

Stakeholders Statement
2nd Meeting of the Interagency and Expert Group on SDG Indicators
Bangkok, 26 October 2015

Global Indicators for:

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

Verbal submission of IAEG Stakeholders on Goal 16:

Thank you Chair.

My comments focus on Goal 16 and there are printed copies for IAEG members.

First, we emphasise the need for survey-based indicators to measure people's experiences and perceptions. This is a proven, effective approach to measuring issues of peace, justice and governance, which enhances people's voices, promotes accountability and ensures that all voices are heard.

Second, there is a strong case for independent and impartial data producers outside of official statistical systems to play a role. For example, building on existing human rights data collection and monitoring mechanisms or building on data collected in collaboration with specific rights-holders.

Third, no single indicator can tell a full story of progress under Goal 16. In line with established practice on measuring peace, justice and governance, we urge the IAEG to utilize complementary indicators for some targets and establish explicit linkages to existing human rights monitoring mechanisms. These indicators will be consequential: let's not allow arbitrary restrictions on their number dictate their impact.

Generally, we endorse 16.1.1 (homicide); 16.2.1 (trafficking); 16.5.1 (corruption); 16.7.1 (representativeness); and 16.10.1 (human rights).

We offer the following suggestions for amendments:

Under 16.1 While it needs more methodological work, we suggest the IAEG retains 16.1.2 on "conflict-related deaths per 100,000" as a key measure of peace.

Under 16.2 We propose an additional survey-based indicator on "Percentage of young women and men aged 18-24 who experience sexual violence by the age of 18."

Under 16.3 We agree with others that 16.3.1 should be replaced with the established survey-based indicator "the 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.” Indicator 16.3.2 must include the duration of detention, as opposed to percentage of detainees in pre-trial detention.

Under 16.4 The IAEG should keep 16.4.1, though it needs further methodological development. We recommend 16.4.2 should be changed to “Percentage of seized illicitly-manufactured or traded firearms that are traced in accordance with international standards”

Under 16.6 16.6.1 should be amended to add wording on “and whether there is timely publication of essential budget documents” and we recommend the addition of the established survey-based indicator on “Proportion of population satisfied with their last experience of public services, disaggregated by services.”

Under 16.7 We agree 16.7.2 should be replaced with the survey-based indicator “Percentage of the population who believe decision making is inclusive and responsive”. Indicators on “civic space” or “enabling environment for civil society” should also be considered.

Under 16.10 We recommend the addition of the established survey-based indicator on “percentage of population who believe can express political opinion without fear” as well as an administrative indicator on the “Existence and implementation of constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees for public access to information”.

Under 16.a We recommend the addition of the survey-based and widely used indicator on “percentage of people who feel safe walking home at night”.

Under 16.b We recommend the addition of an indicator on the “Existence of an independent National Human Rights Institution in compliance with the Paris Principles” as well as the “Number of countries that have ratified and implemented international Conventions of particular relevance for equality and non-discrimination”

Please see our written statement for explanations, linkages with other targets, existing support, methodologies and data sources.

Many thanks for this opportunity.

Written submission of IAEG Stakeholders on Goal 16:

General Comments

First, we would like to endorse a recent letter to the IAEG on the need for survey-based indicators to measure people’s perceptions and experiences. Aside from being the best methodological approach to measuring issues of peace, justice and governance, such

approaches enhance people's voices and promote accountability, and are hence in line with Goal 16. They ensure all voices, including those of youth, are heard. A large number of countries and organisations already use these approaches across the world. We propose several survey-based indicators below.

Second, given the nature of the issues being discussed in Goal 16, there is a strong case for independent and impartial data producers outside of official statistical systems to play a role. For example, it is established requirement and assessment criteria for National Human Rights Institutions to be fully independent of government; this should also be the case as it relates to gathering data on human rights. Indicators under 16.10 should, for example, be gathered by non-official data providers.

Third, the complex nature of the issues being measured in Goal 16 means that no single indicator can tell a full story of progress. In line with established practice on measuring peace, justice and governance, we urge the IAEG to utilize complementary indicators for some targets. We have, for example, made the case for complementary indicators under target 16.3. These indicators will be consequential: let's not allow arbitrary restrictions on their number dictate their impact.

Fourth, we must ensure a participatory and inclusive society for all, without leaving anyone behind. Participation must be measured by disaggregating data, especially for the most vulnerable.

Specific indicator comments

Under target 16.1, we endorse the indicator 16.1.2 on "the number of conflict-related deaths per 100,000". Given that peace is one of five cross-cutting issues in the 2030 Agenda, which mentions conflict 10 times, and that target 16.1 calls for the measurement of all forms of violence everywhere, dropping this indicator would represent a political decision by the IAEG. While methodological approaches will need to be agreed upon by IAEG members and experts, it is crucial that indicator on conflict deaths is retained for further development (based on international law's definition of conflict).

On Target 16.2 we are proposing 2 indicators measuring the gravest and more widespread forms of violence against children. One refers to physical punishment (as proposed) and a second on sexual violence: "Percentage of young women and men aged 18-24 who experiences sexual violence by the age of 18." These two child-focused indicators can help governments establish, as soon as possible, timelines and be able to use existing methodologies for measuring progress. We also believe that measuring both indicators will enable governments to monitor the progress against the ambition of target 16.2.

Under target 16.3, the two suggested indicators focus too narrowly on elements of the criminal justice system to track sustainable development and fail to "preserve the political balance, integration and ambition" of the agenda.

Several IAEG members, numerous UN agencies, the UN Virtual Network on Goal 16 Indicators and some 80 civil society organizations all recommend an indicator that focuses on “the 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.” Such an approach would better respond to the target and is simple to understand. National Statistics Offices and others in more than 25 countries – in all regions – have already been collecting data for such an indicator over many years. As have civil society and academic institutions. This approach would include criminal justice as well.

The indicator for 16.3.2 is ranked as green but it must be amended and improved. On its own it says little about the rule of law or access to justice. It’s 37% in Denmark, 14% in Turkey, 11% in Kazakhstan and 21% in Kyrgyzstan, 35% in Canada. How do we interpret this? We recommend an alternative: “Percentage of total remandees who have been held in detention for more than [a defined period] while awaiting trial, sentencing or a final disposition.” Duration is important for understanding performance, but countries define this differently. We would further note that this indicator, on its own, does not measure the quality of the justice and there are risks that, without a complimentary basket of indicators, it could incentivize speedy trials without due process. The inclusion of an experiential survey indicator for 16.3.1 is thus critical.

Under target 16.4, the Agenda 2030 declaration and targets, as well as the Addis Ababa agreement, prioritize the issue of Illicit Financial Flows. The IAEG would be falling short of its mandate not to agree to work towards measuring their quantity. While this may require methodological refinement, the suggested indicator 16.4.1 should be maintained as a focal point for this. The arms flows indicator 16.4.2 should be amended to “Percentage of seized illicitly-manufactured or traded firearms that are traced in accordance with international standards”

Under target 16.5, we endorse indicator 16.5.1. The methodology for measurement is defined and exists and survey data is already available on this indicator. It is also a good proxy indicator for overall corruption. The indicator on bribery is correlated with other targets, including 16.3,16.9,16.10.16.a, 3.1, 3.2, and 4.1.

Under target 16.6, we agree that indicator 16.6.1 should be amended with additional wording: “and whether there is timely publication of essential budget documents”. We proposed an additional indicator on the “Proportion of population satisfied with their last experience of public services, disaggregated by services.” Aside from clear relevance and an established methodology, this indicator is also strong because it links to the following targets: 1.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4a, 7.1,10.2, 11.1, 16.3 and 16.a. The proposed indicator 16.6.2 could be moved to target 16.5.

Under target 16.7, we endorse 16.7.1. The Open Budget Survey score could also be a useful indicator for this target. Indicator 16.7.2 is, however, of weak relevance. Instead, we would propose an indicator on “Percentage of population who believe decision-making is responsive and inclusive.” We would also support the the European Commission suggestion of an indicator on “Number of countries with institutionalised spaces for multi-stakeholder dialogues on national and local decision making and the existence of independent monitoring feedback

mechanisms". It should be noted that CIVICUS is developing an indicator on "Civic Space" and that, for the Global Partnership on Effective Development Cooperation, the OECD and UN are developing an indicator on "enabling environment for civil society."

Under target 16.10, we endorse the proposed indicator. We support African group's proposal the addition of a survey-based indicator on "percentage of population who believe they can express political opinion without fear", which is already widely used. We would also suggest the IAEG add the suggested indicator on "Existence and implementation of constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees for public access to information".

Under target 16.a, we support the addition of an indicator on "percentage of people who feel safe walking home at night" which would cut across targets 5.2, 10.2, 10.3, 11.1, 11.2, 11.7, 16.2. An indicator on "confidence in police and judicial purposes" could also be useful.

Under target 16.b we would endorse an indicator on the "Existence of an independent National Human Rights Institution in compliance with the Paris Principles." Given their mandates for independent human rights monitoring, existence of such institutions would be a relevant indicators across targets 10.3, 16.1, 16.6, 16.10, 16.a and 16.b.

Target 16 b, along with 5.c and 10.3 call for the elimination of discriminatory laws and policies and the promotion and enforcement of non-discriminatory laws and policies. However, the proposed indicators do not directly address the revision of laws and policies, but have a focus on results rather than means, making it difficult to measure the concrete efforts employed by States. An indicator that measures States' realisation of legally-binding equality and non-discrimination conventions, with institutionalised monitoring mechanisms, would be relevant for all of these targets as well as for target 17.14, which aims to enhance policy coherence for sustainable development: "Number of countries that have ratified and implemented international Conventions of particular relevance for equality and non-discrimination".

Such Conventions include: the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women; the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination; the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities; ILO Convention No. 111 on Discrimination in Employment and Occupation, and; ILO Convention No. 169 on indigenous peoples.

ENDS