

PRACTICAL GUIDANCE: GENDER-RESPONSIVE CITIZEN DATA QUALITY PRINCIPLES

UN WOMEN WORKING PAPER

AUGUST 2026

PRACTICAL GUIDANCE: GENDER-RESPONSIVE CITIZEN DATA QUALITY PRINCIPLES

NOTE TO READERS

This publication is issued as a working practical guidance and serves as a precursor to the broader Citizen Data Quality Assurance (DQA) Framework currently being developed by the Collaborative on Citizen Data.

The Collaborative's DQA Framework will provide a comprehensive approach to assuring the quality of citizen data across thematic areas and use cases. This guidance complements that effort by focusing specifically on gender-responsive citizen data and articulating the foundational quality principles that support the production, assessment and use of gender-responsive citizen data.

As the Collaborative's DQA Framework evolves, this guidance will be reviewed and updated to ensure alignment with the broader framework, while continuing to reflect the specific considerations needed for gender equality and the rights of women and girls.

This working guidance is intended to support ongoing dialogue, testing and practical application, and will benefit from the experiences and feedback of practitioners, national statistical systems, civil society organisations and other stakeholders engaged in producing and using gender-responsive citizen data.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This UN Women working guidance, Gender-responsive citizen data quality principles, presents a set of foundational principles to support the production, assessment and use of high-quality gender-responsive citizen data. It is intended as a precursor to the broader Citizen Data Quality Assurance Framework being developed by the Collaborative on Citizen Data and reflects the collective expertise and experience of practitioners from national statistical systems, civil society, academia, international organizations and development partners working to strengthen gender-responsive data ecosystems.

UN Women would like to thank the donors to its global gender data programme, Women Count (<https://data.unwomen.org>), for their generous financial support, which made this publication possible.

The practical guidance was prepared under the leadership of Papa Seck, Chief of UN Women's Research and Data Section, and Jessamyn Encarnacion, Inter-Regional Adviser on Gender Statistics and Technical Lead of the Women Count Programme. Ramya Emandi coordinated the development of the guidance, served as the primary focal point with the lead author, and led the consultation process, technical review and consolidation of inputs on behalf of UN Women.

The guidance was authored by Monica Pratesi, Full Professor of Statistics at the University of Pisa, who served as the lead author. She developed the conceptual framework and articulated the quality principles that underpin gender-responsive citizen data, drawing on international statistical standards and emerging practices in citizen data.

UN Women is grateful to members of the Working Group on Gender and Citizen Data, co-led by UN Women and Open Data Watch, for their valuable technical guidance and substantive contributions throughout the development of this working guidance. UN Women acknowledges the contributions of Ana Ortigoza (PAHO), Eugenia D'Angelo (Mundo Sur), Lauren Pandolfelli (UNICEF) and Liliana Suchodolska (PARIS21) of the Working Group, whose expertise and feedback helped shape the guidance and ensure its practical relevance across diverse contexts.

Financial and administrative management of the project was coordinated by Lauren Billi, with additional guidance from Silvia Pina-Juste and support from Satanay Eshak, ensuring smooth implementation throughout the project. The publication's visual identity, including its graphics and cover design, was coordinated by Mika Mansukhani.

Artificial intelligence tools were used solely to assist with copy-editing and language refinement. All substantive content, analysis and conclusions remain the responsibility of the authors.

CONTENTS

List of tables.....	5
Acronyms and abbreviations.....	6
Introduction.....	7
I Concepts.....	9
1.1 Conceptual foundations of the Gender-responsive citizen data quality principles.....	9
1.1.1 Citizen data	9
1.1.2 Gender-responsive citizen data.....	9
1.1.3 Sources of gender-responsive citizen data	10
1.1.4 Tailored and aligned approach to citizen data quality	11
1.1.5 Dedicated quality dimensions for gender-responsive citizen data	11
1.2 Gender-responsive citizen data quality principles.....	13
1.2.1 Framing the approach	13
1.2.2 Three data quality dimensions	13
1.2.3 Trustworthiness: Ethical integrity and credibility.....	14
1.2.4 Inclusivity: Representation and participation.....	16
1.2.5 Utility: Actionability and relevance.....	18
1.2.6 Applying the gender-responsive citizen data quality principles in practice	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.3 Connecting gender-responsive citizen data with UN FPOS and NSO standards or approaches.....	20
1.4 Linking gender-responsive citizen data quality principles to the Copenhagen Framework on Citizen Data	23
2 Operations and implementation	25
2.1 Country applications of the gender-responsive citizen data quality principles.....	25
2.2 Practical gender-responsive citizen data quality assurance steps	27
2.3 Implementation guidance for CSOs and NSOs.....	29
2.3.1 Practical steps.....	29
2.3.2 Recommendations.....	30
2.4 Tools and templates.....	31
3 Conclusion.....	32
Endnotes	33
References	34
Appendices	37
Appendix 1 List of countries with active CSO/non-profit statistical programmes.....	37
Appendix 2 Glossary of terms on CSO citizen data collection methods and tools	39
Appendix 3 United Nations Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics	42

Appendix 4 Mapping NSO practices to the Copenhagen Framework for Citizen Data	43
Appendix 5 Tools and templates for gender-responsive citizen data quality assurance	44
Appendix 6 Interview guide for CSO-NSO dialogue on gender-responsive citizen data collaboration	46

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1-1 Illustrative list of sources of gender-responsive citizen data
Table 1-2 Framework for gender-responsive citizen data quality principles
Table 1-3 Gender-responsive citizen data quality principles under trustworthiness
Table 1-4 Gender-responsive citizen data quality principles under inclusivity
Table 1-5 Gender-responsive citizen data quality principles under utility
Table 1-6 CSOs and NSOs involved in the case studies and references, by country
Table 1-7 Alignment of CSO practices on gender-responsive citizen data to UN FPOS and NSOs' standards of practice
Table 1-8 Mapping gender-responsive citizen data quality principles to the Copenhagen Framework of Citizen Data
Table 2-1 Case studies' application of the gender-responsive citizen data quality principles
Table 2-2 Practical quality assurance steps for gender-responsive citizen data

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ANSD	Agence Nationale de la Statistique et de la Démographie or National Agency of Statistics and Demography
CSO	civil society organization
DANE	Departamento Administrativo Nacional de Estadística or National Administrative Department of Statistics
GBV	gender-based violence
KNBS	Kenya National Bureau of Statistics
NGO	non-governmental organization
NSO	national statistical office
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
UN	United Nations
UN FPOS	United Nations Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics
UN Women	United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women

INTRODUCTION

This working guidance has informed and influenced the forthcoming Citizen data quality guidelines, and serves as a thematic companion piece focused on gender equality. It aims to ensure that the value of citizen data is realized through dimensions of quality that are meaningful, inclusive and purpose driven. Drawing on field experiences from Colombia, Ethiopia, Kenya, Senegal, Tanzania and the Philippines, and on eight interviews¹ with representatives of four civil society organizations (CSOs) and four national statistical offices (NSOs), this document introduces 12 gender-responsive citizen data quality principles, classified into three dimensions – trustworthiness, inclusivity and utility – that serves as the foundation of this guidance.

At the heart of this guidance is the recognition that CSOs, especially those advancing women's rights and gender justice, and NSOs are not parallel actors. They are interdependent allies in building a data ecosystem that reflects the lived realities of all people, especially those most often excluded. When their collaboration is grounded in feminist ethics, mutual accountability and shared professional standards, citizen data on gender issues – such as sexual harassment, economic violence, unpaid care or reproductive autonomy – can powerfully complement official statistics. Together, CSOs and NSOs illuminate gaps, validate community knowledge and strengthen the evidence base for action. Their cooperation doesn't just improve data quality but reshapes what is seen as credible, whose voices matter, and how gender inequality is named and addressed through data.

Strengthening CSO-NSO collaborations is one of the key motivations for this guidance: to move from isolated examples of cooperation towards systematic, scalable and institutionalized partnerships that make citizen data a credible and integral part of the wider statistical system.

Citizen data play a vital role in surfacing the lived experiences of women, girls and marginalized gender groups, which are often missed by traditional statistical systems. In this guidance, lived experience refers to knowledge that comes from people's direct, everyday experience of social realities, as shaped by institutions, norms, power relations and material conditions, and not from theory, administrative records or external observation alone. In the context of citizen data on gender issues, lived experience captures: how policies, services and norms are encountered by women and girls in their daily lives; how gender intersects with factors such as age, disability, class, ethnicity, migration status or sexuality to shape opportunities and constraints; realities that are often invisible to official data systems, such as unpaid care work, informal labour, harassment, fear, exclusion or coping strategies. Marginalized gender groups refer to people whose gender identity, expression or socially assigned gender role places them at systematic disadvantage in access to rights, services, safety, representation and voice in data systems. This is not limited to women, and it is not synonymous with 'gender-diverse', though the two overlap.²

More than just sex-disaggregated figures, gender-responsive citizen data reshape how data are produced, validated and used to challenge inequality and drive transformative change. Their strength lies in proximity and responsiveness: citizen data often capture issues as these unfold, reflecting realities that are local, dynamic and deeply contextual. This makes citizen data a powerful complement to official data, filling gaps in representation and bringing visibility to the voices of those often excluded from mainstream statistics.

The guidance is organized in two parts: i) concepts; and ii) operations and implementation. Section 1.1 under Concepts establishes the conceptual foundations of quality for gender-responsive citizen data produced by CSOs. Section 1.2 applies a gender lens to data quality and presents 12 gender-responsive data quality principles organized under the three quality dimensions. Section 1.3 aligns the principles with the United Nations Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics (UN FPOS) and the standards of practice of NSOs. Section 1.4 connects the principles to the Copenhagen Framework on Citizen Data, reinforcing coherence across global and national frameworks.

The second part, operations and implementation, puts the concepts into practice. Section 2.1 demonstrates how the data quality principles are reflected in country applications. Section 2.2 outlines practical steps for quality assurance; Section 2.3 provides actionable guidance for CSO–NSO collaboration; and Section 2.4 offers tools and templates to operationalize the approach.

Together, these sections form a roadmap towards more inclusive, ethical and actionable data systems, where citizen data become a trusted and integral part of advancing gender equality.

I CONCEPTS

1.1 Conceptual foundations of the gender-responsive citizen data quality principles

1.1.1 Citizen data

Operational definition (Copenhagen Framework on Citizen Data)

“Citizen Data refers to data originated from initiatives for which citizens are engaged at various stages of the data value chain, guided by key principles that promote inclusive, responsible, professional, and ethical production and use, regardless of whether or not these data are integrated into official statistics.”

Citizen data refer to information that is collected, produced or analysed directly by people and communities, rather than solely by governments or research institutions. These emerge from a wide variety of participatory, grassroots and digital activities, which can include community-led surveys, participatory mapping, crowdsourcing platforms, citizen science experiments, social media reporting and digital monitoring tools.

In simpler terms, citizen data capture what people observe, experience or care about in their everyday lives and translate these into evidence for action. Such as a network of domestic workers documenting cases of gender-based harassment or systemic underpayment of women to advocate for safer, fairer workplaces; an indigenous community using participatory mapping to protect ancestral lands from extractive activities; or a group of persons with disabilities tracking physical barriers to public buildings to push for more inclusive urban design.

In line with the Copenhagen Framework on Citizen Data, citizen data encompass any initiative where citizens are actively engaged in the data value chain – from designing data collection tools, to gathering, analysing and using data – under inclusive and ethical principles.

1.1.2 Gender-responsive citizen data

Within this broad ecosystem, gender-related citizen data refer specifically to citizen data initiatives that document and analyse the lived realities of women, girls and gender-diverse people through a gendered and intersectional lens. Lived experience (or realities) refers to systematically collected, self-reported data that capture how individuals perceive, navigate and are affected by social, economic and institutional conditions in their daily lives. The initiatives focus on issues often underrepresented or inadequately captured in traditional statistics, such as gender-based violence, unpaid care work, reproductive health or participation in decision-making.

Unlike citizen data, which may address environmental, economic or social issues more broadly and only occasionally consider gender, gender-responsive citizen data apply a gender-focused and intersectional lens, asking not only who is represented but also how power relations shape data production, interpretation and use.

Official statistics on gender-based violence typically capture outcome-level data, such as number of reported cases of domestic violence recorded by police, number of prosecutions or convictions, and number of survivors accessing formal services. Such indicators measure institutional events and speak about what enters official systems. Gender-related citizen data, in contrast, reveal unreported violence, everyday coercion and barriers to seeking help, providing essential context for interpreting outcome-level indicators. These initiatives capture lived-reality data, such as violence that is never reported because of fear, stigma, economic dependence or lack of trust in institutions; patterns of coercive control, harassment or psychological violence that do not meet legal thresholds; and barriers faced when attempting to seek help (e.g., police refusal, unsafe reporting environments, lack of shelters).

For example, police statistics may show a decline in reported domestic violence cases in a given year. Citizen data collected through confidential community surveys or helplines may simultaneously reveal

increased violence, combined with reduced reporting due to lockdowns, mobility restrictions or fear of retaliation. The two data sources are not contradictory but operate at different levels: traditional statistics capture system interaction while citizen data capture lived reality. Together, the sources explain why outcomes look the way they do.

Much of gender-related citizen data are driven by women's rights organizations, community-based and feminist collectives, and civil society organizations (CSOs),³ including research institutions and advocacy networks. These organizations often collect data to amplify voices of marginalized groups and minority groups and influence public policy.

These organizations collect data to 'amplify voices' rather than 'give' voice to those systematically unheard in official statistics. Groups in situations of marginalization or vulnerability already articulate their needs and experiences; however, institutional, social or methodological barriers prevent their voices from being recorded, aggregated or acted upon. Citizen data initiatives play an amplification role, making existing voices legible within policy and statistical systems.

Importantly, marginalized groups and minority groups are not the same, and they become statistically invisible for different reasons. Marginalized groups are excluded due to structural power imbalances related to gender, class, disability, ethnicity, legal status or stigma. Minority groups may be statistically invisible simply because they represent small numbers or rare conditions that fall below sampling thresholds or disclosure rules used by national statistical offices (NSOs). Such groups may or may not be socially marginalized.

Despite their vital role, many CSOs operate with limited statistical capacity, and their data production models remain poorly documented. While some countries conduct censuses of CSOs and non-profit institutions (see Appendix 1), these tend to focus on the economic contribution of the sector (e.g., employment and value added) rather than on how CSOs collect, manage or validate their data. This gap in knowledge implies that too little is known about the scope, quality and potential of CSO-generated citizen data, especially on gender issues. Strengthening understanding of these practices is therefore an essential step towards building mutual recognition and fostering trust and collaboration with NSOs.

1.1.3 Sources of citizen data on gender issues

Gender-responsive citizen data come from a diverse range of sources: from in-person community monitoring and participatory approaches to online reporting platforms, crowdsourcing tools and social media data. Some are based on structured surveys while others emerge from community reporting or online engagement. Table 1-1 summarizes the most common sources and mechanisms, drawing on examples from the six case study countries – Colombia, Ethiopia, Kenya, Senegal, Tanzania and the Philippines – and global initiatives.

Table 1-1 Illustrative list of sources of gender-related citizen data

Type of source	Typical mechanism/tool	Example or application
Community-based monitoring and reporting	Local surveys, needs assessments, community scorecards	Local women's networks tracking access to water and sanitation services
Crisis mapping and emergency response	Crowdsourcing platforms and reporting through text messages	Digital maps used to report and visualize cases of gender-based violence (GBV)
Digital participation and social media	Online forums, apps, chatbots and helplines	GBV hotlines and anonymous reporting apps managed by CSOs
Participatory mapping and citizen science	Use of GPS, open-source tools and sensors	Mapping of unsafe public spaces or monitoring of pollution affecting women's livelihoods
CSO-led audits and shadow reports	Feminist audits, community assessments, service monitoring	NGO reports feeding into Sustainable Development Goal 5 monitoring or shadow submissions for the Convention

Type of source	Typical mechanism/tool	Example or application
		on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women.

These sources can be global in origin or context-specific, depending on the initiative's nature. Kenya and Senegal, for example, have used mobile-based systems to collect gender-based violence (GBV) data, while Colombia and Ethiopia have relied more on structured community surveys and participatory workshops.

Appendix 2 provides a glossary of terms on CSO citizen data collection methods and tools.

1.1.4 Tailored and aligned approach to citizen data quality

To ensure that gender-responsive citizen data can be recognized, trusted and used within national and global statistical systems, such as for monitoring progress on Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 5, it is essential to define specific characteristics of quality while also speaking the language of official statistics. This means that gender-responsive citizen data must be credible and usable for CSOs, which are among its primary producers, while also being relevant, interpretable and trustworthy for NSOs and other public data users. Perspectives on quality should be complementary rather than opposing. Strengthening gender-responsive citizen data requires upholding institutional standards of transparency, documentation and methodological clarity, while preserving the participatory, ethical and inclusive principles that distinguish these from conventional data sources.

Such balance is particularly important because gender data are often perceived as less rigorous or inherently biased, especially when these are rooted in feminist approaches or produced by explicitly feminist women's organizations. Such perceptions – whether implicit or explicit – are frequently reinforced by political contestation around gender equality. In some contexts, evidence on women's and girls' rights is not only questioned but deliberately misrepresented or discredited, making it harder for gender data to inform policy and public debate.

For these reasons, quality assurance is not merely a technical concern for gender-responsive citizen data but a strategic necessity. Robust quality principles help protect gender data from dismissal, misuse or politicized reinterpretation, and support their legitimate use in policy-making and accountability processes. While quality matters for all forms of citizen data, it is especially critical in the gender domain, where data are more likely to be contested.

An additional dimension concerns the sustainability, availability and reusability of gender-responsive citizen data. Ensuring that data are well-documented, ethically governed and accessible over time is essential for enabling cumulative learning, policy continuity and social action, particularly in gender-adverse contexts, where institutional support for gender equality may weaken or regress. In such settings, quality-assured citizen data can serve as a durable evidence base, preserving visibility of gender inequalities even when political conditions are unfavourable.

This guidance thus establishes a foundation for developing global standards for gender-responsive citizen data quality assurance, bridging the technical rigor and trustworthiness of official statistics with the contextual credibility, relevance and lived-reality insights of community-driven data, particularly for groups most often left behind from population-driven data.

1.1.5 Dedicated quality dimensions for gender-responsive citizen data

The need for dedicated quality dimensions for gender-responsive citizen data rests on five core motivations.

i) Relevance across CSOs

The quality dimensions must be meaningful and applicable to the wide range of CSOs, whether formally linked to official statistics or not. CSOs vary greatly in their missions, capacities and methods: from feminist networks conducting local surveys to digital collectives using mobile apps for real-time reporting. A common but flexible quality framework helps ensure that every actor, regardless of size or resources, can follow consistent principles of trust, inclusion and utility.

ii) Adaptability across data collection modes

Gender-responsive citizen data arise from diverse modes, including online forms, mobile apps, satellite imagery, phone interviews, community meetings and in-person surveys. Each mode introduces different challenges and potential biases. For example, data collected via smartphones may exclude women in rural areas without internet access, while in-person interviews may introduce social desirability bias. A flexible quality framework allows producers to adapt quality checks to their specific method rather than apply one rigid standard.

iii) Complementing (not replacing) traditional survey quality models

Traditional frameworks used by NSOs provide a solid foundation for measuring statistical accuracy. One example is the Total Survey Error model that considers possible errors that can occur during the design, collection and analysis of survey data. However, such frameworks are too narrow to fully capture the social and participatory dimensions of gender-responsive citizen data. Hence, the gender-responsive citizen data quality principles under the three quality dimensions – trustworthiness, inclusivity and utility – put forward by this guidance are not meant to replace models like Total Survey Error model but to complement these.

The principles introduce an expanded view of quality that includes ethical integrity, participation and actionability, creating a shared language and practices that allows citizen data to be trusted by NSOs and other institutional users, while remaining meaningful and credible for CSOs and communities.

iv) Bridging survey and administrative quality frameworks

Frameworks used for administrative data, which are typically collected by public institutions through routine operations such as service delivery or taxation and are primarily designed for institutional efficiency, also fall short of capturing the participatory essence of gender-responsive citizen data. The citizen data quality principles thus bridge the gap: they align with survey-based and administrative quality principles while incorporating ethical, inclusive and feminist dimensions relevant to community-generated information.

v) Building a shared and inclusive quality language

Gender-responsive citizen data production involves a highly diverse and multi-actor ecosystem, including CSOs, local governments, private data platforms, NSOs and other actors within national statistical systems. As noted in the Methodological Guide on Citizen Data,¹ such complexity calls for a public-private-people partnership approach to determine appropriate combinations of skills, methodologies, governance arrangements and data strategies.

The ecosystem for gender-responsive citizen data is often even more diverse and fragmented than that of many citizen data initiatives. Gender data cut across multiple policy domains, such as health, education, labour, justice, social protection and local governance, and engage a wide range of line ministries, sectoral agencies, advocacy communities and funding streams. As a result, these are produced, interpreted and used in multiple institutional and political spaces simultaneously, rather than within a single sectoral pipeline.

Hence, developing a common and accessible language of quality – one that is intelligible to statisticians, gender experts, activists and policymakers alike – is critical. Shared quality concepts enable coordination across sectors, reduce fragmentation, and support the effective integration, reuse and scaling of gender-responsive citizen data within and beyond official statistical systems.

By establishing these tailored yet aligned quality dimensions, this guidance creates a bridge between institutional rigor and community credibility, making gender-responsive citizen data trustworthy to both official systems and to the broader data ecosystem and empowering for citizens and communities.

1.2 Gender-responsive citizen data quality principles

1.2.1 Framing the approach

When applying a gender lens to citizen data quality, the goal is not simply to ensure sex-disaggregated data, but to embed gender-focused and intersectional perspectives across every stage of the data process – from design to collection, interpretation and use. This means asking new questions: Who defines what is worth measuring? Whose experiences are visible in the data? Whose voices remain unheard?

Rather than relying solely on traditional statistical measures of precision or error, this approach redefines quality to emphasize credibility, equity and usability, ensuring that data reflect real-world contexts, especially those of women, girls and gender-diverse groups. Imagine a project examining attitudes towards women's mobility. A conventional survey may measure how many women report feeling unsafe walking alone; use of a gender lens, however, will also ask why, perhaps revealing that restrictive social norms, not just safety concerns, limit mobility. The added layer – linking data to lived experience – turns numbers into actionable understanding.

1.2.2 Three data quality dimensions

The theory of change underlying the gender-responsive citizen data quality principles is that the data can inform policy and social change only if these are simultaneously trusted, inclusive and usable. Technical rigor alone is insufficient, just as participation without methodological discipline or relevance without ethical grounding is insufficient. Impact emerges from the interaction of the three quality dimensions – trustworthiness, inclusivity and utility.

Trustworthiness (ethical integrity and credibility) ensures that data are ethically produced, methodologically credible and transparent in their limitations. It establishes confidence among participants, data producers and institutional users by safeguarding rights, documenting methods and enabling validation. Trustworthiness is the condition that allows data to be taken seriously as evidence.

Inclusivity (representation and participation) ensures that data reflects the diversity of lived realities, particularly those that are systematically underrepresented in traditional data systems. Through participatory design and inclusive representation, this dimension expands what is observed and measured, correcting structural blind spots in official statistics. Inclusivity strengthens validity by aligning data with the populations and experiences these claim to represent.

Utility (actionability and relevance) ensures that data are fit for purpose – timely, relevant and actionable for decision-making, advocacy and accountability. Utility closes the loop between evidence and action, translating data into forms and moments that can influence policy, programmes and public debate.

Together, the three dimensions capture technical and social aspects of quality. They are grounded in the recognition that credibility does not stem from lived experience alone, but from the systematic, transparent and standards-aligned translation of lived experience into data, using established qualitative and quantitative methods. At the same time, they recognize that rigor without inclusion or usability limits impact, while participation without rigor undermines credibility.

For example, a CSO may collect data on unpaid care work through participatory time-use diaries.

- The process is **trustworthy** if participants' consent and privacy are respected.
- It is **inclusive** if gender-diverse and marginalized groups across income and other sociodemographic groups participate.
- It has **utility** if the results are used to influence national care policy.

Another example: Across South Asia, women are 20 per cent less likely than men to own a smartphone. Without deliberate inclusion strategies, digital data systems will continue to underrepresent women's realities. Quality, in this context, means recognizing and correcting such structural gaps and not merely measuring them.

The examples illustrate how the three dimensions are interdependent rather than sequential. The dimensions jointly ensure that data initiatives do not replicate but actively challenge structural inequalities, making invisible burdens visible and unheard voices heard.

By integrating trustworthiness, inclusivity and utility, the 12 data quality principles (see Table 1-2) create a pathway from lived experience to legitimate evidence, and from evidence to meaningful policy and social change. The succeeding sections articulate the principles, organized under the three core dimensions. Each principle is discussed with real or hypothetical examples to show how it can be applied in practice.

Table 1-2 Framework for gender-responsive citizen data quality principles

Trustworthiness	Inclusivity	Utility
1. Credibility from lived experience	5. Participatory representation	9. Relevance to gender-focused priorities
2. Transparency of methodology	6. Disaggregation beyond binary	10. Timeliness for advocacy
3. Ethical and gender-focused protocols	7. Accessibility of data processes	11. Responsiveness to emergent needs
4. Accountable structures	8. Locally grounded practices	12. Fitness for gender-focused action

1.2.3 Trustworthiness: Ethical integrity and credibility

Trust is the foundation of quality. Data, no matter how accurate, lose value if not trusted by people – whether because the data misrepresent them, expose them to risk or feel disconnected from their lived realities. In gender-responsive citizen data, trust is especially critical. Many gender-responsive topics, such as gender-based violence, unpaid care work or sexual and reproductive health, are deeply personal and sensitive. Communities must trust the purpose of data collection and the safety and respect embedded in the process.

Globally, mistrust has emerged where data have been misused or misunderstood. For example, where reports of gender-based violence have been dismissed, or where women’s testimonies have been collected but not acted upon. Building trust, therefore, is not only about methodological transparency but also about ethical commitment and accountability.

Trustworthy gender-responsive citizen data are built through:

- Ethical integrity: respecting participants’ rights, consent and safety;
- Transparency: being open about how and why data are collected, processed and used; and
- Collaborative validation: involving those represented in the data in the review and interpretation.

For instance, when a women-led CSO in Senegal documents workplace harassment through confidential interviews, trust of the information provider arises from safe methods and participant control, not from random sampling or large datasets. In gender-responsive citizen data, transparency serves both technical and ethical functions and must align with both FAIR (findable, accessible, interoperable and reusable) and CARE principles.²

From a FAIR perspective, transparency requires clear documentation, metadata and methodological descriptions that make data interpretable and reusable – for example, publishing survey instruments, sampling strategies and coding frameworks used to collect data on unpaid care work or women’s labour participation. From a CARE perspective, transparency also requires openness about governance and consent choices. For instance, clearly stating that data on gender-based violence is shared only in aggregated form, that access is restricted to approved users, or that reuse is limited to policy and advocacy purposes agreed upon by participants.

Under the CARE-first approach, transparency does not imply unrestricted openness. Instead, it makes visible why certain FAIR elements are constrained. For example, a dataset may be fully documented but not openly downloadable due to safety risks, or interoperable only through controlled access

mechanisms. In this way, transparency becomes the means through which CARE guides the responsible and context-sensitive application of FAIR, ensuring usability without compromising ethical integrity or participant protection.

Principles of trustworthiness

1. Credibility from lived experience

Data are considered credible when these are grounded in lived experiences and collected through methodologically sound approaches, in line with established standards for qualitative and quantitative data collection, especially transparency standards. People's lived realities, whether related to care, violence, economic inequality or other dimensions, are shaped by multiple, intertwined factors. Rather than reducing such realities to isolated thematic silos of information, gender-responsive citizen data initiatives seek to capture how different dimensions of life intersect and compound one another in everyday contexts. This means that everyone's experiences are treated as credible when collected ethically and contextually. Moreover, context in data collection increases the credibility of data. By combining women's lived experiences of exclusion with men's accounts of inheritance norms, household decision-making and legal awareness, these initiatives produce data that captures experienced inequality and the social mechanisms that sustain it.

Example: A mixed-gender research team for the International Organization for Migration in Nepal works with community groups to document barriers to women's land ownership, integrating women's and men's perspectives.³

2. Transparency of methodology

This principle ensures that data collection methods, sampling strategies and limitations are clearly documented and publicly accessible. It ensures full documentation and, where possible, open access to data collection methods, including survey instruments, field protocols and analytical procedures. Attention should be given to sampling strategies designed to address gendered exclusion making explicit how gender interacts with other relevant factors (such as age, disability, location, ethnicity, legal status or socio-economic position) in shaping who is included or excluded from the data. Sampling should not consider gender in isolation but reflect the multiple and intersecting dimensions that influence participation and representation.

Example: A CSO conducting a gender audit of local health services publishes its questionnaire and sampling notes online, allowing replication and peer review. This is a hypothetical example grounded in methodology; refer to audit manuals (e.g., ILO and EIGE⁴) as methodological precedents.

3. Ethical and gender-focused protocols

This principle embeds gender-sensitive ethical safeguards, such as informed consent tailored to cultural contexts, anonymity and trauma-informed interviewing.

Example: In a community-based study on unpaid care work and household decision-making, informed consent is not treated as a one-time signature but as a context-sensitive process. Women participants are informed privately about the purpose and use of the data, recognizing that requesting consent in the presence of other household members can expose them to pressure or risk. Interview times and locations are chosen to accommodate caregiving responsibilities, and participants are explicitly told they may skip questions or withdraw without consequences.

In studies on sensitive topics such as gender-based violence, ethical protocols may include interviewer gender matching, trauma-informed questioning, anonymized recording of responses, and referral information for support services. Such measures are protective and methodologically relevant, reducing non-response, social desirability bias and underreporting. Such measures strengthen participant safety and data quality, ensuring that gender norms and power relations are accounted for in the design and implementation of data collection.

Example: A rural time use study employs visual tools and oral consent to include participants with low literacy, ensuring their voices are equally represented.⁵

4. Accountable structures

This principle promotes participatory oversight involving organizations, women-led CSOs and community representatives.

Example: Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS) and GROOTS Kenya jointly validate grassroots data on gender-based violence before national publication, strengthening credibility and ownership.⁶

Table 1-3 provides a summary of the principles under trustworthiness.

Table 1-3 Gender-responsive citizen data quality principles under trustworthiness

Trustworthiness in citizen data refers to data that are technically sound and ethically produced, validated through inclusive stakeholder engagement and perceived as legitimate by diverse communities, especially women and gender minorities.

1. Credibility from lived experience: Recognize women, girls and gender-diverse persons as legitimate data producers. Their lived experiences, particularly regarding violence, unpaid work and access to services, constitute unique, credible data points. Their lived experiences are translated into data with attention to everyday contexts.

2. Transparency of methodology: Ensure full documentation and open access to methods and sampling strategies, explicitly accounting for gendered exclusion and its interaction with other sources of inequality.

3. Ethical and gender focused protocols: Apply gender-sensitive ethical standards, including informed consent adapted to gender norms.

4. Accountable structures: Include feminist organizations or women-led CSOs in oversight and validation processes.

1.2.4 Inclusivity: Representation and participation

Inclusivity in gender-responsive citizen data is not merely a technical consideration but a moral and political imperative. It requires that the realities of women, girls and gender-diverse people are acknowledged and placed at the centre of the data process, from design to use.

Inclusive gender-responsive citizen data begins with participation, asking fundamental questions such as: Who designs the questions? Who collects the data? Who interprets the results? Who uses the results? What are the data collected and used for? The principle ensures that those most affected by inequality, including migrant women, trans communities and women with disabilities, are not treated as passive subjects, but as knowledge-holders and active contributors and beneficiaries of the data.

The barriers to participation must be addressed head on. If surveys are conducted only online, what happens to women in rural areas without internet access? If data collection is done during the workday, who accounts for women's time spent caregiving? Inclusive data collection strategies must be flexible, respectful and adapted to real-life constraints.

True inclusivity is also about grounding the work locally. Partnering with grassroots women's groups, feminist networks and community leaders ensures that data reflect real needs, not just statistical categories. These groups bring cultural understanding, trust and access to people who may want to be heard but have little or no opportunity to participate in formal spaces.

The principle recognizes that men, boys, institutions and community allies play crucial roles as co-producers of gender-responsive citizen data. True inclusivity lies in collaboration, where diverse perspectives across gender, age, ability and social position jointly shape how evidence is created and understood. In practice, this can mean that a women's rights organization partners with a local government office to co-design a safety audit of public spaces; or that a men's youth group joins a feminist CSO to document unpaid care work, challenging stereotypes through shared inquiry. These approaches broaden ownership and strengthen the legitimacy of citizen data, making these representative and transformative.

The principle also means going beyond the binary. Disaggregating data only by male and female misses the complexity of gender identities and the intersections of race, class, sexuality and disability. A gender lens demands that collected data reflect the full spectrum of gender identities and inequalities.

Ultimately, inclusive gender data tells a richer story – one that is plural, contextual and alive with the realities of diverse communities.

Principles of inclusivity

5. Participatory representation

This ensures inclusive participation throughout the data lifecycle, from co-design and collection to validation and use, particularly by women, girls, gender-diverse individuals and other marginalized groups.

Example: A CSO co-designs a healthcare access survey with transgender advocates to ensure relevance and inclusion (e.g., Global Action for Trans Equality).

6. Disaggregation beyond binary

The principle requires collecting and reporting data that goes beyond binary sex categories, incorporating dimensions such as gender identity, age, race, disability and geography to expose intersecting inequalities.

Example: A digital survey tool includes gender identity options beyond female and male and collects location and disability status (e.g., KoboToolbox).

7. Accessibility of data processes

The principle designs data tools and processes that remove barriers to participation. This includes multilingual instruments, low-tech tools for areas with limited connectivity and culturally appropriate approaches.

Example: A mobile platform allows women in informal settlements to submit safety reports via instant messaging in local languages (e.g., HARASSmap in Egypt and Safetipin in India).

8. Locally grounded practices

This anchors data collection in community knowledge systems, respecting local customs while challenging harmful norms. It uses grassroots methods that enhance inclusion and relevance.

Example: A participatory mapping project trains local women leaders to document public service gaps in their villages (e.g., Atlas of Guardians of Abya Yala of MundoSur, and Map Kibera in Nairobi).

Table 1-4 provides a summary of the principles under inclusivity.

Table 1-4 Gender-responsive citizen data quality principles under inclusivity

Inclusivity is the extent to which data collection and usage centre the voices, realities and rights of all people, especially those marginalized by intersecting systems of power, including gender, race, age, disability and sexuality.

5. Participatory representation: Ensure that women, girls and gender-diverse individuals are involved in co-designing, collecting and analysing data.

6. Disaggregation beyond binary: Disaggregate by sex, gender identity and other intersecting factors to reflect structural inequalities.

7. Accessibility of data processes: Address gendered barriers to participation by adapting tools and strategies.

8. Locally grounded practices: Work through grassroots women's organizations and local feminist networks.

1.2.5 Utility: Actionability and relevance

Utility is the test of whether the numbers and stories collected lead to policy changes, programmatic action, better services or stronger advocacy. It is where data comes to life: from gender data to gender action. Through a gender lens, it is not just about data being used but data being usable, timely and fit for gender-focused purpose.

FAIR and CARE data principles should be applied in combination and with clear sequencing. While FAIR principles support technical usability, interoperability and reuse, CARE principles address ethical governance, power relations and the protection of individuals and communities represented in the data. Because gender-responsive citizen data often concerns sensitive, contested or potentially harmful contexts, ethical considerations of consent, authority and collective benefit must guide decisions about openness and reuse. FAIR principles should thus be applied where appropriate and within the boundaries set by CARE, ensuring that data are usable and responsibly governed.

Useful gender-responsive citizen data speak to the right issues, in the right moments and in the right formats. The data align with gender-focused priorities, such as unpaid care, gender-based violence, economic inequality or bodily autonomy, and are available when decisions are made, whether for local budgeting or international treaty reporting. If gender-responsive citizen data arrive too late to influence a policy window or emergency response, the power of the data is diminished.

The communication of data matters: Are data locked away in long, technical reports? Or shared through community dashboards, visual summaries or grassroots storytelling that make the data actionable? Who uses the data also matters: Are data helping activists make their case? Informing local leaders? Are data empowering communities to hold systems accountable? If data are not being used by those most affected, then it must be asked: What are the data for?

Principles of utility

9. Relevance to gender-focused priorities

The principle aligns data efforts with gender justice goals, including ending gender-based violence, recognizing unpaid care work, promoting bodily autonomy and advancing economic equality.

Example: A gender-focused CSO collects data on women's time spent in unpaid care work to support national care policy advocacy (e.g., the Inspiring Girls and Grassroots Networks for Inclusive and Transformative Education or IGNITE project).

10. Timeliness for advocacy

This ensures data are collected and shared in time to inform decision-making processes such as policy development, budgeting and public campaigns.

Example: Trade unions surveyed their members across 70 countries to rapidly document trends in workplace gender-based violence and harassment. The timely evidence was released alongside the 16 Days of Activism campaign to strengthen advocacy for the ratification and implementation of International Labour Organization Convention 190 and Recommendation 206, demonstrating how community-generated evidence can be mobilized to influence policy during key advocacy moments.⁷

11. Responsiveness to emergent needs

The principle builds adaptable systems that respond quickly to crises, political shifts or new gender-related challenges (e.g., pandemics, migration or climate impacts).

Example: During the 2024 floods in Kenya, citizen-generated gender data collected within hours of the disaster provided timely evidence, which humanitarian agencies used to target assistance and advocate for the urgent needs of the most vulnerable populations before official data were available.⁸

12. Fitness for gender-focused action

This formats data in accessible and intersectional ways, using visuals, plain language and

disability-inclusive formats, so that gender-responsive citizen data empowers rights holders and supports advocacy, not only institutional use.

Example: Developed through collaborative community work, the Report GBV Dashboard tracks real-time types and locations of violence. Driven bottom-up by grassroots civil society networks, it formats dense incident tracking into easy-to-use regional dashboards to support local response teams and legal advocates.⁹

Table 1-5 provides a summary of the principles under utility.

Table 1-5 Gender-responsive citizen data quality principles under utility

Utility measures how well gender-responsive citizen data meets the needs of its users, especially marginalized communities. A gender lens ensures the data are fit for purpose in closing gender gaps in policy, services and the realization of rights.

9. Relevance to gender-focused priorities: Align data with gender equity goals such as SDG 5, care work visibility and economic justice.

10. Timeliness for advocacy: Ensure data are available to inform policy windows or advocacy campaigns.

11. Responsiveness to emergent needs: Design adaptive tools that can track gendered impacts of crises.

12. Fitness for gender-focused action: Package data in formats that enable women's rights actors to act.

1.3 Connecting gender-responsive citizen data with UN FPOS and NSO standards or approaches

Field experiences from Colombia, Ethiopia, Kenya, Senegal, Tanzania and the Philippines were analysed to provide country-specific mappings of civil society organization (CSO) practices related to six gender-responsive citizen data initiatives.

- **Colombia:** Feminist organizations partnered with the National Administrative Department of Statistics (DANE) to redesign the Time Use Survey.
- **Ethiopia:** Collaborative survey design between CSOs and the Ethiopian Statistical Service to build capacity on gender-responsive citizen data.
- **Kenya:** Community women leaders and grassroots networks worked with the Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS) to collect and validate data on gender-based violence.
- **Senegal:** A coalition of CSOs and the National Agency of Statistics and Demography (ANSD) created the Women in Mining Index.
- **Tanzania:** Community health organizations used mobile data tools for maternal health monitoring.
- **The Philippines:** Civil society groups developed structured submissions for SDG monitoring, showcasing how citizen data can feed into formal statistical systems.

Table 1-6 presents the CSOs and national statistical offices (NSOs) that participated in the field experiments across the six countries and highlights key sources and references associated with each case study.

Table 1-6 CSOs and NSOs involved in the case studies and references, by country

CSOs/NSOs	References
Colombia	
DANE and feminist organisations redesigning the Time Use Survey	DANE. Undated. "National Survey of Time Use (ENUT)." Medina-Hernández, E. J. and M.J. Fernández-Gómez. 2021. "Analysis of Time Use Surveys Using CO-STATIS: A Multiway Data Analysis of Gender Inequalities in Time Use in Colombia." <i>Sustainability</i>. United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women). 2023. Women Count Phase II: Colombia.
Ethiopia	
Note: there is no strong publicly available exact-match report for this case study	Recommendation: Consider directly contacting the NSO or CSO.
Kenya	
Community women leaders and KNBS on GBV data	KNBS. 2022. Women and Men in Kenya Facts and Figures 2022. KNBS. 2025. Women's Empowerment in Kenya – Developing a Measure 2025. Mutwiri, C. G. 2022. "Using Survey Data for Monitoring Gender-Based Violence – Kenya." Speech delivered during an event of the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Western. KNBS. UN Women East and Southern Africa Regional Office. 2024. Unlocking the Value of Gender Data: A Regional Toolkit for Transformative Action.
Senegal	
ANSD and CSOs creating the	Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative. Undated. " Senegal ."

CSOs/NSOs	References
Women in Mining Index	WIM Sénégal. 2021. WIM Index – Rapport 2021 .
Tanzania	
Community health organisations and mobile data tools for maternal health monitoring	Dillip, A., G. Kahamba, R. Sambaiga, et al. 2024. “ Using Digital Technology as a Platform to Strengthen the Continuum of Care at Community Level for Maternal, Child and Adolescent Health in Tanzania: Introducing the Afya-Tek Program .” <i>BMC Health Services Research</i> 24. Ministry of Health, Community Development, Gender, Elderly and Children, United Republic of Tanzania. 2017. Tanzania Digital Health Investment Road Map (2017–2023) .
The Philippines	
CSOs feeding citizen-data into formal system (SDG monitoring)	Mapa, C.D. Undated. “ SDG Monitoring: The Philippine Experience .” Philippine Statistics Authority. Philippine Statistics Authority and Partnership in Statistics for Development in the 21st Century (PARIS21). 2020. Use of Citizen-Generated Data for SDG Reporting in the Philippines: A Case Study .

One key insight from the case studies is that CSOs are not operating in a vacuum when it comes to producing and using gender-responsive citizen data. In fact, many CSOs are already applying principles that closely align with established norms in official statistical systems, especially those outlined in the UN Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics (UN FPOS) and standards of practice of NSOs.

Each data initiative in the case studies observes CSO-led gender-responsive citizen data practices that not only respond to urgent gender issues but also operate with a level of methodological rigor, ethical commitment and collaborative spirit that echo international standards. Their practices are aligned with relevant UN FPOS and standards of practice or approaches of NSOs (see Table 1-7), emphasizing collaborative and inclusive approaches to data credibility and use.

Table 1-7 Alignment of CSO practices on gender-responsive citizen data to UN FPOS and NSOs’ standards of practice

Country	CSO practice	Alignment with UN FPOS ¹	Alignment with NSO standards of practice
Colombia	Feminist CSOs co-designed the Time Use Survey to reflect unpaid care work	Principle 6 (Confidentiality); Principle 9 (Use of international standards)	Gender-sensitive survey redesign; international SDG indicator integration
Ethiopia	Inclusive co-designed surveys on gender topics with ethical safeguards	Principle 6 (Confidentiality); Principle 8 (National coordination)	Citizen data guidelines; co-development of implementation strategies
Kenya	Community women leaders collected GBV data, which the NSO validated	Principle 3 (Accountability and transparency); Principle 8 (National coordination)	Stakeholder engagement; joint data validation workshops
Senegal	CSOs involved in the development and validation of the Women in Mining Index	Principle 2 (Professional standards and ethics); Principle 3 (Accountability and transparency)	Technical committee review; iterative data validation
Tanzania	Participatory health audits and mobile data collection for maternal health	Principle 1 (Relevance, impartiality and equal access); Principle 5	Use of mobile survey tools; local community audits

		(Sources of official statistics)	
The Philippines	Structured citizen data submissions for SDG monitoring by civil society	Principle 4 (Prevention of misuse); Principle 7 (Legislation)	Inclusion of non-state data in national reporting frameworks

¹The short titles accompanying each principle are not part of UN FPOS. These are used in materials of the United Nations Statistics Division and United Nations Economic Commission for Europe solely to improve readability and do not replace the official wording of the principles.

The case studies include examples of integration, such as Colombia and Kenya, and practices like co-validation and ethical review. In Kenya, community women leaders collected gender-based violence (GBV) data in partnership with KNBS. The collaboration reflects Principles 3 and 8 of UN FPOS, emphasizing transparency and coordination among data producers while also demonstrating good NSO practice through joint validation workshops and stakeholder engagement. (See Appendix 3 for the full text of UN FPOS.)

In Colombia, feminist organizations helped redesign the Time Use Survey to capture unpaid care work better. This speaks directly to the use of Principle 9 of UN FPOS and supports broader efforts to ensure gender-sensitive indicator integration at the national level.

In cases with strong regulatory or legal requirements, like Ethiopia, CSOs worked closely with NSOs to co-develop ethical data collection tools, aligning their work with confidentiality safeguards and NSO-led frameworks for inclusive survey design.

The examples demonstrate that CSO practices can meet and actually meet the high bar set by official statistics. Citizen data, when produced ethically and collaboratively, is not a threat to statistical quality but an asset. CSOs and NSOs can strengthen each other's work. A pluralistic data ecosystem is possible and desirable when anchored in shared principles of trust, professionalism and public value.

1.4 Linking the gender-responsive citizen data quality principles to the Copenhagen Framework on Citizen Data

The Copenhagen Framework for Citizen Data was developed collaboratively by CSOs, NSOs, UN agencies and other partners. Table 1-8 links the gender-responsive citizen data quality principles to the Copenhagen Framework, demonstrating how the principles can align with international norms for recognizing and integrating citizen data into national statistical systems. This alignment ensures that gender-specific quality concerns are not treated as parallel or separate but are anchored in the same language of integrity, transparency and professionalism that guides NSOs, while preserving the grassroots legitimacy and feminist intent that give gender-responsive citizen data their unique value.

Table 1-8 Mapping gender-responsive citizen data quality principles to the Copenhagen Framework of Citizen Data

Gender-responsive citizen data principle	Quality dimension	Corresponding Copenhagen Framework principles
1. Credibility from lived experience	Trustworthiness	Principle 3: Transparency and accountability; Principle 5: Rights-based
2. Transparency of methodology	Trustworthiness	Principle 1: Integrity; Principle 3: Transparency and accountability
3. Ethical and feminist protocols	Trustworthiness	Principle 2: Professional and ethical standards; Principle 5: Rights-based
4. Accountable structures	Trustworthiness	Principle 3: Transparency and accountability; Principle 8: Coordination
5. Participatory representation	Inclusivity	Principle 4: Participation; Principle 5: Rights-based
6. Disaggregation beyond binary	Inclusivity	Principle 5: Rights-based; Principle 6: Disaggregation and inclusion
7. Accessibility of data processes	Inclusivity	Principle 4: Participation; Principle 6: Disaggregation and inclusion
8. Locally grounded practices	Inclusivity	Principle 4: Participation; Principle 7: Local relevance and empowerment
9. Relevance to gender-focused priorities	Utility	Principle 7: Local relevance and empowerment; Principle 9: Usefulness
10. Timeliness for advocacy	Utility	Principle 9: Usefulness
11. Responsiveness to emergent needs	Utility	Principle 9: Usefulness; Principle 7: Local relevance and empowerment
12. Fitness for gender-focused action	Utility	Principle 9: Usefulness; Principle 3: Transparency and accountability

The gender-responsive citizen data quality principles bridge feminist, intersectional and participatory approaches with globally recognized statistical standards. The mapping helps clarify how gender-diverse practices, such as ethical protocols, participatory design or attention to local relevance, are not separate from but reinforce the Copenhagen Framework vision.

- Under trustworthiness, credibility from lived experience aligns with the Copenhagen Framework's emphasis on transparency and rights-based approaches. Data rooted in the experiences of gender-diverse and marginalized groups are legitimate and essential.
- Transparency of methodology and ethical feminist protocols reinforce traditional statistical standards like integrity and professionalism, but with added sensitivity to power dynamics and community protection.

- Under inclusivity, practices like disaggregating beyond the binary or ensuring locally grounded methods are directly connected to principles promoting participation, inclusion and local relevance.
- Under utility, relevance to gender-focused priorities and fitness for gender-focused action echo the Copenhagen Framework's call for useful, timely and empowering data – data that doesn't just sit in reports but drives change on the ground.

Appendix 4 provides a mapping NSO practices to the Copenhagen Framework.

2 OPERATIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION

2.1 Country applications of the gender-responsive citizen data quality principles

The six country case studies offer grounded lessons on how gender-responsive citizen data initiatives have confronted real challenges of ethics, participation and use in diverse institutional and cultural settings. The country experiences have been used to refine the gender-responsive citizen data quality principles, illustrating the reciprocal process in research: fieldwork informing theory, and theory, in turn, providing structure for shared learning.

These experiences collectively highlight how the data quality principles emerge from real practice – from how to build trust, to how to enact inclusivity and how data becomes useful for advocacy and policy (see Table 2-1).

Table 2-1 Case studies' application of the gender-responsive citizen data quality principles

Country	Quality dimension		
	Trustworthiness	Inclusivity	Utility
Colombia: Feminist organizations partnered with DANE to redesign the Time Use Survey, ensuring that unpaid care work is visible in national statistics.	Feminist CSOs collaborated with DANE to revise the Time Use Survey, enhancing legitimacy and rigor.	Centred unpaid care work; ensured recognition of women's invisible labour through feminist-informed indicators.	Led to official recognition of unpaid care in official statistics; informed care policy debates.
Ethiopia: Collaborative survey design between CSOs and the Ethiopian Statistical Service embedded feminist ethics and trust-based engagement in sensitive data collection.	Citizen data guidelines aligned with NSO standards; stakeholder engagement and piloting on gender-sensitive topics ensured reliability.	Inclusive survey design co-created with CSOs; ensured safe and gender-appropriate participation.	Used to guide implementation strategies for gender-focused data; informed evidence-based planning and monitoring.
Kenya: Community women leaders and grassroots networks worked with KNBS to collect and validate data on GBV, demonstrating how co-validation and transparency can strengthen institutional trust.	Community women leaders involved in data collection; validation by KNBS ensures credibility and transparency.	Focus on GBV and justice; participatory methods engaged grassroots women and reflected their lived experiences.	Data used for local SDG planning; enhanced service delivery and visibility of gender-based issues.
Senegal: A coalition of CSOs and the NSO created the Women in Mining Index, using joint validation and iterative learning to assure quality.	A multistakeholder technical committee validated the methodology; daily debriefings and iterative validation processes ensured transparency.	Engaged CSOs in design and data collection; inclusive protocols ensured participation of marginalized gender groups.	Used for developing the Women in Mining Index; supported national and international gender policy alignment.
Tanzania:	Partnership with community health	Emphasized maternal health; audits included	Improved regional health data; supported

Country	Quality dimension		
	Trustworthiness	Inclusivity	Utility
Community health organizations used mobile data tools for maternal health monitoring, emphasizing ethical design and inclusivity in low-resource settings.	organizations; mobile tools ensured transparent, replicable methodologies.	perspectives of women as users and experts of health systems.	targeted interventions for women's health services.
The Philippines: CSOs developed structured submissions for SDG monitoring, showcasing how citizen data can feed into formal statistical systems when guided by shared standards.	Structured citizen data submitted to NSO; reviewed within ethical and methodological frameworks.	Engaged multiple CSOs in gender data collection; captured broad and intersectional gender realities.	Contributed to national SDG reporting; supported advocacy with gender-relevant, timely statistics.

2.2 Practical quality assurance steps for gender-responsive citizen data

Creating high-quality gender-responsive citizen data requires a process that is inclusive, ethically grounded and designed to support meaningful action. Practical quality assurance steps make this possible. This section puts forward a five-step pathway for ensuring that gender-responsive citizen data are credible and fit for purpose. The steps are structured reflections and actions that help citizen data producers (e.g., CSOs, NSOs or local networks) assess and improve their practices through a gender lens.

Each step is designed to be flexible and applicable across different settings, e.g., whether data are collected through a community survey, a mobile app or participatory mapping. Importantly, the process encourages participatory methods, peer review and feedback loops so that quality becomes a shared responsibility.

Step 1: Define purpose and use. Start by identifying the gender issue to be addressed, whom will it impact, who will use the data and in what context. This step ensures the work is grounded in real-world experience and aligned with specific needs, e.g., national policy or grassroots advocacy.

Step 2: Develop a quality profile. The 12 gender-responsive citizen data quality principles are interdependent, but their application can be prioritized according to data use. In this step, data producers identify which principles are most relevant to their specific purpose, data type and available capacities while ensuring that no dimension – trustworthiness, inclusivity or utility – is entirely omitted. The aim is to create a balanced data quality profile that matches ambition with feasibility. For example, a small CSO conducting a rapid safety mapping project may emphasize ethical protocols, transparency and inclusivity of marginalized groups. At the same time, a national survey integrating citizen data may focus more on documentation, validation and usability. In all cases, data producers should apply at least one principle from each of the three dimensions, maintaining a holistic approach to gender-responsive citizen data quality assurance.

Step 3: Conduct a self- or peer assessment. Once a quality profile has been developed, the next step is to assess how well the data initiative aligns with the 12 principles. Using the principles as the checklist for evaluating data quality across the three core dimensions, data producers can perform a self-assessment or invite peer review from partner organizations, statistical offices or community groups. The process encourages participatory scoring and open discussion, helping to identify strengths, gaps and potential biases that may not be visible from within a single organization. This reflective step is not intended as a compliance exercise, but as a learning tool that builds shared understanding of what quality means in context and fosters continuous improvement across CSO- and NSO-led initiatives.

Step 4: Document methods and limitations. Transparency is key. This step involves carefully recording the methods, tools, sampling strategies and ethical protocols, and openly acknowledging any limitations or biases that may affect the data. Doing so creates metadata, or information about the data itself. Metadata describes who collected the data, what tools were used, when and where data were gathered, and under what ethical safeguards. Well-documented metadata make the work transparent and reproducible, helping others understand and correctly interpret the data. These also allow CSOs and NSOs to reuse, compare and integrate citizen data with confidence, strengthening their credibility and long-term value.

Step 5: Iterate and improve. Quality is never final. The last step involves collecting feedback, making improvements and documenting lessons learned. This creates a virtuous cycle of learning and adaptation.

The steps offer a practical roadmap for embedding gender-responsive citizen data quality into every stage of the data journey – from design to use. Whether the role is statistical or community-based, or for gender-focused research, the steps support the transition from good intentions to structured, accountable and effective action. Table 2-2 provides a summary of the steps.

Table 2-2 Practical quality assurance steps for gender-responsive citizen data

Step	Key activities and considerations	Outputs
1. Define purpose and use	• Identify the gender issue (e.g., GBV, care work, economic exclusion) • Define intended data users (e.g., CSOs, NSOs, policymakers) • Determine the decision-making context (i.e., local, national, global)	Purpose statement with gender lens, defined users and use level
2. Develop a quality profile	• Select applicable gender-quality principles • Prioritize quality dimensions based on data use • Identify constraints and capacities (e.g., tools, people, ethics)	Customized quality profile matrix (relevance versus feasibility)
3. Conduct self- or peer assessment	• Use a checklist or rubric to assess trustworthiness, inclusivity and utility • Invite peer review or participatory scoring • Reflect on gaps, strengths, ethics and risks	Descriptive or scored quality assessment report
4. Document methods and limitations	• Record tools, methods, sampling and consent protocols • Note any biases or limitations • Share metadata with data users and communities	Metadata sheet and methodological note
5. Iterate and improve	• Collect feedback from contributors and users • Adjust tools, recruitment or outreach • Document lessons and revisions for future use	Improvement plan and iterative documentation

2.3 Implementation guidance for CSOs and NSOs

The country-based case studies and interviews with civil society organizations (CSOs) and national statistical offices (NSOs) detailed meaningful and impactful CSO-NSO collaborations. However, to move from scattered examples to scalable practice, concrete guidance is needed to help such partnerships thrive.

2.3.1 Practical steps

Drawing on country experiences and on insights from grassroots data producers and official statisticians, the following are practical, actionable steps to make CSO-NSO collaboration smoother, more ethical and more effective.

1. Establish joint protocols.

In Colombia, feminist CSOs and DANE, the NSO of Colombia, collaborated to revise the national Time Use Survey. The collaboration began with joint workshops to define roles and methods. While not a formal Memorandum of Understanding, the co-developed protocol shared expectations and timelines for piloting and implementation. The informal but structured approach led to mutual understanding and accountability.

Lesson: Protocols do not need to be formal to be effective. Shared decision-making at the outset creates smoother workflows and mutual trust.

2. Use co-validation mechanisms.

In Senegal, the development of the Women in Mining Index by a coalition of CSOs was validated through a Technical Committee led by ANSD, the NSO of Senegal. The committee brought together statisticians, sector experts and community actors to review data quality and methodology. Daily debriefs during fieldwork ensured iterative learning and collaborative improvement.

Lesson: Co-validation ensures credibility and reinforces the legitimacy of data within both community and official systems.

3. Share metadata and documentation.

GROOTS Kenya shared comprehensive metadata, including sampling design, tools and protocols, when submitting gender-based violence (GBV) data to the KNBS, the NSO of Kenya. KNBS, in turn, provided cartographic data and guidance on aligning data with national statistical frameworks. The documentation exchange enabled alignment with SDG indicators and facilitated joint analysis.

Lesson: Metadata transparency strengthens the possibility of integration and makes data more interpretable and reusable.

4. Build trust through ethics and feminist engagement.

In Ethiopia, the International Institute of Rural Reconstruction and the Ethiopian Statistical Service co-developed survey protocols that emphasized feminist ethical practices. These included oral consent procedures, interviewer gender choice, trauma-informed approaches and community review of findings. The process gave participants more control while also protecting data quality.

Lesson: Ethical alignment builds lasting trust, especially when gender-sensitive topics like gender-based violence, unpaid care work or reproductive health are involved.

In summary, the steps distil what are already being done on the ground into a practical roadmap – one that others can follow, adapt and improve. Because when CSOs and NSOs work together from a place of shared values and clear protocols, citizen data do not just fill gaps but transform the way gender equality is understood and acted upon.

2.3.2 Recommendations

The following recommendations synthesize lessons learned from country experiences and field interviews and are grouped into three main areas of collaboration.

1. Co-design and coordination

Effective collaboration begins at the design stage, where roles, responsibilities and expectations are jointly defined.

- Start with joint design: Invest time upfront to co-develop data collection protocols, clarify responsibilities, and agree on consent and data-sharing frameworks.
- Establish or join technical committees: Create shared spaces, formal or informal, to discuss data quality, review methodologies and address limitations collaboratively.

2. Data sharing and ethical standards

Mutual transparency and ethical integrity are central to trust between CSOs and NSOs.

- Share metadata both ways: Encourage CSOs to document their methods, tools and data collection while NSOs share standard classifications, mapping resources and technical feedback, promoting interoperability and quality alignment.
- Apply ethical protocols built with community input: Ensure that consent, confidentiality and participant safety are respected throughout the process, especially when working with sensitive gender data.
- Recognize data from lived experience as valid: Value contextual and experiential knowledge as credible evidence, even when it differs from traditional survey methods.

3. Accountability and learning

Sustained collaboration depends on shared responsibility and continuous improvement.

- Foster gender-focused accountability: Involve women's rights organizations and gender-diverse experts in data collection, validation, dissemination, interpretation and use.
- Document and share lessons learned: Record successes and challenges to support replication, adaptation and learning across the broader data community.

2.4 Tools and templates

To support the practical application of this guidance, a suite of tools and templates is included in Appendix 5. The resources are designed to help CSOs implement gender-responsive citizen data quality assurance processes in a consistent, ethical and gender-responsive manner; and NSOs in their cooperation with CSOs. While adaptable to local contexts, the suite of tools and templates offer a common reference for building capacity and promoting mutual accountability.

The tools include:

- **Gender-responsive citizen data quality checklist** – provides a self-assessment framework based on the 12 gender-responsive citizen data quality principles.
- **Metadata template with ethical protocols** – guide CSOs in documenting their data sources, collection methods, sampling strategies and consent procedures.
- **Gender-related citizen data mapping sheet to SDG 5 indicators** – helps stakeholders align grassroots data with national and global reporting frameworks.
- **Interview guide for CSO–NSO dialogue** – offers structured questions to facilitate partnership discussions around data quality, interoperability and trust (see Appendix 6).

3 CONCLUSION

Gender-responsive citizen data expand the statistical gaze towards realities that too often remain invisible: unpaid care, violence in private and public spaces, barriers to health and mobility, and unequal access to resources and decision-making. This guidance shows that these forms of knowledge are not peripheral; they are essential for a complete and just statistical system. Their quality can be assessed, strengthened and aligned with global frameworks without diluting the participatory, contextual and feminist principles that make them powerful.

Across the six country experiences, one insight recurs: quality is produced through methods and relationships. Trust between civil society organizations (CSOs) and national statistics offices (NSOs), inclusive design that respects lived experiences, and purposeful use that connects data to advocacy and institutional action are the conditions under which citizen data becomes credible, meaningful and transformative. The three quality dimensions at the heart of this guidance – trustworthiness, inclusivity and utility – offer a shared language that statisticians and community-based organizations can use to navigate the space together.

The 12 gender-responsive citizen data quality principles and the practical steps put forward in this guidance form a flexible roadmap rather than a rigid checklist. They acknowledge that CSOs operate under varied capacities and constraints, and that NSOs work within formal mandates and methodological standards. Yet both can meet in the middle: CSOs by strengthening documentation, ethical safeguards and participatory validation; NSOs by adapting review processes, sharing technical resources and recognizing data sourced from lived experience as legitimate evidence.

As countries move towards more pluralistic data ecosystems – driven by SDG 5 monitoring, rise of digital citizen reporting and growing public demand for accountability – institutional pathways for integrating citizen data will become increasingly necessary. The alignment of the principles with the UN Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics (UN FPOS) and the Copenhagen Framework on Citizen Data demonstrates that such integration is not only feasible but desirable, provided that feminist ethics and community ownership remain central.

This working guidance is therefore an invitation to continued experimentation, negotiation and learning. Quality assurance in gender-responsive citizen data is not a destination but an evolving practice that grows with new technologies, emerging gender issues and shifting political and social landscapes. By embracing this evolution, CSOs and NSOs together can build data systems that not only measure gender inequality but help dismantle it, making visible the lives, labour, risks and aspirations of those who have long been overlooked.

The work ahead is collective. Strengthening gender data ultimately strengthens democratic accountability, public policy and the capacity of societies to understand themselves. This guidance offers a foundation for that work and a call to carry it forward with rigor, creativity and shared purpose.

ENDNOTES

Introduction

¹ The interviews were conducted online or in person during the Fourth Expert Group Meeting in Bangkok on 10 and 11 November 2025. Interviews with one or more representatives of the following NSOs were conducted: [Italian National Statistical Institute](#), [Statistics Netherlands](#), [Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística](#), and UK Office for National Statistics. For CSOs: [Save the Children](#), [Mundo Sur](#), [Voluntary Service Overseas International](#), and [Defensoria del Pueblo Colombia y la Naturaleza](#).

² Gender-diverse groups is a descriptive term – it highlights plurality of gender identities and expressions – while marginalized gender groups is an analytical and political term – it highlights power asymmetries and exclusion. All marginalized gender groups are part of gender diversity, but not all gender-diverse groups are marginalized in the same way or to the same degree.

³ For simplicity, the term CSOs is used in this document to collectively refer to the diverse actors while acknowledging their distinct roles, strengths and modalities of work on gender-responsive citizen data.

I Concepts

¹ UNSD 2020.

² [FAIR data principles](#) are: Findable, or discoverable through metadata and identifiers; Accessible, or retrievable under clear conditions; Interoperable, or usable across systems and standards; Reusable, or well-documented so others can reuse it correctly. See also [A Human Rights-based Approach to Data](#) by the United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner; [CARE data principles](#) are: Collective benefit, or data use should benefit the communities described; Authority to control, or communities have a say in how data are used; Responsibility, or data users act responsibly and prevent harm; and Ethics, or rights, dignity and consent are respected.

³ See [Barriers to Women's Land and Property Access and Ownership in Nepal](#) (2016) by the International Organization of Migration.

⁴ [A Manual for Gender Audit Facilitators](#), released in 2007 by the International Labour Organization, is a well-known manual describing participatory gender audits, with guidance on questionnaires, sampling, interviews and audit steps. Useful as a methodological precedent even if not tied to a specific health-service audit; [Gender Audit](#), released in 2019 by the European Institute for Gender Equality, describes what a gender audit is and why it matters, and outlines participatory audit processes, though applied mostly to institutions rather than community-based health services.

⁵ As discussed in [The Gender and Rural Advisory Services Assessment Tool](#) (2018) of the Food and Agriculture Organization.

⁶ UN Women East and Southern Africa Regional Office 2024.

⁷ See [Trade Unions in Action Against Gender-Based Violence: 16 Days of Activism](#) (2024).

⁸ See [How Citizen Gender Data Helped Target Relief During the Floods in Kenya](#) (2025).

⁹ See [Harnessing the Power of Data for Gender-Based Violence Prevention and Response in Nigeria](#) (2022) and [Report GBV Dashboard](#).

REFERENCES

On data quality

- Biemer, P.P. 2016. *Total Survey Error: Design, Implementation, and Evaluation*. Wiley.
- Eurostat. 2007. *Handbook on Data Quality Assessment Methods and Tools*. M. Ehling and T. Körner (Eds.). Wiesbaden: Federal Statistical Office of Germany.
<https://www.paris21.org/sites/default/files/dataqualityassessment-eurostat.pdf>.
- Groves, R. and L. Lyberg. 2010. "Total Survey Error: Past, Present, and Future." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 74 (5), pp. 849–879. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Total-Survey-Error%3A-Past%2C-Present%2C-and-Future-Groves-Lyberg/059bdc9d0306ea05cf4097b28dd5d69ecb4304ca>.
- Lenau, S., S. Marchetti, R. Münnich, et al. 2021. *Methods for Sampling and Inference with Non-Probability Samples*. In GRID-2 Project, Deliverable D11.8. European Commission Participant Portal.
<https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/documents/downloadPublic?documentIds=080166e5e31e26db&appId=PPGMS>.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). 2022. *Towards Satellite Accounts for Third Sector and Social Economy: challenges and opportunities*.
https://knowledgehub.unsse.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/OECD_2017_Seminar-Satellite-Accounts-Highlights.pdf
- United Nations Economic Commission for Europe. 2019. *Generic Statistical Business Process Model (GSBPM)*, v5.1. <https://unece.org/statistics/documents/2019/01/standards/gsbpm-v51#>.
- United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women). 2020. *Methodological Guidelines on the Collection and Use of Citizen-Generated Data for Reporting SDG 5 and Gender-Specific Indicators in Other SDGs*. New York: UN Women.
https://data.unwomen.org/sites/default/files/documents/Publications/CGD-Methodological-guidelines_March-2020.pdf.
- United Nations Statistics Division. 2013. *Framework for the Development of Environment Statistics (FDES)*. <https://unstats.un.org/unsd/environment/fdes/FDES-2015-supporting-tools/FDES.pdf>.
- _____. 2020. *Methodological Guide on Citizen-Generated Data*.
- _____. 2022. *Guidance and Toolkit for Quality Assessment of Administrative Data for Official Statistics*. New York: United Nations. https://unstats.un.org/capacity-development/admin-data/docs/quality/guidance_and_toolkit_qa_admin_data_for_official_statistics-en.pdf.

On gender-responsive citizen data quality

- Collaborative on Citizen Data. 2024. *Copenhagen Framework on Citizen Data*.
<https://unstats.un.org/UNSDWebsite/citizenData/events/The-Copenhagen-Framework-on-Citizen-Data-v1.pdf>
- Data2X. 2023. *Mapping Gender Data Gaps in the Environment and Climate Change: A 2023 Update*. Washington, DC: Data2X. <https://data2x.org/resource-center/2023-mapping-gender-data-gaps-environment-and-climate-change/>.
- Global Partnership for Sustainable Development Data. Undated. "Our Impact."
<https://www.data4sdgs.org/our-impact>.
- Open Data Watch. 2020. *ODIN Open Data Inventory 2020/21: Executive Summary*. Washington, DC: Open Data Watch. <https://opendatawatch.com/publications/odin-open-data-inventory-2020-21-executive-summary/>.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). 2018. *Open Government Data Report: Enhancing Policy Maturity for Sustainable Impact*. OECD Digital Government Studies, OECD Publishing, Paris. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264305847-en>.

UN Women. 2018. *Making Every Woman and Girl Count: A Global Strategy for Gender Data*. New York: UN Women. <https://data.unwomen.org/resources/making-every-woman-and-girl-count-global-strategy-gender-data>.

World Bank. 2021. *Women, Business and the Law 2021*. Washington, DC: World Bank. <http://hdl.handle.net/10986/35094>.

On case studies

Colombia

Departamento Administrativo Nacional de Estadística (DANE). Undated. “*National Time Use Survey*.” <https://www.dane.gov.co/index.php/en/statistics-by-topic/national-accounts/satellite-accounts/care-economy-satellite-account/national-survey-of-time-use-enut>.

Medina-Hernández, E.J. and M.J. Fernández-Gómez. 2021. “Analysis of Time-Use Surveys Using CO-STATIS: A Multiway Data Analysis of Gender Inequalities in Time Use in Colombia.” *Sustainability*, 13(23), 13073. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su132313073>.

UN Women. 2023. *Women Count Phase II: Colombia*. New York: UN Women. https://data.unwomen.org/sites/default/files/documents/Women%20Count/Women_Count_Brief_Colombia_final.pdf.

Ethiopia

Collaborative on Citizen Data (forthcoming). 2026. *Case Study of the International Institute of Rural Reconstruction, UN Women and Ethiopian Statistics Service*.

Kenya

Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS). 2022. *Women and Men in Kenya: Facts and Figures, 2022*. Nairobi: KNBS. <https://www.knbs.or.ke/reports/women-and-men-in-kenya-facts-and-figures-2022/>.

_____. 2025. *Women's Empowerment in Kenya: Developing a Measure 2025*. Nairobi: KNBS. <https://www.knbs.or.ke/reports/womens-empowerment-in-kenya-developing-a-measure-2025/>.

Mutwiri, C.G. 2022. “Using Survey Data for Monitoring Gender-Based Violence – Kenya.” Speech delivered during an event of the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Western. KNBS. <https://www.unescwa.org/sites/default/files/event/materials/Kenya%20-%20KNBS.pdf>.

UN Women East and Southern Africa Regional Office. 2024. *Unlocking the Value of Gender Data: A Regional Toolkit for Transformative Action*. https://grootskenya.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/un_women_and_groots_gender_data_use_toolkit_-_unlocking_the_value_of_gender_data_in_east_and_southern_africa.pdf.

Senegal

Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative. Undated. “Senegal.” <https://eiti.org/countries/senegal>.

WIM Sénégal. 2021. *WIM Index: Indice genre dans le secteur minier au Sénégal – Rapport 2021*. Dakar: WIM Senegal. https://wimsenegal.org/media/attachments/2024/01/13/rapport_2021_wim_index.pdf.

Tanzania

Dillip, A., G. Kahamba, R. Sambaiga, et al. 2024. “Using Digital Technology as a Platform to Strengthen the Continuum of Care at Community Level for Maternal, Child and Adolescent Health in

Tanzania: Introducing the Afya-Tek Program.” *BMC Health Services Research* 24, p. 865.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-024-11302-7>

Ministry of Health, Community Development, Gender, Elderly and Children, United Republic of Tanzania. 2017. *Tanzania Digital Health Investment Roadmap (2017–2023)*. Dar es Salaam: United Republic of Tanzania. <https://www.policyvault.africa/policy/tanzania-digital-health-investment-road-map-2017-2023/>.

The Philippines

Mapa, C.D. Undated. “SDG Monitoring: The Philippine Experience” [slide deck]. Philippine Statistics Authority. https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/meetings/iaeg-sdgs-meeting-14/10a_SDG_Monitoring_Philippines.pdf.

Philippine Statistics Authority, and Partnership in Statistics for Development in the 21st Century (PARIS21). 2020. *Use of Citizen-Generated Data for SDG Reporting in the Philippines: A Case Study*. <https://www.paris21.org/knowledge-base/use-citizen-generated-data-sdg-reporting-philippinesa-case-study>.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 List of countries with active CSO/non-profit statistical programmes

European Union (EU) countries

Country	Programme/agency	Description	Link
France	INSEE – SIRENE and RNA	Statistical and administrative registers on associations	https://www.insee.fr/fr/information/1948450
Finland	Statistics Finland – OSF	Official statistics on non-profit organizations and employment	https://stat.fi/en
Germany	Destatis – microcensus and open data	Statistical data and open datasets, including non-profits	https://www.destatis.de/EN/Service/OpenData/opendata.html
Italy	ISTAT – permanent census of non-profit institutions	Regular census providing structural and economic data on non-profit organizations	https://www.istat.it/en/statistical-themes/censuses/nonprofit-institutions/
Poland	Statistics Poland – surveys on associations	Reports and statistics on foundations and associations	https://stat.gov.pl/en/topics/social-economy/social-economy-third-sector/

Non-EU countries

Country/Region	Programme/Agency	Description	Link
Australia	ACNC/ABS	Annual reports and economic satellite accounts of charities and non-profit institutions	https://www.acnc.gov.au/tools/reports/australian-charities-report-10th-edition
India	MOSPI/ GuideStar India	Survey and data repositories on Indian non-profits	https://guidestarindia.com/India_CSO_Reports.aspx
Latin America	ECLAC/IDB	Regional statistical databases and social indicators, including CSO data	https://www.iadb.org/en/knowledge-resources/data/social-data
South Africa	Stats SA/DSD	Census and registry of non-profit organizations with financial and structural data	https://www.statssa.gov.za/?p=4176
United States	BLS/NCCS	Employment and structural data on non-profits; NCCS provides Form 990-based datasets	https://nccs.urban.org/nccs/datasets/core/

Several EU countries conduct censuses or surveys or maintain registers of CSOs and the non-profit sector, though the form, frequency and scope vary widely by country. The following is a summary of the situation.

1. Satellite accounts for non-profit institutions

Many EU countries compile satellite accounts on non-profit institutions as part of their national accounts. The countries include Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Slovakia, Sweden and the Netherlands, among others. The purpose is to measure the economic contribution of the non-profit sector (employment, value added, etc.). This practice follows the 2003 UN Handbook on Non-Profit Institutions in the System of National Accounts. Eurostat encourages this

through the Third Sector Satellite Account initiative, though it is not mandatory under the European Statistical System.

2. Statistical registers of CSOs

Several EU member states maintain statistical business registers or non-profit registries, which include CSOs as legal entities (non-governmental organizations, associations, foundations, etc.). Examples are ISTAT of Italy that conducts periodic censuses on the non-profit sector (e.g., Censimento delle Istituzioni Non Profit); INSEE of France that includes associations in its SIRENE business register and conducts ad hoc surveys; and the Statistisches Bundesamt of Germany that maintains data on non-profits through registers and employment statistics.

3. Dedicated surveys or censuses

In some countries, NSOs or research institutions conduct specific surveys or censuses of CSOs. Examples are: Non-profit Institutions Census of Italy that included structural data on over a sample of 60,000 organizations; Charities Regulator of Ireland that maintains a searchable register, while the CSO uses administrative data for analysis; Central Statistical Office of Poland that conducts surveys on foundations and associations; and Statistics Finland that monitors CSO contributions to employment and welfare services.

4. EU-level efforts

At the EU level, there is no single census of CSOs. However, Eurostat supports civil society data collection under the European Statistical System. CSOs are also often covered in broader Labour Force Surveys, Household Budget Surveys, and Structural Business Statistics. The European Economic and Social Committee and the European Foundation Centre provide data and reports on civil society trends.

Summary

Instrument	Exists in EU?	Scope
Non-profit satellite accounts	In several countries	Economic contribution of non-profit institutions
Registers of CSOs/associations	Common	Legal/formal recognition of CSOs
Dedicated surveys/censuses	In some countries	Structural and operational data
EU-wide census of CSOs	Not yet	Partial coverage via Eurostat and national efforts

Appendix 2 Glossary of terms on CSO citizen data collection methods and tools

Many of the terms in this glossary come from practice and grey literature and are not always defined in formal scientific frameworks. Thus, the provided sources serve as conceptual anchors or academic precedents, rather than normative citations, for the terms and definitions.

Community-based monitoring and reporting

A participatory approach where local communities actively observe, collect and report data about issues affecting their lives, often related to service delivery or rights fulfilment.

The term and practice are defined in guides such as A Guide to Community-Based Monitoring, Reporting and Verification, which describe community-led data collection of social, environmental or service delivery indicators. (Source: Bollers, R., V. Antone, P. Fredricks, et al. 2020. "[A Guide to Community-based Monitoring, Reporting and Verification](#)." World Wildlife Fund Guianas.)

Local surveys and needs assessments, community scorecards

Tools used by CSOs to gather information directly from communities about their needs, priorities and satisfaction with public services, often employing participatory scoring methods.

Community-based monitoring guidance and participatory monitoring toolkits explain how community surveys, scorecards or participatory assessments are used by CSOs or community organizations to track service delivery, rights fulfilment or local development. (Source: McDonald, O. Undated. '[Community Monitoring and Evaluation](#)'.)

Crisis mapping, elections, disaster response

Real-time collection and visualization of data during emergencies or political events using digital tools and crowdsourced reports to guide response and accountability.

A 2019 journal article describes how volunteer and technical communities collaborate to gather, analyse and map critical information about disaster-affected populations; it underlines the use of crowdsourced data to support emergency response. (Source: Hunt, A. and D. Specht. 2019. "Crowdsourced Mapping in Crisis Zones: Collaboration, Organisation and Impact." *Journal of International Humanitarian Action* 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41018-018-0048-1>.)

Crowdsourcing platforms

Online platforms that gather information or input from a large group of people, often used for collecting real-time data on social or environmental issues.

Definitions and conceptual frameworks are given in research on citizen science and crowd science. The participants are non-professional volunteers recruited through open calls, contributing to data collection, classification or research tasks. (Source: Poetz, M.K. and H. Sauermann. 2024. "Citizen Science and Crowd Science." *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Business and Management*. D. Bergh (Ed.). <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190224851.013.385>.)

Social media and online forums

Digital spaces where individuals share experiences and information, which can be aggregated and analysed for insights into public opinion, trends and lived realities.

Definitions and conceptual frameworks are given in research on citizen science and crowd science. Participants are non-professional volunteers recruited through open calls, contributing to data collection, classification or research tasks. (Source: Poetz, M.K. and H. Sauermann. 2024.)

Citizen science initiatives

Scientific research conducted, in whole or in part, by amateur or non-professional scientists, often involving public participation in data collection.

Definitions and conceptual frameworks are given in research on citizen science and crowd science. Participants are non-professional volunteers recruited through open calls, contributing to data collection, classification or research tasks. (Source: Poetz, M.K. and H. Sauermann. 2024.)

Citizen science experiments, e.g., air quality monitoring by volunteers

Specific initiatives where citizens collect scientific data, such as using sensors to track pollution, contributing to environmental research and policy.

Definitions and conceptual frameworks are given in research on citizen science and crowd science. Participants are non-professional volunteers recruited through open calls, contributing to data collection, classification or research tasks. (Source: Poetz, M.K. and H. Sauermann. 2024.)

Gender-based violence hotlines/helplines

Confidential telephone or digital services where survivors of gender-based violence can report incidents and receive support, often used to aggregate anonymized data.

A 2025 peer-reviewed case study explores how survivors use gender-based violence helplines, providing empirical evidence that helplines can function not just as support services but as data collection platforms when anonymized and aggregated. (Makena, G., C. Masiga and G. Ngare. 2025. "Determinants of Utilization of Helplines by Gender-Based Violence Survivors during the COVID-19 Pandemic in Kibra, Kenya." *Journal of Applied Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4(1), pp. 29–42. <https://doi.org/10.35942/jahss.v4i1.27>.)

Metadata

Metadata are 'data about the data'. These provide information that describe how a dataset was created, by whom, when, and under what conditions. Metadata typically include details such as the data source, collection methods, sampling design, geographic coverage, time period and ethical safeguards. Well-documented metadata make data transparent, easier to interpret and more trustworthy for reuse and integration with other datasets. (Source: Eurostat. Undated. "[Glossary: Metadata](#)".)

Probability sample

A sampling method in which every individual or unit in the population has a known and non-zero chance of being selected. This allows for statistical representativeness, meaning results can be generalized to the wider population with measurable confidence. Examples include random sampling, stratified sampling or cluster sampling, commonly used in official surveys and censuses. (Source: Särndel, C.-E., B. Swensson and J. Wretman. 1992. "[Model Assisted Survey Sampling](#)." *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series D (The Statistician)* 44(1), p. 140.)

Non-probability sample

A sampling method in which individuals or units are not selected randomly, and their chance of inclusion is unknown. These samples are often used when time, resources or population data are limited, such as in community-based, participatory or citizen data initiatives. While non-probability samples cannot produce statistically representative estimates, they are valuable for capturing lived experiences, contextual insight, and voices often excluded from traditional surveys. (Source: Särndel, C.-E., B. Swensson and J. Wretman. 1992.)

SMS and mobile app reporting

Mobile-based tools that allow individuals to send reports, surveys or feedback via text messages or applications, often used in areas with limited internet access.

A 2023 study examining public willingness to participate in smartphone-based data collection highlights that individuals may be more likely to share data through apps when they have control over data submission and can review content before sending; this supports the viability of mobile app-based citizen data collection for social research and reporting. (Source: Wenz, A. and F. Keusch. 2023. "Increasing the Acceptance of Smartphone-Based Data Collection." *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Volume 87, Issue 2, Summer 2023, pp. 357–388. <https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfad019>.)

Indigenous territories, informal settlements

Geographic areas often excluded from official data systems. Data from these areas are typically collected through participatory and localized methods.

A 2024 book explores how participatory GIS and community cartography can empower marginalized populations, including indigenous communities and informal settlement dwellers, by generating spatial data grounded in local knowledge, often absent from official datasets. (Sources: Malakar, K.D. and R. Supriya. 2024. [*Mapping Geospatial Citizenship: The Power of Participatory*](#). Cham: Springer.)

The [*Indigenous Navigator*](#) is described as “a framework and set of tools for and by indigenous peoples to systematically monitor the level of recognition and implementation of their rights”.

Civil society organization

A non-state, non-profit and non-market entity that operates independently to represent the interests, voices and rights of individuals, communities or specific groups in society. CSOs include a diverse array of organizations, such as non-governmental organizations (NGOs), community-based organizations, faith-based groups, women’s rights organizations, professional associations, research institutes, trade unions, advocacy coalitions and social movements. CSOs work to influence policy, deliver services, conduct research, and promote accountability, inclusion and justice, often filling gaps left by public institutions and markets. They do not operate to generate profits for private distribution (non-profit); they are institutionally separate from government and business (independent); participation is generally voluntary, in governance and membership (voluntary); they are guided by a social or developmental purpose, such as gender equality, environmental protection or community empowerment (mission-driven).

A recent academic-policy reference defines CSOs broadly to include volunteer and non-profit associations, community-based groups, unions, religious groups, NGOs and others, stressing their role in civic life, advocacy, public interest and social change. (Source: Ishida, Y. 2022. “Civil Society Organizations.” *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance*. Farazmand, A. (Ed.). Cham: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-66252-3_153.)

FAIR data principles

FAIR stands for: Findable, or discoverable through metadata and identifiers; Accessible, or retrievable under clear conditions; Interoperable, or usable across systems and standards; and Reusable, or well-documented so others can reuse it correctly. (Sources: Wikipedia. Undated. “[FAIR Data](#).”; United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner. 2018. [*A Human Rights-based Approach to Data*](#).)

CARE data principles

CARE stands for: Collective benefit, or data use should benefit the communities described; Authority to control, or communities have a say in how data are used; Responsibility, or data users act responsibly and prevent harm; and Ethics, or rights, dignity and consent are respected. (Source: Global Indigenous Data Alliance. Undated. “[CARE Principles for Indigenous Data Governance](#).”)

Appendix 3 United Nations Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics

Note: The short titles accompanying each principle are not part of UN General Assembly Resolution A/RES/68/261. These are used in materials of the United Nations Statistics Division and United Nations Economic Commission for Europe solely to improve readability and do not replace the official wording of the principles.

Principle 1 – Official statistics provide an indispensable element in the information system of a democratic society, serving the government, the economy and the public with data about the economic, demographic, social and environmental situation. To this end, official statistics that meet the test of practical utility are to be compiled and made available on an impartial basis by official statistical agencies to honour citizens' entitlement to public information. Short title: Relevance, impartiality and equal access.

Principle 2 – To retain trust in official statistics, the statistical agencies need to decide according to strictly professional considerations, including scientific principles and professional ethics, on the methods and procedures for the collection, processing, storage and presentation of statistical data. Short title: Professional standards and ethics.

Principle 3 – To facilitate a correct interpretation of the data, the statistical agencies are to present information according to scientific standards on the sources, methods and procedures of the statistics. Short title: Accountability and transparency.

Principle 4 – The statistical agencies are entitled to comment on erroneous interpretation and misuse of statistics. Short title: Prevention of misuse.

Principle 5 – Data for statistical purposes may be drawn from all types of sources, be they statistical surveys or administrative records. Statistical agencies are to choose the source with regard to quality, timeliness, costs and the burden on respondents. Short title: Sources of official statistics.

Principle 6 – Individual data collected by statistical agencies for statistical compilation, whether they refer to natural or legal persons, are to be strictly confidential and used exclusively for statistical purposes. Short title: Confidentiality.

Principle 7 – The laws, regulations and measures under which the statistical systems operate are to be made public. Short title: Legislation.

Principle 8 – Coordination among statistical agencies within countries is essential to achieve consistency and efficiency in the statistical system. Short title: National coordination.

Principle 9 – The use by statistical agencies in each country of international concepts, classifications and methods promotes the consistency and efficiency of statistical systems at all official levels. Short title: Use of international standards.

Principle 10 – Bilateral and multilateral cooperation in statistics contributes to the improvement of systems of official statistics in all countries. Short title: International cooperation.

Appendix 4 Mapping NSO practices to the Copenhagen Framework for Citizen Data

Summary

Dimension	Copenhagen principles	Example from NSO–CSO practice
Trustworthiness	Principle 1: Integrity; Principle 3: Transparency and accountability	Data validation workshops; use of quality standards
Inclusivity	Principle 4: Participation; Principle 5: Rights-based; Principle 7: Local relevance and empowerment	Grassroots engagement; feminist-informed tools
Utility	Principle 7: Local relevance and empowerment; Principle 9: Usefulness	Data used in SDG planning and national reports

Trustworthiness: Copenhagen Principles 1 and 3

Joint data validation workshops (e.g., in Kenya and Tanzania) and formal Memoranda of Understanding underpin transparency and accountability, ensuring data are collected and used ethically and rigorously.

Alignment with the UN Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics and metadata standards builds confidence in the quality and impartiality of the data, in line with the Copenhagen Framework's emphasis on statistical integrity.

→ Result: Citizens, CSOs and government actors can rely on the data, fostering institutional and public trust.

Inclusivity: Copenhagen Principles 4, 5 and 7

Collaborations involved community-based organizations, grassroots leaders and feminist CSOs, which rooted the data in lived experiences (e.g., in Colombia, Uganda and Kenya).

Participatory audits and co-design of surveys brought marginalized voices, especially women voices, into the national statistical ecosystem.

→ Result: The data capture diverse, often overlooked realities, improving representation and equity in policymaking.

Utility: Copenhagen Principles 7 and 9

Citizen-generated data informed SDG monitoring and filled gaps in official statistics (e.g., time-use data in Colombia, maternal health in Tanzania).

Structured submissions from CSOs were considered for national reporting, demonstrating practical integration into state functions.

→ Result: The data becomes not just symbolic but actionable, used to inform planning, policy and resource allocation.

Appendix 5 Tools and templates for applying gender-responsive citizen data quality assurance

This toolkit provides practical templates and tools designed to help ensure that gender-responsive citizen data collection and use are aligned with the quality dimensions of trustworthiness, inclusivity and utility. Each tool supports a specific aspect of planning, documenting or evaluating gender-sensitive citizen data.

Gender-responsive citizen data quality checklist

Use this checklist to ensure key gender-responsive citizen data quality principles are integrated throughout the data process.

Dimension	Checklist item	Yes/No/Notes
Trustworthiness	Are women and gender-diverse individuals involved in data collection or oversight?	
Trustworthiness	Is informed consent adapted to gender-specific risks and contexts?	
Inclusivity	Are sampling methods inclusive of marginalized gender groups?	
Inclusivity	Are data disaggregated by sex and intersecting characteristics?	
Inclusivity	Have safety risks linked to disclosure been assessed and mitigated?	
Utility	Are the data timely and aligned with gender policy or advocacy windows?	
Utility	Are findings presented in accessible formats for gender rights stakeholders?	
.....		

Metadata template with ethical protocols

Use this form to document the data collection process, with attention to gender-focused ethical standards.

Title of dataset	
Date and location of collection	
Target population (gender, age, groups)	
Sampling method	
Consent process description	
Confidentiality safeguards	
Tools used (surveys, apps, interviews)	
Data storage and access	
Ethics review or oversight body	
Limitations or biases identified	
.....	

Citizen data mapping sheet to SDG 5 indicators

Use this tool to map a citizen data initiative to SDG 5 targets and indicators.

SDG 5 indicator	Gender-responsive citizen data theme	Source (e.g., CSO, platform)	Data quality notes
5.2.1: Proportion of women subjected to violence			
5.4.1: Time spent on unpaid domestic and care work			
5.5.1: Women's participation in decision-making			
5.6.1: Access to reproductive health			
...			

Appendix 6 Interview guide for CSO-NSO dialogue on gender-related citizen data collaboration

Use this guide to facilitate structured conversations between NSOs and CSOs working on gender-responsive citizen data.

1. What gender-responsive citizen data priorities do you currently focus on?
2. How do you ensure data quality in citizen data on gender issues?
3. Have you engaged in joint validation or peer review of citizen data with other actors?
4. What challenges have you faced in integrating gender data from citizen sources?
5. What ethical protocols are in place for working with sensitive gender citizen data?
6. What improvements or support would enhance CSO-NSO collaboration on gender data?