



Contents

METHODOLOGY

1. Guiding Principles for Completing Assessments	04
2. Monitor Assessment Framework	07
3. Country Assessment Process	16
4. Understanding Scores	19
5. Data Sources	21

APPENDIX

A Appendix A: Ethical Considerations	23
B Appendix B: Guidelines for Country Team Roles	25

The Global Pluralism Monitor is an assessment of the state of pluralism in a society.

The Monitor assesses the state of pluralism in diverse societies and identifies pathways for policymakers and practitioners to address underlying drivers of exclusion.

This document presents the methodology behind the Monitor. It includes guiding principles for completing assessments, a walkthrough of the Monitor assessment framework, and guidance on the interpretation of the Monitor scores. It is important to note that the Monitor is intended to provide an indicative picture of what is necessary for pluralism to flourish and outline starting points for deeper engagement on the opportunities and challenges in building more pluralistic societies. Importantly, the Monitor does not propose a single route to pluralism. The Monitor reflects an understanding that pluralism is contextual, and may look very different in different places due to the confluence of unique cultural, social, and historical factors.

The Global Pluralism Monitor assesses the state of pluralism at the country level to enable a degree of comparability between countries. This means that assessment of pluralism at sub-national units of analysis (such as provinces or cities) is beyond the current scope of the Global Pluralism Monitor. Such an analysis requires a deeper engagement with the assessment framework at the provincial/sub-national level.

Guiding Principles for Completing Assessments



1

1. GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR COMPLETING ASSESSMENTS

In order to properly complete an assessment of the state of pluralism in a country, assessors and reviewers should keep the following guiding principles in mind throughout the process:

- The Global Center for Pluralism defines **pluralism** as an ethic of respect for diversity rooted in recognition and belonging. In a normative sense, pluralism requires that all peoples are recognized as deserving respect and dignity, and for efforts to ensure that all people can fully express their identities and feel that they belong in society and society belongs to them. Our approach to pluralism places a twin focus on institutions (hardware) and cultural mindsets (software) and the complex interactions between the two.

Pluralism requires a holistic view of society that accounts for the ways that political, economic, and social exclusions overlap to exacerbate inequalities. By approaching inequality and exclusion in a holistic way, the Monitor sheds light on how inclusion in some areas does not necessarily translate into inclusion overall without concerted efforts across society.

Assessing the state of pluralism in a given country requires consideration of the treatment of various diversities as well as their intersections, how inclusions and exclusions take place in the social, political and economic domains, the role of various actors in advancing or eroding pluralism and the interplay between hardware and software throughout society.

- Building pluralistic societies requires equal attention to both the **hardware** and **software** of society. Hardware refers to the institutional arrangements—such as constitutions, legislatures, courts, systems of government, schools and the media—that “define the legal and political space within which members of society act”.¹ Software represents the cultural habits or public mindsets that shape our perceptions of who belongs and who contributes, and influence how we interact with each other on an everyday basis. Hardware and software in a society continuously interact with each other to strengthen or weaken a culture of respect for diversity.

1 Will Kymlicka (2017), “The Hardware and Software of Pluralism,” *Accounting for Change in Diverse Societies*, Global Centre for Pluralism, 1, accessed 27 October 2020, https://www.pluralism.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/WillKymlicka_HardwareandSoftware_EN.pdf

- We recognize that in every society, the treatment of diversity varies across different groups. **Groups** may be widely understood as a collection of individuals who share a common social identification or perceive themselves to be members of the same social category. The Monitor uses ethno-cultural (ethnic, racial, religious, linguistic, Indigenous) and migrant diversity as its primary unit of analysis, and so mention of “groups” throughout the framework refers to ethno-cultural and migrant groups.

To avoid the “tyranny of a single score” which in turn can obscure both the most positive and most negative experiences in a society, most indicators in the framework require separate assessments for each of the salient diversity types in the country. How to determine which types are most salient, and when to apply a disaggregated approach to indicators, will be discussed in section 2.

- The Monitor recognizes that notions of “groupness” can hide intra-group patterns of exclusion, and that inequalities and exclusions are experienced in gendered ways. The intersection of ethno-cultural and migrant identity with gender often compounds the effects of group exclusion. Therefore, for each indicator assessors must also specifically consider the treatment of women within each of the relevant diversity types.
- It is often difficult, if not impossible, to fully encapsulate a country’s experience with diversity, or the intragroup variations that may exist. Therefore, Monitor reports will pay particular attention to the most egregious examples of exclusion for particular indicators or diversity types, as well as examples that demonstrate marked improvements in addressing exclusion.
- Group disaggregated data is an important step towards addressing group exclusion. One of the key barriers to advancing pluralism is the lack of available data, particularly disaggregated along lines of difference. Therefore, throughout the assessment, we encourage assessors to highlight data-gaps which prevent a wholesome analysis of the state of inclusion, exclusion and inequalities.

Monitor Assessment Framework



2

2. MONITOR ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK

The Monitor Assessment Framework reflects the Centre’s dual focus on institutions (hardware) and mindsets (software) and the complex interactions between the two. The Framework comprises a country profile, 20 indicators, and recommendations for policy and practice. The indicators span 5 dimensions: Commitments, Practices, Leadership, Group-based Inequalities, and Intergroup Relations and Belonging. This section provides guidance on using the framework as well as detailed descriptions of its components.

Determining the Diversity Typology

Each society has its own unique experience with managing diversity. In order to account for differentiated approaches to diverse groups within a society, each indicator in the Framework (unless otherwise noted) requires assessors to provide separate scores and narratives for each relevant diversity type within the country. Country teams should use the following table as guidelines for identifying the most salient (and most vulnerable) diversity types in the country:

TABLE 1: GUIDELINES FOR DIVERSITY TYPE SELECTION

CRITERIA	Ethnic	Religious	Linguistic	Racialized	Indigenous	Migrant
Is there a history of violence in the country involving groups in this category?						
Is there a history of exclusion or marginalization of groups in this category?						
Are there groups in this category that enjoy legal recognition as distinct groups?						
Are groups in this category economically, politically, and/or socially dominant?						
Are there targeted positive measures for the inclusion of groups in this category?						
Are the interests of groups in this category represented in decision-making institutions?						

There are two key considerations to keep in mind while using this table:

- There may be an overlap between these categories so that one or more of the most salient diversity types are actually combinations of the categories above (for example, ethno-religious).
- These categories frame the first layer of analysis, but the assessments will also apply an intersectional lens in order to identify intra-group exclusions against women within these diversity types.

The diversity types that are identified as most salient through this exercise will frame the analysis in the final report. Once this preliminary exercise has been done, assessors can proceed with independently completing the questionnaire. The remainder of this section will discuss the various aspects of the framework.

Country Profile

The country profile serves as an introduction to the assessment, and provides context to the country's experience with managing diversity. This includes the history of intergroup relations, disputes with neighbouring countries (when relevant), and the role of diaspora communities (when relevant). Most importantly, the country profile should identify the main sources of division, and the most salient diversity types (using the guidelines above) that will be the focal point of analysis throughout the assessment.

Indicators

1. Commitments: For pluralism, commitments are the most prominent way for states to declare their intent to build inclusive societies, and for non-state actors to keep states accountable. Commitments to pluralism can anchor other efforts to make society's hardware and software more inclusive. The framework includes three separate indicators on commitments:

1. International Commitments: International treaties and conventions are important starting points for pluralism as they represent a globally agreed upon set of protections for diverse groups. While assessors will confirm the ratification status of the various treaties and conventions under the purview of this question, an equally important aspect of this indicator is the level of engagement with treaty monitoring mechanisms.

2. National Commitments: Commitments at the national level, through the Constitution and legislation, are necessary to protect and promote diverse groups' rights. Promotion of the rights would include commitments to preserve diverse cultures, enable expression of identity, and ensure full participation in political, economic and socio-cultural spheres. This may include measures such as collective rights, formal recognition, and affirmative action, for example.

3. Inclusive Citizenship: Citizenship is a prominent means of formal recognition by the state, and often carries with it rights and protections that are not enjoyed by non-citizens. It can be a powerful tool for building inclusive, diverse societies, but can also be used as a way to actively exclude and marginalize groups. This indicator examines the formal and informal mechanisms for accessing citizenship in the country.

II. Practices: While commitments are important, pluralism requires sufficient political will and action to realize commitments in practice. This dimension includes three measures for assessing the extent to which practices of the state reflect a desire to build more inclusive and equal societies:

1. Policy Implementation: To realize commitments towards pluralism requires allocation of adequate resources and a culture of accountability among decision-makers. This indicator assesses whether political commitments are actually implemented.

2. Data Collection: The absence of data on group-based inequalities allows systemic exclusion to persist. The Monitor assesses to what extent quality data on group inequality is collected by the state.

The following matrix may be used by assessors in determining the quality of existing data in the country. This is meant as an indicative exercise and is not intended to be completed comprehensively. The table below is only an illustrative example of how an assessment may approach this indicator.

TABLE 2: GUIDELINES FOR DATA COLLECTION EVALUATION

THEME	When was this data last collected?	Is this data accessible to the general public?	Who collects this data?
Economy (eg. income per capita, employment rates)			
Crime (eg. reported hate crimes, violent crimes)			
Health (eg. child mortality rates, access to healthcare)			
Education (eg. Primary education attainment, literacy levels)			
Electoral data (eg. voter registration, voter turnout)			

GCP recognizes that many countries do not collect disaggregated data and sometimes explicitly prohibit the collection of such data. The reasons are complex – sometimes it is grounded in a history of inter-group conflict (as in Rwanda) or stems from a particular conception of national self-identity (as with France’s commitment to an indivisible French identity). Capacity constraints also prevent many countries from collecting data in a timely or systematic way. In such cases, the score on the data collection indicator will reflect the lack of data, but the narrative justification for that score will also note the reasons why data is not being collected.

3. Claims-making and Contestation: The ability of diverse groups to make claims is vital for pluralism. Groups need to be able to mobilize peacefully for change without repression by the state. This indicator reflects on the political and legal environment for claims-making and how these movements are generally perceived by wider society.

III. Leadership for Pluralism: Pluralism requires leadership from all sectors in society, including non-state actors that may adopt policies and practices that affect groups’ ability to fully participate in society. This indicator assesses four critical non-state actors:

1. Political Parties: The indicator assesses whether political parties espouse respect for diversity through their platforms and messaging, or promote exclusionary narratives and policies that would undermine pluralism. This does not mean that all political parties must have diverse membership, but rather they should practice politics of mutual respect and cooperation.

2. News Media: This indicator is comprised of two sub-indicators: the extent to which diverse groups have representation as creators or contributors in news media, and how prominent pro-pluralism voices are in the country’s media landscape. Both sub-indicators should have their own score and narrative, and the average of both scores will constitute the score for the indicator.

3. Civil Society: For the purposes of the Monitor, ‘civil society’ includes a wide range of actors including professional organizations, voluntary groups, religious groups, and advocacy networks among others. The Monitor assessment framework assesses how prominent or influential pro-pluralism civil society actors are in the country. As with political parties, there is space in pluralistic societies for civil society organizations to advance the claims and concerns of specific groups, but this must be done in such a way that respects other groups’ claims for recognition and dignity as well.

4. Private Sector: The Monitor assesses the extent to which diverse groups are represented in the workforce and leadership in large local private companies. While a diverse group in the workforce is a good place to start, representation in leadership positions in the private sector is a key step towards group inclusion.

Most indicators in the framework are designed to capture groups' experiences. However, the leadership dimension is concerned with the role of the sectors themselves in building or undermining pluralistic societies. Therefore, the indicators in the leadership dimension do not require disaggregation by diversity type.

IV. *Group-based Inequalities:* Around the world, inequalities and exclusions strongly correlate with markers of group difference. In this section the Monitor assesses the breadth of inequalities, their durability (i.e. extent to which they are intergenerational), and the overall difference in treatment between groups (as in, whether some groups are considerably more excluded than others are). This section includes indicators on the following types of group-based inequality:

- 1. *Political:*** This indicator measures to what extent diverse groups enjoy equitable political representation and participation.
- 2. *Economic:*** This indicator measures the extent to which diverse groups enjoy equitable participation and access in the economic domain, including through access to land and resources, access to employment, and equitable income.
- 3. *Social Inequalities:*** This indicator measures the extent to which diverse groups enjoy equitable access to social services, including education, healthcare, and welfare.
- 4. *Cultural:*** This indicator measures the extent to which diverse cultures are treated with respect, or are repressed in favour of dominant cultural norms.
- 5. *Access to Justice:*** This indicator measures the extent to which diverse groups enjoy equitable access to justice, both formal and informal.

V. *Intergroup Relations and Belonging:* In order for pluralism to flourish, there needs to be consensus between groups and individuals that everyone deserves dignity and belong in society. This section includes the following indicators:

- 1. *Intergroup Violence:*** This indicator measures the extent to which there is violence between groups. Not all violence can necessarily be linked to diversity issues, and so assessors should make clear the links between violence and political, economic, or cultural exclusion.
- 2. *Intergroup Trust:*** This indicator measures the extent to which there is intergroup trust, as well as individual attitudes towards people from different groups in everyday interactions.
- 3. *Trust in Public Institutions:*** This indicator measures the extent to which diverse groups trust public institutions, including healthcare providers, law enforcement, and the judiciary.

4. *Inclusion and Acceptance:* A major factor in people's sense of belonging is whether they feel they are accepted. This indicator measures feelings of inclusion and acceptance among individuals, as well as experiences of discrimination.

5. *Shared Ownership of Society:* In pluralistic societies, it is not sufficient for people to feel they are accepted. People should also feel that society belongs to them, and that they have a say in the direction of the country. This indicator measures people's feeling of shared ownership in their society.

All indicators in this dimension (except for the indicator on intergroup violence) rely on survey data. GCP commissions original survey data, the *Pluralism Perceptions Survey*, to facilitate completion of this section, but assessors are also encouraged to use other data where available.

With the exception of the indicator on intergroup violence, disaggregation is not required for this dimension. Intergroup trust, inclusion and acceptance, and shared ownership are measures of society as a whole and not of specific groups' experiences. Thus, disaggregated scores may be difficult to arrive at.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

As a conclusion to the report, assessors will provide preliminary recommendations for policymakers and practitioners based on the findings. These are meant to be starting points for broader discussions with relevant stakeholders to translate the analysis from the report into actionable items. In successive reports, assessors can also reflect on whether recommendations have been acted upon in meaningful ways.

TABLE 3: SUMMARY OF GLOBAL PLURALISM MONITOR ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK AND INDICATORS

Dimension	Indicators	Data Source (Illustrative)
Commitments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Level of engagement with international commitments 2. Constitutional and national legislative commitments to protecting and promoting diverse groups' rights 3. Inclusive citizenship practices 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Constitutions 2. Legislative Acts and Amendments 3. State reports to treaty monitoring bodies
Practices	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implementation of inclusive laws, policies and practices 2. Availability, accessibility and protection of group based inequality data across five datasets- income, crime, health, education, and electoral data 3. Environment for claims-making and contestation vis-à-vis the state 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Judicial practices 2. Budgetary allocation 3. Censuses 4. Freedom House 5. Shadow reports to international bodies
Leadership for Pluralism	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Political parties' values 2. Participation of diverse groups in news media 3. Prominence of news media actors that espouse pluralistic values 4. Prominence of civil society actors that espouse pluralistic values 5. Representation in private sector workforce and leadership 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Diversity reports on private sector 2. Electoral representation data 3. News media and public broadcast practices

<p>Group based inequalities</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Equitable political participation 2. Equitable participation and access in the economic domain 3. Equitable participation and access in the social domain 4. Cultural inequalities 5. Equitable access to justice 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Human development Monitor 2. Data on electoral and political participation 3. World Justice Project 4. USCIRF reports 5. DHS surveys 6. Ethnic Power Relations
<p>Intergroup Relations and Belonging</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Levels of intergroup violence 2. Levels of intergroup trust 3. Levels of trust in public institutions 4. Levels of feelings of acceptance 5. Levels of feelings of shared ownership 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Status of hate crimes and intergroup violence 2. Minorities at Risk dataset 3. Primary data on levels of intergroup trust 4. Primary data on experiences of belonging

Country Assessment Process



3

3. COUNTRY ASSESSMENT PROCESS

The Monitor uses a qualitative expert assessment methodology. Using this approach, country experts can provide assessments that reflect a country's particular context and include relevant nuances on group exclusion. The following section outlines the assessment process in detail. For a comprehensive breakdown of roles and responsibilities for assessors and reviewers, please see [Appendix B](#).

Assessment Phase

- The Centre identifies two country experts to independently complete assessments using the Monitor Assessment Framework. Experts are selected for their deep understanding of diversity issues in the country, and are nationals of the country under assessment or have extensive in-country experience.
- These assessors identify the most salient diversity types that will be included in the assessment using the guidelines provided in section 2. After this exercise, each assessor proceeds to complete a questionnaire using these diversity types, where each indicator from the Framework has been translated into a question. For each question and for each diversity type (unless otherwise noted in the Framework), assessors provide a score from 1 (least pluralistic) to 10 (most pluralistic) and include a narrative justification to explain the rationale behind that score.
- Each question includes benchmarks for scores of 1, 4, 7, and 10 that are meant to reflect the full spectrum of the country's possible experience in order to ensure that assessors are scoring consistently. These benchmarks are only meant to be indicative, and assessors should use the full range of numbers between 1 to 10. In most contexts, the benchmarks will not completely and accurately capture the specifics of a country's experience. These benchmarks are only meant to be used as general guidelines, and ultimately assessors should use their own judgement when arriving at a score.

Review Phase

- Assessors submit their completed questionnaires to a reviewer, who is also an in-country expert on diversity issues. The reviewer ensures that the methodology has been applied rigorously and that the assessors have used reliable and defensible data.
- The reviewer then facilitates a dialogue between the two assessors to arrive at a consolidated report that reflects the views of both assessors. Assessors address any gaps in the assessments as identified at this stage. The reviewer is responsible for compiling the final report and resolving any issues where assessors are unable to reach a consensus.

- Once completed, the final report is submitted to the Centre for an additional level of review to ensure methodological rigour. Based on this process, country teams may be expected to revisit sections of the report.
- Finally, all reports that have gone through this review process are submitted to the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) — an international group of experts from a wide range of disciplinary, geographic, and thematic backgrounds that advise on the ongoing development of the Monitor. The TAG reviews the high-level findings from the various country reports to ensure consistency across reports and to identify emergent trends. The TAG also submits proposed adjustments and revisions to the framework and methodology in light of the findings from the report.
- Following this review process, all reports are published and disseminated through the Centre’s website and targeted stakeholder engagement.

Understanding Scores



4. UNDERSTANDING SCORES

Each country report includes 20 indicators with scores ranging from 1 to 10 and narrative justifications for those scores. The Centre believes that the greatest value of the Global Pluralism Monitor is to understand the story behind a score: an analysis of ongoing trends and underlying factors contributing to the current state of inclusion and exclusion in a country.

The scores presented in this report should not be interpreted as part of a universal scale or ranking system that applies to all countries in the same way. Instead, scores should be understood as a context-specific indication of the country's progress toward (or away from) a pluralistic ideal. For example, a post-conflict society that still experiences violence – but comparatively less than at the height of conflict – might have a similar score to a society that has been peaceful but has recently experienced a surge in hate crimes. The Global Pluralism Monitor aims to assess countries on their own terms to reflect the highly contextual nature of pluralism: there is no single route to success that all societies must follow.

In the questionnaire, each indicator has benchmarks to help assessors score their country's experience. These benchmarks are meant to capture the full spectrum of possible experiences for that indicator, and to ensure that country reports are using the scoring system consistently with other reports to enable some level of comparability. A score of 10 is an aspirational benchmark across all indicators, whereas a score of 1 is the worst-case scenario. The Centre believes that pluralism is always a work in progress, with room for both progress and regress, and thus scores of both 1 and 10 should be rare.

The indicators and benchmarks in the Monitor assessment framework are intended to ensure consistent interpretation of indicators across countries. The scores also help to understand trends within and across countries over time. The narrative justifications that accompany scores are necessary to understand them and the factors that have contributed to any changes in the scores over time.

Data Sources



5

5. DATA SOURCES

Assessors are encouraged to draw on a mix of qualitative and quantitative data when completing Monitor assessments. Assessors are not asked to conduct primary research, but rather to rely on pre-existing data. Table 1 provides some examples of the kinds of data assessors could use for specific indicators. The Global Centre for Pluralism has developed the *Pluralism Perceptions Survey*, an instrument that is implemented by local partners and generates original data on intergroup trust and belonging. This is done in order to ensure consistency and comparability across country contexts. Assessors are provided the results of these surveys to inform completion of the questionnaire.

Pluralism Perceptions Surveys are representative of the population at the national level. All participants in the survey are 18 years and above of age. Wherever possible, the surveys also represent a stratified sample of diversity groups included in the Monitor assessment of a particular country. When a stratified sample size of each group is not possible, we prioritize the national level sample to maintain analytical consistency throughout the Monitor.

Appendix A: Ethical Considerations



A. APPENDIX: ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Consent and Data Privacy

The survey on public perceptions of trust and belonging is the key source of primary data that involves direct contact with individual subjects. The survey adheres to the following protocol to ensure the highest level of privacy for participants:

- The participants have information about the project and the nature of their participation. Online and paper surveys ensure that participants consent to the survey before answering any other questions.
- All survey data is stored so that individuals cannot be identified from their responses. In many cases, intergroup relations may put specific groups or participants at risk. To minimize this, all survey data will be protected on secure servers and hard-disks with password protection.

Risks for Participants

The surveys and assessment reports adhere to the “do no harm” principle in order to prevent any additional harm to diverse groups or individuals. The assessment reports do not include any information about groups and their social, political, or cultural status that is not already available in the public domain. The perceptions survey comprises questions that were tested with a small sample and vetted for any individual trauma that may arise for respondents. The survey is tailored to mitigate the need for participants to provide detailed information about specific acts of violence and discrimination that may trigger trauma.

Wherever applicable, the enumerators will guide participants to appropriate resources about emotional wellness with a focus on addressing experiences of trauma and discrimination.

Attribution

Assessments are published anonymously in order to ensure the safety of researchers and so as to not compromise their work with affected communities discussed in the assessment. In cases where researchers would like to be recognized for their contribution to the Monitor, the Centre will provide letters in recognition of their work directly to contributors for them to use at their discretion.

Appendix B: Guideline for Country Team Roles



B

B. APPENDIX: GUIDELINES FOR COUNTRY TEAM ROLES

The Monitor assessment draws its depth of analysis from a rich interaction between assessors and reviewers. In the country report development process, assessors independently complete the questionnaire, and reviewers ensure that assessors' responses to the questionnaire rigorously follow the Monitor assessment methodology and are rooted in defensible research and analysis. In addition, reviewers lead the consolidation of two assessments into a single country report that reflects the views of both assessors. We understand that the consolidation process may look different from country to country. The following guidelines outline the roles of assessors and reviewers and are intended to ensure a fair division of labour within country teams.

Assessors

- **Meet** to determine the relevant diversity types for the country under assessment using the guidelines provided by GCP. Assessors are encouraged to engage additional expertise if needed and alert GCP to any changes in the assessment team.
- **Complete** the questionnaire. For each indicator, assessors should provide scores using the provided benchmarks as reference points. Assessors must also include a narrative explanation for their scores that draws on defensible data sources.
- **Reach out** to GCP for any additional information. Some terms in the Monitor may need some clarifications when the framework is applied to specific contexts. The GCP team or the Technical Advisory Group can provide the necessary background and examples to translate a concept in the framework accurately.
- **Collaborate** on the consolidating the final country report. Assessors should address issues or gaps raised by the reviewer in their assessments, and work with the rest of the country team to blend the assessments based on recommendations from the reviewer and further discussions on tweaking individual sections from each assessment. Reviewers are responsible for ultimately producing the report, but assessors are responsible for addressing gaps in the report.

Reviewers

- **Verify** the consistency of assessments with the Monitor assessment Framework. Does the narrative explanation match the score given based on the benchmarks provided in the questionnaire? Have assessors answered in the spirit of the question's intention? In instances where there are gaps or methodological inconsistencies, reviewers are encouraged to discuss remedies and suggest revisions with assessors, who will then address these points. Reviewers are not expected to address gaps in the assessment themselves.

- **Ask** assessors to justify the given score by explaining why the next lower or higher does not reflect reality more accurately. This would strengthen the assessment and the narrative provided by assessors.
- **Include** suggestions with your critique. The review should highlight where assessors translated the concepts well and were headed in the right direction, with specific comments and feedback.
- **Crosscheck** the data sources included by assessors, and suggest sources for additional data. It is important that the assessments include reliable data sources and identify key data gaps. Please also indicate if any additional data- quantitative or qualitative- may enrich the narrative.
- **Reflect** on the relationship between argument and evidence as presented by the assessors. There is a chance that views or statements of assessors are different than that of reviewers. This is acceptable as long as the argument is defensible through rigorous and reliable data sources and the analysis is consistent with a pluralism lens on diversity.
- **Reach out** to GCP for any additional information. Some terms in the Monitor may need some clarifications when the framework is applied to specific contexts. The GCP team or the technical advisory group can provide the necessary background and examples to translate a concept in the framework accurately.
- **Facilitate** consolidation of the final report. Reviewers should work with assessors to identify where assessments overlap and complement each other, and provide suggestions on how to combine the two. This is intended to be a collaborative process, and the final country report is meant to reflect the views of both assessors, but in instances where consensus cannot be reached on how to combine assessments, reviewers are empowered to resolve following their own discretion and provided reasonable supporting evidence.
- **Produce** the consolidated report. Reviewers ultimately lead the consolidation process for the final report based on discussions with and revisions from the assessors. At this stage, the most important thing is that the report is rigorous and reflects the assessors' individual analyses.