

**DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION DIRECTORATE
DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE**

DAC Network on Governance

ANTI-CORRUPTION TASK TEAM MEETING

Room Document 2:

Sourcebook on Measuring Peace, Justice and Institutions: Report of the Virtual Network of stakeholders for the development of indicators on peaceful societies, justice and effective institutions for SDG 16 (July 2015)

7-8 October 2015, OECD Conference Centre, Room CC6

This document is submitted for INFORMATION, on 7 October, under Item III of the Draft Agenda {DCD/DAC/GOVNET/A(2015)2}.

The complete document is only available in PDF format.

Contact(s):

Alessandra Fontana – Tel: +33 (0)1 45 24 90 21- E-mail: alessandra.fontana@oecd.org

Lena Diesing –Tel.: +33 (0) 1 45 24 84 57- E-mail: lena.diesing@oecd.org

JT03382505

Complete document available on OLIS in its original format

This document and any map included herein are without prejudice to the status of or sovereignty over any territory, to the delimitation of international frontiers and boundaries and to the name of any territory, city or area.



Sourcebook on Measuring Peace, Justice and Institutions

**Report of the Virtual Network of Stakeholders for the
Development of Indicators on Peaceful Societies, Justice
and Effective Institutions for SDG 16 (July 2015)**



This report is an independent publication commissioned by UNDP and supported by the German Government. The analysis and recommendations expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the official views of the United Nations, its agencies or its Member States. It is commissioned to capture guidance from the Virtual Network on indicators for SDG16. It was written by a team consisting of Gary Milante, Suyoun Jang, Hyunjung Park and Kyungnam Ryu (Stockholm International Peace Research Institute) with substantial inputs from the Virtual Network, though any errors remain those of the author. Correspondence on the report or about the Virtual Network should be directed to Jana Schuhmann (jana.schuhmann@undp.org), Chris Murgatroyd (chris.murgatroyd@undp.org) and Gary Milante (milante@sipri.org).

Table of Contents

I. Executive Summary	5
II. Introduction	8
III. Background	9
IV. Measurability	13
V. Considerations for Identifying Indicators for SDG16	16
1. “Basketing” and using Multiple Indicators for Individual Targets	17
2. Three considerations for indicator identification: Relevance, Simplicity and Feasibility	18
2.1 Relevance Considerations.....	18
2.2 Simplicity Considerations	19
2.2.a The Risk of Oversimplifying: Composite indicators.....	21
2.3 Feasibility Considerations.....	22
2.3.a Feasibility and Capacity Constraints	23
2.3.b Feasibility and Disaggregation.....	25
2.3.c Feasibility and Surveys	25
VI. Using Annex 1 to Identify Outcome Indicators for Targets in SDG16	26
VII. Conclusion: Next Steps for SDG 16 Indicators	30
Bibliography	32
Annex 1: List of Indicators for SDG 16	38
Target 16.1	
Significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere	38
Target 16.2	
End abuse, exploitation, trafficking and all forms of violence against and torture of children.....	44
Target 16.3	
Promote the rule of law at the national and international levels and ensure equal access to justice for all.....	47
Target 16.4	
By 2030, significantly reduce illicit financial and arms flows, strengthen the recovery and return of stolen assets and combat all forms of organized crime.....	52
Target 16.5	
Substantially reduce corruption and bribery in all their forms.....	55
Target 16.6	
Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels	60
Target 16.7	
Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels.....	67
Target 16.8	
Broaden and strengthen the participation of developing countries in the institutions of global governance.....	75

Target 16.9	
By 2030, provide legal identity for all, including birth registration.....	78
Target 16.10	
Ensure public access to information and protect fundamental freedoms, in accordance with national legislation and international agreements	81
Target 16.a	
Strengthen relevant national institutions, including through international cooperation, for building capacity at all levels, in particular in developing countries, to prevent violence and combat terrorism and crime.....	91
Target 16.b	
Promote and enforce non-discriminatory laws and policies for sustainable development	94
Annex 2: Input Indicators on Peace, Justice and Institutions	97

I. Executive Summary

The “Sourcebook on Measuring Peace, Justice and Institutions” represents a short, current stocktaking of knowledge of a group of experts, the Virtual Network of Stakeholders for the Development of Indicators on Peaceful Societies, Justice and Effective Institutions for SDG16, working on measurement of the complex issues. Through workshops and online discussions, the Virtual Network has found that:

- complex concepts related to SDG16 **are being measured** in a number of developed and developing countries,
- these concepts **can be measured** using established and new technologies and methodologies,
- a minimum set of 24 indicators can be proposed for use at the global level to monitor SDG16 (Box 1, above)
- a number of indicators are **complementary** – they are insufficient in and of themselves to measure progress on a complex target and must be paired with other indicators
- a wider set of **supplementary** indicators will be necessary for proper monitoring of national targets (some suggestions are included in Annex 1)
- **disaggregation** is not just a commitment, but will be necessary to ensure that no one is left behind in 2015-2030

The 24 indicators listed below constitute a suggestion for a set of global indicators for consideration for SDG16. The list is by no means complete, fully measuring and monitoring progress on peaceful societies, access to justice for all and effective and accountable institutions would require many more indicators than those listed here. However, to be manageable, the SDG process will require a limited number of global indicators and this list represents the minimum set recommended by the Virtual Network, which had been put forward to the UN Technical Support Team for Goal 16¹ for their consideration in May 2015.

Box 1 The Virtual Network's proposed minimum set of suggested global indicators for measurement of SDG 16

- **Target 16.1 Significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere**
 - Indicator 16.1.1. Violent Deaths per 100,000 people (includes intentional homicides per 100,000 + direct conflict deaths per 100,000)²
 - Indicator 16.1.2a. Percentage of people who have experienced physical and/or sexual violence in the last 12 months, disaggregated by sex, age and location³
 - Indicator 16.1.2b. Proportion of people who feel safe walking at night in the area where they live, disaggregated by sex, age, location and/or urban/rural⁴
- **Target 16.2 End abuse, exploitation, trafficking and all forms of violence against and torture of children**

¹ The Virtual Network has worked closely from the beginning with the TST for Goal 16. The TST was created to support the intergovernmental process that developed the SDGs and the group for Goal 16 has also proposed indicators for Goal 16, including to the IAEG-SDGs in May 2015. The group TST for Goal 16 is led by: EOSG/RoLU, UNDP PBSO, UNDP and UNODC and includes EOSG, DPA, UN Women, UNICEF, ECA, OHCHR, UNFPA, UNEP, DPKO, ILO, OCHA, UNECE, UNEP, UNESCO, UNCDF, UNHCR, OSAA, UNAIDS, IOM, UNODC, ITU, UNCITRAL, World Bank.

² Mainly consistent with TST proposal (same content, different wording)

³ Mainly consistent with TST proposal (same content, different wording)

⁴ Consistent with TST proposal

- Indicator 16.2.1. Percentage of people who have experienced physical and/or sexual violence in the last 12 months – disaggregated by age (see 16.1.2a above)⁵
- Indicator 16.2.2. Number of detected victims of human trafficking disaggregated by type of exploitation⁶
- **Target 16.3 Promote the rule of law at the national and international levels and ensure equal access to justice for all**
 - Indicator 16.3.1. Proportion of those who have experienced a dispute in the past 12 months who have accessed a formal, informal, alternative or traditional dispute resolution mechanism and who feel it was just⁷
 - Indicator 16.3.2. Proportion of all detainees who are not yet sentenced⁸
- **Target 16.4 By 2030, significantly reduce illicit financial and arms flows, strengthen the recovery and return of stolen assets and combat all forms of organized crime**
 - Indicator 16.4.1. Total volume of inward and outward illicit financial flows⁹
- **Target 16.5 Substantially reduce corruption and bribery in all their forms**
 - Indicator 16.5.1. Percentage of population who paid a bribe to a public official, or were asked for a bribe by these public officials, during the last 12 months¹⁰
 - Indicator 16.5.2. Percentage of businesses that paid a bribe to a public official, or were asked for a bribe by these public officials, during the last 12 months¹¹
- **Target 16.6 Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels**
 - Indicator 16.6.1 Actual primary expenditures per sector and revenues as a percentage of the original approved budget* of the government¹²
 - Indicator 16.6.2 Proportion of population satisfied with their last experience of public services, disaggregated by service¹³
- **Target 16.7 Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels**
 - Indicator 16.7.1a Proportion of positions (by sex, disability, age and ethnicity) in public institutions (national and local legislatures, public services and judiciary) compared to national distributions¹⁴
 - Indicator 16.7.1b Percentage of population who believe decision-making at all levels is inclusive and responsive
 - Indicator 16.7.2 Turnout as a share of voting-age population in national election¹⁵
 - Indicator 16.7.3 Legislature conducts public hearings during budget cycle¹⁶
- **Target 16.8 Broaden and strengthen the participation of developing countries in the institutions of global governance**
 - Indicator 16.8.1 Percentage of voting rights in international organizations of developing countries¹⁷
- **Target 16.9 By 2030, provide legal identity for all, including birth registration**

⁵ Mainly consistent with TST proposal (same content, different wording)

⁶ Mainly consistent with TST proposal (same content, different wording)

⁷ Mainly consistent with TST proposal (same content, different wording)

⁸ Mainly consistent with TST proposal (same content, different wording)

⁹ Mainly consistent with TST proposal (same content, different wording)

¹⁰ Mainly consistent with TST proposal (same content, different wording)

¹¹ Mainly consistent with TST proposal (same content, different wording)

¹² Mainly consistent with TST proposal (same content, different wording)

¹³ Consistent with TST proposal

¹⁴ Consistent with TST proposal

¹⁵ Consistent with TST proposal

¹⁶ Consistent with TST proposal

¹⁷ Mainly consistent with TST proposal (same content, different wording)

- Indicator 16.9.1 Percentage of children under 5 whose births have been registered with civil authority¹⁸
- **Target 16.10 Ensure public access to information and protect fundamental freedoms, in accordance with national legislation and international agreements**
 - Indicator 16.10.1 Percentage of budget documents, off budget revenue documents, procurement and natural resource concessions publically available and easily accessible in open data format¹⁹
 - Indicator 16.10.2 Number of verified cases of killing, kidnapping, enforced disappearances, arbitrary detention, assault and torture of journalists, associated media personnel, trade unionists and human rights advocates in the previous 12 months²⁰
 - Indicator 16.10.3 Percentage of population who believes they can express political opinion without fear
- **Target 16.a Strengthen relevant national institutions, including through international cooperation, for building capacity at all levels, in particular in developing countries, to prevent violence and combat terrorism and crime**
 - Indicator 16.a.1 Percentage of requests for international cooperation (law enforcement cooperation, mutual legal assistance and extraditions) made through existing conventions that were met during the reporting year²¹
- **Target 16.b Promote and enforce non-discriminatory laws and policies for sustainable development**
 - Indicator 16.b.1 Proportion of the population who believe that state institutions are treating people of all groups fairly, equitably and without discrimination
 - Indicator 16.b.2 Existence of independent national human rights institutions (NHRIs) in compliance with the Paris Principles²²

¹⁸ Consistent with TST proposal

¹⁹ Consistent with TST proposal

²⁰ Consistent with TST proposal

²¹ Mainly consistent with TST proposal (same content, different wording)

²² Consistent with TST proposal

II. Introduction

As the world considers setting new goals for Sustainable Development in the post-2015 era (2015-2030), Goal 16 stands out as a particularly important goal.

Through Goal 16, the world is making a generational commitment to be more peaceful, to provide equal access to justice for everyone and that people all over the world must be served by institutions that are effective, accountable and inclusive. As the world has committed in the 2030 Agenda for Global Action to “leave no one behind” in this “great collective journey” as well as “address the challenge of financing and creating an enabling environment at all levels for sustainable development in the spirit of global partnership and solidarity”,²³ it must be asked: How will we know when these goals have been met? Proper indicators measuring peace, justice and institutions will need to be selected, tested and refined, and they will need to be monitored. Measuring such complex concepts is no simple feat, but it is not impossible.

SDG 16: Promote Peaceful and Inclusive Societies for Sustainable Development, Provide Access to Justice for All and Build Effective, Accountable and Inclusive Institutions at all Levels

This document is the outcome of a stocktaking exercise from the first half of 2015, capturing current knowledge and practice from a Virtual Network convened to develop guidance on how this can be done. As a sourcebook on a complex topic in a changing world, it is designed to be a ‘living document’ that can be updated with new, relevant information as it becomes available, with new practices as they are adopted and new indicators as they are designed.

This sourcebook is intended to serve as a resource for National Statistics Offices (NSOs), international agencies, academics, think tanks, civil society and interested citizens who are thinking about how to measure the complex concepts in SDG 16 in the post-2015 world. It is with humility that this sourcebook is offered, the Virtual Network agreed that there is no one right answer for choosing “best” indicators or “best” methods for collecting these indicators and could only provide guidance based on their combined expertise on how the process might be undertaken. For this reason, the report cannot be read as a “consensus document”, endorsed in all respects by all members of the Virtual Network. But there was general consensus on a number of principles including, to name but a few: that indicator identification is an iterative and consultative process; that every country will need to have a conversation about national targets and indicators to be used to achieve them, involving consultations with diverse constituencies and stakeholders described above; and that new solutions, innovative technologies and hybrid models may be necessary to measure complex concepts of peace, justice and institutions, particularly in low capacity environments. Where discrepancies or differences of opinion exist within the Virtual Network, they have been flagged in Annex 1.

In the first section of the sourcebook, there is a brief background on the Virtual Network and the SDG16 process to date. This is followed by reflections on recent experiences with indicator collection and use related to peace, justice and institutions. The main section of the report provides guidance on the process of identifying indicators, a brief discussion on

²³ UN “Transforming our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development” Final draft of the outcome document for the UN Summit to adopt the Post-2015 Development Agenda (26 July 2015), UN “Addis Ababa Action Agenda (AAAA)”. Outcome document of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development (23 July 2015).

types of indicators and their relevance, the importance of complementary and supplementary indicators, a look at disaggregation and concludes with some considerations for implementation. The sourcebook also introduces a small set of 24 indicators that the Virtual Network suggests could be used as global indicators for SDG16 (Box 1) and 20 to 30 indicators per target that might be considered for national indicators and adaptation at the local level (Annex 1). Finally, the sourcebook concludes with considerations on the future of the indicator process for SDG16.

In addition to the practical guidance in the sourcebook, Annex 1 is a reference document for government agencies, National Statistics Offices, civil society groups and other users. For each target, one to three *suggested* indicators are identified and then *alternative* specifications of these indicators are included, along with important information about each indicator, its type, sources, practical implementation information and links/cites for further information. Additional indicators that would *supplement* measurement are also included for each indicator. The indicators in Annex 1 are outcome or output indicators, useful for measuring whether a target has been achieved (see more below on quantifying targets and indicators). Because of the complexity of the processes that produce peace, justice and institutions, there are an additional 64 input indicators that were collected by the Virtual Network, included in Annex 2.

III. Background

The Virtual Network of Stakeholders for the Development of Indicators on Peaceful Societies, Justice and Effective Institutions for SDG16 was convened by the UNDP in collaboration with other partners to contribute substantively on the design of a top-level, global monitoring framework for Goal 16, but also discussed indicators for measuring progress on the national level. **The Virtual Network constituted a working group of experts and stakeholders with approximately 50 active members²⁴, including development practitioners, statisticians, UN agencies and civil society organizations.** The experts have extensive experience working in developing and developed countries, NGOs, universities or research entities, or bilateral aid and multilateral agencies on the measurement of issues related to peace, justice and institutional effectiveness.

The group was convened “virtually” through an online platform, and some members of the network were able to meet in various configurations in the first half of 2015, including in the margins of other meetings on statistics taking place in New York anyway and at a workshop in Vienna in May 2015, and contributing to linked initiatives (such as a workshop in Tunis to discuss piloting approaches to governance in the context of the SDGs). It is envisioned, though not yet formalized, that the network could continue to convene virtually in support of the SDG indicator identification process which will be undertaken by the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on SDG Indicators (IAEG-SDG). The IAEG-SDG is responsible for identifying indicators for all SDGs under the guidance of the Economic and Social Council and the UN Statistical Commission by March 2016 (see the Conclusion section below for more on the timeline). **The Virtual Network and its report may also serve to support the identification of regional and national level indicators by National Statistics Offices, and in support of new regional and international initiatives like Strategy for Harmonization of Statistics on Africa (SHaSA) and the Praia**

²⁴ And more than 200 members who joined the network.

Group on Governance Statistics (see below) as they continue to identify and implement monitoring of indicators related to SDG 16. Conversely, the VN will benefit from the insights emerging as these endeavours continue to unfold.

As of the writing of this version of the sourcebook (July 2015), the proposed Outcome Document for the Post-2015 Negotiations, “The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development”, serves as the most recent wording of SDG16 and its attendant targets (see box 2). In addition, there are a number of other relevant goals and targets in the SDGs that intersect with issues related to peace, justice and institutions. While peace, justice and effective, inclusive and accountable institutions are linked to all aspects of development, and, in many cases, are a precondition for development, these issues are particularly relevant for a number of other SDGs, namely, Sustainable Development Goal 1 (Ending poverty), Goal 5 (Gender equality), Goal 8 (Inclusive economic growth), Goal 10 (Reduce inequalities), Goal 11 (Inclusive, safe and resilient cities) and Goal 17 (Strengthen the means of implementation). It is beyond the scope of work in the present analysis to develop these linkages, but future versions of this report may be expanded to include a discussion of these linkages as the SDG agenda develops.

Currently, most targets in the SDGs – especially within Goal 16 - have not been fully defined, i.e. quantified with specifics that could be used to identify when a target has been reached. For example, Target 16.1 reads “Significantly reduce all forms of violence and related deaths everywhere”, but it isn’t clear what “significantly reduce” means (halve, eradicate or reduce by level or percentage?). For that reason the process has to be continued on the national level in order to explicitly define these targets, otherwise it will be challenging if not impossible to tell when a target has been met. Nevertheless, it is possible (and perhaps useful) to define indicators for these targets and collect baseline data (which can be used to inform target setting). The guidance that follows assumes that these targets will be refined and further specified.²⁵

Further complicating the process is the fact that targets and indicators will need to be defined at the global and national levels. In this sourcebook, the Virtual Network interprets these terms in the following ways:

- **Universal Goals:** Some sustainable development goals and parts of goals are absolute in their wording: “end poverty”, “end hunger”, “justice for all”. By definition, they are universal in their completeness and, therefore, also apply to all people. Goals that are not absolute are global goals, but may not apply to all countries and contexts. All sustainable development goals are, by their nature, global as the SDGs are part of a global agreement. Universal goals are a special type of global SDG and represent unique challenges due to their absolute nature. Universal goals imply absolute targets (i.e. end poverty implies a target of zero incidence of extreme poverty for the world).
- **Global Targets:** A global target is an aggregate target for the population of the world. Within each SDG (again, by their nature SDGs are global goals), there are a number of global targets that have been proposed in the Global Agenda for adoption in September 2015. The Global Agenda proposes that progress toward SDGs will be assessed by global aggregate progress against global targets, reported in an SDG Progress Report and reviewed by the High Level Political Forum (HLPF). The current global targets for SDG 16 are listed in Box 1.

²⁵ See UN System Task Team 2013 “Statistics and indicators for the post-2015 development agenda” for reflections and lessons learned on mismatched and underspecified targets from the MDGs.

- National Targets: It is envisioned in the Global Agenda that individual countries will set their own “ambitious” targets in response to the SDGs and global targets, in line with “national development and sustainable development strategies”.²⁶ Presumably the HLPF will be responsible for monitoring and assessing (and coordinating) how national targets will work together to meet global targets, including through coordination at the regional level. Because the goals and targets are “voluntary and country-owned”, it is conceivable that individual countries will identify not just levels for targets put forward in the Global Agenda, but may also specify other targets aligned with meeting the goals.
- Global Indicators: The indicators agreed upon by the IAEG-SDG (later this year) will be used across countries, with standardized methods for measurement and comparable results, such that they can be aggregated for annual, global reporting. Such indicators are considered global indicators. It is not currently clear how missing values of global indicators will be handled in global aggregations and progress reports if countries are not collecting particular indicators. Because the targets and concepts in SDG16 are complex, the global indicators should not be expected to be sufficient to fully measure peace, justice and institutions. Global indicators will need to be supplemented by national indicators in many cases.
- National Indicators: Any indicator used to monitor progress toward a target that is not a global indicator, is considered to be a national indicator. National indicators are a way of customizing monitoring instruments to a country context and may be part of national strategic planning and dialogue processes. Many countries may use the same national indicators. The identification of national targets and indicators is an opportunity for countries and societies to have discussions about their priorities for development with respect to peace, justice for all and effective institutions. Many supplementary indicators included in Annex 1 may be good national indicators. National indicators may “round out” the measurement of a complex concept and may be used to reverse perverse incentives that would otherwise be introduced by other indicators alone.

²⁶ See paragraphs 56 to 61 of the Global Agenda (UN, 2015).

Box 2 Final Draft Version of Sustainable Development Goal 16 and Targets

SDG16: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels

Target 16.1: Significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere

Target 16.2: End abuse, exploitation, trafficking and all forms of violence against and torture of children

Target 16.3: Promote the rule of law at the national and international levels and ensure equal access to justice for all

Target 16.4: By 2030, significantly reduce illicit financial and arms flows, strengthen the recovery and return of stolen assets and combat all forms of organized crime

Target 16.5: Substantially reduce corruption and bribery in all their forms

Target 16.6: Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels

Target 16.7: Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels

Target 16.8: Broaden and strengthen the participation of developing countries in the institutions of global governance

Target 16.9: By 2030, provide legal identity for all, including birth registration

Target 16.10: Ensure public access to information and protect fundamental freedoms, in accordance with national legislation and international agreements

Target 16.a: Strengthen relevant national institutions, including through international cooperation, for building capacity at all levels, in particular in developing countries, to prevent violence and combat terrorism and crime

Target 16.b: Promote and enforce non-discriminatory laws and policies for sustainable development

Source: UN "Transforming our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development" Final draft of the outcome document for the UN Summit to adopt the Post-2015 Development Agenda (26 July 2015),

The guidance in this sourcebook will be useful for a variety of audiences. First and foremost, the Virtual Network was designed to contribute to the work of the UN system, feeding into the IAEG-SDG and UN Statistical Commission debates, and, ultimately to contribute to identification of indicators for monitoring SDG16 at the global level. The Virtual Network acknowledged early on, though, that **any global indicator would be insufficient to measure the targets fully, because of the complexity of the targets in SDG16 and the limits to the number of indicators that could practically be adopted per target**. Where multiple indicators are necessary to measure a target, these indicators would form a “basket”. **As a result, the Virtual Network also identified supplementary indicators for each target that could “round out” indicator selection processes at the national level**. This gives national actors, including planners and statistical offices, the ability to interpret targets and ensure that the measurement and monitoring of progress toward these targets fits national contexts. Supplementary and complementary indicators may also be used by regional or thematic monitoring groups for reporting.

IV. Measurability

SDG16 can be measured, indeed, it is being measured.

The Virtual Network did not start its work from scratch: the members of the network have collected a number of examples that already demonstrate both technical capacity and willingness on the part of national actors to measure and monitor issues related to SDG 16.

Many countries already collect and report many of the administrative data proposed by the Virtual Network. For example, for intentional homicides, nearly half (75) of the countries that report a statistic for intentional homicides in 2012 to UNODC were from national police, NSOs, ministry of justice or other national sources. Additionally, a number of countries use regional statistics organizations to report these statistics, including OAS and Eurostat. Still others use hybrid models for reporting homicides from administrative sources, including reporting by UN peacekeepers on homicides in Liberia. Administrative statistics on budgets, expenditures and revenues are reported regularly to the IMF through the Government Finance Statistics system. Likewise, many countries collect data on birth registration and election turnout. These indicators are all drawn from administrative data which come from national sources (see Box 1 for a discussion of how these indicators are attached to targets). In those countries where these statistics are not already collected, initiatives like SHaSA and other statistical capacity building efforts can help National Statistics Offices and other line ministries to develop the capacity to collect and report this administrative data.

Perhaps the largest and most timely demonstration effect is that of the 54 national statistics office members of SHaSA (Strategic Harmonization of Statistics in Africa) initiative. In addition to ongoing work on the collection of administrative data, SHaSA has introduced “add-on” survey questionnaires and administrative schedules for collecting data and measuring governance, peace and security (GPS). In the last three years, eight African countries (Cape Verde, Uganda, Burundi, Mali, Cameroon, Cote d’Ivoire, Malawi and Tunisia) have undertaken the first round of surveys and data collection and a further 12 have committed to implement the surveys and populate the administrative schedules (Orkin, Razafindrakotoc and Roubaud, 2015). These add-on survey questionnaires yield data on quality of and satisfaction with aspects of governance, including respect for freedoms and experience of corruption, bribery and discrimination.

Beyond the SHaSA experience, National Statistics Offices (NSOs) in developing countries have been engaged in collecting information on different aspects of what is now covered by Goal 16 including the design, execution and verification of household surveys for decades and are not adverse to surveys and survey methods. Recently, modules for household surveys on conflict, displacement, social cohesion, rule of law and governance have been introduced and piloted in a number of countries. One such example is the Mexico's Social Cohesion and Violence Prevention Survey (ECOPRED).²⁷

National level experiences demonstrate not only that governance indicators can be monitored in a variety of development contexts, but also how universal goals embodied in the SDGs are being adapted and interpreted through local context.

- On SDG 16 specifically, UNDP is working with a group of pilot countries (including Albania, Indonesia, Rwanda, Tunisia, UK) to identify preliminary global and contextually specific indicators, including some that have subsequently been suggested for SDG 16, and are currently testing how they could be measured and used for monitoring progress.²⁸ Initial work on these pilots was presented at a workshop in Tunis in April of 2015.
- Another example of national ownership and adaptation of such a monitoring process to local needs is the annual publication of the Rwanda Governance Scorecard by the Rwanda Governance Board. The Governance Scorecard collects data for 163 variables and reports them along 8 key indicators.²⁹
- Likewise, Peru has 12 years of experience in conducting nationally administered surveys that include a component on governance issues which is made publicly available. Survey questions are used to collect data on democracy, corruption and public service efficiency, through household surveys.

Another pertinent example of adaptation comes directly from the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). To reflect national priorities, a number of countries adopted an "MDG 9" at least a decade ago, including Albania and Mongolia (both of which adopted an MDG 9 on inclusive politics and democracy), Afghanistan (which adopted an MDG 9 on security) and Laos (MDG 9 monitors progress on reducing the impact of unexploded ordinance). Malaysia introduced reporting of regional disparities and inequalities among rural and ethnic groups in their reporting on MDGs and Ecuador added indicators on the rights of women, indigenous peoples and ethnic groups.³⁰ These country experiences are examples of national priorities and target setting and demonstrate the feasibility of a global agenda on peace, justice and effective, inclusive and accountable institutions which encourages such adaptation to local context.

While countries continue to develop their own individual approaches, international standards for monitoring many of these issues are emergent. For example:

²⁷ While data and methodology for the survey (ECOPRED 2014) is not available online, more information can be found at: nosmuevelapaz.org. See also: <http://www.saferworld.org.uk/resources/view-resource/891-measuring-peace-from-2015-an-indicator-framework-at-work>.

²⁸ Open Society Foundations is also supporting governments and civil society groups to meaningfully incorporate justice into development planning (including in Serbia, Nepal, Indonesia and Mexico).

²⁹ Indicators are assembled for: rule of law, political rights and civil liberties, participation and inclusiveness, safety and security, investing in human and social development, control of corruption, transparency and accountability, quality of service delivery and economic and corporate governance, see <http://www.rgb.rw/governancescorecard/>.

³⁰ See UN System Task Team (2013)

- UNODC-ECE has published guidelines that provide basic information for development and design of national victimization surveys, and identify key issues on survey approach, methodology, analysis and presentation of results.³¹
- The March 2015 International Classification of Crime for Statistical Purposes provides a comprehensive framework for classification and monitoring types of homicides and other violent crime, thereby enhancing consistency and international comparability of crime statistics, directly relevant to the target 1 of SDG 16.³²
- Likewise, OHCHR has recently developed a Guide on Measurement and Implementation of Human Rights Indicators that provides guidance on quantitative and qualitative indicators to measure progress on implementation of international human rights norms and principles, including those related to political participation, personal security and access to justice, as well as identifying data sources that will include the most marginalized and vulnerable.³³

In addition to these examples of international and national initiatives to identify and develop indicators for peace, justice and institutions, the architecture for international collaboration on indicator identification and monitoring is being built. In March 2015 the UN Statistical Commission validated the proposal for the creation of the Praia Group on Governance Statistic to develop regional and national statistical capacities for measuring peace, rule of law and governance. With an initial mandate through 2020, this group will be led by Cape Verde and will serve as a community of experts and peers to identify good practice and apply the lessons learned from the innovative examples above across countries. This group of experts will be influential in implementation of measurement of SDG 16 in the formative years of the new development agenda.³⁴

Finally, it should be noted that for decades, a number of international and national organizations have developed proven and tested, (often peer-reviewed) methodologies for monitoring a number of issues related to peace, justice and institutions, and have made this data publicly available, including: the Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP), Transparency International, Global Financial Integrity, the World Justice Project (WJP), Ushahidi, Afrobarometer and other regional barometers, etc.³⁵ Questions on conflict have been integrated into a number of household surveys (LSMS and DHS). The World Bank collects data from small and medium enterprises through its Doing Business and Enterprise Surveys. In addition, many private sector firms collect data of interest and relevance, including Gallup, World Values Survey and the Pew Research Center Global Attitudes Project.

The examples above provided rich material for the Virtual Network to draw on from the significant progress being made around the world on developing the technical skills and capacity to measure peace, justice and effective institutions. They also reflect growing political commitments to do so, and form the context for the Virtual Network of demand from states and their people for these aspects of development to be measured.

³¹ <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/data-and-analysis/Manual-on-victim-surveys.html>

³² <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/data-and-analysis/statistics/iccs.html>

³³ <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Indicators/Pages/documents.aspx>

³⁴ <http://unstats.un.org/unsd/statcom/doc15/2015-17-CaboVerde-E.pdf>

³⁵ See Annex 1 for links to a number of sources and also see an extended list on page 7 of:

<http://www.saferworld.org.uk/resources/view-resource/891-measuring-peace-from-2015-an-indicator-framework-at-work>

V. Considerations for Identifying Indicators for SDG16

Building on existing examples and emerging practices, this section outlines principles for the identification of indicators. This guidance has drawn heavily on reflections by the Interagency Expert Group for the MDGs (hereafter referred to as IAEG-MDG) and forward looking recommendations for the post-2015 agenda by the UN System Task Team (hereafter referred to as UNSTT) and the Committee for the Chair of Statistical Activities (CCSA),³⁶ as well as a variety of academic and organizational sources (Mayoux 2002, Brown 2009, Hayden and Samuel 2011, MDF 2015, OECD 2008, Razafindrakoto and Roubaud, 2006). The good practices suggested here are based on extensive experience from the Virtual Network and others who have been engaged in similar indicator processes and has been specifically tailored to issues around SDG16, including challenges with measuring complex concepts like peace, justice and institutions, how to create baskets of complementary and supplementary indicators to measure complex concepts using different types of indicators, and recommendations and considerations for disaggregation of indicators, capacity constraints of government institutions and civil society organizations in less developed countries and other methodological issues.

Before discussing “how” to identify indicators, there is a prior question of “who” should identify indicators. More than simply a technocratic exercise, identifying indicators also involves building consensus on how the indicators will measure progress, how the indicators will be interpreted (what they mean) and how they will influence good policy and performance. This is especially true when considering issues like peace, justice and institutions, as they are highly complex and require agreement on basic principles as well as how outcomes will be measured. To that end, the **Virtual Network recommends that the process below be consultative and iterative over time, bringing together policymakers, statisticians, civil society, concerned citizens, academics and other experts in institutionalized forums to identify indicators and construct a common understanding of what those indicators mean and how they will be used to influence policy and practice.**

Such collaboration in the development of indicators is not without precedent. For example, Indonesia’s planning ministry (BAPPENAS), the Ministry of Justice and Human Rights and the National legal aid foundation of Indonesia have worked to integrate access to justice into national development plans and jointly track the cases that are supported through the national legal aid funds. In the United States, the Office for Access to Justice in the Department of Justice is exploring ways to facilitate contributions of experts and civil society into the US’s efforts to track progress on goal 16.³⁷ Such an approach is also consistent with the global World We Want process which has influenced the Sustainable Development Goals –the most consultative global policy-making process the world has ever undertaken. ³⁸ Given the complexity and political nature of many of the global targets in SDG16 and the importance of ownership (as highlighted in the 2030 Global Agenda) of the national targets and indicators, it is particularly important that the many diverse constituencies at the

³⁶ “Lessons learned from MDG Monitoring from a Statistical Perspective” UN IAEG-MDG Members, March 2013, “Statistics and indicators for the post-2015 development agenda” UN System Task Team on the post-2015 UN Development Agenda, July 2013.

³⁷ <http://www.justice.gov/opa/blog/civil-legal-aid-research>

³⁸ More than seven million people have voted on their priorities for the post-2015 agenda in the UN-sponsored MY World Survey.

national level are involved in identifying indicators through national consultations and discussions on national targets.

1. “Basketing” and using Multiple Indicators for Individual Targets

If multiple indicators are necessary to measure a single target or facet of a target, it will be necessary to communicate how these indicators work together in a basket of indicators. The Virtual Network suggests using the language “complementary” and “supplementary” to refer to indicators to better convey the relationship between multiple indicators for a single target:

- **Complementary Indicators** are those that are necessary to complete measurement of a complex concept. If two indicators are complementary, neither is sufficient alone. Consider measurement of effective institutions (Target 16.6) – at the very minimum, the process of effective institutional performance can only be measured by both an output indicator (“What does the institution produce?”) and an outcome variable (“What is the impact of those outputs?” or “what are one’s experiences with the institution”).
- **Supplementary Indicators** are those that “round out” the measurement of a complex concept. These indicators are suggestions that should be adopted by countries interested in more nuance in their monitoring of a particular target. Supplementary indicators are a means for countries to adapt the universal goals to their own contexts and identify other dimensions of the target that are important to them.

As shown in Box 1 and the suggested indicators in Annex 1, the **Virtual Network found that two or three complementary indicators were necessary at the minimum to measure a number of targets of Goal 16 at the global indicator level.** In addition, the Network agreed that a basket of indicators, larger than the global indicators will be necessary to ensure holistic measures of progress toward national targets. The use of multiple indicators can be extremely useful in reducing perverse incentives introduced by monitoring of a single indicator (encouraging policymakers and government to more broadly meet the target than produce a single output or outcome). It is envisioned that a combination of supplementary and complementary indicators would be adopted by individual countries reflecting national priorities and planning.

As the global indicator identification process will continue through 2015 in time for the next meeting of the Statistical Commission in March of 2016, and the number of global indicators per target still remains an open question, the number of complementary indicators and supplementary indicators per target will need to be calibrated within the larger indicator framework of the agenda and national target setting. Suggested indicators in Box 1 should be considered as “Complementary Indicators” - the minimum set of indicators the Virtual Network has proposed for monitoring SDG16 at the global level. For completeness, Annex 1 also includes alternative indicators, illustrative examples of alternative prioritization, wording and phrasing for a number of indicators. Other indicators in the annex should be used as additional complementary indicators at the national or regional level or as supplementary indicators to be adopted in individual national contexts.

2. Three considerations for indicator identification: Relevance, Simplicity and Feasibility

An indicator should be used to practically monitor and understand progress toward an objective with the minimum burden on statistical capacity.³⁹ While a number of criteria (including SMART indicators: Specific, Measurable, Available/Achievable in a cost-effective way, Relevant for the programme and available in a Timely manner)⁴⁰ have been proposed for good indicators for the SDGs, the considerations from the Virtual Network for SDG 16 have been simplified into three basic thematic areas: Relevance, Simplicity and Feasibility.⁴¹

2.1 Relevance Considerations

All indicators are simplified proxies for the real world—they are like numerical “photographs” of complex systems, snapshots of a phenomenon from a particular perspective at a particular moment. Just as photographers frame their picture and adapt their cameras for a particular environment, indicators must be properly framed to capture the outcome they are measuring. In this analogy, the “framing of the picture” is a question of relevance. In identifying the indicator, the questions below ask whether the variable being measured is relevant to the target or outcome desired.

Issues of relevance are of particular concern for the indicators related to SDG16 for a number of reasons. First and foremost, since peace, justice and institutions are new additions to the global development agenda, it is important that the indicators identified now are properly identified such that they can serve as precedents for future monitoring of these issues. Second, it is often said that “What is measured matters and what matters should be measured” – it is important that indicators measure outcomes that are desirable and avoid creating perverse incentives, particularly as they relate to peace, security and justice.⁴² Indicators that create incentives for countries, statistics offices or national institutions, the police or courts, for example, to underreport or misreport outcomes may be counterproductive to the broader goals of peace, justice and effective institutions. Third, it is important that the indicators selected now are “fit for purpose” to the chosen targets – global indicators should not overstep the international mandate negotiated in the SDGs or risk being ignored as “irrelevant”. Meanwhile, indicators selected at the country level can be adapted to local context, and may be relevant to local interpretations of the goal or target. All of the criteria documents (IAEG-MDG, UNSTT, CCSA and others cited above) stress the importance of relevance, suggesting that indicators “... be clearly linked to the target”.

As the targets for SDG16 are outcome focused, the indicators proposed in Annex 1 are largely outcome indicators, meaning that they measure performance of a system or process through the outcomes or outputs produced. There are a few structural or procedural indicators included as well, these are typically discrete variables which report on the existence of legislation or whether/if a

³⁹ Objective indicators that are specific and measurable are considered to be “objectively verifiable indicators” – they contribute to transparency and accountability as they can be reliably replicated by others and yield the same result (MDF 2005).

⁴⁰ As proposed by CCSA.

⁴¹ Relevance and feasibility are carried over from the UN Stats indicator assessment process of March 2015, simplicity has been adopted here in place of “suitability” (from the original UN Stats exercise) which has been incorporated into relevance.

⁴² Also, as noted in Price (2014), there is a “politics of measurement” – what policymakers choose to prioritize through target setting often reflects normative biases. A consultative process that creates a common understanding of the targets and indicator interpretation can reduce these biases.

country is signatory to an international agreement. At the country level, national planners may also be interested in measuring and monitoring inputs like expenditure on a sector or staffing levels which may not be internationally comparable or relevant for monitoring targets in SDG16, but which are useful for assessing performance of the system at a national level. Input indicators on peace, justice and institutional performance have been compiled by the Virtual Network and are included in Annex 2.

Timeliness is another aspect of relevance. Is the indicator likely to show meaningful change over the time period? Some governance indicators (on reforms, for example) may be very slow-moving or non-linear and cannot be discerned from statistical noise until after two or three decades of change.⁴³ To be useful to the SDG agenda, a change in the indicator over three to five years must be the result of a change in the outcome, to allow policymakers and society to adapt to outcomes over the 15 year cycle (and change course, if necessary). Many statisticians, particularly in developed countries, value high frequency monitoring, which may not be possible for many indicators particularly in low-income countries with limited capacity. As proposed during the post2015 negotiations an annual progress report, based on the indicators, will most likely measure the progress in implementing the post2015 agenda on the global level. Surveys and polling may be expensive and require extensive capacity in the NSO, and therefore only be conducted every third or fifth year. As discussed below, new technologies may yield solutions that reduce costs and increase the frequency of data gathering. If changes in institutional outcomes, including those related to peace and justice, are linked to changes in political leadership, then there may be a lag between when reforms are undertaken and when they are picked up by intermittently collected indicators. Indicator identification must take into account issues related to timeliness to ensure that peace, justice and governance indicators are relevant when they are collected.

Finally, the “actionability” of the indicator is where relevance truly matters. **An indicator is actionable if progress toward the target is reflected in the indicator and if policymakers and stakeholders use the indicator to monitor progress toward the target** (suggesting a positive feedback loop). For example, if an annual survey reveals the percentage of population that has paid a bribe in the last 12 months for a public service, policymakers can experiment with reform programs in the following year that are expected to reduce the incidence of corruption and use the survey results in the third year to monitor progress, providing enough time over a 15 year development agenda to change course if need be. If the indicator or the target is not actionable, there is no relationship between policy/implementation and the outcome or the measurement of the outcome. This is one reason why international rankings are not recommended as single global indicators (though the underlying scores that yield rankings may be useful indicators, see further discussion of rankings below). In the case of international rankings, for example, a change in outcomes in another country may affect the rankings of the target country, such that the indicator ranking for the target country is completely unrelated to the effort toward reaching the outcome.

2.2 Simplicity Considerations

Many guidance documents stress the importance of “simple”, “clear”, “easy to understand”, and “unambiguous” indicators (see the IAEG-MDG, CCSA, UNSTT documents). In this respect, **simple indicators are those that are easy to interpret and communicate,**

⁴³ See Pritchett, Lant; de Weijer, Frauke. 2011. *Fragile States : Stuck in a Capability Trap?*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

like a photograph with proper lighting. In addition, just as photographers must use precise focus, statisticians (CCSA, SDSN) recommend “specific” indicators, i.e. precise indicators that measure a particular dimension of a phenomenon, typically with a single variable. Indicators should also be specific with respect to targets – it must be clear from the measurement of the indicator when the target has been met.⁴⁴ Another dimension of simplicity is the wider consideration of parsimony of the set of indicators (IAEG recommends that indicators “be limited in number”). Lessons learned from the MDG process stress the importance of limiting the number of indicators to a manageable size. All of these dimensions of simplicity (easy to understand, specific and parsimonious) must be taken into account when identifying indicators, and there may be trade-offs with other criteria. For example, a particular candidate indicator may be simpler and more specific but slightly less relevant than another candidate indicator.

A minimum standard for specific indicators is that they be quantified and can thus be measured.⁴⁵ Not all numbers are meaningful, however, and care should be taken when identifying an indicator that looks quantifiable but is not. For example, expert assessments are typically surveys of a small group of subject matter experts. If those assessments use a scale they are typically ordinal (rather than cardinal or interval) and a change in their number isn’t necessarily meaningful as an outcome or target. For example, if an expert scores a system on a scale of 1 to 6, is a change from 1 to 2 the same as a change from 5 to 6? Is it meaningful to have a target of “improve score by 1” with such an indicator? In addition, expert assessments are, by definition, subjective.⁴⁶ Care should also be exercised with other indicators that look quantified but are not necessarily ordinal, rankings and indexes, for example (more on these below). Specificity is one area where targets and indicators are linked. Properly quantifiable indicators allow targets be measured, i.e. reduce by X, reduce to X, reduce by X% or eliminate, for example.⁴⁷

While the indicators should be simple and specific, the targets in SDG16 are particularly complex. Take peace, for example. Peace can mean security of the state to a president, a safe walk home to a worker, a loving and encouraging home to a child. Negative peace has been defined as the absence of violence and positive peace as the enabling environment for resolution of a conflict.⁴⁸ **Measuring such a complex concept will require a number of specific indicators to capture multiple dimensions.** Other concepts in SDG16 are complex and will likely require multiple specific indicators to properly measure and monitor. Consider, for example, parts of the first two targets:

- Target 16.1: “reduce all forms of violence...”
- Target 16.2 “End abuse, exploitation, trafficking and all forms of violence and torture against children”

⁴⁴ Some indicator and target pairings in the MDG process were either overambitious or poorly specified – see IAEG-MDG (page 4) for a discussion of lessons learned from the MDGs on proper specification of indicators.

⁴⁵ Structural variables (yes/no indicators) can be coded 1/0 and qualify as quantification.

⁴⁶ Subjective assessments may introduce reporting biases. Careful design can account for uncertainty around estimates, but cannot necessarily identify the extent of bias. A number of expert assessment indicators are included in the Annex as possible sources for methodology.

⁴⁷ The setting of quantified global outcomes in targets is referred to by many as “benchmarking”, though this definition varies from the corporate definition of the term, which refers to setting individual targets against general or industry standards.

⁴⁸ Galtung (1967) “Theories of Peace: A synthetic approach to peace thinking” PRIO

To be specific, an indicator chosen for target 16.1 would have to be very clear about what forms of violence are being measured and to what extent they will be reduced. If “all forms of violence” includes violent deaths, assaults, violent crimes, gender-based violence and domestic violence (and many other forms of violence), as one might expect, then as many indicators will be required as there are forms of violence, unless they can be meaningfully aggregated. To measure fully a target with more than one objective, more than one indicator will be required. To fully measure Target 16.2 would require multiple indicators, abuse is a different phenomenon than exploitation which is different than trafficking and other forms of violence and torture, all of which are quantifiable. This is not unique to target 16.2, in many SDG targets, multiple outcome objectives are described. For example, each component of Target 16.4 would ideally need to be measured by (at least) one individual indicator – i.e. illicit financial flows, illicit arms flows, stolen asset recovery, organized crime.

Even if the targets are not compound (i.e. are not comprised of multiple dimensions), very few indicators will fully measure an individual target – consider the second half of Target 16.3 “...ensure equal access to justice for all”, assuming that we have a measure of access to adequate and fair dispute resolution (see Annex 1 for suggested indicators), such an indicator would only tell us: of the people that have a dispute, how many felt that they had a fair resolution to the dispute. We don’t know if they actually conceptualize justiciable problems in the same way, had equal access to legal information and justice and what the quality of that justice was (or if their expectations of the process were low or unreasonable). Here the practitioner must assess whether the indicator “covers” enough of the target. While it cannot be quantified, it is meaningful to say that an indicator covers very little or most of a target – meaning in the latter case that the concept represented by the target is nearly fully reflected in the indicator. This is another area where simplicity and relevance may have to be balanced as simpler variables may cover less of a target. Guidance suggests that indicators should be “Valid and meaningful... adequately reflect the phenomenon it is intended to measure and should be appropriate to the needs of the user.”⁴⁹

If the indicator is not sufficient on its own to measure the breadth of the target, then the practitioner needs to identify another complementary indicator to complete measurement of the target. Many targets and concepts in the SDGs are complex, particularly those in SDG 16 and the Virtual Network has identified over 400 possible indicators in Annex 1. The indicators in the annex are for reference purposes only and are of varying quality, not all of them are recommended or even endorsed by the Virtual Network, but they are presented for the sake of completeness.

2.2.a The Risk of Oversimplifying: Composite indicators

A number of global initiatives and monitoring approaches use indexes or composite indicators to collapse multiple concepts into a single metric. While indexes and other composite indicators can simplify monitoring, they should be used with extreme care as the primary metric of progress as they often have underlying assumptions on weighting or aggregating which are not meaningful, sacrificing relevance for simplicity. Once variables are aggregated or averaged, much information is lost and even the meaning of the numbers can change. For example, while the human development index (HDI) is a useful construct to raise global awareness on human development, because of the weighting used in the

⁴⁹ Brown, D., “Good Practice Guidelines for Indicator Development and Reporting”, a contributed paper to the Third World Forum on Statistics, Knowledge and Policy: Charting Progress, Building Visions, Improving Life on 27-30 October 2009, Busan, Korea, available at: <http://www.oecd.org/site/progresskorea/43586563.pdf> .

construction of the index, a change in 1 point at the lower end of the scale doesn't have the same meaning as a change in 1 point at the higher end of the scale – even a simple quantified target of “increase HDI by 5 points” would be very different for a low income country than a high income country. By aggregating, indexes also suggest some substitution effect, by construction the HDI suggests that a lower education can be offset by higher income. This is not a critique of the HDI, rather, it is a reminder that indexes rarely perform well as outcome indicators. For reasons like these, the Virtual Network concurs with other experts that **indexes and other composite indicators remain an important part of measuring progress in general, but cannot sensibly be used to measure SDG16.**⁵⁰

As the examples above demonstrate, there are clearly trade-offs between simplicity and relevance. Not all aspects of complex targets like peace, justice and institutions can be measured with one or two indicators. To properly measure these complex phenomena, sets of complementary and supplementary indicators for each target will need to be identified at the global and national levels. As described above, the indicator identification process must be an iterative, consultative process. Practitioners will likely need to assess a number of indicators by these multiple criteria and determine which set is expected to best deliver global and individual country level monitoring and the Virtual Network urges governments to put in place processes at the national level to facilitate such exchange with relevant stakeholders. The suggested indicators proposed in Box 1 for each target are the product of expert evaluation within the Virtual Network, applying the filters above (and other considerations) to very long lists of all of the possible indicators and proposing the best (or least bad) indicator(s) for each target and the set for SDG16 as a whole.

2.3 Feasibility Considerations

Issues of feasibility should inform indicator selection at the global and national level; it is not realistic to expect that all countries have enough statistical capacity to monitor hundreds or thousands of high-frequency indicators. However, **current capacity or methodologies should not be a limiting factor**; as discussed below, capacity should simply be a consideration in identifying indicators and proposing innovative means of implementation. The IAEG-MDG document recommends indicators that “can be measured in a cost-effective and practical manner...” and that a “regular data collection mechanism has been *or can be* developed with reasonable costs...” (IAEG-MDG 2013, emphasis added). Considerations on feasibility below include current practice and suggestions for overcoming capacity constraints in the short run and building statistical capacity in the long-term. Additionally, practical considerations on disaggregation and the use of perception and experiential surveys are included here under feasibility.

It should also be noted that in most cases in the developing world, the prevalence and delivery of peace, justice and effective institutions are directly related to statistical capacity. This is true not just for government statistical agencies, but also line ministries and domestic civil society groups working on goal 16 themes. As a result, countries affected by conflict, where progress on building peace is most important, have some of the lowest statistical capacity in the world, reducing the feasibility of some indicators. Likewise, the statistical

⁵⁰ Most notably the UNSTT, see that document for a robust critique of composite indicators. Also, note that many indexes and composite indicators have valuable information within components of the index – where this data is collected and reported separately, this sub-component data can be very useful and could be used to monitor progress.

capacity constraints are most prominent in the countries that have the farthest to go on Target 16.6: Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels. Special considerations for interim arrangements, lower threshold requirements on targets and intermediary indicators, and efforts to supplement existing and build new capacity should be incorporated in considerations of feasibility at the global and national level.

Some useful starting points for assessing the feasibility of indicators is current practice. IAEG-MDG recommends that global indicators are derived from a “well-established and recognized peer review mechanism with representatives from both the national and international statistical communities”. In addition, IAEG-MDG suggests that the methodology behind the indicator should be “well-documented and readily available”.⁵¹ These recommendations have been echoed in the SDSN document which suggests that indicators should have “broad international consensus”, “based on international standards, recommendations and best practices to facilitate international comparison” and draw on “well-established sources of public and private data”. However, it is well known that a number of indicators which measure dimensions of SDG16 including for example, measurement of corruption, illicit financial flows and institutional effectiveness do not yet have this broad international consensus. The UNSTT document recommends that when these nascent indicators or emerging methodologies have been developed and piloted by concerned agencies, a small number of countries and/or NGOs, review of these methodologies and consideration of options for bringing the data and indicators into the mainstream should be undertaken. These considerations are further developed in Annex 1 for specific suggested indicators, and may be of use to the Praia Group on Governance Statistics in its work.

While some indicators may be very difficult or costly to measure, or require compromises on the scale or scope of their collection or disaggregation, very few good indicators are impossible. **Methodologies may need to be adapted for indicators to be adopted as international standards, and/or adapted to local contexts for measurement and monitoring with limited capacity.** Sustained data collection over time is an expensive and complicated exercise that requires specific expertise and reliable financial resources. Many have noted that developing countries already find it challenging to produce basic statistics for simple indicators with well-established methodologies, however, developing countries, academia and civil society groups have come a long way in building statistical capacity since the MDGs were adopted. According to a 2012 UN Statistics Division assessment, 106 countries had trend data available for more than 16 of 22 core indicators, compared to none in 2003 and 84 in 2006 (UNSTT, 2013).

2.3.a Feasibility and Capacity Constraints

One solution to limited capacity is simply to build it. Current discussions around financing for development and other global initiatives have stressed the importance of building statistical capacity in developing countries and resources should be targeted at increasing the capacity of NSOs to deliver their own indicators for monitoring the SDGs. Data collection capacity of relevant line ministries must also be strengthened. Indeed, SDG Target 17.18 stresses the importance of building statistical capacity in developing countries by 2020, as a necessary means to measuring and monitoring progress on the SDGs. As discussed above, much of that capacity will need to be built in less developed countries.

⁵¹ Methodologies include data sources, methods of computation and aggregation, treatment of missing variables, etc.

Another way to overcome limited capacity is by supplementing it with other capacity. The Virtual Network recommends that, as part of a long-term strategy for statistical capacity building, **initiatives linking NSOs and domestic civil society groups with third party civil society and academic actors as well as UN agencies, multilateral and development agencies collaborate on data collection and monitoring exercises.** Initiatives like the Praia Group on Governance Statistics have recognized the critical need for building this trust between users and producers, and for ensuring collaboration in the international and national statistical communities comprised of both government and non-government organizations. This may also be practical as an interim arrangement; additional statistical capacity could assist with baseline studies in the short term while statistical capacity is brought online by 2020.⁵² So long as the indicators are objectively verifiable, international and national statistics communities should be interested in collaborative, low cost models to produce them, as they would expect to get the same result regardless of who produces the indicator.

Alternatively, capacity constraints may be eased by **reducing the burdens of statistical data collection.** The simplest means is to reduce the scale or scope of data collection to adapt to local capacity. A survey that might be conducted annually in a high income country may be conducted every three years in a developing country. A costly census could be replaced by better monitoring of identity information (see Target 16.9). New technologies (including high frequency cell phone surveys and internet hosting of data, rather than printing, for example) can reduce costs, simplify procedures or increase scope (in the case of cell phone surveys, enumerators need not travel and conduct face to face interviews and data can be automatically tabulated).

Validation and verification also requires capacity and can affect feasibility. Many civil society organizations, think tanks, academics, international organizations and others produce statistics or indicators that can be used for monitoring progress on a number of the targets in SDG 16. Following the principle of “nothing about us without us”, it is reasonable to expect that NSOs should be involved in indicator identification and collection of data on their country. However, **that does not mean that NSOs have to collect all of the data, they could equally be involved in verification and validation processes of third party data.** Such a collaborative approach would actually increase methodological rigor over the current status quo (Saferworld, 2015), providing an opportunity for NSOs to review data and would increase knowledge exchange between NSOs and third parties.

For an example of how hybrid solutions and innovative approaches to data collection might be employed, consider a suggested indicator for target 16.1 (significantly reduce all forms of violence) - Conflict deaths per 100,000 people. Presently this indicator is not collected or reported by most NSOs or national administrative sources. Meanwhile, the Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP) is regarded as one of the preeminent academic sources on conflict-related deaths in the world. A standing capacity could be built to pair researchers from UCDP and other violent event observatories with independent NSOs in countries affected by conflict to jointly produce an indicator on conflict-related deaths for target 16.1. In such a set-up, peace researchers could monitor violence with access to additional local data from the country, reviewing methodology directly with NSOs and NSOs could validate/verify outcomes for reporting. Where discrepancies exist, both parties could flag them – note that such flagging does not diminish the quality of the data, but rather increases the transparency

⁵² For more on hybrid models and alternative methods of data collection, see <http://www.saferworld.org.uk/news-and-views/comment/174-who-should-measure-the-sustainable-development-goals> .

on data quality for both sources. Collaboration and independent verification from NSOs on international data or from international sources on NSO data could also contribute to trust-building between users of data in the national context.

2.3.b Feasibility and Disaggregation

A key principle in the new global agenda is ensuring that “no one is left behind” in this next round of development. This principle applies at the global (between countries) and the national (within countries) levels. To ensure that no one is left behind in the next 15 years of development, data across all of the indicators for the SDGs will need to be disaggregated along a number of dimensions and marginalized groups must participate in the process of national indicator selection. Some disaggregation is already an internationally binding commitment, as all countries have ratified at least one human rights treaty, and so have already obliged themselves to guarantee rights and freedoms without discrimination based on grounds including race, ethnicity, color, sex, age⁵³, language, religion, disability, migratory status, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status – so they will need to collect disaggregated data on performance to ensure that they are not discriminating in delivery of public services, governance, justice and rule of law.⁵⁴

Beyond existing binding commitments to disaggregate under international law, the Virtual Network agreed that many of the indicators in SDG 16 and other SDGs will need to be disaggregated along other dimensions (possibly including by social group, income levels, location, among others) for policymakers to properly assess progress on peace, justice for all and effective institutions. **The legal obligation of States not to discriminate against any population group in the exercise of their human rights is immediate, but it is acknowledged that disaggregation is a feasibility concern – it can be expensive and often requires additional capacity.** Additionally, the Virtual Network has noted that disaggregated statistics can be used to build grievance narratives and that there are some national restrictions on gathering data by ethnicity or identity group. Care must be taken in identifying indicators and their disaggregation such that they do not contribute to violence or conflict. As this capacity is strengthened, the depth and dimensions of disaggregation can be increased over time to ensure that the target can be effectively measured in each national context in a manner that permits a determination of whether no one is left behind. Throughout the negotiation process, many States have taken the position that no target should be considered met until it is met for all, and this cannot be determined without disaggregation.

2.3.c Feasibility and Surveys

Surveys and polls are assessments by individuals of outcomes, preferably by a representative sample of the population of interest (nationally representative for national surveys). Perception surveys report subjective impressions and opinions of a context, program or service. Experiential surveys report incident or event data from direct personal participation or observation. Victimization surveys are a special type of experiential survey which is carefully crafted to extract information about crimes that have been committed against the respondent (or family of the respondent) and their reporting behavior, preferably without

⁵³ Note that disaggregation by age links closely with Target 16.2 and other commitments in the SDGs to development for children. Children constitute more than 30% of the world’s population and they are more dependent on public services for their survival and development than any other group.

⁵⁴ For a broader discussion on obligations for disaggregation of data, and the human rights considerations of data disaggregation, see <http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/HRIndicators/DataDisaggregation.pdf> .

causing duress.⁵⁵ As shown in Annex 1, surveys (perceptions, experiential, victimization) are useful sources of data in their own right and can be paired with other data sources to round out monitoring of a complex concept with people’s actual experiences or beliefs – providing outcome measurement that complements other process or output indicators. For example, with respect to target 16.3 (access to justice), the Virtual Network recommends pairing two complementary indicators: 1) an outcome indicator on performance of the courts, with 2) an experiential survey question for those who have experienced a dispute and used a dispute resolution mechanism. These two indicators, while still incomplete in measuring the very complex concept of equal access to justice for all, will yield a better combined sense of performance of the justice system and how/if people who need it, use it.

There are significant feasibility considerations on the use of surveys as they can be expensive and require expertise to execute properly and interpret. However, **many NSOs and international organizations** (including the regional barometers and Gallup) **conduct surveys every year already**. The Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) and Living Standards and Measurement Surveys (LSMS), supported by USAID and the World Bank, respectively, have yielded hundreds of surveys undertaken by NSOs in more than 100 developing countries. Surveys have been adopted as a useful tool for assessing outcomes of programmes, projects and services and the Virtual Network has recommended a number of survey questions (see Annex 1) as necessary, complementary indicators for assessing progress on SDG16. Survey questions are not a “cure all” and should be used proportionally – they must be designed properly, “fit for purpose”, to connect real outcomes to subjective assessment – they should “measure what can be managed” (adapted from Price 2014). But with these considerations taken into account, they can be a **powerful tool for triangulating the performance of complex processes and complement other statistics and indicators from administrative sources**.

VI. Using Annex 1 to Identify Outcome Indicators for Targets in SDG16

Once a target has been identified using the filters described above, indicators must be selected that can accurately assess progress toward and/or completion of the target. These indicators do not have to be created anew, indeed, of the 24 global indicators proposed by the Virtual Network, 2/3 are already being collected by National Statistics Offices or other organizations. The Virtual Network has also identified over 400 indicators that can be used as possible supplementary indicators for the 12 targets in SDG16 (see Annex 1). Many of these have already been applied in country contexts and may only require adaptation to the global standards or local context to be relevant.

Indicators in Annex 1 are arranged by target. For each target, one or two “Suggested indicators” are listed first. These 24 suggested indicators represent a modest attempt by the Virtual Network to identify the minimum set of global indicators necessary to measure Goal 16 (see box 2). The numbering conventions follows the goal, target and indicator numbering – so the first suggested indicator for the first target for goal 16 would be 16.1.1 and the third indicator for the seventh target is 16.7.3, etc. While these indicators have been proposed to the Technical Support Team for Goal 16 of the UN System and have fed into the background work on identifying indicators for the IAEG-SDG, the suggestions are far from definitive and

⁵⁵ Good victimization surveys have been carefully designed to ensure that they “do no harm” – they do not cause further emotional or psychological stress to victims through the survey process.

represent an attempted stocktaking by the Virtual Network as of July 2015. Where more than one suggested indicator is listed for a specific target, all of the suggested indicators are considered complementary, i.e. they should be considered together as necessary to measure a significant amount of the concept in the target (though even 24 indicators is hardly sufficient to measure such complex targets). In two cases, the Virtual Network suggests two possible alternatives to be used as a global indicator (16.1.2 and 16.7.1), these are listed as “-Alternate- Indicators” where one of two options are proposed, and further sub-indicated by “a” or “b”.

Some discussion of these suggested indicators, why they were selected and their strengths (and weaknesses) follows Box 2. In addition, the entries in the annex include additional details, notes and comments from the Virtual Network on the relevance, simplicity and feasibility of each of the suggested indicator. On feasibility, origins of the data (most are already gathered by NSOs or line ministries), scope and current sources are described for each indicator to designate the extent to which the indicator has been mainstreamed and is widely available (following the criteria for feasibility outlined above). In addition, for every suggested indicator, alternatives are listed which include different wording or phrasing⁵⁶, suggestions for disaggregation and other indicators that can be calculated based on the indicator (derivatives). In addition, there are a number of supplementary indicators listed for each target, which are provided as a reference resource for national actors identifying national indicators. In some cases, indicators listed in the annex have been proposed as possible global indicators for targets in SDG16.

As described under Relevance, above, the indicators suggested in Annex 1 are mainly outcome indicators - they measure performance of a system. Some structural indicators have been included as well. Structural indicators, following guidance from the UN Stats exercise (March 2015), measure existence or non-existence of certain legal, institutional or administrative instruments (e.g., laws, national plans, etc.). At the country level, national planners may also be interested in measuring and monitoring inputs like expenditure on a sector or staffing levels which may not be internationally comparable or relevant for monitoring targets in SDG16, but which are useful for assessing performance of the system at a national level. Input indicators on peace, justice and institutional performance have been compiled by the Virtual Network and are included in Annex 2.

As examples of the identification process described in the previous sections, a few of the considerations employed in identifying these indicators is listed below by target. Abbreviated language is used to describe each target, though the indicators are meant to measure, as fully as possible, the full target (see language above).

- *Target 1 (Reduce violence)*: Intentional homicides is a very specific, simple and relevant indicator for measuring violence – the methodology is well established and many countries already collect data on intentional homicides, but violent death does not only result from intentional homicide – another significant cause of death is “conflict death”. Many countries with conflict do not collect or report data on direct conflict deaths, but direct conflict deaths has a proven methodology, well-established in the literature, and most importantly is a direct analog to intentional homicides (conflict deaths can be counted the same way as homicides and deaths in one category would not be double-counted in the other). **There are many countries that have low homicide rates, but high deaths due to violence that would not be**

⁵⁶ For most alternative indicators or specifications, the Virtual Network has identified a reason why the suggested indicator is preferred to the alternative indicator, however space does not permit inclusion of these arguments.

considered peaceful, so to reflect the broader objective of SDG16 (promote peaceful societies), the Virtual Network recommended combining intentional homicides and conflict related deaths into a single indicator, measured by per 100,000 population (following homicide methodology). In addition, to round out the measurement of deaths, and measure other elements related to the target (reduce all forms of violence), the Virtual Network recommended two other possible indicators: 1) percentage of people who have experienced violence (gathered through experiential or victimization surveys) OR 2) proportion of people who feel safe walking at night (a well-established perceptions survey question, already gathered in a number of international and national polls).

- *Target 2 (Reduce violence against children)*: In the interest of parsimony, the Virtual Network proposes using the same variable as that proposed for target 1 (percentage of people who have experienced violence), disaggregated by age, to measure experience of violence by children. This would be further complemented by an indicator measuring the incidence of reported trafficking of children (though reporting issues exist with detection indicators like 16.2.2). While the Virtual Network recommends using an indicator on detected human trafficking, care should be taken in interpreting the values and designing targets – **an increase in the number of detected cases may be a sign of progress if the increase is due to increased capacity in detection or increased trust in authorities** – however, obviously, the target should be ending child trafficking.
- *Target 3 (Access to justice for all)*: The network agreed that 16.3. entails two concepts, “rule of law” and “access to justice”, which are hard to measure by one single indicator. Furthermore attention has to be paid to cover not only the criminal justice system, but also civil justice. Here, the Virtual Network focused on measuring equal access to justice for all. **It was agreed that complementary indicators including an experiential survey indicator was necessary to fully measure the concept of access to justice for all.** While the combination of the survey question (16.3.1) and administrative data on detention (16.3.2) provide a good assessment of the criminal and dispute resolution mechanisms, they only represent a portion of the functioning of the justice system. Detention rates were selected as a measure of performance of the justice system, over alternatives like conviction rates or speed of trial, as the latter may not measure delivery of justice. A number of alternative specifications for the detention indicator are included in Annex 1 and vary by definition of detention, sentencing and disposition of case. Supplementary indicators, including input indicators (see Annex 2), would be required to better monitor national progress toward this target, including indicators on legal aid, child detention, resolution of civil disputes, trust in police and courts, deaths in custody of the state and others (see alternatives in Annex 1).
- *Target 4 (Reduce illicit financial flows)*: The measurement of illicit activities is, by definition, difficult (actors engaged in illegal activity do not want to be discovered and make an effort to obfuscate and conceal their activities). In the interest of parsimony and identifying a short list of global indicators, the Virtual Network suggested a single global indicator on illicit financial flows (IFFs) for Target 4 as **monitoring IFFs can also inform progress on other aspects of this target, including revenues emanating from illicit arms sales and organized crime.** At the national level, supplementary indicators would be necessary to monitor other aspects of the target (arms flows, recovery and return of stolen assets and combatting of organized crime). While a number of methodologies have been proposed, ongoing work by the IMF, World Bank, UN and regional actors will be needed to finalize definitions and

measurement methods for this indicator. The indicator is multi-purpose and could inform targets 8.3 (development-oriented policies), 16.4 (illicit financial flows), 16.5 (corruption and bribery) and, conceivably, 17.1 (domestic resource mobilization) and plays also an important role in implementing the Addis Ababa Action Agenda. .

- *Target 5 (Reduce corruption):* The Virtual Network identified an experiential/victimization survey to measure reduction in corruption and bribery the two global indicators identified for Target 16.5. Note that the question identified for these two indicators (16.5.1 and 16.5.2) is identical except that the respondents for each are individuals or businesses, respectively. **These survey questions are well established and have been used in a number of international and national surveys.** Corruption, like other illicit activities (trafficking, organized crime) can be difficult or impossible to measure through incidence (administrative data) or perceptions. However, there is evidence that experiential surveys (asking if the respondent has asked to or paid a bribe) are much more accurate than perceptions surveys (people's assessments of the level of corruption). Here, special attention should be paid not to incriminate a respondent by the way the question is formulated.
- *Target 6 (Effective and accountable institutions):* The two indicators identified for Target 6 constitute another pairing of a perceptions indicator with an administrative outcome indicator to serve as complementary indicators of a complex concept (effectiveness, accountability and transparency of government institutions). The perceptions indicator is a straightforward citizen assessment of public services and performance. **The administrative data indicator (expenditure and revenue vis-à-vis budget) is highly relevant indicator of state effectiveness and has been developed for use as an indicator in a number of public financial management systems.** The potential for perverse incentives is acknowledged (e.g. managing the system to deliver expenditure which meets budget predictions without delivering actual improvements in people's lives from the money spent) but not considered so significant to undermine the integrity of the indicator – other indicators at the national level should be able to determine the presence of such approaches, and would be an essential supplement to this global indicator. In addition to measuring effectiveness, reporting on the indicator can also reflect increased transparency and accountability regarding government expenditures and revenues. The perception survey on satisfaction can be used to assess transparency and accountability. **The perception survey would be a multi-purpose indicator,** informing Targets 1.4 (access to basic services), 3.8 (access to quality, essential health-care services), 4.1, 4.2 and 4a (quality education, including facilities), 7.1 (access to affordable, reliable energy services), 10.2 (social inclusion), 11.1 (adequate housing), 16.3 (rule of law), and 16.6 (effective, accountable and transparent institutions).
- *Target 7 (Responsive and inclusive decision-making):* **A number of indicators were suggested by the Virtual Network for Target 7, because of the complexity of the concepts (responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making).** The first two indicators are alternates, an administrative indicator on representation in government positions by sex, disability, age and ethnicity or a survey indicator on the perceived inclusivity and responsiveness of decision-making. One of these two indicators could be further complemented by administrative data on voter turnout and public participation in the budget processes. Note that all of these indicators would likely still be incomplete in measuring progress toward the target at any individual national level – additional indicators on freeness and fairness of elections, vibrancy of civil society and other

non-governmental organizations and the presence/size of opposition parties/diversity in parliament or government may be necessary to supplement global indicators for local context.

- *Target 8 (Strengthen participation of developing countries in global government):* Target 8 is similar to MDG 8 and does not lend itself to easy quantification or a single indicator to measure progress. An administrative/structural indicator on voting rights and participation in multilateral institutions is **a relevant, simple and feasible indicator for what is a difficult target to measure in practice.**
- *Target 9 (Legal identity for all):* The registration of births is a reasonable proxy for (though not identical to) legal identity. Measuring this indicator for all children is an important element of measuring progress in increasing birth registration, as well as ensuring that older children are not left behind. **Disaggregation by age, sex, region and population group, displacement and migratory status (including statelessness) could be used to better inform other targets and indicators.** Registration for children under 5 would ensure that the final cohort for 2030 represents population born after 2025 and gives countries ten years to build national civil registration capacity. This indicator can also be used to inform targets 4.1, 4.2 (universal access to education). A household survey module could be adapted to capture non-registered populations.
- *Target 10 (Public access to information):* This target is complicated because it combines access to information and fundamental freedoms. **No single indicator adequately covers both concepts.** Given this complexity, a number of complementary indicators are proposed in Annex 1 for Target 16.10. The right global indicators will be determined by the definition of public access to information and fundamental freedoms. The safety and security of journalists, human rights activists and others that use access to information to inform public dialogue and debate is relevant to each.

VII. Conclusion: Next Steps for SDG 16 Indicators

This sourcebook represents a short but current stocktaking of knowledge of an informal group of experts working on measurement of peace, justice and institutional effectiveness and transparency. Through workshops and online discussions, the Virtual Network has found that complex concepts related to SDG16 are being measured in a number of developed and developing countries, that these things can be measured using established and new technologies and methodologies, that a minimum set of indicators can be proposed for use at the global level to monitor SDG16 (in Box 1) and that a wider set of supplementary indicators will be necessary for proper monitoring of national targets (some suggestions are included in Annex 1).

The indicator development process will be complicated, at both the national and global level. The ongoing global consultation process includes a number of concurrent streams of activity on SDG 16 (and the other related SDGs above), as well as other important initiatives, including the financing for development discussion convened in Addis Ababa in July 2015. The experts in the Virtual Network were involved in a number of these interlinked activities and have had inputs on these other streams of activity. Indeed, many institutions, agencies and actors are producing their own think pieces, notes and contributions to the global goal setting and indicator identification process. The report is not a consensus document and

cannot do justice to all of these documents, but has made an effort to reflect as many of the recent findings as possible⁵⁷. As it is a living document, these and other sources can be added in future versions of the sourcebook.

The 2030 Agenda document outlines the global indicator identification process undertaken by the Inter-Agency Expert Group on the Sustainable Development Goals (IAEG-SDG).⁵⁸ It is envisioned that the IAEG-SDG will propose a global indicator framework by the end of 2015 in time for submission to the 47th session of the Statistical Commission in March of 2016

As the indicators for SDG 16 and the rest of the global agenda are developed, methodologies for monitoring and reporting will need to be developed as well. These considerations go beyond the scope of this sourcebook, but the Virtual Network suggests looking forward in thinking about design. Good indicators are responsive to policy and performance, they are simple and accessible and can be used by a number of stakeholders to monitor progress. When indicators and government statistics are produced well, they become institutions and are used as inputs to good policy, contributing to a virtuous cycle of good policy, good outcomes and good monitoring which leads to good policy. As states commit to monitoring the indicators associated with more than 100 targets in the SDGs, they should be considering how regular reporting on these indicators can be used for internal agenda-setting and planning and how the reporting can be used to communicate progress to the people of the country and encourage civil society participation. Here, again, hybrid solutions and collaborative relationships between NSOs and stakeholders including civil society, government, media and society can contribute to building statistical numeracy and the trust between data users and producers necessary for effective evidence-based policy.

The Virtual Network is committed to continuing to support the process of indicator identification at the global and national level for SDG 16.

⁵⁷ This current stocktaking benefits from a number of earlier stocktaking exercises, including UN Statistics Division (2014), Price (2015), Saferworld (2015), g7+ (2012) and, of course, informal discussions and comments on the virtual Network website and review by the VN.

⁵⁸ The first meeting of the IAEG-SDGs took place on 1-2 June 2015 at the United Nations Headquarters in New York. The IAEG-SDGs was established by the Statistical Commission at its 46th session to develop an indicator framework for the monitoring of the goals and targets of the post-2015 development agenda at the global level, and to support its implementation.

Bibliography

African Union Commission (AUC), UNDP and Saferworld, “Towards Regional and National Statistical Capacities for Measuring Peace, Rule of Law and Governance: An Agenda for the Post-2015 Sustainable Development Goals Framework”, outcome Document of a meeting at the AUC, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, 11-12 June 2014.

- Brown, D., “Good Practice Guidelines for Indicator Development and Reporting”, a contributed paper to the Third World Forum on Statistics, Knowledge and Policy: Charting Progress, Building Visions, Improving Life on 27-30 October 2009, Busan, Korea, available at: <http://www.oecd.org/site/progresskorea/43586563.pdf>.
- Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), “Decision tree indicators SDG 16”, March, 2015.
- Galtung, Y., *Theories of Peace: A Synthetic Approach to Peace Thinking*, Oslo: PRIO, September 1967.
- Global Forum for Media Development (GFMD), “GFMD Proposed Indicators for SDG 16.10”, May 2015, available at: [http://gfmd.info/attachment/66/Proposed%20SDG%2016.10%20Indicators%20-%20GFMD%20\(May%202015\)%20\(1\).pdf?g_download=1](http://gfmd.info/attachment/66/Proposed%20SDG%2016.10%20Indicators%20-%20GFMD%20(May%202015)%20(1).pdf?g_download=1)
- Hydén, G. and Samuel, J. (eds), *Making the State Responsive: Experience with Democratic Governance Assessments*, New York: UNDP, 2011).
- Institute for Economics and Peace, “Measuring Goal 16: Identifying Priority Indicators Based on Key Statistical and Normative Criteria”, September 2014, available at: <http://economicsandpeace.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/UN-Post-2015-Short-Paper-WEB.pdf>
- International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding, “Draft List of Common Peacebuilding and Statebuilding Indicators (For Consultation)”, 18 February 2013.
- International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding, “Peacebuilding and Statebuilding Indicators – Progress, Interim List and next steps, Document 03- For discussion”, note of the Third International Dialogue Global Meeting on “The New Deal: Achieving Better Results and Shaping the Global Agenda”, Washington, D.C., 19 April 2013, available at: <http://www.pbsdialogue.org/documentupload/03%20PSG%20Indicators%20EN.pdf>
- Mayoux, L., “What Do We Want to Know? Selecting Indicators”, *Enterprise Impact News* Issue 5, Jan/Feb 2002, available at: http://www.classtoolkit.org/sites/default/files/documents/Selecting_Indicators.pdf.
- MDF, “MDF Tool: Indicators”, 2005, Available at: <http://www.toolkitsportdevelopment.org/html/resources/40/408CC56F-509A-40D8-BE46-D7EEB4261F97/10%20Indicators.pdf>.
- México nos Mueve la Paz, <http://nosmuevelapaz.org>.
- OECD, *Handbook on Constructing Composite Indicators: Methodology and User Guide*, Paris: OECD, 2008, available at: <http://www.oecd.org/std/42495745.pdf>.
- OHCHR, *Human Rights Indicators: A Guide to Measurement and Implementation*, New York and Geneva: UN, 2012, available at: <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Indicators/Pages/documents.aspx>.

- OHCHR, “SDGs Indicator Framework: A Human Rights Approach to Data Disaggregation to Leave No One Behind”, draft background note, 25 February 2015, available at: <http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/HRIndicators/DataDisaggregation.pdf>.
- OHCHR, “Proposed indicators for SDG 16”, *Discussion Paper Draft*, 4 May 2015.
- Open Society Foundation, Serbia, “Measuring Effectiveness of Institutions in Serbia in a Post 2015 SDG Context”, 2015.
- Orkin, M., Razafindrakoto, M. and Roubaud, F., “Governance, peace and security in Burundi, Mali and Uganda Comparative NSO data for measuring Goal 16 of the SDGs”, *Policy Brief*, May 2015.
- Orme, B., “SDG 16.10's Indicators Relevant and Technically Feasible Indicators: June 2015 Update – Proposed Indicators for SDG 16.10”, *GFMD News*, 7 July 2015, available at: <http://gfmd.info/en/site/news/807/SDG-1610's-indicators-relevant-and-technically-feasible-indicators.htm>.
- Price, M., “Measuring Security Progress: Politics, Challenges and Solutions”, *CRU Meeting Report*, 21 January 2015, available at: <http://www.clingendael.nl/sites/default/files/Measuring%20Security%20Progress%20Report%20o.pdf>.
- Pritchett, L. and de Weijer, F., *Fragile States: Stuck in a Capability Trap?*, Washington, DC: World Bank, 2011, available at: <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/9109>.
- Razafindrakoto, M. and Roubaud, F., “Governance, Democracy and Poverty Reduction: Lessons drawn from the 1-2-3 Surveys in Francophone Africa”, *The African Statistical Journal* Vol. 2, May 2006, pp. 43-82.
- Rwanda Governance Board (RGB), “Rwanda Governance Scorecard (RGS)”, 2015, available at: <http://www.rgb.rw/governancescorecard/>.
- Saferworld, “Measuring Peace from 2015: An Indicator Framework at Work”, *Saferworld Briefing*, March 2015, available at: <http://www.saferworld.org.uk/resources/view-resource/891-measuring-peace-from-2015-an-indicator-framework-at-work>.
- Small Arms Survey. “Reducing Illicit Arms Flows and the New Development Agenda”, *Research Notes* No. 50, March 2015, available at: http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/fileadmin/docs/H-Research_Notes/SAS-Research-Note-50.pdf
- Steven, D., *The Post-2015 Agenda – Delivering its Core Promises to Children*, New York: Center on International Cooperation, May 2015.
- Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN), “Indicators and a Monitoring Framework for the Sustainable Development Goals_ Launching a data revolution for the SDGs”, revised working draft (Version 7), March 20, 2015, available at: <http://unsdsn.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/150218-SDSN-Indicator-Report-FEB-FINAL.pdf>. UN OCHCR, “Proposed indicators for SDG 16”, *Discussion Paper Draft*, 4 May 2015.

- UK Department for International Development, “Measuring Goal 16: Evidence from the United Kingdom”, presentation on a review of the existing data and indicators to measure goal 16, 2015.
- UN, “Albania’s Pilot: Draft/Progress Report of Phase I ”, 2015.
- UN, “My World Dataset”, 2015, available at: <http://data.myworld2015.org/>.
- UN, “Transforming our World: The 2030 Agenda for Global Action”, Final Draft of The Outcome Document for the UN Summit to Adopt the Post-2015 Development Agenda”, 8 July 2015, available at: https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/7603Final%20draft%20outcome%20document%20UN%20Sept%20Summit%20ow%20letter_08072015.pdf.
- UN, “Outcome document of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development: Addis Ababa Action Agenda”, A/CONF.227/L.1, 15 July 2015, available at: http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/CONF.227/L.1.
- UN DESA and UNDP, “Technical Support Team (TST) Issues Brief: Conflict Prevention, Post-Conflict Peacebuilding and the Promotion of Durable Peace, Rule of Law and Governance”, November, 2013, available at: https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/2639Issues%20Brief%20on%20Peace%20etc_FINAL_21_Nov.pdf.
- UNDP, “Concept Note: Virtual Network of Stakeholders for the Development of Indicators on Peaceful Societies, Justice and Institutions for Sustainable Development Goal 16”, parallel event of the Inter Agency and Expert Group Meeting, 2 June 2015, New York.
- UNESCO, “UN Plan of Action on the Safety of Journalists and the Issue of Impunity”, CI-12/CONF.202/6, 12 April 2012, available at: http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CI/CI/pdf/official_documents/UN-Plan-on-Safety-Journalists_EN_UN-Logo.pdf.
- UNESCO, “Media in Support of Sustainable Development and a Culture of Peace”, JAK/2015/PI/H/03, 2015, available at: http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/FIELD/San-Jose/pdf/Book_UNESCO_Media_and_Development_May_2015_01.pdf.
- UN Foundation and UN Association of the United States of America (UNA-USA), “Advancing the Rule of Law, Economic Growth and Human Dignity: Suggested Global Indicators for Target 16.3”, 2015.
- UN General Assembly, “Report of the Open Working Group of the General Assembly on Sustainable Development Goals”, A/68/970, 12 August 2014, available at: <http://undocs.org/A/68/970>.
- UN Inter-Agency and Expert Group on MDG Indicators (IAEG-MDG), “Lessons learned from MDG Monitoring from a Statistical Perspective: Report of the Task Team on Lessons Learned from MDG Monitoring of the IAEG-MDG”, March 2013, available at: <http://unstats.un.org/unsd/broaderprogress/pdf/Lesson%20Learned%20from>

[%20MDG%20Monitoring_2013-03-22%20\(IAEG\).pdf](#).

UNICEF, UN Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) and UNDP, “An Accountability Framework for Conflict, Violence, Governance and Disaster in the Post-2015 Development Agenda”, report of the Expert Meeting, Glen Cove, New York, 18-19 June 2013, available at: <https://www.worldwewant2015.org/file/462643/download/503942>

UNODC and UN Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), “Manual on Victimization Surveys”, 2010, available at: <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/data-and-analysis/Manual-on-victim-surveys.html>.

UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), “International Classification of Crime for Statistical Purposes (ICCS), Version 1.0”, March 2015, available at: <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/data-and-analysis/statistics/iccs.html>.

UN Statistical Commission. “Technical report by the Bureau of the United Nations Statistical Commission (UNSC) on the process of the development of an indicator framework for the goals and targets of the post-2015 development agenda”, 3-6 March 2015, available at: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/6754Technical%20report%20of%20the%20UNSC%20Bureau%20%28final%29.pdf>

UN Statistical Division, “Statistical note 29: Conflict Prevention, Post-conflict Peacebuilding and the Promotion of Durable Peace, Rule of Law and Governance” in *Compendium of Statistical Notes for the Open Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals (OWG)*, pp. 181-89, March 2014, available at: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/3647Compendium%20of%20statistical%20notes.pdf>.

UN System Task Team on the Post-2015 UN Development Agenda, “Statistics and Indicators for the Post-2015 Development Agenda”, July 2013, available at: http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/policy/untaskteam_undf/UNTT_MonitoringReport_WEB.pdf.

UN Technical Support Team (TST) Working Group on Goal 16, “Table of indicators for targets under proposal Goal 16”, 2015.

UN TST Working Group on Goal 16, “Table of prioritized indicators: Goal 16. Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels”, 27 January 2015.

UN TST Working Group on Goal 16, “Prioritized indicators for Goal 16”, 9 February 2015.

UN TST Working Group on Goal 16, “Goal 16: Supplementary Metadata for Indicators”, 15 May 2015.

UN TST Working Group on Goal 16, “Further information on indicators”, 15 May 2015.

Virtual Network, “Feedback to TST”, a report of the UNODC-UNDP workshop on “Virtual Network of Stakeholders for the Development of Indicators on Peaceful Societies, Justice and Effective, Inclusive and Accountable Institutions for Sustainable Development Goal 16”, 6-7 May 2015, Vienna.

Wheeler, T., “Who Should Measure the Sustainable Development Goals?”, *Safeworld News and Views*, 15 May 2015, available at: <http://www.saferworld.org.uk/news-and-views/comment/174-who-should-measure-the-sustainable-development-goals>.

World Bank, “Existing Surveys that Respond to Indicator 16.3.1”, 2015.

Annex 1: List of Indicators for SDG 16

SDG16: Promote Peaceful and Inclusive Societies for Sustainable Development, Provide Access to Justice for All and Build Effective, Accountable and Inclusive Institutions at all Levels

Target 16.1

Significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere

***Suggested Indicator 16.1.1. Violent Deaths per 100,000 people (includes intentional homicides per 100,000 + direct conflict deaths per 100,000)*⁵⁹**

Relevance: Violent deaths are clearly linked to violence and violence related deaths. The concept is well understood and a decrease in violent deaths over time is associated with an increase in peace and reduction in violence.

Type of Indicator: Outcome indicator

Simplicity: This indicator is used to identify the level of peacefulness and personal security across countries. It is also easy to understand and focuses on the most measurable and widely collected data. It does not fully measure “all forms of violence”, as it would not include assaults, one-sided killings by the state, extortion and other threats of violence, etc. However, these other aspects of violence are more nuanced and definitions vary. Homicides and conflict deaths are easier to measure and more discrete, and therefore a simpler, but sufficiently relevant indicator to capture the target.

Feasibility: This administrative indicator (intentional homicides) is existing and well-developed based on statistical data routinely produced by law enforcement authorities and/or public health institutions, with a high degree of international comparability and a high level of measurability. It has been mainstreamed and standardized methodologies exist. Data on conflict deaths has a well-established methodology, but has not been mainstreamed into national accounting systems.

Origin of Data:

- For intentional homicides: Administrative data (police, health), incident reporting, can be validated with household and victimization surveys (has anyone in your family been a victim of homicide?)
- For conflict-related deaths: Variety of methodologies, including expert reporting

Scope: Globally comparable – reported in nearly all countries of the world

Source:

- For intentional homicides: UNODC collects and publishes data from criminal justice systems through its annual data collection (UN Crime Trends Survey, UN-CTS). Alternatively, may be produced by public health institutions. UNODC and WHO are working together to harmonize data and procedures to produce joint UNODC-WHO homicide estimates at country, regional and global level.
- For conflict-related deaths: Gathered by a number of global observatories, including the Uppsala Conflict Data Program battle deaths dataset, IISS Armed Conflict Database, PRIO Battle-Deaths Data and WHO.

Links/Citations:

⁵⁹ This indicator is drawn from the following Virtual Network lists: 1st and 2nd TST Master List, TST Core Set, TST Further Information, PSG-Int'l Dialogue, PSG Short-Int'l Dialogue, UN-IEP, Glen Cove, SDSN, Addis Ababa-AUC and TST Metadata.

- The latest UNODC Homicide Statistics (2013) dataset contains data for 219 countries and territories. Available at: www.unodc.org/gsh/
- UCDP database, available at: <http://www.pcr.uu.se/research/ucdp/database>
- For additional metadata, see OHCHR Human Rights Indicators Guide (pp. 158-159), available at: http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/Human_rights_indicators_en.pdf

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. [Battle deaths/reported conflict deaths] per 100,000 people
- b. Percentage of reported homicides

Potential Disaggregations or Quantifiable Derivatives:

- a. Change in intentional homicide rate
- b. Change in direct conflict deaths per 100,000
- c. Violent death of women (disaggregated violent deaths statistic)
- d. Violent deaths of children 0-19
- e. Number of victims of conflict and armed violence receiving legal or administrative measures of redress disaggregated by sex and by age group

Linked or related indicators:

- a. Percentage of reported homicides in a given year that resulted in court adjudication within [12/24] months
- b. Reported extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions
- c. Incidence of extra-judicial or extra-legal violent deaths
- d. Suicide rate per 100,000

Indicator 16.1.2a Percentage of people who have experienced physical and/or sexual violence in the last 12 months, disaggregated by sex, age and location⁶⁰

Relevance: This is an extremely relevant indicator for measuring people's actual experiences of safety and security through a victimization survey. A change in this indicator within country is highly informative and reflects changing conditions of security.

Type of Indicator: Outcome

Simplicity: This is a very measurable indicator, easily understood and methodically sound. Separate from homicide rates, this indicator looks at different types of violence (responding to the wider target wording 'reduce all forms of violence'), which addresses peacefulness and personal security more broadly. This indicator goes beyond reported crime to look at the full range of violence from the victim's perspective, thereby complementing administrative data on violent deaths.

Feasibility: Dataset is developing. At the international level, there is no comprehensive data repository on prevalence of sexual and gender-based violence as reported in surveys. Incentives for reporting through administrative channels (police and health services) are low and proper design of questions in victimization surveys reduces the stigma for reporting and monitoring. As the indicator is based on survey, however, it is possible to include psychological violence whether or not this constitutes a crime under national law. This is particularly important to fully capture the scale of domestic and community violence, as well as hate crimes. This indicator can be used to monitor targets 5.2 (women), 10.3 (hate crimes), 16.1 (violence and deaths) and 16.2 (children).

Origin of Data: Population-based and specialized surveys, Crime victimization surveys, Administrative statistics.

Sources:

- WHO, the Demographic and Health Survey and a number of countries have implemented VAW surveys.
- UN Women on implementation of SGBV surveys
- The UNODC-ECE Manual on victimization surveys provides guidelines on how to measure this indicator using victimization surveys, 72 countries have implemented at least one national victimization survey since 2009.

Links/Citations:

- <http://genderstats.org/> (only women aged 15-49)
- Philippine National Statistics Office and USAID, "The 2008 National Demographic and Health Survey (NDHS)", available at: <http://dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/FR224/FR224.pdf>
- Philippine Statistics Authority and USAID, "2013 National Demographic and Health Survey (NDHS)", available at: <https://dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/FR294/FR294.pdf>
- Nigeria National Population Commission, USAID, and UNFPA, "The 2008 National Demographic and Health Survey", available at: http://www.population.gov.ng/images/ndhs_data/ndhs_2013/2008_ndhs_final_report.pdf
- Nigeria National Population Commission, USAID, UKaid and UNFPA, "2013 National Demographic and Health Survey (NDHS)", available at: http://www.population.gov.ng/images/ndhs_data/ndhs_2013/2013_ndhs_final_report.pdf
- Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics (BBS), Ministry of Planning and UNFPA, "Report on Violence Against Women (VAW) Survey 2011", available at: http://203.112.218.66/WebTestApplication/userfiles/Image/Latest%20Statistics%20Release/VAW_Survey_2011.pdf

⁶⁰ This indicator is drawn from the following Virtual Network lists: 1st and 2nd TST Master List, TST Core Set, TST Further Information, PSG-Int'l Dialogue, PSG Short-Int'l Dialogue, UN-IEP, Glen Cove, Addis Ababa-AUC, TST Metadata and OHCHR.

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Percentage of the adult population subjected to physical, psychological or sexual violence within the last 12 months, by sex of the victim, by age group, location/region and by perpetrator
- b. Percentage of people admitting being victims of sexual and gender based violence that reported it to authorities
- c. Percentage of referred cases of sexual and gender-based violence against women and children that are investigated and sentenced
- d. Percentage of the population subjected to physical, psychological or sexual violence within the last 12 months
- e. Incidence of rape and sexual violence
- f. Rape and other forms of sexual violence per 100,000
- g. Proportion of women (aged 15-49) subjected to sexual violence by persons other than an intimate partner, since age 15

Potential Disaggregations or Quantifiable Derivatives:

- a. Percentage of women and men aged 18-24 years who first experienced sexual violence prior to age 15 and age 18
- b. Percentage of young women and men aged 18-24 years who experienced sexual violence by age 18
- c. Reported cases of torture without any or due judicial process

Indicator 16.1.2b Proportion of people who feel safe walking at night in the area where they live, disaggregated by sex, age, location and/or urban/rural⁶¹

Relevance: This indicator is robust due to its widespread use in national victimization surveys and global polling surveys. This is an extremely relevant indicator for measuring people's perceptions and experiences of safety and security. A change in this indicator within country is highly informative and reflects how people experience safety and security. Values should not be compared between countries as expectations of security may vary from society to society. The indicator is suggested as an alternate for the previous indicator drawn from victimization surveys as it is used more broadly (though it may be slightly more removed from the experiential measure of victimization surveys)

Type of Indicator: Outcome

Simplicity: This indicator is an example of a perception-based measure that addresses perceived levels of safety, an important component of a peaceful and inclusive society. To capture the inclusiveness of society, it will be important to disaggregate the indicator for a wide range of population groups in order to detect tensions. Proper sampling methods can also ensure replicability.

Feasibility: This indicator can easily be measured at the global level through crime victimization surveys, but could also be reported upon regionally or nationally. Dataset is updated regularly. Provided the survey questions allow for sufficient disaggregation, and appropriate measures are taken to protect vulnerable persons, this indicator is proposed to monitor targets 5.2 (women), 10.2 (non-discrimination) and 16.1 (violence and deaths).

Origin of Data: Population-based and specialized surveys, Crime victimization surveys

Scope: Globally comparable

Sources:

- Gallup World Poll [GALLUP SURVEY QUESTION]: Do you feel safe walking alone at night in the city or area where you live?
- World Value Survey, SHaSA initiative (Harmonized Module on Peace and Security), National and International Crime Victimization Surveys.
- An increasing number of countries are implementing victimization surveys and UNODC has experimented the global collection of victimization data.

Links/Citations: www.gallup.com

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- Percentage of citizens who feel safe [at home] – WORLD VALUE SURVEY QUESTION: In the last 12 months, how often have you or your family felt unsafe from crime in your home?

Potential Disaggregations or Quantifiable Derivatives:

- a. Percentage of women and men who report feeling safe walking alone at night in the city or area where they live

⁶¹ This indicator is drawn from the following Virtual Network lists: 1st and 2nd TST Master List, TST Core Set, TST Further Information, PSG-Int'l Dialogue, PSG Short-Int'l Dialogue, UN-IEP, Glen Cove, Addis Ababa-AUC, TST Metadata and OHCHR.

***Supplementary Indicators that measure other dimension of Target 16.1
(Significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere)***

Also, see Annex 2 for a listing of input/process indicators on peace, justice and institutional performance.

16.1.a Number of violent injuries per 100,000, by sex of the victim, by age group, location/region

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Percentage of people who experienced violent injuries in the previous year, by sex of the victim, by age group, location/region
- b. International violent injury rate per 100,000
- c. International homicide or violent injury rate per 100,000

16.1.b Score on the annual Global Peace Index (positive/negative peace)

16.1.c Violent crime rate (intentional homicide, assault and sexual violence, including attempts) per 100,000 population

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Percentage of reported homicides in a given year that resulted in court adjudication within 12/24 months

Potential Disaggregations or Quantifiable Derivatives:

- a. Assaulted in past year – GALLUP WORLD POLL QUESTION: Within the past 12 months, have you been assaulted or mugged?
- b. Money/property stolen – GALLUP WORLD POLL QUESTION: Within the past 12 months, have you had money or property stolen from you or another household member?
- c. Reported incidents of violence against children per 100,000, by sex of the victim, by age group, location/region
- d. Percentage of women and men aged 18-24 years who experienced sexual violence prior to age [15/18]

16.1.d Number of refugees

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Number of displaced persons
- b. Political refugees and internal displacement caused by conflict and violence

16.1.e Reported disappearances

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Change in incidence of disappearances per year

Target 16.2

End abuse, exploitation, trafficking and all forms of violence against and torture of children

Suggested Indicator 16.2.1. Percentage of people who have experienced physical and/or sexual violence in the last 12 months – disaggregated by age⁶² (see 16.1.2a above)

Relevance: This is directly relevant to the issue of violence against children and has the advantage of overlapping with another indicator already proposed for target 1 (see suggested indicator 16.1.2a), so long as that indicator is disaggregated by age.

Type of Indicator: Outcome indicator

Simplicity: The indicator is simple and easily interpretable. It does not suffer from time lag, reporting and recall issues associated with, for example, surveys of adults who experienced violence before they turned 18 (see alternative indicators below).

Feasibility: As described under previous target, this indicator has already been used in victimization, household and experiential surveys and disaggregated data can be collected. It is less demanding than high-frequency indicators that would require monthly surveys (see alternative indicators below), though it does suffer from some similar self-reporting issues to other alternative indicators described below which must be taken into account when designing survey questions.

Origin of Data: Specialized survey, Household surveys

Scope: Globally comparable

Source:

- UNICEF for household surveys (fully comparable data is available for some 50 low- and middle-income countries)
- On child related indicators, at international level, data on violent crime are collected by UNICEF and UNODC; at national level, data are produced by criminal justice sources (the police/judiciary), and social and child protection services.

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Percentage of children aged 1-14 years who experienced any physical punishment by caregivers in the past month- as recommended by UNICEF
- b. Reported incidents of violence against children per 100,000, by sex of the victim, by age group, location/region
- c. Percentage of young adults aged 18-24 years who have experienced violence by age 18, by type (physical, psychological and/or sexual) – as recommended by UNICEF
- d. Rate of child maltreatment
- e. Proportion of child exploitation, violence or abuse cases that underwent public hearing
- f. Percentage of children who have experienced physical or sexual violence, by sex of the victim and perpetrator, by age group, location/region
- g. Number of War-Displaced Children per 100,000 children
- h. Reported cases of torture without any or due judicial process (children)

⁶² This indicator is drawn from the following Virtual Network lists: 1st and 2nd TST Master List, TST Core Set, TST Further Information, Glen Cove, Addis Ababa-AUC and TST Metadata.

Suggested Indicator 16.2.2. Number of detected victims of human trafficking disaggregated by type of exploitation⁶³

Relevance: This indicator directly measures an aspect of the target and is highly relevant to the target.

Type of Indicator: Outcome indicator

Simplicity: This indicator directly measures the detected incidence of exploitation and trafficking. It is easy to communicate and understand. This indicator also contributes to measuring target 16.1 (as trafficking often requires violence, coercion or the threat of the use of force) and 16.4 (as trafficking is one form of organized crime). Interpretation and targeting are complicated by the inclusion of “detected” in the indicator – an increase in detected victims may be due to an increase in human trafficking or due to increased reporting due to capacity of authorities to detect trafficking and/or increased trust in the authorities.

Feasibility: Data is existing and updated regularly. However the indicators are dependent on the ability of the country to detect and assist victims of trafficking and smuggled migrants. As these human rights abuses affect both adults and children, and States have existing obligations to prevent them for both population groups, it is proposed that they should be measured for all persons as part of monitoring of target 16.1, and disaggregated by characteristics of victims, including age to enable specific monitoring of target 16.2.

Origin of Data: Administrative statistics

Source (who produces, and controls - often linked to origin of data):

- UNODC Global Report on Trafficking in Persons
- US State Department Trafficking in Persons Reports
- IOM Human Trafficking Database tracks victims of trafficking assisted by IOM. Cases disaggregated by sex, age, nationality, destination country, type of trafficking, details of the recruitment and exploitation process. Has global coverage (based on IOM presence) between 2000 and 2010. Database is internal to IOM but may be available publicly on request.
- CLANDESTINO Database on Irregular Migration measures stocks of irregular migrants; some data available on age, gender and nationality. Covers EU countries between 2007-2009 and is updated periodically.

Links/Citations:

- Global Report on Trafficking in Persons, available at: <http://www.unodc.org/glotip.html>
- European Migration Network and Luxembourg National Contact Point, “Identification of Victims of Trafficking in Human Beings in International Protection and Forced Return Procedures”, available at: <https://www.emnluxembourg.lu/sites/default/files/documents/LU%20EMN%20NCP%20Identification%20of%20Victims%20of%20THB%20-%20English.pdf>

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Number of victims of human trafficking and smuggled migrants per 100,000 people
- b. Reported number of victims of trafficking (within and across countries), slavery, exploitation and forced labor

⁶³ This indicator is drawn from the following Virtual Network lists: 1st and 2nd TST Master List, TST Core Set, TST Further Information and TST Metadata.

Supplementary Indicators that measure other dimensions of Target 16.2 (End abuse, exploitation, trafficking and all forms of violence against and torture of children)

16.2.a Violent discipline of children

16.2.b UNICEF Global Database on Child marriage (EXAMPLE OF NATIONAL SURVEY)

- i. Number of women and men aged 18 years and older who were married or in union before ages 15 and 18
- ii. Percentage of women aged 20 to 49 years who were married or in union before age 18 (by region (by wealth quintile, region, residence, level of education)
- iii. Percentage of women aged 20-24 who were married before the age of 18
- iv. Percentage of the currently married women married by specific ages (<15 years, <18 years)

16.2.c Child Malnutrition

- i. Proportion of children under age five moderately or severely stunted
- ii. Proportion of children under age five moderately or severely underweight

16.2.d Child Labour Indicators, by sex (as percentage of children in the relevant age group)

- i. Children aged 5-11 years in economic activity
- ii. Children aged 12-14 years in economic activity excluding those in light economic activity
- iii. Children aged 5-14 performing HH chores for an average of at least 28 hours per week
OR (MICS indicators)
 - i. Percentage of children 5-17 years of age involved in child labour
 - a) Age 5–11 years: At least 1 hour of economic work or 28 hours of domestic work per week
 - b) Age 12–14 years: At least 14 hours of economic work or 28 hours of domestic work per week
 - c) Age 15-17: At least 43 hours of economic work or domestic work per week
 - ii. Percentage of children 5-17 years of age working under hazardous conditions

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Child Employment in Agriculture, Manufacturing and Services
- b. Number of children recruited by armed forces and non-state armed groups

16.2.e Female genital mutilation (EXAMPLE OF MICS INDICATOR)

- i. **Approval for FGM/C:** Number of women age 15-49 years favouring the continuation of female genital mutilation/cutting (FGM/C)/Total number of women age 15-49 years who have heard of FGM/C
- ii. **Prevalence of FGM/C among women:** Number of women age 15-49 years who report to have undergone any form of female genital mutilation/cutting (FGM/C)/Total number of women age 15-49 years
- iii. **Prevalence of FGM/C among girls:** Number of girls age 0-14 years who have undergone any form of female genital mutilation/cutting (FGM/C), as reported by mothers/ Total number of girls age 0-14 years

16.2.f Number of child friendly police procedures

Target 16.3

Promote the rule of law at the national and international levels and ensure equal access to justice for all

Suggested Indicator 16.3.1. Proportion of those who have experienced a dispute in the past 12 months who have accessed a formal, informal, alternative or traditional dispute resolution mechanism and who feel it was just⁶⁴

Relevance: This indicator measures the experience of those who had a dispute in accessing the justice system and whether that experience was considered fair. It also measures the process in terms of accessibility and quality of services, rather than the outcome. Whether a mechanism is "fair" is measured as reported by persons experiencing dispute, with a focus on the process of dispute resolution and not the outcome. Experience has shown respondents are able to separate outcome from the fairness of the process itself. The indicator covers the full spectrum of mechanisms for dispute resolution.

Type of Indicator: Process

Simplicity: This indicator is a sound measure for trust and confidence in the rule of law and access to justice systems. It captures experience in both civil and criminal law, and with state and non-state dispute resolution mechanisms. It seeks to drive an approach to the rule of law and access to justice which focuses not only on institutions, but on individuals' experience of the justice system and on just outcomes.

Feasibility:

Origin of Data: Household surveys

Scope: Data is available for 107 countries

Source:

- Government
- Data from existing household surveys can be expanded and collected by the World Bank at the global level.

Links/Citations:

- Extensive data is collected by the World Justice Project, available at: http://worldjusticeproject.org/sites/default/files/files/wjp_rule_of_law_index_2014_report.pdf

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Percentage of people who have experienced a dispute, reporting access to an adequate dispute resolution mechanism
- b. Percentage of civil cases resolved through mediation and Alternative Dispute Resolution (rather than courts)
- c. Percentage of people who are aware of alternative dispute resolution processes
- d. Percentage of people who report confidence in their ability to access legal information and support should they need it
- e. Proportion of respondents who have successfully used alternative dispute resolution processes
- f. Alternative dispute resolution legislation exists
- g. Degree to which there are effective formal or informal mechanisms and programs in place to prevent and resolve disputes peacefully
- h. Percentage of civil cases resolved through ADR/Mediation than in courts
- i. Proportion of those who have experienced a dispute in the past 12 months and who have accessed a fair formal, informal, alternative or traditional dispute mechanism

⁶⁴ This indicator is drawn from the following Virtual Network lists: 1st TST Master List, Further Input, Addis-Ababa-AUC, Glen Cove, NY Long and Short, TST Metadata and TST Prioritized Indicators.

Suggested Indicator 16.3.2. Proportion of all detainees who are not yet sentenced⁶⁵

Relevance: This indicator can be used to assess the overall functioning and effectiveness of the justice system in any given country.

Type of Indicator: Process, Outcome

Simplicity: It is measurable using sound methodology, and easy to communicate and understand.

Feasibility:

Origin of Data: Administrative statistics

Scope: Globally comparable, regional, national – available for 118 countries and territories

Source:

- Data on unsentenced and total detainees from UN-CTS are available for 114 countries (This coverage could increase to 184 countries if other sources (research institutions and NGOs) are included).
- At the international level, UNODC collects data on pre-trial detention, but not by length of time which is much harder to obtain. Extensive data is also commonly available at a national level from law enforcement authorities. Other organizations collecting data on prisons include the Council of Europe (SPACE) and the OAS; Ministry of Justice Prisons;

Links/Citations:

- Definitions and other metadata are provided in the UN-Crime Trends Survey (UN-CTS)
- Guidance on collection of information on detained persons, as well as example data collection sheets, are provided in the United Nations Manual for the Development of a System of Criminal Justice Statistics, as well as (for children), in the UNODC/UNICEF Manual for the Measurement of Juvenile Justice Indicators.

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Percentage of total detainees who have been held in detention for more than 12 months while awaiting sentencing or a final disposition of their case
- b. Detainees held in detention while awaiting sentencing and/or a final disposition of the case, by sex (often referred to as pre-trial detention) as a percentage of the overall prison population
- c. Proportion of prisoners kept in pre-trial detention relative to total number of prisoners
- d. Unsentenced detainees as percentage of overall prison population by age, sex, region and population group
- e. Proportion of total prisoners currently awaiting trial
- f. Extent of pre-trial detention or percentage of prison detainees who have been held in detention for more than 12 months while awaiting sentencing or another final disposition of their case (excluding appeals)
- g. Extent of pre-trial detention (Average length of time suspects spend in jail or prison before trial or sentencing)
- h. Average period of pre-trial detention
- i. Time gap between [violence/homicide] case filing and hearing
- j. Incidents of unlawful detainment

⁶⁵ This indicator is drawn from the following Virtual Network lists: 1st and 2nd TST Master List, TST Core Set, TST Further Information, SDSN, NY Long, NY Short, TST Metadata and TST Prioritized Indicators.

Supplementary Indicators that measure other dimensions of Target 16.3 (Promote the rule of law at the national and international levels and ensure equal access to justice for all)

16.3.a Percentage of criminal cases in which the defendant/people does not have legal or other representation in court

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Percentage of defendants in criminal cases who are represented by legal counsel
- b. Conviction rates for indigent defendants provided with legal representation as a proportion of conviction rates for defendants with lawyer of their own choice
- c. Ratio of conviction rates (violent crimes) for impoverished defendants who are provided with free legal representation vs. conviction rates for defendants with legal representation of their own choosing

16.3.b Unmet need for legal aid among the population in the poorest quintile in national consumption in the past 12 months, by sex and by age group

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Ability of poor people to appeal judicial decisions in serious offence cases

16.3.c Number of children in detention per 100,000 child population

16.3.d Proportion of justice sector budget allocated for provision of free legal aid services

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Proportion of public budget allocated to police, security and justice (Also see Annex 4)
- b. Proportion of public budget allocated to justice and legal aid (Also see Annex 4)
- c. The proportion of overall budget allocated to legal aid services as ratio of total government expenditure
- d. Existence of public financing mechanisms for legal aid services

16.3.e Average time to resolve [civil] disputes

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Average time between civil case filing and clearing
- b. Ratio of formal cases filed to cases resolved per year
- c. Number of cases resolved by courts in 12 months as a proportion of the total number of new cases in the same time period disaggregated by type (civil and criminal)
- d. Average time between case filing and clearing for SGBV cases

16.3.f Proportion of requests for legal assistance and free interpreters being met (criminal and civil proceedings) annually, by sex of requestor

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Percentage of people who have access to free legal aid
- b. Percentage of people who have access to a legal representation
- c. Percentage of people who seek representation (by a legal counsel or by non-lawyers, where relevant) represented by them in court
- d. People's legal awareness, including human rights and legal representation/assistance

16.3.g Existence of a comprehensive legal aid system (in line with UN Principles and Guidelines on access to legal aid in the criminal justice system)

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Compliance with recommendations from the Universal Periodic Review and UN Treaties

16.3.h World Bank Worldwide Governance Indicator, Rule of Law score

16.3.i World Justice Project Rule of Law Index:

- a. Constraint on government power:**
 - i. Government powers are effectively limited by the legislature
 - ii. Government powers are effectively limited by the judiciary
 - iii. Government powers are effectively limited by independent auditing and review
 - iv. Government officials are sanctioned for misconduct
 - v. Government powers are subject to non-governmental checks
 - vi. Transition of power is subject to the law
- b. Open Government:**
 - i. Publicized laws and government data
 - ii. Right to information
 - iii. Civic participation
 - iv. Complaint mechanisms
- c. Fundamental Rights:**
 - i. Equal treatment and absence of discrimination
 - ii. The right to life and security of the person is effectively guaranteed
 - iii. Due process of law and rights of the accused
 - iv. Freedom of opinion and expression is effectively guaranteed
 - v. Freedom of belief and religion is effectively guaranteed
 - vi. Freedom from arbitrary interference with privacy is effectively guaranteed
 - vii. Freedom of assembly and association is effectively guaranteed
 - viii. Fundamental labor rights are effectively guaranteed
- d. Order and Security:**
 - i. Crime is effectively controlled
 - ii. Civil conflict is effectively limited
 - iii. People do not resort to violence to redress personal grievances
- e. Regulatory enforcement:**
 - i. Government regulations are effectively enforced
 - ii. Government regulations are applied and enforced without improper influence
 - iii. Administrative proceedings are conducted without unreasonable delay
 - iv. Due process is respected in administrative proceedings
 - v. The government does not expropriate without lawful process
 - vi. Adequate compensation
- f. People can access and afford civil justice

16.3.j Percentage of people who trust the [police/courts]

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. TRANSPARENCY INTERNATIONAL SURVEY QUESTION: How much do you trust the police?

16.3.k V-Dem Indicators on Justice

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Equality before the Law and Individual Liberty (V-Dem Index)
 - i. Rigorous and impartial public administration
 - ii. Transparent laws with predictable enforcement
 - iii. Access to justice for men/women
 - a) Property rights for men/women
 - b) Freedom from torture/political killings/forced labor
 - c) Freedom of religion/foreign movement/domestic movement
- b. Freedom of Expression (V-Dem Index)

- c. Constraints on government power
 - i. Government compliance with judiciary/high court/lower court
 - ii. Executive respects the Constitution
 - iii. Government attacks on the judiciary
 - iv. Lower court/High court independence
 - v. Legislative constraints on the executive: legislature questions/investigates the executive

16.3.l Conviction rates by type of adjudicated crimes (e.g. rape, homicide, physical assaults) and characteristics of victims and perpetrators (e.g. sex, juvenile)

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Number of persons convicted per recorded/perceived crime
- b. Percentage of persons convicted of a violent crime who have previously been convicted of a violent crime within the past five years (recidivism)

16.3.m Percentage of people who report crime to authorities

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. % of victims who reported crime to authorities
- b. Percentage of victims (of certain types of crimes) who tried to report these crimes to the police
- c. % of victims who reported crime to authorities within the last 12 months
- d. Proportion Crimes (assault and sexual violence, including attempts) reported to the police

16.3.n Number of people who die in custody of the state

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Death in police custody
- b. Number of deaths in custody per 100,000 persons detained within the last 12 months, by sex
- c. Incidence of death or physical injury during arrest or apprehension or in custody

16.3o Rate of compliance with binding resultant judgments of bilateral and multilateral investment treaty disputes

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Number of legally binding bilateral and/or multilateral investment treaties

16.3p Derived aggregate score of the World Bank Investing Across Borders (IAB) initiative annual scores

16.3q World Bank Doing Business project “Ease of Doing Business” aggregate annual score

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Ability for individual (s) to establish small or medium enterprise (SME) or limited liability Company

Target 16.4

By 2030, significantly reduce illicit financial and arms flows, strengthen the recovery and return of stolen assets and combat all forms of organized crime

Suggested Indicator 16.4.1. Total volume of inward and outward illicit financial flows⁶⁶

Relevance: While illicit financial flows are explicitly mentioned in the target, the monitoring of illicit financial flows can also inform progress on other aspects of this target, including revenues emanating from illicit arms sales and organized crime.

Type of Indicator: Outcome, Process (for Alternative Indicator C: structural)

Simplicity: Illicit financial flows are commonly defined as the transfer of money that is earned, transferred or spent through illicit means, into or out of a country. They include legally earned monies that are transferred illicitly or monies that are acquired through illegal activities, such as crime, corruption or tax evasion. They usually also capture tax avoidance. The indicator, therefore, also measures some aspect of target 16.5.

Feasibility: Although the UN Economic Commission for Africa, UNDP, Global Financial Integrity and others have produced global country-by-country estimates, more work on methodologies would be required as there is not universal agreement on the definition of illicit financial flows or methodologies for measurement. The indicator is proposed to monitor targets 8.3 (development-oriented policies), 16.4 (illicit financial flows), 16.5 (corruption and bribery) and 17.1 (domestic resource mobilisation).

Origin of Data: Administrative data, Expert assessment

Scope: Globally comparable

Source:

- UN Economic Commission for Africa, UNDP, Global Financial Integrity (151 countries) and others have produced global country-by-country estimates.
- The Financing for Development draft text of 6 May 2015 "invite[s] the United Nations, IMF and the World Bank in collaboration with regional organizations, to publish official estimates of [illicit financial flows] volume and breakdown"
- IMF: Balance of payments data, Direction of Trade Statistics (DOTS)
- World Bank: Data on debt and debt service
- UN COMTRADE: Data on bilateral trade in commodity groups
- US Dept. of Commerce: Data on trade transactions by Harmonized System coding categories
- European Statistics: Data on trade transactions by Harmonized System coding categories

Links/Citations:

- Global Financial Integrity, available at: <http://www.gfintegrity.org/issues/data-by-country/>
- Mbeki Report of the High-Level Panel on Illicit Financial Flows from Africa, available at: <http://www.uneca.org/iff>

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Illicit financial flows as % of GDP
- b. Total value of inward and outward illicit financial flows (in current US\$)
- c. Adherence/ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism and the Convention against Transnational Organized Crime

Potential Disaggregations or Quantifiable Derivatives:

- a. Reduction in the volume of illicit financial flows

⁶⁶ This indicator is drawn from the following Virtual Network lists: 2nd TST Master List, TST Core Set, TST Further Information, UN-IEP, Glen Cove, SDSN, NY long, TST Metadata, OHCHR and TST Prioritized Indicators.

Supplementary Indicators that measure some aspect of Target 16.4 (By 2030, significantly reduce illicit financial and arms flows, strengthen the recovery and return of stolen assets and combat all forms of organized crime)

Note from the Virtual Network: While some aspects of arms flows (illegal) would be captured in illicit financial flows, many aspects and components of Target 16.4 would not be measured by measuring illicit financial flows. To properly measure the full breadth of Target 16.4 a number of the indicators below would have to be considered complementary indicators.

16.4.a Value of illicit production and trafficking of arms as a total and as a percentage of GDP

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Countries that mark and record small arms at the time of import in accordance with international standards; as agreed to by all Member States in the International Tracing Instrument and required by States party to the UN Firearms Protocol.
- b. Number of illicitly circulating small arms and light weapons as a total and in relation to population number/by GDP (small arms ownership rates by sex)
- c. Small arms ownership rate
- d. Small arms database: Exports and imports of small arms and ammunition
- e. Percentage of small arms marked and recorded at the time of import in accordance with international standards
- f. Ratification of the Arms Trade Treaty

Potential Disaggregations or Quantifiable Derivatives:

- a. If someone in your community wanted to obtain an illegal small arm, how easy would this be?
- b. How would you describe the number of illegal weapons in your community?

16.4.b Value of illicit production and trafficking of natural resources, as a total and as a percentage of GDP

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Extractive industries transparency initiative status (compliant, candidate, suspended, or other, EITI)
- b. Resource Governance Index (Revenue Watch Institute)
- c. Active participation in (co-operation with) Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEGT) or equivalent illicit logging control initiative/ the Egmont Group of Financial Intelligence Units/ the Kimberley process/ the UN Programme of Action on SALW/ Interpol

Potential Disaggregations or Quantifiable Derivatives:

- a. Compliance with EITI standards for extractive industries (for resource-producing countries)

16.4.c Value of illicit production and trafficking of drugs, as a total and as a percentage of GDP

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Profits generated by trafficking in cocaine
- b. Prevalence of drug use among general population.
- c. Drug seizures/laboratory seizures over prevalence of drug use among general population
- d. Value of illicit economy would include drugs, natural resources and other trafficking

16.4.d Global volume of money laundering

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Anti-money laundering index score

16.4.e Drug-related crime per 100,000 population

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Estimated number of drug-related deaths and rates per million people aged 15-64

16.4.f Number of investigations and convictions against suspicious financial activity relating to organized crime, money laundering, bribery and corruption, and financing of terrorism

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Number of investigations and convictions against suspicious financial activity relating to bribery and corruption
- b. Total number of cases analyzed by the body in charge of fighting money laundering and illicit flows in the last 12 months
- c. Total number of reported cases to the body in charge of fighting money laundering and illicit flows that were addressed by the justice system
- d. Conviction rate for all corruption cases in the justice system/year
- e. Proportion of corruption cases that are cleared by the judiciary system within 12 months
- f. Assets and liabilities of BIS reporting banks in international tax havens by country
- g. Ratification of UNCAC and up-to-date legal framework against bribery and corruption, which facilitates stolen asset recovery
 - i. Signatory to relevant treaties, submission of requisite reporting
 - ii. National anti-corruption laws are compliant with UNCAC provisions
 - iii. UNCAC gap analysis and self-assessment report
 - iv. Stolen Asset recovery initiative

16.4.g WORLD ECONOMIC FORUM SURVEY QUESTION: To what extent does organized crime (mafia-oriented racketeering, extortion) impose costs on businesses in your country?

Target 16.5

Substantially reduce corruption and bribery in all their forms

Suggested Indicator 16.5.1. Percentage of population who paid a bribe to a public official, or were asked for a bribe by these public officials, during the last 12 months⁶⁷

Clarification: “Public official” should be defined in accordance with the United Nations Convention Against Corruption, Chapter I Article 2.

Relevance: This indicator speaks directly to an individual’s experience of corruption and bribery in everyday life, including while accessing basic public services or avoid a ticket or harassment by the police. By providing a direct measure of the experience of bribery, this indicator provides an objective metrics of corruption, a yardstick to monitor progress in the fight against corruption.

Type of Indicator: Outcome, Process; (for Alternative indicator J: structural)

Simplicity: The indicator is measurable using sound methodology, and easy to communicate and understand. This indicator is also multi-purpose as it can contribute to measuring target 16.6.

Feasibility: The indicator can be measured through population surveys, increasingly being used to measure the experience of corruption. In order to reduce the total number of global indicators, this indicator is proposed to monitor targets 1.4 (access to basic services), 8.3 (promotion of private enterprise), 16.3 (rule of law), 16.5 (corruption) and 16.6 (effective, accountable and transparent institutions).

Origin of Data:

- Sample survey, Experience/ Household Survey, Factual survey
- For Alternative Indicators C & G below: Household corruption surveys and victimization surveys with a module on bribery
- For Alternative Indicators H, I, J, N: Administrative data or Perception survey

Scope: Globally comparable

Sources:

- TI Bribe Payers Index
- TI Global Bribery Barometer
- World Bank Country Policy and Institutional Assessment
- Afrobarometer
- CEPII Institutional Profiles Database
- UNODC collects prevalence data on bribery from surveys through the annual United Nations Survey of Crime Trends and the Operations of Criminal Justice Systems mandated by the UN General Assembly (UN-CTS).

Links/Citations:

- World Bank CPIA, available at: <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/IQ.CPA.TRAN.XQ>
- Gallup Survey, available at: http://media.gallup.com/dataviz/www/WP_Questions_WHITE.pdf
- CEPII, available at: http://www.cepii.fr/institutions/doc/IPD_2012_cahiers-2013-03_EN.pdf
- Philippines, Office of the Ombudsman, “2013 National Household Survey on Experience with Corruption in the Philippines”, available at: <http://www.ombudsman.gov.ph/docs/caravan/2013OMBCorruptionSurveyReport.pdf>

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

⁶⁷ This indicator is suggested by CIGI and SHaSA and drawn from the following Virtual Network lists: 1st and 2nd TST Master List, TST Core Set, TST Further Information, PSG-Int’l Dialogue, Addis Ababa-AUC, NY long, NY short, TST Metadata, OHCHR and TST Prioritized Indicators.

- a. Existence of mandatory public register that discloses the beneficial ownership of trust funds and companies
- b. Percentage of persons who paid a bribe to a security, police or justice official or were asked a bribe by these public officials, in the past 12 months
- c. Percentage of persons who had at least one contact with a public official, who paid a bribe to a public official, or were asked for a bribe by these public officials, during the last 12 months
- e. Proportion of the population admitting having paid bribes in the last 12 months
- f. Proportion of the population admitting knowing someone who has paid bribes in the last 12 months
- g. % of population that reports paying a bribe when obtaining a public service or when interacting with a public official
- h. Proportion of [persons/businesses] that did, were asked or were expected to pay a bribe or provide a product or service to a public official
- i. GALLUP WORLD POLL SURVEY QUESTION: Was there at least one instance in the last 12 months when you had to give a bribe/present, or not?
- j. Reported rates of bribery (individual experience) in basic public services
- k. Existence of a reporting mechanism through which citizens can report corruption cases
- l. World Bank CPIA – Transparency, accountability and corruption in public sector
- m. AFROBAROMETER SURVEY QUESTION: In your opinion, how often in this country do officials who commit crimes go unpunished?
- n. World Bank CPIA – Quality of public administration
- o. CEPII Institutional Profiles Database, Level of corruption (petty/large corruption)

Potential Disaggregations or Quantifiable Derivatives:

- a. Reduction in number of people who report paying a bribe (when interacting with government officials that they have had to give money or offer a gift to a civil servant in the past 12 months)
- b. Percentage of [population/businesses] that paid a bribe to, or were asked a bribe by a public official during the last 12 months, and reported it to the authorities
- c. Disaggregation by age⁶⁸

⁶⁸ Children very often encounter corruption and bribery, for example when accessing health, education and other public services. The Centre for Children’s Rights at Queen’s University in Belfast, in collaboration with Save the Children, Plan International, UNICEF and a wide range of other national, regional and international organizations, has developed a methodology and tools to capture children’s views (with a main focus on children 10-18 years of age) on public spending to realize children’s rights. The methodology, which is based on both an online survey and facilitated discussions with children, captures children’s views on what sectors governments should invest in, what groups of children governments should prioritize in public spending and how governments should make decisions on public budget allocation and spending with a focus on transparency, participation and accountability. The perceptions of almost 2.700 children from 71 countries were collected using this methodology. A report and video summarizing the views of these children can be found on the following link: <http://www.childrightsconnect.org/govtspendingsurvey/>. The report also outlines the methodology and tools used to engage with children.

Suggested Indicator 16.5.2. Percentage of businesses that paid a bribe to a public official, or were asked for a bribe by these public officials, during the last 12 months⁶⁹

Relevance: This indicator speaks directly to businesses' experience of corruption and bribery, which can have a profound financial impact on the economy and government expenditures and speaks to the accountability of institutions. By providing a direct measure of the experience of bribery, this indicator provides an objective metrics of corruption, a yardstick to monitor progress in the fight against corruption.

Type of Indicator: Outcome

Simplicity: It is measurable using sound methodology, and easy to communicate and understand. This indicator also contributes to measuring target 16.6.

Feasibility: The indicator can be measured through business surveys. In order to reduce the total number of global indicators, this indicator is proposed to monitor targets 1.4 (access to basic services), 8.3 (promotion of private enterprise), 16.3 (rule of law), 16.5 (corruption) and 16.6 (effective, accountable and transparent institutions).

Origin of Data:

- Expert review, Business surveys
- Business corruption surveys or Business victimization surveys with module on bribery (for Alternative Indicator C: Perception survey, Expert analysis, Opinion/ Factual survey)

Scope: Globally comparable, Available in many countries

Source:

- UNODC is responsible for global monitoring
- For Alternative Indicator C: World Bank Enterprise Survey

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Percentage of businesses that paid a bribe to a public official, or were asked a bribe by these public officials, during the last 12 months
- b. Percentage of businesses who had at least one contact with a public official, who paid a bribe to a public official, or were asked for a bribe by these public officials, during the last 12 months
- c. Percentage of firms identifying corruption as a major constraint

⁶⁹ This indicator is suggested by Transparency International and drawn from the following Virtual Network lists: 1st and 2nd TST Master List, TST Core Set, TST Further Information, UN-IEP, Glen Cove, NY Long and Short and TST Prioritized Indicators.

Supplementary Indicators that measure some aspect of Target 16.5 (Substantially reduce corruption and bribery in all their forms)

16.5.a Percentage of public officials who have been hired through formal and standardized procedure

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Asset declaration requirement & wealth made public
- b. Existence of legislation that requires public officials to declare assets
- c. Laws in place requiring disclosure of assets by key political and administrative leaders
- d. Existence of a law requiring the disclosure of private donations to political parties (yes/no)
- e. Share of staff recruited using merit-based practices
- f. SURVEY QUESTION: In practice, civil servants are appointed and evaluated according to professional criteria
- g. Percentage of cases of corruption prosecuted
- h. UNCAC national review reports
- i. UNCAC national self-assessments

16.5.b TRANSPARENCY INTERNATIONAL, GLOBAL CORRUPTION BAROMETER SURVEY QUESTION: How effective do you think your government's actions are in the fight against corruption?

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. GALLUP WORLD POLL SURVEY QUESTION: Do you think the government of your country is doing enough to fight corruption, or not?
- b. GALLUP WORLD POLL SURVEY QUESTION: Do you think the level of corruption in this country is lower, about the same, or higher than it was 5 years ago?

16.5.c CORRUPTION PERCEPTIONS INDEX, Transparency International

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Control of corruption score (WGI)
- b. Absence of corruption score, World Justice Project
 - i. Government officials in the executive branch do not use public office for private gain
 - ii. Government officials in the judicial branch do not use public office for private gain
 - iii. Government officials in the police and the military do not use public office for private gain
 - iv. Government officials in the legislative branch do not use public office for private gain

16.5.d V-Dem index on corruption

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Executive (the head of state, the head of government, and cabinet ministers) bribery and corrupt exchanges
- b. Executive embezzlement and theft
- c. Bribes to the judiciary
- d. Corrupt activities in the legislature
- e. Public sector embezzlement and theft; public sector corrupt exchanges

16.5e Rate of compliance with binding resultant judgments of bilateral and multilateral investment treaty disputes.

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Number of legally binding bilateral and/or multilateral investment treaties

16.5f Derived aggregate score of the World Bank Investing Across Borders (IAB) initiative annual scores.

16.5g World Bank Doing Business project “Ease of Doing Business” aggregate annual score.

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Ability for individual (s) to establish small or medium enterprise (SME) or limited liability Company.

Target 16.6

Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels

Suggested Indicator 16.6.1. Actual primary expenditures per sector and revenues as a percentage of the original approved budget* of the government⁷⁰

Relevance: This indicator is highly relevant indicator of state effectiveness, measuring the capacity of the state to plan, budget and spend on key priorities to the maximum of its available resources. This indicator can also contribute to increased transparency and accountability regarding government expenditures and revenues.

Type of Indicator: Outcome (for Potential Disaggregation Indicator A: Structural)

Simplicity: This is not a particularly simple variable (see definitional issues below), however, it is easily quantifiable once defined.

Feasibility: Data is readily available through existing national budget processes and has a very high level of feasibility. However, as several VN participants noted, the description of this indicator does not clarify how this indicator could be reasonably measured. Most countries revise their budget several times across the year and submit it to parliament for approval. Therefore it is unclear which budget the “original approved budget” should be. PEFA Indicator PI-3 measures the “aggregate revenue out-turn compared to original approved budget”. Two possibilities might include the legally valid budget (which might have been changed several times throughout the year) or the initial budget (which is not legally binding anymore due to changes made by government and approved by parliament).

Origin of Data: Administrative data (for Potential Disaggregation Indicator A: Administrative as well as Factual survey

Scope: Globally comparable (for Potential Disaggregation Indicator A: Regional)

Source:

- National budget processes, PEFA Secretariat (World Bank – 149 countries), PI-3
- For Tax revenue (alternative indicator c): National Statistical Systems/IMF
- For alternative indicator i: Ministry of Local Government/Decentralization
- For derivative indicator a: Independent assessment

Links/Citations:

- <https://www.pefa.org/en/content/methodological-guidance-and-practical-tools>
- Data for 149 countries (398 observations), available at: www.pefa.org
- Government of Ghana, “Table 3.1 Comparison of Budget estimates against Actuals (p. 41)”, and “Annex 5a: Data used for scoring PI-1 (p. 187)”, in “Ghana: Public Expenditure & Financial Accountability (PEFA) Performance Review”, June 2013, available at: http://www.mofep.gov.gh/sites/default/files/reports/Ghana_PEFA_2012_Report%20.pdf
- Republic of Lebanon, Public Finance Annual Review 2012”, available at: http://www.finance.gov.lb/en-US/finance/ReportsPublications/DocumentsAndReportsIssuedByMOF/Documents/Public%20Finance%20Reports/Annual/YR_2012.pdf

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Primary government expenditures as a percentage of original approved budget
- b. Actual revenues collected compared to projections (aggregated revenue outturn vs. budgeted)
- c. Tax revenues as a % of GDP OR Tax effort (Capacity of tax administration):
 - i. Transparency of taxpayer obligations and liabilities,

⁷⁰ This indicator is drawn from the following Virtual Network lists: • TST Core Set, NY Long, NY Short and TST Metadata.

- ii. Effectiveness of measures of taxpayer registration and tax assessment,
- iii. Effectiveness in collection of tax payments
- d. Ratio of planned expenditures for reaching adopted target(s) to actual expenditures, by recipient and donor countries
- e. Ratios of actual budget revenues/expenditures for reaching adopted target(s) to Gross National Income (GNI), by recipient and donor countries
- f. Ratio of Post-2015 development indicator X to GNI per capita
- g. Global Integrity Report, Combined score:
 - i. Government conflict-of-interest safeguards & checks and balances
 - ii. Public administration and professionalism
 - iii. Government oversight and controls
 - iv. Anti-corruption legal framework
- h. Public availability of reports on budgets, expenditures and handling of complaints

Potential Disaggregations or Quantifiable Derivatives:

- a. Locally-collected taxes as a proportion of national government allocations to local governments (SHaSA)
- b. Reduction in the gap between proposed and executed budgets (aggregate spending and to particular functions/areas)
- c. Disaggregation by age⁷¹

⁷¹ Children are more dependent on public services for their survival and development than most other groups. They come in contact with public service providers on a daily basis, e.g. by going to school, visiting a health clinic, accessing the justice system and using social services, including in relation to prevention and management of violence and abuse. Quality public services are also essential to address poverty, including child poverty. Without capturing their perceptions on the quality of public services, the picture will not be complete. Where children are not able to express their own views, the perception surveys should be designed so that their caregivers could provide information on the quality of services provided to the child. See footnote 10 of the Annex for more details on methodologies.

Suggested Indicator 16.6.2. Proportion of population satisfied with their last experience of public services, disaggregated by service⁷²

Relevance: This outcome indicator focuses on the effectiveness aspect of the target, and indirectly on the accountability aspect, drawing on population sample-surveys (Aspects of the accountability and transparency aspects may also be covered in 16.10). The indicator could distinguish among various public services.

Type of Indicator: Outcome indicator

Simplicity: It is measurable using sound methodology, and easy to communicate and understand. This indicator also contributes to measuring target 16.3.

Feasibility: In addition to administrative data, this indicator is an example of a perception-based measure that addresses satisfaction with public services and is currently collected through various surveys. This indicator requires the use of perception-based population surveys and can be used to collect relevant data on the lived experience of individuals seeking access to and obtaining basic public services, such as health care, education, water and sanitation, as well as services provided by the police and judicial system. In order to reduce the total number of global indicators, this indicator is proposed to monitor targets 1.4 (access to basic services), 3.8 (access to quality, essential health-care services), 4.1, 4.2 and 4a (quality education, including facilities), 7.1 (access to affordable, reliable energy services), 10.2 (social inclusion), 11.1 (adequate housing), 16.3 (rule of law), and 16.6 (effective, accountable and transparent institutions).

Origin of Data:

- Administrative data, Composite indicator, Example of perception-based measure (subjective, outcome, fast-changing indicator); Population survey,⁷³ Perception survey; Survey opinion

Scope:

- Globally comparable for perception surveys such as World Value surveys
- Regional for the SHaSA surveys, Barometers as well as National

Source:

- Data is currently collected by perception surveys such as the World Value Survey, Gallup, Afrobarometer and the other Barometers, and various NSOs, is globally or regionally comparable. The general methodology is well established among NSOs in developed and developing countries.
- In Africa, the approach has already been applied and reported by several NSOs using the SHaSA questionnaire. Nine countries have already started to collect data using the Harmonised Module on Democratic Governance, with as many as 20 more expressing interest in conducting survey in the future. Questions on the Harmonised Module ask specifically about rates of access to, and trust in, the following services/institutions: public service (in general), courts of justice, police, public hospitals and clinics, public schools, tax/customs authorities, social security system, state media, Parliament, army, President, Prime Minister (where applicable), Mayor (where applicable).
- Regional Barometers (e.g. 19 countries in Africa in 2014 amongst 36 in total since the Afrobarometer process started, 10 Arab states in the Arabbarometer, 18 Latin American states in the Latinobarometer, 13 Asian states with three surveys and a further five with at least one survey each) ask about experience of accessing essential government services, including public schools, public clinics and hospitals, registration offices (birth certificate, driver's licence, passport, voter's card, permits, etc.), water, sanitation and electricity. Questions also ask about ease of access, including the need for bribes, gifts or favours.

⁷² This indicator is drawn from the following Virtual Networks lists: 1st TST Master List, TST Core Set, TST Further Information, Addis Ababa-AUC, PSG-Int'l Dialogue (proposed by Sierra Leone, DRC), PSG Short, NY Long and NY Short.

⁷³ That collects relevant data on the lived experience of individuals seeking access to and obtaining basic public services, such as health care, education, water and sanitation, as well as services provided by the police and judicial system.

- The World Values Survey asks respondents in 60 countries (for the 6th Wave, 2010-2014) about confidence in institutions including the armed forces, the police, the courts, government and parliament. There are also questions on the extent to which government should take responsibility to ensure that everybody is provided for. Private sector data collectors already conduct surveys in a range of countries – Gallup’s World Poll conducts representative surveys face to face in over 140 countries covering the emerging and developed world, including questions on confidence in the judicial system, in the local police, in the military and in government. Edelman’s Trust Barometer breaks down questions of trust amongst a range of institutions.

Links/Citations:

- SHaSA Harmonised Module on Democratic Governance
- Global Barometer Study, available at: <http://www.jdsurvey.net/gbs/gbs.jsp>
- World Values Survey, available at: <http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/wvs.jsp>
- Gallup World Poll, available at: <http://www.gallup.com/services/170945/world-poll.aspx>
- Republic of Rwanda, “Assessment of Citizens’ Satisfaction on Recruitment Practices in Rwandan Public Institutions”, available at: http://www.psc.gov.rw/fileadmin/templates/Documents/RESEARCH_ISSUES/Citizen_Satisfaction_on_Recruitment.pdf

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Proportion of people who perceive parliaments/politicians address their needs/concerns, by sex
- b. Percentage of respondents who think that politicians respond to the population's concerns and needs
- c. Percentage of population who express trust in government officials, by sex
- d. Percentage of respondents saying that they (Not at all, Slightly, Somewhat, Completely) trust The President, The Prime Minister
- e. Percentage of people who believe the government delivers services effectively
- f. Proportion of people satisfied with basic social services (education, health, etc.)
- g. Proportion of population satisfied with their last experience of public services, disaggregated by service
- h. Citizen satisfaction with public services (e.g. local police, health care, education, judicial system)
- i. General satisfaction with the performance of security institutions
- j. Percentage of people who are satisfied with the professionalism/efficiency/accountability of public security forces

Potential Disaggregations or Quantifiable Derivatives:

- a. Satisfaction with government performance (possibly by sector/area)

Supplementary Indicators that measure some aspect of Target 16.6 (Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels)

16.6.a Quality of public financial management and internal oversight mechanisms

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Signatory to relevant treaties and submission of requisite reporting
- b. World Bank CPIA Quality of budgetary & financial management rating
- c. Level of government budget transparency

16.6.b Fairness in decisions of governance officials

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. In your country, to what extent do government officials show favoritism to well-connected firms and individuals when deciding upon policies and contracts?

16.6.c MAPS (Methodology for Assessing Procurement Systems) Thresholds of public procurement reform

16.6.d Existence of oversight mechanisms (internal and external – civil society, parliament, etc.)

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Existence of local and national oversight bodies for essential services that are inclusive of stakeholders, that publicize all information, and that have the capacity to recommend remedial action
- b. Number of independent oversight bodies and mechanisms for ensuring government accountability
- c. Degree of civilian and parliamentary oversight of security institutions and budgets that are public
- d. Existence of national and local oversight bodies
- e. Self-assessment by parliaments as oversight bodies
- f. Percentage of complaints against government officials or cases filed through redress mechanism resolved/addressed
- g. Existence of a legal framework for challenging the decisions of public officials
- h. V-Dem indicators:
 - i. Percentage of directly elected lower and upper chamber of parliament [EXACT QUESTION: What percentage of the upper/lower (or unicameral) chamber of the legislature is directly elected in popular elections?]
 - ii. Opposition parties exercise oversight over the governing party [EXACT QUESTION: Are opposition parties (those not in the ruling party or coalition) able to exercise oversight and investigatory functions against the wishes of the governing party or coalition?]
 - iii. Legislature questions and exercises oversight over the executive [EXACT QUESTION: If executive branch officials were engaged in unconstitutional, illegal, or unethical activity, how likely is it that a body other than the legislature, such as a comptroller general, general prosecutor, or ombudsman, would question or investigate them and issue an unfavorable decision or report?]

16.6.e Proportion of people who affirm trusting public institutions (calculate separately for different institutions)

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Citizen trust in government
- b. Percentage of respondents saying that they (Not at all, Slightly, Somewhat, Completely) trust the Parliament
- c. Percentage of the population who believe that state institutions are treating people of all groups fairly, equitably and without discrimination

16.6.f Equality of access to various public services

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Proportion of population who believe public services are accessible to them equitably, by sex and by social group
- b. Proportion of personnel to beneficiaries in all categories of public services (number of students per teacher, number of health care professionals per 100,000 population, etc.)
- c. Proportion of people who affirm being able access to different public services when needed (education, healthcare, justice, etc.)
- d. Degree of equitable access to, and resourcing of, outcomes from public services
- e. Reported rates of sexual coercion in accessing public services

16.6.g Selected Internet-based services available to citizens, by level of sophistication of service

16.6.h Percentage of individuals using the Internet for getting information from general government institutions

16.6.i Percentage of individuals using the internet for getting information from & for interacting with general government institutions

16.6.j Compliance with Open Contracting Initiative

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Proportion of government procurement (financial value) awarded through an open and competitive process
- b. Open and transparent bidding process, government publication
- c. Public advertising of all government procurement
- d. Percentage of government procurement that is advertised publicly OR Percentage of procurement decisions
- e. The Government publishes the results of all procurement decisions

16.6.k World Bank CPIA – Equity of Public Resource Use Score

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Budget process allows for resources to be allocated on the basis of need (e.g. to address inequalities by region, ethnicity, gender and so on)
- b. Percentage of contracts, payments, revenues and expenditure related to the exploitation of natural resources that is publicly available

- c. Percentage of strategic concession processes applying the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forest, UN Guiding Principles or free, prior, informed consent

16.6.l. Number of Prisoners per prison officer

16.6.m. Percentage of prisoners who report having experienced physical or sexual victimization while imprisoned over the past 6 months, by sex

Target 16.7

Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels

Suggested Indicator 16.7.1a. Proportion of positions (by sex, disability, age and ethnicity) in public institutions (national and local legislatures, public services and judiciary) compared to national distributions⁷⁴

Relevance: This indicator focuses on the representativeness aspect of the target, but the presence of diversity also conduces to inclusivity and responsiveness of decision-making. The indicator is also highly gender relevant. Therefore disaggregation should be possible by sex within more sophisticated systems and so the indicator may capture gender differences as they are reflected in the comparative experience of men and women in representation. Consequently this indicator is also relevant for Goal 5.

Type of Indicator: Process, Outcome

Simplicity: It is easy to understand and communicate.

Feasibility: This indicator is measurable by way of nationally collected administrative data. Social groups should be defined at the national level, but could include indigenous populations, ethnic or religious groups, those with disabilities or populations whose livelihoods or common natural resources are affected by decisions concerning large-scale investments or public infrastructure. This indicator is proposed to monitor targets 5.5 (women’s full and effective participation), 10.2 (political inclusion), and 16.7 (responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making).

Origin of Data: Administrative statistics

Sources and **Scope:**

- The data was to be collected from national administrative information.
- At the international level, the ILO compiles data on female share of employment by occupation, by level of position, and by private/public sector. UN Women and the Inter-Parliamentary Union compile statistical information about women parliamentarians, women members of cabinet and other relevant information.
- Global Barometer Study, World Values Survey, Gallup World Poll

Links/Citations:

- Global Barometer Study, available at: <http://www.jdsurvey.net/gbs/gbs.jsp>
- World Values Survey, available at: <http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/wvs.jsp>
- Gallup World Poll, available at: <http://www.gallup.com/services/170945/world-poll.asp>
- SHaSA Harmonised Module on Democratic Governance

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Diversity in representation (by sex, region and social groups) in state institutions (legislature, government, military, and judiciary) compared to national average
- b. Diversity in representation in key decision-making bodies (legislature, executive, and judiciary) (Replace with “Proportions of positions (by sex, disability and population

⁷⁴ This indicator is drawn from the following Virtual Network lists: 1st and 2nd TST Master List, TST Core Set, TST Further Information, PSG-Int’l Dialogue, PSG Short, UN-IEP, Glen Cove and TST Metadata.

- groups) in public institutions (national and local legislatures, public service, and judiciary) compared to national distributions)
- c. Diversity in representation in key state institutions (basket): Whether elected and appointed officials in key state institutions and decision-making bodies are representative of the population
 - d. Breakdown of representation in selected institutions/senior public administration posts

Suggested Alternative Indicator 16.7.1b. Percentage of population who believe decision-making at all levels is inclusive and responsive⁷⁵

Relevance: Some members of the Virtual Network agreed that the 16.7.1a above did not fully reflect the concept for Target 16.7 and that a perception survey was necessary to better capture inclusivity and responsiveness. Alternatives are listed below.

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. The population's level of satisfaction in the political system's inclusivity and effectiveness
- b. Percentage of the population who think public authorities take their interests/suggestions into consideration for local/national decision making, by sex, urban/rural and social group
- c. SURVEY QUESTION: Did you participate in a government-organized meeting, consultation, etc.?

⁷⁵ This indicator is drawn from the following Virtual Network lists: TST Further Information and Addis Ababa-AUC.

Suggested Indicator 16.7.2. Turnout as a share of voting-age population in national election⁷⁶

Relevance: This outcome indicator focuses on the inclusion, participation and representation aspects of the target, and indirectly on the responsiveness aspect, drawing on administrative data from government sources, buttressed by expert collation of comparable data across different countries. National elections include parliamentary elections and elections for head of state or government.

Type of Indicator: Outcome indicator

Simplicity: This indicator seeks to measure increases in inclusion, participation and representation in terms of turn-out of eligible voters in elections.

Feasibility: This is based on the national administrative data, expert collation of comparable data across different countries. However, it is still unanswered how to deal with countries in which voting is mandatory. Voter turnout might be higher in countries where voting is mandatory, which would affect comparability across countries. This can be resolved by including other alternative indicators or specifications listed below or disaggregating data by countries where there is a legal obligation to vote or not.

Origin of Data: Administrative data

Scope: Globally comparable, National (This indicator is efficient for cross-country comparison, assuming comparability of different levels of elections – e.g. Presidential, Parliamentary, local, etc. IDEA maintains databases at all levels)

Source:

- National administrative data, expert collation of comparable data across different countries. Data on turn-out relative to eligibility/voting-age population will be collected routinely by national authorities, including electoral bodies (registration of voters), national registration entities (birth registration, national identity, social security entitlement, etc.). Turn-out will be tabulated at the time of election based on votes tallied by the electoral authorities.
- International organizations such as the International Institute for Democracy, Electoral Assistance (IDEA) and Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem) maintain detailed tables on turn-out and registration at multiple levels for all countries of the world.

Links/Citations:

- <http://www.idea.int/vt/viewdata.cfm#>
- <https://v-dem.net/>

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. V-Dem Indicator-Direct Democracy: Number of popular votes this year [QUESTION: How many direct democracy elections (initiatives, referendums and/or plebiscites) occurred this year?]
- b. Was the voter's list updated for the last general election?

Possible Disaggregation or Derivatives:

- a. V-Dem: Proportion of registered voters who actually voted during the last presidential, legislative and municipal elections
- b. Percentage of voter turnout in national and local elections
- c. Percentage of voting age population registered to vote

⁷⁶ This indicator is drawn from the following Virtual Network list: TST Metadata.

Suggested Indicator 16.7.3. Legislature conducts public hearings during budget cycle⁷⁷

Relevance: This indicator offers a precisely definable specification in a key domain of citizen participation in decision-making. There are few other ways to measure the participatory qualities of decision-making.

Type of Indicator: Process

Simplicity: The level referred to would be categorized (never, infrequently, frequently, always), or else could be treated as a yes/no structural indicator.

Feasibility: The survey has been conducted in a number of countries and gives easily interpretable results on participation (see sources below). Because it is a survey of governments (effectively drawing on administrative statistics) there may be a response bias that would not be present in some alternative indicators structural variables (extent of legislation which can be independently verified) or experiential surveys (proportion of people who report they have participated in a budgeting process).

Origin of Data: Administrative statistics

Sources and **Scope:**

- The International Budget Partnership surveyed public participation in the budget process in 100 countries for the Open Budget Survey 2012 and 102 countries for the 2015 Survey (being released on September 9th 2015).
- The evidence from the 2012 survey shows, for example, that in 28 countries (developed and developing) the public is offered opportunities to testify during legislative budget hearings on the macroeconomic and fiscal framework presented in the budget.

Links/Citations: <http://internationalbudget.org/what-we-do/open-budget-survey/>

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Extent or existence of legislative oversight of the budget process
- b. Existence of a legal requirement for the government to have public consultation in legislation and budgets
- c. Extent to which legislature conducts public hearings during budget cycle
- d. Proportion of people who report they have participated in a budgeting process
- e. Citizen participation in policy-monitoring systems: Citizens are informed about place, date and topic of public discussion
- f. Proportion of local government bodies who implemented participatory processes for the design of local development plans and related budget

⁷⁷ This indicator is drawn from the following Virtual Network list: TST Metadata.

Supplementary Indicators that measure other dimensions of Target 16.7 (Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels)

16.7.a Percentage of women heads of government departments

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Proportion of women in local government (regional parliaments and legislative bodies, local councils, mayors)
- b. Proportion of seats held by women in national Parliament, Senate and Local Assemblies (reserved & un-reserved seats) and government ministerial positions
- c. V-Dem: Gender Quotas in Parliament
- d. Number of women and men that formally participate in peace processes (where relevant)
- e. Representation of women among mediators, negotiators and technical experts in formal peace negotiations
- f. Proportion of CSO managers (and members) who are women

Potential Disaggregations or Quantifiable Derivatives:

- a. Increase in % of seats held by women in parliaments and national assemblies

16.7.b Proportion of people who believe last national election was free and fair, by sex

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. AFROBAROMETER SURVEY QUESTION (EXAMPLE): How would you rate the freeness and fairness of the last national election?
- b. V-Dem: Index of Electoral Fairness
 - i. Election intentional irregularities
 - ii. Election vote-buying
 - iii. Election related violence
 - iv. Electoral management body autonomy from government
 - v. Existence of accurate voter-registry
- c. Percentage of eligible voters who say they felt free to vote in elections without fear or intimidation

16.7.c Participation in political processes and civic engagement at local level

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Membership of political parties and political NGOs
- b. % of people who have taken part in or would consider attending lawful demonstrations
- c. The number of people who report participating in some law-making or rule-making process in the last year
- d. V-Dem Index of Participation [QUESTIONS: How large is the involvement of people in civil society organizations (CSOs)?; Are major CSOs routinely consulted by policymakers on policies relevant to their members?
- e. Proportion of the population who participated in the last 12 months in village/ neighborhood/ municipal council meetings

- f. Existence and implementation of national laws or policies ensuring children's ethical and meaningful participation in local and national decision-making⁷⁸

16.7.d Proportion of public funds allocated to public participation in decision making; Civil society organizations

16.7.e Existence of constituencies (mechanisms or bodies) and enforcement agencies (e.g., youth, women, traditional leaders) to ensure consultative, bottom-up process of representation in decision-making; existence and enforcement of legislation for ensuring representation of specific groups

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Constitution/laws prescribe all citizens should enjoy same level of civil liberties regardless of language, ethnicity, religion, race, sexual orientation, gender identity, region, disability, caste
- b. A process exists by which civil society and communities can participate in the development of local/national standards and plans of action relating to essential services

16.7.f Proportion of parliamentarians that are [independent/from opposition parties]

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. V-Dem party related indicators:
 - i. Elections multiparty
 - ii. Opposition parties autonomy
 - iii. Party Ban
 - iv. Barriers to parties
 - v. Party national reach and linkages

16.7.g Number of reported irregularities (intimidation, corruption or arbitrary interference) with registration, maintenance and review of electoral rolls

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. EU EOM SURVEY QUESTIONS (EXAMPLES):
 - i. Is there any evidence of irregularities related to the implementation of the special voting procedures?
 - ii. Are there signs of any irregularities, such as voters being offered inducements to vote for a particular candidate or party?

16.7.h EIU Democracy Index

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. 5 indicators included in the EIU Democracy Index:
 - i. Electoral process and pluralism
 - ii. Functioning of government
 - iii. Political participation
 - iv. Political culture

⁷⁸ UNICEF would be a potential lead agency on this indicator and data on this proposed indicator could be collected through State Party reporting to the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child on measures taken to implement the Convention on the Rights of the Child (www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/CRC/Pages/CRCIndex.aspx).

v. Civil liberties

16.7.i Proportion of non-governmental organizations, trade unions or other associations consulted about government decisions, strategies and policies in their sector

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. % of people who are consulted and/or can participate in local processes (e.g. planning) affecting their daily lives
- b. V-Dem Indicator: Local and regional government directly elected (yes/no) and relative power of elected officials compared to appointed by central government [QUESTIONS: Are there elected local/regional governments, and – if so – to what extent can they operate without interference from unelected bodies at the local/regional level?; At the local/regional level, are government offices elected in practice?; How would you characterize the relative power, in practice, of elected and non elected offices at the local/regional level?]

Target 16.8

Broaden and strengthen the participation of developing countries in the institutions of global governance

Supported Indicator 16.8.1. Percentage of voting rights in international organizations of developing countries⁷⁹

Relevance: Representation and participation of developing countries in international organizations, including international financial institutions, is often below their relative weight in the world in terms of population or GDP. This indicator would measure the representativeness of developing countries in international organizations, compared to their size in terms of population or GDP as appropriate.

Type of Indicator: Outcome

Simplicity: This is not a simple indicator and is unlikely to contribute to broad understanding of this target in the SDGs. Several participants noted that voting rights in the multilateral development banks is based on share of financial contribution, so this indicator would be unlikely to drive progress. Some participants proposed an alternative indicator focused on developing country representation in leadership positions within the UN and/or international financial institutions, but other participants noted that employees of the UN and IFIs are international civil servants and cannot be seen as representing their nation of origin. In conclusion participants were not able to recommend an improved indicator but agreed further technical work should go into refining this indicator moving forward.

Feasibility: This indicator would be easily measurable by way of data collected by international organizations. The data for this indicator are publicly available in the founding documents of each international organization, as updated. This indicator is proposed to monitor targets 10.6 (enhanced representation for developing countries in decision-making), 16.3 (rule of law at the international level), 16.8 (participation of developing countries in institutions of global governance) and 17.10 (non-discriminatory and equitable multilateral trading system).

Origin of Data: Administrative (global)

Scope: Globally comparable (Global indicator, not a regional or national indicator)

Source:

- International organizations, for example, include the governing bodies of all agencies, funds and programmes of the UN system (including and the IMF and the World Bank), but also the Preparatory Commission for the CTBTO, IAEA, OPCW and WTO.

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Percentage of voting rights in international financial institutions (BIS, IMF and World Bank) of developing countries
- b. Percentage of executive leaders and members of the managing boards of international development, peace and human right organizations who are nationals of developing countries, by sex
- c. Proportion of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions formally initiated/led by developing countries
- d. Share of senior UN positions (P5 and above) occupied by nationals of developing countries, by sex

⁷⁹ This indicator is drawn from the following Virtual Network lists: TST Core Set, TST Further Information, TST Metadata and OHCHR.

- e. Percentage of voting rights in international organizations of developing countries, compared to population or GDP as appropriate
- f. WTO trade group membership

***Supplementary Indicators that measure other dimensions of Target 16.8
(Broaden and strengthen the participation of developing countries in the
institutions of global governance)***

16.8.a. Annual report by Bank for International Settlements (BIS), International Accounting Standards Board (IASB), International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS), International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), World Trade Organization (WTO) [other organizations to be added] on relationship between international rules and the SDGs and the implementation of relevant SDG targets.

Target 16.9

By 2030, provide legal identity for all, including birth registration

Suggested Indicator 16.9.1. Percentage of children under 5 whose births have been registered with civil authority⁸⁰

Relevance: The registration of births is a reasonable proxy for – although not identical to – legal identity. Data availability is limited for children over the age of 5, but measuring this indicator for all children is an important element of measuring progress in increasing birth registration, as well as ensuring that older children are not left behind. Participants suggested that this indicator should be disaggregated by age, sex, region and population group, displacement and migratory status (including statelessness). Network members also noted the potential for divergence between birth registration and the issuance, and verification of birth registration documents.

Type of Indicator: Process, Outcome

Simplicity: It is relatively easy to measure with well-established methodologies and is easy to communicate. Some participants, including the World Bank, argued that the percentage of children under 1 would be a more actionable indicator as the five year time frame will be harder to move and less responsive.

Feasibility: National civil registration systems exist in most countries, although this data needs to be supplemented by survey data to capture non-registered population. Caution needs to be taken to ensure that access to public services is not dependent on birth registration. This indicator is proposed to monitor targets 4.1, 4.2 (universal access to education), and 16.9 (legal identity for all). Statisticians should ensure that the design of household survey modules is suitable to capture non-registered populations, which may require substantial alterations to sampling designs to capture previously unmeasured populations.

Origin of Data: Administrative statistics, Household survey, Structural (for existence of legislation requiring registration)

Scope: Globally comparable

Source:

- At international level, data is collected by UNICEF through the Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS), Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) and national civil registry systems
- For alternative indicator B (birth registration): In addition to UNICEF, data from UNHCR and National administration/Government (Birth registration record and population census) are available

Links/Citations:

- UNICEF, available at: http://www.unicef.org/protection/57929_58010.html and http://www.unicef.org/protection/57929_58022.html#Birth
- Government of India, “Table 12: Birth Registration of Children (p. 50)“, in “India Country Report 2013: Statistical Appraisal”, available at: http://mospi.nic.in/Mospi_New/upload/SAARC_Development_Goals_%20India_Country_Report_29aug13.pdf

⁸⁰ This indicator is proposed by UNICEF, OSF/ Namati, Matt Andrews (Harvard), Charles Kenny (CGD), Post 2015 HLP and UNHCR, and drawn from the following Virtual Network lists: 1st and 2nd TST Master List, TST Core Set, TST Further Information, Addis Ababa-AUC; UP-IEP, NY Long, Short, SDSN, TST Metadata and OHCHR.

- Republic of Zambia, “Table 5, Core 7: Birth Registration”, in “Zambia Sexual Behaviour Survey 2009”, available at: http://www.zamstats.gov.zm/report/Demo/zambia_sexual_behaviour_2009.pdf

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- Percentage of children under 1 whose births have been registered with civil authority
- Percentage of the adult population possessing a national identity document. “Possession” needs to be established by actual verification of the ID.
- Percentage of the population in possession of a birth certificate, disaggregated by by age, sex, region and population group, displacement and migratory status (including statelessness). “Possession” needs to be established by actual verification of the birth certificate.
- Percentage of the population in possession of a legal national ID, disaggregated by by age, sex, region and population group, displacement and migratory status (including statelessness). “Possession” needs to be established by actual verification of the ID.
- Civil registration rate for children under five
- Birth Registrations
- Percentage of the population with basic national identity documentation, by sex
- Percentage of the general population with birth registrations, by sex
- Percentage of people who possess legal identity, by sex
- Proportion of people in a state who possess a registered form of legal identification
- Percentage of adult population holding an identity document which allows them to access public services and entitlements, conclude a lease, open a bank account, and enter and leave their country of residence

Supplementary Indicators that measure other dimensions of Target 16.9 (By 2030, provide legal identity for all, including birth registration)

16.9.a Existence of a fair, transparent and accessible process for obtaining legal identification exists

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Existence of legislation requiring births to be registered by an official institution, which makes allowances for late birth registration
- b. The proportion of requests for identity documents fulfilled or rejected on stated grounds within a reasonable amount of time, defined as X days

16.9.b Population figures made publicly available and updated annually (underpinned by regular periodic population census)

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Population figures used as a basis for political representation and budget allocation are updated annually on the basis of best available information – underpinned by regular periodic population census

Target 16.10

Ensure public access to information and protect fundamental freedoms, in accordance with national legislation and international agreements

Suggested Indicator 16.10.1. Percentage of budget documents, off budget revenue documents, procurement and natural resource concessions publically available and easily accessible in open data format (alternatively: The extent to which budget documents....)⁸¹

Relevance: The indicator gives a broad measure of the extent that information on the operations of government is publicly available, focusing on the critical areas of expenditures and revenues, public procurement and concessions for natural resources. It does not represent the full breadth of public access to information, as there is no single indicator that can measure full access to information. An alternative indicator proposed by some members of the virtual network would be a measure of compliance, a structural or process indicator measuring representing the enabling and legal environment around public access to information, based on the principle that all people should have legally guaranteed access to what should be public information (see supplementary indicator 16.10.a).

Type of Indicator: Process indicator

Simplicity: This indicator is very simple (perhaps overly simplified) and, on its own, does not measure the full breadth of public access to information for modern societies and governments.

Feasibility: It may be difficult to measure/identify/define how many total, relevant government documents are available (the denominator for determining percentage. Continuing access and preservation of information is also important to ensure transparency.

Origin of Data: Administrative data (for alternative language using extent: Expert review)

Scope: Globally comparable, Regional for African Development Bank (AFDB) Governance Ratings 2011

Source:

- African Development Bank (AFDB) for Governance Ratings 2011 (All 53 African countries covered, 2005-2011)
- Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA)

Links/Citations: Data for 149 countries (collected on 398+ occasions), available at: www.pefa.org

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Compliance with international standards for budget transparency
- b. Compliance with recommendations from the Universal Periodic Review and UN Treaty
- c. Countries publish timely, comprehensive, comparable, and useable fiscal reports throughout the year according to a set of graduated standards, derived from established international norms i.e. the Open Budget Survey (IBP)
- d. Publication of fiscal reports by government according to a set of graduated standards, derived from established international norms

⁸¹ This indicator is drawn from the following Virtual Network lists: 1st and 2nd TST Master List, TST Core Set, TST Further Information and TST Metadata.

- e. Percentage of government expenditures, procurement and revenue information that is publicly available
- f. Publication of information pertinent to each and all of the Sustainable Development Goals, including implementation of relevant legal guarantees and mechanisms

Potential Disaggregations or Quantifiable Derivatives:

- a. Percentage of government revenues, procurement and natural resource concessions that are publicly available and easily accessible in open data format
- b. Publicly available reports on court spending (annually)
- c. Public reports on spending for prisons

Suggested Indicator 16.10.2. Number of verified cases of killing, kidnapping, enforced disappearances, arbitrary detention, assault and torture of journalists, associated media personnel, trade unionists and human rights advocates in the previous 12 months⁸²

Relevance: This indicator is a proxy for the freedoms of expression, including freedom of the media, association and peaceful assembly. This is a good measure of how fundamental freedoms are protected in practice, as it focuses on human rights violations that are generally committed against individuals challenging official positions. States have an international human rights obligation to respect, protect and fulfill the fundamental freedoms of all individuals. Therefore if this obligation is fully realized over the time period, the number of such cases will be zero, and a value above zero should result in clear policy measures, which are detailed in international human rights standards.

Type of Indicator: Outcome indicator

Simplicity: Data has a high level of measurability and accuracy. The indicator is specific as the terms are clearly defined in international law. It is easy to understand and interpret, but it might lead to misunderstanding because numbers alone do not tell the whole story. This indicator is complementary to other indicators as it does not fully cover other aspects of the target, such as “public access to information”. It does not include millions of people who create and share information via social media, community media and others who are not accredited media personnel or who identify as social media advocates. Therefore more than one indicator is necessary to measure this target.

Feasibility: This indicator collates data from multiple sources listed below and updated regularly. As it relies upon reports of individual events, this indicator may underestimate (or sometimes, though more rarely, overestimate) the true number of cases. In most instances, the number of cases reported will depend on the access to information, motivation and perseverance of civil society organizations and the media. In order to reduce the total number of global indicators, this indicator is proposed to monitor targets 5.2 (violence against women), 16.1 (violence and deaths), 16.3 (rule of law), 16.6 (accountable institutions) and 16.10 (protection of fundamental freedoms).

Origin of Data: Expert review, Events-based, Administrative statistics

Scope: Globally comparable

Source:

- At the national level, relevant police and judicial statistics may be available. Data may also be collected through automated text analysis of media or online sources, with appropriate verification
- At the international level, some data for this indicator are currently collected by way of the UNESCO Media Development Indicators, OHCHR reports on violations of media freedom, UNESCO Journalist Safety Indicators, the World Report on Freedom of Expression and Media Development, and the annual reports of the Human Rights Council-mandated Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances, communication reports of Special Procedures of the Human Rights Council, and individual complaints to relevant treaty bodies
- Regarding NGO sources, Reporters without Borders, Article 19, the Human Rights Observatory, Press Freedom Barometer and Committee to Protect Journalists are among those that collate relevant data at the international level.

⁸² This indicator is drawn from the following Virtual Network lists: 1st and 2nd TST Master List, TST Core Set, TST Further Information, UN-IEP, Glen Cove, SDSN, TST Metadata and OHCHR.

Links/Citations:

- Reporters Without Borders, available at: <http://www.rsf.org> and Article 19, at: <http://www.article19.org>
- The annual reports of the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances and Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances, available at: www.ohchr.org
- Declaration on the Right and Responsibility of Individuals, Groups and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognized Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, available at: <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/SRHRDefenders/Pages/Declaration.aspx>
- UNITED NATIONS (2004), Human Rights Defenders: Protecting the Right to Defend Human Rights, available at: <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/SRHRDefenders/Pages/SRHRDefendersIndex.aspx>
- UNITED NATIONS (2012), Human Rights Indicators: A Guide to Measurement and Implementation, available at: <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Indicators/Pages/HRIndicatorsIndex.aspx>
- UNITED NATIONS (2014), The Safety of Journalists and the Danger of Impunity: Report by the Director-General to the Intergovernmental Council of the IPDC (Twenty-Ninth Session), available at: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002301/230101E.pdf>

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Implementation of the UN Plan of Action on the Safety of Journalists and the Issue of Impunity, as mandated by the UN Chief Executives Board and monitored by UNESCO in compliance with recent General Assembly and Security Council resolutions on the protection of journalists and independent media
- b. Number of verified cases of killing, kidnapping, enforced disappearance, arbitrary detention and torture of journalists, associated media personnel, trade unionists and human rights advocates in the previous 12 months
- c. Number of journalists killed, imprisoned, missing or in exile
- d. Number and types of attacks on human rights defenders and journalists
- e. Number of journalists and associated media personnel that are physically attacked, unlawfully detained or killed as a result of pursuing their legitimate activities
- f. Reported cases of killing, enforced disappearance, arbitrary detention, assault and torture of journalists or human rights defenders
- g. Proportion of [journalists/media professionals] who affirm having received threats in the last 12 months

Potential Disaggregations or Quantifiable Derivatives:

- a. Reduction in number of journalists killed, number of journalists who report sanctions
- b. Proportion of journalists and any other media persons who reported sanctions, political or corporate pressure for the publication of information

Further Note from the Virtual Network: A multi-target indicator on 'fundamental freedoms' has been backed by UNESCO, ILO and the OHCHR. This has developed since the Virtual Network has been convened and so was not included as a "suggested" indicator, but might well be considered one if the Network were convened today. The wording of the proposed multi-target indicator would be as follows:

Numbers of violations of fundamental freedoms which impact on public access to information, and percentage of judicial cases resolved (disaggregated by

targeted group: journalists, associated media personnel; human rights defenders; trade unionists; human rights advocates).

This alternative proposed indicator for SDG 16.10 would formally incorporate into the SDGs monitoring framework the regular progress reports by UNESCO on the implementation of the UN Plan of Action on the Safety of Journalists and the Issue of Impunity, which was adopted by the UN Chief Executives Board on 12 April 2012, in accord with UN Security Council Resolutions 2222 of May 2015 and 1738 of December 2006; UN General Assembly Resolutions 68/163 of December 2013 and 69/185 of December 2014; and UN Human Rights Council Resolutions 21/12 of September 2012 and 27/5 of September 2014, among other relevant United Nations resolutions, declarations, and conventions on the protection of journalists and independent media. Led by UNESCO, the UN Plan of Action draws on normative and programmatic support from UNDP, DPI and the UNHCHR, among other UN agencies and offices. It marks the first effort to systematically bring the UN family of agencies together with other relevant stakeholders to address the worsening situation of the safety of journalists.

UNESCO's biannual reports on the Plan's implementation include surveys of national government actions to investigate, prosecute and prevent killings and abductions of working journalists and UN system efforts to strengthen legal and physical protections of independent media. As emphasized in the Riga Declaration, adopted by consensus at the 2015 UN World Press Freedom Day commemoration in Latvia, the safety of journalists and the issue of impunity “are directly relevant to implementing the proposed Sustainable Development Goal 16,” particularly the SDG 16.10 target ensuring public access to information. The Riga Declaration called on UNESCO to continue “highlighting the importance of freedom of expression, public access to information and the safety of journalists and the issue of impunity within the post-2015 development agenda processes” and “coordinating the implementation of the UN Plan of Action throughout the UN system.”

The member organizations of GFMD as well as other leading civil society champions of SDG16.10, such as Article 19 and the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA), continue to insist on the critical importance of both categories of indicator for this target: the first monitoring official measures taken to ‘ensure public access to information,’ as the target language plainly stipulates, and the second evaluating the enabling legal and security environment for independent media and freedom of expression, which is a prerequisite for public access to information as envisaged by SDG16.10.

Suggested Indicator 16.10.3. Percentage of population who believe they can express political opinion without fear⁸³

Relevance: This indicator is highly relevant to target and likely to have meaningful change over the time period on the national level, on the one hand. This indicator may be differently understood in different country contexts and care should be taken in comparing results across countries (aggregating at the global level may not be meaningful). Popular understanding of what constitutes legitimate and permissibly expressed “political opinion” will itself change if/as freedom of political expression is gradually strengthened and differ by country.

Type of Indicator: Output

Simplicity: This is a simple indicator. It has been used in a number of countries and contexts and is well understood by survey respondents and the results are easily interpretable by policymakers.

Feasibility: Data is updated regularly and already used in a number of surveys.

Origin of Data: Perception survey

Scope: Globally comparable

Source:

- The Gallup World Poll asks this precise question with an established, proven methodology.

Links/Citations:

- <http://www.gallup.com/poll/105226/world-poll-methodology.aspx>

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Ability to express political opinions, Gallup World Poll
- b. AFROBAROMETER SURVEY QUESTIONS:
 - i. In this country, how free are you say what you want?
 - ii. In this country, how free are you to join any political organization you want?
 - iii. In this country, how free are you to choose to vote for without feeling pressured?
- c. Number of people who have signed a petition, joined in boycotts, attended peaceful demonstrations, joined strikes or any other protest
- d. Percentage of respondents indicating (Yes, No) that they have taken part in (A) a petition; (B) a strike; (C) a demonstration in the previous 12 months
- e. ISS-ISD Combined score:
 - i. The cost of social organizations
 - ii. How easy it is for individuals to form group associations?
 - iii. Likelihood of collective action

⁸³ This indicator is drawn from the following Virtual Network lists: 1st TST Master List, UN-IEP, Glen Cove, NY Long and NY Short.

***Supplementary Indicators that measure other dimensions of Target 16.10
(Ensure public access to information and protect fundamental freedoms, in
accordance with national legislation and international agreements)***

***16.10.a Extent to which the rights to freedom of expression, association, peaceful
assembly and access to information are guaranteed in law and practice⁸⁴***

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Existence of a comprehensive law and legal regime that ensures the right of access to information from public bodies, based on international standards
- b. Existence and implementation of a national law and/or constitutional guarantee on the right to information
- c. National Open Data Policy in place
- d. Existence of law on access to information, which specifies a time limit for responding to requests
- e. Existence of an RTI law that establishes:
 - i. citizens' access to information, including laws, budgets, and expenditures,
 - ii. defines a time limit for responding to RTI requests, and
 - iii. establishes a mechanism for appeal in the event of denial
- f. Existence of legislation for freedom of expression, media, association and peaceful assembly
- g. National law or constitutional guarantee on [freedom of expression/freedom of assembly]
- h. Percentage of laws that are publicly available
- i. Percentage of population who have access to all legislation
- j. Percentage of laws that are translated in all official language(s)
- k. Number and proportion (by sector of activity) of associations closed, dissolved or suspended
- l. V-Dem Freedom of Association Index
 - i. Ban to political parties or to forming a party
 - ii. Government control over CSO formation and activity
 - iii. Multiparty elections

***16.10.b Monitoring the adoption and implementation of constitutional,
statutory and/or policy guarantees and mechanisms for public access to
information***

***16.10.c Percentage of respondents saying that (No, A little, Enough, Too much)
information is provided to citizens by the national government on government
decisions***

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- f. % of people who report knowledge of where to find information about the provision of (particular) state services
- g. Public satisfaction with access to public information, including through the media
- h. Proportion of people satisfied with system for processing information requests

⁸⁴ Could be tracked by the OHCHR through data provided by states and non-states actors as input to the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) of the UN Human Rights Council, available at: www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/UPR/Pages/UPRMain.aspx. GFMD, TAP network and others recommend this as a complementary indicator.

16.10.d World Press Freedom Index, Reporters Without Borders

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Press Freedom Index, Freedom House
- b. Proportion of population believing that the Media of their country are free
- c. V-Dem Media Openness Index
- d. % of journalists that are women
- e. Proportion of licensed radio & TV media organizations that broadcast non-official local languages at least once a day

16.10.e Numbers of websites blocked and of data users provided by internet service providers on requests from governments⁸⁵

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Number of blocked online sources and websites

16.10.f Proportion of people who perceive freedom of speech is granted in their country

16.10.g Number of Freedom of Information (FOI) requests per capita

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. The response rate to FOI requests
- b. Proportion of FOI requests that meet minimum standards of timeliness and open standards
- c. Percentage of public requests for official information are granted
- d. Information of public importance about all public authorities is released in a timely manner (proactive disclosure framework)
- e. The proportion of requests for information lodged and answered fully in a reasonable amount of time, defined as X days
- f. Number of laws governing direct interactions between citizens and the state, for which simple restatements have been publicized (e.g. information posted online, disseminated through media, and in visible public spaces)
- g. Average time taken and average fee charged by public bodies to respond to freedom of information requests
- h. Proportion of information requests by the media responded to effectively by the Government

16.10.h Individuals using the internet

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Percentage of individuals using the Internet

⁸⁵ Comments from VN: This would need further specification, because many countries block websites on a clear legal basis and in accordance with principles of the rule of law. Reporting in this important area requires legal and cultural contextual analysis, and is most usefully incorporated as one of many relevant criteria considered by 'expert review' evaluations of progress on ensuring public access to information, along with overall public accessibility of digital information platforms and services. Suggestions might also include sites conducting illegal transactions, illegal pornographic data and others.

16.10.i Individuals owning a mobile phone

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Percentage of individuals using a mobile cellular telephone

16.10.j Indexes of Freedom

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Freedom in the World Survey, Freedom House
 - i. Level of political rights [free, partly-free, not-free]:
 - a) Electoral process
 - b) Political pluralism and participation
 - c) Functioning of government
 - ii. Level of civil liberties [free, partly-free, not-free]:
 - a) Freedom of expression and belief
 - b) Associational and organizational rights
 - c) Rule of law
 - d) Personal autonomy and individual rights
- b. V-Dem Fundamental Freedom Index
 - i. Freedom of religion
 - ii. Freedom from torture
 - iii. Freedom from political killings
 - iv. Freedom of foreign/domestic movement
 - v. Freedom from forced labor
 - vi. Respect for property rights
 - vii. Respect for access to justice

16.10.k World Bank Worldwide Governance Indicator, Voice and Accountability Score

16.10.l Number of registered CSOs per 100,000 inhabitants

16.10.m Proportion of people who report feeling free to join civil society organizations, by sex

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Proportion of people who report being free to join a civil society organization

16.10.n Number of days required to legally establish an operational civil society organization

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Number of days it takes to register a CSO

16.10.o Number and proportion (by sector of activity) of associations closed, dissolved or suspended

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. V-Dem Core Civil Society Index
 - i. CSO entry and exit

- ii. CSO repression
- iii. CSO participatory environment

16.10.p Union density rate

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Collective bargaining coverage rate

Linked Indicators:

- a. Ratification and adoption of ILO Convention Nos. 87 and 98 on freedom of association and collective bargaining

16.10.q Literacy rate of Youth and Adults, urban and rural literacy rate

16.10.r Media and Information (MIL) competencies

Target 16.a

Strengthen relevant national institutions, including through international cooperation, for building capacity at all levels, in particular in developing countries, to prevent violence and combat terrorism and crime

Suggested Indicator 16.a.1. Percentage of requests for international cooperation (law enforcement cooperation, mutual legal assistance* and extraditions**) made through existing conventions that were met during the reporting year⁸⁶

Clarification: “Mutual legal assistance” refers to various types of formal legal assistance given by one State to another State to support the requesting State in the criminal justice process. “Extradition” refers to the surrender of an alleged or convicted criminal from one State to another state. Both concepts respond to the growing need for international cooperation in criminal matters at a time when criminal activities increasingly cross-national borders.

Relevance: The indicator signifies the capacity of a state to afford mutual legal assistance and extraditions in relation to the requests submitted by other states.

Type of Indicator: Process

Simplicity: This is a simple structural variable as it can be easily quantified and counted. It is not particularly accessible or specific, as different countries are likely to be parties to different cooperation agreements.

Feasibility: A universal coverage of the indicator is considered feasible, taking into account that most countries have concluded a large number of bilateral and/or multilateral MLA and extradition agreements and have designated institutional focal points for incoming and outgoing requests for MLA and extraditions that keep detailed records.

Origin of Data: Administrative statistics

Scope: Globally comparable

Source:

- UNODC has information on UNCAC ratification and for about 80 countries to date which have undergone the implementation review of UNCAC, chapter 3 [Criminalization and Law enforcement] and 4 [International Cooperation].
- Statistics are provided; UNODC fielded a special module of the 2013 United Nations Survey of Crime Trends and the Operations of Criminal Justice Systems in which countries were asked to report relevant data on mutual legal assistance (MLA) and extradition. Data on MLA were provided by 30 countries, while data on the number of MLA requests granted were available for 13 countries. Data on extradition were provided by 35 countries, while data on the number of extradition requests granted were available for 24 countries.

Links/Citations:

⁸⁶ This indicator is drawn from the following Virtual Network lists: 1st TST Master List, TST Further Information and TST Metadata.

- Philippines, National Economic and Development Authority, “General Appropriations Act, FY 2015”, <http://www.dbm.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/GAA/GAA2015/GAA%202015%20Volume%20I/NEDA/NEDA.pdf>

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Proportion of requests for Mutual Legal Assistance that are met

***Supplementary Indicators that measure other dimensions of Target 16.a
(Strengthen relevant national institutions, including through international
cooperation, for building capacity at all levels, in particular in developing
countries, to prevent violence and combat terrorism and crime)***

***16.a.a Percentage of population who express confidence in the impartiality of the
security forces, police and judicial mechanisms (both formal and informal) in
treating people fairly regardless of their race, colour, sex, language, religion,
political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other
status***

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Percentage of population who express confidence in the impartiality of judicial mechanisms
- b. Criminal Justice Score, World Justice Project:
 - i. Criminal investigation system is effective
 - ii. Criminal adjudication system is timely and effective
 - iii. Correctional system is effective in reducing criminal behavior
 - iv. Criminal system is impartial
 - v. Criminal system is free of corruption
 - vi. Criminal system is free of improper government influence
 - vii. Due process of law and rights of the accused
- c. Percentage of people who felt discriminated by police, justice or other security institution
- d. Public confidence in the performance of justice institutions (formal/customary), including human rights mechanisms
- e. Public confidence in the performance of security institutions
- f. Percentage of [police/judges] who have been hired through formal and standard procedure
- g. Existence of violence prevention or conflict prevention action plans
- h. Percentage of victims who report physical and/or sexual crime to law enforcement agencies
 - a. This indicator would use the same data source as victimization surveys from 16.1

***16.a.b Indicator on international cooperation in preventing violence and
combating terrorism and crime [to be developed - This indicator will track
international cooperation for building capacities at all levels, in particular in
developing countries, for preventing violence and combating terrorism and
crime]***

Target 16.b

Promote and enforce non-discriminatory laws and policies for sustainable development

Suggested Indicator 16.b.1. Proportion of the population who believe that state institutions are treating people of all groups fairly, equitably and without discrimination⁸⁷

Relevance:

Type of Indicator: Outcome indicator

Simplicity:

Feasibility:

Origin of Data: Population survey, Crime victimization surveys

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Reported number of victims of direct and indirect discrimination and hate crimes
- b. Percentage of population reporting having personally felt discriminated against or harassed within the last 12 months on the basis of a ground of discrimination prohibited under international human rights law

Potential Disaggregations or Quantifiable Derivatives:

- a. Proportion of people who felt discriminated by the national justice system
- b. Percentage of people who felt discriminated by police, justice or other security institution

Linked Indicators:

- a. Reduction in the % of people who report being denied access to services (health/education/etc.) because of discrimination
- b. Reduction in the % of people who report being denied access to services (health/education/etc.) because of lack of identity documentation

⁸⁷ This indicator is drawn from the following Virtual Network list: TST Prioritized Indicators.

Suggested Indicator 16.b.2. Existence of independent national human rights institutions (NHRIs) in compliance with the Paris Principles⁸⁸

Relevance: This indicator measures the global continual efforts of countries in setting up independent national institutions, through international cooperation, to promote inclusive, peaceful and accountable societies. The creation and fosterage of a NHRI indicates a State's commitment to promote and protect the human rights provided in international human rights instruments. Compliance with the Paris Principles vest NHRIs with a broad mandate, competence and power to investigate, report on the national human rights situation, and publicize human rights through information and education.

Type of Indicator: Outcome

Simplicity: Data has a high level of measurability.

Feasibility: The main source of data on the indicator is administrative records of the Sub-Committee on Accreditation reports of the ICC. OHCHR compiles the data into a global directory of NHRI status accreditation updated every six months, after the Sub-committee on Accreditation submits its report. This information can be accessed on a continuous basis, including through maps. This indicator is proposed to monitor targets 10.3 (eliminate discriminatory laws), 16a (strengthen national institutions) and 16b (promote and enforce non-discriminatory laws).

Origin of Data: Administrative data

Source: International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions (ICC), OHCHR

Links/Citations:

- A global directory of NHRI status accreditation is available at: http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/HRIndicators/NHRI_May2014_map.pdf
- Data for the indicator are available here: <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Countries/NHRI/Pages/NHRIMain.aspx>
- Maps of the data are available here: <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Indicators/Pages/HRIndicatorsIndex.aspx>

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Existence of an independent national Human Rights institution

Linked Indicators

- a. Type of accreditation of National Human Rights Institutions by the rules of procedure of the International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions
- b. Ratification of Human Rights treaties

⁸⁸ This indicator is drawn from the following Virtual Network lists: 1st TST Master List, TST Further Information, UN-IEP, TST Metadata and OHCHR.

***Supplementary Indicators that measure other dimensions of Target 16.b
(Promote and enforce non-discriminatory laws and policies for sustainable
development)***

16.b.a Existence of domestic laws for implementing non-discrimination

***16.b.b Existence of an independent body responsible for promoting and
protecting the right to non-discrimination***

***16.b.c Inequality gaps (ratio of most deprived population to the rest of the
population or most advantaged population) using indicators disaggregated to
the extent feasible by all grounds of discrimination prohibited by international
human rights law, including sex, age, geographical residence (e.g. rural/urban),
ethnic background, income and disabilities***

***16.b.d Combined scores: freedom of speech, freedom of assembly & association,
electoral self-determination, Cingranelli-Richards (CIRI) Database***

Annex 2: Input Indicators on Peace, Justice and Institutions

Peace

Input Indicator 1. Military spending as a percentage of GDP

Input Indicator 2. Number of police and judicial sector personnel (qualified judges, magistrates, prosecutors, defense attorneys) per 100,000 and distribution across the territory

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Number of police, security and judiciary personnel per 100,000 people
- b. Number of national security forces personnel (including police and gendarmerie) per 100,000 people
- c. Number of police personnel per 100,000 people, by sex

Potential Disaggregations or Quantifiable Derivatives:

- a. Ratio of police personnel to citizens per 100,000
- b. Ratio of military personnel to citizens per 100,000

Linked Indicators:

- a. Proportion of women in managerial positions in national security institutions (military and police)
- b. Sex distribution in managerial positions in national security forces, police and judiciary
- c. Proportion of law enforcement professionals who are women (including judges, military and police)

Input Indicator 3. Average number of months of basic police training for new recruits

Input Indicator 4. Percentage of personnel in national security system that has been trained to address sexual and gender-based violence cases, by sex and by managerial level

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Ratio of official security personnel specifically dedicated to the fight against gender based violence per 100 000 people
- b. Proportion of security personnel trained on how to address gender based violence

Input Indicator 5. Proportion of public budget allocated to police, security and justice

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Percentage of public budget dedicated to security institutions and prisons

Input Indicator 6. Frequency of payment of salaries within police force

Justice

Input Indicator 7. Number of legal professionals produced annually

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Physical accessibility of formal and customary judicial services to the public
- b. Number of judicial personnel (qualified judges, magistrates, etc.) per 100,000 population and distribution across the territory

Input Indicator 8. Number of police and judicial sector personnel (qualified judges, magistrates, prosecutors, defense attorneys) per 100,000 and distribution across the territory

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Number of police, security and judiciary personnel per 100,000 people
- b. Number of justice sector personnel per 100,000 population, by sex
- c. Number of judiciary personnel per 100,000 people
- d. Number of judges, prosecutors, and defence lawyers per 100,000 people
- e. Number of legal and paralegal service providers per 100,000 persons, by sex

Potential Disaggregations or Quantifiable Derivatives:

- a. Ratio of justice personnel per 100,000 people
- b. Ratio of judges/magistrates per 100,000 people
- c. Judges/magistrates to population ratio
- d. Number of public defense lawyers per 100,000, by sex
- e. Number of child-specialized judges per 100,000 people
- f. Number of judges per violent death

Linked Indicators:

- a. Sex distribution in managerial positions in national security forces, police and judiciary
- b. Proportion of law enforcement professionals who are women (including judges, military and police)

Input Indicator 9. Minimum resources, staffing and recruitment procedures for judiciary system – including courts, judges, court personnel, prosecutors and defense counsels

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Presence of vetting process for new judiciary personnel
- b. Minimum standards to protect court personnel
- c. Number of lawyers per 100,000 population and/or number and frequency of circuit courts

Input Indicator 10. Minimum resources, staffing and recruitment procedures for penal system – including prisons, prison personnel

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Public reports on spending for prisons
- b. Regularity of payments for penal system personnel
- c. Presence of vetting process for new penal system recruits
- d. Skills and competencies of penal system personnel
- e. Management of prison systems in compliance with human rights standards
- f. Separate detention facilities for women and children

Input Indicator 11. Independence of Judiciary

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. % of judges who are appointed for fixed terms that provide a guaranteed tenure, which is protected until retirement age or the expiration of a defined term of substantial duration
- b. Independence of Judiciary (CIRI Human Rights Database); Judicial independence/Score (WEF Global Competitiveness Report, BTI)

Institutions

Input Indicator 12. WORLD BANK CPIA – Quality of Public Administration

Input Indicator 13. Regulatory Framework for Political Finance and/or Political Finance Database

Input Indicator 14. WORLD BANK – Open Contracting Initiative

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Proportion of government procurement (financial value) awarded through an open and competitive process
- b. Open and transparent bidding process, government publication
- c. Public advertising of all government procurement
- d. Percentage of government procurement that is advertised publicly OR Percentage of procurement decisions
- e. The Government publishes the results of all procurement decisions

Input Indicator 15. Extractive industries transparency initiative status (compliant, candidate, suspended, or other)

Input Indicator 16. Number of civil servants (administrative employees of the state) per 100,000 population

Alternative Indicators or Specifications:

- a. Number of auditors per 10,000 government employees
- b. Number of national statisticians per 10,000 government employees
- c. Budget for audit and reporting
- d. Budget for national statistics

Input Indicator 17. Independence of Auditing Authorities

Input Indicator 18. Independence of National Statistics Offices in Data Analysis (expert assessment)

Input Indicator 19. World Bank Statistical Capacity Indicator (SCI)