FINAL TECHNICAL REPORT GLOBAL CENTRE FOR PLURALISM CENTRE MONDIAL DU PLURALISME

Global Centre for Pluralism

Global Centre for Pluralism

Final Technical Report

Leaving No One Behind: Addressing Inequalities and Exclusions through a Global Pluralism Monitor

Global Centre for Pluralism
Ottawa, ON

GLOBAL PLURALISM MONITOR
IDRC FINAL TECHNICAL REPORT
September 2023

Executive Summary

The *Leaving No One Behind: Addressing Inequalities and Exclusions through a Global Pluralism Monitor* project supported the further development and expansion of the Global Pluralism Monitor (the Monitor), a national-level evaluation tool that assesses the state of pluralism in a country. The outcomes of this three-year project confirm the Monitor's value as a unique and robust tool to support decision-making, policies and catalyze pathways for advancing pluralism in societies globally.

The Global Centre for Pluralism (the Centre) developed the Monitor to enable practitioners and policymakers to identify sources of inequality, exclusion and division in societies, and track trends over time. The Monitor's holistic design also supports recognition of the opportunities and pathways to strengthen pluralistic policies and practices. Monitor assessments were undertaken in 22 countries in this phase of the project.[1] This phase of the Monitor project builds off research involving a series of country case studies and how pluralism links with existing fields of practice supported by IDRC in 2016 followed by the development and piloting of the pluralism framework and methodology in 2019, which was also supported by IDRC.

The first year of the project produced several innovations critical to the current success of the project. These included an intersectional review, leading to the incorporation of an intersectional gender approach across all indicators and diversity groups. As a result, gender analysis constitutes a core element of the Monitor methodology allowing for more nuanced data on the status of women and girls in a society. A more rigorous approach to selecting salient diversity types (ethnocultural groups/peoples) in a country was also developed. This helps actualize the Monitor's ability to disaggregate experiences within and across groups which is key to surfacing trends and avenues to make progress. Finally, a "leadership for pluralism" dimension in the assessment framework was fully developed. This dimension looks carefully at non-state actors as potential enablers or spoilers for strengthening pluralism, recognizing that government does not fully determine the state of pluralism in a country. These steps underpinned the production of robust Monitor reports and impactful post-assessment, in-country engagement opportunities.

Successful recruitment of representative, multidisciplinary assessment teams with gender analysis capacity on the teams ensured the necessary expertise for implementing Monitor assessments. The Centre also implemented Pluralism Perceptions Surveys for all countries under assessment. This quantitative data complements the Monitor's qualitative assessment framework. A partnership with Afrobarometer generated data on 36 countries in Africa, including the 6 countries under assessment. Ipsos conducted all

---

[1] The countries assessed in this phase include: Afghanistan, Australia, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Colombia, Germany, Ghana, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Malaysia, Mexico, Nigeria, South Africa, South Korea, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tunisia in the United Kingdom. Assessments could not be completed in Afghanistan and Ukraine due to insecurity and upheaval in each case.

the other surveys, excluding Afghanistan, to ensure timely availability of the data. The survey data will be publicly available in the near future.

The Centre has taken a deliberate, co-creative approach to engaging in-country stakeholders on the Monitor reports, with the process being led by in-country partners. The Centre established partnerships with key civil society organisations (CSOs), particularly those that act as networks for other CSOs and/or governmental authorities. This approach has proven critical to the successful utilization of reports. For example, efforts in Ghana are advancing dialogue on affirmative action policies, regionally based inequalities and the impact of ethnic identities on political outcomes. Work in Malaysia looks at pluralism in relation to questions of constitutionally-rooted inequalities, sectarian mobilization in politics and the ability of youth to make a positive impact.

In-country engagement on the reports has also confirmed the value of the Monitor framework and methodology as a tool to inform practical actions for pluralism. In Colombia, partners are innovating a monitoring tool adapted in part from the Monitor framework to track implementation of the Ethnic Chapter of the 2016 Peace Accord with emphasis on the 'Women, Family and Generations' section of the Ethnic Chapter. Partners in Sri Lanka are looking to socialize the Monitor framework of analysis with government officials and other CSOs. This seeks to bring a pluralism lens to decision-making in government and to equip non-state actors with a new tool that can be adapted to support their current efforts.

Finally, the project supported the development of the [Global Pluralism Monitor website](#), designed to profile the reports, advance awareness of key findings and trends as well as advance engagement by elevating the profile of work being done to strengthen pluralism by non-state and state actors.

The Research Problem

There is growing consensus that inclusion is core to sustainable development, and that everyone should participate in and benefit from development, regardless of gender or cultural background. However, vulnerable groups, including religious and ethno-cultural minorities, Indigenous groups, and women and girls are subject to various forms of exclusion in political, economic, and social domains, often in intersecting ways that compound disadvantage. Despite this conceptual recognition of the importance of inclusion, progress on addressing the challenges has been limited. A major obstacle is the lack of reliable and consistent disaggregated data to measure exclusion and group-based inequalities and monitor progress. The Global Centre for Pluralism (the Centre) developed the Global Pluralism Monitor (the Monitor, formerly the Global Pluralism Index) to enable practitioners and policymakers to identify the sources of inequality, exclusion and division in societies, and track trends over time.

The Centre broadly refers to the institutional frameworks that define state-society (vertical) relations as the 'hardware' of pluralism. The norms and attitudes of people and groups underpinning society-society (horizontal) relations are termed the 'software' of pluralism. The Centre's hardware and software framing explicitly connote the interdependence of state institutions and societal norms in shaping how a society responds to diversity and thereby strengthens or weakens pluralism. The Monitor's analytical framework reflects this conceptual understanding of pluralism by incorporating dimensions and indicators capturing data on the hardware and software of pluralism to help identify and address underlying sources of persistent, group-based inequalities, exclusions, and marginalization. This aims to increase appreciation

for the multiple ways state and society interact to become more pluralistic and increase inclusion. Using this innovative and holistic approach, the Monitor is contributing valuable data to global efforts to measure and track inclusion as part of Agenda 2030, as well as add value to ongoing efforts in the field of upstream conflict prevention.

This project builds off two prior projects supported by IDRC. In 2016, IDRC supported research (Project #108291-001), including country case studies and how pluralism links with existing fields of practice. In 2019, IDRC supported the development and piloting of the pluralism framework and methodology (Project # 108962). Based on the foundation of these previous interventions, GCP requested support to take the work of the Global Pluralism Monitor forward—incorporating the lessons learnt from the pilot, building the necessary systems and structures to scale results, and expanding assessment in six countries.

Objectives

General Objective: *Develop the partnerships, capacities, and structures to scale the Monitor to a wide geographic coverage, capturing different kinds of pluralism experiences around the world and engage stakeholders to use the findings to advance more inclusive policies and practices.*

By early 2021, the Centre recognized that this assessment tool was not actually an index that produces a ranked ordering of cases, or in this case countries. The Centre underwent a reflection and review process to identify how ontologically and epistemologically the assessment tool and framework measure a country against itself and can track that country's pluralism journey over time. The project was renamed Global Pluralism Monitor to reflect that while it is neither designed nor intended to produce a rank ordering of countries, it can allow for a country to measure itself over time, while also drawing from comparative learning across countries.

The understanding that this project is not producing a global index on pluralism also reduced emphasis on the imperative to dramatically scale up the number of assessed countries and led to an adjustment of the timeframe for reassessment of countries. The Centre still sought to assess a substantial number of countries to allow for both meaningful progress and maximum learning through ambitious implementation, and carefully examined the pathways to scale the number of countries by combining IDRC's support with the Centre's own funds and those from other partners, including Global Affairs Canada (GAC) and Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung (KAS). As the interim reports indicate, the project initially sought to assess 30 countries. However, through the implementation of the assessment process, the Centre realised that this target was impracticable based on two fundamental lessons: (1) the teams in each country required more time and technical support than initially anticipated to complete the country assessment and final report, and (2) the importance of strong, locally led partnerships to drive stakeholder engagement meant it took more time to understand how the report findings and frameworks can best support in-country change processes. The decision to reduce the overall number of countries assessed supports greater realisation of the specific objectives of the project and will inform the review and scaling of the Monitor in subsequent stages.

In the end, assessment was initiated in 22 countries: Afghanistan, Australia, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Colombia, Germany, Ghana, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Malaysia, Mexico, Nigeria, South Africa, South Korea, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tunisia, Ukraine and the United Kingdom.

Assessments could not be completed in Afghanistan and Ukraine due to the onset of massive insecurity and upheaval in each case. As a result, 20 countries were assessed as part of this phase of project implementation. IDRC's funding supported assessments in 6 countries as well as other essential processes such as data visualization and gathering of Pluralism Perceptions Survey data at a large scale across Africa in partnership with Afrobarometer.

Specific Objective #1: *Refine the framework and methodology of the Monitor and improve its ability to measure the treatment of diversity with an intersectional lens and capture different kinds of pluralism experiences and regional variation.*

A thorough review of the Monitor framework and methodology was conducted in the first year of the project, including engaging a wide array of experts throughout the review process (i.e. the Technical Advisory Committee and pilot assessors) and undertaking an intersectional review of the tool. Final revisions included incorporating an intersectional gender approach across all indicators and diversity groups, a more rigours approach to selecting salient diversity types in a given country, and the addition of "leadership for pluralism" as a dimension in the assessment framework. GCP also updated the methodology of assessment and the process for orienting Country Assessment Teams.

Monitor reports are produced by three-member expert assessment teams recruited from the country being assessed and/or who have significant experience in the country. Two assessors individually conduct the assessments, and the reviewer works with the assessors to consolidate findings into a final report. The revised Monitor framework has proven to be robust based on follow-up review discussions with assessment team members. Almost all assessment team members indicate an enhanced understanding for the importance of pluralism, and some have begun utilizing understandings of pluralism in their own work as academics and practitioners. They also indicate an appreciation for the technical design of the Monitor framework.

The Monitor framework does present some challenges because it is unique and does not take the shape of a typical policy/research report or academic paper. The Centre's staff developed a thorough process and schedule to ensure the required support, with three sessions taking place throughout the assessment phase based on certain milestones. The last session takes place when both assessments are complete to inform the work of the reviewer, who consolidates the assessments. In order to ensure the integrity of the assessment, to optimise the expertise of the assessment teams, and to not affect the substance of the issues, the Centre's staff only provide guidance on the technical application of the methodology and framework of analysis.

Based on the recommendation of the intersectional review and the inputs of the overall Monitor review process, the Centre ensured the importance of deeply centering gender and intersectional analysis throughout the Monitor's design. As such, the revised methodology requires that the treatment of women and girls for each diversity group in a country is assessed across each indicator. Recruitment of assessment team members deliberately sought to establish gender analysis expertise on the team to ensure their capacity to implement this critical aspect of the methodology.

Specific Objective #2: *Build a network of partners in the Global South to ground the Monitor in regional contexts and facilitate implementation of the Index.*

The objective of developing a network of regional partners to facilitate implementation of Monitor assessments was premised on the original concept of creating a global index that measured and ranked pluralism in countries. With the shift toward developing a tool to measure pluralism within a country against itself, the focus on regional partnership shifted. However, the importance of partnership did not change. Indeed, the importance of strong in-county partnerships only increased as progress was made toward learning from implementation of assessments in 20 countries alongside in-country engagement. Partnerships for in-country engagement have been established in Colombia, Ghana, Malaysia, and Sri Lanka, while the Centre is in the process of developing partnerships in South Africa and is also exploring the possibility for in-country engagement in Jordan.

Moving forward there are various opportunities to develop and strengthen regional partnerships. For example, as a regional organisation itself, CDD Ghana provides opportunities for collaboration across a number of West African counties. In Colombia, our country-based partners' networks provide a basis to learn about and develop potential partnerships with regional organisations. Finally, specific themes arising across Monitor reports create opportunities to develop regional partnerships. Indigeneity is a theme in 10 of the Monitor-assessed countries, underpinning the development of a partnership with the Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact (AIPP). This regional partnership allows the Centre to explore whether and how the strengthening of pluralism can increase the flourishing of Indigenous peoples. More about the specifics of engagement are discussed below under 'Objective 5.'

Specific Objective #3: *Establish capacities and partnerships for perception survey data collection to support long-term scaling of the Monitor.*

The Centre undertook two approaches to perception survey data collection. A partnership was established with Afrobarometer that incorporated a set of core questions from the Pluralism Perception Survey into the Round 9 survey conducted by Afrobarometer. As a result of this partnership, the Centre now has data for 36 countries in Africa.

Sequencing of assessments in Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria, South Africa, Sudan, and Tunisia became a critical aspect of coordinating with Afrobarometer. Large scale survey efforts such as those conducted by Afrobarometer are impacted by a range of issues, including the schedules of national statistical agencies, periods of insecurity in some countries, and the COVID-19 pandemic. Regular communication and updates from Afrobarometer were essential to sequencing the work of assessment teams to ensure data was gathered and ready for use. The Ghanaian and Nigerian assessment teams concluded their assessments without the use of the perception survey data due to excessive delays created by their respective national statistics agencies. In every other country under Monitor assessment, the Centre was able to sequence the work of assessment teams to benefit from the survey data. Assessment teams in Ghana and Nigeria were able to draw on other relevant perception surveys to complete their assessments. The Centre is considering ways to connect the Pluralism Perceptions Survey with findings in these reports given its ability to generate data that other surveys do not capture.

The pluralism perception survey data for 36 countries in Africa represents a massive and valuable data set that the Centre is currently analyzing to support current and forthcoming research initiatives. The large-scale implementation of perception survey data generates an understanding of important dynamics around pluralism on a country-by-country basis across Africa that will underpin country-specific and comparative research. Operationally, gathering large scale data in this fashion will enrich the decision-making process on future assessments in Africa by accounting for survey results in country selection criteria for future assessments. An economy of scale was achieved through large-scale implementation. However, the full value of this cost savings is weighed against coordinating Monitor assessment completion around the schedule of a massive survey implementation agenda that can cause extensive delays through no fault of the survey implementer.

The Centre relied on IPSOS to implement the Pluralism Perception Survey in all countries outside of Africa, except for Afghanistan. Contracts with IPSOS were on a country-by-country basis and could be scheduled to work within the timeline of the assessments. However, this approach did not serve the objective of building large scale implementation of Pluralism Perception Surveys. Deliberations with in-country partners indicates the potential for future surveys to be conducted by in-country survey providers. This will be explored to determine if these surveys can be implemented with greater contextual sensitivity and possibly cost savings that can allow for the implementation of more surveys and free-up resources for greater in-country engagement work.

Specific Objective #4: *Build systems and capacity for data analysis and visualization.*

Data Analysis: A dedicated, external data analyst whose research relates the work of the Centre prepared analysis reports on the survey data that the country teams used for their work. The data analyst also provided direct support to the assessment teams upon request, including any requests about manipulating the data to explore correlations and connections. This work is ongoing with Sudan due to delays in receiving the survey data and because of the continued conflict. It is worth noting that two members of the Sudanese assessment team expressed their desire to continue with the assessment once they were safely settled outside of the country, indicating that it is even more critical to produce a Monitor report in light of recent developments in that country.

Data analysis for the additional 30 countries covered by Afrobarometer that were not part of the first wave of Monitor implementation is underway. Statistical reports produced from this data will inform a program of research developed in collaboration with the data analyst and partners in the region. The data analyst is also currently working on a full review of all the survey data gathered and the pluralism perception survey instrument itself, which will underpin ways the survey instrument and survey implementation process can be improved for future assessments. It will also support the optimal presentation of the data on the Global Pluralism Monitor website.

Monitor Website and Data Visualization: The Centre has been working with a web design and communications company specializing in providing services to organizations in the challenging space of social transformation. This began with the development of branding guidelines for the Monitor and progressed to website design and development. The main emphasis is on the optimal presentation of the report findings, with the goal of making the Global Pluralism Monitor website a tool for disseminating the

findings, supporting wider stakeholder engagement, and facilitating access to information on issues of relevance to researchers and decision-makers. While visiting the website, users can access/download the full reports and view key findings and summaries across indicators.

The website also enables the Centre to profile work being done toward progress on key issues and challenges identified on a country-by-country basis, as well as on core themes that cut across multiple countries. The Centre's staff will track these issues through the networks developed in implementing the Monitor assessments to generate this content. In addition, a number of communications resources and assets have been developed, including social media tools and strategies, to increase awareness and invite engagement with Monitor reports and key findings. All of this aims to make the website a driver of engagement by advancing dialogue and expanding networks to support efforts to strengthen pluralism.

Specific Objective #5: *Engage stakeholders around findings to inform policies and practices in selected countries.*

Whereas the Monitor reports serve as roadmaps for the change required to strengthen pluralism in each country, Monitor-based stakeholder engagement serves to support the actors working to bring about change in that country. The framework enables systematic identification of key issues, recognition of actors operating in those spaces, and appreciation for the potential policy/practice on ramps where those in the country are seeking to make progress.

Strengthening pluralism is a form of social transformation and will only happen by centering the leadership and taking direction from those directly implicated. The Centre has taken a deliberate, co-creative approach to engaging in-country stakeholders, with the process being led by our in-country partners. The Centre has established partnerships with key civil society organisations (CSOs), particularly those that act as networks for other CSOs and/or governmental authorities. Based on the co-creative process and the priorities identified by our partners, engagement activities look different in each. In some countries, activities are based on issues identified in the report that coincide with the work of the partner organization. In other countries, engagement is focussed on the potential of the Monitor to inform local processes, with the framework and methodology being adapted to the specific context and used to inform decision-making.

Variation of contexts, range of issues, maximising impact, and learning outcomes underpinned the choice of countries for in-country engagement, with activities underway or scheduled in Colombia, Ghana, Malaysia, and Sri Lanka. The wide variety of topics and different approaches to engagement across countries is demonstrated in the description of activities below:

Colombia: The Monitor report in Colombia focuses on Afro-Colombian, Indigenous, peasant, and Roma peoples, with the Centre establishing partnerships with the Consultancy for Human Rights and Development (CODHES) and Women of the Ethnic Commission Returning Together to the Root – Mujeres de la Comisión Étnica (MCE). [CODHES](#) is a civil society organization (CSO) advancing human rights, humanitarian law and the promotion of sustainable peace. MCE is made up of members of the Ethnic Commission for the Peace and Defense of Territorial Rights focussed on the implementation of the Ethnic Chapter of the 2016 Peace Accord. Specifically, MCE works to incorporate the experiences, backgrounds,

and perspectives of gender, women, family, and multiple generations in the implementation of the Ethnic Chapter. Both CODHES and MCE bring together civil society leaders across Afro-Colombian and Indigenous peoples to collaborate in their respective work. Using a co-creative process, an engagement agenda was developed with both partners to better understand how Afro-Colombian and Indigenous leaders can use the Monitor's framework of analysis and methodology to strengthen pluralism.

The collaboration with CODHES is designed to consider how the Monitor's framework of analysis can support the monitoring of the implementation of the recommendations for Guarantees of Non-Repetition (GNR) identified in the final report of Colombia's Truth Commission (CEV). CODHES and the Centre organized two regional workshops, one in September 2022 in the Pacific region and one in November 2022 in the Caribbean region. These regions have high concentrations of Indigenous and Afro-Colombian communities deeply impacted by the civil war. Over 35 social leaders from CSOs/CBOs participated, especially those from women's organizations. The collaborative design created space for participants to critically review the Monitor's findings and framework of analysis in relation to the GNR and their own work. For example, participants formed groups to both apply and comment on the value of specific dimensions and indicators to their local context. Participants aggregated their observations at the end of each workshop, with both groups identifying the distinct experiences of Indigenous and Afro-Colombian peoples. For example, discussions addressed the existence of greater protections for Indigenous peoples and the importance of the rural-urban divide within each group, confirming the value of the Monitor's disaggregated design that requires the selection of specific diversity groups/peoples with separate scores for each indicator. Participants discussed that levels of recognition, respect, and protection of diversity are extremely low across ethnic peoples, even with the presence of legal and constitutional protections and commitments.

The regional workshops led to the design of a national forum in Bogotá in March 2023, which echoed the view that pluralism and specifically the Monitor provide an important evaluative lens. Social leaders believe that the way to improve the living conditions of those in the territories is through accurate, community-driven data, and community participation. Monitoring pluralism at the territorial level can provide a more accurate baseline to measure the effectiveness of the GNR, allowing for an understanding of what weakens/strengthens pluralism. However, communities need to tailor the framework and methodology to their local contexts. National Forum participants also identified the importance of government support to make territorial monitoring a reality. The Centre is continuing its dialogue with partners and a growing network of contacts to understand how best to support these efforts going forward.

Collaboration with MCE began when they invited the Centre to join an MCE-planned retreat in Cali, Colombia that took place in October 2022. MCE's holistic approach to advocacy and community work is grounded in a recognition of the diverse experiences within and across Afro-Colombian and Indigenous peoples and centres on the value rooted in embracing and preserving the diversity of their network. In many ways, this embodies pluralism in practice. The retreat brought together the Indigenous, Afro-Colombian, and gender diverse women representing MCE's CSO/CBO network. The agenda focussed on the ways MCE can play an active role to apply their ingenuity to the implementation of the Ethnic Chapter of the 2016 Peace Accord, and more specifically on implementation of the 'Women, Family, and Generations' section of the Ethnic Chapter. The agenda showcased the use of traditional teachings with

technical expertise in human rights monitoring and offered those working on the rights of ethnic peoples a chance to directly input on the way forward for MCE. Adopting a participatory approach, the Centre presented the Monitor framework and methodology, along with the findings for Colombia. Participants found value in the Monitor, recognising that the methodology accounts for the status of ethnic groups in Colombia across many different dimensions, such as international and domestic law, politics and leadership, group inequalities and belonging between ethnic peoples and the wider Colombian society.

Deliberations, however, overwhelmingly turned to an exploration of the importance of moving from a national-level evaluation to a territorial, community-based application. Based on discussions during the retreat, MCE assembled a technical group to prepare findings on adapting and applying the Monitor framework and methodology to their work. In 2023, these discussions led to a formal partnership with MCE. The Centre is serving as a technical resource to MCE as it works on the development of a monitoring tool that MCE's network and other women CSO/CBO leaders in affected communities can utilize to monitor implementation of the Ethnic Chapter of the 2016 Peace Accord.

Indigenous and Afro-Colombian knowledge systems underpin the adaptation of the framework and development of a methodology. MCE's innovations incorporate data gathering through community-based, collective memory research to create a baseline for the monitoring tool they are developing. It is exciting to see the use of traditional social spaces created by women to establish safety for participants in the difficult process of collective memory research. Participatory dialogues in communities, as well as more conventional forms of data analysis, will enable data gathering on current conditions and future expectations for the implementation of the Ethnic Chapter of the peace agreement. MCE formally launched this effort in Bogotá in May 2023 at an event attended by a network of Indigenous and Afro-Colombian social leaders, officials from the Ministry of Justice, and several foreign representatives. Since then, MCE has focussed on the technical design of the monitoring tool, with the Centre continuing to share experience from the design of the Monitor. MCE is now set to pilot its tool in several communities in the Yurumangui river basin, starting with activities to socialize and train women from impacted communities on the tool. The Centre is eager to both support and accompany MCE on this next, critical phase in its efforts to strengthen pluralism in Colombia.

Ghana: Engagement activities in Ghana are based on collaboration with the Ghana Centre for Democratic Development (CDD Ghana) and other groups and individuals working on issues related to pluralism. [CDD Ghana](#) is an organisation committed to instilling democratic values and institutionalisation of good governance practices in Ghana and Africa through robust public opinion surveys and applied policy research. They are a convenor that brings together state and non-state actors to discuss salient policy challenges and a capacity-building organisation that educates change agents in support of policy reform.

The engagement agenda took shape through a series of discussions with CDD Ghana that identified issues most relevant to their work and the current political and social landscape in the country. From mid-late April 2023, CDD Ghana planned and facilitated three events aimed at advancing policy conversations with diverse audiences based on the Monitor's key findings, including (i) how ethnic and religious diversity operates in the country; (ii) the unequal position of women and girls in Ghanaian society; and (iii) the inequality faced by those living in Northern Ghana.

The first event was a formal launch of the Monitor report, where a presentation of Monitor report was followed by two experts presenting technical reviews of the findings. Attendees included CSO representatives, academics, community members, government representatives, and the media. While the discussion covered the core themes identified by CDD Ghana, it also identified the salience of regional security concerns arising from ethnically framed tensions between Fulani pastoralists and farmers—a topic that was sustained in further discussions during engagement in Ghana. These discussions affirmed the Centre's understanding that in addition to identifying issues at a national level of assessment, the Monitor can add real value by seeing these dynamics through a pluralism lens to enrich the policy discussion. For example, one participant referred to the Monitor report in the context of the discussions as a 'google or digital map' to enhance the understanding and approach to complicated challenges. Extensive media coverage reflected wider interest in the Monitor report and served to expand the scope of discussion. More information on the impact of engagement in Ghana are available at [Affirmative Action Roundtable with CDD Ghana | Global Centre for Pluralism](#).

The second event addressed gender inequality in Ghana, more specifically the Affirmative Action Bill introduced in 2011, which is a tangible mechanism to address gender inequality. The Bill has yet to be passed into law and needs critical support and amplification if it is to succeed. The Affirmative Action Roundtable brought together representatives from the Ministry of Gender, Children, and Social Protection, the Affirmative Action Coalition, and other CSOs and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) working on the issue. A commitment was made by Mrs. Faustina Acheampong, Director of Gender from the Ministry of Gender, Children, and Social Protection to put forward the bill to the Executive. There was a renewed belief on the importance of this legislation, with one attendee who had been working on the rights of women and girls for many years stating that this had motivated her to re-commit to work on the Bill after many years of inaction and resistance from the government.

The last event centered on regional diversity and was held in the in Damango in the Savanna Region in northern Ghana to specifically focus on the severity of North-South inequality. CDD-Ghana organised a community meeting with faith leaders, community members, local politicians from the District Assembly, and CSO/NGO representatives to discuss findings related to ethnic minorities and their lack of political inclusion and access to critical infrastructure and other social amenities in the North. The meeting gave space to District Assembly members to provide information on their municipality's access to healthcare and education, and other constituents' needs. Participants affirmed the findings on the inequities in the North of Ghana and the activities connected different actors with the intention of generating assistance for local initiatives.

Ongoing dialogue with CDD Ghana offers several opportunities to further advance the application of a pluralism lens. The Centre remains committed to accompanying partners in relation to the state of pluralism in Ghana as these conversations continue.

Malaysia: In-country engagement in Malaysia is based on partnership with the All-Party Parliamentary Group Malaysia on SDGs ([APPGM SDG](#)). It was founded in Jan 2O2O by individuals from the Malaysian CSO SDG Alliance to serve as the legal entity to manage the localising of SDGs with parliamentarians. Since 2020, the APPGM SDG has undertaken mapping of local needs in 84 parliamentary constituencies as well as undertaken 260 SDG micro-SDG solution projects at the grassroots level addressing economic, social

and environmental concerns. The APPGM SDG has enlisted the support 132 solution providers of whom a majority are CSOs and NGOs.

The co-creative process with APPGM SDG produced an engagement plan grounded in core themes in the Global Pluralism Monitor: Malaysia report. Engagement in Malaysia took place over the end of August and early September 2023. APPGM SDG planned activities with the aim of advancing an understanding of the ways a pluralism lens offers a new perspective on pressing societal challenges identified in the Monitor report. The themes range from the constitutional foundations of group-based differences to the potential for majority-group 'blind spots' to group-based negatively affecting minorities, to dynamics around religion and identity that can impede strengthening pluralism.

The agenda involved meetings with a range of political officials and prominent experts to share the findings of the Monitor report on Malaysia and the Monitor's framework of analysis and methodology. Centre staff and representatives of APPGM SDG attended these meetings together. Meetings with senior government leaders and officials leaned into the difficult issues in an open and respectful form. Among other things, officials expressed the intention of responding in writing to the findings of the Monitor report on Malaysia. This can serve as one component of a sustained dialogue that involves government decision-makers, a wide variety of implicated CSOs and policy institutes, as well as the Centre. Again, the Centre's role in these dialogues will proceed based on partnership and ethical allyship front-ending the leadership role of those working on the issues in Malaysia in conversation with the Centre.

The Centre also had the opportunity to present the Monitor report for Malaysia at the 'Malaysian SDG Conference 2023 – Building Inclusive Communities' held in Kuching, Sarawak on Sept. 2-3, 2023. This conference is one of four being held in Malaysia to advance progress in realizing the SDGs. The choice of attending the conference in Sarawak is connected to recent enabling legislation to actualize constitutional provisions for greater Indigenous self-governance in the states of Sabah and Sarawak. This is a topic covered in the Monitor report. While the full range of issues were explored during the conference, it was seen as important to present both the findings and Monitor framework of analysis and methodology in regions where affected populations are concentrated. Deliberations focussed on expanding the understanding of pluralism and increasing an understanding for how the Monitor framework of analysis operationalizes an evaluation of the challenges facing Malaysia through a pluralism lens.

In-country engagement intentionally seeks to take dialogues to regions and in Malaysia this was further realized through an event held in the state of Kelantan. Increasing political mobilization on the basis of religion, particularly by regionally-based Islamic political organizations, underpinned the design of this event. The potential for certain forms of Islamic-based political mobilization to weaken the prospects of strengthening pluralism is a trend identified in the Monitor report for Malaysia. Dialogue was open and while differing visions of the role of religion generally and Islam specifically were shared, it was clear that heterogeneity exists in these spaces. Introducing pluralism to attendees at the event provides an opportunity to move past the zero-sum framing that typically frames challenging conversations on group-based differences that can prevent greater understanding and acceptance.

APPGM SDG also coordinated with youth-based CSOs to hold a roundtable discussion as part of the program of a 'Youth SDG Summit' as a final major event. The Centre's team was privileged to be able to

present the Monitor report, framework of analysis and methodology. This event further reinforced the correct understanding of APPGM SDG that engagement in Malaysia should serve to expand awareness of, and dialogue on, pluralism. Dialogue with youth CSOs during this event fuelled robust questioning from attendees reflecting a desire to better understand pluralism as a normative concept that sees diversity as a source of strength and as a lens that can support evaluative exercises like the Monitor to identify ways to expand more pluralistic policies and practices.

The Centre will be doing a post-engagement review with partners and new contacts developed during the engagement process to identify next steps.

Sri Lanka: The Centre is currently finalizing in-country engagement plans in a partnership with the National Peace Council of Sri Lanka (NPC). NPC works to further a culture of peace in Sri Lanka. Non-violence, respect for human rights and the free expression of ideas are core values guiding the work of the organization. NPC draws on its network with CSOs, institutes and government officials to support a range of activities including research, training, and mobilization with the aim of promoting peace and conflict transformation.

The Global Pluralism Monitor: Sri Lanka Report (Sri Lanka | Global Centre for Pluralism) focusses on ethnic and religious identity-based cleavages to make sense of patterns of state decision-making rooted in past conflict that persist into the present. Defeat of the Liberational Tigers of Tamil Elam did not set the stage for a process of reconciliation and the policies and practices that can help prevent a repetition of ethno-sectarian conflict. A core theme of the report draws attention to the ways in which the design of key institutions is meant to appeal to ethno-sectarian majoritarian needs in ways that can fuel zero-sum, group-based contestation. However, the current economic crisis cannot be fully explained without understanding the political economy generated by the persistence of state decision-making that weakens pluralism. NPC sees opportunities to engage state and non-state actors on pluralism that are created, in part, by the current economic crisis.

Dialogue with NPC is arriving at a final proposal for in-country engagement that reaches a variety of state and non-state actors. The core part of the agenda focusses on a workshop with government administrators and a workshop with CSOs to explore the Monitor's framework of analysis and methodology and its potential application to their respective work. The former workshop seeks to socialize a pluralism lens and the Monitor's framework of analysis as a means of changing the way government officials gather and synthesize information for policy development and implementation. The latter workshop, with CSOs, intends to train CSO representatives to share the Monitor's framework of analysis within their organization and across CSO networks as a tool to use in advocacy efforts.

In addition to these activities, NPC is also developing a panel discussion on pluralism with linkages to studies on inclusion in Sri Lanka. This event will interrogate/critically engage with pluralism as a concept. Improving the conceptualization and understanding of pluralism is one of the goals of the Monitor project and this event seeks to contribute to that goal while also socializing the concept in Sri Lanka. Finally, NPC is arranging meetings with political officials to share the findings of Monitor report for Sri Lanka and to share comparative experience and knowledge from other countries where Monitor assessments have been undertaken.

Methodology

Step 0: Identify the Assessment Teams

The Monitor is researched and written by assessment teams. Each team consists of two assessors and one reviewer. Each assessor is responsible for working through the Monitor framework independently and then submitting their draft report to the reviewer. Then, the reviewer consolidates the two assessments and finalizes the scores and narrative assessments together with the team. The Centre recruits assessment teams. These teams are made up of individuals from the country of analysis or with substantial, demonstrated and vetted experience in the country in fields related to pluralism. This includes experts from academia, nongovernmental organizations, civil society organizations, government and the private sector.

Step 1: Choose Diversity Types

Assessment teams use the Monitor framework to choose the diversity types that will be analyzed. Not all forms of diversity can be included, so teams are asked to select those diversity types that best tell the story of pluralism in their country. The diversity types are chosen among ethnic, racial, religious, cultural, Indigenous, regional or linguistic groups. Other forms of diversity can be selected when teams feel these are necessary to understand the state of pluralism in a country.

Step 2: Apply the Monitor Framework

Each diversity type is assessed across 5 dimensions – commitments, practices, leadership, group-based inequalities and intergroup relations, and belonging – with 20 indicators. Each diversity type is also analyzed with a gender lens against the Monitor framework. These assessments use secondary research, as well as results from the Global Pluralism Perceptions survey commissioned by the Centre.

Step 3: Country Profiles, Indicators and Scores

Every Monitor report has a country profile section that provides an overview of the state of pluralism in a country. The country profile provides context for the diversity types chosen and for some of the salient issues discussed throughout the report. Each indicator under a dimension is scored on a scale of 1 through 10. A score of 1 indicates a low level of adherence or commitment to pluralism, while a score of 10 indicates the strongest level of commitment to it. This numerical score is accompanied by a narrative explanation.

Step 4: Recommendations

Assessment teams provide recommendations based on the results of the Monitor assessment to inform in-country stakeholders and the Centre's strategy for disseminating Monitor results. These recommendations reinforce calls from country experts, organizations and the international community.

The full detail of the Monitor methodology is available [here](#).

Project Implementation and Management

The core activities of the project supported by IDRC include support for implementation of Monitor assessments, data collection and analysis, in-country engagement, and data visualization (inclusive of branding, publication of Monitor reports and related material, and website design). These items are

discussed in sequence below, followed by a look at what was learned during implementation and how several adaptations became key to the current successes of the project.

Implementation of Monitor assessments begins with recruitment of assessment teams. Taking time to learn about the experts working in relevant fields and disciplines through research and dialogue with contacts is essential. It became clear that this process can take several months. Once teams are established, Centre staff coordinate an orientation for the team on the project and initially laid out a schedule for completion within six months. Regular communications with teams revealed the need for greater support from the Centre on the technical aspects of the methodology. Three support sessions were scheduled during the assessment phase of the project followed by regular support to the reviewer in working towards a finalized report. Timelines were extended during this learning process, as well as important innovations in how teams were supported on the methodology by the Centre. For example, reports scheduled for completion in late 2021 arrived in the spring of 2022, reflecting an extension of 3-6 months for assessment completion. The affirmation of robust findings in reports and appreciation for the value of the Monitor's framework of analysis and methodology expressed during in-country engagement reflect the benefits of adapting to teams' needs during report production.

Data collection supported by IDRC was central to an exceptional initiative to include core questions from the Pluralism Perceptions Survey in the R9 cycle of the Afrobarometer survey. A partnership agreement with Afrobarometer initially projected R9 survey completion in September 2021. The ability to place pluralism-related questions alongside the other questions of the Afrobarometer survey combined with the scale of the data made the benefits of this partnership obvious. However, the onset of the global COVID-19 pandemic, combined with myriad challenges in numerous countries impacting Afrobarometer's ability to schedule and implement surveys, caused significant delays. This did impact the completion of 4 of the 6 African countries where Monitor assessment implementation was underway. Centre staff maintained regular communication with Afrobarometer and impacted assessment teams to adapt schedules and ensure minimal impact. The survey data for 36 countries was provided to the Centre in Q2 allowing full completion of the terms of the partnership in July 2023. The Centre is now collaborating with a data analyst in synthesizing the data to set the stage for developing research through partnerships in Africa based on the Pluralism Perceptions Survey.

Engagement based on Monitor reports is a central pillar of the Montor project itself. The Monitor is a unique assessment tool not only in its design and methodology, but also because the project actively seeks to ensure Monitor reports can support actors trying to strengthen pluralism. The extension of timelines on the project allowed for greater consideration through dialogues with in-country partners to actualize the decolonized, co-creative approach to engagement elaborated above. The Centre empowered the Global Analysis team responsible for Monitor implementation to explore and give shape to an approach on engagement consistent with the logic of the Monitor and values of the Centre. This ensured a whole-of-organization understanding on engagement which is key to its success since expertise from across the organization is core to this important work. IDRC support for Centre staff travel was then coordinated with Centre core funds and other donor funds to support the engagement activities that have largely validated the value of the Monitor project.

Data visualization encompasses work to develop a design and brand for the Monitor project, application of the branding guidelines to publishing reports and related materials, and the development of a website as a platform to sustain engagement on Monitor reports. As completed Monitor reports arrived in late 2021, the Centre engaged a service provider specializing in working with organizations that implement assessment tools in policy spaces relevant to the Monitor. The first phase of work developed the branding guidelines and design for public facing outputs of the project over the course of late 2021 and early 2022. The same service provider successfully put forward proposals based on the Centre's RFQ for website design and development. This work was undertaken over the course of mid-2022 resulting in the completion of the website in September 2021. Centre staff, particularly on the Global Analysis team, focussed their efforts on maximizing the ways in which the online platform can support accessibility and drive engagement on the issues emerging from Monitor reports. The website will be publicly launched during the final week of September 2023.

Learning and adapting has been fundamental to the implementation of the Monitor project. In some cases adapting simply meant working to minimize challenges created by unforeseen but understandable delays, such as delays in receiving perceptions survey data. However, much of the learning and adaptation has been essential to the project's success. This has been realized both in terms of the substance of Monitor reports as well as the way engagement is unfolding.

Allowing more time for assessment teams become comfortable with the methodology opens up the chance for the Monitor to further contribute to the understanding of group/identify formation. As discussed above, the first step in assessment team work is to select the groups/peoples the assessment will focus on that best helps tell the story of pluralism in a country. Teams are provided a heuristic guide on forms of diversity such as race, religion, indigeneity, and migration among others, but are empowered to take the time to reflect and not be bound by the heuristic guide at this stage. This approach allowed assessment teams to meaningfully consider the socioeconomic drivers of intergroup relations and impact on identity where this was seen as necessary by teams.

The Bosnia and Herzegovina report highlights the shared experience of economic decline and rising inequality within each of the constituent peoples of the consociational arrangement. This analysis opens up consideration of cross-cutting interests for Bosniaks, Croats and Serbs that can potentially reshape intergroup relations and then a rethinking of certain institutional arrangements. In Sri Lanka, the political economy of Sinhalese Buddhist majoritarianism is threaded throughout the assessment within each diversity type. This is key to identifying state decision-making patterns that underpin the current economic crisis affecting all Sri Lankans. This approach to identity in the assessment also helps to identify the entry points for dialogue about identity and pluralism in the context of the economic crisis showing the possibilities for positive change. Colombia's assessment includes 'peasant' as one of the groups studied. This is an emergent identity in that official recognition of this identity group is happening in the census and in the legal system. In Sudan, two of the groups focussed on in the assessment are pastoralists/farmers and those in the informal economy. Like the Colombia assessment team, this approach reflects a recognition that in some contexts, the interdependence of socioeconomic conditions, intergroups relations, and identity formation deserves explicit study through the Monitor's framework of analysis. The results, broadly, serve to affirm the understanding that identity evolves fluidly, and the ideas of primordial identities (and conflict) can be unhelpful for strengthening pluralism. This also confirms the robustness of

the Montor's framework of analysis and methodology which expressly focusses on groups/peoples to understand the state of pluralism in a society in ways that move past the tendency to reify and calcify identity groups.

Engagement is the other area of work where learning and adapting has underpinned progress and success. Like the longer timeline for Monitor assessment implementation, a decolonized and co-creative approach to in-country engagement requires time to build understanding and trust. Adapting to the longer timelines for report completion opened opportunities to ensure the development of a robust and relevant engagement program. In Colombia, MCE's efforts to innovate a monitoring tool (as elaborated above) has resulted in a partnership with the Transitional Justice division of the Ministry of Justice. MCE sets the terms of that relationship but indicates that collaborating with the Centre helped open the space where MCE's ingenuity and expertise could become clear to others. This approach, which front ends the capacity and knowledge of partners, is rooted in the ideal of constructive partnership and ethical allyship.

One element of the approach to engagement is to be reflexive as those we dialogue with define the issues and plans in conversation with the Centre which offers perspectives from the Monitor project specifically and the organization's experience broadly. This approach requires comfort with a level of uncertainty that is rooted in the complexity of the societal challenges facing (prospective) partners. By adopting this approach, the Centre was able to support the development of communities of practice on pluralism in relation to global indigeneity. The partnership with the Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact (AIPP) to hold a 'Conference Dialogue on Indigenous Self-Governance, Civic Space, Democracy and Pluralism' on September 28-29, 2022, in Chang Mai, Thailand reflects the success of this approach. Deliberations over several months with AIPP were essential to arriving at an understanding that the most meaningful contribution from the Monitor project to AIPP's initiative was facilitating the participation of experts on Indigeneity in Bolivia, Canada, Iraq and Malaysia – all Monitor-assessed countries. The growing relationships through this work are as important as the knowledge shared and developed. This is work the Centre will continue to advance in the area of global indigeneity as well as other fields.

Implementation did entail some variations in spending with specific budget lines that exceed the 10% threshold set by IDRC. Short explanations for these variances are provided here that are mostly linked to the discussion of how the project evolved elsewhere in this report:
- 14% ($4,193) underspend on country assessment team: an assessor's contract was terminated due to the inability to produce the necessary work following extensive accommodations and follow-up.
- 33% ($600) underspend on research assistance: delays in delivering specific pluralism perception survey data shifted the schedule of work for the data analyst with a modest budget impact.
- 24% ($6,604) overspend on international travel for engagement: work with CODHES and MCE in Colombia necessitated increased travel, including on shorter notice when important opportunities emerged requiring our presence as a partner, increasing travel costs.
- 11% ($4,050) overspend on data visualization: work on website design and development established the need to try and account for the text-heavy nature of Monitor reports with greater attention to devising means to increase accessibility that increased some costs in the process.

Gender Equality and Inclusion

The Monitor project is Gender Responsive and seeks to be Gender Transformative in terms of the Gender Progress Markers used by IDRC. Intersectionality in the current design of the Monitor's methodology emphasizes 'gender as a method' whereby gender equality pervades all aspects of project implementation. The discussion here provides an overview of how this has been realized and connects with data provided in other sections of this report.

Recruitment of assessment teams followed exhaustive efforts to identify the necessary expertise and ensure gender equality. Recruitment of 32 women to join assessment teams constitutes 53 percent of the experts implementing Monitor assessments. The Centre also ensured gender analysis expertise exists on the teams because of the intersectional analysis built into the methodology of the Monitor.

Assessments demonstrate the overall success and the challenge of implementing intersectional analysis per the Monitor's methodology. Assessment teams need to account for gender dynamics for each of the groups focussed on in the assessment across the indicators. All the reports address gender dynamics but some do so more robustly than others. Part of the challenge is the absence of data on key issues, which reflects the invisibilization of gender inequality. The main challenge, however, stems from the indicative nature of Monitor reports that require 500 words for the narrative per indicator. Teams choosing to focus on three or more diversity types can face real limitations on the extent to which gender analysis can be incorporated within the recommended word count.

The Ghana assessment team adopted a novel approach by mandating the GE expert to essentially focus on gender analysis while accounting for the diversity types chosen for the study. This contrasts with the current methodology whereby assessors focus on each diversity type and account for gender within that group/people. The resulting report was one of the strongest in terms of intersectionality and understanding dynamics around gender equality. The learning from this example will inform a methodological review of the Monitor to understand whether and how this approach can be adapted.

Comparatively weaker implementation of gender analysis within each diversity type in a Monitor report does not preclude opportunities to advance gender equality. Colombia demonstrates this extremely well. The Monitor report on Colombia addresses gender equality but is not sustained to the degree gender analysis is conducted in the Monitor report for Ghana. As described in the review on engagement implementation in Colombia, gender equality is at the core of engagement work with MCE and CODHES. MCE's initiative is entirely focussed on gender equality and represents a meaningful contribution to actualizing the 'Women, Family and Generations' section of the Ethnic Chapter in the 2016 Peace Accord. Engagement in Ghana also focusses on gender equality, particularly with respect to dialogue on the Affirmative Action Bill, but the variance in implementing gender analysis in the Monitor assessment does result in a variance on gender equality during engagement.

Additionally, establishing gender equality as a core element of the Monitor methodology allows the Centre to advance the role and impact of women across the areas of work stemming from the Monitor project. For example, two of the four experts on Indigeneity that participated in the AIPP conference on Indigenous self-governance, civic space, democracy and pluralism are women.

Project Outputs and Dissemination

What follows is a listing of project outputs followed by a short discussion on how those outputs are linked to project objectives.

- 11 published Monitor reports
    - 4 Monitor reports prepared for publication phase
    - 3 Monitor reports in review phase
    - Monitor reports for Sudan and Tunisia in modified review phase to account for changing circumstances following inception of the assessment
- Publication of Monitor methodology and framework of analysis (Methodology | Global Centre for Pluralism).
- Preparation of pluralism perceptions survey data pursuant to publication in the near future.
- Translation of 8 Monitor reports into 11 languages and translation of Monitor methodology and framework into 4 languages for engagement in 3 countries.
- Website developed featuring two pathways to access full Monitor reports, country content pages with status of core issues, news stories, blogs, profiles of ongoing work by partners, full access to Monitor methodology and framework of analysis, and ability to engage with content.
- 66 experts trained on the Monitor framework of analysis, methodology and pluralism.
- Approximately 350 workshop, roundtable, panel, conference participants and attendees oriented on the concept of pluralism and Monitor project across three countries.

Regular dialogue with teams in the early implementation of the assessments resulted in a decision to anonymize reports. Three reasons underpinned this decision: (i) experts' positionality in terms of their public work can impact scoring and narrative analysis; (ii) personal security of some assessment team members; (iii) potential for selective non-attribution to be perceived as a sign of bad faith during engagement. This is an issue the Centre continues to navigate and will evolve through experience.

Advancing understanding on the state of pluralism through the Monitor seeks to support actors doing the hard work of positive social transformation in a country. Meeting the demand of partners to explore the ways in which the Monitor framework of analysis and methodology can be of as much value to their work as the reports themselves is a major, overarching achievement. The specific achievements stemming from this progress are described in the results of engagement work covered in subsections 'IV' and 'V' under the Section on Objectives above.

Project Outcomes

Positively impacting policies and practices that strengthen pluralism is the aim of the Monitor project. Monitor reports are designed to be tools offering change agents a robust evaluative framework that operationalizes the conceptualization of pluralism in a framework that can identify pathways for change. Implementation of the Monitor discussed in this report covers the first effort to roll-out the project following several years of work designing, piloting and finalizing design of the Monitor. This context is important for understanding any discussion on outcomes, most of which are discussed in preceding sections of this report.

Through work with both the assessment teams and in-country partners, the project served to validate the Global Pluralism Monitor as a unique and impactful tool that serves to enhance understanding of and action for positive change in the ways societies view and respond to diversity.l Various experts on assessment teams indicate that participation in the project is informing the way they approach their own work through a greater understanding of pluralism and learning from team members in conducting the assessment. Engagement activities also demonstrate greater understanding of pluralism and interest in the relevance of the concept for positive social transformation. For example, the first regional workshops in Colombia with CODHES and MCE found that over 90 percent of participants understand and can explain the concept of pluralism and apply pluralism to their work. MCE's and CODHES' ongoing efforts (discussed above) attest to the veracity of those findings. Engagement in Ghana and Malaysia similarly reflect positive reception and active interest in the concept of pluralism.

The engagement activities described in subsections 'IV' and 'V' under the section on Objectives above reflect the positive and active embrace of pluralism as a concept that is relevant to potentially transforming policies and practices. However, it is important to emphasize that the Centre's role in these collaborative efforts is premised on the understanding that positive social transformation is only possible through the leadership of in-country actors with the Centre serving as a supportive partner and ethical ally. The work being done by partners, such as MCE, reflects an intensive application of pluralism to realize core provisions implicating Afro-Colombian and Indigenous peoples which is an outcome of the project. MCE is now set to pilot their innovation in monitoring but is not yet at the stage where those activities can be applied by decision-makers to alter policies and practices that strengthen pluralism. The Centre is committed to continuing accompaniment in Colombia, but also in other context where partnerships have been undertaken or are underway.

Overall Assessment and Recommendations

IDRC support for the *Leaving No One Behind – Addressing Inequalities and Exclusions through the Global Pluralism Monitor* project has enabled the further refinement and implementation of the Monitor framework and methodology in a wide variety of contexts, as well as initial rounds of in-country engagement on assessment findings in selected countries. With funding and ongoing support from IDRC, the project outcomes confirm the Monitor's value as a unique and robust tool to support decision-making, policies and catalyze pathways for advancing pluralism in societies globally.

The project supported refinements and adaptations over the course of project implementation that were critical to the overall success and confirmation of the Monitor's impact. These included improvements to the framework and methodology noted in in this report, as well as an understanding of the level of ongoing support and mentorship required from the Centre for the successful completion the assessment process. This learning has implications for current and future approaches to scaling, funding and overall impact of the tool. Project findings will not only inform the number of countries assessed, but also the level and intensity of the Centre's work with assessment teams through each stage of assessment. Thus, the Centre will consider a wider range of criteria in selecting future countries for assessment, including the extent to which each new country will potentially add to global understanding of pathways to pluralism,

The project has surfaced important learnings about the potential role for regional and global partners, such as IDRC, to both amplify assessment findings and support regional and global learning, experience sharing and research. Initial thematic trends and issues emerging from the assessment reports completed to date are indicative of the potential for the Monitor to underpin knowledge, experience sharing and research on gender equality and affirmative action policies, drivers of group-based conflict, indigeneity and state sovereignty, the impact of pluralism on democratic norms and institutions, the media's ability to undermine or advance pluralism, judicial systems and sources of social transformation, among many other topics.

Work being done to adapt the Monitor framework of analysis and methodology in collaboration with in-country partners will shape efforts to share knowledge and experience within countries and regionally. Regional partnerships remain essential to the Monitor project and will develop through efforts to actively expand communities of practice on strengthening pluralism across countries. This work also entails developing regional partnerships to implement re-assessment processes.

As outlined in this report, the project confirmed the value-add of the Monitor tool for informing policy and practical actions for advancing pluralism by a range of societal actors.

Progress on achieving the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals and on advancing and sustaining human development more generally will be significantly enhanced by an increased understanding of the underlying sources of group-based inequalities, exclusions and marginalization. Persistent, systemic group-based inequalities are often less visible than standard measures of vertical inequalities. Group-based inequalities persist and hold countries back from achieving their SDG goals as these are more often the result of deeply-held social narratives and perceptions about particular groups. The Monitor framework and methodology presents a holistic picture of how and where groups experience exclusions and inequalities – and offers a roadmap of policy options and practical actions that can be taken to address these challenges.