



Institutional Accountability and Transparency for Sustainability: A Study of the Obligations of Institutions and Non-state Actors under International Law

Sardar M.A. Waqar Khan Arif *

Syed Mudasser Fida Gardazi †

Nafees Ahmed Khan ‡

Abstract

The principles of accountability and transparency are fundamental and central to the bulk of United Nations (UN) Conventions and other international legal instruments. However, accountability within an institution requires in-depth impartiality, equality, and neutrality. The role of the UN and other organizations is significant, particularly for the achievement of sustainable development goal (SDG) goal 16. In this context, this paper focuses on the obligations of institutions for achieving sustainable development goals 16. It aims to discuss the role of human rights-based institutions, including mechanisms, standards, and institutional arrangements, and explores their obligations. It also identifies the obligations of nonstate actors and argues that such actors can be managed/well-ordered with the accountability tools and guidance provided by SDG 16 for achieving accountability, peace, justice, and good governance at all levels. Finally, it discusses challenges for overall sustainable development.

- DOI: 10.31703/gssr.2021(VI-I).55
- Vol. VI, No. I (Winter 2021)
- Pages: 540 – 551
- p- ISSN: 2520-0348
- e-ISSN: 2616-793X
- ISSN-L: 2520-0348

Key Words: Institutional Accountability, Transparency, Non-state Actors, Institutional Obligations, Sustainable Development Goals

Introduction

SDG 16: Promote Peaceful and Inclusive Societies for Sustainable Development, Provide Access to Justice for All and Build Effective, Accountable and Inclusive Institutions at All Levels The SDG 16 aims to promote peaceful societies by providing access to justice to all and by strengthening institutions. It also stresses accountability and transparency within institutions. The ultimate purpose is to uphold the rule of law, human rights, and political stability in global governance. The societies can be developed if justice, accountability, and transparency within institutions be ensured by states. However, the rise of non-state actors, standard setters, and NGOs posed certain challenges in achieving sustainability and global governance.

The international community has endorsed SDG 16 as accountable and transparent

institutions that play a role in enabling sustainability. It is the most important goal because it is not only limited to accountability and transparency. Rather, it includes peace and justice for all. It can be linked with SDG 5, which relates to gender equality and women empowerment. The participation of women in institutions is significant in this context. It is important to note that the project on the progress of sustainable development found that: "Expectations of a more proactive role of governments come together with expectations of greater accountability of governments. Deficits in governance...are seen as hindering inclusive growth by squandering resources needed for development" (Bardales & Arenas, 2014). Thus it means that accountability and transparency within institutions are essential elements for progress and sustainable development.

* Assistant Professor of Law, Department of Law, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, University of Kotli, Azad Jammu and Kashmir, Pakistan. Email: sardarwaqarkhan@gmail.com

† Assistant Professor of Law, Department of Law, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Azad Jammu and Kashmir, Muzaffarabad, Pakistan.

‡ Lecturer in Law, Department of Law, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Mirpur University of Science and Technology, Azad Jammu and Kashmir, Pakistan.

The agenda of sustainable development by 2030 is highly agreed upon by states. It is a set of political processes and consultations which lead to the overall development of the people. The agenda of SDGs is pushed further by Millennium development goals (MDGs), and there is a relationship between them. The Millennium Declaration of 2000 was also significant for the development of states. The agenda of SDGs differ from the agenda of MDGs in the sense that the former aims to resolve social and political issues, access to justice, elimination of poverty, women empowerment, and transparent governance everywhere in societies. All SDG goals link with each other and aim to establish sustainable development at every level. SDG 16 is specific to transparency and accountability within institutions.

The SDG 16 is quite lengthy in terms of its implementation because establishing peace everywhere has certain challenges. How accountability and transparency can be ensured at the national and international levels? It is difficult to determine. States have their own political, economic, and legal interests and agenda for development. Moreover, governance approaches and systems vary from state to state. However, each state aims to establish peace, good governance, and sustainable development. For instance, African countries maintain that: "governance, peace, and security are important to measure – and they are measurable" ([Report of African Union, 2014](#)). In other words, there are certain challenges at national and regional levels to progress towards SDG 16 and for global governance. Global indicators are incomparable across states because of different systems of governance and approaches ([Bolaji-Adio, 2015](#)). In governance, there are certain factors that lead to instability and insecurity. For example, the factor of corruption in states is a hurdle to good global governance and sustainable development. Bribery incidents are also significant in various regions.

The World Bank has obtained information in this regard by doing Enterprise Surveys. The surveys revealed that the ratio of bribery is high in certain reporting economies, such as the ratio of bribe payment request to firms is 25% or more in 17 out of 32 reporting economies ([Report of Asian Development Bank, 2017](#)). These are crucial challenges for least developing countries. It is argued that the active participation of states for achieving SDG 16 is necessary for further

progress and development. Implementation of SDG 16 at national and regional levels is needed of the hour.

In this context, this paper focuses on institutional accountability and transparency for sustainability. It aims to address the obligations of institutions and non-state actors under international law. The paper is divided into V Sections. An attempt is made to discuss the definition of sustainable development and concepts of accountability and transparency as envisaged in SDG 16 in Section I. It is necessary because the term sustainable development is linked with other concepts, such as sustainable development and law, sustainability, sustainable development, and society. Section II discusses the content of human rights mechanisms and standards in relation to accountability and transparency. Section III elaborates the obligations of institutions with reference to SDG 16. In order to create the context for further discussion, the obligations of nonstate actors (NSAs) are analyzed in Section IV. Section V discusses challenges to SDG 16 and overall challenges to sustainable development. Brief conclusions of the discussion will then follow.

Institutional Accountability for Sustainable Development

Definition of Sustainable Development

The term Sustainable development has different connotations. It is linked with sustainability, sustainable development and law, sustainability and society, and so on. Hael argues that sustainable behavior requires: (i) "A treatment of the present and the future that places a positive value on the very long run; (ii) Recognition of all the ways in which environmental assets contribute to economic well-being; and (iii) Recognition of the constraints implied by the dynamics of environmental assets" (Heal, 2000). The definition provided in the report of UN's Brundtland Commission is as follows: "Sustainable development is a development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own need" (Report of WCED, 1987). Indeed, it is a broad definition that covers various aspects of sustainable development. Based on this definition, it is necessary to discuss accountability and transparency as envisaged in SDG 16.6, which is central to this paper.

SDG 16.6: Develop Effective, Accountable, and Transparent Institutions at all Levels

The SDG 16.6 aims to achieve effective, accountable, and transparent institutions at all levels that is the highly complicated, far-reaching, complex and ambiguous goal. There exist deep responsibilities on the shoulders of government as well as people concerned within institutions for achieving this target at its length. The focus of this target includes the element of corruption that is a big challenge for states. This target is multifaceted and encompasses special measures to be taken by the governments. It also demands the participation of the society or persons working within institutions to ensure accountability. Stable mechanisms and accurate measures are to be used and taken to capture the breadth of this target. Andreas suggests that for achieving this target, it is necessary to draw attention on the assessment on factual data and complementary measures to be taken up in this regard. An analysis of regulations in practice may also be considered for assessing institutional accountability and transparency ([Schedler, 2012](#)). The assessment of experts carried out by private or public institutes is also helpful for ascertaining the breadth of this target. It is an additional measure too for capturing other aspects of SDG 16 in general. The assessment of various organizations and institutions in an unbiased and reliable way is central to the achievement of SDG 16.6. It is also important to concentrate on previous actions of institutions or work carried out by such institutions. The question to be focused on is whether are actions of organizations or institutions are constructive or disruptive? In particular, what is the exact scope of limitations on actions of NGOs representation? Who will bear the cost of mistakes committed by NGOs or organizations?

These questions have serious implications for those countries where a vulnerable economy and weak governance or weak political structure exist (Haque, 2008). States and international institutions create and support NGOs, corporations or agencies to perform special activities. The nature of activities carried out by NGOs includes partnership with other corporations, public and private management, management activism, and trust-building among various institutions (Kaldor et. al, 2006). These NGOs became profit-seeking sectors and *de*

facto partners of states and international institutions because of their participation in “the establishment of global norms and standards, negotiating, influencing and proposing policy solutions to public social problems” (Jordan, 2006). It is difficult to watch or control their actions when they perform functions in an individual capacity or in a dual way. At the same time, they are partners of states and partners of international companies. It is difficult to distinguish them from states when they perform actions in a dual way. It is also difficult to distinguish their actions if such NGOs implement policies of private companies rather than governmental public companies. The dual function seeks special attention in order to achieve accountability within NGOs (Kamat, 2003).

The selection and participation of people in institutions and NGOs is significant for consideration. The selection variable requires the competency and eligibility of the people concerned. There is a need to check and balance the actions of various institutions. Kapur argues that: "The increasing participation of NGOs in the World Bank's governance has also enhanced US influence, particularly in policy formulation. Participatory institutions can often yield highly inequitable outcomes as a result of the inequality of the participation process in already unequal settings, resulting from unequal consciousness of needs, unequal ability to articulate demands or transform these demands into decisions" (Kapur, 2000). Thus participation of the people and check and balance for them is important for achieving accountability and transparency within institutions.

The functioning of NGOs in a transparent and effective way has potential challenges.

The performance of functions by NGOs requires reliable, effective, and legitimate methods to be followed (Jordan, 2006). The governance of NGOs and organizations relates inter se accountability and transparency. Whether NGOs follow defined regulations in letter and spirit, and what are the possible implications for overcoming growing challenges, such as inequality within themselves? (Jordan, 2006). The democratic recognition of NGOs is also important. Accountability within NGOs itself is a big challenge, as pointed out by Edward that: “The challenge for NGOs is to show that they can put into practice the [accountability] principles that they campaign for in others” ([Edwards, 2000](#)

).

The accountability of Transitional national corporations (TNCs) at the domestic and international level is also necessary because they have the historical position as a frontier of global governance ([Scholte, 2011](#)). The term global governance is also broad in its context. However, the purpose of global organizations, agencies, and institutions is to protect the interests of the public at large in various domains of the world. The accountability of global organizations is linked with the accountability of other institutions within the context of global governance. If accountability in these organisations is ensured, ultimately, good governance will contribute to sustainable development ([Scholte, 2011](#)).

Along with NGOs and other organizations, a reference to nonstate actors is important for concentration. The potential standards for NSAs are the provisions of international law and human rights standards or mechanisms and domestic law. It is important to note that the accountability gap lies within international NGOs and organizations because they are not directly party to human rights instruments and enforcement mechanisms. Compliance with the norms of human rights law is crucial for the purposes of accountability and transparency ([Peters, 2010](#)). NGOs or organizations are chartered under the law of the land of the respective state and possess obligations to perform their functions within defined parameters of domestic law.

However, it is not necessary that the provisions of domestic law comply with the norms of international law. National and international standards may be diverse with each other. National organizations may evade regulations or policies. As a result, due to diversity in national and international standards, accountability within organizations is a big challenge. It is necessary to expand the scope of the norms of international law in order to avoid violations and accountability. In this respect, efforts of organizations for economic cooperation and development (OECD) and the UN are significant ([OECD Guidelines, 2000](#)). These bodies have adopted human rights standards in the case of violation of the norms by corporations, such as support for the Apartheid regime in South Africa and forced labour in Myanmar ([Report of the UN ECOSOC, 2003](#)). For NGOs, self-regulation is emerging in terms of accountability. In this respect, various firms also

have taken into consideration the code of conduct for accountability and transparency (Grant & Keohane, 2005).

Indeed, participatory and delegated accountability, models of accountability, require positive responses from other constituencies or groups. For instance, the claim that NSAs are unaccountable has no strong footing. It also does not mean that NSAs are ignored for accountability in the global domain. In fact, the actions of NSAs are accountable subject to their participatory level and actions. At least, under the human rights regime, NSAs are accountable for their actions. However, it can also be extended to other institutions or NGOs for achieving accountability and transparency. The merger of models of accountability within institutions is required (Grant & Keohane, 2005). The proposed indicators for developing effective, transparent, and accountable institutions are to take special and extraordinary measures for ensuring accountability and transparency; to strengthen anti-corruption frameworks within states and to spare maximum amount of budget in this regard by respective governments and to extend the scope of application of human rights regimes. The next section relates to the analysis of human rights-based approaches, mechanisms, and standards to support discussed arguments in relation to institutional accountability and transparency.

Human Rights Approaches, NHRIs, and Sustainable Development

[The UN conference of 2012](#) on sustainable development highlighted that every state has an obligation "to respect, protect and promote human rights," and that "democracy, good governance and the rule of law . . . are essential for sustainable development". The dimensions of sustainable development are social development, economic growth, and environmental protections ([The UN conference of 2012](#)). It is also followed by the statement of Secretary-General Ban Ki Moon, who reiterated that "a far-reaching vision of the future firmly anchored in human rights and universally accepted values and principles", is necessary for sustainable development ([Report of Secretary-General UN, 2015](#)).

Meanwhile, in 2012, the HRC has created a mandate of experts to study "the human rights obligations, including non-discrimination

obligations, relating to the enjoyment of a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment" (Resolution of HRC, 2012). The experts have studied the situation in detail by considering norms of human rights law, declarations, reports submitted by states, universal periodical review, regional reports of states on situations of human rights, reports of treaty bodies, and special rapporteurs. To that end, fourteen reports are issued to describe different dimensions of human rights situations in states ([Report of Knox, 2014](#)). For example, one report states that: "States must not only refrain from violating the rights of free expression and association directly; they must also take steps to protect the life, liberty, and security of individuals exercising those rights" ([Report of Knox, 2013](#)).

In 2014, the final report was submitted to HRC, which contains conclusions of all previous reports of experts. A reference to the development in relation to MDGs is also presented and considered in relation to the situation of human rights ([Alston, 2005](#)). It is important to note that the debate over sustainable development is backed by the UN 2012 Conference and reports of the experts. The document which emphasized on situation of human rights and sustainable development is 'The Future We Want' (Comprehensive document in relation to SDGs, 2012).

In 2015, the UN considered that the protection of human rights is central to the debate of SDGs ([Report on SDGs, 2015](#)). As a result, the member states of the UN have adopted a global framework in September 2015. The 2030 agenda relates to sustainable development. The member states will make in reality designed 17 goals and 169 targets on various social, environmental, economic, and cultural aspects of sustainable development. The time span for completion of this agenda is 15 years for member states. Above all, the Declaration has recognized basic human rights as the foundation and basis to agenda 2030. The text is somewhat verbatim of the provisions of human rights instruments. An example is a text of the Universal Declaration of human rights (UDHR), 1948. The Declaration 2030 recognizes human rights and fundamental freedoms without distinction. It correlates with the provisions of the UDHR (The UNSC Resolution, 70/1). For instance, the Declaration states that: "The new Agenda [...] is grounded in the Universal

Declaration of Human Rights, international human rights treaties [...]."

It is important to note that under international legal obligations, member states are required to submit reports on progress and development for fulfilling human rights, which are envisaged in human rights instruments. Each Covenant or Convention has a committee that overlooks the implementation of human rights norms in the domestic legal system of states. For example, ICCPR, 166, CEDAW, 1979 and CRC, 1984 have their own committees, and member states are required to submit reports periodically. The treaty bodies have their own standards and mechanisms for ensuring the implementation of human rights norms. After submissions of reports, the treaty bodies issue conclusions and recommendations for states in order to further the process of implementation of norms.

The Human Rights Council (HRC) deals with universal periodical review, and states are required to review their record after four and half years. The purpose is to peer-review the commitments and obligations of member states as envisaged in human rights instruments. Under periodical review, the performance of states on implementation is assessed, and recommendations are made to improve the situation of human rights. In this context, civil society and various organizations also report human rights situations and implementation of treaty norms for states. For example, Amnesty International, Human rights watch, and so on. These bodies also propose recommendations for states keeping in view the peer-review of reports submitted. Thus these mechanisms and standards are to be followed by state parties to domesticate norms of human rights instruments. Institutions are also required to implement norms of human rights law as they possess "delegated authority" to improve the situation.

Human Rights Obligations

Member states assume human rights obligations under international law by becoming parties to international treaties. These obligations can be classified in general as "obligation to respect, protect and fulfill," as pointed out by the UN Special Rapporteur. The obligation to respect requires to refrain from interference or curtailing enjoyment of human rights. The obligation to protect requires non-interference by third

parties, and the obligation to fulfill requires states to take positive and practical measures to facilitate the enjoyment of basic human rights. These obligations include direct and indirect obligations, such as the obligation to protect against harmful conduct of third parties in relation to NSAs in an indirect way (Report of the UN Special Rapporteur, 1987).

Similarly, the obligation to fulfill requires the state to take prompt and necessary measures for the progressive realization of human rights norms. These obligations are core obligations of states, and deviation from these obligations is impermissible regardless of other direct or indirect realm of obligations (Lane & Hesselman, 2017). However, these obligations also extend to organizations, institutions, NSAs, and individuals because of the shifting paradigm of the norms of human rights law and applicability from traditional states to individuals. The institutions, more or less, also have these obligations in relation to the protection of human rights and for sustainable development (Lewis, 1989). In this context, institutions are also accountable for their actions. For the promotion and protection of human rights, National Human Rights Institutions (NHRIs) also play an effective role.

The Role of NHRIs and Accountability

The focus of NHRIs is not limited to the promotion of human rights. The NHRIs play an effective role in transforming SDGs in a practical way and link to human rights standards and mechanisms. NHRIs are necessary for the progressive realization of the 2030 agenda. These address SDGs by performing a wide range of functions, such as reporting and monitoring, and tackling governance matters. The Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions (GANHRI) has adopted the Merida Declaration in 2015, which aims to outline activities and functions of all NHRIs that can undertake in relation to contribute to a human rights-based approach to the SDGs Agenda 2030. The Declaration emphasized 'knowledge sharing' and 'capacity building'. The Declaration outlined how NHRIs can perform functions in relation to the integration of human rights and sustainable development. A working group on sustainable development was also established by GANHRI to create cooperation among NHRIs. The role of NHRIs is significant "in the context of the 2030 Agenda, since collaboration between a variety of

actors and sectors will be absolutely essential for effective and equitable implementation" (Conference Report, 2016). The NHRIs promote awareness about accountability and transparency to achieve the SDGs goal and to strengthen national processes ([Report of DIHR, 2017](#)).

The system of NHRIs "monitor[s] progress towards agreed objectives, examine[s] obstacles to implementation, identify[es] successful approaches, and suggest[s] changes and remedy actions to those policies deemed ineffective to meet internationally agreed goals." The focus of NHRIs for SDG 16 extends to "Governments and public institutions will also work closely on implementation with regional and local authorities, sub-regional institutions, international institutions, academia, philanthropic organizations, volunteer groups, and others." However, for achieving SDG 16, states have direct and indirect human rights obligations. The institutions, such as, NHRIs are also working for achieving SDGs. However, there is further need to strengthen the framework of accountability.

Obligations of Institutions: Goal 16

The term social accountability can be defined as "an approach towards building accountability that relies on civic engagement, i.e., in which it is ordinary citizens and/or civil society organizations who participate directly or indirectly in exacting accountability" (Melina et. Al, 2004).

In this respect, the domestication of the norms of international law by states is essential for sustainable development. The institutions are under obligations of domestic law to promote and respect state laws and policies. Institutions are also under international legal obligations to respect, protect and fulfill norms of international law. The most important obligation on institutions is to take transparency and accountability initiatives and measures for ensuring the implementation of target 16.6. The system of check and balance on institutions may be ensured by states in order to achieve sustainability. The mechanism and implementation of human rights-based approaches are essential in this respect ([Peruzzotti & Smulovitz, 2006](#)). Similarly, the role of civil society for improving the situation of sustainability is important. Institutions are under

obligation to take institutional measures and steps to secure sustainable development. The state policies and political and institutional mechanisms are to be followed by institutions in this regard ([McNeil & Malena, 2010](#)).

Non-state Actor's Involvement and Accountability

The term non-state actor is not defined under international law in express terms. However, in simple words it includes all groups and entities which are not states or which fall within the public domain. For example, NGOs and private and public companies, tribal structures, religious-based organizations, community and society based groups etc. The authority of NSAs is informal that compete or co-exist with other groups or states. Usually, NSAs have their rules and regulations within institutions or states. However, certain groups also involved themselves in illicit or illegal activities, such as armed groups. NSAs are constructive partners of the institutions and society and possess a pivotal role ([Smits & Wright, 2012](#)).

In this context, the engagement of NSAs in the international legal framework is a big challenge because of the various categories and classifications of NSAs. For example, it is difficult to engage armed groups in particular in the development of law and practice. The role of NSAs is quite significant for achieving their goals. For example, civil society or various NGOs play an important role in flourishing confidence in the minds of people for state-building through providing services to the individuals at the doorsteps ([Report of World Bank, 2011](#)). The multiple roles of NSAs reveal that they sometimes work as an alternative to the state concerned. By virtue of multiple roles, they seek enjoyment of various functions, such as authority, accountability, and local legitimacy ([Scheve, 2009](#)). The participation and coordination of NSAs at local level activities gain the confidence of the people. As a result, NSAs play an effective role for the state-building process and building confidence ([Putzel & John, 2012](#)).

States can ensure the implementation of norms of international law by involving NSAs for the success of various programs. It is because the NSAs play a prominent role in the local governance. For example, the Local Coordination Committees (LCC) in Syria have performed their

functions as the foundation for improvement in local governance during uprisings in 2011. Similarly, voluntary community development councils also played an important role in the identification of leaders and implementing projects within communities in Afghanistan post 9/11 (Report of R & D, 2012). The involvement and engagement of NSAs in local governance and communities are essential for sustainable development. The participation and engagement of such actors may contribute to settlement in particular after conflicting situations. As a result, it leads to further improvement of the local community and governance structures.

The system of accountability within NSAs is also important for ensuring the implementation of norms of international law and for sustainable development. However, the actions of NSAs in the global domain are accountable and NSAs are, more or less, liable for the violation of norms of international law. The need of the hour is to make solidified attempts for their participation and engagement at local levels in order to smooth the governance process and state-building. The most important functions attributed to NSAs can be classified into three broadheads. The extended role of civil society in this respect can give rise to overall accountability and capacity in the state-building process. It is necessary to build national and international partnerships between states and NSAs for advancing SDGs ([Report of World Bank, 2011](#)). It is also necessary to ensure the involvement of NSAs in order to achieve SDGs. For this purpose, the international policy commitments to NSAs may be emphasized by states in order to strengthen the state-building process ([Chan et al., 2015](#)).

Challenges for Sustainable Development

The 2030 agenda has certain challenges, as pointed out by the UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan put it in 2005: "We will not enjoy development without security; we will not enjoy security without development; and we will not enjoy either without respect for human rights". The UN Secretary-General Antonio Guterres has also emphasized the role of member states as the principal implementers of preventive action and stated that: "prevention is best served by strong sovereign states, acting for the good of their people." It is an important consideration for implementation of SDG 16 which relates to the promotion of "peaceful and inclusive societies

for sustainable development", "provid[ing] access to justice for all", and "build[ing] effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels" (Kezie-Nwoha & Lalbahadur, 2017).

The protection of human rights and the security of people is the cornerstone for further development. The implementation of SDGs globally is a big challenge for states because SDGs provide opportunities as well as challenges. It is important that respective states may translate and domesticate the agenda of SDGs within national actions plan. The major challenges include: (i) financial and economic stability of states; (ii) maintaining peace and security; (iii) eradication of poverty; (iv) accountability and implementation of SDGs (Kumar et al., 2016). For achieving these objectives, the SDGs are expected to take a more inclusive and diverse approach by mobilizing civil society and NSAs in both developing and developed countries ([Sustainability Science, 2016](#)).

In this context, the EU has also adopted SDGs strategy to highlight challenges which is important for consideration. The strategy highlighted that such challenges could be overcome by either Education and training; or Research and development (Pisano et. al, 2015). "There can be no sustainable development without peace and no peace without sustainable development". Thus the need of the hour is to formulate effective policies and ensure implementation within institutions in order to achieve SDG 16.6. Reforms in existing legal frameworks of developing countries are necessary in order to enhance the scope of overall sustainable development ([Report of MIDAS Centre, 2017](#)).

Conclusion

It is concluded from the above discussion that universal peace and security can be established only if agenda 20130 of SDGs be ensured by states at its length. It is necessary to promote inclusive and peaceful societies based on respect for human rights, the rule of law, and transparent and accountable institutions. For achieving SDG 16 in particular, many states and regions have increased levels of peace and security. However, the developing countries and the regions where protracted violence and armed conflict occurs lack access to justice and institutional transparency and accountability.

States and the institutions have obligations under domestic and international legal framework to respect, protect and fulfill the human rights of people at large. In this context, NSAs also have obligations direct and indirect to respect norms of international law. The role of NHRIs is significant for achievement of target 16.6. Without sustainable development and respect for human rights, it is crucial to maintain peace and security and governance worldwide. There is need to develop more transparent and effective institutions at all levels in order to achieve SDGs. The role of NGOs, public and private companies and civil society is significant for promotion of SDGs. However, it has certain challenges as well, such as corruption, domestication and implementation of norms of international law, eradication of poverty, social accountability, and economic and social development of states.

The paper has revealed that the role of NSAs is also significant for achieving sustainable development. In this context, the engagement and participation of NSAs in the international domain is essential for further progress. Institutions are accountable for their actions, at least under the provisions of human rights law. However, states have to take necessary and special measures for the promotion and projection of SDGs and human rights in order to achieve peace, stability, global governance, and ends of justice.

Recommendations for Achieving Target 16.6

The recommendations in relation to accountability and transparency include: Special legislation and implementation is necessary for safeguarding private and public servants from malpractices and political manipulation. In this respect, special performance management tools and measures must be taken for persons involved within institutions. The salaries and budget for law enforcement agencies or implementation committees be increased to avoid any kind of bribery incidents. The other reforms to be taken by states include: (i) States must take special steps to address implementation of SDGs at regional and country level; (ii) States have to address inequalities and discrimination at its length in peaceful societies and institutions; (iii) States may redesign patterns of relations with other states and international actors based on

mutual respect and mutual accountability; (iv) States may create a balance between various organs and ensure implementation of the doctrine of separation of power; (v) States may promote and protect right to development of people at large; (vi) States may consider human rights violations and ensure security at all levels and (vii) States may advance political, social and economic participation, women empowerment, engagement of NSAs, social dialogue and transparency.

References

- Alston, P. (2005). "Ships Passing in the Night: The Current State of the Human Rights and Development Debate Seen Through the Lens of the Millennium Development Goals". *27 Human rights Quarterly*. 27(3), 760.
- Bardales, D., & Arenas, P. (2014). Project report titled: "The World We Want", *Global Movement for Children of Latin America and Caribbean – MMI-LAC*, October. p25.
- Bolaji-Adio, A. (2015). "The Challenge of Measuring SDG 16, What role for African regional frameworks?". *Entre Politiques et pratique dans la coopearion internationale* (ECDPM). Discussion paper no. 175, p7.
- Chan, S., Asselt, H., Hale, T. et al., (2015). "Reinvigorating International Climate Policy: A Comprehensive Framework for Effective Nonstate Action". *Global Policy*. 1-8.
- Conference Report. (2016). ENNHRI, ANNHRI & UNDP. *Role of National Human Rights Institutions in implementing the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goal*.
- Edwards, M. (2000). "Victims of their Own Success". *Guardian Weekly*. Policy Centre.
- Goetz, A., & Jenkins, R. (2005). *Reinventing Accountability*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Malena, C., Forster, R., & Singh, J. (2004). 'Social Accountability: An Introduction to the Concept and Emerging Practice'. *Social Development Paper* 76. Washington DC: World Bank.
- Grant, R. W., & Keohane, R. (2005). "Accountability and Abuses of Power in World Politics". *American Political Science Review*. 99, 35.
- Haque, I. (2008). "Nonstate Actors and Global Governance", 15.
- Heal, G. (2000). *Valuing the Future: Economic Theory and Sustainability*. New York: Columbia University Press. 13.
- Hoise, A. (2016). Scottish Human Rights Commission. *Contributing to the Accountability Web: The Role of NHRIs and the SDGs*. 23 March.
- Jordan, L. (2006). "Mechanisms for NGO accountability". *Global Public Policy Institute Research*. Paper Series 3. p5.
- Kaldor, J. M., Anheier H. K., & Glasius, M. E. (2003). "*Global civil society in an era of regressive globalization: The State of global civil society in 2003*", in Kaldor, M., Anheier, H. and Glasius, M. (Eds), *Global Civil Society*, Oxford University Press. 3-33.
- Kamat, S. (2003). "NGOs and democracy: false saviors of international development". *Harvard International Review*. 25(1), 67.
- Kapur, D. (2000). "From Shareholders to Stakeholders: The Changing Anatomy of Governance of the World Bank". Revised version of a paper prepared for conference at Northwestern University on "Reinventing the World Bank". p20.
- Kezie-Nwoha H., & Lalbahadur, A. (2017). "Sustainable Development Goal 16: The Challenge of Sustaining Peace in Places of Crisis Position Paper". Prepared for the African Policy Circle. 3-5.
- Kumar, S., Kumar, N., & Vivekadhish S. (2016). "Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) to Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs): Addressing Unfinished Agenda and Strengthening Sustainable Development and Partnership". *Indian Journal of Community Medicine*. Official Publication of Indian Association of Preventive & Social Medicine.
- Lane L., & Hesselman, M. (2017). "Governing disasters: embracing human rights law and governance in a multi-level, multi-actor disaster governance landscape". *Governance and Politics*. 5(2). 93-104.
- Lewis, N. (1989). '*Regulating Non-Government Bodies: Privatization, Accountability, and the Public-Private Divide*' in Jowell, J. and Oliver D. (eds.), *The Changing Constitution* (2nd) Oxford: Clarendon Press. p219.
- Malena, C., Forster, R., & Singh, J. (2004). "Social Accountability: An Introduction to the Concept and Emerging Practice". *Social Development Paper* 76. Washington DC: World Bank. p3.
- McNeil, M., & Malena, C. (eds) (2010). *Demanding Good Governance: Lessons from Social Accountability Initiatives in Africa*. Washington DC: World Bank.
- OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises. (2000). (DAFFE/IME/WPG 15).
- Peruzzotti, E., & Smulovitz, C. (2006). "Social Accountability: An Introduction".

- Peruzzotti, E., & Smulovitz, C. (eds) *Enforcing the Rule of Law: Social Accountability in the New Latin American Democracies*, Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh.
- Peters, A., Koechlin, L., Forster, T., & Zinkemagal, G. F. (2010). *Non-State actors as standard setters*, Cambridge University press. p125.
- Putzel, J., & Di John, J. (2012). "Meeting the challenges of crisis States". Crisis States Research Centre Report. *London School of Economics and Political Science*. p5.
- Report of OECD. (2011). "Supporting Statebuilding in Situations of Conflict and Fragility: Policy Guidance". DAC Guidelines and Reference Series. *OECD Publishing*. pp. 51-52.
- Report of Transparency International Bangladesh MIDAS Centre (Levels 4 & 5). (2017). "Sustainable Development Goal 16: Preparedness, Progress and Challenges of Bangladesh: A Study of Selected Targets". p61.
- Report of African Union, United Nations Development Fund (UNDP) and Safer world. (2014).
- Report of Asian Development Bank. (2017). "Key indicators for Asia and the Pacific". part-I *Sustainable Development Goals Trends and Tables*. p76.
- Report of Department for International Development. (2012). 'Operational plan 2011- 2015', DFID Civil Society Department. p2.
- Report of Australian Government/AusAID. (2012). "Civil society engagement framework: Working with civil society organisations to help people overcome poverty". p2.
- Report of the UN Secretary-General. (2013). "A Life of Dignity for All: Accelerating Progress towards the Millennium Development Goals and Advancing the United Nations Development Agenda beyond 2015". U.N. Doc. A/68/202. 74-75.
- Resolution of Human Rights Council. (2012). 19/10, 2, U.N. Doc A/HRC/RES/19/10.
- Report of John H. Knox. (2014). Independent expert. "United Nations Mandate on Human Rights and the Environment".
- Report of World Bank. (2011). "World Development Report 2011 – Conflict, Security, and Development". Washington DC. 112, 115.
- Report of John HKnox.(2013). UN Independent Expert. "Report of the Independent Expert on the Issue of Human Rights Obligations Relating to the Enjoyment of a Safe, Clean, Healthy and Sustainable Environment". U.N. Doc. A/HRC/25/53 (Dec. 30). 39-40.
- Report of World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). *Our Common Future*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Report of DIHR. (2016). *Human Rights in Follow-up and Review of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development 2016. Human Rights and Data – tools and resources for sustainable development*.
- Schedler, A. (2012). "Judgment and Measurement in Political Science". *Perspectives on Politics*. 10(1): pp21-36.
- Scheye, E. (2009). "Realism in Justice and Security Development: Supporting Improvement in the Performance of nonstate/Local Justice and Security Networks". *Netherlands Institute for International Relations Clingendael – Conflict Research Unit*. p8.
- Scholte, J. A. (2011). *Building Global Democracy? Civil Society and Accountable Governance*. Cambridge University Press. pp15-16.
- Smits, R., & Wright, D. (2012). "Engagement with Nonstate Actors in Fragile States: Narrowing Definitions, Broadening Scope". *Conflict Research Unit, The Clingendael Institute*. The Hague. p5.
- Sustainability Science. (2016). "Call for paper for sustainability science and implementing the sustainable development goals". Vol. 11, Issue 2, pp 177–178.
- The Day After. (2012). "The day after project". August.
- Tisne, M. (2010). 'Transparency, Participation and Accountability: Definitions', unpublished Background Note for Transparency and Accountability Initiative, Institute of Development Studies. p2.
- UN ECOSOC Sub-Commission on the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights. (2003). "Norms of the Responsibilities of Transnational Corporations and Other Business Enterprises of 13 August 2003", (UN-Doc. E/CN.4/Sub.2/2003/12/Rev. 2).
- United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development. (2012). Rio de Janeiro, Braz., June 20-22. "The Future We Want", U.N. Doc. A/CONF.216/L.1 (June 19, 2012).

United Nations General Assembly resolution 70/1, Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, paras 10 and 19.

UN Special Rapporteur for the Right to Food. (1987). "The right to adequate food as a human right: final report submitted by Asbjørn Eide". E/CN.4/Sub.2/1987/23.

Umberto Pisano, U., Lange, L., Berger G., & Hametner, M. (2015). "The Sustainable

Development Goals (SDGs) and their impact on the European SD governance framework Preparing for the post-2015 agenda". Institute for Managing Sustainability. ESDN Quarterly Report No:35. p20.

Zaken, M. V. B. (2009). "Beleidsnotitie maatschappelijke organisaties: samenwerken, maatwerk, meerwaarde". 14 April. p11.