

Guidance on Goal 16 at Second Meeting of the Inter-Agency and Experts Group on SDG Indicators, 26-28 October 2015

The UN System has provided over a long-term support to the inter-governmental process on the SDGs and the Agenda 2030, including substantive support to the development of indicators for Goal 16. We are committed to supporting the IAEG in fulfilling its obligation to preserve the political balance, integration and ambition of the 2030 Agenda in developing the global indicator framework. The world has been watching the discussions in Bangkok this week, to ensure that the final global indicator framework reflects the supremely ambitious and transformational vision of the 2030 Agenda.

In providing our guidance regarding the remaining open questions we are speaking on behalf of UNDP, EOSG/RoLU and PBSO as the co-chairs of the Inter Agency Group on Goal 16 for this exercise.

1. Additional proposed indicators for 16.1.

- a) The proposed indicator **“Proportion of people that feel safe walking alone around the area they live”**, as supported by Cabo Verde and several members, reflects very well the purpose of the target and should be considered as additional indicator. Here, we would also like to emphasize the relevance of this indicator for Goal 11.7.1., the indicator would serve the purpose on safe public spaces in a broader scope and should also be disaggregated by sex. A methodology is available. Data is collected through national and international crime victimization surveys, which are being implemented by an increasing number of countries. The International Crime Victimization Survey (ICVS), for example, has been conducted in approximately 80 countries worldwide. In addition, the Harmonized Module on Peace and Security in the Strategy for the Harmonization of Statistics in Africa (SHaSA) already collects data on this indicator, disaggregating between perceptions of safety at night and in the daytime, perceptions of safety whilst walking compared to being at home, perceptions of safety on public transport, etc.
- b) We support an indicator on National Human Rights Institutions (NHRI), but would suggest using the formulation **“Existence of independent NHRI in compliance with Paris Principles”**, which also captures a qualitative element of the institution, and placing it as an additional indicator to 16.b. rather than 16.1. The specific mandates of NHRIs vary, but their overall role is to promote and advance the protection of civil political, economic, social and cultural rights, including addressing discrimination in all its forms. The indicator is useful in measuring not only 16.b., but also 1.4., Goal 5, 10.3., 16.6., 16.7., and 16.10., as well as all targets that address various forms of violence. Data is already available, gathered by the OHCHR.

2. Indicator 16.3.1.

Both currently proposed indicators for 16.3.1. and 16.3.2. focus on the criminal justice system. Target 16.3. on the rule of law and equal access to justice is much broader in scope. To discharge the IAEG's obligation to preserve the political balance, integration and ambition of the 2030 Agenda an indicator that captures more fully the scope of the target should be adopted.

We therefore support the alternative indicators proposed by the US and supported by several IAEG-members and suggest a combination of the two alternatives provided by the US:

"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 the process was just."

It gets to the heart of what justice systems do, which is to resolve disputes. Disputes between people, between businesses, and between people and the state. The indicator also captures criminal justice issues. The first part of the indicator [proposed by the US as alternative b)] focusses on the access to the justice system. The second part [proposed by the US as alternative c)], assesses the quality of the process, providing an important proxy on the respect for the rule of law.

Data can be collected through household surveys. Surveys in 151 countries already respond to this or closely related questions, proofing that methodologies are in place.

3. Indicator 16.3.2.

We re-emphasize that target 16.3. should not be measured by indicators focusing on criminal justice only to ensure the political balance, integration and ambition of the agenda is preserved .

The proposed indicator on pretrial detention has been accepted by many members; it is relevant in a lot of countries and also feasible to measure. However, this indicator bears the risk of perverse incentives, namely to sentence detainees without a fair trial. We therefore call not to choose this indicator as the only indicator measuring the rule of law and access to justice.

4. Indicator 16.4.2.

a) In principle we support the proposed indicator. Our suggested alternations are based on the fact that not all collected firearms are recorded or traced for several reasons (amnesty, change in law etc.). The data collected would have been inconsistent. Therefore we suggest to delete "and collected" or alternatively to replace the indicator by

"Percentage of small arms marked and recorded at the time of import in accordance with international standards".

All states import small arms, usually in significant numbers. But not all States seize them, or at least a significant number of them. Marking firearms at the time of import is a commitment that all States have agreed to.

We also suggest to replace the term “firearms” by “Small Arms and Light Weapons” (SALW). The use of the term "firearms" unnecessarily limits the scope of the indicator. "Firearm" is the term used in the Firearms Protocol to the UN Convention Against Transnational Organised Crime (UNTOC). However, there are 3 other relevant global instruments -- the UN Programme of Action against the illicit trade in SALW, the Arms Trade Treaty and the International Tracing Instrument (this latter one is particular relevant to tracing) -- and they all use the term "Small Arms and Light Weapons" (SALW) and not the term "firearms." SDG Target 16.4 aims to reduce "illicit arms flows." We suggest not to limit the scope of the indicator to just firearms (i.e. handguns, rifles and shotguns) when heavier weapons (e.g. mortars, RPGs, heavy machine guns, portable missile systems, etc.) are also widely trafficked. For this reason, the term "firearms" should be replaced with "small arms and light weapons."

- b) We suggest retaining only one indicator on small arms and introduce another indicator to measure at least one of the remaining three concepts of 16.4., namely Illicit Financial Flows, Asset recovery and organized crime.

5. Indicator 16.5.1.

We support the proposed indicator with the addition made by Canada to include an “and” between “public official” AND “who paid” to clarify the reference group for this proposed indicator. This indicator provides solid information on the experience of bribery, typically occurring in the interaction between people/businesses and the public sector in the context of basic service delivery/transactions. This indicator can be measured through Household corruption surveys and victimisation surveys with a module on bribery. Asking the respondents if they “have been asked” to pay a bribe ensures that no one has to expose him/herself to prosecution. Various programmes and initiatives have produced data on the experience of corruption by the population. Programmes of surveys on the experience of corruption have been supported by international organizations, including by UNODC, the World Bank and UNDP.

At national level, surveys on the experience of corruption are conducted by an increasing number of countries, sometimes as part of the regular production by official statistics. Data on bribery can also be collected as part of general victimization surveys.

We support the suggestion to include the private sector into the existing indicator or add a second one as initially suggested as indicator 16.5.2.

Furthermore we raise our concerns against any indicator that includes the number of prosecutions/convictions on bribery. These indicators are not actionable and may even create perverse incentives. In countries with high corruption levels cases are usually not prosecuted. It

is also not clear what the increase/ decrease of number would tell us: does the level of corruption rise/sink or do public institutions work more efficiently? Finally it can also create incentives for misuse, e.g. by incriminating someone for political purposes.

6. Indicator 16.6.2.

We welcome the alternative indicator proposed for 16.6.2.:

“Proportion of population satisfied with their last experience of public services”

We strongly suggest to it keep it in the framework. The SDGs have been negotiated to be explicitly oriented to outcomes. Outcomes for people are also well measured using experiential or perception surveys. Experience in collecting data for this perception survey already exist through various NSOs, the general methodology is well-known in developed and developing countries. Regional Barometers, as the Afrobarometer, also collect respective data. This indicator is also relevant for other targets: 16.a, 16.3, 16.9 and all other targets with access to basic services such as health, education, e.g. 1.4 (access to basic services), 3.8 (health coverage), 4.1, 4.2, 4.a (education), 7.1 (energy), 10.2 (social inclusion), 11.1 (housing).

7. Indicator 16.7.2.

We suggest to consider the alternative indicator proposed: **“Turnout as share of voting age population in national and local elections”**

This indicator should be disaggregated, including by age and gender, in order to capture also the participation of the youth and to serve also in the measurement of target 5.5.

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. In addition, international organisations such as the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA) maintains detailed tables on turn-out and registration at multiple levels for all countries of the world.

We also consider the second proposal **“Percentage of population who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive”** as relevant and suitable for the purpose.