

GENERAL COMMENTS ON IAEG-SDGs PROPOSAL

Comment by ATD Fourth World:

The Outcome Document states in paragraph 74 that follow up and review processes should be based on “data which is high-quality, accessible, timely, reliable and disaggregated by income, sex, age, race, ethnicity, migration status, disability and geographic location and other characteristics relevant in national contexts”. Following this recommendation the note on disaggregation on the proposed list of indicators should include income and disability as part of the explicit factors together with sex, age and residence (U/R). They are factors that are relevant to all contexts and countries.

16.1 significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere

Number of victims of intentional homicide by age, sex, mechanism and where possible type of perpetrator, per 100,000 population

Comments by Saferworld: KEEP

This is a strong indicator. Efforts will be required to widen coverage and overcome reliance on estimates.

Conflict-related deaths per 100,000 people (disaggregated by age, sex and cause)

Comments by Saferworld: KEEP

This is a strong indicator. Few NSOs, however, currently collect data on it, meaning that third parties such as the Uppsala Conflict Database Program will be required for initial global baselines and/or could be authorised by the UNSC to be the primary source for this data, using a consistent methodology across countries. In the long-term, NSOs could collect this data.

It should be noted that there is a difference between direct conflict deaths and conflict-related deaths, which include for example those who die of disease due to displacement from conflict (which is potentially harder to get data on). The IAEG may want to consider changing the wording.

Comment by ATD Fourth Word: ADD

This indicator should be disaggregated by income, disability and social groups to assess how violence affects different groups and to measure progress on the poorest and most marginalized and discriminated against.

ADD: Percentage of people who report that they feel safe walking alone at night in the city or area where they live

Comments by Saferworld: ADD

This perception indicator is a direct measure of people's sense of security and freedom from fear, underpinning the target and the aspiration of the wider goal.

It's strength also comes from the fact that, when disaggregated by urban/rural, age, gender, the indicator can be used for targets 5.2, 10.2, 10.3, 11.1, 11.2, 11.7, 16.2, 16.a

Global data for this indicator could be drawn from Gallup's annual World Poll, which covers 95% of the world's population. Nonetheless, the indicator is already being used by several NSOs, including those in Africa that are part of the SHaSA process. The indicator could be packaged into household, victimisation or national polling surveys.

Proposed Indicator by Nonviolence International: Investment in peace education leading to reduction in desire to use Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW), measured as a) Money invested, and b) Number of peace education programs (quantitative, data source - International Action Network on Small Arms (IANSA))

Proposed Indicator by Nonviolence International: Annual reduction in medical statistics on gun related violence and death (quantitative, data source – International Action Network on Small Arms (IANSA))

Indicator should ensure provision of data on number of country where laws have been enacted or reformed to ensure punishment for violence particularly gender based violence.

Indicator and Data source should reflect per cent reduction in murder cases.

Indicator and Data source should reflect per cent reduction in Violence Against Women, Sexual Violence and Gender Based Violence

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

Percentage of children aged 1-14 years who experienced any physical punishment by caregivers in the past month

Comments by Saferworld: KEEP

This is a strong indicator that has widespread support.

Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age and form of exploitation

Comments by Saferworld: KEEP

This is a strong indicator that could be used in 5.2, 10.7. Due to the illicit nature of human trafficking, accurate data may be challenging to access.

Proposed Indicator by Nonviolence International: Number of community and traditional leaders involved in the fight to end child abuse, exploitation and trafficking (quantitative, data source International Action Network on Small Arms (IANSA))

International Labour Organisation (ILO) has stated that there are 4.5 million victims of sex trafficking in the world. Data on victims under control of traffickers from oaths taking rituals or threats to victim's life and family. Louisa Eikhomun Echoes of Women in Africa Initiative

Indicator and Data source should reflect per cent reduction in child abuse, child labour and child trafficking

Indicator and Data source should reflect per cent reduction in murder cases infanticide

Number of victims of intentional infanticide by age, sex, mechanism and where possible type of perpetrator, per 100,000 population

Reduction in Number of child molestation cases reported at the police station and to community police

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

“Percentage of victims of violence in the previous 12 months who reported their victimization to competent authorities or other officially recognized conflict resolution mechanisms (also called crime reporting rate)”

Comments by Saferworld: MOVE

This indicator is already used below in 16a and is a better proxy measure of security service capacity and public confidence in authorities. Its direct relevance to justice and the rule of law is limited.

Comment by ATD Fourth World

As proposed by UN WOMEN this indicator should be disaggregated by income to measure progress on access to justice by the lowest quintile

Comments by OSF: REMOVE

The proposed indicator is already incorporated into target 16.a and a further focus on criminal justice does not advance the balance and ambition sought in the SDG outcome document.

ALTERNATE: 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 just

Comments by Saferworld: ALTERNATE

This is potentially a very informative objective indicator that directly captures the target's intended outcome, which is people's access to an effective dispute resolution mechanism – the heart of justice. Importantly, its focus goes beyond the formal justice sector. This indicator has been tested in several contexts and can be easily added to household surveys or national polling.

ALTERNATE: Proportion of the population who live within reasonable reach (measured in km or time of travel) of a primary justice service provider (e.g. a qualified lawyer, paralegal, or other person trained to act as a legal advisor) whose resolutions are fair and enforced

Comments by Namati:

I am not set on this over the above alternative Saferworld put forwards, if there is the ability to merge so that reach (measured in time/distance) is covered. This data can be collected through administrative data, GIS, and public surveys. Government data on legal forums is readily available. Governments and civil society would need to cooperate to collect data on legal aid/ primary justice service providers, as services are often provided by NGOs. While, this may be problematic in fragile and conflict-affected states, states lacking political will, and regions with poor communication and transportation infrastructure. Increasingly, Geographic Information Systems (GIS) can overlay geographic population data with that of justice services so as to generate per capita ratios of coverage. Having information on reach allows for better sub national planning and coordination among primary justice providers to ensure access to justice for all - Kenya is a good example of where this has been effective.

Comments by OSF -- ALTERNATE: We recommend the alternative indicator: "**proportion of those who have experienced a dispute in the past 12 months and who report access to a fair formal, informal, alternative or traditional dispute resolution mechanism**". This indicator is highly relevant for the target's focus on rule of law and access to justice, is simple to understand, is currently gathered through household surveys and is available for 107 countries. This indicator was recommended by the TST and the virtual network on goal 16 indicators and we would urge its inclusion. I would also note that this is the language used by the virtual network and within the TST and that agreeing on this within TAP could help solidify a consensus for the IAEG.

Unsentenced detainees as percentage of overall prison population

Comments by Saferworld: REMOVE

While this indicator has some merit when used along with public confidence indicators, it risks incentivising speedy but unjust trials. The link between the speed of sentencing and the quality of the rule of law or people's access to justice should not be assumed.

Comments by OSF: AMEND

While we welcome the focus on the theme of pre-trial detention, the current construction is problematic: it is insensitive to change, not action-oriented, and is not useful for international comparison. We recommend the IAEG build upon one of the initial TST suggestions:

“Percentage of total remandees who have been held in detention for more than 12 months while awaiting trial, sentencing or a final disposition”. We would further note that not all jurisdictions count the start and end point of detention in the same way and that this indicator, on its own, does not measure the quality of the justice served and there are risks that, without a complementary basket of indicators, it could incentivize speedy trials without due process.

ALTERNATE: Percentage of people who voice confidence in the judicial system

This perception indicator gathers people's views on the judicial system – and is potentially a proxy of their confidence in the rule of law more widely (making it also useful for 16.6, 16.7 and 16b). When used alongside other measures of justice, perception indicators can provide a validation of whether people believe that the justice system is fair and effective. Data on this indicator already exists in the Gallup World Poll, which could be used for global baselines, and it could be easily added to household surveys or national polls.

Comments by Namati:

If we can extend this from just the judicial system to make clear both formal and informal primary justice services are reviewed.

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

Total value of inward and outward illicit financial flows (in current US\$)

Comments by Saferworld: KEEP

This is a strong indicator. While the methodology can still be refined, Global Financial Integrity has shown how it can be used.

Total annual value of inward and outward illicit financial flows due to trade misinvoicing (in current US\$) at the country level.

Comments by Global Financial Integrity: REPLACE CURRENT INDICATOR

The way the current indicator is written it is unclear if it is meant to infer that total volumes should be provided on a country level or just the aggregated global level. The World Bank and IMF repeatedly referenced during FfD negotiations that country-level data is needed. Also, it is unclear in the current indicator if this exercise would be carried out only once or every year for the post-2015 period. We would suggest that the new indicator language on trade misinvoicing should spell out that these estimates of volumes should occur every year up to 2030 so that progress toward reducing them can be determined.

Further, there was considerable disagreement in the FfD negotiations over the definition of ‘illicit financial flows.’ However, ‘trade misinvoicing’ (i.e. trade fraud) has been defined in the academic literature and used for decades. Trade misinvoicing is the method that is used to move close to 80 percent of all illicit money offshore so it is relevant to the current target which calls for “substantially reduce illicit financial flows.” This change, we believe, will provide an indicator that is fit for purpose.

There are IMF studies and books that demonstrate the ability to use Direction of Trade Statistics to highlight the impact of illicit money leaving developing economies: The following is not a comprehensive list but is representative:

1. External Debt and Capital Flight in Sub-Saharan Africa, S. Ibi Ajayi and Moshin S. Khan, Editors, IMF, 2000 link: <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/nft/2000/extdebt/index.htm>
2. An Analysis of External Debt and Capital Flight in the Severely Indebted Low Income Countries in Sub-Saharan Africa, S. Ibi Ajayi, IMF Working Paper No. WP/97/68, June 1997
3. Capital Flight from Russia, Prakash Loungani and Paolo Mauro, IMF Policy Discussion Paper, PDP/00/06, June 2000 . This paper recognizes the role of trade misinvoicing in Russia but does not carry out the actual calculations. Uses a broader definition of the Hot Money method that includes the net errors and omissions to capture balance of payments leakages; link: <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/pdp/2000/pdp06.pdf>
4. Capital Flight: Scale and Nature L. Grigoryev and A. Kosarev, February 24, 2000 link <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/seminar/2000/invest/pdf/kosarev.pdf>
5. Philippines 2014 Article IV Consultation - Staff Report; Press Release; IMF Country Report No. 14/245; June 18, 2014 ; link: <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/scr/2014/cr14245.pdf>. This is an official Board Document on a member following an Article IV Consultation. It refers to the GFI study on the Philippines on page 52, footnote 3.
6. Putting the Cart Before the Horse? Capital Account Liberalization and Exchange Rate Flexibility in China Eswar Prasad, Thomas Rumbaugh, and Qing Wang January 1, 2005 IMF Policy Discussion Paper No. 05/1

7. [Money Laundering: Muddying the Macroeconomy - Finance & Development - March 1997 - Peter J. Quirk](#)
8. [Capital Controls: Country Experiences with Their Use and Liberalization IMF Occasional Paper 190, May 17, 2000 part 1 of 3](#)
9. [Robbing the Riches: Capital Flight, Institutions, and Instability; by Valerie Cerra, Meenakshi Rishi, and Sweta C. Saxena; IMF Working Paper 05/199; October 1, 2005.](#)

With these citations it would seem that the assessment of “robustness, reliability, validity” are self-evident and should be considered “high.” Further, the “Objective Verifiability” should also be listed as “high” given that these are IMF publications.

Comments by OSF: REPLACE CURRENT INDICATOR

The provision of financial secrecy by states is a key driver of illicit financial flows. We would propose two additional indicators for consideration:

- **“Financial Secrecy Ranking on the Financial Secrecy Index**
- **“The number of Tax Information Exchange Agreements ratified by jurisdiction”**

The Financial Secrecy Index produced every two years by the Tax Justice Network and ranks jurisdictions according to the level of financial secrecy they provide and global relevance of their financial services sector – the higher a country is ranked on the index, the more financial secrecy it provides.

Tax Information Exchange Agreements (TIEAs) allow tax administrators to better detect tax avoidance and evasion. Thus, the larger a jurisdiction’s TIEA treaty network, the less likely it should be for that jurisdiction to be used to facilitate illicit financial flows.

Percentage of seized and collected firearms that are recorded and traced, in accordance with international standards and legal instruments

SAFERWORLD SUGGESTS REPLACE WITH: Percentage of people who believe that illicit arms are widespread in their community

This indicator is based on survey questions developed as part of the UN International Small Arms Control Standards (ISACS). It would be a proxy for the extent to which people are affected by the illicit arms trade – thus being more outcome focused than the suggested indicator. The survey question could be easily added to household surveys or national polls.

ADD: Business perceptions of the cost of organised crime

This perception indicator is based on a survey of businesses, asking whether they believe organised crime imposes costs on business in their country. While this is a restricted perspective, its specific focus may be more revealing than generalised assessments. A weakness is that the indicator does not focus on transnational organised crime. Data are

currently collected for this indicator through the World Economic Forum's Global Competitiveness Report (WEF-GCR). 14,000 executives across 144 countries were polled on this question for its latest 2014–15 report. Data have been collected since 2005. As such, this indicator would be feasible for universal use with some expansion of coverage. In order to gather people's views on the presence of organised crime in their country or community, the indicator could also be relatively feasibly integrated into polling of the general public or into crime victimisation surveys.

ADD: Recovered stolen assets as a percentage of illicit financial flows

Comments by Saferworld: ADD

This issue of stolen assets in the target is not currently captured in the other indicators. As a percentage of illicit financial outflows in a given year – excluding trade mispricing – the indicator would demonstrate successes in proportion to the challenge.

Some countries currently maintain their own asset recovery databases. As part of the Stolen Asset Recovery Initiative (STAR), the World Bank and UNODC currently host the Asset Recovery Watch (ARW), which compiles, systematizes and publishes information about completed and active asset recovery efforts around the world.

Proposed Indicator by Nonviolence International (add back in): Percentage of small arms marked and recorded at the time of import in accordance with international standards (quantitative, data source International Tracing Instrument (ITI))

Proposed Indicator by Nonviolence International: Number of state marked SALW and number of manufacturers marking weapons for an importing state at point of manufacture (quantitative, data source UNODA)

Proposed Indicator by Nonviolence International: Number of weapons and ammunition stockpiles (quantitative, data source Small Arms Survey)

Proposed Indicator by Nonviolence International: Investment in CSO Campaigns to ban artisanal production of SALW (Ref. ECOWAS) (quantitative, Small Arms Survey)

Proposed Indicator by Nonviolence International: Police Statistics on thwarted organized crime or arrest and seizures of goods under OC (quantitative, data source UNODC)

16.5 substantially reduce corruption and bribery in all its forms

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.

Comments by Saferworld: KEEP

This is a strong indicator; it has already been used relatively comprehensively around the world.

Comments by Transparency International: KEEP

This indicator is the best options for measuring changes in corruption by using the proxy of reported experiences of bribery. The suggestion would be to look beyond official data sources for data and use regional surveys such as Afrobarometer (see question 56: http://www.afrobarometer.org/sites/default/files/questionnaires/Round%206/saf_r6_questionnaire.pdf) and Eurobarometer (http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_397_en.pdf) as well as global barometers (see question 7: http://www.transparency.org/gcb2013/in_detail)

Comments by Save the Children: KEEP - Considering that children come in contact with corruption and bribery on a daily basis, it would be important to ensure that this indicator is disaggregated by age (as suggested in the IAEG updated list of indicators) and that any household/perception surveys used are designed to also capture the perceptions of children taking their evolving capacities into account.

Comment by ATD Fourth World

This indicator should be disaggregated by income.

ADD: Percentage of people who believe that corruption is widespread throughout the government in their country

Comments by Saferworld: ADD

Furthermore, it should be noted that evidence of corruption is extremely challenging to collect, especially at high political levels beyond day to day experiences of most people: perceptions may be as close as we can get.

Data for this indicator are currently gathered through Gallup's World Poll and Transparency International's Corruption Perceptions Index, demonstrating the high feasibility of this indicator. It could be added to household, victimisation or national polling surveys.

Proposed Indicator by Nonviolence International: National action taken on Auditor General's Report by Parliament through Public Accounts Committee (quantitative, data source - International Action Network on Small Arms (IANSA))

Proposed Indicator by Nonviolence International: Annual volume of state prosecuted complaint cases (quantitative, data source UNODC)

16.6 develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels

Primary government expenditures as a percentage of original approved budget

International Budget Partnership Comment

This is difficult to assess when fiscal reports are not produced and made available. It is also not clear what is meant by 'primary government expenditures'.

IBP Suggested Indicator

Regular reporting on budgeted vs. actual revenues and expenditures, disaggregated by type of revenue and by sector/sub-sector.

Source: Various sources exist to complement the PEFA / World Bank assessments, including the Open Budget Survey by the International Budget Partnership, first published in 2006 and now in its fifth edition covering 102 countries.

CENTRE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS AND CLIMATE CHANGE RESEARCH: Alternate

Regular publication of fiscal reports of actual government expenditure as percentage of approved budget per sector-by Centre for Human Rights and Climate Change Research

Primary government expenditures as a percentage of original approved budget

Comments by Saferworld: REMOVE

This indicator is very specific and only provides a partial picture of government effectiveness.

ALTERNATE: Proportion of population satisfied with the quality of public services, disaggregated by service

Comments by Saferworld: ALTERNATE

This indicator directly measures people's experiences of institutions. It has been used by NSOs in several contexts over a long period of time.

ALTERNATE: Open Budget Index Score

Comments by OSF: ALTERNATE

We recommend an alternative indicator: "**Open Budget Index Score**". IBP biennially produces the open budget survey measuring the transparency and comprehensiveness of national public budget information, extent of public participation and strength of oversight institutions. The Open Budget Survey 2015 (out Sept 9th) includes 102 countries.

Comments by Save the Children: The indicator 'Proportion of population satisfied with their last experience of public services, disaggregated by services' should be a primary suggested indicator for this target. As indicated by Saferworld, this indicator directly measures people's experiences of institutions and it has been used by NSOs in several contexts already. Again, children is one of the groups that are highly dependent on public services and it would thus be

crucial to not only ensure that this indicator is disaggregated by age but that any household/perception/other surveys are also designed to capture the perceptions of children taking their evolving capacities into account. There are many methodologies and tools developed at national, regional and international levels to capture children's perceptions on public policy-making and governance, including issues related to transparency, participation and accountability, that could be adapted to capture the views of children in relation to this indicator.

Comments by ATD Fourth World:

We support this indicator very strongly: **"Proportion of population satisfied with the quality of public services, disaggregated by service"** very strongly. People living in extreme poverty have different experiences than the rest of the population when accessing public services, they often feel shamed, humiliated, excluded (see [participatory research](#) and [UN Guiding Principles on Extreme Poverty and Human Rights](#)). This indicator should be disaggregated by income.

Percentage of recommendations to strengthen national anti-corruption frameworks (institutional and legislative) implemented, as identified through the UNCAC Implementation Review Mechanism

Comments by Saferworld: MOVE

This indicator focuses on processes rather than actual outcomes from people and is corruption focused. It could, however, potentially be moved to target 16.5 or 16b.

Comments by OSF: MOVE

The proposed indicator does not advance the balance and ambition of the outcome document and the theme is adequately covered by target 16.5. We recommend an alternative indicator: **"proportion of population satisfied with their last experience of public services, disaggregated by service"**. This outcome indicator was evaluated and recommended by the virtual network on goal 16 indicators, is framed from people's perspective, is well established among NSOs in developed and developing countries and is currently collected through numerous surveys including the World Value Survey, Gallup, the Regional Barometers and various NSOs. I would also note that this is the language used by the virtual network and within the TST and that agreeing on this within TAP could help solidify a consensus for the IAEG.

ALTERNATE: Open Budget Index Score

Comments by Saferworld: ALTERNATE

Focusing on an important aspect of governance, this capacity indicator would help measure transparency and access to information in a country. The International Budget Partnership (IBP) currently scores countries using its Open Budget Survey and Open Budget Survey Tracker. Information is gathered through a standard questionnaire completed by researchers who provide evidence drawn from official documents and conduct interviews. The Open Budget Survey 2015 includes 102 countries.

As well as requiring improvements in coverage and timeliness, this indicator could be challenged on the basis of subjectivity. Nonetheless, it demonstrates the feasibility, in principle,

of measuring transparency of and access to information about government budgets. It should be noted that expert assessments from third parties have been proposed as indicators in other goals.

The indicator could also be used for 16.10.

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

International Budget Partnership comment on both proposed indicators:

There is growing consensus that public participation in budgeting is an essential component of any public finance management system and decision-making process. This consensus is affirmed by the High Level Principles on Fiscal Transparency issued by the Global Initiative for Fiscal Transparency (GIFT), endorsed by United Nations General Assembly Resolution 67/218. This consensus is also supported by the International Monetary Fund, which recently included public participation as an indicator in its revised Fiscal Transparency Code, and by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, which has similarly included public participation in its Principles of Budgetary Governance.

IBP Suggested New Indicator

Extent to which the executive and/or the legislature receive inputs through written submissions or public meetings from citizens during the budget cycle, and provide feedback on the use of such inputs.

Source: 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. <http://internationalbudget.org/what-we-do/openbudget-survey/>

ENDA Tiers Monde suggested new indicator

In country, percentage of local authorities using participative budgeting process.

Proportions of positions (by age, sex, disability and population groups) in public institutions (national and local legislatures, public service, and judiciary) compared to national distributions.

Comments by Saferworld: KEEP

This is a strong indicator measuring a part of the target.

Centre for Human Rights and Climate Change Research ALTERNATE

Number of countries which promote gender parity and gender balance in policy and decision making bodies.

Proportion of countries that address young people's multisectoral needs with their national development plans and poverty reduction strategies

Comments by Saferworld: REMOVE

This indicator only measures representativeness and responsiveness to one social group (youth). It is too specific.

Comments by We are the Present: KEEP

While this indicator might address a specific group it is important to highlight that this group will be the most affected by the action/effectiveness of these indicators. Positive Discrimination is necessary in this case.

Centre for Human Rights and Climate Change Research

Keep but in terms of priority, set as secondary level.

ALTERNATE: Percentage of population who believe they can influence policy-making in their country

Comments by Saferworld: ALTERNATE

This perception indicator would reflect people's views on the essence of the target and is potentially the optimal way to measure feelings of responsiveness and inclusiveness as it relates to decision-making. It is also worded in a way that would be more universal than indicators on elections. While there are currently no known global data sources for this indicator, it would be feasible to add it into existing national polls or household surveys. The indicator might require that survey questions outline or define the different types of policy-making processes to which the question applies.

Comments by Save the Children: Agree with Saferworld about the above indicator with a slight suggested change in language along the lines of indicator 16.7.2 in the IAEG list of indicators, i.e. 'Percentage of population who believe decision-making at all levels is inclusive and responsive'. But also OK with language suggested by Saferworld. From Save the Children's perspective and taking into consideration that children, who constitute more than 30% of the world's population, need to have a voice in decision-making, it is again important to ensure that this indicator is disaggregated by age and that any household/perception/other survey are designed to also capture the views of children taking their evolving capacities into account.

Comments by We are the Present: Agree with Saferworld.

World Federalist Movement Canada (WFMC) Suggested New Indicator

Proportion of representation by population in local, subnational, national, regional and global assemblies (city councils, legislatures, parliaments, etc) disaggregated by sex, ethnicity, religion, etc.

Reasoning: To determine how well populations are represented within their elected (or appointed) assemblies by geographic jurisdiction and population

Source: National Statistical Data by Country, UN Agency Statistics, Third-Party Data

Note1: There is currently no assembly at the global level directly representing global citizens. Data should be collected on people's opinions regarding this and whether they think such an assembly should be established.

Note2: Some indicators within the current draft attempt to articulate this indicator but at present they are either too wordy on one side or not broad enough on the other. We need something concise that will encompass everything from local to global levels.

Proposed Indicator by Nonviolence International:

Survey Governments' Affirmative Policies and implementation (quantitative, data source UNODC, OSCE)

Levels of Voice and Accountability

Comments by Transparency International: NEW

This indicator is based on an index compiled by the World Bank of 215 countries and draws on the public's perceptions. It is a good indicator as it would look at whether policy matters are responsive, participatory and inclusive.

(<http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/index.aspx#home>).

Comments by OSF:

The proposed indicator is not well constructed, easy to communicate nor comprehensive in covering the ambition of the target. We suggest two alternatives for the target, both of which are based on Virtual Network/TST consultation:

The "**percentage of population who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive**". This outcome indicator was evaluated and recommended by the virtual network on goal 16 indicators, is relevant for the target's focus, easy to communicate, feasible to gather through existing, well established methodologies and more accurately reflects the balance and ambition sought through the SDG outcome document. I would also note that this is the language used by the virtual network and within the TST and that agreeing on this within TAP could help solidify a consensus for the IAEG.

The "**extent to which the executive and/or the legislature receive inputs through written submissions or public meetings from citizens during the budget cycle, and provide feedback on the use of such inputs**". This indicator is contained in IBP's Open Budget Survey and has been gathered for over 100 countries. 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. <http://internationalbudget.org/what-we-do/openbudget-survey/>

Increase in # of people attending town meetings organized by local govt.

Increase in % of local governments that hold town meetings in the last year before making decision

No of states that involve local people in budgeting and financial auditing and publicly publish the results of such audits

of well publicized government's meetings open to citizens & CSOs

No of countries that have frameworks for participation of civil society, and women's groups in particular, in the project of target setting;

16.8 broaden and strengthen the participation of developing countries in the institutions of global governance

Percentage of members or voting rights of developing countries in international organizations

Comments by Saferworld: KEEP

This is a fairly strong indicator. The IAEG or UNDESA would need to agree on which international organizations it applied to, as well as defining developing countries.

This indicator can also be used for target 10.6

No of countries that have framework for ensuring Compliance and Monitoring

No of indicators for measuring the commitment of wealthy countries to development

No of indicators for measuring the Lack of sufficient sensitivity to country context.

16.9 by 2030 provide legal identity for all including birth registration

Percentage of children under 5 whose births have been registered with civil authority

Comments by Saferworld: KEEP

This indicator is broadly accepted. Nonetheless, the age could be lowered to 1 in order to bring it into line with established practice.

Comments by Save the Children: KEEP. This indicator is widely accepted and already measured globally.

Comment by ATD Fourth World:

People living in extreme poverty are most often excluded from household surveys. To measure progress on birth registration in the lowest quintile, field surveys will be needed to cover those

who were excluded by household surveys. To track progress on the poorest this indicator should be disaggregated by income.

Namati

This indicator is good, however it only covers legal identity at birth. It neglects the wider issue of those who already lack legal identity and stateless people. Legal identity for all is really important to ensuring access to rights and services to all people, including those who have already fallen through the cracks, and birth registration for those under 5 is important but much too narrow. Therefore we suggest the following

ADDITION: The proportion of people in a state who possess a registered form of legal identification

This indicator is relatively straightforward and easy to understand and can easily be tracked by administrative government data and third party sources. Legal identity documents and birth registration is tracked by many national governments as well as UNICEF and the World Bank population indicators. We would suggest this is broken down at the national level into the all relevant form of legal identification needed for services e.g. not just birth certificates. This is because a birth certificate often isn't the document needed to vote or to enroll in university or get a formal sector job. Or vice versa - people may have an ID card but be required to show a birth certificate or other document. Tracking both would prevent the problem of "partial documentation". Ensuring disaggregation of this data will bring to light any discriminatory treatment or disproportionate challenges faced by vulnerable groups - a country may reach 90% on the indicator but if the other 10% are all women, or belong to a certain ethnic or religious group, or are the most rural, or for some reason are those most in need of accessing legal identity documents, this can be addressed. This incentivize governments to expand access to legal identity and eliminate discrimination against those who lack legal identity.

No of countries that have reformed laws on legal identity and promote civic registration

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

Global Forum for Media Development (GFMD) SDG16.10 indicator proposal #1:

"The adoption and implementation of legal guarantees and mechanisms ensuring public access to information, including but not limited to information pertinent to the achievement of each and all of the Sustainable Development Goals"

Note: As documented by regular country reports [biennial; or in 2016, 2020, 2025 & 2029) to an appropriate designated UN body [tbd: UNESCO, UNDP, DESA, HLPF]

Comment:

An indicator specifically requiring and monitoring national legal provisions for ‘ensuring public access to information’ is absolutely essential for the achievement of SDG16.10, by any reasonable interpretation of either the spirit or the literal text of this potentially historic and transformative target. Without such an indicator, SDG16.10 becomes functionally meaningless for most countries.

A majority of UN member states - more than a hundred - already have such laws on the books; at least a dozen more are actively discussing national “A2I” statutes. The aim of SDG16.10 should be to make compliance universal by 2030, if not sooner, with the adoption of A2I laws by all UN member states. Verification of the existence of such laws becomes a simple matter of public record.

The process of “implementation” is a constant: All countries, at all stages of development, can do better than they are doing now, and can reasonably be asked to document such progress. This is not onerous. Most countries with such laws already have enforcement monitoring systems of some kind. The designated UN agency should provide a basic template for these regularly issued SDG 16.10 indicator reports, offer technical support as requested and needed, and publish the completed national reports in a consistent, globally accessible online format.

The baseline for implementation for every nation is inherently different, however, for a wide variety of socioeconomic and historical reasons. This requires different priorities, from improving internet access to legal reforms to systematizing the proactive digital disclosure of all information that should be readily available to the general public. These different national starting points and priorities should be acknowledged in this universal UN reporting process.

The GFMD proposal above is similar in text and intent to the lead 16.10 indicator originally proposed by UNESCO and supported by GFMD, IFLA, Article 19 and other nongovernmental organizations specialized in freedom of information and media, and included in the first UN-DESA Statistics Division submissions to the UN Statistical Commission, which GFMD would still consider acceptable:

“Number of countries that have adopted and implemented constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees for public access to information.”

[Global Forum for Media Development \(GFMD\) SDG16.10 indicator proposal #2:](#)

GFMD supports the complementary inclusion of the proposed multitarget indicator for four SDG 16 targets and one SDG 5 target, as a reasonable and feasible measurement tool for monitoring the ‘protection of fundamental freedoms’ required by SDG 16.10 - yet only if there is also a lead SDG16.10 indicator specifically requiring and assessing public access to information. The proposed indicator below, ‘suggested’ as the sole indicator

for SDG16.10 by UN-DESA, is supported by the OHCHR, ILO and UNESCO for these five 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). As those UN agencies have recognized, this indicator by itself does not and was not intended to monitor or require broad, open, public access to information:

“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.”

Additional GFMD comments:

- National monitoring reports for the lead SDG 16.10 indicator should include systematic assessments of public access to information by civil society, media, academia, political parties, and local and regional governments
- Narrowly construed public finance indicators (disclosure of budgetary information and government contract terms and so forth) should be strongly resisted as antithetical to the letter and spirit of SDG 16.10. Moreover, such disclosure should in any event be mandated by the passage and implementation of broad-based access to information laws.
- We should strongly oppose on principle the arbitrary limitation of the number of indicators for all 169 targets, as many targets - such as SDG16.10 - were deliberately constructed to cover different and differently measurable but complementary objectives (such as the reduction of both air and water pollution, and the elimination of both child marriage and female genital mutilation). Yet the objective of the UN Statistics Division and UN-SDSN and many influential member-state NSOs is to limit the total number of indicators to fewer than one per target. This in effect would retroactively edit out of the SDGs many of their most important objectives.
- The recent rough estimate by USG Wu of ‘about 300’ indicators for the 17 goals and 169 targets sounds about right, with most but not all targets requiring two stand-alone indicators. That number sounds far more daunting for NSOs than it really is: most of the originally proposed 300+ indicators are already being tracked by the intergovernmental system in some official way, including the 60 MDGs indicators and many scores of other accepted international economic and environmental data sets, with minimal input or involvement from most national statistical offices. And don’t get pulled into the phony proposed distinction between a ‘limited’ set of ‘global’ indicators and the great broad ever-expanding universe of ‘national’ indicators: all that matters for monitoring and achieving the SDGs, next year and 15 years hence, as with the MDGs, are the agreed, mandated indicators which will apply to all targets, and to all countries.

“Percentage of actual government budget, procurement, revenues and natural resource concessions that are publicly available and easily accessible”

IBP Comment

Bundling these elements together makes it difficult to measure their public availability and accessibility as a percentage. On budgets, at least five budget documents should be made publically available (Executive's Budget Proposal, Enacted Budget, Year-End Report, Audit Report, and Citizens Budget). Each should provide breakdowns according to expenditure allocated and spent towards each of the SDGs.

IBP Suggested Indicator

Extent to which budget information, including expected and actual on-budget and off-budget revenue and expenditure, procurement, and natural resource concessions, is publicly available and easily accessible in open data format.

Source: Assessments such as World Bank assessments / PEFA, Open Budget Survey

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

Comments by Saferworld: KEEP

This indicator has broad support. It will be important that independent third parties – rather than official government bodies – are responsible for gathering data for this indicator.

Comments by Article 19:

As mentioned, this indicator has broad support. While our organisational preference would be to have an indicator that more fully encompassed the nature of “fundamental freedoms”, we recognise that no quality measurement of “civic space” (which is really what is meant by protection of fundamental freedoms) has been developed that would be accepted by the IAEG at this point and would be supportive of this.

We are supportive of the comments by Save the Children and CIVICUS below looking to broaden the indicator, but feel strongly that there should be two indicators- one on access to information as proposed by GFMD above, with the support of UNESCO, and a separate one on the fundamental freedoms.

If we are going down the route of something broader, I would propose: “*Extent to which the rights to freedom of expression, association, and assembly are guaranteed in law and practice*”

ADD: Percentage of people who feel that they can express political views without fear

Comments by Saferworld: ADD

Freedom of expression is a fundamental freedom. The Gallup World Poll collected data on this indicator across many countries in the past, demonstrating its feasibility. Alternatively, in order to focus more on behaviours, a variant of this indicator would measure the percentage of people who feel free to join any political organisation they want (Afro-barometer currently collects data on this indicator).

Nonetheless, political restrictions could obstruct efforts to gather data for either indicator in some contexts: if people already fear expressing political views, some may be less likely to respond honestly to polling or other forms of survey. It would be crucial that those conducting surveys are – and are perceived to be - independent of the state.

COMMENTS BY OSF: we agree here and would note that indicator does not adequately capture the themes in the target nor represent the ambition of the outcome document. The language proposed has traction within the virtual network and TST and recommend we embrace it.

We recommend an alternative indicator to measure the multiple components of this target:

· **Percentage of budget documents, off budget revenue documents, procurement and natural resource concessions publically available and easily accessible in open data format**

Additional indicator: existence of enabling policies and practices with regard to the freedoms of expression, association and peaceful assembly

Comment by CIVICUS

Objective: evaluation of legislation and official policies dealing with registration of civil society organisations, their ability to organize public meetings, raise resources from domestic and international sources and operate freely in general

Already existing indexes and tools for measurement: Enabling Environment Index, Enabling Environment National Assessment, CSO Sustainability Index, Freedom in the World Survey, NGO Law Monitor, and dedicated monitoring efforts by the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC) and the CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness (CPDE).

In development: Civic Space Monitor which will rate the existence of the freedoms of expression, association and peaceful assembly across countries and the Civic Pulse which collates the views of civil society leaders on the conditions for civil society in their countries, including the ability of civil society to engage in policy dialogue and form networks.

Comments by Save the Children: The indicator '*Number of verified cases of killings, kidnapping, enforced disappearance, arbitrary detention and torture of journalists, associated media personnel, trade unionists and human rights advocates in the previous 12 months*' captures important elements related to protection of fundamental freedoms. However, in our view it provides a too narrow measurement of protection of fundamental freedoms. It would measure the more extreme violations of these freedoms, but would not measure the realization of internationally agreed standards related to the rights of information, expression, association and peaceful assembly in less extreme situations. In view of this, we agree with an indicator along CIVICUS suggestions - maybe as follows: '*Extent to which the rights to freedom of expression,*

association, peaceful assembly and access to information are guaranteed in law and practice'. In addition to suggestions already made above in this section, the legal guarantees of these rights could also 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 (www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/UPR/Pages/UPRMain.aspx). Considering that the UPR is a universal review of the human rights records of all UN Member States, it has the potential to collect information on the protection of these fundamental freedoms in all countries. Information from the UPR could be complemented with relevant information from UN Human Rights Treaty Bodies and UN Human Rights Special Procedures. And as mentioned for other indicators, children also have the rights to freedom of expression, association, and peaceful assembly. In view of this, the suggested indicator should be disaggregated by age and should also capture the views of children taking their evolving capacities into account.

16.a strengthen relevant national institutions, including through international cooperation, for building capacities at all levels, in particular in developing countries, for preventing violence and combating terrorism and crime

Percentage of victims of violence in the previous 12 months who reported their victimization to competent authorities or other officially recognized conflict resolution mechanisms (also called crime reporting rate)

Comments by Saferworld: KEEP

This is a strong proxy for capacities of security services and other authorities to deal with crime and present conflict.

Percentage of Official Development Assistance devoted to institution-building

Comments by Transparency International: ADD

This could be based on data from the OECD CRS

(<https://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=CRS1>) and/or the IATI registry

(<http://www.iatiregistry.org/>) by looking at information on aid provided to support governance.

Comment by ATD Fourth World

This indicator should be disaggregated by income

No of countries that have in place programmes and funding to build capacity of the legal and judicial sector on international framework for countering terrorism

No of countries where the judiciary is independent

of activities taken in countries to promote training of the Judiciary on judicial standards and the role of the judiciary in ensuring accountability for post 2015 development

16.b promote and enforce non-discriminatory laws and policies for sustainable development

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.

Comments by Saferworld: KEEP

This is a strong indicator which measures people's direct experiences of discrimination.

Comment by ATD Fourth World:

People living in poverty report as part of their daily experience to be humiliated, shamed, discriminated... To measure correlations in between poverty and discrimination this indicator should be disaggregated by income.