TAP Network Synthesized Inputs for Second Meeting of IAEG-SDGs Consultation

16.1

The first suggested indicator should be retained, and is a strong indicator. Efforts will be required to widen coverage and overcome reliance on estimates.

The second suggested indicator should be retained, and is a strong indicator. Few NSOs, however, currently collect data on direct conflict deaths, meaning that third parties such as the Uppsala Conflict Data 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. Methodologies exist for calculating indirect conflict deaths – for example deaths from diseases associated with displacement); data from other goals (for example on health) would need to be drawn on.

Data 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.

16.2

The first suggested IAEG indicator is strong and enjoy widespread support, including from relevant UN agencies and the Goal 16 Virtual Network.

We would recommend the following indicator to replace the second indicator: "Percentage of young women and men aged 18-24 who experiences sexual violence by the age of 18."

While this only refers to only one specific form of violence, it is the most widespread, and socially accepted, type of violence against children and will provide a good indication of children's overall exposure to violence. It is universally relevant. Fully comparable data are available for some 60 low- and middle-income countries (household surveys such as MICS that have been collecting data on this indicator in low- and middle-income countries since 2005).

Additionally, the issue of human trafficking needs to be addressed somewhere in this framework, for example in 5.2 or 10.7.

16.3

Suggested Indicator: "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"

The suggested indicators focus on narrow elements of criminal justice. To advance progress towards sustainable development—and to "preserve the political balance, integration and ambition" of the agenda—the framework should include indicators that more fully respond to the target. Priority indicator 1 advances the 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. It captures criminal justice as well.

16.4

Indicator 1: "Total annual value of inward and outward illicit financial flows at the country level (in current US$) disaggregated by trade misinvoicing and other sources." Indicator closely mirrors that suggested by IAEG. Additions include a requirement for an annual country level report and data disaggregated by sources.

Indicator 2: "Percentage of seized and collected firearms that are recorded and traced, in accordance with international standards and legal instruments." Same as suggested by IAEG.

Indicator 3: "Recovered stolen assets as a percentage of illicit financial flows." Stolen assets issue is not captured in other indicators. As a % of IFFs in a given year, excluding trade mispricing, indicator would demonstrate successes in proportion to the challenge.

Indicator 4: "Percentage of businesses who believe organized crime imposes costs on business in their country." This indicator could be feasibly integrated into polling of the general public or into crime victimization surveys.

16.5

The proposed indicator has already been used comprehensively around the world. Governments and other actors have successfully used this indicator to track changes in corruption. People's experience with bribery has a strong and positive correlation with perceptions of public sector corruption and other SDG targets. The indicator is feasible and sustainable.

Data exists from regional surveys (e.g Afrobarometer, Latinobarometer and Eurobarometer) as well as global surveys (e.g. Transparency International). Findings must be disaggregated (by gender, age, income, ethnicity, disability, sector and urban/rural). Also, the definition for public official must be aligned with the UN Convention against Corruption (Article 2). In addition, an indicator about people's perceptions of whether their government is effectively addressing corruption should be included. Existing data is available (e.g. from UNODC, Gallup, and TI). Another complementary indicator could be the "Annual volume of state prosecuted complaint cases" (quantitative, data source compiled by UNODC).

16.6

The first suggested indicator is very specific and only provides a partial picture of government effectiveness.

Alternate suggested indicator: "Proportion of population satisfied with the quality of public services, disaggregated by service"

This alternate indicator directly measures people's experiences of institutions. It has been used by NSOs in several contexts over a long period of time. Additionally, other surveys and data from non-official sources have been used to measure these perceptions – including in marginalized communities.

The second suggested indicator should be moved from 16.6 to either 16.5, 16.b or 16.10.

As an alternative, we would suggest an alternate indicator of "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 and includes 102 countries.

16.7

Suggested alternate indicator: "Percentage of population who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive"

We would recommend a reversion to the previous indicator of 16.7.2. 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.

Alternatively, a similarly effective option would be an indicator of "Percentage of population who believe they can influence policy-making in their country." 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.

16.8

The suggested indicator for this target should be retained. This is a fairly strong indicator. However, it would require the IAEG, UNDESA or Member States to agree on which international organizations it applied to, as well as defining "developing countries."

16.9

We would endorse this suggested indicator by the IAEG-SDGs. This indicator relies on established, widely used methodologies. Targeted surveys and specific methodologies will be needed to reach non-registered populations who are typically not covered in general household surveys. Like other indicators, results for this indicator should be disaggregated to surface inequalities including, but not limited to, age, gender, region, population group, income, disabilities, etc.

16.10

We support UNESCO's proposal for two complementary but distinct indicators for the two interrelated components of SDG16.10:

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

2. "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."

The latter indicator was proposed by UNESCO, OHCHR and ILO for 5 targets, in whole or in part, including 16.10's commitment to the protection of 'fundamental freedoms.' The former specific indicator on legal provisions for 'ensuring public access to information' is essential for the achievement of 16.10, in keeping with both the spirit and literal text of this target. More than 100 countries already have such laws and verification is a matter of public record.

16.a

We would recommend a combination of the proposals to read: "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)".

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

Another indicator could also be added on "Percentage of Official Development Assistance devoted to institution-building," which could draw on data from the OECD CRS and the IATI registry by looking at information on aid provided to support governance.

These indicators must also be disaggregated by income.

16.b

The suggested indicator for this target should be retained. This is a strong indicator which measures people's direct experiences of discrimination. In an effort to measure correlations in between poverty and discrimination this indicator should be disaggregated by income.