainable-development-goals-make-more-just-city.

95.   *Id.*

96.   UNIV. OF BALTIMORE & SUSTAINABLE DEV. SOLUTIONS NETWORK, *supra* note 77, at 48–49.

97.   G.A. Res. 70/1, *supra* note 2, ¶ 48.

98.   *See* U. N. SECRETARY-GENERAL'S INDEP. EXPERT ADVISORY GRP. ON A DATA REVOLUTION FOR SUSTAINABLE DEV., *supra* note 4.

governments can leverage the SDGs' emphasis on data to promote and advance human rights.

Human rights indicators have increasingly been recognized as a means of measuring governments' compliance with and progress on human rights.[99] U.N. officials, human rights experts, and advocates have urged the use of human rights indicators as a way for countries to provide statistical data to measure their own progress in respecting and promoting the rights contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the human rights treaties, and to enable civil society and independent human rights institutions to monitor a country's compliance with human rights treaty obligations.[100]

Responsive to this urging, in 2012, the OHCHR created a conceptual framework for developing human rights indicators.[101] The framework seeks to measure both enjoyment of human rights and a state's efforts towards compliance. Specifically, the OHCHR framework for human rights indicators calls for indicators related to structural measures, processes, and outcomes.[102] The OHCHR framework counsels that human rights indicators be both qualitative and quantitative, measuring objective and fact-based information (for example, the prevalence of children who are underweight), as well as subjective and perception-based information (for example, the percentage of people who report feeling safe walking alone at

---

99.   *See* Rosga & Satterthwaite, *supra* note 92, at 263–79 (discussing the move towards the development of human rights indicators by U.N. treaty bodies and the OHCHR); *see also* René Urueña, *Indicators and the Law: A Case Study of the Rule of Law Index*, *in* THE QUIET POWER OF INDICATORS: MEASURING GOVERNANCE, CORRUPTION, AND RULE OF LAW 75 (Sally Engle Merry et al. eds., 2015) (discussing the history, methodology, and role of a particular indicator, the Rule of Law Index).

100.   Rosga & Satterthwaite, *supra* note 92, at 263–79 (discussing origins and development of the OHCHR human rights indicator initiative).

101.   U.N. Office of the High Comm'r for Human Rights, *Human Rights Indicators: A Guide to Measurement and Implementation*, U.N. Doc. HR/PUB/12/5 (2012), http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/Human_rights_indicators_en.pdf.

102.   Structural indicators measure a country's commitment to implementing the right. This includes measuring the adoption of laws, policies, regulations, and other strategies to promote and protect the objective or right being measured. Process indicators assess a country's ongoing effort to implement human rights commitments. Outcome indicators measure the results (impact and effectiveness) of institutions, policies, and other processes. *Id.* at 34–38; Rosga & Satterthwaite, *supra* note 92, at 295–97.

night).[103] And, grounded in the core human rights principle of non-discrimination, the framework calls for indicators that are disaggregated according to gender, race, ethnicity, disability, age, and other factors contributing to inequality and rights violations.[104]

There is robust scholarly critique of human rights indicators.[105] For example, scholars raise concern that indicators may provide an incentive for governments to engage in rights violations in one area in order to demonstrate quantifiable success in other areas. And they have raised concern that, in some instances, the use of indicators may squelch more inclusive and participatory decision-making.[106]

While recognizing the validity of these and other critiques, scholars and human rights advocates nevertheless see potential benefit in using human rights indicators to measure progress towards the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda. A central reason for adopting human rights indicators to track progress towards achieving the SDGs is to ensure that human rights guide their implementation and that the Goals achieve core human rights priorities, including equality and non-discrimination.[107] The Center for Economic and Social Rights, for example, has developed a set of criteria to guide selection of human rights indicators and proposed a number of methodologies and indicator sets to inform the creation of global indicators for measuring progress towards the SDGs.[108]

Drawing on this guidance and the OHCHR framework, states and localities can engage with communities to create locally relevant and robust human rights indicators related to each of the seventeen Goals. Local indicators should be aligned with international human

---

    103.   U.N. Office of the High Comm'r for Human Rights, *supra* note 101, at 16–17.
    104.   *Id.* at 68–70.
    105.   *See* David Nelken, *Contesting Global Indicators, in* THE QUIET POWER OF INDICATORS: MEASURING GOVERNANCE, CORRUPTION, AND RULE OF LAW, *supra* note 99, at 317 (summarizing critiques of indicators related to both methodology and interpretation); Rosga & Satterthwaite, *supra* note 92, at 302–10.
    106.   Rosga & Satterthwaite, *supra* note 92, at 302–10.
    107.   CTR. FOR ECON. & SOC. RIGHTS, *supra* note 58, at 35 (explaining that there must be an accountability structure to ensure the achievement of human rights goals).
    108.   CTR. FOR ECON. & SOC. RIGHTS, THE MEASURE OF PROGRESS: HOW HUMAN RIGHTS SHOULD INFORM THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS INDICATORS (Oct. 2015), http://www.cesr.org/sites/default/files/downloads/cesr_measure_of_progress.pdf.

rights standards; measure inequalities and discrimination; capture perceptions and experiences of people living in poverty; and include indicators to measure the adoption of state and local laws and policies protecting human rights, ongoing efforts to implement human rights commitments, and the impact and effectiveness of these efforts.[109] Through the use of local human rights indicators, stakeholders can assess and report on the progress of states and localities towards achieving the SDGs in a way that is both consistent with, and supportive of, human rights.

Moreover, because the majority of the SDGs specifically relate to standards found in the universal human rights treaties, including those ratified by the United States, the SDGs offer states and localities an opportunity to develop human rights indicators that measure progress toward resolving recognized human rights concerns within the United States.[110] Thus, as part of their effort to formulate robust human rights indicators, states and localities can map the Goals to specific human rights recommendations the United States has received from the human rights treaty monitoring bodies, the U.N. special procedures, and the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, as well as those recommendations that the United States accepted through its second UPR.[111] By explicitly grounding state and local indicators in these recommendations, states and localities can create concrete benchmarks for measuring progress towards addressing acknowledged concerns. This progress can be

---

109.   *Id.* at 2–5.

110.   The Danish Institute for Human Rights has mapped the SDGs and targets to human rights standards, and found that more than ninety-two percent of the SDG targets can be linked to human rights standards. *See Human rights and the SDGs*, DANISH INST. FOR HUMAN RIGHTS, http://www.humanrights.dk/our-work/sustainable-development/human-rights-sdgs (last visited Sep. 17, 2017). In addition, the Danish Institute for Human Rights has developed a comprehensive resource guide delineating the human rights implications of the Sustainable Development Goals. *Id.* The OHCHR has created a chart linking each of the SDGs to the relevant human rights instruments, as well. *See Sustainable Development Goals*, U.N. OFFICE OF THE HIGH COMM'R FOR HUMAN RIGHTS, http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/MDGs/Post2015/SDG_HR_Table.pdf (last visited Oct. 4, 2017).

111.   Such an approach is consistent with Philip Alston's suggestion with respect to implementation of the MDGs, namely that "international human rights obligations voluntarily undertaken by the country concerned should be one of the key reference points taken into account in MDG planning and implementation." Alston, *supra* note 27, at 809.

assessed during human rights reporting opportunities and in the course of U.S. reporting on SDG implementation.[112]

For example, U.N. human rights treaty monitoring bodies and U.N. special procedures have recently expressed strong concern with persistent rates of maternal mortality among Black women in the United States and issued recommendations to the United States to address racial disparities in access to maternal health care.[113] During its second Universal Periodic Review, the United States accepted recommendation 316, to ensure equal access to quality maternal health services.[114] These recommendations correlate to Goal Three, to achieve good health and well-being; Goal Five, to address gender inequality; and Goal Ten, to reduce inequality within and among countries. States and cities can reference these recommendations in local human rights-based SDG indicators to ensure health, implement gender equality, and reduce inequalities more generally.

Through such mapping and subsequent reference and incorporation, both government and civil society can monitor and regularly assess improvements, gaps, and setbacks in addressing

---

112.   The U.N. Human Rights Council has noted the potential for the UPR to serve as a means for tracking countries' progress towards achieving the SDGs. President of the Human Rights Council, *supra* note 8, at 9; *see also* U.N. Office of the High Comm'r for Human Rights & Ctr. for Econ. & Soc. Rights, *supra* note 29, at 71 ("[D]ata generated by the review mechanisms for post-2015 global development goals should feed systematically into international human rights review and reporting processes."). The Chairs of the U.N. human rights treaty bodies have similarly noted the complementarity between the human rights treaty bodies and the High-level Political Forum, and the potential role of the treaty bodies as a source of data to support implementation and review of the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda. *See* U.N. OFFICE OF THE HIGH COMM'R FOR HUMAN RIGHTS, CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE 2030 AGENDA FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT 9 (2016), http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/MDGs/Post2015/HRTB_Contribution_26May2016.pdf (discussing the benefits of using the High-Level Political Forum, including consistency across states and accountability).

113.   Comm. on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, Concluding Observations on the Combined Seventh to Ninth Periodic Reports of the United States of America, ¶ 15, U.N. DOC. CERD/C/USA/CO/7-9 (Sept. 25, 2014); Human Rights Council, Report of the Working Group on the Issue of Discrimination Against Women in Law and in Practice, on its Mission to the United States, ¶¶ 72, 89, U.N. DOC. A/HRC/32/44/Add.2 (June 7, 2016); Human Rights Council, Report of the Working Group of Experts on People of African Descent on its Mission to the United States, ¶ 117, U.N. DOC. A/HRC/33/61/Add.2 (Aug. 18, 2016).

114.   Human Rights Council, *supra* note 113, ¶ 12.

recognized human rights concerns and aid the overall effort to develop locally relevant human rights indicators.[115]

C. Engage State and Local Human Rights Commissions and Other Relevant Agencies in Implementation and Follow-Up

While the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda lacks a rigorous accountability mechanism at the global level, localization of the SDGs offers opportunities for engaging local officials in human rights implementation, monitoring, and review.

State and local human rights commissions are uniquely well suited for this role. Within the United States, over 200 state and local commissions or agencies are mandated by state, county, or city government to enforce human and civil rights; conduct research, training, and public education; and issue policy recommendations related to civil and human rights concerns.[116] Commissions go by different names and have varying missions. Yet all generally operate to prevent and eliminate discrimination through a variety of means, including enforcing anti-discrimination laws and engaging in community education and training to prevent discrimination.[117]

In recent years, state and local human rights and human relations commissions have become increasingly interested in undertaking human rights activity.[118] The umbrella organization of state and local human rights and human relations agencies, the International Association of Official Human Rights Agencies (IAOHRA), has adopted several resolutions proclaiming its support for domestic incorporation of human rights treaties, with members pledging to undertake actions to integrate human rights standards and strategies into their daily functioning.[119]

---

115.   *See* Darrow, *supra* note 11, at 108 (noting that states should reflect progress towards the development goals in national reporting to the human rights treaty bodies and in the UPR).

116.   *See IAOHRA Members and Human Rights Agencies Database by State*, IOAHRA, http://www.iaohra.org/members (last visited Oct. 6, 2017); Kenneth L. Saunders & Hyo Eun (April) Bang, *A Historical Perspective on U.S. Human Rights Commissions*, *in* EXECUTIVE SESSION PAPERS, HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSIONS AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE 1, 1–4, 12, 14 (Marea L. Beeman ed., 2007).

117.   Saunders & Bang, *supra* note 116, at 1–4.

118.   Risa E. Kaufman, *State and Local Commissions as Sites for Domestic Human Rights Implementation*, *in* HUMAN RIGHTS IN THE UNITED STATES: BEYOND EXCEPTIONALISM 89 (Shareen Hertel & Kathryn Libal eds., 2011).

119.   IAOHRA member agencies, through resolutions using same or similar language, have repeatedly affirmed the importance of integrating international

Several local and state commissions have taken up the charge. For example, in 2014, the Tennessee Human Rights Commission held a series of statewide hearings on the status of human rights in Tennessee, resulting in an omnibus human rights report.[120] Other commissions have explicitly incorporated human rights into their approach. The Portland, Oregon Human Rights Commission incorporated the Universal Declaration of Human Rights into its bylaws.[121] The Eugene, Oregon Human Rights Commission's mandate is to support and promote the full range of human rights within the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.[122]

Consistent with these efforts to advance human rights locally, state and local human rights commissions and other state and local agencies can play a key role in SDG implementation. For example, they can convene community members to participate in the development of locally relevant, human rights-based SDG indicators. State and local commissions can hold hearings and community consultations to assess local progress towards meeting the Goals. And they can issue reports assessing where there has been progress made and where gaps remain. Indeed, several local agencies already use human rights standards as benchmarks to understand the potential impact of local policies and decisions and measure program effectiveness.[123]

---

human rights into their work. *See e.g.*, INT'L ASS'N OF OFFICIAL HUMAN RIGHTS AGENCIES, *International Human Rights, Res. No. 1, in* 2010 IAOHRA CONFERENCE (2010), http://media.wix.com/ugd/a7a927_73da08ea3665440ba9893c0df9cdec83.pdf (resolving that member agencies should affirm the importance of integrating international human rights into their work); INT'L ASS'N OF OFFICIAL HUMAN RIGHTS AGENCIES, *International Human Rights, Res. No. 4, in* 2011 IAOHRA CONFERENCE (2011), http://media.wix.com/ugd/a7a927_4723ddaa49a34399b7e5791a32732aeb.pdf; INT'L ASS'N OF OFFICIAL HUMAN RIGHTS AGENCIES, *International Human Rights, Res. No. 2, in* 2013 IAOHRA CONFERENCE (2013), http://media.wix.com/ugd/a7a927_17083b2eea2b4c3fae1484ea3a66e7eb.pdf.

120.   TENN. HUMAN RIGHTS COMM'N, THE STATUS OF HUMAN RIGHTS IN TENNESSEE 5–6 (2014), https://www.tn.gov/assets/entities/humanrights/attachments/FINAL_The_Status_of_Human_Rights_in_Tennessee_11.21.14.pdf.

121.   HUMAN RIGHTS COMM'N, BYLAWS, Art. II (2013).

122.   Eugene, Or., Ordinance 20481 (Nov. 28, 2011) (broadening the Eugene Human Rights Commission's mandate to promote and support the full range of human rights within the Universal Declaration of Human Rights).

123.   San Francisco's early adoption of a local ordinance implementing the human rights norms and principles of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) requires that the city's government agencies and departments implement the standards of CEDAW and "integrate gender equity and human rights principles into all of its operations."

By playing a monitoring function, state and local human rights commissions can also contribute to human rights treaty reporting and U.S. reporting for the Universal Periodic Review, noting progress and gaps in local SDG implementation when the United States comes up for review. As many commentators have noted, engaging international and regional human rights mechanisms, including human rights treaty bodies, the Universal Periodic Review, and the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, will help to fill the accountability gap of the SDGs and ensure that the SDGs contribute towards the overall realization of human rights.[124]

Such a role for state and local human rights commissions in SDG implementation is consistent with that urged for National Human Rights Institutions (NHRIs), including national Human Rights Commissions. Although the United States does not have a NHRI, such institutions exist in countries across the globe and are

---

S.F., CAL., ADMIN. CODE ch.12, § 12K.4 (1998). To implement the ordinance, the city's Commission on the Status of Women conducts a gender analysis of the budget, services, and employment practices of selected city departments to identify barriers and discrimination against women. *See* ANU MENON, S.F. DEP'T ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN, HUMAN RIGHTS IN ACTION: SAN FRANCISCO'S LOCAL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS' WOMEN'S TREATY (CEDAW) 8 (2010).

Similarly, inspired by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the government of Eugene, Oregon, has developed the "triple bottom line framework," which encourages city decision-makers to take into account the environmental, equity, and economic impacts and benefits of policy proposals, budget choices, and other city projects and initiatives. The assessment tool prioritizes the protection and fulfillment of the full panoply of rights in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. *See* CITY OF EUGENE, TRIPLE BOTTOM LINE FRAMEWORK (June 2013), https://www.eugene-or.gov/index.aspx?NID=512 (describing the Triple Bottom Analysis Tool and its uses). The tool has informed policy decisions related to the assessment of brownfield sites and transportation investments. *See* CITY OF EUGENE SUSTAINABILITY COMM'N, MEETING AGENDA (Mar. 20, 2013), http://www.eugene-or.gov/ArchiveCenter/ViewFile/Item/2277. And it has influenced programming and budget allocations within the city's recreation department. *See* CITY OF EUGENE LIBRARY, RECREATION AND CULTURAL SERVS., ANNUAL REPORT (2010), http://issuu.com/cityofeugenerecreation/docs/eugenelrcsannualreport2010web.

And Portland, Oregon's Human Rights Commission has adopted a Human Rights Impact Analysis, which informs its recommendations to the Mayor and Human Rights Council. COLUMBIA LAW SCH. HUMAN RIGHTS INST., USING HUMAN RIGHTS ASSESSMENTS IN LOCAL GOVERNANCE: A TOOLKIT FOR STATE AND LOCAL HUMAN RIGHTS AND HUMAN RELATIONS COMMISSIONS 6 (2014), http://www.law.columbia.edu/sites/default/files/microsites/human-rights-institute/files/iaohra_toolkit_9.11.14_reduced.pdf.

124.   *See* CTR. FOR SOC. & ECON. RIGHTS, *supra* note 58, at 37–38.

charged with monitoring and promoting governments' compliance with human rights.[125] In 2015, the Global Alliance of NHRIs adopted the Mérida Declaration, outlining ways in which NHRIs can contribute to implementation and follow up of the SDGs, including developing human rights indicators, promoting a transparent and inclusive process for participation, and monitoring progress towards implementation.[126] Within the United States, state and local human rights commissions and other local agencies can draw upon this international guidance and emerging good practices[127] to leverage their unique role and advance human rights locally through the SDGs.

CONCLUSION

Throughout the United States, local communities daily confront human rights challenges, including food insecurity, police brutality, racial disparities in infant and maternal mortality rates, and lack of affordable housing. As a global agenda for eradicating extreme poverty, the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda sets such local issues in its sights and offers an important opportunity for states and localities within the United States to assess needs, set benchmarks, and measure progress towards implementing solutions. By ensuring a participatory and transparent approach to indicator formation and data collection, integrating human rights principles into every aspect of implementation, follow up, and review, and engaging the unique functions of state and local human rights commissions, states and localities within the United States can implement the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda in a way that

---

125.   *See* G.A. Res. 48/134 (Dec. 20, 1993) (suggesting a set of objectives and minimum standards for national human rights institutions).

126.   INT'L COORDINATING COMM. FOR NAT'L HUMAN RIGHTS INST., THE MÉRIDA DECLARATION (2015), http://nhri.ohchr.org/EN/ICC/International Conference/12IC/Background%20Information/Merida%20Declaration%20FINAL.p df; *see also* NADJA FILSKOV, GLOBAL ALL. OF NAT'L HUMAN RIGHTS INST, NATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS INSTITUTION ENGAGING WITH THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS (SDG) (2017), http://nhri.ohchr.org/EN/News/Documents/ GANHRI_NHRIs%20engaging%20with%20the%20SDGs.pdf   (discussing   the Mérida Declaration and the role of NHRIs in SDG implementation).

127.   *See* STEVEN L.B. JENSEN ET AL., DANISH INST. FOR HUMAN RIGHTS & CTR. FOR ECON. & SOC. AFFAIRS, REALIZING RIGHTS THROUGH THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS: THE ROLE OF NATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS INSTITUTIONS 1, 5–6 (2015), https://www.humanrights.dk/sites/humanrights.dk/files/media/ dokumenter/udgivelser/research/nhri_briefingpaper_may2015.pdf.

maximizes the Agenda's potential for advancing human rights at home.