List of indicator proposals (11 August 2015)

Read me first

1. The list of proposals contains suggestions for global indicators for the goals and targets of the post-2015 development agenda based on inputs from international agencies and entities. It also presents the assessment made by countries of the indicators that were suggested in February on the basis of three criteria (feasibility, suitability and relevance). It provides a starting point for the deliberations of the IAEG-SDGs to identify the most appropriate indicators under the goals and targets, taking into account the relevant criteria for the selection of indicators, as well as the need for the coherent and comprehensive measurement of all goals and targets and the need to limit the number of global indicators.

2. Every effort has been made to reflect all inputs from international agencies and entities that are or could be responsible for the global monitoring of the proposed indicators. However, this list of proposals is work in progress and further inputs might be required during the discussions of the IAEG-SDGs

List of Indicator Proposals - made available 11 August 2015

3. **This list of indicator proposals has incorporated the changes in the goal and targets adopted by the Intergovernmental negotiations and included in their final proposal: "Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development" published on 1 August 2015. The indicators included in this new version of the list of proposals remains unchanged from the version released on 7 July 2015.**

Version 2 – made available on 7 July 2015

4. This version of the list of proposals incorporates all additional or updated inputs, comments or corrections received from agency experts at the first meeting of the IAEG-SDGs, held from 1-2 June 2015 or immediately after. The meeting report, the list of statements and related inputs received during or subsequent to the meeting and the list of all inputs received from agencies and other entities on indicator proposals and metadata are available on the SDG indicator website at http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/.

5. The list contains suggested indicators (highlighted in blue), as well as additional proposals or inputs provided by agencies and entities. Initially suggested indicators that were assessed by countries are highlighted in light blue (see below for further information). The letters in parenthesis after these indicators indicate the rating based on the three criteria as indicated above. The suggested indicators under each target are based on the inputs and comments received. The presentation does not imply any judgment by the Secretariat on which indicators should eventually be selected. For the suggested indicators, the Secretariat indicates their state of statistical development according to a three tier system (see for further information in paragraph 9 below) based on the information available, which will need to be revisited as more complete information becomes available.

6. All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.

Version 1 – made available on 29 May 2015

List of indicator proposals (11 August 2015)

Read me first

7. In preparation of the first meeting of the IAEG-SDGs, the Secretariat compiled a first list of indicator proposals and associated metadata ('List of proposals' – version 1) with the help of agencies and entities and based on the initial assessment of proposed provisional indicators included in the Technical report of the Bureau of the Statistical Commission presented to the March 2015 session of the intergovernmental negotiations. The initial assessment of proposed provisional indicators in which 70 Member States participated is entirely reflected in this list of indicator proposals and associated metadata. The assessed indicators are highlighted in light blue and are recognizable by the assessment results shown behind them in brackets. For example an indicator rated "AAA" has been found to be easily feasible, suitable and very relevant to measure the respective target for which it was proposed by a majority of national statistical offices (60 per cent or more). Please see the technical report for full details.

8. When conducting the assessment of proposed provisional indicators in February and March 2015, many national statistical offices expressed their wish for detailed metadata and an improved description of the proposed indicators. Therefore, the Secretariat requested agencies and entities to provide this additional information, which was then presented along with the assessment in the list of indicator proposals and associated metadata that was provided as an input to the first meeting of the IAEG-SDGs.

9. Within the list of proposed indicators and associated metadata, one or more indicators were identified as the suggested priority indicators based on the inputs from agencies and entities that were requested to identify their priority indicator for the targets in their area of work and expertise. In cases where multiple priority indicators were proposed under one target, precedence was in general given to the proposals by agencies with a mandate in the specific area and/or already responsible for global monitoring of the specific indicator. The suggestion of one priority indicator under each target was meant to illustrate a possible framework consisting of a limited number of indicators, as requested by the inter-governmental negotiations on SDGs, and did not imply any judgment by the Secretariat on which indicators should eventually be selected.

10. In addition, for each suggested indicator the Secretariat evaluated its stage of development according to a three tier system based on the information provided by the relevant entities: a first tier for which an established methodology exists and data are already widely available; a second tier for which a methodology has been established but for which data are not easily available; and a third for which an internationally agreed methodology has not yet been developed. It should be noted that the coverage and level of detail of the metadata provided by the relevant agencies vary across indicators and that this initial evaluation may need to be revisited as more complete information becomes available.

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

Goal 1 End poverty in all its forms everywhere

Target 1.1 By 2030, eradicate extreme poverty for all people everywhere, currently measured as people living on less than $1.25 a day.

Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator	**Proportion of population below $1.25 (PPP) per day disaggregated by sex and age group and employment status (or Proportion of employed people living on less that $1.25 PPP) a day)**	**Household surveys (LFS, HIES, LSMS, Integrated HH surveys, etc.)**	**World Bank and ILO**	**Tier I**		**2.3,1.2,8.5**
Indicator 1.1.1 Proportion of population below $1.25 (PPP) per day disaggregated by sex and age group (ABB)						
IFAD					1	2.3
ILO	Alternative text: **[Proportion of population below $1.25 (PPP) per day per capita disaggregated by sex and age group and employment status.]** Justification: the disaggregation by status in employment will allow for capturing the working poor which is one of the core MDG indicators	Household surveys (LFS, HIES, LSMS, Integrated HH surveys, etc.).	Responsible entities: World Bank and ILO. Availability: ILO has estimates available by employment status for 119 countries.		1	8.5
UNICEF	The extreme poverty rate is the proportion of the population living on less than the extreme poverty line (currently at US$1.25 per day), measured at 2011 international prices, adjusted for purchasing power parity (PPP). This indicator is expressed as a percentage. The underlying disaggregation can calculate the poverty rates for the different population subgroups, specifically the child poverty rate (aged 0-17) . Other dimensions of disaggregation are location.	World Bank PovCalNet; Micro database (World Bank)	World Bank. Globally available.		1	1.2
WB	Poor populations are defined by comparing household consumption or income aggregates per capita with a new international poverty line after switching the 2005 PPP with the 2011 PPP. We suggest the indicator description be modified to: **["Proportion of population below $1.25 (PPP) per day, with disaggregations of it by sex and age group."]** In this way, it is clear that we need to monitor the proportion for all people as well."	Household Survey	World Bank		1	

Target 1.2 By 2030, reduce at least by half the proportion of men, women and children of all ages living in poverty in all its dimensions according to national definitions.

Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator	**Proportion of population living below national poverty line, disaggregated by sex and age group**	**Household surveys**	**World Bank** **Data availability:** **Unisex: Data available for all countries that have household income or consumption surveys.** **SPC: data are widely available and used by Pacific Island countries, most of which have by now two data points; ILO: working poverty available by employment status for 44 countries;**	**Tier I**		**1.1,8.5,**
Indicator 1.2.1 Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) disaggregated by sex and age group (BBA)						
IFAD	Disaggregated by urban and rural				1	2.3
UNICEF	**[Proportion of children living in multidimensional poverty.]** This indicator is expressed as a percentage. Deprivation dimensions and indicators should be based on internationally agreed standards and definitions. Deprivation dimensions include inter alia: nutrition, education, health, housing , water and sanitation.	MICS and DHS; household surveys	UNDP, UNICEF. MPI is available over 100 countries.		1	1.1; 2.1; 2.2; 3.1; 3.2; 3.7; 3.8; 4.1; 4.2; 4.5; 4.6; 6.1; 6.2; 10.3; 11.1
WB	The MPI (Multi-Dimensional Poverty Index) cannot measure Target 1.2. Instead, we propose an indicator that is more directly linked to this indicator. Target 1.2 says for each of all dimensions, we need to halve the proportion of people living in poverty. But, MPI does not measure that. In other words, even if MPI is halved by 2030, the proportion of people living in poverty in some dimensions might not be halved. In other words, this indicator does not fit the objective of Target 1.2 well. Instead, we would propose measuring the **[proportion of people in poverty for each dimension separately].** By doing this, we can directly see whether the proportion of people living in poverty is halved for all dimensions or not.				2	
Indicator 1.2.2 Proportion of population living below national poverty line, disaggregated by sex and age group (AAA)						
IFAD					2	2.3
ILO	Alternative text: **[Proportion of population living below national poverty line, disaggregated by sex and age group and employment status.]** Justification: the disaggregation by status in employment, namely : employed, unemployed, outside the labour force, will allow for capturing the working poor which is one of the core MDG indicators	Household surveys (LFS, HIES, LSMS, Integrated HH surveys, etc.).	Responsible entities: World Bank and ILO. Availability: ILO working poverty available by employment status for 44 countries.		1	8.5

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	UNICEF	**[Proportion of children (0-17) living in households defined as poor according to the national poverty line .]** This indicator is expressed as a percentage. The underlying disaggregation can calculate the poverty rates for the different subgroups specified in the target, specifically children (aged 0-17) and women and girls to be able to measure progress towards Target 1.2.	Household budget or income surveys	World Bank, UNICEF. Data available for all countries that have household income or consumption surveys.		2	1.1
	UNWOMEN	UN Women supports the disaggregation of the population living below the national poverty line by sex and age group. At the regional level, CEPAL has made progress in identifying innovative ways to measure poverty by sex. For example, the ratio of women to men living below the national poverty line (often referred to as the Poverty Femininity Index) is routinely calculated by countries in Latin America and the Caribbean as a supplementary measure under Goal 1 of the MDGs. The measure yields important findings about women's vulnerability to poverty. The measure is currently calculated for women and men age 20 to 59 as follows: sum of female in poor households/Sum of male in poor households/sum of female in all households/sum of male in all households.	In the case of Latin America and the Caribbean, the ratio is calculated using data come from national household-budget surveys. When such surveys are not available, other household surveys conducted by official institutions of statistics are used. Analysis done for other regions has tended to use the DHS and MICs, in these cases the wealth index has been used as the proxy for identifying poorest households.	Country coverage: this indicator has been calculated for about 90 countries; but likely possible for a greater number of countries.		1	
	WB	Poor populations are defined as those whose household expenditure or income aggregates per capita (or per adult equivalence scale) are smaller than national poverty lines and the ratio of the poor population over the total population is used for this indicator. Disaggregations of this by sex and age groups will be also calculated.				1	

Target 1.3 Implement nationally appropriate social protection systems and measures for all, including floors, and by 2030 achieve substantial coverage of the poor and the vulnerable.

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Percentage of population covered by social protection floors/systems, disaggregated by sex, composed of the following: a) Percentage of older persons receiving a pension; b) Percentage of households with children receiving child support; c) Percentage of working-age persons without jobs receiving support; d)Percentage of persons with disabilities receiving benefits; e) Percentage of women receiving maternity benefits at childbirth; f) Percentage of workers covered against occupational injury; and g) Percentage of poor and vulnerable people receiving benefits.**	**Social Security administrative data consolidated by the ILO Social Security Inquiry.**	**Responsible entity: ILO. Availability: Information on old age coverage for 175 countries; on jobless support for 79 countries; on disability for 171 countries; on maternity for 139 countries; on child benefits for 109 countries; on occupational injury coverage for 172 countries. Also responsible: OECD.**	**Tier II**		**5.4, 8.5, 8.8, 10.4**
Indicator 1.3.1		**Percentage of population covered by social protection floors/systems, disaggregated by sex, with break down by children, unemployed, old age, people with disabilities, pregnant women/new-borns, work injury victims, poor and vulnerable, including one or more of the following: a) Percentage of older persons receiving a pension; b) Percentage of households with children receiving child support; c) Percentage of unemployed persons receiving unemployment benefits; d)Percentage of persons with disabilities receiving disability benefits; e) Percentage of pregnant women receiving maternity benefits; f)Percentage of workers covered against occupational accidents; and g) Percentage of poor and vulnerable people receiving benefits (BAA)**					
	ILO	Alternative text: **[Percentage of population covered by social protection floors/systems, disaggregated by sex, composed of the following: a) Percentage of older persons receiving a pension; b) Percentage of households with children receiving child support; c) Percentage of working-age persons without jobs receiving support; d)Percentage of persons with disabilities receiving benefits; e) Percentage of women receiving maternity benefits at childbirth; f) Percentage of workers covered against occupational injury; and g) Percentage of poor and vulnerable people receiving benefits.]**	Social Security administrative data consolidated by the ILO Social Security Inquiry.	Responsible entity: ILO. Availability: Information on old age coverage for 175 countries; on jobless support for 79 countries; on disability for 171 countries; on maternity for 139 countries; on child benefits for 109 countries; on occupational injury coverage for 172 countries.		1	5.4, 8.5, 8.8, 10.4

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	WB	Alternative formulation: "Percentage of poor and vulnerable people covered by social protection systems further break downs including one or more of the following: • Percentage of older persons receiving a pension; • Percentage of households with children receiving child support; • Percentage of unemployed persons receiving unemployment benefits; • Percentage of persons with disabilities receiving disability benefits; • Percentage of pregnant women receiving maternity benefits; • Percentage of workers covered against occupational accidents; • Percentage of poor and vulnerable people receiving benefits"	Household surveys reported in the ASPIRE platform (world bank): www.worldbank.org/aspire	For main indicator - percentage of poor and vulnerable covered - World Bank, data currently available for 112 countries, with expansion to 140 countries in July 2015; for break down: Social Security Inquiry (ILO)		[1]	1.4; 1.5; and :3.8 : universal health coverage; coverage by social protection is the main vehicle on how to ensure that people are protected against the financial consequences of ill health 5.4 (social protection explicitly mentioned); 8.8 (coverage by SP as important part of the decent work agenda) 10.4.: social protection is the most reliable way to achieve redistribution in favour of the bottom 40%, 12.c: coverage by compensatory social protection transfers is the proven way to protect the poor in energy subsidy reforms 13.1 : social protection measures directly contribute to resilience to climate shocks
Indicator 1.3.2 Average social protection transfers as % of income / or poverty line (BBB)							
	UNICEF	**[Percentage of children receiving a child or other social grant (disaggregated as possible by poverty status, wealth quintiles, disability, gender and location).]** Note: Social grants include cash grants, assistance for school fees, material support for education, income generation support in cash or kind, food assistance provided at the household level, or material or financial support for shelter	ASPIRE Database (World Bank)	World Bank, ILO, UNICEF		1	1.1; 1.2

Target 1.4 By 2030, ensure that all men and women, in particular the poor and the vulnerable, have equal rights to economic resources, as well as access to basic services, ownership and control over land and other forms of property, inheritance, natural resources, appropriate new technology and financial services, including microfinance.

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Proportion of the population living in households with access to basic services.**	**MICS and DHS; household surveys**	**World Bank, UNDP, UNICEF**	**Tier II**		**1.2; 3.1; 3.2; 3.7; 3.8;4.1; 4.2; 4.5; 4.6; 5.6; 6.1; 6.2; 7.1; 11.1**
Suggested Indicator		**Share of women among agricultural land owners by age and location (U/R)**	**Included in Minimum Set Gender Indicators**	**FAO and UNSD (EDGE)**	**Tier III soon Tier II**		
Indicator 1.4.1 Proportion of population/households with access to basic services (to be defined) by sex and age group (BBA)							
	ITU	Proposed indicator to measure this target: **[proportion of households with broadband Internet access, by urban/rural]**	Data on this indicator are produced by NSOs, through household surveys. Some countries conduct a household survey where the question on households with broadband Internet access is included every year. For others, the frequency is every two or three years. Overall, the indicator is available for 53 countries at least from one survey in the years 2011-2014. Survey data for the proportion of households with Internet access (not broken down by narrowband/broadband) is available for 101 countries and ITU estimates data for this indicator for almost all other countries.	ITU collects data for this indicator from NSOs annually. Overall, the indicator is available for 53 countries at least from one survey in the years 2011-2014. Survey data for the proportion of households with Internet access (not broken down by narrowband/broadband) are available for 101 countries and ITU estimates data for this indicator for almost all other countries.			9.1, 9.c, 11.1
	UNCDF					1	
	UNEP	We suggest following basic but transformational services: renewable energy and water, sustainable transport, insurance, credit, justice, and information	Database for each of the services selected can be identified at a second stage	Can be identified at a second stage		2	Targets in Goals 2,3 4, 6,7, 9, 10, 16
	UNICEF	**[Proportion of the population living in households with access to basic services]**. Basic services to be defined but should include: antenatal care (access to health professionals at birth), basic vaccines, access to primary and secondary education, improved water source, improved sanitation, electricity and social security (TBC).	MICS and DHS; household surveys	World Bank, UNDP, UNICEF		1	1.2; 3.1; 3.2; 3.7; 3.8;4.1; 4.2; 4.5; 4.6; 5.6; 6.1; 6.2; 7.1; 11.1

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	UPU	The key issue is the definition of a basket of transformative basic services to be included in this indicator: (1) included in this should be electronic access, more specifically to ICT, such as the proportion of households with access to the Internet, ownership of a mobile phone, and with broadband internet, but also physical access to basic e-commerce logistics and postal services, such as the proportion of population with a physical address and benefiting from home delivery for postal and parcel services. (2) for access to formal financial services provided by financial institutions, payment and account services should be ideally distinguished: \% adults with a formal account or personally using a mobile money service in the past 12 months". Possible to have a break down by income e.g. bottom 40% of income share or <$1.25/day. Adults: ages 15+. Formal account: account at a bank or at another type of financial institution, such as a credit union, microfinance institution, cooperative, or the post office (if applicable), or a debit card; including an account at a financial institution for the purposes of receiving wages, government transfers, or payments for agricultural products, paying utility bills or school fees or a card for the purposes of receiving wages or government transfers. Account/card ownership within the past 12 months. Mobile money account includes GSM Association (GSMA) Mobile Money for the Unbanked (MMU) services in the past 12 months to pay bills or to send or receive money along with receiving wages, government transfers, or payments for agricultural products through a mobile phone in the past 12 months."	UPU existing data; ITU existing data; World Bank Global Findex (individual survey - added module to Gallup World Poll)	(1) On home delivery for postal and parcel services: Universal Postal Union. Data availability: ~ 160 countries. Annual. Available since 1875 (19th century) up to 2014 (21st century). (2) On postal accounts and payment services: Universal Postal Union. Data availability: ~ 130 countries. Annual. Available since 1899 (19th century) up to 2014 (21st century).		1	5.b, 9.1, 9.c, 10.3, 11.1, 16.7, 17.6, 17.8; And 1.4, 2.3, 5.a, 8.10
	WB	Basic services is a complicated and unclear metric, and success of this indicator will rely on the clear definition of services as sub-indicators. It doesn't seem feasible/technically robust to aggregate "ownership and control of land and other forms of property, inheritance, natural resources, appropriate new technology and financial services" under one overarching category "basic services" as the "services" included in the target seem to be quite diverse. (1) Included in this should be access to the internet, ownership of a mobile phone, and households with broadband internet access. (2) For access to financial services, there exists a well-established and widely available existing indicator that is comparable across countries: "% adults with a formal account or personally using a mobile money service in the past 12 months". Possible to have a break down by income e.g. bottom 40% of income share or <$1.25/day. Adults: ages 15+. Formal account: account at a bank or at another type of financial institution, such as a credit union, microfinance institution, cooperative, or the post office (if applicable), or a debit card; including an account at a financial institution for the purposes of receiving wages, government transfers, or payments for agricultural products, paying utility bills or school fees or a card for the purposes of receiving wages or government transfers. Account/card ownership within the past 12 months. Mobile money account includes GSM Association (GSMA) Mobile Money for the Unbanked (MMU) services in the past 12 months to pay bills or to send or receive money along with receiving wages, government transfers, or payments for agricultural products through a mobile phone in the past 12 months."	ITU Existing data; World Bank Global Findex (individual survey - added module to Gallup World Poll)	On Financial Services: World Bank. Data availability: ~ 145 countries. Triennial. Available for 2011 and 2014.		1	5.b, 9.1, 9.c, 10.3, 11.1, 16.7, 17.6, 17.8; And 1.4, 2.3, 5.a, 8.10
Indicator 1.4.2	**Proportion of adult population with tenure that is legally recognised and documented or perceived as secure, by sex and age group (BBB)**						

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	IFAD	FAO recognizes the value of the indicator 1.4.2 currently included in the UNSD template. However, such indicator poses several challenges in terms of feasibility, methodology and data availability. In order to be operational, the indicator should be more specific, and focus either on "equality in recognition and documentation" or on "perception of tenure security". The attempt to address the two issues (equality and perception) with one indicator could result into misleading and incomparable data. In addition, "perception of tenure security" requires focused and not trivial methodological efforts in order to reach a proper operational definition. On this basis, FAO believes an alternative indicator will be more appropriate to monitor Target 1.4 adequately. As an alternative to the current 1.4.2 indicator, FAO proposes the following indicator: **"[Percentage of female/male agricultural landowners out of total agricultural landowners", disaggregated by age groups, ethnicity and income levels".]** This indicator shows the distribution of male and female owners of agricultural land and hence zooms in on gender inequalities in this highly important productive resource. An increase in the percentage of female landowners indicates that out of those with ownership rights to land, a larger proportion is women, signifying progress towards equal rights to land. This indicator is based on a broad definition of ownership. In addition to officially titled ownership, it also includes other proxies, such as the right to use, sell or bequeath the land, or the right to use it as collateral. This enable the indicator to capture a "bundle of rights" related to land, rather than land ownership in the strictest sense of the term. The indicator frames gender differences in resource ownership by comparing the proportions of men and women out of those that have some degree of rights to land.	No data is available for the indicator 1.4.2 currently included in this template. For the landownership indicator proposed by FAO, data is available for 11 countries. Additional, but yet unprocessed surveys lead to a conservative estimate of additional 10-15 countries for which the indicator will be derived. This indicator will be more available in the future through the data collection processes indicated in the relevant factsheet.	FAO-UN. FAO has the mandate to collect and disseminate information related to agriculture and is strategically positioned to monitor legal frameworks related to land tenure, as well as to collect, analyse and disseminate land-related statistics. FAO is working to strengthen and improve data collection through efforts such as the new Guidelines for the World Census of Agriculture (WCA 2020) as well as the development of the AGRIS toolkit are clear indications of the commitment of FAO in sex-disaggregated land indicators.		1	5.a
	FAO	FAO recognizes the value of the indicator 1.4.2 currently included in the UNSD template. However, such indicator poses several challenges in terms of feasibility, methodology and data availability. In order to be operational, the indicator should be more specific, and focus either on “equality in recognition and documentation” or on “perception of tenure security”. The attempt to address the two issues (equality and perception) with one indicator could result into misleading and incomparable data. In addition, “perception of tenure security” requires focused and not trivial methodological efforts in order to reach a proper operational definition. On this basis, FAO believes an alternative indicator will be more appropriate to monitor Target 1.4 adequately. As an alternative to the current 1.4.2 indicator, FAO proposes the following indicator: “Percentage of female/male agricultural landowners out of total agricultural landowners”, disaggregated by age groups, ethnicity and income levels”. This indicator shows the distribution of male and female owners of agricultural land and hence zooms in on gender inequalities in this highly important productive resource. An increase in the percentage of female landowners indicates that out of those with ownership rights to land, a larger proportion is women, signifying progress towards equal rights to land. This indicator is based on a broad definition of ownership. In addition to officially titled ownership, it also includes other proxies, such as the right to use, sell or bequeath the land. This enable the indicator to capture a “bundle of rights” related to land, rather than land ownership in the strictest sense of the term. The indicator frames gender differences in resource ownership by comparing the proportions of men and women out of those that have some degree of rights to land. See metadata for complete description of indicator	No data is available for the indicator 1.4.2 currently included in this template. For the landownership indicator proposed by FAO, data is available for 11 countries. Additional, but yet unprocessed surveys lead to a conservative estimate of additional 10-15 countries for which the indicator will be derived. This indicator will be more available in the future through the data collection processes indicated in the relevant factsheet.	FAO-UN. FAO has the mandate to collect and disseminate information related to agriculture and is strategically positioned to monitor legal frameworks related to land tenure, as well as to collect, analyse and disseminate land-related statistics. FAO is working to strengthen and improve data collection through efforts such as the new Guidelines for the World Census of Agriculture (WCA 2020) as well as the development of the AGRIS toolkit are clear indications of the commitment of FAO in sex-disaggregated land indicators.		1	5.a
	UNCDF	Propose a Multi-Purpose Indicator: **[Adults owning an account either through a financial institution or mobile money provider, disaggregated by income level, geography location gender, age and education]**	Global Findex	World Bank - Data is available for 142 countries		2	Targets 2.3 , 5.a , 8.10, 10.2
	UNEP	**[Percentage of women, men, indigenous peoples and local communities with secure tenure rights to individually or communally held land, property and natural resources]**	This will be measured by: i) percentage with legally documented or recognized evidence of tenure, and ii) percentage who perceive their rights are recognized and protected (disaggregation by sex, urban/rural). Using administrative data, global polls, surveys, censuses (More info in the attached doc - Suggested phased approach)	FAO, UN-Habitat, UNEP, WRI - A few countries, but scaling-up is feasible		1	1.4; 2.3; 5.a.; 10.2; 11.1.; 15.a

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	UNWOMEN	As an alternative to the current 1.4.2 UN Women joins FAO in proposing the following indicator: ["**Proportion of women who own and/or control land out of total agricultural landowners. Landowners are defined as those having the right sell (where applicable), bequeath and make decisions about the use of the land".]** The indicator is based on a broad definition of ownership covering officially titled ownership, but also other proxies, such as the right to use, sell (in context where the right to sell is applicable) or bequeath the land. This enable the indicator to capture a "bundle of rights" related to land. This conceptualization of ownership is important, particularly in economies where the framework of ownership is not well defined. In such situations, ownership may be supported by legal documents or simply recognized within the community. As conceptualized the indicator captures a 'bundle of rights', with respect to land ownership .	No data is available for the indicator 1.4.2 currently included in this template. For the alternative proposed indicator: the EDGE project will have data for 8 countries. FAO has identified another 11 or so countries with more surveys planned.	FAO, UNSD, UN Women		1	5.a, 2.3
	UPU	One missing issue here was the lack of explicit reference to geography or a proper and formal street address. The indicator should be refined as follows: **[proportion of adult population (by sex and age) with tenure that is legally recognised and documented, including a formal street address, by sex and age group.]**	On the population formally covered by street addressing systems, the Universal Postal Union regularly uses as proxy \percentage of the population having mail delivered at home\"	On home delivery for postal services: Universal Postal Union. Data availability: ~ 160 countries. Annual. Available since 1875 (19th century) up to 2014 (21st century).		2	1.4; 2.3; 5.a.; 10.2; 11.1.; 15.a
	IUCN	Currently proposed indicator: IUCN supports adoption of this indicator.				1	2.3

Target 1.5 By 2030, build the resilience of the poor and those in vulnerable situations and reduce their exposure and vulnerability to climate-related extreme events and other economic, social and environmental shocks and disasters.

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters per 100,000 people.**	**National Disaster Loss Databases, 85 (will be more than 115 by 2016)**	**UNISDR**	**Tier II**		**11.5, 13.1, 14.2, 15.3**
Indicator 1.5.1	**Number of people affected by hazardous events by sex (CBB)**						
	UNEP	Alternative: **[Proportion of population resilient/robust to hazards and climate - related events by sex]**	UNEP/UNISDR see UNEP Supplementary technical document	UNEP/UNISDR Global - all countries		1	2.1;2.4;11.5;13.1
	IFAD					1	13.1
	UNICEF	[**Number of people affected by hazardous events by sex.]** Should also be disaggregated by age and disability. Could consider categorizing 'affected' (dead. Injured, displaced etc.). The ISDR expert group when developing similar indicators for Sendai stated: The "affected" indicator is very subjective, not easily defined, and therefore, any measure of this variable would be not comparable over time or among countries, thus making it inappropriate to track progress or use as a target. It is advisable to use instead a combination or one of the following: injured, evacuated, relocated, houses damaged, houses destroyed and directly exposed.					
	UNISDR	UNISR proposes refinement into **[Number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters per 100,000 people."]**. Please see UNISDR input paper attached." Disaster is defined by UNISDR as a "serious disruption of the functioning of a community or a society involving widespread human, material, economic or environmental losses and impacts, which exceeds the ability of the affected community or society to cope using its own resources." The terms "relocated" and "evacuated" are still under discussion by relevant agencies.	National Disaster Loss Databases, 85 (will be more than 115 by 2016)	UNISDR		1	11.5, 13.1, 14.2, 15.3
Indicator 1.5.2	**Proportion of health and educational facilities affected by hazardous events (BBB)**						
	IFAD					2	
	UNICEF	[**Proportion of health and educational facilities affected by hazardous events.]** Impact of events should be measured on a scale, not left up to governments to interpret 'affected'. So as per above perhaps 'damaged' may be better, is more measurable and links with Sendai targets language (though appreciate this may not capture economic and social shocks).					
	UNISDR	UNISR proposes **["Direct disaster economic loss in relation to global gross domestic product"]**. Please see UNISDR input paper attached."	National Disaster Loss Databases, 85 (will be more than 115 by 2016)	UNISDR		2	11.5, 13.1, 14.2, 15.3, 2.4

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	OHCHR	**[Percentage of persons forcibly displaced by disasters, crises and other shocks who have found a durable solution to their displacement]** Current indicators 1.5.1 and 1.5.2 should be replaced as they are covered more comprehensively by/under 11.5.1 and 11.5.2. However, whereas 11.5 and its indicators cover only disasters, 1.5 covers a wider range of hazards, such as social, economic and environmental shocks. Hence a multi-purpose global indicator covering the number of people killed, injured, displaced or otherwise affected by disasters, crises and other (social, economic and environmental) shocks (linked to 1.5, 11.5, 13.1, 16.1 as well as 10.7) would be advisable, complemented by the above alternative indicator 1 for 1.5 (linked also to 11.5, 13.1, 16.1 as well as 10.7)) that would measure the (number and) percentage of forcibly displaced people who have found a durable solution to their displacement as a measure of resilience among particularly vulnerable and marginalized groups (i.e. refugees and internally displaced persons). See supplementary metadata material for justification.	Existing/developing (national level) Government statistics and population data. Registration and documentation of IDPs and refugees, in particular UNHCR registration (figures disaggregated by age, gender and disabilities - AGD mainstreaming) and profiling exercises, annual refugee flow and stock figures and number of asylum applications, participatory needs assessments and population surveys by humanitarian actors. IOM Displacement Tracking Matrix. Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC) IDP Database and Annual Global Estimates Reports for displacement induced by conflict/generalized violence and disasters, as well as UN Population Fund (UNFPA) figures to normalize displacement estimates. Joint IDP Profiling Service (collects data disaggregated by sex, age, location and diversity). OCHA situation reports (in ongoing humanitarian emergencies). Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters (CRED) EM-DAT International Disaster Database	UNHCR (global coverage, with data generally provided by Governments, based on their own definitions and methods of data collection). Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (Currently internal displacement profiles for 50 countries. Global reports since 1998.)		1	11.5, 16.1, 10.7, 13.1

Target 1.a Ensure significant mobilization of resources from a variety of sources, including through enhanced development cooperation, in order to provide adequate and predictable means for developing countries, in particular least developed countries, to implement programmes and policies to end poverty in all its dimensions.

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Share of total overall government spending (incl. subnationals) on programs directed to bottom 40% of population of country (%).**		**World Bank**	**Tier III**		**[3.1; 3.2; 3.3; 3.4; 3.7; 3.8; 4.1; 4.2; 4.3; 4.6; 5.6]**
Indicator 1.a.1	**Resources mobilized and spent for poverty reduction, including government, private sector and development partners (BBB)**						
	UNICEF	**[New indicator proposed] [Spending on essential services (education and health) as % of total government spending (% of total government spending)].** This indicator is expressed as a percentage.	Government expenditure data: IMF's World Economic Outlook database (total government expenditures), UNESCO's Institute for Statistics database (education expenditures) and World Bank Development Indicators (health expenditures).	UNICEF Total coverage is 124 countries.		1	3.1; 3.2; 3.3; 3.4; 3.7; 3.8; 4.1; 4.2; 4.3; 4.6; 5.6
	WB	Indicator 1.a.1 has no precise meaning and cannot be measured as proposed. Suggest to drop. Alternatively replace with something like: **["Share of total overall government spending (incl. subnationals) on programs directed to bottom 40% of population of country (%)."]** New possible indicator for 1a: **["Sum of Total Grants and FDI and non-debt creating inflows - $$$ equivalent."]**					

Target 1.b Create sound policy frameworks at the national, regional and international levels, based on pro-poor and gender sensitive development strategies, to support accelerated investment in poverty eradication actions.

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Number of national action plans related to multi-lateral environmental agreements that support accelerated investment in actions that eradicate poverty and sustainably use natural resources.**	**Data on all national action plans for MEAs can be found in INFORMEA, which in turn draws upon the data from individual MEAs such as the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans (http://www.bipindicators.net/statusofNBSAPs and http://www.cbd.int/nbsap/)**	**INFORMEA (www.informea.org). Information currently available for more than 160 countries**	**Tier I**		**Targets 1.b, 13.2 and 15.9**
	WB	A suggestion is that indicator 1.b should read: **["Share of government recurrent and capital spending going to sectors that disproportionately benefit women, poor and vulnerable groups (%)"]**					
	UNEP	**[Number of national action plans related to multi-lateral environmental agreements that support accelerated investment in actions that eradicate poverty and sustainably use natural resources]**	Data on all national action plans for MEAs can be found in INFORMEA, which in turn draws upon the data from individual MEAs such as the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans (http://www.bipindicators.net/statusofNBSAPs and http://www.cbd.int/nbsap/)	INFORMEA (www.informea.org). Information currently available for more than 160 countries		1	Targets 1.b, 13.2 and 15.9

Goal 2 End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture

Target 2.1 By 2030, end hunger and ensure access by all people, in particular the poor and people in vulnerable situations, including infants, to safe, nutritious and sufficient food all year round.

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Prevalence of undernourishment**	**The FAO methodology combines available micro-data on food consumption derived from surveys with macro-data from food balance sheets. The ability of the indicator to approximate access to food depends upon the extent to which existing data allow characterizing effectively the probability distribution of habitual food consumption in the reference population.**	**FAO - Consistent time series for the indicator exist from 1990-92 for about 140 countries. The indicator is regularly reported in the annual State of Food Insecurity in the World Report published by FAO, IFAD and WFP since 1999 and in the Millennium Development Goal Report of the UN Statistics Division. Data on the indicators are published on the FAO Statistics website, at http://www.fao.org/economic/ess/ess-fs/ess-fadata/it/#.VM89cGjF-VM and updated every year.**	**Tier I**		

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

Suggested Indicator	**Prevalence of population with moderate or severe food insecurity, based on the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES)**	**For the FIES: FAO and National Data. Data are collected annually by FAO for about 150 countries through the Food Insecurity Experience Scale module included in the Gallup World Poll, starting from 2014. A number of countries already use similar tools for national food insecurity assessment (e.g., HFSSM in the US and Canada; EMSA in Mexico; EBIA in Brazil; ELCSA in Guatemala.) Data collected through these tools may be used to inform an assessment that would be comparable with the ones obtained by FAO using the FIES in other countries. Over time, ownership of the FIES indicators will be transferred to countries that may start producing their own data. FCS data is collected around the world by WFP, NGOs, and government partners are often collected within the context of larger/broader food security monitoring systems (FSMS). FSMS surveys and associated household questionnaires typically include a number of core modules; household demographics, income sources, expenditures, food consumption and food sources, coping strategies and shocks. A typical completed FSMS household questionnaire, if collected using a conventional "face-to-face" (i.e. on site enumerator and respondent) approach, costs approximately $30. For the purpose of providing a rough estimate of the cost and feasibility of collecting only the FCS data together with the standard household demographic data, we estimate the cost at approximately $15 to $20 per household using the conventional face-to-face approach for data collection. See attached metadata for a more complete explanation.**	**FAO can ensure global coverage (about 150 countries every year covering more than 95% of the world population) annually. For countries that regularly use similar scales, national data will be used to inform the indicators for global monitoring. FAO provides the methodology for calibrating all measures against the common, global reference. Indicators values will be disseminated annually by FAO.**	**Tier II**		**The severity of food insecurity is a determinant and early warning sign of possible malnutrition. The FIES based indicators can thus be used as predictors of various forms of malnutrition, and therefore be relevant for target 2.2. A number of experts have highlighted the contribution of the FCS indicator to information on nutrient adequacy estimates, caloric intake, and have also highlighted unique benefits not associated with other dietary diversity indicators. In that context the use of the FCS would also be an added value to target 2.2, 3.1, and 3.2.**
Indicator 2.1.1 Prevalence of Undernourishment (PoU). (BAA)							
IFAD	This is the current MDG indicator 1.9. It is proposed here as it is already established, and FAO will continue to publish it in the future. However, it presents several limitations as an indicator for the new and more ambitious target to "ensure access by all people to [...] food". In particular, it does not allow for disaggregation by population groups and it is not sufficiently sensitive to detect very low levels of undernourishment (5% being the lowest detectable limit). For these reasons, we propose two additional indicators that have not been established yet, but for which there is on-going work by FAO and the WFP respectively. These are: **[Indicator 2.1.2 below, on the prevalence of population with moderate or severe food insecurity, based on the FIES, developed by FAO, and the percentage of households with insufficient food consumption, based on the Food Consumption Score, developed by WFP.]**	The FAO methodology combines available micro-data on food consumption derived from surveys with macro-data from food balance sheets. The ability of the indicator to approximate access to food depends upon the extent to which existing data allow characterizing effectively the probability distribution of habitual food consumption in the reference population.	Consistent time series for the indicator exist from 1990-92 for about 140 countries. The indicator is regularly reported in the annual State of Food Insecurity in the World Report published by FAO, IFAD and WFP since 1999 and in the Millennium Development Goal Report of the UN Statistics Division. Data on the indicators are published on the FAO Statistics website, at http://www.fao.org/economic/ess/ess-fs/ess-fadata/it/#.VM89cGjF-VM and updated every year.		1	
FAO	This is the current MDG indicator 1.9. It is proposed here as it is already established, and FAO will continue to publish it in the future. However, it presents several limitations as an indicator for the new and more ambitious target to "ensure access by all people to [...] food". In particular, it does not allow for disaggregation by population groups and it is not sufficiently sensitive to detect very low levels of undernourishment (5% being the lowest detectable limit). For these reasons, we propose two additional indicators that have not been established yet, but for which there is on-going work by FAO and the WFP respectively. These are: Indicator 2.1.2 below, on the **[prevalence of population with moderate or severe food insecurity, based on the FIES, developed by FAO, and the percentage of households with insufficient food consumption, based on the Food Consumption Score, developed by WFP.]**	The FAO methodology combines available micro-data on food consumption derived from surveys with macro-data from food balance sheets. The ability of the indicator to approximate access to food depends upon the extent to which existing data allow characterizing effectively the probability distribution of habitual food consumption in the reference population.	Consistent time series for the indicator exist from 1990-92 for about 140 countries. The indicator is regularly reported in the annual State of Food Insecurity in the World Report published by FAO, IFAD and WFP since 1999 and in the Millennium Development Goal Report of the UN Statistics Division. Data on the indicators are published on the FAO Statistics website, at http://www.fao.org/economic/ess/ess-fs/ess-fadata/it/#.VM89cGjF-VM and updated every year.		1	
UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for this indicator to be disaggregated by sex and age.					
WB			FAO			
Indicator 2.1.2 Prevalence of population with moderate or severe food insecurity, based on the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES). (CBB)							

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	IFAD	This indicator is a direct implementation of the concept of "access to food" that informs the target and is based on the FIES, which is an example of experience-based food insecurity scales, directly measuring the effective ability to access food at the individual or household level. Experience-based food security scales have been tested since 1995 and used in a number of countries for regular monitoring of food insecurity among households. FAO has piloted its application in 2013, and started collecting data globally in 2014. A global reference scale of severity and universal thresholds for classification of moderate and severe levels of food insecurity for comparable use worldwide are produced by the FAO Voices of the Hungry project. The Food Consumption Score measured by the World Food Programme can in certain countries complement FIES- and undernourishment indicator. The FCS indicator is a "food access" indicator, and is based on both dietary diversity, and the frequency of food groups consumed. The FCS is a score calculated using the frequency of consumption of different food groups consumed by a household during the 7 days before the survey. The FCS in its standard form has been in use by WFP for over 15 years and has enabled the organization to assess and monitor food access and consumption in developing countries. See attached metadata for a more complete explanation.	For the FIES: FAO and National Data. Data are collected annually by FAO for about 150 countries through the Food Insecurity Experience Scale module included in the Gallup World Poll, starting from 2014. A number of countries already use similar tools for national food insecurity assessment (e.g., HFSSM in the US and Canada; EMSA in Mexico; EBIA in Brazil; ELCSA in Guatemala.) Data collected through these tools may be used to inform an assessment that would be comparable with the ones obtained by FAO using the FIES in other countries. Over time, ownership of the FIES indicators will be transferred to countries that may start producing their own data. FCS data is collected around the world by WFP, NGOs, and government partners are often collected within the context of larger/broader food security monitoring systems (FSMS). FSMS surveys and associated household questionnaires typically include a number of core modules; household demographics, income sources, expenditures, food consumption and food sources, coping strategies and shocks. A typical completed FSMS household questionnaire, if collected using a conventional "face-to-face" (i.e. on site enumerator and respondent) approach, costs approximately $30. For the purpose of providing a rough estimate of the cost and feasibility of collecting only the FCS data together with the standard household demographic data, we estimate the cost at approximately $15 to $20 per household using the conventional face-to-face approach for data collection. See attached metadata for a more complete explanation.	FAO can ensure global coverage (about 150 countries every year covering more than 95% of the world population) annually. For countries that regularly use similar scales, national data will be used to inform the indicators for global monitoring. FAO provides the methodology for calibrating all measures against the common, global reference. Indicators values will be disseminated annually by FAO.		2	The severity of food insecurity is a determinant and early warning sign of possible malnutrition. The FIES based indicators can thus be used as predictors of various forms of malnutrition, and therefore be relevant for target 2.2. A number of experts have highlighted the contribution of the FCS indicator to information on nutrient adequacy estimates, caloric intake, and have also highlighted unique benefits not associated with other dietary diversity indicators. In that context the use of the FCS would also be an added value to target 2.2, 3.1, and 3.2.
	FAO	This indicator is a direct implementation of the concept of "access to food" that informs the target and is based on the FIES, which is an example of experience-based food insecurity scales, directly measuring the effective ability to access food at the individual or household level. Experience-based food security scales have been tested since 1995 and used in a number of countries for regular monitoring of food insecurity among households. FAO has piloted its application in 2013, and started collecting data globally in 2014. A global reference scale of severity and universal thresholds for classification of moderate and severe levels of food insecurity for comparable use worldwide are produced by the FAO Voices of the Hungry project. The Food Consumption Score measured by the World Food Programme can in certain countries complement FIES- and undernourishment indicator. The FCS indicator is a "food access" indicator, and is based on both dietary diversity, and the frequency of food groups consumed. The FCS is a score calculated using the frequency of consumption of different food groups consumed by a household during the 7 days before the survey. The FCS in its standard form has been in use by WFP for over 15 years and has enabled the organization to assess and monitor food access and consumption in developing countries. See attached metadata for a more complete explanation.	For the FIES: FAO and National Data. Data are collected annually by FAO for about 150 countries through the Food Insecurity Experience Scale module included in the Gallup World Poll, starting from 2014. A number of countries already use similar tools for national food insecurity assessment (e.g., HFSSM in the US and Canada; EMSA in Mexico; EBIA in Brazil; ELCSA in Guatemala.) Data collected through these tools may be used to inform an assessment that would be comparable with the ones obtained by FAO using the FIES in other countries. Over time, ownership of the FIES indicators will be transferred to countries that may start producing their own data. FCS data is collected around the world by WFP, NGOs, and government partners are often collected within the context of larger/broader food security monitoring systems (FSMS). FSMS surveys and associated household questionnaires typically include a number of core modules; household demographics, income sources, expenditures, food consumption and food sources, coping strategies and shocks. A typical completed FSMS household questionnaire, if collected using a conventional "face-to-face" (i.e. on site enumerator and respondent) approach, costs approximately $30. For the purpose of providing a rough estimate of the cost and feasibility of collecting only the FCS data together with the standard household demographic data, we estimate the cost at approximately $15 to $20 per household using the conventional face-to-face approach for data collection. See attached metadata for a more complete explanation.	FAO can ensure global coverage (about 150 countries every year covering more than 95% of the world population) annually. For countries that regularly use similar scales, national data will be used to inform the indicators for global monitoring. FAO provides the methodology for calibrating all measures against the common, global reference. Indicators values will be disseminated annually by FAO.		2	The severity of food insecurity is a determinant and early warning sign of possible malnutrition. The FIES based indicators can thus be used as predictors of various forms of malnutrition, and therefore be relevant for target 2.2. A number of experts have highlighted the contribution of the FCS indicator to information on nutrient adequacy estimates, caloric intake, and have also highlighted unique benefits not associated with other dietary diversity indicators. In that context the use of the FCS would also be an added value to target 2.2, 3.1, and 3.2.
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for this indicator to be disaggregated by sex and age.					
	WB	The concern we have with this indicator is that it seems new and untested so would suggest removing, unless it can be demonstrated be a robust estimate of food insecurity (tested with actual data compared to other indicators)					

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	WFP	**["The Food Consumption Score measured by the World Food Programme]** can in certain countries complement FIES- and undernourishment indicator. The FCS indicator is a "food access" indicator, and is based on both dietary diversity, and the frequency of food groups consumed. The FCS is a score calculated using the frequency of consumption of different food groups consumed by a household during the 7 days before the survey. The FCS in its standard form has been in use by WFP for over 15 years and has enabled the organization to assess and monitor food access and consumption in developing countries. While by definition the FCS is a composite indicator, the food frequency data collected for its computation provides a rich data repository that may be employed in a variety of ways. For example, nutrient adequacy may be analysed from the raw frequency data, and unweighted or differentially weighted scores may be adapted to reflect cultural and geographic dietary variation, to account for seasonality, or to prioritize dietary habits that are consistent with sustainable development goals. WFP currently has statistically representative FCS data at national scale, for over 35 countries around the world, from which baseline values have been derived. To facilitate global monitoring, global targets would have to be established, which would require significant investments."	"FCS data is collected around the world by WFP, NGOs, and government partners are often collected within the context of larger/broader food security monitoring systems (FSMS). FSMS surveys and associated household questionnaires typically include a number of core modules; household demographics, income sources, expenditures, food consumption and food sources, coping strategies and shocks. A typical completed FSMS household questionnaire, if collected using a conventional "face-to-face" (i.e. on site enumerator and respondent) approach, costs approximately $30. For the purpose of providing a rough estimate of the cost and feasibility of collecting only the FCS data together with the standard household demographic data, we estimate the cost at approximately $15 to $20 per household using the conventional face-to-face approach for data collection. WFP is a member of the International Household Survey Network (IHSN). As a member of IHSN, WFP maintains a micro-data catalogue and associated website, with meta-data files for its statistically representative household level surveys. These surveys and related studies are known and referred to as Comprehensive Food Security Vulnerability Assessments (CFSVAs). The CFSVA surveys contain Food Consumption Score (FCS) data, along with many other variables. Detailed metadata for the CFSVA surveys, including the metadata for the FCS Indicator data; can be viewed and accessed at WFP's IHSN Survey Data Portal at the following link: http://nada.vam.wfp.org/index.php/catalog . WFP is committed to transparency and data access, and survey data are maintained in publicly available databases. Detailed Metadata tables for the FCS indicator are available at the link immediately below: http://www.wfp.org/content/meta-data-food-consumption-score-fcs-indicator""	Since 2003, WFP's VAM/Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping team has completed more than 80 baseline surveys worldwide, most of these have been carried out with national scale coverage. The large majority of these surveys contain Food Consumption Score data. The FCS is measured at household level, and therefore can easily be aggregated at the community, national, or regional level using appropriate population adjustments. The proportion of households failing to achieve a minimally acceptable FCS is easily comparable across countries, while scores for households that are not in states of severe or moderate food insecurity are more easily subjected to cultural and geographic variation. To account for this variation, an analysis of scores associated with high-quality diets in each country can be used to estimate proportions of households meeting acceptable dietary requirements.		1	A number of experts have highlighted the reliability of the FCS indicator with respect to nutrient adequacy estimates, caloric intake, and have also highlighted unique benefits not associated with other dietary diversity indicators. In that context the use of the FCS would also be an added value to target 2.2, 3.1, and 3.2.
	GlobalMigrationWG		NB! Disaggregate by displacement status				

Target 2.2 By 2030, end all forms of malnutrition, including achieving, by 2025, the internationally agreed targets on stunting and wasting in children under 5 years of age, and address the nutritional needs of adolescent girls, pregnant and lactating women and older persons.

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Prevalence of stunting (height for age <-2 SD from the median of the WHO Child Growth Standards) among children under five years of age**	**MICS, DHS and other national household surveys**	**UNICEF, WHO, World Bank joint dataset (145 countries)**	**Tier I**		
Indicator 2.2.1		**Prevalence of Stunting (low height-for-age) in children under 5 years of age. (BAA)**					
	IFAD	While we support use of the two listed indicators on stunting and overweight, maintained by WHO and UNICEF, we strongly encourage inclusion of the **[Minimum Dietary Diversity for Women (MDD-W) indicator]**, that is the percentage of women, 15-49 years of age, who consume at least 5 out of 10 defined food groups. This is an indicator of the probability of micronutrient adequacy, which provides a necessary link between food and nutrition in the global assessment.	The MDD-W is a new indicator that has been developed and validated against high-quality quantitative dietary data. It is not yet regularly reported although similar data on dietary diversity of women have been reported in the past. Potential data sources include the DHS surveys and the UNICEF MICS.	FAO proposes to become the maintainer of the MDD-W indicator.			
	FAO	While we support use of the two listed indicators on stunting and overweight, maintained by WHO and UNICEF, we strongly encourage inclusion of the Minimum Dietary Diversity for Women (MDD-W) indicator, that is the percentage of women, 15-49 years of age, who consume at least 5 out of 10 defined food groups. This is an indicator of the probability of micronutrient adequacy, which provides a necessary link between food and nutrition in the global assessment.	The MDD-W is a new indicator that has been developed and validated against high-quality quantitative dietary data. It is not yet regularly reported although similar data on dietary diversity of women have been reported in the past. Potential data sources include the DHS surveys and the UNICEF MICS.	FAO proposes to become the maintainer of the MDD-W indicator.			
	UNICEF	**[Prevalence of stunting (height for age <-2 SD from the median of the WHO Child Growth Standards) among children under five years of age]**	MICS, DHS and other national household surveys	UNICEF, WHO, World Bank Joint dataset (145 countries)		1	targets 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 3.1, 3.2, 4.1, 4.2
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for this indicator to be disaggregated by sex.					
	WB			WHO		1	
Indicator 2.2.2		**Prevalence of overweight children under 5 years of age. (BAA)**					
	UNICEF	**[Prevalence of overweight (weight for height >+2 SD from the median of the WHO Child Growth Standards) among children under five years of age]**	MICS, DHS and other national household surveys	UNICEF, WHO, World Bank Joint dataset (145 countries)		2	targets 3.4
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for this indicator to be disaggregated by sex.					
	WB			WHO		2	
	UNICEF	**[Prevalence of wasting (weight for height <-2 SD from the median of the WHO Child Growth Standards) among children under five years of age]**	MICS, DHS and other national household surveys	UNICEF, WHO, World Bank Joint dataset (145 countries)		3	targets 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 3.1, 3.2,
	UNICEF	**[Exclusive breastfeeding among 0-5 month olds]**	MICS, DHS and other national household surveys	UNICEF Global databases (126 countries)		4	Target 2.1, 3.2

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	UNICEF	**[Prevalence of anaemia (Hb = 11 g/dl) among women of reproductive age]**	MICS, DHS and other national household surveys	WHO Global databases (all countries globally; developed and developing as they are modelled estimates)		5	Target 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 3.1, 3.2, 4.1, 4.5, 5.5

Target 2.3 By 2030, double the agricultural productivity and incomes of small-scale food producers, in particular women, indigenous peoples, family farmers, pastoralists and fishers, including through secure and equal access to land, other productive resources and inputs, knowledge, financial services, markets and opportunities for value addition and non-farm employment.

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Value of production per labour unit (measured in constant USD), by classes of farming/pastoral/forestry enterprise size**	**National enterprise surveys. For agriculture, specialized farm surveys , or integrated household surveys including an agricultural module already exist (eg., LSMS-ISA, Integrated Surveys for Agriculture) FAO and the World Bank are working to define a new Agricultural and Rural Integrated Survey (AGRIS) program, that may be used as a source of data to inform this and many others indicators of relevance for the SDG that depend on farm/enterprise level information.**	**FAO and the World bank. Data to compute the indicator for agricultural producers are currently available for nine developing countries through LSMS-ISA. When the AGRIS program will be in operation, indicators will be published through FAOSTAT.**	**Tier II**		
Indicator 2.3.1		**Value of agricultural production per hectare (measured in constant USD/hectare, disaggregated for the two lowest quintiles of countries' farm size distribution, as well as for female-headed smallholder producer households) (BBB)**					
	IFAD	Propose improved alternative: "**[Value of production per labour unit (measured in constant USD), by classes of farming/pastoral/forestry enterprise size]**". This indicator measures labour productivity as a proxy for net income of small food producers, and thus is more directly relevant to the formulation of the target. Agreement needs to be found on a comparable definition of "small scale producer" in each sector.	National enterprise surveys. For agriculture, specialized farm surveys , or integrated household surveys including an agricultural module already exist (eg., LSMS-ISA, Integrated Surveys for Agriculture) FAO and the World Bank are working to define a new Agricultural and Rural Integrated Survey (AGRIS) program, that may be used as a source of data to inform this and many others indicators of relevance for the SDG that depend on farm/enterprise level information.	FAO and the World bank. Data to compute the indicator for agricultural producers are currently available for nine developing countries through LSMS-ISA. When the AGRIS program will be in operation, indicators will be published through FAOSTAT.		1	
	FAO	Propose improved alternative: **["Value of production per labour unit (measured in constant USD), by classes of farming/pastoral/forestry enterprise size".]** This indicator measures labour productivity as a proxy for net income of small food producers, and thus is more directly relevant to the formulation of the target. Agreement needs to be found on a comparable definition of "small scale producer" in each sector.	National enterprise surveys. For agriculture, specialized farm surveys , or integrated household surveys including an agricultural module already exist (eg., LSMS-ISA, Integrated Surveys for Agriculture) FAO and the World Bank are working to define a new Agricultural and Rural Integrated Survey (AGRIS) program, that may be used as a source of data to inform this and many others indicators of relevance for the SDG that depend on farm/enterprise level information.	FAO and the World bank. Data to compute the indicator for agricultural producers are currently available for nine developing countries through LSMS-ISA. When the AGRIS program will be in operation, indicators will be published through FAOSTAT.		1	
	UNCDF	Propose an additional Multi-Purpose Indicator:**[Adults owning an account either through a financial institution or mobile money provider, disaggregated by income level, geography location gender, age and education]**	Global Findex	World Bank - Data is available for 142 countries		2	Targets 1.4 , 5.a , 8.10 , 10.2
	UNWOMEN	As an additional indicator UN Women proposes the following:**["Proportion of women who own and/or control land out of total agricultural landowners. Landowners are defined as those having the right sell (where applicable), bequeath and make decisions about the use of the land".]** The indicator is based on a broad definition of ownership covering officially titled ownership, but also other proxies, such as the right to use, sell (in context where the right to sell is applicable) or bequeath the land. This enable the indicator to capture a "bundle of rights" related to land. This conceptualization of ownership is important, particularly in economies where the framework of ownership is not well defined. In such situations, ownership may be supported by legal documents or simply recognized within the community. As conceptualized the indicator captures a 'bundle of rights', with respect to land ownership .	No data is available for the indicator 1.4.2 currently included in this template. For the alternative proposed indicator: the EDGE project will have data for 8 countries. FAO has identified another 11 or so countries with more surveys planned.	FAO, UNSD, UN Women		2	1.4, 5a

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	WB	A concern with this indicator is that it would be only collected infrequently (not annually). Data on the distribution of farm sizes, and yields on these farm sizes in not available for many countries for one year, let along multiple years. We propose two alternative indicators since the disaggregation by economic classification is important, as needed gains by poorest countries (e.g. Africa) are larger than less poor (e.g. Asia). [**(1) Cereal yields by economic classification: FAO would be responsible for this. (2) Agricultural value added per worker by economic classification. World Bank (World Development Indicators) would be responsible for this.]** Finally, we propose another alternate indicator as the proposed indicator 2.3.1 can be considered as an outcome of improved access to/use of goods and services mentioned in the second half of the wording of the target. For access to financial services: **["% adults with a formal account or personally using a mobile money service in the past 12 months"]**. Possible to have a break down by income e.g. bottom 40% of income share or <$1.25/day. Adults: ages 15+. Formal account: account at a bank or at another type of financial institution, such as a credit union, microfinance institution, cooperative, or the post office (if applicable), or a debit card; including an account at a financial institution for the purposes of receiving wages, government transfers, or payments for agricultural products, paying utility bills or school fees or a card for the purposes of receiving wages or government transfers. Account/card ownership within the past 12 months. Mobile money account includes GSM Association (GSMA) Mobile Money for the Unbanked (MMU) services in the past 12 months to pay bills or to send or receive money along with receiving wages, government transfers, or payments for agricultural products through a mobile phone in the past 12 months."					
	IUCN	Proposed additional/alternative indicator: IUCN recommends that the indicator of **["Proportion of adult population with tenure that is legally recognised and documented of perceived as secure, by sex and age group"**], proposed as 1.4.2 would be an appropriate additional indicator to reflect the elements of "secure and equal access to land" in this Target.				1	1.4

Target 2.4 By 2030, ensure sustainable food production systems and implement resilient agricultural practices that increase productivity and production, that help maintain ecosystems, that strengthen capacity for adaptation to climate change, extreme weather, drought, flooding and other disasters and that progressively improve land and soil quality.

	ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Percentage of agricultural area under sustainable agricultural practices.**	**At global level, currently there is no data available. However many if not most of the countries record areas which are the object of practices contributing to environmental sustainability under various schemes, either of a regulatory nature, like protected areas for instance, or as part of a subsidies scheme or in a payment for environmental services scheme or as part of voluntary standards, public or private. Countries are also preparing, as part of national reports for the state of the world biodiversity for food and agriculture, statistics on practices contributing to biodiversity, most of which have a broader positive impact on the environment. Moreover, many countries are participating in internationally established strategic frameworks which promote the collection of data at country level. Hence, the data for computing the indicator should be collected through the records that are held in the process of the country participation to those schemes and strategies.**	**FAO is carrying on a consultation process to develop an indicator on "Area under sustainable land management", to be developed by the end of 2015. The process will be within the framework of the "World Overview of Conservation Approaches and Technologies" (WOCAT) partnership and in the support of UNCCD implementation and will support countries to assess, map and monitor SLM as well as land degradation.**	**Tier II**		**The proposed alternative is used as one component of indicator 15.3.2, Area of land/soils under sustainable management**
Indicator 2.4.1		**Emissions of greenhouse gases in agriculture (per hectare of land and per unit of output, separately for crop and livestock sectors). (BBB)**					
	IFAD	Propose improved alternative: **["Percentage of agricultural area under sustainable agricultural practices"].** The indicator is more directly linked with the target, particularly to the aspects of sustainable production, adaptation to climate change and improvement of land and soil. The indicator is defined by the following formula: A= area on which are conducted practices contributing to environmental sustainability of agriculture / agricultural area, where Agricultural Area = Arable land and Permanent crops + Permanent meadows and pastures (FAOSTAT), and Area on which are conducted practices contributing to environmental sustainability of agriculture = the surface area identified and/or acknowledged by the government as being affected by agronomic activities and practices that contribute to environmental sustainability of agriculture.	At global level, currently there is no data available. However many if not most of the countries record areas which are the object of practices contributing to environmental sustainability under various schemes, either of a regulatory nature, like protected areas for instance, or as part of a subsidies scheme or in a payment for environmental services scheme or as part of voluntary standards, public or private. Countries are also preparing, as part of national reports for the state of the world biodiversity for food and agriculture, statistics on practices contributing to biodiversity, most of which have a broader positive impact on the environment. Moreover, many countries are participating in internationally established strategic frameworks which promote the collection of data at country level. Hence, the data for computing the indicator should be collected through the records that are held in the process of the country participation to those schemes and strategies.	FAO is carrying on a consultation process to develop an indicator on "Area under sustainable land management", to be developed by the end of 2015. The process will be within the framework of the "World Overview of Conservation Approaches and Technologies" (WOCAT) partnership and in the support of UNCCD implementation and will support countries to assess, map and monitor SLM as well as land degradation.		1	The proposed alternative is used as one component of indicator 15.3.2, Area of land/soils under sustainable management

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

FAO	Propose improved alternative: **["Percentage of agricultural area under sustainable agricultural practices"].** The indicator is more directly linked with the target, particularly to the aspects of sustainable production, adaptation to climate change and improvement of land and soil. The indicator is defined by the following formula: A= area on which are conducted practices contributing to environmental sustainability of agriculture / agricultural area, where Agricultural Area = Arable land and Permanent crops + Permanent meadows and pastures (FAOSTAT), and Area on which are conducted practices contributing to environmental sustainability of agriculture = the surface area identified and/or acknowledged by the government as being affected by agronomic activities and practices that contribute to environmental sustainability of agriculture.	At global level, currently there is no data available. However many if not most of the countries record areas which are the object of practices contributing to environmental sustainability under various schemes, either of a regulatory nature, like protected areas for instance, or as part of a subsidies scheme or in a payment for environmental services scheme or as part of voluntary standards, public or private. Countries are also preparing, as part of national reports for the state of the world biodiversity for food and agriculture, statistics on practices contributing to biodiversity, most of which have a broader positive impact on the environment. Moreover, many countries are participating in internationally established strategic frameworks which promote the collection of data at country level. Hence, the data for computing the indicator should be collected through the records that are held in the process of the country participation to those schemes and strategies.	FAO is carrying on a consultation process to develop an indicator on "Area under sustainable land management", to be developed by the end of 2015. The process will be within the framework of the "World Overview of Conservation Approaches and Technologies" (WOCAT) partnership and in the support of UNCCD implementation and will support countries to assess, map and monitor SLM as well as land degradation.		1	The proposed alternative is used as one component of indicator 15.3.2, Area of land/soils under sustainable management
UNISDR	UNISR proposes **[Agricultural loss due to disasters"]**. Please see UNISDR input paper attached."	National Disaster Loss Databases, 85 (will be more than 115 by 2016)	UNISDR		1	15.3, 1.5, 13.1, 11.5, 14.2
WB	Change indicator name to **[Emissions of greenhouse gases in agriculture (CO2 equivalent per hectare of land and per unit of output, separately for crop and livestock sectors).]"**		FAO			
Indicator 2.4.2	**Absolute levels of emissions in relevant sectors and sub-sectors. (BBB)**					
IFAD	Propose dropping in favour of above alternative, **["Percentage of agricultural area under sustainable agricultural practices"]**					
FAO	Propose dropping in favour of above alternative, **["Percentage of agricultural area under sustainable agricultural practices"]**					
UNISDR	UNISR proposes **"[Direct disaster economic loss in relation to global gross domestic product]"**. Please see UNISDR input paper attached."	National Disaster Loss Databases, 85 (will be more than 115 by 2016)	UNISDR		2	11.5, 13.1, 14.2, 15.3, 2.4
WB	The concern we have with this indicator is that it implies that the absolute levels of emissions across all countries and sectors should decline. But it is better for overall emissions reduction to produce more beef in Ireland (for example) that has lower emissions intensive production than some other European countries. This may raise absolute emissions in Ireland, but lower it by more in other countries with substitution of production.					
IUCN	Proposed additional/alternative indicator: Focusing both indicators under Target 2.4 on GHG emissions seems too narrow. IUCN suggests complementing them with **["Red List Index (biodiversity used for food and medicine)"].** This would also help to reflect contributions towards resilience, maintenance of ecosystems, and adaptation to climate change. It is used as an indicator towards Aichi Target 14 (http://www.bipindicators.net/foodandmedicine).	Data sources: IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (http://www.iucnredlist.org/), generating "RLI for species used for food and medicine" as used by Butchart et al. (2010) Science 328: 1164-1168.	Responsible entities and national availability: TRAFFIC and IUCN Red List Partnership (http://www.iucnredlist.org/partners/partners-and-technical-support). Available globally since 1980s, and can be disaggregated to national and regional levels (Rodrigues et al. 2014 PLoS ONE 9(11): e113934).		2	15.5 (and disaggregated versions for other targets)

Target 2.5 By 2020, maintain the genetic diversity of seeds, cultivated plants and farmed and domesticated animals and their related wild species, including through soundly managed and diversified seed and plant banks at the national, regional and international levels, and ensure access to and fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge, as internationally agreed.

ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator	**Ex Situ Crop Collections Enrichment index**	**Data are reported by member countries to the Commission of Genetic Resources of Food and Agriculture on the implementation of the Second Global Plan of Action for PGRFA, as agreed at CGRFA-15**	**FAO - The indicator has been calculated by FAO in 2008 and 2014. It will be calculated again in 2015 and then periodically every 2-3 years based on data reported by member countries to the Commission of Genetic Resources of Food and Agriculture. Country data are stored in WIEWS, the FAO PGRFA information system.**	**Tier I**		**15.5**
Indicator 2.5.1	**Ex-situ crop collections indicator. (CBB)**					
UNEP	The two indicators 2.5.1 and 2.5.2 should be rolled into one, so that a second indicator can measure ABS which is a second part of this Target. Therefore, propose Indicator 2.5.1 to read: **[Number/percentage of local crops and breeds, and their wild relatives, classified as being at-risk, not-at-risk, and unknown-levels of risk of extinction]**	http://www.bipindicators.net/domesticanimals and http://www.bipindicators.net/cropcollections : data collected from Domestic Animal Diversity Information System (DAD-IS), and EURISCO, USDA-GRIN, ICRISAT, CIAT, SINGER, ILRI	WCMC working with FAO, International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI), Bioversity International			Goal 15

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	FAO	Proposed reformulation of the name: **[Ex Situ Crop Collections Enrichment index]** It measures global trends in the diversity of ex situ conserved materials, providing an overall assessment of the extent to which we are managing to maintain and/or increase the total genetic diversity required for current and future production and therefore secure under controlled conditions from any permanent loss of this type of genetic diversity occurring in the field. For a detailed description see http://www.bipindicators.net/cropcollections	Data are reported by member countries to the Commission of Genetic Resources of Food and Agriculture on the implementation of the Second Global Plan of Action for PGRFA, as agreed at CGRFA-15	FAO - The indicator has been calculated by FAO in 2008 and 2014. It will be calculated again in 2015 and then periodically every 2-3 years based on data reported by member countries to the Commission of Genetic Resources of Food and Agriculture. Country data are stored in WIEWS, the FAO PGRFA information system.	1	1	15.5
	IFAD	Proposed reformulation of the name: **[Ex Situ Crop Collections Enrichment index]** It measures global trends in the diversity of ex situ conserved materials, providing an overall assessment of the extent to which we are managing to maintain and/or increase the total genetic diversity required for current and future production and therefore secure under controlled conditions from any permanent loss of this type of genetic diversity occurring in the field. For a detailed description see http://www.bipindicators.net/cropcollections	Data are reported by member countries to the Commission of Genetic Resources of Food and Agriculture on the implementation of the Second Global Plan of Action for PGRFA, as agreed at CGRFA-15	FAO - The indicator has been calculated by FAO in 2008 and 2014. It will be calculated again in 2015 and then periodically every 2-3 years based on data reported by member countries to the Commission of Genetic Resources of Food and Agriculture. Country data are stored in WIEWS, the FAO PGRFA information system.		1	15.5
	WB	No sure what this means. An alternative is **[Number of varieties and animal breeds integrating germplasm accessed from gene banks under benefit sharing contracts"]*					
	IUCN	Currently proposed indicator: IUCN supports the adoption of this indicator. It is used as an indicator towards Aichi Target 13 (http://www.bipindicators.net/cropcollections).				1	
Indicator 2.5.2 Number/percentage of local breeds classified as being at-risk, not-at-risk, and unknown-levels of risk of extinction. (BBB)							
	IFAD	The indicator presents the percentage of livestock breeds classified as being at risk, not at risk or of unknown risk of extinctions at a certain moment in time, as well as the trends for those percentages.	The indicator serves to monitor the implementation of the Global Plan of Action for Animal Genetic Resources. Data are contained in FAO's Global Databank for Animal Genetic Resources DAD-IS	FAO - The indicator is based on the most up to date data contained in FAO's Global Databank for Animal Genetic Resources DAD-IS (http://dad.fao.org/) at the time of calculation		1	15.5
	FAO	The indicator presents the percentage of livestock breeds classified as being at risk, not at risk or of unknown risk of extinctions at a certain moment in time, as well as the trends for those percentages.	The indicator serves to monitor the implementation of the Global Plan of Action for Animal Genetic Resources. Data are contained in FAO's Global Databank for Animal Genetic Resources DAD-IS	FAO - The indicator is based on the most up to date data contained in FAO's Global Databank for Animal Genetic Resources DAD-IS (http://dad.fao.org/) at the time of calculation		1	15.5
	UNEP	Alternative:**[Number of permits or their equivalents made available to the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearinghouse established under the Nagoya Protocol and number of Standard Material Transfer Agreements, as communicated to the Governing Body of the International Treaty]**	The ABS Clearinghouse will make permits available on-line: https://absch.cbd.int/.	CBD (ABS Clearing House) and FAO (Secretariat of the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture)			Goal 15
	WB			UNEP			
	IUCN	Modify currently proposed indicator: IUCN supports the adoption of this indicator. However, rather than expressing this indicator as "Number/percentage...", it would be much preferable to express it as **["Red List Index (local breeds and wild relatives)"]**, and to assess the extinction risk of local breeds and wild relatives against The IUCN Red List Categories & Criteria (http://www.iucnredlist.org/technical-documents/categories-and-criteria) accordingly. This is also used as an indicator towards Aichi Target 13 (http://www.bipindicators.net/domesticatedanimals).				2	15.5 (and disaggregated versions for other targets)

Target 2.a Increase investment, including through enhanced international cooperation, in rural infrastructure, agricultural research and extension services, technology development and plant and livestock gene banks in order to enhance agricultural productive capacity in developing countries, in particular least developed countries.

ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator	**The Agriculture Orientation Index (AOI) for Government Expenditures**	**FAO collects, in collaboration with the IMF, data on Government expenditure in Agriculture. The annual data and indicator value compiled by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN (FAO), can be found on the FAOSTAT domain at: http://faostat3.fao.org/download/I/IG/E, covering the periods 2001-2012. The underlying annual data is official country data, from 2001 to 2012, reported by countries through a questionnaire jointly developed by FAO and the IMF using the COFOG and GFSM classifications. The database currently covers 139 countries.**	**FAO - Coverage is high, with 139 countries included. However, some countries have not provided data for all 13 years from 2001 to 2012, and the level of government to which expenditures pertain can differ.**	**Tier I**		
Indicator 2.a.1 Agriculture Orientation Index for Government Expenditures (BBB)						

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	IFAD	The Agriculture Orientation Index (AOI) for Government Expenditures is defined as the Agriculture share of Government Expenditures, divided by the Agriculture Share of GDP, where Agriculture refers to the agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting sector.	FAO collects, in collaboration with the IMF, data on Government expenditure in Agriculture. The annual data and indicator value compiled by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN (FAO), can be found on the FAOSTAT domain at: http://faostat3.fao.org/download/I/IG/E, covering the periods 2001-2012. The underlying annual data is official country data, from 2001 to 2012, reported by countries through a questionnaire jointly developed by FAO and the IMF using the COFOG and GFSM classifications. The database currently covers 139 countries.	Coverage is high, with 139 countries included. However, some countries have not provided data for all 13 years from 2001 to 2012, and the level of government to which expenditures pertain can differ.		1	
	FAO	The Agriculture Orientation Index (AOI) for Government Expenditures is defined as the Agriculture share of Government Expenditures, divided by the Agriculture Share of GDP, where Agriculture refers to the agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting sector.	FAO collects, in collaboration with the IMF, data on Government expenditure in Agriculture. The annual data and indicator value compiled by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN (FAO), can be found on the FAOSTAT domain at: http://faostat3.fao.org/download/I/IG/E, covering the periods 2001-2012. The underlying annual data is official country data, from 2001 to 2012, reported by countries through a questionnaire jointly developed by FAO and the IMF using the COFOG and GFSM classifications. The database currently covers 139 countries.	Coverage is high, with 139 countries included. However, some countries have not provided data for all 13 years from 2001 to 2012, and the level of government to which expenditures pertain can differ.		1	
	UPU	Either adding a second indicator for target 2.a. covering **[access to basic rural infrastructure],** or adding a new dimension to the index in 2.a.1. A complementary proxy indicator in this area could be defined as follows: proportion of the total number post offices located in rural areas.	UPU existing data	On number of post offices in rural areas: Universal Postal Union. Data availability: ~ 180 countries. Annual but collection was discontinued for a number of years between 1990 and 2014 and will be collected again in 2016 and onwards on an annual basis. Otherwise available since 1875 (19th century) up to 2014 (21st century).		n/a	

Target 2.b Correct and prevent trade restrictions and distortions in world agricultural markets, including through the parallel elimination of all forms of agricultural export subsidies and all export measures with equivalent effect, in accordance with the mandate of the Doha Development Round.

	ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Percent change in Import and Export tariffs on agricultural products**	**WTO**	**WTO**	**Tier I**		
Suggested Indicator		**Agricultural Export Subsidies**	**OECD**	**OECD**	**Tier I**		
	WB	As stated, this is not a measurable indicator. Alternatives could be **[(1) Trade restrictiveness indicators (OTRI) for agricultural sector or (2) Distortions to Agricultural Incentives]**. (1) Trade restrictiveness indicators (OTRI) for agricultural sector: The overall trade restrictiveness indicators (OTRI) summarizes the trade policy stance of a country by calculating the equivalent uniform tariff that will keep its overall imports at the current level when the country in fact has different tariffs and non-tariff barriers for different sectors, including agricultural goods. OTRI and some other related indices, such as the Trade Restrictiveness Index (TRI) and the Market Access Overall Trade Restrictiveness Index (MAOTRI). The rigorous analytical method can be used to update the indicators on an annual basis. (2) Distortions to Agricultural Incentives: The World Bank's research project on "Distortions to Agricultural Incentives" has produced a core database of Nominal Rates of Assistance to producers, or NRAs, together with a set of Consumer Tax Equivalents, or CTEs, for farm products and a set of Relative Rates of Assistance to farmers in 82 focus countries	(1) Trade restrictiveness indicators (OTRI) for agricultural sector: Data is available for up to 170 countries. The website of trade restrictiveness with more information: http://econ.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/EXTDEC/EXTRESEARCH/0,,contentMDK:22574446~pagePK:64214825~piPK:64214943~theSitePK:469382,00.html (2) Distortions to Agricultural Incentives: Data is available for up to 82 countries. For more details: http://econ.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/EXTDEC/EXTRESEARCH/EXTPROGRAMS/EXTTRADERESEARCH/0,,contentMDK:21012395~pagePK:64168182~piPK:64168060~theSitePK:544849,00.html	(1) Trade restrictiveness indicators (OTRI) for agricultural sector: World Bank (2) Distortions to Agricultural Incentives: World Bank. Current work on distortions to agricultural incentives is ongoing in partnership with IFPRI and other organizations: http://www.ag-incentives.org/			17.10
	ESCAP	The indicator does not reflect the target correctly. New Indicator - **[Reduction in the following specific indicators of the WTO members: 1. Import and Export tariffs 2. Anti dumping, safeguard and CVD cases 3. Domestic subsidy on agricultural products. 4. Export subsidy on agricultural products 5. Non tariff measures.]**	WTO	WTO			
	OECD	Suggested Alternative Indicator: **[Producer Support Estimates in Agriculture that are highly production and trade distortive.]** This indicator fits the target very well, a well-established methodology exists and data cover a large number of the countries for which this issue is most relevant.	OECD; Producer and Consumer Support Estimates Database; see http://www.oecd.org/tad/agricultural-policies/producerandconsumersupportestimatesdatabase.htm	OECD		1	

Target 2.c Adopt measures to ensure the proper functioning of food commodity markets and their derivatives and facilitate timely access to market information, including on food reserves, in order to help limit extreme food price volatility.

	ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Indicator of (food) Price Anomalies (IPA) (CBB)**		**FAO**	**Tier II**		
Indicator 2.c.1		**Indicator of (food) Price Anomalies (IPA) (CBB)**					

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	IFAD	The IPA is uniquely suited to the Target 2.c as it allows early detection of abnormal market conditions, permitting the timely adoption of policies and measures aiming to limit extreme food price volatility.		FAO		1	
	FAO	The IPA is uniquely suited to the Target 2.c as it allows early detection of abnormal market conditions, permitting the timely adoption of policies and measures aiming to limit extreme food price volatility.		FAO		1	

Goal 3 Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages

Target 3.1 By 2030, reduce the global maternal mortality ratio to less than 70 per 100,000 live births.

	ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Maternal deaths per 100,000 live births**	**CRVS, household surveys, censuses, health facility data, RAMOS, confidential enquiries, modelling**	**Maternal Mortality Expert and Interagency Group (MMEIG), led by WHO with UNICEF, UNFPA, World Bank, UNDESA; data - all countries, global database available; bi-annual global reporting**	**Tier I**		
Suggested Indicator		**Proportion of births attended by skilled health personnel**	**Household Surveys (will also start producing modelled time series from 2016)**	**UNICEF and WHO**	**Tier I**		**3.7, 3.8**
Indicator 3.1.1	**Maternal deaths per 100,000 live births (AAA)**						
	UNICEF	**[Maternal deaths per 100,000 live births]**	Estimates by UN Interagency Maternal mortality Estimation Interagency Group (MMEIG) based on national data from vital registration, household surveys, surveillance or sample registration systems, Census and RAMOS,	WHO, UNICEF, UNFPA, The World Bank		1	
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for this indicator to be disaggregated by causes of maternal death, where data allows.					
	WHO	No change; **[Maternal deaths per 100,000 live births]**: annual number of female deaths from any cause related to or aggravated by pregnancy or its management (excluding accidental or incidental causes) during pregnancy and childbirth or within 42 days of termination of pregnancy, irrespective of the duration and site of the pregnancy, per 100 000 live births, for a specified time period	CRVS, household surveys, censuses, health facility data, confidential enquiries, modelling	Maternal Mortality Expert and Interagency Group (MMEIG), led by WHO with UNICEF, UNFPA, World Bank, UNDESA; data - all countries, global database available; bi-annual global reporting		1	
	UNFPA	**[Maternal deaths per 100,000 live births]**: annual number of female deaths from any cause related to or aggravated by pregnancy or its management (excluding accidental or incidental causes) during pregnancy and childbirth or within 42 days of termination of pregnancy, irrespective of the duration and site of pregnancy, per 100,000 live births, for a specified time period.	CRVS, Household Surveys and Population census, plus modelling by the MMEIG; confidential enquiries	WHO, UNFPA, the World Bank, UNICEF, UNPD. Data available for all UN countries and series for the period 1990-2015		1	
Indicator 3.1.2	**Skilled birth attendance (AAA)**						
	UNICEF	**[Proportion of births attended by skilled health personnel]**	Household Surveys (will also start producing modelled time series from 2016)	UNICEF and WHO		1	3.7; 3.8
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for this indicator to be disaggregated by location and income group.					
	WHO	No change; **[Percentage of live births attended by skilled health personnel during a specified time period]**	Household surveys, health facility data	WHO, UNICEF; data - all countries, global database available		2	
	UNFPA	**[Per cent of births attended by skilled health personnel (SBA) during a specified time period]**	Household surveys (DHS and MICS); Health Facility Data	WHO, UNICEF		2	

Target 3.2 By 2030, end preventable deaths of newborns and children under 5 years of age, with all countries aiming to reduce neonatal mortality to at least as low as 12 per 1,000 live births and under-5 mortality to at least as low as 25 per 1,000 live births.

	ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Under-five mortality rate (deaths per 1,000 live births)**	**Estimates by The UN Inter-agency Group for Child Mortality Estimation (UN IGME) based on data from household surveys, censuses, vital registration systems, etc.**	**UN Interagency Group on Child Mortality Estimation (IGME), led by UNICEF and WHO, with UNDESA and World Bank; 3.2.1: Data are available for 196 countries and territories for the period 1990-2014 for 3.2.1, and 191 countries for 3.2.2. For 196 countries and territories there are at least two available data points during this time period for 3.2.1, and for 186 countries for 3.2.2.**	**Tier I**		
Suggested Indicator		**Neonatal mortality rate (deaths per 1,000 live births)**	**Estimates by The UN Inter-agency Group for Child Mortality Estimation (UN IGME) based on data from household surveys, censuses, vital registration systems, etc.**	**UNICEF, WHO, UN Population Division, World Bank**	**Tier I**		
Indicator 3.2.1	**Under-five mortality per 1,000 live births (AAA)**						

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	UNICEF	should be: **[Under-five mortality rate (deaths per 1,000 live births)]**	Estimates by The UN Inter-agency Group for Child Mortality Estimation (UN IGME) based on data from household surveys, censuses, vital registration systems, etc.	UNICEF, WHO, UN Population Division, World Bank		1	
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for this indicator to be disaggregated by sex					
	WHO	No change; **[Probability of a child born in a specific year or period dying before reaching the age of five years, if subject to age-specific mortality rates of that period, expressed per thousand live births.]**	CRVS, household surveys, censuses	UN Interagency Group on Child Mortality Estimation (IGME), led by UNICEF and WHO, with UNDESA and World Bank; Data are available for 196 countries and territories for the period 1990-2014. For 196 countries and territories there are at least two available data points during this time period.		1	
Indicator 3.2.2	**Neonatal mortality per 1,000 live births (AAA)**						
	UNICEF	should be: **[Neonatal mortality rate (deaths per 1,000 live births)]**	Estimates by The UN Inter-agency Group for Child Mortality Estimation (UN IGME) based on data from household surveys, censuses, vital registration systems, etc.	UNICEF, WHO, UN Population Division, World Bank		1	
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for this indicator to be disaggregated by sex					
	WHO	No change; **[Probability of a child born in a specific year or period dying during the first 28 completed days of life, if subject to age-specific mortality rates of that period, expressed per thousand live births.]**	CRVS, household surveys, modelling	UN Interagency Group on Child Mortality Estimation (IGME), led by UNICEF and WHO, with UNDESA and World Bank; data - Data are available for 191 countries and territories for the period 1990-2014. For 186 countries and territories there are at least two available data points during this time period.		2	
	WHO	**[Full immunization coverage (DTP3 containing vaccine, measles, all recommended vaccines)]**	Household surveys, health facility data	WHO - UNICEF, annual joint reporting; global database available with data for all countries		2	

Target 3.3 By 2030, end the epidemics of AIDS, tuberculosis, malaria and neglected tropical diseases and combat hepatitis, water-borne diseases and other communicable diseases.

ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator	**Number of new HIV infections per 1,000 susceptible population (by age, sex, and key populations)**	**Country owned, internationally-consistent modelled estimates**	**UNAIDS 158 countries Updated annually**	**Tier I**		**3.2, 3.1, 10.2; is partly overlapping with 6.1 and 6.2**
Suggested Indicator	**TB incidence per 1,000 persons per year**	**CRVS, household surveys, health facility data, modelling**	**WHO; data - all countries; global database available; annual reporting**	**Tier I**		
Suggested Indicator	**Malaria incident cases per 1,000 person per year**	**Household surveys, health facility data, modelling**	**WHO; data - all countries; global database available; annual reporting**	**Tier I**		
Suggested Indicator	**Estimated number of new hepatitis B infections per 100,000 population in a given year**	**Household surveys, health facility data, madling**	**WHO - data: estimates under development for all countries;**	**Tier I**		
Indicator 3.3.1	**HIV incidence per 100 susceptible person years (adults, key populations, children, adolescents) (AAA)**					
UNAIDS	**[Number of new HIV infections per 1000 susceptible population (by age, sex, and key populations)]**	Country owned, internationally-consistent modelled estimates	UNAIDS, 158 countries; Updated annually		1	3.2, 3.1, 10.2
UNICEF	The target is "Reducing new HIV infections among adults to below 200,000", but the indicator is a case rate - number of new HIV infections per 1000 susceptible population. The proposed indicator is not consistent with the target which is a number, i.e. 200,000 new infections by 2030. If the indicator remains as a case rate, then replace the word 'susceptible' with 'uninfected population'. Susceptible is ambiguous and subject to multiple interpretations, if all that is intended to mean is 'uninfected population'. OR Simplify the indicator to **["Number of new infections"]** so it is in line with the current wording of the target.				1	
UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for this indicator to be disaggregated by sex.					
WB	We suggest changing to **[\Number of new HIV infections per 1000 susceptible population (by age, sex, and key populations)"]**	Country owned, internationally-consistent modelled estimates	UNAIDS, 158 countries		1	3.2, 3.1, 10.2
WHO	No change; **[Number of new HIV infections per 1,000 person years among susceptible persons]**	Household surveys, surveillance, modelling	UNAIDS, WHO; data - all countries; global database available; biannual reporting for countries, annual for regions and global		1	
UNFPA	**[Number of new HIV infections per 1,000 person years among susceptible persons (age, sex, key populations)]**	Household surveys, surveillance, modelling	UNAIDS; WHO; Data - all countries		1	
Indicator 3.3.2	**HIV/AIDS deaths per 100,000 population (AAA)**					
UNAIDS	**[AIDS-related deaths per 100,000 of the total population (by age, sex, and key populations)]**	Country owned, internationally-consistent modelled estimates	UNAIDS, 158 countries, Updated annually		2	3.2, 3.1, 10.2

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	UNICEF	Similar to the comments above, the target is a number, i.e. zero AIDS-related deaths, while the indicator is a case rate. It is not, therefore, clear what the ideal case rate threshold should be that countries would use for measuring progress. Also need to clarify whether this will be based on all the population in the country, or only the total number of people living with HIV, so it is more specific to the intended target population. Alternatively simplify the indicator to **['number of AIDS related deaths']** to be in line with the wording of the proposed target.				1	
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for this indicator to be disaggregated by sex.					
	WB	We suggest changing terminology to **["AIDS-related deaths per 100,000 population"]**	Country owned, internationally-consistent modelled estimates	UNAIDS, 158 countries		2	3.2, 3.1, 10.2
	WHO	No change; **[Estimated number of adults and children that have died due to HIV/AIDS in a specific year, expressed as a rate per 100 000 population]**	CRVS, household surveys, health facility data, modelling	UNAIDS, WHO; data - all countries; global database available; biannual reporting for countries, annual for regions and global		2	
	UNFPA	**[Estimated number of adults and children that have died due to HIV/AIDS in a specific year, expressed as a rate per 100,000 population.]**	CRVS, household surveys, health facility data, modelling	UNAIDS, WHO; data - all countries		2	
Indicator 3.3.3	**TB incidence per 1,000 person years (AAA)**						
	UNICEF	**[TB incidence per 1,000 person years]**					
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for this indicator to be disaggregated by sex.					
	WHO	**["TB incidence per 1,000 persons per year"]** - No change; Estimated number of new and relapse tuberculosis (TB) cases arising in a given year, expressed as the rate per 100 000 population. All forms of TB are included, including cases in people living with HIV	CRVS, household surveys, health facility data, modelling	WHO; data - all countries; global database available; annual reporting		1	
Indicator 3.3.4	**Number of TB deaths (AAA)**						
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for this indicator to be disaggregated by sex.					
	WB	We suggest changing to **[\Number of deaths attributable to tuberculosis (TB) in a given year, expressed as the rate per 100 000 population"]**					
	WHO	No change; **[Estimated number of deaths attributable to tuberculosis (TB) in a given year, excluding HIV-positive TB deaths]**	CRVS, household surveys, health facility data, modelling	WHO; data - all countries; global database available; annual reporting		2	
Indicator 3.3.5	**Malaria incident cases per 1,000 person years (AAA)**						
	UNICEF	**[Malaria incident cases per 1,000 person years]**					
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for this indicator to be disaggregated by sex.					
	WHO	No change; **[Number of confirmed reported malaria cases per 1000 persons per year]**	Household surveys, health facility data, modelling	WHO; data - all countries; global database available; annual reporting		1	
Indicator 3.3.6	**Malaria deaths per 100,000 population (AAA)**						
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for this indicator to be disaggregated by sex.					
	WHO	No change; **[Number of adults and children that have died due to malaria in a specific year, expressed as a rate per 100 000 population]**	CRVS, household surveys, health facility data, modelling	WHO; data - all countries; global database available; annual reporting		2	
Indicator 3.3.7	**Prevalence of hepatitis B surface antigen in children under 5 (BBA)**						
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for this indicator to be disaggregated by sex.					
	WHO	Replace: **[Estimated number of new hepatitis B infections per 100,000 population in a given year]**	Household surveys, health facility data, modelling	WHO - data: estimates under development for all countries;		1	
Indicator 3.3.8	**Presence of 13 IHR core capacities for surveillance and response (BBB)**						
	WHO	Move to 3.d.1					Now as indicator 3.d.1
	WHO	**[Number of people requiring interventions against neglected tropical diseases]**	Household surveys, health facility data, administrative data	WHO - data: all countries		2	

Target 3.4 By 2030, reduce by one third premature mortality from non-communicable diseases through prevention and treatment and promote mental health and well being.

	ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Probability of dying of cardiovascular disease, cancer, diabetes, or chronic respiratory disease between ages 30 and 70**	**CRVS, household surveys**	**WHO; data - all countries**	**Tier II**		
Indicator 3.4.1	**Probability of dying of cardiovascular disease, cancer, diabetes, or chronic respiratory disease between ages 30 and 70 (BAA)**						
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for this indicator to be disaggregated by sex and income.					
	WHO	No change; **[Probability of dying between the exact ages 30 and 70 years from cardiovascular diseases, cancer, diabetes, or chronic respiratory diseases.]**	CRVS, household surveys	WHO; data - all countries		1	
Indicator 3.4.2	**Current tobacco use among persons 15 years and over (AAA)**						
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for this indicator to be disaggregated by sex, age and income.					
	WHO	Move to 3.a.1					Now as Indicator 3.a.1

Target 3.5 Strengthen the prevention and treatment of substance abuse, including narcotic drug abuse and harmful use of alcohol

	ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

Suggested Indicator		**Coverage of treatment interventions (pharmacological, psychosocial and rehabilitation and aftercare services) for substance use disorders**	**Administrative records; Annual Report Questionnaire Part II Comprehensive Approach to Drug Demand Reduction and Supply as mandated by the Drug Conventions and compiled annually by UNODC; WHO, Global Information System on Alcohol and Health (GISAH); WHO, ATLAS-SU: Resources for Treatment and Prevention of Substance Use Disorders**	**WHO; data - all countries; global database available; regular global monitoring report; UNODC for drug-related treatments, all countries are mandated to report as a yearly cycle (Response Rate=60-65% of MS)**	**Tier II**		
Indicator 3.5.1	**Coverage of opioid substitution therapy among opioid-dependent drug users (BBB)**						
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for this indicator to be disaggregated by sex and income.					
	WHO	**[Percentage of people who suffer from substance abuse disorders receiving treatment and care (by substance and type)]**	Special surveys; administrative records	UNODC; global database; annual updating		2	
	UNODC	Coverage of treatment interventions (pharmacological, psychosocial and rehabilitation and aftercare services) for substance use disorders	Administrative records; Annual Report Questionnaire Part II Comprehensive Approach to Drug Demand Reduction and Supply as mandated by the Drug Conventions and compiled annually by UNODC; WHO, Global Information System on Alcohol and Health (GISAH); WHO, ATLAS-SU: Resources for Treatment and Prevention of Substance Use Disorders	WHO; data - all countries; global database available; regular global monitoring report; UNODC for drug-related treatments, all countries are mandated to report as a yearly cycle (Response Rate=60-65% of MS)		1	
Indicator 3.5.2	**Coverage of interventions for the prevention of substance abuse interventions among people under 25 (BBB)**						
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for this indicator to be disaggregated by sex and income.					
	WHO	Replace: **[Total alcohol per capita (APC) is defined as the total (sum of recorded APC three-year average and unrecorded APC) amount of alcohol consumed per adult (15+ years) over a calendar year, in litres of pure alcohol]**	Administrative records	WHO; data - all countries; global database available; regular global monitoring report		1	
	UNODC	Coverage of evidence based and evaluated interventions for the prevention of substance use	Annual Report Questionnaire Part II Comprehensive Approach to Drug Demand Reduction and Supply as mandated by the Drug Conventions and compiled annually by UNODC; WHO, Global Information System on Alcohol and Health (GISAH); WHO, ATLAS-SU: Resources for Treatment and Prevention of Substance Use Disorders	UNODC for drug-related prevention, all countries are mandated to report as a yearly cycle (Response Rate=60-65% of MS) and WHO for alcohol		2	

Target 3.6 By 2020, halve the number of global deaths and injuries from road traffic accidents

	ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Number of road traffic fatal injury deaths per 100 000 population (age-standardized)**	**CRVS, household surveys, administrative records**	**WHO and UN Road Safety Collaboration data collation data - all countries; global database available; annual updating, regular global report**	**Tier I**		**is partly overlapping with 11.2**
Indicator 3.6.1	**Number of deaths due to road traffic accidents (AAA)**						
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for this indicator to be disaggregated by sex and age.					
	WB	Consider changing to **["Fatalities due to road crashes" (this target is in place as part of the UN global Decade of Action on Road Safety, Note that the target deadline is 2020)."]**	Decade of Road Safety	WHO and UN Road Safety Collaboration data collation			
	WHO	No change: **[Number of road traffic fatal injury deaths per 100 000 population (age-standardized)]**	CRVS, household surveys, administrative records	WHO; data - all countries; global database available; annual updating, regular global report		1	

Target 3.7 By 2030, ensure universal access to sexual and reproductive health-care services, including for family planning, information and education, and the integration of reproductive health into national strategies and programmes.

	ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Percentage of women of reproductive age (15-49 years) who have their need for family planning satisfied with modern methods.**	**Household surveys**	**UNDESA, UNFPA; Data are available for 138 countries and territories for the period 1990-2014; 90 countries and territories have at least two available data points. 183 countries and territories have data on contraceptive prevalence (one component of this indicator); 156 countries and territories have at least two data points.**	**Tier I**		

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

Suggested Indicator		**Adolescent birth rate (10-14; 15-19) per 1,000 women in that age group**	**CRVS, household surveys, censuses**	**UNDESA; Data for the adolescent birth rate (15-19) are available for 225 countries and territories for the period 1990-2014; 223 countries and territories have at least two data points. Data on births to mothers under the age of 15 are available for at least 102 countries and territories for the period 2000-2014, UNFPA.**	**Tier I**		**5.3, 5.6**
Indicator 3.7.1	**Adolescent birth rate (10-14, 15-19) (AAA)**						
	UNICEF	**[Adolescent birth rate (10-14, 15-19)]**	Household Surveys				
	UNWOMEN	UN Women recommends giving priority 1 to indicator 3.7.2**[Demand satisfied with modern contraceptives.]** The indicator should be disaggregated by income group, rural/urban location and other context specific factors.					
	WHO	**[Annual number of births to women aged 15-19 years per 1,000 women in that age group.]** The birth rate among adolescents younger than age 15 is more meaningfully measured for ages 12-14 as births among 10-11 year olds are rare and a rate with respect to the 10-14 year old population would not correctly reflect the increased risk of early childbearing by age.	CRVS, household surveys, censuses	UNDESA; Data for the adolescent birth rate (15-19) are available for 225 countries and territories for the period 1990-2014; 223 countries and territories have at least two data points. Data on births to mothers under the age of 15 are available for at least 102 countries and territories for the period 2000-2014.		2	Target 5.3 and 5.6
	UNFPA	**[Adolescent birth rate (10-14; 15-19) years per 1,000 women in that age group.]**	Vital statistics and household surveys (DHS and MICS)	UNPD, UNFPA		2	
Indicator 3.7.2	**Demand satisfied with modern contraceptives (BBA)**						
	UNICEF	**[Demand satisfied with modern contraceptives]**	Household Surveys				
	WB	The global RH community has suggested this. The question is whether it will be easy to track and interpret. **[Contraceptive prevalence rate]** which is commonly measured in surveys (DHS and MICS) and is MDG indicator is an alternative					
	WHO	**[Percentage of women of reproductive age (15-49 years) who have their need for family planning satisfied with modern methods.]** The numerator is the percentage of women of reproductive age (15-49 years old) who are currently using, or whose sexual partner is currently using, at least one modern contraceptive method. The denominator is the total demand for family planning (the sum of contraceptive prevalence (any method) and the unmet need for family planning.	Household surveys	UNDESA, UNFPA; Data are available for 138 countries and territories for the period 1990-2014; 90 countries and territories have at least two available data points. 183 countries and territories have data on contraceptive prevalence (one component of this indicator); 156 countries and territories have at least two data points.		1	Target 5.6
	UNFPA	**[Percentage of women of reproductive age (15-49 years) who have their need for family planning satisfied with modern methods.]** The numerator is the percentage of women of reproductive age (15-49 years old) who are currently using at least one modern contraceptive method. The denominator is the total demand for family planning (the sum of contraceptive prevalence (any method) and the unmet need for family planning.	Household surveys (DHS and MICS)	UNFPA, UNPD		1	

Target 3.8 Achieve universal health coverage, including financial risk protection, access to quality essential health-care services and access to safe, effective, quality and affordable essential medicines and vaccines for all.

	ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Coverage of tracer interventions (e.g. child full immunization, ARV therapy, TB treatment, hypertension treatment, skilled attendant at birth, etc.)**	**household surveys and facility data**	**WHO and World Bank; data - all countries; WHO global database for tracer indicators available; biannual global progress report on UHC, first in 2015.**	**Tier II**		**is part of 1.2; partly overlapping with 10.4**
Suggested Indicator		**Fraction of the population protected against catastrophic/impoverishing out-of-pocket health expenditure**	**Household surveys**	**WHO and World Bank; data - 89 countries; global database under development; biannual global progress report on UHC, first in 2015**	**Tier II**		
Indicator 3.8.1	**Fraction of the population protected against impoverishment by out-of-pocket health expenditures (BBB)**						
	WB	Suggest to consider the following wording: **[Financial protection coverage, People experiencing impoverishment due to out-of-pocket health care expenditures (by quintiles), People experiencing catastrophic health expenditures (by quintiles)]**					

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	WHO	Replace: **[Coverage of tracer interventions (e.g. child full immunization, ARV therapy, TB treatment, hypertension treatment, skilled attendant at birth, etc.).]** NOTE: Coverage of tracer interventions may include: antenatal care (4+ visits), NTD preventive chemotherapy, ARV therapy, TB treatment, ITN use; also pneumonia care seeking, diarrhoea treatment with ORS+zinc in children, ACT for malaria treatment, treatment severe mental illness, coverage emergency obstetrics care, hypertension treatment, diabetes treatment etc. Indicators in other targets also used for monitoring 3.8 are skilled birth attendance, immunization coverage, demand for modern contraceptives satisfied, coverage of treatment and care for people who suffer from substance abuse, harmful use of alcohol, air pollution levels, and tobacco use.	Household surveys, health facility data	WHO and World Bank; data - all countries; WHO global database for tracer indicators available; biannual global progress report on UHC, first in 2015		1	
	UNFPA	Replace: **[Coverage of tracer interventions (e.g., child full immunisation, ARV therapy, TB treatment, skilled birth attendance, etc.).]** *Coverage of tracer interventions may include: antenatal care, NTD preventive chemotherapy, ARV therapy, TB treatment, ITN use, also pneumonia care seeking and diarrhoea treatment with ORS+zinc in children; treatment severe mental illness; coverage emergency obstetric care, etc.	Household surveys, health facility data	WHO and World Bank;		1	
Indicator 3.8.2	**Fraction of households protected from incurring catastrophic out-of-pocket health expenditure (CBB)**						
	UNCDF	Alternative Indicator: **[Adults who personally paid for health insurance]**	Global Findex	World Bank - Data is available for 142 countries		2	
	WB	**[Essential health services coverage (promotion and prevention).]** This will comprise of the following: Women with at least four antenatal care visit during pregnancy (by quintile), Contraceptive prevalence rate among women of reproductive age (by quintile), Postnatal care visit within two days of birth (by quintile), Children fully immunized (by quintile) Essential health services coverage (treatment and rehabilitation,), Births attended by skilled health personnel (by quintile), Smear-positive tuberculosis treatment-success rate (by quintile), Eligible adults and children currently receiving antiretroviral therapy (by quintile), Children under 5 with fever who are treated with appropriate anti-malarial drugs (by quintile), Under-fives with suspected pneumonia taken to an appropriate health-care provider (by quintile), Under-fives with diarrhoea receiving oral rehydration and continued feeding (by quintile), Children under five years old suffering from stunting (height for age) (by quintile), Non-use of tobacco among age 15 years or more (by quintile), Population using improved drinking-water sources (by quintile), Population using improved sanitation facilities (by quintile)					
	WHO	No change: **[Fraction of the population protected against catastrophic/impoverishing out-of-pocket health expenditure]**	Household surveys	WHO and World Bank; data - 89 countries; global database under development; biannual global progress report on UHC, first in 2015		1	
	UNFPA	Replace: **[Fraction of the population protection against catastrophic and impoverishing out-of-pocket health spending]**	Household Surveys	WHO and World Bank;		2	
	UNICEF	**[Proportion of births attended by skilled health personnel]**	Household Surveys (will also start producing modelled time series from 2016)	UNICEF and WHO		1	3.7; 3.8
	UNICEF	**[Proportion of pregnant women who had at least four antenatal care visits]**	Household Surveys (will also start producing modelled time series from 2016)	UNICEF and WHO		2	3.7; 3.8
	UNICEF	**[Proportion of children age 12-23 months who received third dose of DPT containing vaccine]**	WHO and UNICEF estimates of national immunization coverage (WUENIC)	UNICEF and WHO		2	3.8
	UNICEF	**[number and percentage of 194 World Health Assembly Member States that reach >/=90% national coverage for all vaccines in their national immunization schedule, unless otherwise recommended (3 doses of DTP containing vaccine, 3 doses of polio vaccine, 1 dose of MCV for all Member States and BCG for Member States where included in the schedule as well as three doses of Hepatitis B vaccine, three doses of Hib vaccine, two or three (depending on vaccine used) doses of PCV, and two or three (depending on vaccine used) doses of rotavirus vaccine.]**	WHO and UNICEF estimates of national immunization coverage (WUENIC)	WHO and UNICEF		1	
	UNICEF	**[Proportion of children under-five sleeping under an insecticide treated bed net]**	Household surveys (modelled time series data using program data on nets delivered and distributed and household surveys)	UNICEF		1	
	UNICEF	**[Proportion of children with suspected pneumonia who sought care from health facility or provider]**	Household surveys	UNICEF		1	
	UNICEF	**[Proportion of children with diarrhoea who sought care from health facility or provider]**	Household surveys	UNICEF		1	
	UNICEF	**[Proportion of children with diarrhoea who received ORS and Zinc]**	Household surveys	UNICEF		1	
Target 3.9	**By 2030, substantially reduce the number of deaths and illnesses from hazardous chemicals and air, water and soil pollution and contamination.**						

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator	**Population in urban areas exposed to outdoor air pollution levels above WHO guideline values**	**Administrative records; satellite data**	**WHO; data - 91 countries in global database; biannual updates planned; OECD also has geospatially-based measures for air pollution exposure with significant granularity at local level. It is rather straightforward to extend country coverage to a global level.**	**Tier I**		**is partly overlapping with 6.3, 11.6 and 12.4**
Indicator 3.9.1	**Population in urban areas exposed to outdoor air pollution levels above WHO guideline values (BBB)**					
UNEP	Alternative: **[Death and disability (disaggregated by sex and age) from indoor and outdoor air quality, water/sanitation, and contaminated sites]**	Measured against 2012 baseline (note: Global Burden of Disease methodologies) . Data on water/sanitation and contaminated sites can be obtained from the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm convention's national reports. Data for small particulate matter due to transportation in urban areas.	WHO , and Secretariats of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions. National air quality observatories.			6.2, 6.3,
WHO	No change	Administrative records; satellite data	WHO; data - 91 countries in global database; biannual updates planned		1	
Target 3.a	**Strengthen the implementation of the World Health Organization Framework Convention on Tobacco Control in all countries, as appropriate.**					
ContributorName	**Specification**	**Source**	**Entity**	**Tier**	**Priority**	**Interlinkages**
Suggested Indicator	**Tobacco use among persons 18 years and older** **Age-standardized prevalence of current tobacco use among persons aged 18 years and older**	**Household surveys**	**WHO; data - all countries; global database available; regular global reporting**	**Tier I**		
WHO	**[Tobacco use among persons 18 years and older]**: Age-standardized prevalence of current tobacco use among persons aged 18 years and older	Household surveys	WHO; data - all countries; global database available; regular global reporting		1	
Target 3.b	**Support the research and development of vaccines and medicines for the communicable and non-communicable diseases that primarily affect developing countries, provide access to affordable essential medicines and vaccines, in accordance with the Doha Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health, which affirms the right of developing countries to use to the full the provisions in the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights regarding flexibilities to protect public health, and, in particular, provide access to medicines for all.**					
ContributorName	**Specification**	**Source**	**Entity**	**Tier**	**Priority**	**Interlinkages**
Suggested Indicator	**Proportion of population with access to affordable essential medicines on a sustainable basis**	**Facility surveys**	**WHO; data - all countries**	**Tier I**		
WHO	**[Access to affordable essential medicines]**: [Proportion of population with access to affordable essential medicines on a sustainable basis]	Facility surveys	WHO; data - all countries		1	
Target 3.c	**Substantially increase health financing and the recruitment, development, training and retention of the health workforce in developing countries, especially in least developed countries and small island developing States.**					
ContributorName	**Specification**	**Source**	**Entity**	**Tier**	**Priority**	**Interlinkages**
Suggested Indicator	**Health worker density and distribution**	**Census, household surveys, health facility data, administrative systems**	**WHO; data - all countries; global database available; annual updating**	**Tier I**		
WHO	**[General government expenditure on health as % of GDP]:** Current expenditure on health by general government and compulsory schemes (% current expenditure on health)	National Health Accounts	WHO; data - all countries; global database available; annual updating		2	
WHO	**[Health worker density and distribution:]** Number of health workers per 10000 population (by categories, geographic distribution, place of employment, etc.)	Census, household surveys, health facility data, administrative systems	WHO; data - all countries; global database available; annual updating		1	
Target 3.d	**Strengthen the capacity of all countries, in particular developing countries, for early warning, risk reduction and management of national and global health risks.**					
ContributorName	**Specification**	**Source**	**Entity**	**Tier**	**Priority**	**Interlinkages**
Suggested Indicator	**Percentage of attributes of 13 core capacities that have been attained at a specific point in time.**	**Country report and independent assessment**	**WHO; data - all countries; global database available; regular updating**	**Tier II**		
WHO	Percentage of attributes of 13 core capacities that have been attained at a specific point in time. The 13 core capacities are: (1) National legislation, policy and financing, (2) Coordination and National Focal Point communications; (3) Surveillance; (4) Response; (5) Preparedness; (6) Risk communication; (7) Human resources; (8) Laboratory; (9) Points of entry; (10) Zoonosis; (11) Food safety; (12) Chemical; (13) Radionuclear.	Country report and independent assessment	WHO; data - all countries; global database available; regular updating		1	
Goal 4	**Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all**					
Target 4.1	**By 2030, ensure that all girls and boys complete free, equitable and quality primary and secondary education leading to relevant and effective learning outcomes.**					
ContributorName	**Specification**	**Source**	**Entity**	**Tier**	**Priority**	**Interlinkages**

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

Suggested Indicator	**Percentage of children/young people at the end of each level of education achieving at least a minimum proficiency level in (a) reading and (b) mathematics. Disaggregations: sex, location, wealth (and others where data are available)**	**Various international (eg PIRLS, PISA, TIMSS), regional learning assessments (eg LLECE, SACMEQ, PASEC) national and citizen-led learning assessments. Data are available at the primary level for about 50 countries from PIRLS and at lower secondary level for about 70 countries from PISA and 65 countries from TIMSS. Once the learning scale has been created the existing results can be reported according to a common scale. This is expected to take 3-5 years to achieve.**	**UNESCO-UIS will form a broad technical group including Member States to develop and maintain measures. UNESCO-UIS will compile data from learning assessments conducted by other organizations and transform them to the common learning scale.**	**Tier III**		**1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.3, 3.4, 3.7, 3.c, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5, 5.b,7.a, 8.6, 8.7, 8.b, 10.2, 10.6, 12.8, 13.3, 13.b, 16.a; is part of 4.5**
Indicator 4.1.1	**Percentage of children who achieve minimum proficiency standards in reading and mathematics at end of: (i) primary (ii) lower secondary (BAA)**						
UNESCO	**[Percentage of children/young people at the end of each level of education achieving at least a minimum proficiency level in (a) reading and (b) mathematics.]** These minimum proficiency levels will be defined with reference to a new universal learning scale which is being developed to allow for the calibration of different assessments according to a common metric. Disaggregations: sex, location, wealth (and others where data are available)	Various international (eg PIRLS, PISA, TIMSS), regional learning assessments (eg LLECE, SACMEQ, PASEC) national and citizen-led learning assessments. Data are available at the primary level for about 50 countries from PIRLS and at lower secondary level for about 70 countries from PISA and 65 countries from TIMSS. Once the learning scale has been created the existing results can be reported according to a common scale. This is expected to take 3-5 years to achieve.	UNESCO-UIS will form a broad technical group including Member States to develop and maintain measures. UNESCO-UIS will compile data from learning assessments conducted by other organizations and transform them to the common learning scale.		1	1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.3, 3.4, 3.7, 3.c, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5, 5.b,7.a, 8.6, 8.7, 8.b, 10.2, 10.6, 12.8, 13.3, 13.b, 16.a
UNICEF	**[Percentage of children who achieve minimum proficiency standards in reading and mathematics at end of: (i) Grade 2; (ii) primary; and (iii) lower secondary.]** UNICEF suggest the inclusion of "grade 2" as a critical stage for monitoring children's learning. Percentage of children/young people at the end of each level of education achieving at least a fixed level in (a) reading and (b) mathematics. The fixed level will vary according to the specific learning assessment used as may the age or grade of the pupils covered. A new universal learning scale is being developed which will allow for the calibration of different assessments according to a common scale.	Various international (eg PIRLS, PISA, TIMSS), regional learning assessments (eg LLECE, SACMEQ, PASEC) and citizen-led assessments. Data are available at the primary level for about 50 countries from PIRLS and at lower secondary level for about 70 countries from PISA and 65 countries from TIMSS. Once the learning scale has been created the existing results can be reported according to a common scale. This is expected to take 3-5 years to achieve.	UNESCO-UIS will form a broad technical group including Member States to develop and maintain measures. UNESCO-UIS will compile data from learning assessments conducted by other organizations and transform them to the common learning scale.		1	
UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for the indicator to be disaggregated by sex.					
WB	The indicator requires the development of a global metric for each subject as a reference point to which different assessments (national, regional and international) can be anchored. Assessments at other levels (e.g. Grade 2) could be considered.					
Indicator 4.1.2	**Completion rate (primary, lower secondary, upper secondary) (AAA)**						
UNESCO	**[Percentage of children/young people aged 3-5 years above the official age for the last grade of each level of education who have completed that level. Disaggregations: sex, location, wealth (and others where data are available)]**	Household surveys including DHS, MICS, national surveys which collect data on the highest grade/year of education completed. Currently available for c100 low and middle income countries. Further development work is needed to agree on a common indicator methodology and to extend the coverage especially to more developed countries. This is expected to take a further 1-3 years.	UNESCO-UIS will convene an inter-agency group of experts to develop common methodologies for, initially, completion and participation indicators derived from household surveys. UNESCO-UIS will compile data from household surveys conducted by other organizations.		2	1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.3, 3.4, 3.7, 3.c, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5, 5.b,7.a, 8.6, 8.7, 8.b, 10.2, 10.6, 12.8, 13.3, 13.b, 16.a
UNICEF	**[Percentage of children/young people aged 3-5 years above the official age for the last grade of each level of education who have completed that level.]**	Household surveys including DHS, MICS, national surveys which collect data on the highest grade/year of education completed. Currently available for c100 low and middle income countries. Further development work is needed to agree on a common indicator methodology and to extend the coverage especially to more developed countries. This is expected to take a further 1-3 years.	UNESCO-UIS will convene an inter-agency group of experts to develop common methodologies for, initially, completion and participation indicators derived from household surveys. UNESCO-UIS will compile data from household surveys conducted by other organizations.		2	
UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for the indicator to be disaggregated by sex.					
WB	This indicator is currently available but work is required to finalise a common methodology and increase the number of surveys available to calculate it.					

Target 4.2 By 2030, ensure that all girls and boys have access to quality early childhood development, care and pre-primary education so that they are ready for primary education.

	ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Percentage of children under 5 years of age who are developmentally on track in health, learning and psychosocial well-being Disaggregations: sex, location, wealth (and others where data are available)**	**One possible source is the ECDI from MICS but other sources should be explored in order to ensure that the range of characteristics and their levels are relevant in all parts of the world. This is expected to take 3-5 years to achieve. The ECDI is currently available for about 30 countries.**	**UNESCO-UIS will compile data from household surveys conducted by other organizations.**	**Tier III**		**1.4; is part of 4.5**
Indicator 4.2.1	**Early Childhood Development Index (BBB)**						

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	UNESCO	ECDI is replaced by a more generic title **["Percentage of children under 5 years of age who are developmentally on track in health, learning and psychosocial well-being"]**, but this is essentially the same indicator. The more generic title allows for the use of a wider range of data sources in addition to UNICEF's MICS (from which the ECDI is produced). The indicator is calculated from individual level data (eg from household surveys). It is a composite measure across a range of agreed characteristics which demonstrate the levels of health, learning and psychosocial well-being of each child and whether they exceed a fixed level commensurate with being on-track developmentally in each area for their given age. Disaggregations: sex, location, wealth (and others where data are available)	One possible source is the ECDI from MICS but other sources should be explored in order to ensure that the range of characteristics and their levels are relevant in all parts of the world. This is expected to take 3-5 years to achieve. The ECDI is currently available for about 30 countries.	UNESCO-UIS will compile data from household surveys conducted by other organizations.		1	1.4
	WB	This indicator is currently tracked via the Early Childhood Development Index available from MICS but work is needed over the next 3-5 years to examine other alternatives, reach consensus and develop a set of questions for use across surveys.					
Indicator 4.2.2	**Participation rate in organized learning (one year before the official primary entry age) (BAB)**						
	UNESCO	Proposed modification: **["Participation rate in organized learning (from 24 months to the official primary entry age)"]** The age range for the indicator has been widened to include younger children and hence a broader range of organized learning opportunities: Participation rate in organized learning (from 24 months to the official primary entry age). The indicator is the percentage of children in the given age range who participate in one or more organized learning programme. The age range will vary by country though would most commonly cover the age group 2-5 years as 6 years is the most common official age for entry to primary education. Disaggregations: sex, location, wealth (and others where data are available) from household surveys; sex (and others where data are available) from administrative sources	This indicator can be calculated from two different sources: (i) administrative data from schools and other centres of organized learning or (ii) household surveys (eg MICS, DHS, national surveys). The first of these is often limited to formal types of learning and hence may not cover the full range of learning opportunities. It may also double-count children participating in more than one programme in different settings. (The UIS survey currently collects data on both early childhood educational development and pre-primary education by single year of age from 2 years upwards.) The latter may require some adaptation to cover the youngest children and also the full range of learning opportunities. This is expected to take 3-5 years to achieve. Data for the age-group 3 and above is currently available from MICS/DHS for about 60 developing countries.	UNESCO-UIS from administrative sources. UNICEF and others from household surveys. UNESCO-UIS will convene an inter-agency group of experts to develop common methodologies for, initially, completion and participation indicators derived from household surveys. UNESCO-UIS will compile data from household surveys conducted by other organizations.		2	1.4
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for the indicator to be disaggregated by sex.					
	WB	It is necessary to harmonise this indicator across surveys in two areas: (i) age group of reference (e.g. MICS asks question about 3- to 4-year-olds) and (ii) description of programmes (e.g. many surveys may not capture the concept of organized learning).					

Target 4.3 By 2030, ensure equal access for all women and men to affordable and quality technical, vocational and tertiary education, including university

ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator	**Participation rate of adults in formal and non-formal education and training in the last 12 months**	**This indicator is usually calculated from individual level data collected in household surveys. One such source is the European Union's Adult Education Survey covering about 30 countries. Considerable work is required to develop a set of questions to be applied in labour force or other surveys globally. This is expected to take 1-3 years to achieve.**	**UNESCO-UIS will convene an inter-agency group of experts to develop common methodologies for, initially, completion and participation indicators derived from household surveys. UNESCO-UIS will compile data from household surveys conducted by other organizations.**	**Tier II**		**1.4, 4.4, 5.b, 8.5, 9.2**
Indicator 4.3.1	**Enrolment ratios by level and type of education (TVET and tertiary) (AAA)**					
UNESCO	**["Enrolment ratios by level and type of education: (a) participation rate of 15-24 year olds in TVET and (b) gross enrolment ratio in tertiary education"]** *** [This is really two indicators as the TVET one is now proposed as a net participation rate.] Enrolment ratios by level and type of education: (a) participation rate of 15-24 year olds in TVET and (b) gross enrolment ratio in tertiary education (a) the percentage of young people aged 15-24 years participating in technical and vocational education or training (in a given time period eg last 12 months) (b) total enrolments of any age in tertiary education expressed as a percentage of the 5-year age-group immediately following the end of upper secondary education. Disaggregations: sex, location, wealth (and others where data are available) from household surveys; sex (and others where data are available) from administrative sources	These indicators can be calculated from two different sources: (i) administrative data from educational institutions (eg schools, colleges and universities) or (ii) household surveys with specific questions/modules on education and training of those aged 15 years and above. The first of these is often limited to formal types of learning and usually does not cover TVET provided by employers or in other settings then educational institutions. The latter is most easily captured through surveys of individuals. This is expected to take 3-5 years to achieve.	(i) UNESCO-UIS (ii) UNESCO-UIS will compile the data collected in household surveys run by other organizations.		2	1.4, 3.b, 5.b, 8.5, 8.6, 8.b, 9.2, 9.5, 10.2, 14.a

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	UNICEF	[This is really two indicators as the TVET one is now proposed as a net participation rate.] **[Enrolment ratios by level and type of education: (a) participation rate of 15-24 year olds in TVET and (b) gross enrolment ratio in tertiary education (a) the percentage of young people aged 15-24 years participating in technical and vocational education or training (in a given time period eg last 12 months) (b) total enrolments of any age in tertiary education expressed as a percentage of the 5-year age-group immediately following the end of upper secondary education]**	These indicators can be calculated from two different sources: (i) administrative data from educational institutions (eg schools, colleges and universities) or (ii) household surveys with specific questions/modules on education and training of those aged 15 years and above. The first of these is often limited to formal types of learning and usually does not cover TVET provided by employers or in other settings then educational institutions. The latter is most easily captured through surveys of individuals. This is expected to take 3-5 years to achieve.	(i) UNESCO-UIS (ii) UNESCO-UIS will compile the data collected in household surveys run by other organizations.		1	
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for the indicator to be disaggregated by sex.					
	WB	Enrolment ratio for tertiary is available. Data are available on technical-vocational enrolment in upper secondary, post-secondary non-tertiary and short-cycle tertiary education. There are difficulties in collecting data by age and TVET in settings other than formal schools/universities.					
	UNESCO	New proposal (previously under Target 4.3 but we think it fits better under 4.4): **[Participation rate of adults in formal and non-formal education and training in the last 12 months.]** The percentage of people in a given age-range (eg 25-64 years) participating in education or training in the 12 months prior to being interviewed. Disaggregations: sex, location, wealth (and others where data are available)	This indicator is usually calculated from individual level data collected in household surveys. One such source is the European Union's Adult Education Survey covering about 30 countries. Considerable work is required to develop a set of questions to be applied in labour force or other surveys globally. This is expected to take 1-3 years to achieve.	UNESCO-UIS will convene an inter-agency group of experts to develop common methodologies for, initially, completion and participation indicators derived from household surveys. UNESCO-UIS will compile data from household surveys conducted by other organizations.		1	1.4, 4.4, 5.b, 8.5, 9.2
	UNICEF	New proposal (previously under Target 4.4 but we think it fits better under 4.3): **[Participation rate in formal and non-formal education and training in the last 12 months.]** The percentage of people in a given age-range (eg 25-64 years) participating in education or training in the 12 months prior to being interviewed	This indicator is usually calculated from individual level data collected in household surveys. One such source is the European Union's Adult Education Survey covering about 30 countries. Considerable work is required to develop a set of questions to be applied in labour force or other surveys globally. This is expected to take 1-3 (or 3-5?) years to achieve.	UNESCO-UIS will convene an inter-agency group of experts to develop common methodologies for, initially, completion and participation indicators derived from household surveys. UNESCO-UIS will compile data from household surveys conducted by other organizations.		2	

Target 4.4 By 2030, substantially increase the number of youth and adults who have relevant skills, including technical and vocational skills, for employment, decent jobs and entrepreneurship

	ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Percentage of youth/adults with ICT skills by type of skill**	**Already collected by ITU. See ITU's response on indicator 5.b.2 for further details.**	**International Telecommunications Union (ITU)**	**Tier I**		**5.b, 8.5, 8.6, 8.b, 9.2, 9.c**
Indicator 4.4.1		**Participation rate in formal and non-formal education and training in the last 12 months among 25-64 year-olds (BAB)**					
	UNESCO	Suggest to move this indicator to Target 4.3 as it is a measure of participation not a measure of skills acquired. **[The percentage of people in a given age-range (eg 25-64 years) participating in education or training in the 12 months prior to being interviewed. Disaggregations: sex, location, wealth (and others where data are available)]**	This indicator is usually calculated from individual level data collected in household surveys. One such source is the European Union's Adult Education Survey covering about 30 countries. Considerable work is required to develop a set of questions to be applied in labour force or other surveys globally. This is expected to take 1-3 years to achieve.	UNESCO-UIS will convene an inter-agency group of experts to develop common methodologies for, initially, completion and participation indicators derived from household surveys. UNESCO-UIS will compile data from household surveys conducted by other organizations.		2	1.4, 4.3, 5.b, 8.5, 9.2
	UNICEF	Suggest to move this indicator to Target 4.3 as it is a measure of participation not a measure of skills acquired.					
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for the indicator to be disaggregated by sex.					
	WB	Currently data are only available on adult education in European Union countries. Considerable work is required to develop a set of questions to be applied in labour force or other surveys globally.					
Indicator 4.4.2		**Percentage of youth/adults who are computer and information literate (BBB)**					
	ILO	Alternative indicator: **["Skills mismatch index"]**. Justification: Computer and information literacy is a narrow indicator to access the level of skills for employment. The skills mismatch index captures the underutilization or inadequate employment related to skills by occupation and other variables and therefore captures the decent aspect of jobs.	Household surveys (LFS, HIES, LSMS, Integrated HH surveys, etc.). Currently calculations only available based on European LFS.	Responsible entity: ILO. Availability: ILO skills mismatch index available for 33 countries.		1	
	UNESCO	**["Percentage of youth/adults with ICT skills by type of skill"]** *** The name of the indicator has been modified to better reflect the proposal of the Partnership on Measuring ICT for Development: Percentage of youth/adults with ICT skills by type of skill. According to UN definitions, youth are in the age group 15-24 years and adults are represented by the population aged 15 years and above. See ITU's response on indicator 5.b.2 for further details. Disaggregations: sex (and others where data are available)	Already collected by ITU. See ITU's response on indicator 5.b.2 for further details.	International Telecommunications Union (ITU)		1	5.b, 8.5, 8.6, 8.b, 9.2, 9.c

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	UNICEF	The name of the indicator has been modified to better reflect the proposal of the Partnership on Measuring ICT for Development: **[Percentage of youth/adults with ICT skills by type of skill.]** Youth are normally defined as the age group 15-24 years. Adults are normally the population aged 15 years and above. See indicator 5.b.2 for further details.	Already collected by ITU. See indicator 5.b.2 for further details.	ITU		1	
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for the indicator to be disaggregated by sex.					
	WB	Few surveys (e.g. ICILS) attempt to measure such skills. Major efforts are required to improve global data collection. There is an indicator on Individuals with ICT skills, by type of skill, by age.		Existing Indicator collected and maintained by ITU			4.3, 5.b, 8.2, 8.3

Target 4.5 By 2030, eliminate gender disparities in education and ensure equal access to all levels of education and vocational training for the vulnerable, including persons with disabilities, indigenous peoples and children in vulnerable situations.

	ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Parity indices (female/male, urban/rural, bottom/top wealth quintile] for all indicators on this list that can be disaggregated**	**Same sources and availability as the underlying indicators themselves**	**UIS; Data available for over 100 countries**	**Tier I**		**All equity targets and targets associated with the underlying indicators; covers also 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.6 is part of 5.1**
Indicator 4.5.1	**Parity indices (female/male, urban/rural, bottom/top wealth quintile] for all indicators on this list that can be disaggregated (BBA)**						
	UNESCO	These indices require no additional data than the specific disaggregations of interest. They are simply the ratio of the indicator value for one group to that of the other. Typically the likely more disadvantaged group is the numerator. A value of exactly 1 indicates parity between the two groups. The indicator is not symmetrical about 1 but a simple transformation can make it so (by inverting ratios that exceed 1 and subtracting them from 2). This will make interpretation easier. In addition, education indicators for with disabilities or in conflict-affected or emergency situations will be monitored in line with efforts to improve coverage. Disaggregations: sex, location, wealth (and others such as disability status or conflict-affected as data become available)	Same sources and availability as the underlying indicators themselves.	Same sources and availability as the underlying indicators themselves.		1	All equity targets and targets associated with the underlying indicators
	UNICEF	These indices require no additional data than the specific disaggregations of interest. They are simply the ratio of the indicator value for one group to that of the other. Typically the likely more disadvantaged group is the numerator. A value of exactly 1 indicates parity between the two groups. The indicator is not symmetrical about 1 but a simple transformation can make it so (by inverting ratios that exceed 1 and subtracting them from 2). This will make interpretation easier. Other disaggregations such as by disability status should be added as data become available.	Same sources and availability as the underlying indicators themselves.	Same sources and availability as the underlying indicators themselves.		1	All equity targets
	UNWOMEN	UN Women supports this indicator and It is included as a Tier I indicators (#24) under the 52 minimum set of gender statistics .	UIS	Data available for over 100 countries			NA (would not be appropriate for other targets)
	WB	Alternative ideas instead of the parity index may be: **[(i) odds ratio; (ii) concentration index; or (iii) least advantaged group (e.g. poorest rural girls) relative to the mean.]** In addition, education indicators for people with disabilities will be monitored in line with efforts to improve coverage.					

Target 4.6 By 2030, ensure that all youth and a substantial proportion of adults, both men and women, achieve literacy and numeracy.

	ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Percentage of the population in a given age group achieving at least a fixed level of proficiency in functional (a) literacy and (b) numeracy skills.** **Disaggregations: sex, location, wealth (and others where data are available)**	**This indicator is collected via skills' assessment surveys of the adult population.** **Currently data are available for 33 mostly high-income countries from PIAAC. Similar information is available for (urban areas of) of 13 low- and middle-income countries from STEP.** **Considerable work is required to develop a cost-effective module that can be integrated into national and international surveys. This is expected to take 3-5 years to achieve.**	**OECD (PIAAC) World Bank (STEP) UNESCO-UIS will compile the data collected in assessment surveys run by other organizations.**	**Tier III**		**1.2, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.3, 3.4, 3.7, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5, 5.6, 8.5, 8.6, 8.b, 10.2, 12.8, 13.3, 13.b,**
Indicator 4.6.1	**Percentage of youth/adults proficient in literacy and numeracy skills (BAA)**						
	UNESCO	**[Percentage of the population in a given age group achieving at least a fixed level of proficiency in functional (a) literacy and (b) numeracy skills.]** According to UN definitions, youth are in the age group 15-24 years and adults are represented by the population aged 15 years and above. Disaggregations: sex, location, wealth (and others where data are available)	This indicator is collected via skills' assessment surveys of the adult population. Currently data are available for 33 mostly high-income countries from PIAAC. Similar information is available for (urban areas of) of 13 low- and middle-income countries from STEP. Considerable work is required to develop a cost-effective module that can be integrated into national and international surveys. This is expected to take 3-5 years to achieve.	OECD (PIAAC), World Bank (STEP), UNESCO-UIS will compile the data collected in assessment surveys run by other organizations.		1	1.2, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.3, 3.4, 3.7, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5, 5.6, 8.5, 8.6, 8.b, 10.2, 12.8, 13.3, 13.b,

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	UNICEF	**[Percentage of the population in a given age group achieving at least a fixed level of proficiency in functional (a) literacy and (b) numeracy skills.]** Youth are normally defined as the age group 15-24 years. Adults are normally the population aged 15 years and above.	This indicator is collected via skills' assessment surveys of the adult population. Currently data are available for 33 mostly high-income countries from PIAAC. Similar information is available for (urban areas of) of 13 low- and middle-income countries from STEP. Considerable work is required to develop a cost-effective module that can be integrated into national and international surveys. This is expected to take 3-5 years to achieve.	OECD (PIAAC), World Bank (STEP). UNESCO-UIS will compile the data collected in assessment surveys run by other organizations.		1	
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for the indicator to be disaggregated by sex.					
	WB	While a number of middle-income (STEP) and high-income (PIAAC) countries have assessed literacy skills of adults, a cost-effective tool needs to be inserted in other surveys for use across countries.					
Indicator 4.6.2 Youth/adult literacy rate (AAA)							
	UNESCO	**[Percentage of the population in a given age group able to read with understanding a simple sentence about their every day life.]** According to UN definitions, youth are in the age group 15-24 years and adults are represented by the population aged 15 years and above. Disaggregations: sex and location (and others where data are available)	Household surveys including DHS, MICS, national surveys and censuses which collect data on literacy skills. Available regularly (at least once every 5-10 years) but not annually for c160 developing countries but few developed countries collect similar data.	UNESCO-UIS		2	1.2, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.3, 3.4, 3.7, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5, 5.6, 8.5, 8.6, 8.b, 10.2, 12.8, 13.3, 13.b,
	UNICEF	**[Percentage of the population in a given age group able to read with understanding a simple sentence about their every day life.]** Youth are normally defined as the age group 15-24 years. Adults are normally the population aged 15 years and above.	Household surveys including DHS, MICS, national surveys and censuses which collect data on literacy skills. Available regularly (at least once every 5-10 years) but not annually for c160 developing countries but few developed countries collect similar data.	UNESCO-UIS		2	
	UNWOMEN	UN Women supports this indicator and part of it is (Youth literacy rate) included as a Tier I indicators (#20) under the 52 minimum set of gender statistics, but we would like it to be disaggregated by sex.					

Target 4.7 By 2030, ensure that all learners acquire the knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development, including, among others, through education for sustainable development and sustainable lifestyles, human rights, gender equality, promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence, global citizenship and appreciation of cultural diversity and of culture's contribution to sustainable development.

	ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Percentage of 15-year old students enrolled in secondary school demonstrating at least a fixed level of knowledge across a selection of topics in environmental science and geoscience. The exact choice/range of topics will depend on the survey or assessment in which the indicator is collected.** **Disaggregations: sex and location (and others where data are available)**	**PISA 2006, administered in 57 countries, estimated an "environmental science performance index."** **ICCS 2009, which included 38 countries, contains workable items for larger-scale tracking that will require validation in developing world settings.** **ICCS 2016 will provide globally-comparable data on civic knowledge and engagement, and students' roles in peaceful functioning of schools.** **Major efforts will be required to develop a tool for use in other surveys. This is expected to take 3-5 years to achieve.**	**OECD (PISA), IEA (ICCS)** **UNESCO-UIS will compile data from assessments and surveys run by other organizations**	**Tier III**		**1.5, 3.d, 11.6, 12.2, 12.8, 13.1, 13.3, 13.b, 15.9**
Indicator 4.7.1 Percentage of 15- year old students showing proficiency in knowledge of environmental science and geoscience (BBB)							
	UNESCO	**[Percentage of 15-year old students enrolled in secondary school demonstrating at least a fixed level of knowledge across a selection of topics in environmental science and geoscience.]** The exact choice/range of topics will depend on the survey or assessment in which the indicator is collected. Disaggregations: sex and location (and others where data are available)	PISA 2006, administered in 57 countries, estimated an "environmental science performance index." ICCS 2009, which included 38 countries, contains workable items for larger-scale tracking that will require validation in developing world settings. ICCS 2016 will provide globally-comparable data on civic knowledge and engagement, and students' roles in peaceful functioning of schools. Major efforts will be required to develop a tool for use in other surveys. This is expected to take 3-5 years to achieve.	OECD (PISA), IEA (ICCS) UNESCO-UIS will compile data from assessments and surveys run by other organizations		1	1.5, 3.d, 11.6, 12.2, 12.8, 13.1, 13.3, 13.b, 15.9
	UNICEF	**[Percentage of 15-year old students enrolled in secondary school demonstrating at least a fixed level of knowledge across a selection of topics in environmental science and geoscience.]** The exact choice/range of topics will depend on the survey or assessment in which the indicator is collected.	PISA 2006, administered in 57 countries, estimated an "environmental science performance index." ICCS 2009, which included 38 countries, contains workable items for larger-scale tracking that will require validation in developing world settings. ICCS 2016 will provide globally-comparable data on civic knowledge and engagement, and students' roles in peaceful functioning of schools. Major efforts will be required to develop a tool for use in other surveys. This is expected to take 3-5 years to achieve.	OECD (PISA), IEA (ICCS), UNESCO-UIS will compile data from assessments and surveys run by other organizations		1	
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for the indicator to be disaggregated by sex.					

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	WB	Only one survey (PISA 2006) attempts to measure such knowledge. Major efforts will be required to develop a global measurement tool. Defining this indicator via the knowledge of environmental science and geoscience is reaching very high. Instead a simple, standardized test could be designed that looks at basic sustainability concepts, such as: land use (long term productivity ensured); biodiversity (humans coexisting with other species); resource security (water, land, mineral resources); consumption, material flows and recycling (how can I consume and manage my waste with maximum sustainability?); pollution (and how it affects basic resources and ecosystem services); population growth, economic growth (how many people, and how much consumption, can an ecosystem support?); fragility of ecosystems (major threats such as climate change, deforestation, pollution, depletion of resources, collapse of ecosystems – e.g. oceans). Such a standardized test would probably show very precisely which level of awareness the youth of a society has. The adult population is of course another matter.	PISA (2006)				
	UNFPA	Replace with: **[Percentage of schools that provided life skills-based HIV and sexuality education]** This indicator is in a testing phase, with the infrastructure in place. Proposal is consistent with indicator 28 of the Framework for Action of the Post 2015 Education agenda (draft version 31 March 2015), Annex I (Technical Advisory Group/TAG proposed indicators).]	Data source: EMIS Annual School Census.	UNESCO		1	
Indicator 4.7.2	**Percentage of 13-year old students endorsing values and attitudes promoting equality, trust and participation in governance (CBB)**						
	UNESCO	**[Percentage of 13-year old students enrolled in school supporting a range of values and attitudes promoting equality, trust and participation in governance.]** The exact choice/range of values and attitudes will depend on the survey or assessment in which the indicator is collected. Disaggregations: sex and location (and others where data are available)	ICCS 2009, which included 38 countries, has measured such attitudes. Major efforts will be required to develop a tool for use in other surveys. This is expected to take 3-5 years to achieve.	IEA (ICCS), UNESCO-UIS will compile data from assessments and surveys run by other organizations		1	1.5, 5.2, 5.3, 5.5, 12.8, 13.3, 13.b, 16.1, 16.3, 16.6, 16.7
	UNICEF	**[Percentage of 13-year old students enrolled in school supporting a range of values and attitudes promoting equality, trust and participation in governance.]** The exact choice/range of values and attitudes will depend on the survey or assessment in which the indicator is collected.	ICCS 2009, which included 38 countries, has measured such attitudes. Major efforts will be required to develop a tool for use in other surveys. This is expected to take 3-5 years to achieve.	IEA (ICCS), UNESCO-UIS will compile data from assessments and surveys run by other organizations		2	
	UNWOMEN	Alternative proposal: **[Percentage of schools that provide life skills-based HIV and sexuality education.]** This indicator is currently proposed as a thematic indicator by Technical Advisory Group on Education. The indicator requires development. An overhaul of the way countries report on this indicator will be required to ensure estimates are better linked to the reality at the school level.	Country reports	UNESCO		2	3.7, 5.6
	UNFPA	Replace with: **[Countries implementing the framework on the World Programme on Human Rights Education]** Proposal is consistent with indicator 29 of the Framework for Action of the Post 2015 Education agenda (draft version 31 March 2015), Annex I (Technical Advisory Group/TAG proposed indicators).]	(as per UNGA resolution 59/113, and part of the existing accountability framework as per Recommendation 1974, part of statutory reporting and with a reporting track record.)	OHCHR		2	
Target 4.a	**Build and upgrade education facilities that are child, disability and gender sensitive and provide safe, non-violent, inclusive and effective learning environments for all**						
	ContributorName	**Specification**	**Source**	**Entity**	**Tier**	**Priority**	**Interlinkages**
Suggested Indicator		**Percentage of schools with access to (i) electricity; (ii) Internet for pedagogical purposes (iii) basic drinking water and (iv) basic sanitation facilities; and (v) basic handwashing facilities (as per the WASH indicator definitions)**	**The indicator can be calculated from administrative sources on school facilities. Data are currently available on electricity and Internet for c70 countries and on water and sanitation for c100 countries.** **Considerable efforts will be required to apply the WASH definitions fully and extend coverage to more countries. This is expected to take 1-3 years.**	**UNESCO-UIS and UNICEF**	**Tier II**		**6.1, 6.2, 7.1, 9.c, 17.8**
Indicator 4.a.1	**Percentage of schools with access to (i) electricity; (ii) drinking water; and (iii) single-sex sanitation facilities (as per the WASH indicator definitions) (BAA)**						
	UNESCO	Proposed modification: **["Percentage of schools with access to (i) electricity; (ii) Internet for pedagogical purposes (iii) basic drinking water and (iv) single-sex basic sanitation facilities; and (v) basic handwashing facilities (as per the WASH indicator definitions)"].** The indicator is the percentage of schools (primary, lower and upper secondary) with each of the facilities listed. Basic drinking water is defined as: A functional drinking water source (MDG 'improved' categories) on or near the premises and water points accessible to all users during school hours. Basic sanitation facilities are defined as: Functional sanitation facilities (MDG 'improved' categories) separated for males and females on or near the premises. Basic handwashing facilities are defined as: Functional handwashing facilities, soap (or ash) and water available to girls and boys. Disaggregations: location and, for basic sanitation and handwashing facilities, sex	The indicator can be calculated from administrative sources on school facilities. Data are currently available on electricity and Internet for c70 countries and on water and sanitation for c100 countries. Considerable efforts will be required to apply the WASH definitions fully and extend coverage to more countries. This is expected to take 1-3 years.	UNESCO-UIS and UNICEF		1	6.1, 6.2, 7.1, 9.c, 17.8

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	UNICEF	**[Percentage of schools with access to (i) electricity; (ii) Internet for pedagogical purposes (iii) basic drinking water and (iv) basic sanitation facilities; and (v) basic handwashing facilities (as per the WASH indicator definitions)]** The indicator is the percentage of schools (primary, lower and upper secondary) with each of the facilities listed. Basic drinking water is defined as: A functional drinking water source (MDG 'improved' categories) on or near the premises and water points accessible to all users during school hours. Basic sanitation facilities are defined as: Functional sanitation facilities (MDG 'improved' categories) separated for males and females on or near the premises. Basic handwashing facilities are defined as: Functional handwashing facilities, soap (or ash) and water available to girls and boys	The indicator can be calculated from administrative sources on school facilities. Data are currently available on electricity and Internet for c70 countries and on water and sanitation for c100 countries. Considerable efforts will be required to apply the WASH definitions fully and extend coverage to more countries. This is expected to take 1-3 years.	UNESCO-UIS and UNICEF		1	
	UNISDR	UNISDR propose (**[a) \Number of educational facilities damaged due to disasters" and (b) "Number of countries with critical infrastructure protection plan".**] Please see UNISDR input paper attached."	(a) National Disaster Loss Databases, 85 (will be more than 115 by 2016), (b) SFDRR Monitor (to be developed), 0 (but HFA Monitor covered 133 countries in 2013)	UNISDR		(a) 1, (b)2	(a)(b) 9.1, 1.5, 11.5, 13.1, 14.2, 15.3
	WB	Could also include **[(iv) computers for pedagogical purposes].** However, it should be noted that considerable work is required to extend the coverage of current data collection efforts to all countries."	Existing data collected by UIS	UIS			4.1, 9.1
	UNFPA	**[Percentage of students experiencing bullying, corporal punishment, harassment, violence, sexual discrimination and abuse**] [Proposal is consistent with indicator 34 of the Framework for Action of the Post 2015 Education agenda (draft version 31 March 2015), Annex I (Technical Advisory Group/TAG proposed indicators). Whereas the current indicator addresses physical aspects of an enabling learning environment, the proposed additional indicator addresses social and safety aspects, in line with the target. Given that the target covers multiple areas, the two indicators together try to capture this better than only one.	This indicator is part of an existing accountability framework and available through the Global School-based Student Health Survey by UIS-UNESCO	UNESCO			
	UNESCO	The indicator is the **[percentage of schools (primary, lower and upper secondary) with adapted facilities and resources designed for those with disabilities.]** Disaggregations: location	Major preparatory work will be required to develop an approach on the assessment of school conditions for people with disabilities. This is expected to take 3-5 years.	Not yet identified		2	1.4, 6.2, 10.210.3

Target 4.b By 2020, substantially expand globally the number of scholarships available to developing countries, in particular least developed countries, small island developing States and African countries, for enrolment in higher education, including vocational training and information and communications technology, technical, engineering and scientific programmes, in developed countries and other developing countries.

	ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Volume of ODA flows for scholarships by sector and type of study; Total net official development assistance (ODA) for scholarships and student costs in donor countries (types of aid E01 and E02). Data expressed in US dollars at the average annual exchange rate.**	**Data are compiled by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development from returns submitted by its member countries and other aid providers.**	**OECD-DAC; Data are available for essentially all high-income countries, and for an increasing number of middle-income aid providers.**	**Tier I**		**1.a, 2.a, 9.5, 9.b, 10.b, 12.a, 13.b, 17.2, 17.6**
Indicator 4.b.1	**Volume of ODA flows for scholarships by sector and type of study (BBB)**						
	UNESCO	See OECD-DAC's response for definition of this indicator	See OECD-DAC's response for sources of this indicator	OECD-DAC		1	1.a, 2.a, 9.5, 9.b, 10.b, 12.a, 13.b, 17.2, 17.6
	WB	This indicator only measures some sources of scholarships.					

Target 4.c By 2030, substantially increase the supply of qualified teachers, including through international cooperation for teacher training in developing countries, especially least developed countries and small island developing States

	ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Percentage of teachers in (i) pre-primary (ii) primary, (iii) lower secondary and (iv) upper secondary education who have received at least the minimum organized teacher (i.e. pedagogical training) pre-service or in-service required for teaching at the relevant level in a given country. Disaggregations: sex (and others where data are available)**	**The indicator can be calculated from administrative sources on teachers. Data are currently available for c100 countries. Considerable further work would be required if a common standard for teacher training is to be applied across countries.**	**UNESCO-UIS**	**Tier I/III**		**1.2, 1.4, 1.a, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.7, 3.c, 3.d, 5.1, 5.5, 5.b, 8.6, 8.7, 10.2, 12.8, 13.3, 13.b**
Indicator 4.c.1	**Percentage of trained teachers by level of education according to national standards (AAA)**						
	UNESCO	**[Percentage of teachers in (i) pre-primary (ii) primary, (iii) lower secondary and (iv) upper secondary education who have received at least the minimum organized teacher (i.e. pedagogical training) pre-service or in-service required for teaching at the relevant level in a given country. Disaggregations: sex (and others where data are available)]**	The indicator can be calculated from administrative sources on teachers. Data are currently available for c100 countries. Considerable further work would be required if a common standard for teacher training is to be applied across countries.	UNESCO-UIS		1	1.2, 1.4, 1.a, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.7, 3.c, 3.d, 5.1, 5.5, 5.b, 8.6, 8.7, 10.2, 12.8, 13.3, 13.b
	UNICEF	**[Percentage of teachers in (i) pre-primary (ii) primary, (iii) lower secondary and (iv) upper secondary education who have received at least the minimum organized teacher (i.e. pedagogical training) pre-service or in-service required for teaching at the relevant level in a given country.]**	The indicator can be calculated from administrative sources on teachers in schools. Data are currently available for about 100 countries. Considerable further work would be required if a common standard for teacher training is to be applied across countries.	UNESCO-UIS		1	
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for the indicator to be disaggregated by sex.					
	WB	Major efforts will be required to agree on common standards.					

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	UNESCO	**[Percentage of teachers in (i) pre-primary (ii) primary, (iii) lower secondary and (iv) upper secondary education who have at least the minimum academic qualifications required for teaching at the relevant level or a given subject in a given country. Academic qualifications are most often linked to the subject(s) the teacher teaches. Disaggregations: sex (and others where data are available)]**	The indicator can be calculated from administrative sources on teachers. Data at the international level were collected for the first time in 2014 but some further work is required to extend the country coverage. This is expected to take 1-3 years to achieve	UNESCO-UIS		2	1.2, 1.4, 1.a, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.7, 3.c, 3.d, 5.1, 5.5, 5.b, 8.6, 8.7, 10.2, 12.8, 13.3, 13.b

Goal 5 Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls

Target 5.1 End all forms of discrimination against all women and girls everywhere.

	ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Whether or not legal frameworks are in place to promote equality and non-discrimination on the basis of sex**	**Member State responses to CEDAW, World Bank Women Business and Law Database**	**Methodology being developed by OHCHR and UN Women. A tentative proposal is that the CEDAW Committee would monitor the indicator as part of their country reporting and review process using a standardized template to assess all countries in a comparable manner.**	**Tier III**		
Indicator 5.1.1	**Whether or not legal frameworks discriminate against women and girls, as identified by the CEDAW committee (BBB)**						
	UNWOMEN	Revised proposal: [**Whether or not legal frameworks are in place to promote equality and non-discrimination on the basis of sex.]**This is a new indicator requiring development. The indicator is a binary indicator (Yes/No). Countries need to report a yes on all of the following questions: <U+0095> Is equal pay for work of equal value guaranteed in law? <U+0095> Is national law in line with ILO Convention 103 on Maternity Protection? <U+0095> Does national law prohibit discrimination based on a definition of discrimination against women in accordance with art 1 of CEDAW? <U+0095> Is the national minimum legal age of marriage for girls and boys, with or without parental consent, established at 18 years? <U+0095> Does the national legal framework provide equal rights for women and men with respect to inheritance and property? <U+0095> Can women (married or unmarried) confer citizenship to children and non-national spouse in the same way as a man?<U+0095> Is there a law specifically criminalizing domestic violence?<U+0095> Is there a gender quota for parliament and local government to accelerate women's representation?	Member State responses to CEDAW, World Bank Women Business and Law Database	Methodology being developed by OHCHR and UN Women. A tentative proposal is that the CEDAW Committee would monitor the indicator as part of their country reporting and review process using a standardized template to assess all countries in a comparable manner.		1	10.3, 16.b
Indicator 5.1.2	**Whether or not inheritance rights discriminate against women and girls (BBB)**						
	UNWOMEN	If 5.1.1 is accepted as priority 1 we would suggest dropping 5.1.2 as it is redundant.					

Target 5.2 Eliminate all forms of violence against all women and girls in the public and private spheres, including trafficking and sexual and other types of exploitation.

	ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Proportion of ever-partnered women and girls (aged 15-49) subjected to physical and/or sexual violence by a current or former intimate partner, in the last 12 months**	**The data would come from DHS and other specialized VAW surveys. Included in the Minimum Set of Gender Indicators**	**The data would be compiled by UNICEF, UN Women and UNSD -- around 100 but not fully comparable, UNFPA, WHO.**	**Tier II**		
Suggested Indicator		**Proportion of women and girls (aged 15-49) subjected to sexual violence by persons other than an intimate partner, since age 15**	**The data would come from DHS and other specialized VAW surveys. Included in the Minimum Set of Gender Indicators.**	**The data would be compiled by UNICEF, UN Women, UNSD, UNFPA, and WHO.**	**Tier II**		**16.1**
Indicator 5.2.1	**Proportion of ever-partnered women and girls (aged 15-49) subjected to physical and/or sexual violence by a current or former intimate partner, in the last 12 months (BAA)**						
	UNICEF	**[Proportion of ever-partnered women and girls (aged 15-49) subjected to physical and/or sexual violence by a current or former intimate partner, in the last 12 months]**	Household surveys such as DHS.	Unisex maintains a global database on the issue since 2014. Fully comparable data are available for more than 40 low- and middle-income countries. Additional data (based on slightly different definitions) are available for a number of LAMI and high income countries.		1	
	UNWOMEN	This indicator is included as a Tier II indicator under the 52 minimum set of gender statistics endorsed by the Statistical Commission through its decision 44/109. The indicator should be disaggregated by age groups (5 year groups), income, rural/urban location and other context specific factors.	The data would come from DHS and other specialized VAW surveys, not yet compiled by EDGE data portal and Minimum Set of Gender Indicators	The data would be compiled by UNICEF, UN Women and UNSD		1	Can be used to track 16.1
	WB		DHS	39 countries			
	GlobalMigrationWG	**[Number of victims of human trafficking per 100,000 persons (5.2 and 16.2).]** See full specification in attached meta-data word file	Administrative statistics from the criminal justice system (courts, police, etc.). Current data sources include the UNODC Global Report on Trafficking in Persons, the U.S. Department of State's Trafficking in Persons Report; IOM Trafficked Migrants Assistance Database	Ministries of Justice/Interior, Global Migration Group		1	10.7; 16.2

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	UNFPA	**[Proportion of ever-partnered women and girls (aged 15-49) subjected to physical and/or sexual violence by a current or former intimate partner, in the last 12 months (explore expansion to women over 49 years of age)].** While disaggregation is currently limited to ages 15-49, we would advocate for efforts to explore expansion of this measurement to women over 49, for possible consideration in a periodic review of the indicators somewhere down the line. UNFPA could lead this effort	Household and specialized surveys using WHO methodology. Data available for majority of countries and trends for few of them.	UN Women, WHO, UNICEF, UNFPA			
Indicator 5.2.2	**Proportion of women and girls (aged 15-49) subjected to sexual violence by persons other than an intimate partner, since age 15. (BAA)**						
	UNWOMEN	This is included as a Tier II indicator under the 52 minimum set of gender statistics endorsed by the Statistical Commission through its decision 44/109.	The data would come from DHS and other specialized VAW surveys, , not yet compiled by EDGE and Minimum Set of Gender Indicators	The data would be compiled by UNICEF, UN Women and UNSD		2	16.1
	WB		DHS	39 countries			
	UNFPA	**[Proportion of women and girls (aged 15-49) subjected to sexual violence by persons other than an intimate partner, in the last 12 months (explore expansion to women over 49 years of age)]**. While disaggregation is currently limited to ages 15-49, we would advocate for efforts to explore expansion of this measurement to women over 49, for possible consideration in a periodic review of the indicators somewhere down the line. UNFPA could lead this effort	Household and specialized surveys using WHO methodology. Data available for majority of countries and trends for few of them.	, WHO, UNICEF, UNFPA			
Target 5.3	**Eliminate all harmful practices, such as child, early and forced marriage and female genital mutilation.**						
	ContributorName	**Specification**	**Source**	**Entity**	**Tier**	**Priority**	**Interlinkages**
Suggested Indicator		**Percentage of women aged 20-24 who were married or in a union before age 18 (i.e. child marriage)**	**Household surveys such as MICS and DHS. Included in the Minimum Set of Gender Indicators**	**UNICEF maintains a global database on the issue since 2003. Fully comparable data are available for some 117 low- and middle-income countries. UNICEF is also the agency responsible for reporting on this indicator as part of the UN expert group on gender indicators. UNFPA.**	**Tier I**		
Suggested Indicator		**Percentage of girls and women aged 15-49 years who have undergone FGM/C, by age group (for relevant countries only)**	**Household surveys such as MICS and DHS. Included in the Minimum Set of Gender Indicators**	**UNICEF maintains a global database on the issue since 2004. Data are available for some 29 low- and middle-income countries where the practice is concentrated. UNICEF is also the agency responsible for reporting on this indicator as part of the UN expert group on gender indicators. UNFPA.**	**Tier I**		
Indicator 5.3.1	**Percentage of women aged 20-24 who were married or in a union before age 18 (i.e. child marriage) (AAA)**						
	UNICEF	**[Percentage of women aged 20-24 who were married or in a union before age 18 (i.e. child marriage)]**	Household surveys such as MICS and DHS.	UNICEF maintains a global database on the issue since 2003. Fully comparable data are available for some 117 low- and middle-income countries. UNICEF is also the agency responsible for reporting on this indicator as part of the UN expert group on gender indicators.		1	
	UNWOMEN	**[Percentage of women aged 20-24 who were married or in a union before age 18 (i.e. child marriage)]**	Household surveys such as MICS and DHS.	UNICEF maintains a global database on the issue since 2003. Fully comparable data are available for some 117 low- and middle-income countries. UNICEF is also the agency responsible for reporting on this indicator as part of the UN expert group on gender indicators.		Equal priority	Also relevant for 5.6
	WB		DHS	90 countries			
	UNFPA	**[Percentage of women aged 20-24 who were married or in a union before age 18 (i.e. child marriage)]**	Household surveys (DHS and MICS)	UNFPA and UNICEF			
Indicator 5.3.2	**Percentage of girls and women aged 15-49 years who have undergone FGM/C, by age group (for relevant countries only) (CBB)**						
	UNICEF	**[Percentage of girls and women aged 15-49 years who have undergone FGM/C, by age group (for relevant countries only)]**	Household surveys such as MICS and DHS.	UNICEF maintains a global database on the issue since 2004. Data are available for some 29 low- and middle-income countries where the practice is concentrated. UNICEF is also the agency responsible for reporting on this indicator as part of the UN expert group on gender indicators.		2	

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	UNWOMEN	Revised formulation: **[Percentage of girls and women aged 15-49 years who have undergone FGM/C, disaggregated by age group with a particular focus on 15-19]**. Note: monitoring the 15-19 age group will enable focussing on the most vulnerable age group and would be a more sensitive measure of the impact of policy interventions.	Household surveys such as MICS and DHS.	UNICEF maintains a global database on the issue since 2004. Data are available for some 29 low- and middle-income countries where the practice is concentrated. UNICEF is also the agency responsible for reporting on this indicator as part of the UN expert group on gender indicators.		Equal priority	
	UNFPA	**[Percentage of girls and women aged 15-19 who have undergone FGM]**	Household surveys (DHS and MICS)	UNFPA, UNICEF			

Target 5.4 Recognize and value unpaid care and domestic work through the provision of public services, infrastructure and social protection policies and the promotion of shared responsibility within the household and the family as nationally appropriate.

	ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Average daily (24 hours) spent on unpaid domestic and care work, by sex, age and location (for individuals five years and above)**	**68 countries with TUS data since 2005; UNSD has compiled info on unpaid work for 51 countries. Included in the Minimum Set of Gender Indicators**	**UN Women and UNSD will monitor. Time use surveys data compiled from databases from ECLAC, OECD, UNECE and national statistical offices for 75 countries.**	**Tier II**		
Indicator 5.4.1	**Average weekly hours spent on unpaid domestic and care work, by sex, age and location (for individuals five years and above) (CBB)**						
	UNWOMEN	This indicator is included as a Tier II indicator under the 52 minimum set of gender statistics. Data exists for this indicator exists, coming from several time use surveys. Currently we have data disaggregated by sex for a specific age group per survey. Not all of the surveys have the data disaggregated by location. In the future we aspire to be collect this data for individuals five years and above, but currently it is not available.	Time use surveys	UN Women and UNSD will monitor. Time use surveys data compiled from databases from ECLAC, OECD, UNECE and national statistical offices for 75 countries.		1	
	WB		LSMS and LFS (World Bank)	12 countries			
Indicator 5.4.2	**Proportion of households within 15 minutes of nearest water source (BBB)**						
	UNWOMEN	Revised indicator: **[Percentage of population using an improved source with a total collection time of 30 minutes or less for a roundtrip including queuing.]**	Household surveys (DHS and MICs)	JMP on WASH would monitor the indicator. The DHS database (Statcompiler) has data available for 60 countries since 2000. MICs data reaches 108 countries since 1994.		2	Target 6.1

Target 5.5 Ensure women's full and effective participation and equal opportunities for leadership at all levels of decision-making in political, economic and public life.

	ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Proportion of seats held by women in national parliaments**	**Member States. Included in the Minimum Set of Gender Indicators.**	**IPU, Country coverage: all countries with national parliaments**	**Tier I**		
Suggested Indicator		**Proportion of seats held by women in local governments**	**Member States. Included in the Minimum Set of Gender Indicators.**	**UN Women UCLG; Country coverage: All countries.**	**Tier I**		**16.7**
Indicator 5.5.1	**Proportion of seats held by women in local governments (AAA)**						
	UNWOMEN	UN Women proposes that indicator 5.5.1 (local government) and the alternative proposal for 5.5.2 (national parliaments) should have equal priority. 5.5.1 is an indicator that will complement data on national parliaments to provide a more complete picture of women's representation in public life at all levels, as the target specifies. There is strong demand for this data from multiple stakeholders, yet no global dataset exists. Methodologies and standards are currently being developed by UN Women and UCLG to enable global comparison of national data.	Member States	UN Women UCLG; Country coverage: All countries.		1	16.7
Indicator 5.5.2	**Proportion of women who have a say in household decisions (for large purchases, their own health and visiting relatives) (BBB)**						
	UNWOMEN	Alternative proposal: **[Proportion of women in national parliaments]**	Member States	IPU, Country coverage: all countries with national parliaments		1	16.7

Target 5.6 Ensure universal access to sexual and reproductive health and reproductive rights as agreed in accordance with the Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development and the Beijing Platform for Action and the outcome documents of their review conferences.

	ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Proportion of women (aged 15-49) who make their own sexual and reproductive decisions.**	**DHS, MICS and other health and household surveys.**	**UNFPA**	**Tier II**		
Suggested Indicator		**[Proportion (%) of countries with laws and regulations that guarantee all women and adolescents access to sexual and reproductive health services, information and education (official records)**	**Member States**	**UNPFA, some baselines available.**	**Tier II**		**3.7**
Indicator 5.6.1	**Percentage of women and girls who make decisions about their own sexual and reproductive health and reproductive rights by age, location, income, disability and other characteristics relevant to each country (CBB)**						
	UNWOMEN	Revised indicator: **[Percentage of women (aged 15-49) who make their own sexual and reproductive decisions]**. See attached supplementary document.	DHS, MICS and other health and household surveys.	UNPFA, Indicator will be measured through DHS and MICS covering most of low and middle income countries. In developed countries the indicator will be measured through national household surveys.		1	3.7

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	UNFPA	**[Percentage of women (aged 15-49) who make their own sexual and reproductive decisions.]** Rationale: This is an indicator measuring specific decisions by women (aged 15-49) on their own sexuality and reproduction. Interviewees will have to provide a "yes" answer to all three questions in order to count as a woman who makes her own sexual and reproductive decisions. The first question looks at the ability to say no to sexual intercourse as a critical condition of sexual autonomy. The second question measures the woman's decision concerning using or not using contraception. The third question measures the woman's decision about reaching sexual and reproductive healthcare for her***see supplementary technical materials attached***	Measurement: Indicator will be measured through DHS and MICS covering most of low and middle income countries. In developed countries the indicator will be measured through national household surveys	UNFPA		1	
Indicator 5.6.2	**Existence of laws and regulations that guarantee all women and adolescents informed choices regarding their sexual and reproductive health and reproductive rights regardless of marital status. (BBB)**						
	UNWOMEN	Revised indicator: **[Proportion (%) of countries with laws and regulations that guarantee all women and adolescents access to sexual and reproductive health services, information and education (official records)]**	Member States	UNPFA, some baselines available.		2	3.7
	UNFPA	**[Proportion (%) of countries with laws and regulations that guarantee all women and adolescents access to sexual and reproductive health services, information and education.]** Legal/regulatory frameworks covered by this indicator include laws and regulations that explicitly guarantee: 1. Access to SRH services without third party authorization (from the spouse, guardian, parents or others); 2. Access to SRH services without restrictions in terms of age and marital status; 3. Access by adolescents to SRH information and education. Note: the indicator also measures the absence of laws that prohibit or restrict access to SRH services ***See supplementary technical materials attached***	Sources of information and methodology: The suggested methodology consists of initial self-reporting by governments through a detailed survey to be developed based on the indicators below with detailed questions that safeguard the replicability and reliability of state responses. This procedure was applied for the ICPD+20 review survey with support to governments from UNFPA's country offices where needed	UNFPA		2	

Target 5.a Undertake reforms to give women equal rights to economic resources, as well as access to ownership and control over land and other forms of property, financial services, inheritance and natural resources, in accordance with national laws.

	ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Share of women among agricultural land owners by age and location (U/R)**	**Included in Minimum Set Gender Indicators**	**FAO and UNSD (EDGE), UN Women**	**Tier III soon Tier II**		
Suggested Indicator		**The legal framework includes special measures to guarantee women's equal rights to land ownership and control.**	**Data for both alternative proposals are available and currently disseminated by FAO. Indeed, some indicators are already available through FAO's Gender and Land Rights Database (see next section). In addition to existing data, FAO is working to strengthen and improve data collection through efforts such as the new Guidelines for the World Census of Agriculture (WCA 2020) as well as the development of the AGRIS toolkit. These are clear indications of the commitment of FAO in sex-disaggregated land indicators.**	**"FAO - FAO has the mandate to collect and disseminate information related to agriculture and is working to monitor legal frameworks related to land tenure, as well as to collect, analyse and disseminate land-related statistics. This applies to both alternative indicators proposed. For the rights-based indicator, data is available for over 80 countries (Gender and Land Rights Database, http://www.fao.org/gender-landrights-database/en/). Data on the proportion of adult women landowners out of total landowners is available for 11 countries: http://www.fao.org/gender-landrights-database/data-map/statistics/en/?sta_id=1162. \"**	**Tier II**		**1.4**
Indicator 5.a.1	**Proportion of adult population owning land, by sex, age and location (BBB)**						

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	IFAD	FAO suggests that alternative indicators may be more appropriate to monitor Target 5.a adequately, compared to the proposals contained in the UN Statistical Division's preliminary list of global SDG indicators. As an alternative to the current indicator on landowners in this list for target 5.a, FAO proposes the following rights-based indicator: [**"The legal framework includes special measures to guarantee women's equal rights to landownership and control"]**. The indicator is based on rights and focuses on the legal framework. This makes it more appropriate and valid to monitor Target 5.a which focuses on legal reform processes. The indicator monitors reforms to guarantee women's equal rights to economic resources, as well as access to ownership and control over land through the use of special measures. More specifically, the indicator allows for monitoring progress towards gender equity through the adoption of women-specific measures to strengthen women's secure rights to land and other productive resources. The proposed indicator is supported also by a number of international instruments and, in particular, monitors legal reforms that guarantee women's land rights and increase their access and ownership of land or other productive resources. The indicator also provides a good indication of governments' efforts to move towards the realization of women's land rights and more gender-equal land tenure. For more information on this indicator, please see the relevant factsheet.	Data for both alternative proposals are available and currently disseminated by FAO. Indeed, some indicators are already available through FAO's Gender and Land Rights Database (see next section). In addition to existing data, FAO is working to strengthen and improve data collection through efforts such as the new Guidelines for the World Census of Agriculture (WCA 2020) as well as the development of the AGRIS toolkit. These are clear indications of the commitment of FAO in sex-disaggregated land indicators.	"FAO - FAO has the mandate to collect and disseminate information related to agriculture and is working to monitor legal frameworks related to land tenure, as well as to collect, analyse and disseminate land-related statistics. This applies to both alternative indicators proposed. For the rights-based indicator, data is available for over 80 countries (Gender and Land Rights Database, http://www.fao.org/gender-landrights-database/en/). Data on the proportion of adult women landowners out of total landowners is available for 11 countries: http://www.fao.org/gender-landrights-database/data-map/statistics/en/?sta_id=1162. \"		1	1.4
	FAO	FAO suggests that alternative indicators may be more appropriate to monitor Target 5.a adequately, compared to the proposals contained in the UN Statistical Division's preliminary list of global SDG indicators. As an alternative to the current indicator on landowners in this list for target 5.a, FAO proposes the following rights-based indicator: **["The legal framework includes special measures to guarantee women's equal rights to landownership and control"]**. The indicator is based on rights and focuses on the legal framework. This makes it more appropriate and valid to monitor Target 5.a which focuses on legal reform processes. The indicator monitors reforms to guarantee women's equal rights to economic resources, as well as access to ownership and control over land through the use of special measures. More specifically, the indicator allows for monitoring progress towards gender equity through the adoption of women-specific measures to strengthen women's secure rights to land and other productive resources. The proposed indicator is supported also by a number of international instruments and, in particular, monitors legal reforms that guarantee women's land rights and increase their access and ownership of land or other productive resources. The indicator also provides a good indication of governments' efforts to move towards the realization of women's land rights and more gender-equal land tenure. For more information on this indicator, please see the relevant factsheet.	Data for both alternative proposals are available and currently disseminated by FAO. Indeed, some indicators are already available through FAO's Gender and Land Rights Database (see next section). In addition to existing data, FAO is working to strengthen and improve data collection through efforts such as the new Guidelines for the World Census of Agriculture (WCA 2020) as well as the development of the AGRIS toolkit. These are clear indications of the commitment of FAO in sex-disaggregated land indicators.	FAO - FAO has the mandate to collect and disseminate information related to agriculture and is working to monitor legal frameworks related to land tenure, as well as to collect, analyse and disseminate land-related statistics. This applies to both alternative indicators proposed. For the rights-based indicator, data is available for over 80 countries (Gender and Land Rights Database, http://www.fao.org/gender-landrights-database/en/). Data on the proportion of adult women landowners out of total landowners is available for 11 countries: http://www.fao.org/gender-landrights-database/data-map/statistics/en/?sta_id=1162.		1	1.4
	UNWOMEN	Alternative proposal from FAO supported by UN Women:**["The legal framework includes special measures to guarantee women's equal rights to landownership and control"]**. The indicator monitors reforms to guarantee women's equal rights to economic resources, as well as access to ownership and control over land through the use of special measures. More specifically, the indicator allows for monitoring progress towards gender equity through the adoption of women-specific measures to strengthen women's secure rights to land and other productive resources. The proposed indicator is supported also by a number of international instruments and, in particular, monitors legal reforms that guarantee women's land rights and increase their access and ownership of land or other productive resources. The indicator also provides a good indication of governments' efforts to move towards the realization of women's land rights and more gender-equal land tenure. For more information on this indicator, please see the supplementary information.	Data for both alternative proposals are available and currently disseminated by FAO. Indeed, some indicators are already available through FAO's Gender and Land Rights Database (see next section). In addition to existing data, FAO is working to strengthen and improve data collection through efforts such as the new Guidelines for the World Census of Agriculture (WCA 2020) as well as the development of the AGRIS toolkit. These are clear indications of the commitment of FAO in sex-disaggregated land indicators.	FAO - FAO has the mandate to collect and disseminate information related to agriculture and is working to monitor legal frameworks related to land tenure, as well as to collect, analyse and disseminate land-related statistics. This applies to both alternative indicators proposed. For the rights-based indicator, data is available for over 80 countries (Gender and Land Rights Database, http://www.fao.org/gender-landrights-database/en/). Data on the proportion of adult women landowners out of total landowners is available for 11 countries: http://www.fao.org/gender-landrights-database/data-map/statistics/en/?sta_id=1162.		1	1.4, 2.3
	UPU					2	

Indicator 5.a.2 Proportion of population with an account at a formal financial institution, by sex and age (BBB)

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	UNCDF	Refine indicator to be a Multi-Purpose Indicator:**[Adults owning an account either through a financial institution or mobile money provider, disaggregated by income level, geography location gender, age and education]**	Global Findex	World Bank - Data is available for 142 countries			Targets 1.4 , 2.3 , 8.10, 10.2
	UNWOMEN	No changes	World Bank Findex	World Bank		2	
	UPU	Payment and account services should be ideally distinguished: **% adults with a formal account or personally using a mobile money service in the past 12 months]**". Possible to have a break down by gender, age (i.e. youth) among other categories (e.g. income, rural). Adults: ages 15+. Formal account: account at a bank or at another type of financial institution, such as a credit union, microfinance institution, cooperative, or the post office (if applicable), or a debit card; including an account at a financial institution for the purposes of receiving wages, government transfers, or payments for agricultural products, paying utility bills or school fees or a card for the purposes of receiving wages or government transfers. Account/card ownership within the past 12 months. Mobile money account includes GSM Association (GSMA) Mobile Money for the Unbanked (MMU) services in the past 12 months to pay bills or to send or receive money along with receiving wages, government transfers, or payments for agricultural products through a mobile phone in the past 12 months."	World Bank Global Findex (individual survey - added module to Gallup World Poll)	World Bank. Data availability: ~ 145 countries. Triennial. Available for 2011 and 2014.		1	
	WB	Definition for \% adults with a formal account or personally using a mobile money service in the past 12 months". Possible to have a break down by gender, age (i.e. youth) among other categories (e.g. income, rural). Adults: ages 15+. Formal account: account at a bank or at another type of financial institution, such as a credit union, microfinance institution, cooperative, or the post office (if applicable), or a debit card; including an account at a financial institution for the purposes of receiving wages, government transfers, or payments for agricultural products, paying utility bills or school fees or a card for the purposes of receiving wages or government transfers. Account/card ownership within the past 12 months. Mobile money account includes GSM Association (GSMA) Mobile Money for the Unbanked (MMU) services in the past 12 months to pay bills or to send or receive money along with receiving wages, government transfers, or payments for agricultural products through a mobile phone in the past 12 months."	World Bank Global Findex (individual survey - added module to Gallup World Poll)	World Bank. Data availability: ~ 145 countries. Triennial. Available for 2011 and 2014.		1	Indicator 5.a.2 can be used for 1.4, 2.3, 5.a, 8.10
	GlobalMigrationWG		NB! Disaggregate by migratory status				

Target 5.b Enhance the use of enabling technology, in particular information and communications technology, to promote the empowerment of women.

	ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Proportion of individuals who own a mobile telephone, by sex**	**Data for the this indicator are collected by NSOs, through household surveys. A number of countries already collect this indicator but data will only be collected at the international level as of 2015**	**ITU**	**Tier II**		
Indicator 5.b.1	**Individuals who own a mobile phone, by sex (AAA)**						
	ITU	Correct indicator name: **[proportion of individuals who own a mobile telephone, by sex]**	Data for the this indicator are collected by NSOs, through household surveys. A number of countries already collect this indicator but data will only be collected at the international level as of 2015	ITU will start data collection at the international level in 2015. A number of countries already collect this indicator through official surveys at the national level.			1.4, 2.c, 11.b, 12.8, 13.1, 16.10, 17.8
	UNWOMEN	Correct indicator name: **[proportion of individuals who own a mobile telephone, by sex]**	Data for the proportion of individuals owning a mobile phone are collected by national statistical offices (NSO). A number of countries already collect this indicator through official surveys but data will only be collected at the international level as of 2015	ITU will start data collection at the international level in 2015. A number of countries already collect this indicator through official surveys at the national level.		1	1.4, 2.c, 11.b, 12.8, 13.1, 16.10, 17.8
	WB	**[Individuals who own a mobile phone, by sex, of which share of smart phones]**	Existing data but new at the international level, data to be collected by ITU from 2015	ITU		1	1.4, 11.b, 13.1
Indicator 5.b.2	**Individuals with ICT skills, by type of skill, by sex (BAA)**						
	ITU	Correct indicator name: **[proportion of individuals with ICT skills, by type of skills, by sex]**	Data for this indicator are collected by NSOs, though household surveys. By 2015, data for this indicator were available for only 3 developing countries although OECD countries have been collecting data for this indicator for a number of years.	ITU collect data on this indicator from NSOs, annually. By 2015, data for this indicator were available for only 3 developing countries although OECD countries have been collecting data for this indicator for a number of years.			4.3, 4.4

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	UNWOMEN	Correct indicator name: **[proportion of individuals with ICT skills, by type of skills, by sex]**	Data for the proportion of individuals with ICT skills, by type of skills, by sex are collected by national statistical offices (NSO). By 2015, data for this indicator were available for only 3 developing countries although OECD countries have been collecting data for this indicator for a number of years.	ITU collect data on this indicator from NSO, annually. By 2015, data for this indicator were available for only 3 developing countries although OECD countries have been collecting data for this indicator for a number of years.		2	4.3, 4.4
	WB	**[Individuals with ICT skills, by type of skill, by age]**	ITU	ITU, existing indicator		2	4.3, 4.4, 8.2, 8.3

Target 5.c Adopt and strengthen sound policies and enforceable legislation for the promotion of gender equality and the empowerment of all women and girls at all levels.

	ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Percentage of countries with systems to track and make public allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment**	**Methodology being developed.**	**UN Women takes lead in monitoring progress on the indicator. Through its programmes, UN Women is providing technical support to the governments in setting up accountability systems to track gender equality allocations. The indicator is included in UN Women's Strategic Plan (SP) 2014-2017, allows systematic and regular monitoring on the progress. ** Data is available for 35 countries which reported on the indicator in the first round of monitoring. Detailed list of these countries can be found in Table A 6 of 'Making Development Cooperation more Effective: First Progress Report (2014)'.**	**Tier III**		
Indicator 5.c.1	**Indicator to be finalized which will monitor the existence and quality of policies to achieve gender equality (BBB)**						
	UNWOMEN	Alternative proposal (priority 2): See proposal for 5.1.1		Methodology being developed by OHCHR and UN Women. A tentative proposal is that the CEDAW Committee would monitor the indicator as part of their country reporting and review process using a standardized template to assess all countries in a comparable manner.		2	5.1
Indicator 5.c.2	**Percentage of countries with systems to track and make public allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment (BBB)**						
	UNWOMEN	\This indicator on gender equality promotes government's accountability towards adequate allocation of resources to address gender equality commitments. The indicator measures whether the governments put in place a system to track and make public resource allocations for gender equality. The indicator recognises that governments play a significant role in the achievement of gender equality outcomes by improving the accountability systems and the efficient management of public resources. The indicator is included as one of ten global indicators in the Busan monitoring framework. For the first round of monitoring, which took place in the last quarter of 2013, UN-DOCO coordinated the process through a joint UNCT effort. Focal points and coordinators from within the national governments were designated to collect the data including for the indicator on gender equality. UNDOCO prepared supplementary guidance for UN participation and each UNCT designated its own focal point for participating in the monitoring process. UN Women also took part in the data collection by working closely with the designated government focal points to ensure that reporting on the gender indicator is completed. Once the data collection process was completed, a UNDP-OCED joint support team (JST) analysed the data to prepare the first progress report on the Busan Partnership Agreement. In case of gender indicator, UN Women took lead in analysing the data and compiling the report in collaboration with the OECD-Gendernet. See metadata for more detailed information.	National governments	UN Women takes lead in monitoring progress on the indicator. Through its programmes, UN Women is providing technical support to the governments in setting up accountability systems to track gender equality allocations. The indicator is included in UN Women's Strategic Plan (SP) 2014-2017, allows systematic and regular monitoring on the progress. ** Data is available for 35 countries which reported on the indicator in the first round of monitoring. Detailed list of these countries can be found in Table A 6 of 'Making Development Cooperation more Effective: First Progress Report (2014).		1	17.1

Goal 6 Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all

Target 6.1 By 2030, achieve universal and equitable access to safe and affordable drinking water for all.

	ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

Suggested Indicator	**Percentage of population using safely managed drinking water services**	**Data on use of basic drinking water sources is already available from national household surveys and censuses for all developing countries and from administrative sources for all developed countries. Data on safety and continuity of supplies are currently available from household surveys and administrative sources including regulators for c.100 countries**	**WHO/UNICEF JMP already maintains a global database and regularly reports on progress in access to drinking water for all countries. WHO/UNICEF JMP is currently developing estimates for the safety and continuity of drinking water services based on available data.**	**Tier I**		
Suggested Indicator	**Average weekly time spent in water collection (including waiting time at public supply points), by sex, age, location and income.**	**DHS/MICs**	**JMP on WASH could monitor this indicator. This data is collected in MICS and DHS, for over 100 countries.**	**Tier I**		**Additional could also monitor 5.4.**
Indicator 6.1.1	**Percentage of population using safely managed drinking water services (AAA)**					
ECE	No change to indicator. For further details see statistical note prepared by WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme on Water Supply and Sanitation (JMP). Definition: Population using a basic drinking water source (current JMP categories for improved drinking water) which is located on premises and available when needed; free of faecal contamination and/or regulated by a competent authority	Data on use of basic drinking water sources is already available from national household surveys and censuses for all developing countries and from administrative sources for all developed countries Data on safety and continuity of supplies are currently available from household surveys and administrative sources including regulators for c.100 countries	WHO/UNICEF JMP already maintains a global database and regularly reports on progress in access to drinking water for all countries WHO/UNICEF JMP is currently developing estimates for the safety and continuity of drinking water services based on available data.		1	Use of safely managed drinking water services is relevant to the achievement of targets 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.9, 4.1, 4.2, 4a, 5.2, 5.4, 6.4, 6.5, 6.6, 10.3, 11.1, 11.3, 11.5, 13.1
UNICEF	No change to indicator. For further details see statistical note prepared by WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme on Water Supply and Sanitation (JMP). Definition: Population using a basic drinking water source (current JMP categories for improved drinking water) which is located on premises and available when needed; free of faecal contamination and/or regulated by a competent authority	Data on use of basic drinking water sources is already available from national household surveys and censuses for all developing countries and from administrative sources for all developed countries. Data on safety and continuity of supplies are currently available from household surveys and administrative sources including regulators for c.100 countries	WHO/UNICEF JMP already maintains a global database and regularly reports on progress in access to drinking water for all countries. WHO/UNICEF JMP is currently developing estimates for the safety and continuity of drinking water services based on available data.		1	Use of safely managed drinking water services is relevant to the achievement of targets 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.9, 4.1, 4.2, 4a, 5.2, 5.4, 6.4, 6.5, 6.6, 10.3, 11.1, 11.3, 11.5, 13.1
UNWOMEN	Additional proposal: UN Women would like to add another indicator here,**[Average weekly time spent in water collection (including waiting time at public supply points), by sex, age, location and income.]**	DHS/MICs	JMP on WASH could monitor this indicator. This data is collected in MICS and DHS, for over 100 countries.		2	Additional could also monitor 5.4.
WHO	No change to indicator. For further details see statistical note prepared by WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme on Water Supply and Sanitation (JMP). ** Definition: Population using a basic drinking water source (current JMP categories for improved drinking water) which is located on premises and available when needed; free of faecal contamination and/or regulated by a competent authority	Data on use of basic drinking water sources is already available from national household surveys and censuses for all developing countries and from administrative sources for all developed countries. ** Data on safety and continuity of supplies are currently available from household surveys and administrative sources including regulators for c.100 countries	WHO/UNICEF JMP already maintains a global database and regularly reports on progress in access to drinking water for all countries (http://www.wssinfo.org/) ** WHO/UNICEF JMP is currently developing estimates for the safety and continuity of drinking water services based on available data.		1	Use of safely managed drinking water services is relevant to the achievement of targets 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.9, 4.1, 4.2, 4a, 5.2, 5.4, 6.4, 6.5, 6.6, 10.3, 11.1, 11.3, 11.5, 13.1

Target 6.2 By 2030, achieve access to adequate and equitable sanitation and hygiene for all and end open defecation, paying special attention to the needs of women and girls and those in vulnerable situations.

	ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Percentage of population using safely managed sanitation services**	**Data on use of basic sanitation facilities is already available from national household surveys and censuses for all developing countries and from administrative sources for all developed countries ** Data on disposal or treatment of excreta are limited but estimates for safe management of faecal wastes can be calculated based on faecal waste flows associated with the use of different types of basic sanitation facility.**	**WHO/UNICEF JMP already maintains a global database and regularly reports on progress in access to basic sanitation for all countries (http://www.wssinfo.org/). ** WHO/UNICEF JMP is working with the GEMI initiative to develop global baseline estimates for safe management of faecal wastes.**	**Tier II**		**Use of safely managed sanitation services is relevant to the achievement of targets 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.9, 4.1, 4.2, 4a, 5.2, 5.4, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, 6.6, 8.9, 10.3, 11.1, 11.3, 11.5, 13.1**
Indicator 6.2.1		**Percentage of population using safely managed sanitation services (AAA)**					
	ECE	No change to indicator. For further details see statistical note prepared by WHO/UNICEF JMP Definition: Population using a basic sanitation facility (current JMP categories for improved sanitation) which is not shared with other households and where excreta is safely disposed in situ or transported to a designated place for safe disposal or treatment	Data on use of basic sanitation facilities is already available from national household surveys and censuses for all developing countries and from administrative sources for all developed countries Data on disposal or treatment of excreta are limited but estimates for safe management of faecal wastes can be calculated based on faecal waste flows associated with the use of different types of basic sanitation facility.	WHO/UNICEF JMP already maintains a global database and regularly reports on progress in access to basic sanitation for all countries WHO/UNICEF JMP is working with the GEMI initiative to develop global baseline estimates for safe management of faecal wastes.		1	Use of safely managed sanitation services is relevant to the achievement of targets 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.9, 4.1, 4.2, 4a, 5.2, 5.4, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, 6.6, 8.9, 10.3, 11.1, 11.3, 11.5, 13.1

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	UNICEF	No change to indicator. For further details see statistical note prepared by WHO/UNICEF JMP. Definition: Population using a basic sanitation facility (current JMP categories for improved sanitation) which is not shared with other households and where excreta is safely disposed in situ or transported to a designated place for safe disposal or treatment	Data on use of basic sanitation facilities is already available from national household surveys and censuses for all developing countries and from administrative sources for all developed countries. Data on disposal or treatment of excreta are limited but estimates for safe management of faecal wastes can be calculated based on faecal waste flows associated with the use of different types of basic sanitation facility.	WHO/UNICEF JMP already maintains a global database and regularly reports on progress in access to basic sanitation for all countries. WHO/UNICEF JMP is working with the GEMI initiative to develop global baseline estimates for safe management of faecal wastes.		1	Use of safely managed sanitation services is relevant to the achievement of targets 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.9, 4.1, 4.2, 4a, 5.2, 5.4, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, 6.6, 8.9, 10.3, 11.1, 11.3, 11.5, 13.1
	WB	**[Percentage of population whose faecal waste is safely managed]**		JMP		1	3.1, 3.2, 3.4
	WHO	No change to indicator. For further details see statistical note prepared by WHO/UNICEF JMP ** Definition: Population using a basic sanitation facility (current JMP categories for improved sanitation) which is not shared with other households and where excreta is safely disposed in situ or transported to a designated place for safe disposal or treatment. ** Definition: Population with a handwashing facility with soap and water in the household	Data on use of basic sanitation facilities is already available from national household surveys and censuses for all developing countries and from administrative sources for all developed countries ** Data on disposal or treatment of excreta are limited but estimates for safe management of faecal wastes can be calculated based on faecal waste flows associated with the use of different types of basic sanitation facility.	WHO/UNICEF JMP already maintains a global database and regularly reports on progress in access to basic sanitation for all countries (http://www.wssinfo.org/). ** WHO/UNICEF JMP is working with the GEMI initiative to develop global baseline estimates for safe management of faecal wastes.		1	Use of safely managed sanitation services is relevant to the achievement of targets 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.9, 4.1, 4.2, 4a, 5.2, 5.4, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, 6.6, 8.9, 10.3, 11.1, 11.3, 11.5, 13.1
	UNSD	No change to indicator		However, any methodology developed under the GEMI initiative should be aligned with the SEEA standard which deals with the collection and treatment of wastewater.		1	
Indicator 6.2.2 Population with a hand washing facility with soap and water in the household (BAA)							
	ECE	No change to indicator. Definition: Population with a handwashing facility with soap and water in the household	Data on use of hand washing facilities is available from national hh surveys and censuses. Data is currently available for 50-100 developing countries.	WHO/UNICEF JMP already maintains a global database on the use of handwashing facilities with soap and water in the household		1	Use of handwashing facilities with soap and water is relevant to the achievement of targets 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.9, 4.1, 4.2, 4a, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, 11.1, 11.3, 11.5, 13.1.
	UNICEF	No change to indicator. Definition: Population with a handwashing facility with soap and water in the household	Data on use of hand washing facilities is available from national hh surveys and censuses. Data is currently available for 50-100 developing countries.	WHO/UNICEF JMP already maintains a global database on the use of handwashing facilities with soap and water in the household		1	Use of handwashing facilities with soap and water is relevant to the achievement of targets 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.9, 4.1, 4.2, 4a, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, 11.1, 11.3, 11.5, 13.1.
	WHO	No change to indicator. For further details see statistical note.	Data on use of hand washing facilities is available from national hh surveys and censuses. Data is currently available for 50-100 developing countries.	WHO/UNICEF JMP already maintains a global database on the use of handwashing facilities with soap and water in the household (http://www.wssinfo.org/)		1	Use of handwashing facilities with soap and water is relevant to the achievement of targets 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.9, 4.1, 4.2, 4a, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, 11.1, 11.3, 11.5, 13.1.
Target 6.3 By 2030, improve water quality by reducing pollution, eliminating dumping and minimizing release of hazardous chemicals and materials, halving the proportion of untreated wastewater and substantially increasing recycling and safe reuse globally.							
	ContributorName	**Specification**	**Source**	**Entity**	**Tier**	**Priority**	**Interlinkages**

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

Suggested Indicator	**Percentage of wastewater safely treated , disaggregated by economic activity**	**Existing data are available from WHO/UNICEF JMP, FAO-QUASTAT, IBNET and UN-Water GLAAS, as well as population density data, and land-use/ land-cover data from earth observations. New data will come from a variety of sources combining utility and regulator data for off-site systems and potentially household surveys and measured data for onsite systems, supplemented by modelled estimates where no reliable national data exist. Modelled estimates can be generated using JMP data combined with treatment performance in different population density and income settings**	**WHO and UN-Habitat, on behalf of UN-Water. Under the UN-Water umbrella, a partial monitoring framework is already in place, currently being finalized under the inter-agency monitoring initiative known as GEMI (Integrated Monitoring of Water and Sanitation Related Targets). GEMI is a new coherent monitoring framework, working closely with JMP), an autonomous programme affiliated with UN-Water, to ensure long-term monitoring for the entire SDG 6. The GEMI monitoring initiative in collaboration with WHO/UNICEF JMP will provide baseline estimates for safe management of faecal wastes. Through combined data sources, data is available for at least 85 countries. Less data are available for onsite and industrial.**	**Tier II**		**Safe treatment of wastewater is relevant to the achievement of targets 1.4, 1.5, 2.3, 3.2, 3.3, 3.9, 6.4, 8.9, 9.4, 10.3, 11.1, 11.3, 11.5, 1.6, 12.4, 13.1, 14.1.**
Suggested Indicator	**Percentage of receiving water bodies with ambient water quality not presenting risk to the environment or human health**	**Existing data (direct values) are available from UNEP's GEMS/Water, GEMStat and OECD. Additional information on optical water properties from remote sensing can be used as proxies for sediments and eutrophication/nutrient loading. Measurements would be completed at local laboratories and/or achieved using field measurements on appropriate protocols for sample collection and analysis. For data-poor areas estimates can be generated using existing - in situ - data combined with modelled data and remote sensing information. Data is collected at the scale of the receiving water body basin scale and can be aggregated to the country and regional scale.**	**UNEP (through GEMS/Water), on behalf of UN-Water A partial monitoring framework is already in place, currently being finalized under the GEMI monitoring initiative under the UN-Water umbrella (see description under 6.3.1). Related to indicator 6.3.2, GEMI will draw upon metadata standards which are already in place, among other sources on pre-existing datasets such as GEMStat and FAO-AQUASTAT.**	**Tier II**		**3.3, 8.4, 9.4, 11.5, 12.4, 14.1, 14.2, 15.1**
Indicator 6.3.1	**Percentage of waste water safely treated (BAA)**						
ECE	Definition: Proportion of wastewater generated both through domestic and industrial sources safely treated compared to total wastewater generated both through domestic and industrial sources. A ladder will define progressive improvement of "safely treated wastewater" from no treatment the highest level of service. Additional comment from ECE Statistical Division: A clear definition of "safely treated wastewater" and classification for the "ladder" is needed for producing statistics. Ideally this is based on the definition of wastewater treatment steps no treatment, preliminary treatment, primary treatment, secondary treatment, tertiary treatment (different levels possible). Statistics exist for several countries.	Existing data are available from WHO/UNICEF JMP, FAO-QUASTAT, IBNET and UN-Water GLAAS, as well as population density data, and land-use/land-cover data from earth observations. New data will come from a variety of sources combining utility and regulator data for off-site systems and potentially household surveys and measured data for onsite systems, supplemented by modelled estimates where no reliable national data exist. Modelled estimates can be generated using JMP data combined with treatment performance in different population density and income settings. Additional comment by ECE Statistical Division: If the indicator is based on treatment levels official statistics collected by Eurostat, UNSD and others could be used.	WHO and UN-Habitat, on behalf of UN-Water Under the UN-Water umbrella, a partial monitoring framework is already in place, currently being finalized under the inter-agency monitoring initiative known as GEMI (Integrated Monitoring of Water and Sanitation Related Targets). GEMI is a new coherent monitoring framework, working closely with JMP), an autonomous programme affiliated with UN-Water, to ensure long-term monitoring for the entire SDG 6. The GEMI monitoring initiative in collaboration with WHO/UNICEF JMP will provide baseline estimates for safe management of faecal wastes. Through combined data sources, data is available for at least 85 countries. Less data are available for onsite and industrial treatment.		1	Wastewater safely treated can inform on the status of the following indicators: Target 3.3: water-borne diseases (as it is a conveyor of such). Target 3.9: water pollution (as it is one of the main water pollutants). 6.2: adequate and equitable sanitation and hygiene 6.4: water use efficiency and sustainable withdrawals 6.5: Integrated water resource management 9.4: upgrading industrial infrastructure to make them sustainable 11.6: reducing environmental impacts of cities<U+0085>municipal and other waste management Target 12.4: the management of chemicals and wastes (present in wastewater). 13.1 resilience to climate related hazards and natural disasters Target 14.1: the status of marine

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	UNEP	Multi-purpose indicator: **[Proportion of population resilient/robust in urban and rural areas to environmental pollutants and hazardous chemicals]**	National Reports under the Basel Convention with regard to the accidents involving transboundary movements of hazardous and other wastes. Stockholm Convention: (i) (Global Monitoring Plan, which also collects data on POPs in air, human milk, blood, and water).	Secretariat of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions (partly). Countries covered: 183 Parties of the Basel Convention, 154 Parties to the Rotterdam Convention and 179 countries to the Stockholm Convention			Applies to targets 3.9 , and 11.2, 12.4
	UNICEF	Definition: Proportion of wastewater generated both through domestic and industrial sources safely treated compared to total wastewater generated both through domestic and industrial sources. A ladder will define progressive improvement of "safely treated wastewater" from no treatment the highest level of service	Existing data are available from WHO/UNICEF JMP, FAO-QUASTAT, IBNET and UN-Water GLAAS, as well as population density data, and land-use/ land-cover data from earth observations. New data will come from a variety of sources combining utility and regulator data for off-site systems and potentially household surveys and measured data for onsite systems, supplemented by modelled estimates where no reliable national data exist. Modelled estimates can be generated using JMP data combined with treatment performance in different population density and income settings	WHO and UN-Habitat, on behalf of UN-Water. Under the UN-Water umbrella, a partial monitoring framework is already in place, currently being finalized under the inter-agency monitoring initiative known as GEMI (Integrated Monitoring of Water and Sanitation Related Targets). GEMI is a new coherent monitoring framework, working closely with JMP), an autonomous programme affiliated with UN-Water, to ensure long-term monitoring for the entire SDG 6. The GEMI monitoring initiative in collaboration with WHO/UNICEF JMP will provide baseline estimates for safe management of faecal wastes. Through combined data sources, data is available for at least 85 countries. Less data are available for onsite and industrial		1	
	UNWTO						target 8.9 and 12.b: sustainable tourism
	WB	Note: all channels of waste should be considered (including septic tanks, open defecation, industries) but not mining or agriculture (diffuse sources of pollution). Measured in BOD				1	12.4
	WHO	No change to indicator. For further details see statistical note. ** Definition: Proportion of wastewater generated both through domestic and industrial sources safely treated compared to total wastewater generated both through domestic and industrial sources. ** A ladder will define progressive improvement of "safely treated wastewater" from no treatment the highest level of service.	Existing data are available from WHO/UNICEF JMP, FAO-QUASTAT, IBNET and UN-Water GLAAS, as well as population density data, and land-use/land-cover data from earth observations. ** New data will come from a variety of sources combining utility and regulator data for off-site systems and potentially household surveys and measured data for onsite systems, supplemented by modelled estimates where no reliable national data exist. ** Modelled estimates can be generated using JMP data combined with treatment performance in different population density and income settings.	WHO and UN-Habitat, as part of an inter-agency monitoring initiative known as GEMI (Integrated Monitoring of Water and Sanitation Related Targets). (http://www.unwater.org/gemi/en/) ** GEMI is a new coherent monitoring framework, working closely with JMP. ** Through combined data sources, data is available for at least 85 countries. Less data are available for onsite and industrial treatment.		1	Safe treatment of wastewater is relevant to the achievement of targets 1.4, 1.5, 2.3, 3.2, 3.3, 3.9, 6.4, 8.9, 9.4, 10.3, 11.1, 11.3, 11.5, 1.6, 12.4, 13.1, 14.1.
	UNSD	No change to indicator	The SEEA will provide robust statistics on the generation of wastewater by different sectors and treatment of said wastewater in the long-term. It is important that the data collected by the OECD/Eurostat and UNSD/UNEP questionnaire is made fully SEEA compliant.	However, the System of Environmental Economic Accounts provides a standard methodology to measure this indicator, and monitoring initiatives should align to the standard over time.		1	

Indicator 6.3.2 Percentage of receiving water bodies with ambient water quality not presenting risk to the environment or human health (CBB)

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	ECE	Definition: Proportion of receiving water bodies with ambient water quality not presenting risk to the environment or human health compared to all receiving water bodies. Water quality is estimated through a water quality index (WQI), compiling a core set of parameters: total dissolved solids (TDS); percentage dissolved oxygen (%DO); dissolved inorganic nitrogen (DIN); dissolved inorganic phosphorus (DIP); and Escherichia coli (E. coli). The GEMStat Index approach is used to calculate the index, in which measured parameter values are compared to guideline values (proximity to target approach).The actual parameters as well as guideline values can be adapted to local conditions. WQI ranges from 0 (very bad water quality) to 100 (excellent water quality). Further information will be provided in forthcoming metadata notes for targets 6.3-6.6	Existing data (direct values) are available from UNEP's GEMS/Water, GEMStat and OECD. Additional information on optical water properties from remote sensing can be used as proxies for sediments and eutrophication/nutrient loading. Measurements would be completed at local laboratories and/or achieved using field measurements on appropriate protocols for sample collection and analysis. For data-poor areas estimates can be generated using existing - in situ - data combined with modelled data and remote sensing information. Data is collected at the scale of the receiving water body basin scale and can be aggregated to the country and regional scale.	UNEP (through GEMS/Water), on behalf of UN-Water A partial monitoring framework is already in place, currently being finalized under the GEMI monitoring initiative under the UN-Water umbrella (see description under 6.3.1). Related to indicator 6.3.2, GEMI will draw upon metadata standards which are already in place, among other sources on pre-existing datasets such as GEMStat and FAO-AQUASTAT.		1	This indicator can inform on the following targets: Target 3.3: water-borne diseases (E. coli). Target 8.4: decoupling progress and resource efficiency and effects on ambient WQ Target 9.4: progress in technology and process transitions towards sustainability and innovation. Target 11.5: risk for people to be prone to water related disasters (linked to poor WQ) Target 12.4: outcome of the management of chemicals and wastes (water quality). Targets 14.1 & 14.2: progress in receiving coastal waters and estuaries pollution, management and restoration efficiency. Target 15.1: the status of freshwater ecosystems.
	UNEP	**[Water quality Index]**	http://www.bipindicators.net/wqib as well as Stockholm Convention: (i) (Global Monitoring Plan, which also collects data on POPs in air, human milk, blood, and water).	GEMS/Water (Indicator under the BIP) and Secretariat of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions (partly). Countries covered: 183 Parties of the Basel Convention, 154 Parties to the Rotterdam Convention and 179 countries to the Stockholm Convention			
	UNWTO						target 8.9 and 12.b: sustainable tourism
	WB	**[Nitrate level of surface water and groundwater measured in a representative number of points]**		UNEP		1	15.1, 15.8

Target 6.4 By 2030, substantially increase water-use efficiency across all sectors and ensure sustainable withdrawals and supply of freshwater to address water scarcity and substantially reduce the number of people suffering from water scarcity.

ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator	**Percentage change in water use efficiency over time.**	**The indicator can be calculated using existing datasets from FAO-AQUASTAT on water withdrawals in different sectors, together with datasets on value generation from National Accounts Main Aggregates (UNSD), World Energy Outlook (International Energy Agency), World Bank demographic datasets, WaterStat Database (Water Footprint Network) and IBNET (the International Benchmarking Network for Water and Sanitation Utilities). The System of Environmental-Economic Accounting (SEEA, 2012) will provide robust withdrawal and consumption based statistics in the long-term but is currently only being compiled by a select number of countries. Modelled data could be used to fill in gaps while capacity is being developed, so that the indicator could be calculated for all countries immediately. The indicator provides an aggregated measure of overall change in productivity across sectors, but it is built on sectoral data and is therefore relevant to each of the sectors**	**FAO, on behalf of UN-Water A partial monitoring framework is already in place, currently being finalized under the GEMI monitoring initiative under the UN-Water umbrella (see description under 6.3.1). Data on efficiency are available for all countries. Data for baseline year will be used to track progress in successive years.**	**Tier I**		**This indicator informs on the following targets: 2.4, 8.4, 9.4 12.2, 12.3, 15.1.**

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

Suggested Indicator	**Percentage of total available water resources used, taking environmental water requirements into account (Level of Water Stress)**	**Existing data are available from FAO-AQUASTAT. EWR data are presently not collected by AQUASTAT, but many feasible methods are available for countries that do not already have good institutional arrangements in place to collect this data on their own. Modelled data could be used to fill in gaps while capacity is being developed. The System of Environmental-Economic Accounting (SEEA, 2012) will provide robust withdrawal and consumption based statistics in the long-term but is currently only being compiled by a select number of countries. Data are collected at the scale of the river basin/aquifer and can be aggregated to the sub-national, national and regional scales.**	**FAO, on behalf of UN-Water. A partial monitoring framework is already in place, currently being finalized under the GEMI monitoring initiative under the UN-Water umbrella. As one of the sources for GEMI, FAO-AQUASTAT data are available for all countries, with a track record (incomplete) starting in 1960.**	**Tier I**		**Target 15.1: This indicator provides information on the level of pressure on freshwater ecosystems**
Indicator 6.4.1 Water Stress (BAA)							
IFAD	Proposed new wording (the definition does not change): **[Percentage of total available water resources used, taking environmental water requirements into account (Level of Water Stress).]** Definition: the ratio between total water withdrawals (use) by all sectors and available water resources, taking environmental water requirements (EWR) into account. This indicator is also known as water withdrawal intensity. The indicator builds on MDG indicator 7.5 and also accounts for EWR and includes both groundwater and surface water withdrawals. It is proposed to classify the level of water stress in three main categories: low, high and very high. The thresholds for the indicator could be country specific, to reflect differences in climate and national water management goals. Alternatively, uniform thresholds could be proposed using existing literature on water stress and water scarcity (e.g. high stress is when more than 40 % of total available water resources is used, very high stress when more than 80 % of total available water is used).	Existing data are available from FAO-AQUASTAT. EWR data are presently not collected by AQUASTAT, but many feasible methods are available for countries that do not already have good institutional arrangements in place to collect this data on their own. Modelled data could be used to fill in gaps while capacity is being developed. The System of Environmental-Economic Accounting (SEEA, 2012) will provide robust withdrawal and consumption based statistics in the long-term but is currently only being compiled by a select number of countries. Data are collected at the scale of the river basin/aquifer and can be aggregated to the sub-national, national and regional scales.	FAO, on behalf of UN-Water. A partial monitoring framework is already in place, currently being finalized under the GEMI monitoring initiative under the UN-Water umbrella. As one of the sources for GEMI, FAO-AQUASTAT data are available for all countries, with a track record (incomplete) starting in 1960.		1	Target 15.1: This indicator provides information on the level of pressure on freshwater ecosystems
FAO	Proposed new wording (the definition does not change): **[Percentage of total available water resources used, taking environmental water requirements into account (Level of Water Stress)]** Definition: the ratio between total water withdrawals (use) by all sectors and available water resources, taking environmental water requirements (EWR) into account. This indicator is also known as water withdrawal intensity. The indicator builds on MDG indicator 7.5 and also accounts for EWR and includes both groundwater and surface water withdrawals. It is proposed to classify the level of water stress in three main categories: low, high and very high. The thresholds for the indicator could be country specific, to reflect differences in climate and national water management goals. Alternatively, uniform thresholds could be proposed using existing literature on water stress and water scarcity (e.g. high stress is when more than 40 % of total available water resources is used, very high stress when more than 80 % of total available water is used).	Existing data are available from FAO-AQUASTAT. EWR data are presently not collected by AQUASTAT, but many feasible methods are available for countries that do not already have good institutional arrangements in place to collect this data on their own. Modelled data could be used to fill in gaps while capacity is being developed. The System of Environmental-Economic Accounting (SEEA, 2012) will provide robust withdrawal and consumption based statistics in the long-term but is currently only being compiled by a select number of countries. Data are collected at the scale of the river basin/aquifer and can be aggregated to the sub-national, national and regional scales.	FAO, on behalf of UN-Water. A partial monitoring framework is already in place, currently being finalized under the GEMI monitoring initiative under the UN-Water umbrella. As one of the sources for GEMI, FAO-AQUASTAT data are available for all countries, with a track record (incomplete) starting in 1960.		1	Target 15.1: This indicator provides information on the level of pressure on freshwater ecosystems

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	ECE	Proposed new wording (the definition does not change): **Percentage of total available water resources used, taking environmental water requirements into account (Level of Water Stress)** (Old wording: Water Stress) *** Definition: the ratio between total water withdrawals (use) by all sectors and available water resources, taking environmental water requirements (EWR) into account. This indicator is also known as water withdrawal intensity. The indicator builds on MDG indicator 7.5 and also accounts for EWR and includes both groundwater and surface water withdrawals. It is proposed to classify the level of water stress in three main categories: low, high and very high. The thresholds for the indicator could be country specific, to reflect differences in climate and national water management goals. Alternatively, uniform thresholds could be proposed using existing literature on water stress and water scarcity (e.g. high stress is when more than 40 % of total available water resources is used, very high stress when more than 80 % of total available water is used). Additional comment by ECE Statistical Division: Important are the clarification of terminology and concepts: a) Terminology: In Water Statistics and SEEA Water Accounting the term "use of water" is NOT a synonym for water withdrawal. It is a different concept. B) Concept of the proposed indicator: It is suggested to make a clear distinction between a Water Exploitation Index (annual water abstraction (or withdrawal) in relation to renewable freshwater resources (proposed is to use Long Term Annual Average figures for it) and a water consumption index (where water consumption is defined as the difference between water abstraction and water returns). An index only based on water abstraction will also include non-consumptive uses, such as run-through cooling etc. which only have a small impact on the overall water balance. It is also suggested to define how in-situ uses and hydropower use of water are to be included or excluded in the definition of water abstraction.	Existing data are available from FAO-AQUASTAT. EWR data are presently not collected by AQUASTAT, but many feasible methods are available for countries that do not already have good institutional arrangements in place to collect this data on their own. Modelled data could be used to fill in gaps while capacity is being developed. The System of Environmental-Economic Accounting (SEEA, 2012) will provide robust withdrawal and consumption based statistics in the long-term but is currently only being compiled by a select number of countries. Additional comment by ECE Statistical Division: Water Statistics (even if not compiled in form of SEEA-Water Accounts, provide an important data source). They are e.g. available at National Statistical Offices, Eurostat, UNSD. Data are collected at the scale of the river basin/aquifer and can be aggregated to the sub-national, national and regional scales.	FAO, on behalf of UN-Water A partial monitoring framework is already in place, currently being finalized under the GEMI monitoring initiative under the UN-Water umbrella (see description under 6.3.1). As one of the sources for GEMI, FAO-AQUASTAT data are available for all countries, with a track record (incomplete) starting in 1960.		1	Target 15.1: This indicator provides information on the level of pressure on freshwater ecosystems
	UNWTO						target 8.9 and 12.b: sustainable tourism
Indicator 6.4.2 Water Productivity (BBB)							
	IFAD	Proposed new wording (the definition does not change): **"Percentage of change in water use efficiency over time"**. Definition: this indicator tracks change in water use efficiency over time for major sectors, including energy, industry, agriculture, and drinking water supply. The unit for efficiency can vary between the sectors, e.g. revenue in dollars for industry, energy production in kWh for energy or in kcal for agriculture. Sectoral efficiencies are aggregated in a single indicator through the use of weighting coefficients proportional to each sector's share of total water withdrawal/ consumption.	The indicator can be calculated using existing datasets from FAO-AQUASTAT on water withdrawals in different sectors, together with datasets on value generation from National Accounts Main Aggregates (UNSD), World Energy Outlook (International Energy Agency), World Bank demographic datasets, WaterStat Database (Water Footprint Network) and IBNET (the International Benchmarking Network for Water and Sanitation Utilities). The System of Environmental-Economic Accounting (SEEA, 2012) will provide robust withdrawal and consumption based statistics in the long-term but is currently only being compiled by a select number of countries. Modelled data could be used to fill in gaps while capacity is being developed, so that the indicator could be calculated for all countries immediately. The indicator provides an aggregated measure of overall change in productivity across sectors, but it is built on sectoral data and is therefore relevant to each of the sectors	FAO, on behalf of UN-Water A partial monitoring framework is already in place, currently being finalized under the GEMI monitoring initiative under the UN-Water umbrella (see description under 6.3.1). Data on efficiency are available for all countries. Data for baseline year will be used to track progress in successive years.		1	This indicator informs on the following targets: 2.4, 8.4, 9.4 12.2, 12.3, 15.1.
	FAO	Proposed new wording (the definition does not change): "Percentage of change in water use efficiency over time". Definition: this indicator tracks change in water use efficiency over time for major sectors, including energy, industry, agriculture, and drinking water supply. The unit for efficiency can vary between the sectors, e.g. revenue in dollars for industry, energy production in kWh for energy or in kcal for agriculture. Sectoral efficiencies are aggregated in a single indicator through the use of weighting coefficients proportional to each sector's share of total water withdrawal/ consumption.	The indicator can be calculated using existing datasets from FAO-AQUASTAT on water withdrawals in different sectors, together with datasets on value generation from National Accounts Main Aggregates (UNSD), World Energy Outlook (International Energy Agency), World Bank demographic datasets, WaterStat Database (Water Footprint Network) and IBNET (the International Benchmarking Network for Water and Sanitation Utilities). The System of Environmental-Economic Accounting (SEEA, 2012) will provide robust withdrawal and consumption based statistics in the long-term but is currently only being compiled by a select number of countries. Modelled data could be used to fill in gaps while capacity is being developed, so that the indicator could be calculated for all countries immediately. The indicator provides an aggregated measure of overall change in productivity across sectors, but it is built on sectoral data and is therefore relevant to each of the sectors	FAO, on behalf of UN-Water A partial monitoring framework is already in place, currently being finalized under the GEMI monitoring initiative under the UN-Water umbrella (see description under 6.3.1). Data on efficiency are available for all countries. Data for baseline year will be used to track progress in successive years.		1	This indicator informs on the following targets: 2.4, 8.4, 9.4 12.2, 12.3, 15.1.

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	ECE	Proposed new wording (the definition does not change): **[Percentage of change in water use efficiency over time]** (Old wording: Water Productivity) *** Definition: this indicator tracks change in water use efficiency over time for major sectors, including energy, industry, agriculture, and drinking water supply. The unit for efficiency can vary between the sectors, e.g. revenue in dollars for industry, energy production in kWh for energy or in kcal for agriculture. Sectoral efficiencies are aggregated in a single indicator through the use of weighting coefficients proportional to each sector's share of total water withdrawal/ consumption. Additional comment by ECE Statistical Division: A "Percentage of change in water use efficiency over time" would give much better values for countries with poor water use efficiencies as there is high potential for improvement. For countries who have already achieved a high degree of water use efficiency the change over time will be much smaller than for countries having still high potential for improvement. It is therefore suggested to compare both, the change over time, but also the actual water use efficiency by economic activity (ISIC Division level). Also regional differences, in particular in relation to agriculture and different climatic conditions, are to be considered.	The indicator can be calculated using existing datasets from FAO-AQUASTAT on water withdrawals in different sectors, together with datasets on value generation from National Accounts Main Aggregates (UNSD), World Energy Outlook (International Energy Agency), World Bank demographic datasets, WaterStat Database (Water Footprint Network) and IBNET (the International Benchmarking Network for Water and Sanitation Utilities). The System of Environmental-Economic Accounting (SEEA, 2012) will provide robust withdrawal and consumption based statistics in the long-term but is currently only being compiled by a select number of countries. Additional comment by ECE Statistical Division: Water Statistics (even if not compiled in form of SEEA-Water Accounts, provide an important data source). They are e.g. available at National Statistical Offices, Eurostat, UNSD. Modelled data could be used to fill in gaps while capacity is being developed, so that the indicator could be calculated for all countries immediately. The indicator provides an aggregated measure of overall change in productivity across sectors, but it is built on sectoral data and is therefore relevant to each of the sectors.	FAO, on behalf of UN-Water A partial monitoring framework is already in place, currently being finalized under the GEMI monitoring initiative under the UN-Water umbrella (see description under 6.3.1). Data on efficiency are available for all countries. Data for baseline year will be used to track progress in successive years.		2	This indicator informs on the following targets: Target 2.4: the water aspect of resources use efficiency in agriculture Target 8.4: water use efficiency in different sectors Target 9.4: water use efficiency in the different sectors (municipal water efficiency - status of water supply infrastructure, industrial efficiency - use of clean and environmentally sound processes). Target 12.2: water use efficiency in the different sectors Target 12.3: This indicator (disaggregated) informs on water use efficiency in drinking water supply (net losses). Target 15.1: the use of inland freshwater ecosystems and their services
	UNWTO						target 8.9 and 12.b: sustainable tourism
	IUCN	Proposed additional/alternative indicator: IUCN recommends use of the **["Natural Water Capital Index"]** here.				2	

Target 6.5 By 2030, implement integrated water resources management at all levels, including through transboundary cooperation as appropriate

ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator	**Degree of integrated water resources management (IWRM) implementation (0-100)**	**Data for 134 countries are available from UNEP-DHI (e.g. http://www.unepdhi.org/rioplus20 (see data file zip link) – full data available on request). Data are collected through the use of national IWRM questionnaires (one per country), measuring both qualitative and quantitative aspects of IWRM. This approach has been successfully applied to measure the status of IWRM for the Commission on Sustainable Development in both 2008 and 2012 (Rio+20). Results can easily be disaggregated to give a more nuanced picture of status both at national and regional (transboundary) levels.**	**UNEP, on behalf of UN-Water. Under the UN-Water umbrella, the GEMI monitoring initiative (see further information and description under 6.3.1), will draw on UNEP-DHI data, which are available for 134 countries. This can be used to provide a baseline for measurements. The UN World Water Assessment Programme (WWAP) initiated a project in 2014 to develop a methodology for gender-disaggregated data collection and produce gender-sensitive indicators. In November 2014, the Gender-Disaggregated Indicators presented by WWAP were officially endorsed by the African Ministers' Council on Water (AMCOW). AMCOW officially committed to "establish national targets and a monitoring and evaluation framework for each of the seven pillars of the AMCOW gender policy and strategy, including sex-disaggregated indicators in the African context following guidelines developed by WWAP, by 2016."**	**Tier I**		**This indicator directly underpins all the other water and sanitation related goals and targets, as it informs about the Means of Implementation for SDG 6 technical targets. The indicator can thus be employed to support reporting on targets 6.a and 6.b, and be further complemented by the UN-Water Global Analysis and Assessment of Sanitation and Drinking-Water (GLAAS) for WASH-related issues. Target 1.b, Target 11.b.**
Indicator 6.5.1	**Status of IWRM Implementation (BBB)**					

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

ECE	Proposed new wording (the definition does not change): **[Degree of integrated water resources management (IWRM) implementation (0-100)]** (Old wording: Status of IWRM Implementation) *** Definition: this indicator defines the extent to which integrated water resources management (IWRM) is implemented, by describing (1) the extent to which an enabling environment for IWRM (policy, strategic planning, legal framework and financing) has been established, (2) the structure and performance of an institutional framework to support IWRM processes, and (3) the degree to which management instruments/tools are applied. Issues relating to gender, governance, ecosystems, capacity, and transboundary aspects of water management are included. Status of implementation can be described as a percentage and as stages in a process, ranging from not developed to fully implemented (0 to 100 %). Calculations are based on a statistical analysis of national questionnaires (one per country).	Data for 134 countries are available from UNEP-DHI (e.g. http://www.unepdhi.org/rioplus20 (see data file zip link) - full data available on request). Data are collected through the use of national IWRM questionnaires (one per country), measuring both qualitative and quantitative aspects of IWRM. This approach has been successfully applied to measure the status of IWRM for the Commission on Sustainable Development in both 2008 and 2012 (Rio+20). Results can easily be disaggregated to give a more nuanced picture of status both at national and regional (transboundary) levels.	UNEP, on behalf of UN-Water Under the UN-Water umbrella, the GEMI monitoring initiative (see further information and description under 6.3.1), will draw on UNEP-DHI data, which are available for 134 countries. This can be used to provide a baseline for measurements. The UN World Water Assessment Programme (WWAP) initiated a project in 2014 to develop a methodology for gender-disaggregated data collection and produce gender-sensitive indicators. In November 2014, the Gender-Disaggregated Indicators presented by WWAP were officially endorsed by the African Ministers' Council on Water (AMCOW). AMCOW officially committed to "establish national targets and a monitoring and evaluation framework for each of the seven pillars of the AMCOW gender policy and strategy, including sex-disaggregated indicators in the African context following guidelines developed by WWAP, by 2016."		1	This indicator directly underpins all the other water and sanitation related goals and targets, as it informs about the Means of Implementation for SDG 6 technical targets. The indicator can thus be employed to support reporting on targets 6.a and 6.b, and be further complemented by the UN-Water Global Analysis and Assessment of Sanitation and Drinking-Water (GLAAS) for WASH-related issues. Target 1.b: This indicator informs on the existence of sound policy frameworks to support accelerated investments in poverty eradication actions. Target 11.b.
WB	**[Percentage of basins/catchments with mechanisms for stakeholder involvement in WRM decisions/water allocation]**						
Indicator 6.5.2 Availability of operational arrangements for transboundary basin management (CBB)							
ECE	Proposed new wording (the definition does not change): **[Percentage of transboundary basin areas with operational arrangements for integrated management in place]** (Old wording: Availability of operational arrangements for transboundary basin management) *** Definition: proportion of surface area of transboundary basins (both surface and groundwater) that have an operational agreement/arrangement or institution for transboundary water cooperation in management, compared to total surface area of transboundary basins. For the cooperation framework to be considered as "operational", it requires that there are regular meetings of the riparian countries to discuss the integrated management of the water resource and to exchange information.	A global database exists of freshwater treaties and international river basin organizations, as well as several regional ones, e.g., for the Pan-European region the second Assessment under the Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes (Water Convention). A global baseline comparative assessment of transboundary waters, including river basins (286) and 166 aquifers in 90 countries, has been undertaken by the Transboundary Waters Assessment Project (TWAP, completed in 2014), involving generation of geo-referenced datasets. Basin level data can be disaggregated to country level (for national reporting) and aggregated to regional and global level.	UNECE (as Secretariat for the Water Convention) and UNEP, on behalf of UN-Water Under the UN-Water umbrella, the GEMI monitoring initiative will provide a basis for monitoring proposed indicator 6.5.2 under the leadership of UNEP, UNECE and UNESCO-IGRAC (Integrated Groundwater Resources Assessment Centre) for this indicator (see 6.3.1 for further description on GEMI). UNECE acts as Secretariat for the Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes (the "Water Convention"). Reporting on transboundary water cooperation is currently being developed under the Water Convention. Spatial data (delineating transboundary basins) are available for all known (286) transboundary basins. Data available at global level on the 120 international river basin organisations.		2	Target 1.b: This indicator informs on the existence of sound policy frameworks at regional and international levels, based on pro-poor and gender-sensitive development strategies to support accelerated investments in poverty eradication actions Target 11.b: This indicator informs on the existence of integrated policies and plans for transboundary water management.

Target 6.6 By 2020, protect and restore water-related ecosystems, including mountains, forests, wetlands, rivers, aquifers and lakes.

ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

Suggested Indicator	**Percentage of change in wetlands extent over time**	**The indicator uses the existing Living Planet Index methodology for data collection and analysis. Data are compiled and disseminated through the Ramsar Convention's "State of the World's Wetlands and their Services" (SoWWS) reports which are overseen by its Scientific and Technical Review Panel. The data originates from multiple sources including national reports submitted to the Ramsar Convention, published scientific papers and, increasingly, through analysis of remote sensing data. Currently, 169 Parties regularly report on trends in wetlands to the Ramsar Convention. Other data sources enable fully global coverage. The data can be disaggregated by wetland type: for example, for lakes, floodplains, coastal wetlands or artificial/constructed wetlands. Wetland area is most accurately estimated through manual digitalization of aerial or satellite images, a methodology that in the coming years will be advanced by remote sensing. Supplementary information comes through scientific papers and national reports. Heterogeneous datasets are considered to be acceptable, if not desirable: change in extent will still be captured and heterogeneous datasets allow for more discrete analysis by wetland type, location and region.**	**CBD and UNEP, on behalf of UN-Water Assessments are undertaken by the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands, in collaboration with CBD (including the biodiversity indicators partnership) and UNEP, through the GEMI monitoring initiative. Under the UN-Water umbrella, the GEMI monitoring initiative will integrate the monitoring Framework in place under the SoWWS (see description of GEMI under 6.3.1). Baseline data are available at the global level. Historical records are available for some regions and wetlands types from the 1700's. The baseline assessment will be 2015 (first SoWWS report) with remote sensing data using 1970 as the baseline year. Currently, 169 Parties regularly report on trends in wetlands to the Ramsar Convention. Other data sources enable fully global coverage.**	**Tier II**		**This indicator can inform on the following targets: Target 9.1 and 9.2, Target 11.5, Target 11.6, Target 11.7, Target 12.2, Target 12.4, Target 13.1, Target 14.1, Target 14.2 and 14.5, Target 15.1, 15.2 and 15.3**
Indicator 6.6.1 Change in wetlands extent over time (% change over time) (BBB)							
ECE	Proposed new wording (the definition does not change): **[Percentage of change in wetlands extent over time]** *** Definition: Change in total wetland area over time (% change/year). The Ramsar broad definition of "wetland" is used, which includes rivers and lakes, enabling three of the biome types mentioned in the target to be assessed - wetlands, rivers, lakes - plus other wetland types.	The indicator uses the existing Living Planet Index methodology for data collection and analysis. Data are compiled and disseminated through the Ramsar Convention's "State of the World's Wetlands and their Services" (SoWWS) reports which are overseen by its Scientific and Technical Review Panel. A summary of the first assessment exercise is being provided to Ramsar COP-12 in June 2015 providing baseline analysis (http://www.ramsar.org/sites/default/files/documents/library/cop12_doc23_bn7_sowws_e_0.pdf) The indicator is also a sub-indicator for Aichi Biodiversity Target 5 (with reporting mechanism in place for that). The data originates from multiple sources including national reports submitted to the Ramsar Convention, published scientific papers and, increasingly, through analysis of remote sensing data. Wetland area is most accurately estimated through manual digitalization of aerial or satellite images, a methodology that in the coming years will be advanced by remote sensing. Supplementary information comes through scientific papers and national reports. Heterogeneous datasets are considered to be acceptable, if not desirable: change in extent will still be captured and heterogeneous datasets allow for more discrete analysis by wetland type, location and region. The data can be disaggregated by wetland type: for example, for lakes, floodplains, coastal wetlands or artificial/constructed wetlands. This enables more refined assessment of progress towards target 6.6 since wetland type and location are relevant variables when assessing progress towards target 6.6.	CBD and UNEP, on behalf of UN-Water Assessments are undertaken by the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands, in collaboration with CBD (including the biodiversity indicators partnership) and UNEP, through the GEMI monitoring initiative. Under the UN-Water umbrella, the GEMI monitoring initiative will integrate the monitoring Framework in place under the SoWWS (see description of GEMI under 6.3.1). Baseline data are available at the global level. Historical records are available for some regions and wetlands types from the 1700's. The baseline assessment will be 2015 (first SoWWS report) with remote sensing data using 1970 as the baseline year. Currently, 169 Parties regularly report on trends in wetlands to the Ramsar Convention. Other data sources enable fully global coverage.		1	This indicator can inform on the following targets: Target 9.1 and 9.2, Target 11.5, Target 11.6, Target 11.7, Target 12.2, Target 12.4, Target 13.1, Target 14.1, Target 14.2 and 14.5, Target 15.1, 15.2 and 15.3
UNEP	**[Wetland Extent Trends (WET) Index, an adaptation of the Living Planet Index (LPI) of species population abundance proposed for target 15.5.]** The WET Index presents proportional change in extent over time against a baseline value of 1 (baseline year = 1970 but can be varied). Currently this is the only global indicator of wetland extent available. Methodology and first global and regional results submitted for peer reviewed publication (also used by the CBD Secretariat as a contribution to GBO-4 in 2014, and the Ramsar Secretariat in various State of the World's Wetlands assessment and communication materials produced in 2015). Quality of the index is dependent upon the underlying database of wetland change time series from which it is derived. This can be enhanced over time with more recent (and more representative) time series data and the use of large scale remotely sensed data.	Database of individual wetland extent time series harvested from the literature.	Methodology developed by, and global database currently held by, UNEP-WCMC working in collaboration with the Ramsar Secretariat (Indicator under the BIP)			The WET index is directly relevant to Target 15.1 and 15.5; A coastal and marine wetland cut of the WET Index would be relevant for Target 14.2

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	IUCN	Proposed additional/alternative indicator: "Change in wetlands extent" focuses solely on area, and so is a poor measure of whether the most important places for biodiversity are protected. IUCN suggests complementing this with an indicator of [**"Coverage by protected areas of freshwater sites of particular importance for biodiversity"**], using Key Biodiversity Areas to identify these. The indicator is used by the BIP as an indicator towards Aichi Target 11 (http://www.bipindicators.net/paoverlays).	Data sources: Protected Planet (http://www.protectedplanet.net/) for protected areas data; Important Bird & Biodiversity Areas (http://www.birdlife.org/datazone/site) and Alliance for Zero Extinction sites (http://www.zeroextinction.org/) for Key Biodiversity Areas data; indicator developed by Butchart et al. (2012) PLoS ONE 7(3): e32529.	Responsible entities and national availability: IUCN & UNEP-WCMC, BirdLife International, AZE. Available globally since 1950s, and can be disaggregated to national and regional levels.		1	15.1 (and disaggregated versions for other targets)
	UNSD	Percentage change in wetlands extent over time		As the SEEA Experimental Ecosystem Accounts is being established, the Ecosystem Unit (EU) described in the SEEA EEA Technical Guidance 2015 provides at the framework for classifying wetland assets. The wetland EU can be tailored to country needs and be linked to condition assessments and wetland ecosystem services. The wetland EU can be adapted to both international (Ramsar) and national systems of wetland classifications.		1	

Target 6.a By 2030, expand international cooperation and capacity-building support to developing countries in water- and sanitation-related activities and programmes, including water harvesting, desalination, water efficiency, wastewater treatment, recycling and reuse technologies

	ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
		ODA for water and sanitation related activities and programmes	**OECD-DAC**	**OECD-DAC**	**Tier II**		
NA							

Target 6.b Support and strengthen the participation of local communities in improving water and sanitation management.

	ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
NA							

Goal 7 Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all

Target 7.1 By 2030, ensure universal access to affordable, reliable and modern energy services

	ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Percentage of population with electricity access (%)**		**World Bank (as part of SE4All)**	**Tier I**		
Suggested Indicator		**Percentage of population with primary reliance on non-solid fuels (%)**			**Tier I**		
Indicator 7.1.1	**Percentage of population with electricity access (%) (AAA)**						
	UNICEF	**[Percentage of population with electricity access]**					
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for this indicator to be disaggregated by location and income.					
	WB	Indicators 7.1.1 and 7.1.2 are solid and fit for purpose. However, we would like to note that there is scope to improve these indicators over time to capture important dimensions of energy access such as the reliability and affordability of service, which are highlighted in the formulation if SDG7. A large consortium of agencies co-led by WB and IEA is currently working on a more sophisticated multitier methodology, which is not yet available, but which may - over time - be able to contribute to the improvement of these basic access measures.					
Indicator 7.1.2	**Percentage of population with primary reliance on non-solid fuels (%) (BAA)**						
	UNICEF	**[Percentage of population with primary reliance on non-solid fuels (%)]**					
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for this indicator to be disaggregated by location and income.					
	WB	Solid and fit for purpose					

Target 7.2 By 2030, increase substantially the share of renewable energy in the global energy mix

	ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Renewable energy share in the total final energy consumption (%)**			**Tier I**		
Indicator 7.2.1	**Renewable energy share in the total final energy consumption (%) (AAA)**						
	UNWTO						target 8.9 and 12.b: sustainable tourism
	WB	Solid and fit for purpose					
	UNSD	Share of energy from renewable sources in net domestic energy use	The SEEA Central Framework and the SEEA Energy provide standard methodology for calculating this indicator. The EA methodology should be evaluated against the standard.	UNSD/OECD			
Indicator 7.2.2	**Enabling legislation and framework for renewable energy production established by 2020 (BBA)**						

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
	WB	Indicator 7.2.2 is not really an indicator of renewable energy outcomes, but rather a measure of the effort that policy makers are putting into creating a regulatory environment for renewable energy. While this is important and valuable, we do not feel it belongs as an SDG indicator.					
Target 7.3	**By 2030, double the global rate of improvement in energy efficiency**						
	ContributorName	**Specification**	**Source**	**Entity**	**Tier**	**Priority**	**Interlinkages**
Suggested Indicator		**Rate of improvement in energy intensity (%) measured in terms of primary energy and GDP**			**Tier I**		**7.3**
Indicator 7.3.1	**Rate of improvement in energy intensity (%) measured in terms of primary energy and GDP (AAA)**						
	UNWTO						target 8.9 and 12.b: sustainable tourism
	UPU					2	
	WB	Solid and fit for purpose					
	UNSD	Ratio of value added to net domestic energy use, by industry.	Energy productivity indicators defined as value added generated over net domestic energy use. Such indicator can be calculated at the aggregate economy-wide level, as well as by industry and by primary energy source.	UNSD		1	
Indicator 7.3.2	**Composite Energy Efficiency Improvement Index built up of sub-indicators measuring transport energy efficiency, industrial energy efficiency, power generation energy efficiency, buildings energy efficiency and agricultural energy efficiency (CBA)**						
	IFAD	MODIFIED: **[Composite Energy Efficiency Improvement Index built up of sub-indicators measuring average fuel economy of vehicles in litres per 100 kilometre, energy efficiency, industrial energy efficiency, power generation energy efficiency, buildings energy efficiency and agricultural energy efficiency]**	The transport sector is a major user of fossil fuels, and a major emitter of greenhouse gasses. CO2 emissions are growing more rapidly than any other sector - set to go from one quarter today to one third by 2050. By measuring the average fuel economy we can measure the overall CO2 emissions of the global fleet. A number of global fora - IPCC, G20, SE4ALL, GFEI, have adopted a target of at least doubling the efficiency of the average vehicles / the global fleet, which would save 2GT CO2e/ year by 2050	The Global Fuel Economy Initiative keeps track of this and publishes a report every 2 years. http://www.fiafoundation.org/our-work/global-fuel-economy-initiative/about-gfei			
	UNWTO						target 8.9 and 12.b: sustainable tourism
	UPU	The Universal Postal Union, with postal and logistics networks heavily involved in transportation, supports the following modification introduced by UNEP: composite Energy Efficiency Improvement Index built up of sub-indicators measuring average fuel economy of vehicles in litres per 100 kilometre, energy efficiency, industrial energy efficiency, power generation energy efficiency, buildings energy efficiency and agricultural energy efficiency.	The Universal Postal Union produces a Annual Carbon Inventor for the postal operators of its 192 member countries. This inventory covers postal activities under scope 1, 2 and 3, including energy consumption for transports and buildings at country, regional and global level. As indicated by UNEP: the transport sector is a major user of fossil fuels, and a major emitter of greenhouse gasses. CO2 emissions are growing more rapidly than any other sector - set to go from one quarter today to one third by 2050. By measuring the average fuel economy we can measure the overall CO2 emissions of the global fleet. A number of global fora - IPCC, G20, SE4ALL, GFEI, have adopted a target of at least doubling the efficiency of the average vehicles / the global fleet, which would save 2GT CO2e/ year by 2050	As indicated by UNEP: the Global Fuel Economy Initiative keeps track of this and publishes a report every 2 years. http://www.fiafoundation.org/our-work/global-fuel-economy-initiative/about-gfei ** UPU data availability: 130 countries on an annual basis since 2010/2011		1	
	WB	Indicator 7.3.2 is valuable at pointing to the need to measure underlying energy input to output measures in different sectors. Unfortunately, the data needed to implement such an indicator is only available for a handful of countries. However, as input to composite indicator, **["Fuel Economy on New Light Duty Vehicles"]** is available for major countries, regions and the globe	IEA	IEA			
Target 7.a	**By 2030, enhance international cooperation to facilitate access to clean energy research and technology, including renewable energy, energy efficiency and advanced and cleaner fossil-fuel technology, and promote investment in energy infrastructure and clean energy technology**						
	ContributorName	**Specification**	**Source**	**Entity**	**Tier**	**Priority**	**Interlinkages**
Suggested Indicator		**Improvement in the net carbon intensity of the energy sector (GHG/TFC in CO2 equivalents)**		**UNFCCC (or GHG data derived from the energy data above using the IPCC guidelines)**	**Tier II**		
Indicator 7.a.1	**Improvement in the net carbon intensity of the energy sector (GHG/TFC in CO2 equivalents) (BBA)**						
	WB	Indicator 7.a.1 is useful insofar as the carbon intensity of energy production is a measure that paints a much broader picture of the environmental sustainability of the energy sector, going beyond renewable energy to capture nuclear power as well as lower carbon fossil fuels.					
Indicator 7.a.2	**Amount of Foreign Direct Investment and Financial transfer for these purposes (BBB)**						
	WB	Indicator 7.a.2 focuses primarily on financing, which is an input variable, and we doubt the necessary data would be available.					
Target 7.b	**By 2030, expand infrastructure and upgrade technology for supplying modern and sustainable energy services for all in developing countries, in particular least developed countries and small island developing States**						
	ContributorName	**Specification**	**Source**	**Entity**	**Tier**	**Priority**	**Interlinkages**

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

Suggested Indicator		**Ratio of value added to net domestic energy use, by industry.**	**Energy productivity indicators defined as value added generated over net domestic energy use. Such indicator can be calculated at the aggregate economy-wide level, as well as by industry and by primary energy source.**	**UNSD**	**Tier I**		**7.3**
Indicator 7.b.1	**Rate of improvement in energy productivity (the amount of economic output achieved for a given amount of energy consumption). (BBA)**						
	WB	Indicator 7.b.1 is mathematically almost identical to indicator 7.3.1 on energy efficiency, as energy productivity and energy intensity are essentially the same thing.					
	UNSD	Ratio of value added to net domestic energy use, by industry.	Energy productivity indicators defined as value added generated over net domestic energy use. Such indicator can be calculated at the aggregate economy-wide level, as well as by industry and by primary energy source.	UNSD		1	7.3
Indicator 7.b.2	**Percentage of international cooperation projects being implemented to facilitate access to clean energy (BBB)**						
	WB	Indicator 7.b.2 again refers to financing, which is an input rather than an output. We also have doubts whether suitable data would be available. An alternative approach that could be considered would be to look at trade data on uptake of clean energy technologies by lower income countries. Good data is available on the extent if clean energy imports and the existence of tariffs and non-tariff barriers. These indicators successfully capture whether or not countries have access to technologies. This approach is put forward in the SE4ALL Global Tracking Framework 2015.					

Goal 8 Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all

Target 8.1 Sustain per capita economic growth in accordance with national circumstances and, in particular, at least 7 per cent gross domestic product growth per annum in the least developed countries

	ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**GDP per capita, PPP**	**World Bank**	**World Bank**	**Tier I**		
Indicator 8.1.1	**GDP per capita, PPP (AAA)**						
	ILO			Responsible entity: World Bank.		1	
	UNEP		WDI http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.PCAP.PP.CD	World Bank/180		2	
	UPU	The purpose would be to strengthen this indicator by contributing to build up a reliable real time proxy indicator: (1) for short-run and real-time GDP variations: volumes and values of global e-commerce transactions by country (domestic and/or international transactions) (2) for short-run and real-time price variations: on-line price index by country	(1) The UPU consolidates international postal and parcels data from tracking system in real-time, gathering several billions records every year on each international e-commerce transaction (the system could be expanded to cover domestic transactions as well) (2) Already potentially available through MIT \One billion prices project\"."	(1) The Universal Postal Union in collaboration with UN Global Pulse and UNSD Comtrade (on-going project of testing the proxy within the UN Global Working Group on Big Data for Official Statistics). Data availability: ~ 170 countries. Real-time data. Available since 2010 in terms of volumes (partial archives back to 1999). Availability of values for most countries starting in 2016-17 (2) MIT. Evolving number of countries available. Potential of accessing real-time data.		1	
Indicator 8.1.2	**Inclusive Wealth Index (CBB)**						
	ILO	Delete. The target specifies the GDP measurement. Alternative measurement could be considered under target 17.19.					
	UNCDF	**[Number and % of subnational regions experiencing 7% per annum GDP growth.]**	National statistics disaggregated by territorial division at the first level (province, state, governorate etc.). Statistics from major cities.				
	UNEP		http://inclusivewealthindex.org/#the-world-wants-to-know-how-its-doing	UNEP/140		1	1.3, 1.5, 9.2, 11.5, 12.2., 17.19
	UPU					2	
	WB	Possible new Indicator 8.1.3: [**"Growth rates of household expenditure or income per capita among the bottom 40 percent of the population and the total population.""**] Note this is similar to Target 10.1 as proposed below.					

Target 8.2 Achieve higher levels of economic productivity through diversification, technological upgrading and innovation, including through a focus on high-value-added and labour-intensive sectors

	ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Growth rate of GDP per employed person**	**GDP figures based on National Accounts and employment figures on Household surveys.**	**WB and ILO**	**Tier I**		
Indicator 8.2.1	**Growth rate of GDP per employed person (AAA)**						
	ILO		GDP figures based on National Accounts and employment figures on Household surveys.	Responsible entity: ILO. Availability: Data available for 124 countries.		1	

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
	UNCDF	**[% Increase in gross fixed capital formation in sub national regions.]**	National statistics disaggregated by territorial division at the first level (province, state, governorate etc.). Statistics from major cities				
	UNEP						
Indicator 8.2.2	**Export diversification in terms of products and markets (BBB)**						
	ILO	Delete. The focus of the target is clearly on increasing productivity levels.					
	UNCDF	**[Number / value of investment projects in each region.]**	National statistics disaggregated by territorial division at the first level (province, state, governorate etc.). Statistics from major cities				
	UNEP	Alternative: **[Share of environmental goods in total exports]**	Constructed based on UNCOMTRADE and OECD and APEC lists	Already constructed by UNEP-ETB for 128 countries for the work on the Green Economy Progress Index		1	

Target 8.3 Promote development-oriented policies that support productive activities, decent job creation, entrepreneurship, creativity and innovation, and encourage the formalization and growth of micro-, small- and medium-sized enterprises, including through access to financial services

	ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Share of informal employment in non-agriculture employment by sex.**	**Household surveys (LFS, HIES, LSMS, Integrated HH surveys, etc.).**	**Responsible entity: ILO. Availability: Share of informal employment available for 62 countries.**	**Tier II**		**8.5, 8.8**
Indicator 8.3.1	**Job openings rate (openings as % of employment and openings) and total separations (separations as % of employment) in non-farm establishments (BBB)**						
	ILO	Alternative indicator: **[Share of informal employment in non-agriculture employment by sex.]** Justification: As the target promotes formalization, it is key to have available information on this aspect to address policies. Moreover, the indicator provides certain continuity to the former indicator on vulnerable employment in the MDGs. The initial proposed indicator is not available for most countries and it has not been agreed or used internationally yet.	Household surveys (LFS, HIES, LSMS, Integrated HH surveys, etc.).	Responsible entity: ILO. Availability: Share of informal employment available for 62 countries.		1	8.5, 8.8
	WB	As proposed, 8.3.1. in our view should be CBB – it is not very feasible to collect the proposed indicator. The core element of this target is 'supportive policies' related to entrepreneurship and SME development (which may lead to job creation, but for which the proposed indicators will be very hard to measure). It may be more relevant to use Doing Business DTF for "starting a Business'"					
Indicator 8.3.2	**% of MSMEs with a loan or line of credit (CBB)**						
	ILO	Delete. Access to financial services is measured in other targets.					
	UNCDF	Same Indicator	Enterprise Surveys	World Bank - Data is available for 135 countries		2	Target 9.3.2
	UNEP	Alternative: **[Share of environmental patents in total patents]**	WIPO	Data available for 123 countries		1	
	WB	For further details, see http://www.enterprisesurveys.org. Firm size levels are 5-19 (small), 20-99 (medium), and 100+ employees (large-sized firms).	World Bank Enterprise Surveys	World Bank. Data availability: ~135 developing economies, every 3-4 years, starting in 2006		2	8.3 and 9.3. Can potentially be used for 5.a if broken down by \ownership by gender\"."

Target 8.4 Improve progressively, through 2030, global resource efficiency in consumption and production and endeavour to decouple economic growth from environmental degradation, in accordance with the 10-year framework of programmes on sustainable consumption and production, with developed countries taking the lead

	ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Resource productivity.**	**- Statistical surveys and administrative data on material use and value added collected from the national statistics office**	**- UNEP/International resources panel is responsible for policy application of data but not on the data collection and dissemination per se. - UNIDO: Data are partially available for international reporting - The System of Environmental Economic Accounts provides a standard methodology for calculating this indicator. However, no international data collection mechanism is yet in place and countries are still in implementation phase.**	**Tier II**		**9.4, 12.1, 12.2**
Indicator 8.4.1	**Indicator for national material efficiency (production and consumption approaches) (CBB)**						
	UNEP			International Resource Panel		1	

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	UNSD	**[Resource productivity.]** Resource productivity is gross domestic product (GDP) divided by domestic material consumption (DMC). DMC measures the total amount of materials directly used by an economy. It is defined as the annual quantity of raw materials extracted from the domestic territory of the focal economy, plus all physical imports minus all physical exports.	- Statistical surveys and administrative data on material use and value added collected from the national statistics office	- UNEP/International resources panel is responsible for policy application of data but not on the data collection and dissemination per se. - UNIDO: Data are partially available for international reporting - The System of Environmental Economic Accounts provides a standard methodology for calculating this indicator. However, no international data collection mechanism is yet in place and countries are still in implementation phase.		1	9.4, 12.1, 12.2
	OECD	Suggested alternative indicator: **[Effective Tax Rates on Energy Use.]** This indicator fits the target very well, a well-established methodology exists and data cover 80% of world energy and 84% of global carbon emissions from energy.	See http://www.oecd.org/tax/tax-policy/taxingenergyuse.htm and http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/docserver/download/2313021e.pdf?expires=1434984054&id=id&accname=ocid84004878&checksum=AC6BDF712748EA74C98B4C18438173D9	OECD		1	12.c, 13.2
Indicator 8.4.2	**Sectoral material efficiency (CBB)**						
	UNEP			International Resource Panel		2	

Target 8.5 By 2030, achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all women and men, including for young people and persons with disabilities, and equal pay for work of equal value

	ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Average hourly earnings of female and male employees by occupations (Wages/Gender wage gap)**	**Household surveys (LFS, HIES, LSMS, Integrated HH surveys, etc.), Establishment surveys, Administrative records.**	**Responsible entity: ILO. Availability: Hourly earnings and gender wage gap: 66 countries.**	**Tier II**		**10.3,10.4**
Suggested Indicator		**Unemployment rate by sex, age-group and disability.**	**Household surveys (LFS, HIES, LSMS, Integrated HH surveys, etc.), Administrative records.**	**Responsible entity: ILO. Availability: 224 countries.**	**Tier I/II**		**8.6**
Indicator 8.5.1	**Employment to working-age population (15 years and above) ratio by gender and age group, and people with disabilities (AAA)**						
	ILO		Household surveys (LFS, HIES, LSMS, Integrated HH surveys, etc.).	Responsible entity: ILO. Availability: 181 countries (without breakdown for people with disabilities).		2	8.6; 10.3
	WB	Standard Indicator, in agreement					
Indicator 8.5.2	**Unemployment rate by gender and age-group (AAA)**						
	ILO	Alternative indicator: **[Average hourly earnings of female and male employees by occupations (Wages/Gender wage gap)]** Justification: The target is explicit in measuring equal pay for work of equal value and therefore it is crucial to include certain component addressing this aspect. Besides, it provides continuity to the MDG indicator. The initial proposed indicator is already captured in 8.6.2	Household surveys (LFS, HIES, LSMS, Integrated HH surveys, etc.), Establishment surveys, Administrative records.	Responsible entity: ILO. Availability: Hourly earnings and gender wage gap: 66 countries.		1	10.3,10.4
	UNWOMEN	Additional indicator proposed by UN Women:**[Gender gap in wages**]. This indicator should be added to capture the target element on equal pay for work of equal value. The indicator is a Tier 3 indicator part of the minimum set of gender indicators. More methodological development is requires to enable global comparability.	Labour Force Surveys	ILO, country coverage from ILO database and other national sources is 119		1	
	GlobalMigrationWG		NB! Disaggregate by migratory status				
	WB	Standard Indicator, in agreement					

Target 8.6 By 2020, substantially reduce the proportion of youth not in employment, education or training

	ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Percentage of youth (15-24) not in education, employment or training (NEET)**	**Household surveys (LFS, HIES, LSMS, Integrated HH surveys, etc.), Administrative records.**	**Responsible entity: ILO/OECD. Availability: 88 countries.**	**Tier I**		
Indicator 8.6.1	**Percentage of youth (15-24) not in education, employment or training (NEET) (AAA)**						
	ILO		Household surveys (LFS, HIES, LSMS, Integrated HH surveys, etc.), Administrative records.	Responsible entity: ILO./OECD Availability: 88 countries.		1	8.5
	UNEP		WDI: http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SL.UEM.NEET.ZS			1	
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for this indicator to be disaggregated by sex.					
	WB	Standard Indicator, in agreement					
Indicator 8.6.2	**Youth (15-24) unemployment rate (AAA)**						
	ILO	Alternative indicator: **[Unemployment rate by gender and age-group.]** Justification: By including an age group covering 15-24 years, the indicator covers youth and compares their situation with the rest of population. It makes therefore the unemployment rate redundant in 8.5.2 allowing to better capture quality aspects of decent work.	Household surveys (LFS, HIES, LSMS, Integrated HH surveys, etc.), Official estimates, Administrative records.	Responsible entity: ILO. Availability: 224 countries.		2	8.5
	UNEP		WDI http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SL.UEM.1524.ZS			2	
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for this indicator to be disaggregated by sex.					

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
	WB	Standard Indicator, in agreement					
Target 8.7	**Take immediate and effective measures to eradicate forced labour, end modern slavery and human traffickign and secure the prohibition and elimination of the worst forms of child labour, including recruitment and use of child soldiers, and by 2025 end child labour in all its forms.**						
	ContributorName	**Specification**	**Source**	**Entity**	**Tier**	**Priority**	**Interlinkages**
Suggested Indicator		**Percentage and number of children aged 5-17 years engaged in child labour, per sex and age group (disaggregated by the worst forms of child labour)**	**Household surveys (Child Labour Surveys, Mixed Surveys, LFS, HIES, LSMS, Integrated HH surveys, etc.).**	**Responsible entity: ILO. Availability: Data available for about 60 countries (at least one data set collected in each of past 5 years for generating estimates of the proposed indicators).**	**Tier II**		**4.1, 8.8, 16.2**
Indicator 8.7.1	**Percentage and number of children aged 5-17 years engaged in child labour, per sex and age group (disaggregated by the worst forms of child labour) (BBA)**						
	ILO		Household surveys (Child Labour Surveys, Mixed Surveys, LFS, HIES, LSMS, Integrated HH surveys, etc.).	Responsible entity: ILO. Availability: Data available for about 60 countries (at least one data set collected in each of past 5 years for generating estimates of the proposed indicators).			4.1, 8.8, 16.2
	UNICEF	**[Percentage and number of children aged 5-17 years engaged in child labour, per sex and age group (disaggregated by the worst forms of child labour)]**					
Indicator 8.7.2	**Number of people in forced labour (CBB)**						
	ILO		Household surveys (Child Labour Surveys, Mixed Surveys, LFS, HIES, LSMS, Integrated HH surveys, etc.).	Responsible entity: ILO. Availability: 10 countries for selected forms of forced labour, pending national circumstances.			8.8, 16.2
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for this indicator to be disaggregated by sex and age.					
Target 8.8	**Protect labour rights and promote safe and secure working environments for all workers, including migrant workers, in particular women migrants, and those in precarious employment**						
	ContributorName	**Specification**	**Source**	**Entity**	**Tier**	**Priority**	**Interlinkages**
Suggested Indicator		**Frequency rates of fatal and non-fatal occupational injuries and time lost due to occupational injuries by gender and migrant status**	**Household surveys (LFS, HIES, LSMS, Integrated HH surveys, etc.), Official estimates, Establishment surveys, Administrative records.**	**Responsible entity: ILO. Availability: Fatal rate: 117 countries; Non-fatal rate: 89 countries; Time lost: 107 countries. Breakdown by migrant status not currently available.**	**Tier II**		**8.5**
Suggested Indicator		**Number of ILO conventions ratified by type of convention.**	**NORMLEX (Information System on International Labour Standards of the ILO).**	**Responsible entity: ILO. Availability: All ILO member states (185). Breakdown by type of ILO convention (fundamental, governance, technical).**	**Tier I**		**8.5**
Indicator 8.8.1	**Ratification and implementation of ILO fundamental conventions and relevant international labour and human rights standards (BAA)**						
	ILO	Alternative indicator: **[Number of ILO conventions ratified by type of convention.]** Justification: This indicator is more straightforward and will provide information not only on the ratification of ILO fundamental conventions, but on that of ILO governance and technical conventions as well.	NORMLEX (Information System on International Labour Standards of the ILO).	Responsible entity: ILO. Availability: All ILO member states (185). Breakdown by type of ILO convention (fundamental, governance, technical).			8.5
	UNEP	Alternative: Vulnerable employment	WDI http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SL.EMP.VULN.ZS/countries			1	
Indicator 8.8.2	**Frequency rates of fatal and non-fatal occupational injuries and time lost due to occupational injuries by gender (BBA)**						
	ILO	Alternative indicator: **[Frequency rates of fatal and non-fatal occupational injuries and time lost due to occupational injuries by gender and migrant status]**. Justification: The target refers particularly to migrant workers and therefore if not included it does not make sense. However, this breakdown is being developed and information is not currently available.	Household surveys (LFS, HIES, LSMS, Integrated HH surveys, etc.), Official estimates, Establishment surveys, Administrative records.	Responsible entity: ILO. Availability: Fatal rate: 117 countries; Non-fatal rate: 89 countries; Time lost: 107 countries. Breakdown by migrant status not currently available.			8.5
	UNEP					2	
	UNWOMEN	Please change to: by sex and age.					
	GlobalMigrationWG	To be disaggregated by migratory status. See specification in attached meta-data word file	Labour force surveys, administrative records	National Statistical Offices; Ministry of Labour, Ministry of Health			10.7
	WB	Likewise, indicator 8.8.2 not very feasible.					
Target 8.9	**By 2030, devise and implement policies to promote sustainable tourism that creates jobs and promotes local culture and products**						
	ContributorName	**Specification**	**Source**	**Entity**	**Tier**	**Priority**	**Interlinkages**

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

Suggested Indicator		**Tourism direct GDP (as % of total GDP and in growth rate); and Number of jobs in tourism industries (as % total jobs and growth rate of jobs, by gender)**	**Existing data sources: National Statistical Offices and National Tourism Administrations. Not all countries have GDP figures for tourism, therefore value added could be used instead. The same applies for employment: not all countries count the number of jobs, some will have only the number of employees (or the full-time equivalents) which is a good substitute.**	**World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO). Currently around 60 countries have a fully developed System of Tourism Statistics that allows to construct a Tourism Satellite Account (TSA) and obtain economic aggregates like tourism GDP. All countries have at least a basic system of Tourism Statistics that allows to gather information about physical flows and monetary aggregates like tourism expenditures.**	**Tier II**		
Indicator 8.9.1	**Tourism direct GDP (BAA)**						
	ICAO	ICAO proposes that its **['Connectivity Opportunities Utilisation Indicator']** and the current proposed indicators be merged into one indicator. More than half of the tourists arrive by air, increasing connectivity is therefore the key catalyst in promoting sustainable tourism and economic development. The merged indicator specifically measures the efficacy of policy making at the State level aimed at maximizing air connectivity and tourism opportunities. With the merged indicator, States can monitor and benchmark the pace of their policy implementation to increase air connectivity and tourism along with tourism's contribution to GDP. The gap between connectivity opportunity available and unutilized can be monitored at the State level as a function of the opportunity available to the State to increase its GDP. It is expected that this will accelerate the pace of implementation of policies leading to increasing of air connectivity and sustainable tourism and economic development. The merged indicator monitors critical policy implementation and thus is better suited to monitoring Target 8.9.	ICAO Data needed for this proposed indicator is collected by ICAO as part of its Core Statistics Program (see above). For tourisms contribution to GDP, Data is collected by UNWTO. Metadata on tourism statistics is available with UNWTO. ICAO and UNWTO collaborate actively in sharing and analysis of each others data.	ICAO is responsible for global monitoring of the 'Connectivity Opportunities Utilisation Indicator'. Data is available for all ICAO Member States. UNWTO is responsible for global monitoring of indicators related to tourism contribution to GDP.		1	
	UNWTO	Economic aggregates indicator: **[tourism direct GDP (as % of total GDP and in growth rate) and number of jobs in tourism industries (as % total jobs and growth rate of jobs, by gender)]**	existing data sources: National Statistical Offices and National Tourism Administrations. Not all countries have GDP figures for tourism, therefore value added could be used instead. The same applies for employment: not all countries count the number of jobs, some will have only the number of employees (or the full-time equivalents) which is a good substitute.	World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO). Currently around 60 countries have a fully developed System of Tourism Statistics that allows to construct a Tourism Satellite Account (TSA) and obtain economic aggregates like tourism GDP. All countries have at least a basic system of Tourism Statistics that allows to gather information about physical flows and monetary aggregates like tourism expenditures.		1	
	WB	Likewise, indicator not very feasible. (For 'tourism' there is a challenge in attributing the extent of use of several services by tourists vs non-tourists; it would be a measure of particular sub-service sectors regardless of users).					
Indicator 8.9.2	**Tourism consumption (BAA)**						
	UNEP	Alternative: [**Number of jobs in the sustainable tourism sector / total number of green and decent jobs x countries**]				2	
	UNWTO	Replace the indicator \tourism consumption" by **[Environmental pressure indicator: residual flows and natural inputs (absolute figures and % change rates) derived from a System of Environmental-Economic Accounting (SEEA) for Tourism "]**	to be developed data sources: National Statistical Offices in collaboration with National Tourism Administrations	Only a handful of countries experimented with environmental-economic account for tourism in the past years. This is an area where the World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO) has already initiated work to identify SDG specific indicators for tourism.		2	
	WB	[these two indicators may have difficulties in measurement. Jobs created would also depend on definition of 'tourism' sectors/companies. May be more realistic to use more accessible indicators such as **["Tourist arrivals".]**					

Target 8.10 Strengthen the capacity of domestic financial institutions to encourage and expand access to banking, insurance and financial services for all

	ContributorName	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Number of commercial bank branches and ATMs per 100,000 adults**		**IMF Financial Access Survey/189 countries**	**Tier I**		
Suggested Indicator		**% adults with a formal account or personally using a mobile money service in the past 12 months". Possible to have a break down by income e.g. bottom 40% of income share or <$1.25/day, by gender, age (youth) and rural. Adults: ages 15+**	**World Bank Global Findex (individual survey - added module to Gallup World Poll)**	**World Bank. Data availability: ~ 145 countries. Triennial. Available for 2011 and 2014.**	**Tier I**		**1.4, 2.3, 5.a, 8.10**

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

Indicator 8.10.1 Getting Credit: Distance to Frontier (CBB)							
	WB	In addition to the 2 indicators, 8.10.1 and 8.10.2, we propose 8.10.3: Access to financial services: [**"% adults with a formal account or personally using a mobile money service in the past 12 months". Possible to have a break down by income e.g. bottom 40% of income share or <$1.25/day, by gender, age (youth) and rural. Adults: ages 15+].** Formal account: account at a bank or at another type of financial institution, such as a credit union, microfinance institution, cooperative, or the post office (if applicable), or a debit card; including an account at a financial institution for the purposes of receiving wages, government transfers, or payments for agricultural products, paying utility bills or school fees or a card for the purposes of receiving wages or government transfers. Account/card ownership within the past 12 months. Mobile money account includes GSM Association (GSMA) Mobile Money for the Unbanked (MMU) services in the past 12 months to pay bills or to send or receive money along with receiving wages, government transfers, or payments for agricultural products through a mobile phone in the past 12 months. For indicator 8.10.1 see http://www.doingbusiness.org. For indicator 8.10.2 see http://fas.imf.org.	For 8.10.1 World Bank Doing Business. For 8.10.2 IMF Financial Access Survey (survey of financial regulators). 8.10.3 World Bank Global Findex (individual survey - added module to Gallup World Poll)	For 8.10.1 World Bank. Data availability: ~ 180 countries. Available annually starting 2010. For 8.10.2 IMF. Data availability: ~180 countries. Available annually starting 2004. For 8.10.3 World Bank. Data availability: ~ 145 countries. Triennial. Available for 2011 and 2014.		3	Proposed indicator in cell D196 can also be used for 1.4, 2.3, 5.a, 8.10
	UPU	The UPU supports the World Bank proposition to add an additional indicator to the 2 indicators, 8.10.1 and 8.10.2, namely: Indicator 8.10.3 measuring access to financial services defined as **"[% adults with a formal account or personally using a mobile money service in the past 12 months". Possible to have a break down by income e.g. bottom 40% of income share or <$1.25/day, by gender, age (youth) and rural. Adults: ages 15+]**. Formal account: account at a bank or at another type of financial institution, such as a credit union, microfinance institution, cooperative, or the post office (if applicable), or a debit card; including an account at a financial institution for the purposes of receiving wages, government transfers, or payments for agricultural products, paying utility bills or school fees or a card for the purposes of receiving wages or government transfers. Account/card ownership within the past 12 months. Mobile money account includes GSM Association (GSMA) Mobile Money for the Unbanked (MMU) services in the past 12 months to pay bills or to send or receive money along with receiving wages, government transfers, or payments for agricultural products through a mobile phone in the past 12 months. For indicator 8.10.1 see http://www.doingbusiness.org. For indicator 8.10.2 see http://fas.imf.org.	UPU existing data. For 8.10.1 World Bank Doing Business. For 8.10.2 IMF Financial Access Survey (survey of financial regulators). 8.10.3 World Bank Global Findex (individual survey - added module to Gallup World Poll)	On postal accounts and payment services: Universal Postal Union. Data availability: ~ 130 countries. Annual. Available since 1899 (19th century) up to 2014 (21st century).		1	Proposed indicator in cell D196 (D196 of the original Excel file, D23 here) can also be used for 1.4, 2.3, 5.a, 8.10
Indicator 8.10.2 Number of commercial bank branches and ATMs per 100,000 adults (AAA)							
	UNCDF	Same Indicator	IMF Financial Access Survey	IMF - Data is available for 189 countries		1	

Target 8.a Increase Aid for Trade support for developing countries, in particular least developed countries, including through the Enhanced Integrated Framework for Trade-Related Technical Assistance to Least Developed Countries

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Aid for Trade Commitments and Disbursements (CBB)**	**OECD/WTO**	**WTO/OECD**	**Tier II**		
Indicator 8.a.1 Evolution in Aid for Trade Commitments and Disbursements (CBB)							
	ESCAP	New - **[Enhanced AfT support - In 5 years the amount of AfT should be doubled]**.	OECD/WTO	WTO			

Target 8.b By 2020, develop and operationalize a global strategy for youth employment and implement the Global Jobs Pact of the International Labour Organization

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Total government spending in social protection and employment programmes as percentage of the national budgets and GDP and collective bargaining rates**	**Household surveys (LFS, HIES, LSMS, Integrated HH surveys, etc.), Official estimates, Establishment surveys, Administrative records.**	**Responsible entity: ILO. Availability: Collective bargaining rates available for 84 countries.**	**Tier I**		
Indicator 8.b.1 Total government spending in social protection and employment programmes as percentage of the national budgets and GDP (AAA)							
	ILO	Alternative indicator: **[Total government spending in social protection and employment programmes as percentage of the national budgets and GDP and collective bargaining rates]**. Justification: the Global Jobs Pact called for sound social dialogue and therefore collective bargaining rates and coverage should be reported and combined to administrative data on government expenditure.	Household surveys (LFS, HIES, LSMS, Integrated HH surveys, etc.), Official estimates, Establishment surveys, Administrative records.	Responsible entity: ILO. Availability: Collective bargaining rates available for 84 countries.			
	WB	**[Total government spending in employment programmes as percentage of the national budgets and GDP]**					

Goal 9 Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and foster innovation

Target 9.1 Develop quality, reliable, sustainable and resilient infrastructure, including regional and transborder infrastructure, to support economic development and human well-being, with a focus on affordable and equitable access for all

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

Suggested Indicator	**Share of the rural population who live within 2km of an all season road**	**For Rural access, while historic data based on household surveys exists for many countries, current efforts are underway by the World Bank, DFID, and others to develop a new methodology using GIS data.**	**Methodology and initial test country data to be completed by June, data to be available for 7 pilot countries by Dec 2015, with dramatic expansion planned in 2016.**	**Tier II**		**2.3, 11.2**
Suggested Indicator	**Passenger and freight volumes**	**For Passenger and Freight volumes, data available from World Bank World Development Indicators.**	**World Bank, Passenger and freight data available from World Development Indicators, Baseline data exists for [80] countries, with the new methodology to be applied in an expanding set of countries.**	**Tier II**		**2.3, 11.2**
Indicator 9.1.1	**Percentage share of people employed in business infrastructure (consultancy, accounting, IT and other business services) in total employment (BBB)**					
ICAO	ICAO proposes that its indicator **"Percentage of effective implementation in the infrastructure development of aerodromes and ground aids"** replaces the current indicator 9.1.1. The intent of the target is to have infrastructures of good quality which are resilient and sustainable. Aerodromes are key infrastructures for a State, related to tourism and economic development. The ICAO indicator measures directly the quality and reliability factors of a representative infrastructure, whereas the current indicator focuses on people employed in that sector which is unrelated to quality or sustainability of those infrastructures. The ICAO indicator is a percentage which can be targeted, whereas targeting the employment percentage share is difficult."	ICAO has been collecting and validating data for Effective Implementation Monitoring since 2005. The data source and methodology used are fully mature with data available for 98 percent of all UN Member States. See the metadata provided with the indicator for further information.	ICAO is responsible for global monitoring of the level of implementation of aerodrome and ground aids. Data is available for all ICAO Member States.		1	Target 8.9.1 as aerodromes are a driver for tourism
ILO	The ILO does not compile the numerator of the share.					
ITU	Proposed alternative indicator: **[Proportion of households with broadband Internet access, by urban/rural]**	Data on this indicator are produced by NSOs, through household surveys. Some countries conduct a household survey where the question on households with broadband Internet access is included every year. For others, the frequency is every two or three years. Overall, the indicator is available for 53 countries at least from one survey in the years 2011-2014. Survey data for the proportion of households with Internet access (not broken down by narrowband/broadband) is available for 101 countries and ITU estimates data for this indicator for almost all other countries.	ITU collects data for this indicator from NSOs annually. Overall, the indicator is available for 53 countries at least from one survey in the years 2011-2014. Survey data for the proportion of households with Internet access (not broken down by narrowband/broadband) are available for 101 countries and ITU estimates data for this indicator for almost all other countries.			1.4, 9.c, 11.1
UNEP					2	
UNIDO	Proposed new indicator **[Proportion of households with broadband internet access, by urban, rural]**	Annual surveys by NSOs. Data are available in ITU for more than 170 countries (see technical notes ITU)	ITU For international monitoring data available in ITU for more than 170 countries		1	1.4, 9.c, 11.1
UNISDR	UNISR proposes **[Number of health and educational facilities affected, length of road affected by disasters]**". Please see UNISDR input paper attached."	National Disaster Loss Databases, 85 (will be more than 115 by 2016)	UNISDR		1	1.5,11.5,4.a, 13.1, 14.2, 15.3
UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for disaggregation by sex					
UPU	This indicator should be given up and replaced by an overall indicator on the quality of logistics service in the era of e-commerce. In that regard, the UPU would welcome the introduction of [**World Bank's Logistics Performance Index (LPI) complemented by a postal and express quality of service indicator: average parcel shipping time/parcel shipping time standards, by country, both for domestic and international service, and by product (UNSD Comtrade HS classification for international trade) and for each bilateral flow for any country-pair.]**	UPU existing data; World Bank LPI	UPU - big data available for most countries, both on an annual and real-time basis (trough consolidated tracking systems data and quality of service measurement systems) with real-time data potentially back to 1999 with progressive coverage of almost all countries by 2012 and onwards. World Bank - Data available for most countries		1	
WB	New Indicator Suggested: **[Logistics Performance Index]**	Surveys	World Bank - Data available for most countries		2	
Indicator 9.1.2	**Transport by air, road and rail (millions of passengers and ton-km and % population with access to all season road) (BAA)**					
ICAO	ICAO supports this indicator as a complement to the ICAO indicator proposed under 9.1.1. Actual usage rates of transport infrastructure are a measure of the effectiveness of those infrastructures. This indicator ties in best with a quality related indicator as the one ICAO proposes as a replacement of 9.1.1. Usage rates alone do not indicate if an infrastructure is of high quality or is sustainable, unless they are seen in conjunction with a quality related standard like the one proposed by ICAO.					
UNEP	Alternative: **[Kilometres of walking and cycling facilities, and person- kilometres of mass transit systems]**	There is a need to switch to more sustainable modes of transport - i.e. walking/ cycling and public transport. The target is about sustainable infrastructure . The currently proposed indicator does not measure that.	(sources will be identified)		1	Alternative indicator would also be relevant for 11.2

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	UNIDO	Proposed new indicator **[Percentage of paved road in total]**	Administrative data from national sources	World Bank/UNIDO (data not available for international reporting)		2	2.3
	UNISDR	UNISR proposes "**[Number of countries with critical infrastructure plan"]**. Please see UNISDR input paper attached.	SFDRR Monitor (to be developed), 0 (but HFA Monitor covered 133 countries in 2013)	UNISDR		2	1.5,11.5,4.a, 13.1, 14.2, 15.3
	UPU	The postal and express tonnage related to the development of e-commerce (both at the domestic and international levels, by product (HS classification), and by country-pair) could be provided by the Universal Postal Union to complement this indicator.	UPU existing data	UPU - big data available for most countries, both on an annual and real-time basis (trough consolidated tracking systems data) with real-time data potentially back to 1999 for international tonnage and with a progressive coverage of all countries by 2012 and onwards. World Bank - Data available for most countries		1	
	WB	This is merging two separate indicators sets, passenger and freight volumes, and proportion of population living within two kilometres of an all season road. For access to all season road, the specific indicator should read '**[Share of the rural population who live within 2km of an all season road]**"	For Passenger and Freight volumes, data available from World Bank World Development Indicators. For Rural access, while historic data based on household surveys exists for many countries, current efforts are underway by the World Bank, DFID, and others to develop a new methodology using GIS data.	World Bank, Passenger and freight data available from World Development Indicators, Baseline data exists for [80] countries, with the new methodology to be applied in an expanding set of countries. Methodology and initial test country data to be completed by June, data to be available for 7 pilot countries by Dec 2015, with dramatic expansion planned in 2016.		1	2.3, 11.2

Target 9.2 Promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and, by 2030, significantly raise industry's share of employment and gross domestic product, in line with national circumstances, and double its share in least developed countries

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Manufacturing Value Added (share in GDP, per capita, % growth)**	**MVA data are available in a large number of countries. Currently UNIDO maintains the World MVA database which contains data for about 200 economies. Data are presented at constant and current prices. Data can be presented for country groups (LDCs, LLDC) and the world regions.**	**UNIDO Data are available in UNIDO for more than 200 economies**	**Tier I**		
Suggested Indicator		**Manufacturing employment, in percent to total employment**	**Industrial surveys (NSOs) and UNIDO Gender disaggregated data available**	**UNIDO Data are available in UNIDO for more than 180 countries**	**Tier I**		**8.5.1**
Indicator 9.2.1	**MVA (share in GDP, per capita, % growth) (AAB)**						
	UNIDO	**"[[Manufacturing value added, per capita, in percent to GDP and growth rates]** *** Manufacturing value added is the key indicator for measuring industrialization of an economy. The description of data sources and compilation method is given on technical notes. No replacement of this indicator is proposed.	NSOs and UNIDO MVA database	UNIDO Data are available in UNIDO for more than 200 economies		1	
	Eurostat		available from Eurostat, assuming MVA means manufacturing value added			1	
	WB	The concept of "sustainability" in industrialization is not really reflected by the indicators. What does "sustainable industrialization" actually mean? Or is this only about economic sustainability, discounting the two other pillars, social and environmental?					
Indicator 9.2.2	**Manufacturing employment (share of total employment and % growth (AAA)**						
	ILO	Alternative indicator: **[Share of industry (identifying manufacturing) in total employment]**. Justification: The target is to increase industry's share of employment, of which manufacturing is a subset. Moreover, data for industry as a whole is more widely available than for the manufacturing sector, improving the robustness of regional and global estimates that could be produced. However, the manufacturing part should be identified.	Household surveys (LFS, HIES, LSMS, Integrated HH surveys, etc.), Official estimates, Establishment surveys.	Responsible entity: ILO with UNIDO inputs. Availability: 175 countries for industry's share of employment; more limited coverage for annual growth rates which would require consecutive annual data points.			
	UNIDO	**"[Manufacturing employment, in percent to total employment]"** *** This indicator measures the job creation in manufacturing compared to the whole economy. It has high rating from the member states. Specifications are provided in technical notes	Industrial surveys (NSOs) and UNIDO Gender disaggregated data available	UNIDO Data are available in UNIDO for more than 180 countries		2	8.5.1

Target 9.3 Increase the access of small-scale industrial and other enterprises, in particular in developing countries, to financial services, including affordable credit, and their integration into value chains and markets

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Percentage share of (M) small scale industries' value added in total industry value added**	**Refers to valued added of small industries in relation to total value added (See UNIDO technical notes)**	**Industrial surveys (NSO) and UNIDO/ UNIDO**	**Tier I/II**		
Indicator 9.3.1	**Percentage share of (M) small scale industries' value added in total industry value added (BAA)**						

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	UNIDO	**"[Share of small scale industries in total industry value added]"** *** Refers to valued added of small industries in relation to total value added (See UNIDO technical notes)	Industrial surveys (NSO) and UNIDO	UNIDO (Data for international reporting are partially available)		1	2.3
Indicator 9.3.2 % of (M)SMEs with a loan or line of credit (BBB)							
	UNCDF	Same Indicator	Enterprise Surveys	World Bank - Data is available for 135 countries		2	Target 8.3.2
	UNIDO	Proposed to reformulate as - **[Percentage of small scale industry receiving loan or other financial services]** (see UNIDO notes)	Central Bank data	UNIDO (data not available for international reporting)		2	1.4
	WB		World Bank Enterprise Surveys	World Bank. Data availability: ~135 developing economies, every 3-4 years, starting in 2006		2	8.3 and 9.3. Can potentially be used for 5.a if broken down by \ownership by gender"."
Target 9.4 By 2030, upgrade infrastructure and retrofit industries to make them sustainable, with increased resource-use efficiency and greater adoption of clean and environmentally sound technologies and industrial processes, with all countries taking action in accordance with their respective capabilities							
	Contributor Name	**Specification**	**Source**	**Entity**	**Tier**	**Priority**	**Interlinkages**
Suggested Indicator		**Carbon emission per unit of value added**	**Industrial surveys (NSO) / UNIDO database and estimates of emission**	**UNIDO Data available for more than 150 countries for international reporting**	**Tier I**		**8.5.1**
Indicator 9.4.1 Intensity of material use per unit of value added (international dollars) (CBB)							
	UNIDO	Priority of this indicator is changed (see UNIDO technical notes)	Industrial surveys (NSO) ; UNIDO	UNIDO Data are partially available for international reporting		2	8.4.1 and 8.4.2
	UNSD	Resource productivity. Resource productivity is gross domestic product (GDP) divided by domestic material consumption (DMC). DMC measures the total amount of materials directly used by an economy. It is defined as the annual quantity of raw materials extracted from the domestic territory of the focal economy, plus all physical imports minus all physical exports.	- Statistical surveys and administrative data on material use and value added collected from the national statistics office	- UNEP/International resources panel is responsible for policy application of data but not on the data collection and dissemination per se. - UNIDO: Data are partially available for international reporting - The System of Environmental Economic Accounts provides a standard methodology for calculating this indicator. However, no international data collection mechanism is yet in place and countries are still in implementation phase.			9.4, 12.1, 12.2
Indicator 9.4.2 Energy intensity per unit of value added (international dollars) (BBB)							
	UNIDO	This indicator is replaced by **[Carbon emission per unit of value added]** (see UNIDO technical notes)	Industrial surveys (NSO) / UNIDO database and estimates of emission	UNIDO Data available for more than 150 countries for international reporting		1	8.5.1
Target 9.5 Enhance scientific research, upgrade the technological capabilities of industrial sectors in all countries, in particular developing countries, including, by 2030, encouraging innovation and substantially increasing the number of research and development workers per 1 million people and public and private research and development spending							
	Contributor Name	**Specification**	**Source**	**Entity**	**Tier**	**Priority**	**Interlinkages**
Suggested Indicator		**R&D expenditure as percentage of GDP**	**Research and development surveys (NSO, Line ministries)**	**UNESCO-UIS Data available for about 135 countries for international reporting**	**Tier I**		**2a, 3b, 12a, 14a, 17.6, 17.7**
Indicator 9.5.1 Research and development expenditure and employment (BAA)							
	UNIDO	This indicator combines expenditure and employment. It is proposed to replace by a single indicator - **[the number of researchers per million inhabitants.]**	Research and development surveys (NSO, Line ministries)	UNESCO - UIS Data available for more than 140 countries for international reporting		2	2a, 3b, 5.5, 12a, 14a, 17.6, 17.7
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for the indicator on employment in research and development to be disaggregated by sex.					

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	UNESCO	**[(a) Research and development expenditure: R&D expenditure as a % of GDP]** ** Disaggregations: field of science (relevant for targets 2a, 3b, 12a, 14a, 17.6 and 17.7) *** (b) **[Research and development employment: Researchers per million inhabitants (in head counts)]** Disaggregations: field of science (relevant for targets 2a, 3b, 12a, 14a, 17.6 and 17.7) and sex (relevant for target 5.5)	R&D surveys (NSOs and line ministries) *** (a) Research and development expenditure: Data available for 134 countries; (b) Research and development employment: Data available for 142 countries	UNESCO-UIS		1	(a) R&D expenditure: 2a, 3b, 12a, 14a, 17.6, 17.7 Overall R&D data provide a reference for specific areas of R&D, such as health, agriculture, etc. Also, data by field of science provide more targeted data. *** (b) R&D employment: 2a, 3b, 5.5, 12a, 14a, 17.6, 17.7 Overall R&D data provide a reference for specific areas of R&D, such as health, agriculture, etc. Also, data by field of science provide more targeted data. Data by sex (for researchers) could contribute to Target 5.5
Indicator 9.5.2	**Percentage share of medium and high-tech industry value added in total value added (BBB)**						
	UNESCO					3	
	UNIDO	*** Move to Means of Implementation ***					
	UNIDO	New indicator proposed: **[R&D expenditure as percentage of GDP]** - Earlier indicator (Percentage share of medium and high-tech (MHT)) is moved to means of implementation	Research and development surveys (NSO, Line ministries)	UNESCO-UIS Data available for about 135 countries for international reporting		1	2a, 3b, 12a, 14a, 17.6, 17.7

Target 9.a Facilitate sustainable and resilient infrastructure development in developing countries through enhanced financial, technological and technical support to African countries, least developed countries, landlocked developing countries and small island developing States

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Amount of investments in infrastructure as a % of GDP**	**Central Bank data**	**Data not available for international reporting**	**Tier II**		
Indicator 9.a.1	**Annual credit flow to infrastructure projects (in International Dollar) (BBB)**						
	UNIDO	Reformulate as **"[Amount of investment in infrastructure]"**	Central Bank data	Data not available for international reporting		1	
	WB	indicator does not reflect the sustainability concept expressed in target 9.a.					
Indicator 9.a.2	**Percentage share of infrastructure loans in total loans (BBB)**						
	UNIDO	Reformulated as **[Annual credit flow to infrastructure projects]**	Central Bank data	Data not available for international reporting		2	
	WB	indicator does not reflect the sustainability concept expressed in target 9.a.					

Target 9.b Support domestic technology development, research and innovation in developing countries, including by ensuring a conducive policy environment for, inter alia, industrial diversification and value addition to commodities

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Percentage share of medium and high-tech (MHT) industry value added in total value added**	**Industrial surveys (NSO), UNIDO**	**UNIDO Data available for more than 150 countries for international reporting**	**Tier I**		
Indicator 9.b.1	**Aggregate value of all support mechanisms for technology and innovation (in International Dollar, % of GDP) (CBB)**						
	UNIDO	New indicator proposed due to low rating of existing indicator -**[Percentage share of medium and high-tech (MHT) industry value added in total value added]** - See UNIDO notes	Industrial surveys (NSO), UNIDO	UNIDO Data available for more than 150 countries for international reporting		1	
Indicator 9.b.2	**Aggregate value of expenditure on diversification and value addition policy related instruments and mechanisms (in International Dollar; % of GDP) (CBB)**						
	UNIDO	New indicator proposed due to low rating and limited data availability **[Coefficient of industrial diversification.]** Methodology is described in UNIDO notes	Industrial surveys (NSO), UNIDO	UNIDO Data available for more than 150 countries for international reporting		2	8.2.2

Target 9.c Significantly increase access to information and communications technology and strive to provide universal and affordable access to the Internet in least developed countries by 2020

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Percentage of the population covered by a mobile network, by technology**	**Data are produced by national regulatory telecom authorities or Information and Communication Technology Ministries, who collect the data from Internet service providers. By 2014, data on 2G mobile population coverage were available for about 144 countries, from developed and developing regions, and covering all key global regions. Data on 3G mobile population coverage were available for 135 countries.**	**ITU collects data annually. By 2014, data on 2G mobile population coverage were available for about 144 countries, from developed and developing regions, and covering all key global regions. Data on 3G mobile population coverage were available for 135 countries.**	**Tier I**		**1.4, 2.3, 2.c, 9.1, 11.b, 13.1,**
Indicator 9.c.1	**Fixed and Mobile broadband quality measured by mean download speed (BBA)**						

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	ITU	Official data on the current indicator do not exist. Proposed alternative indicator to monitor affordability of Internet access: **[Broadband Internet prices]**	Data are compiled by national regulatory telecom authorities or Information and Communication Technology Ministries, who collect the data from operators/Internet service providers. For countries that do not respond to the questionnaire, ITU collects data on the broadband Internet prices directly from operators/Internet service providers' websites. By 2014, data were available for 160 economies, from developed and developing regions, and covering all key global regions.	ITU collects data for this indicator annually. By 2014, data were available for 160 economies, from developed and developing regions, and covering all key global regions.			9.1
	UNIDO	Proposed new indicator **[Broadband Internet prices]**. It refers to the price of a monthly subscription to an entry-level (fixed or mobile) broadband plan, based on the offer by the operator with the largest market share in the country	Survey Data from National ICT authorities, ITU	ITU Data available for more than 145 countries for international reporting			9.1
	UPU					2	
	WB	**[Fixed broadband subscriptions broken down by speed]**	Existing collected by ITU	ITU		2	8.1, 17.6
Indicator 9.c.2	**Subscription to mobile cellular and/or fixed broad band internet (per household/100 people) (AAA)**						
	ITU	The current indicator is already proposed for Target 9.1. Proposed alternative indicator, which is particularly relevant for LDCs: **[Percentage of the population covered by a mobile network, broken down by technology]**	Data are produced by national regulatory telecom authorities or Information and Communication Technology Ministries, who collect the data from Internet service providers. By 2014, data on 2G mobile population coverage were available for about 144 countries, from developed and developing regions, and covering all key global regions. Data on 3G mobile population coverage were available for 135 countries.	ITU collects data annually. By 2014, data on 2G mobile population coverage were available for about 144 countries, from developed and developing regions, and covering all key global regions. Data on 3G mobile population coverage were available for 135 countries.			1.4, 2.3, 2.c, 9.1, 11.b, 13.1,
	UNIDO	Proposed new indicator - **[Percentage of the population covered by a mobile broadband network, broken down by technology (see ITU notes)]** ** Percentage of the population covered by a mobile broadband network, broken down by technology	Survey Data from National ICT authorities, ITU	ITU Data available for more than 145 countries for international reporting			1.4, 2.3, 2.c, 9.1, 11.b, 13.1,
	UPU	The UPU proposes to add a third indicator for target 9.c, namely indicator 9.c.3 related to e-commerce development: **[e-commerce as a share of total GDP and/or total international trade.]**	UPU existing data; UNCTAD measurement of the information society	UPU - big data available for most countries on a real-time basis (trough consolidated tracking systems data) with real-time data potentially back to 1999 for international tonnage, volumes and with a progressive coverage of all countries by 2012 and onwards. Generalization of the capture of the value of goods (e-commerce related customs declarations) from 2016-17 onwards.		1	
	WB		Existing collected by ITU	ITU		1	1.4, 5.b, 9.1, 10.3, 11.1, 16.7, 17.6, 17.8

Goal 10 Reduce inequality within and among countries

Target 10.1 By 2030, progressively achieve and sustain income growth of the bottom 40 per cent of the population at a rate higher than the national average

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Growth rates of household expenditure or income per capita among the bottom 40 percent of the population and the total population**	**Household Surveys**	**World Bank**	**Tier I**		**is partly overlapping with 1.2**
Indicator 10.1.1	**Measure income inequality using the Gini coefficient or Palma ratio, pre- and post-social transfers/tax, at global, regional and national level disaggregated by groups as defined above (AAA)**						
	OHCHR	**[Income inequality pre- and post-social transfers/tax at national, regional and global levels]**	Household survey	World Bank currently collects relevant data at global level, but at a lower level of disaggregation than required by this indicator.		1	10.2, 10.3
	WB	This indicator does not directly measure the target but Indicator 10.1.2 does.	Household Surveys				
Indicator 10.1.2	**Change in real disposable income and consumption by quintiles over time, at global, regional and national level. (BAA)**						
	WB	To make the indicator fully consistent with the target we suggest modifying indicator description to **[Growth rates of household expenditure or income per capita among the bottom 40 percent of the population and the total population].*" The part on 'global' and 'regional' should be taken out due to concerns about aggregation. "	Household Surveys	World Bank		1	

Target 10.2 By 2030, empower and promote the social, economic and political inclusion of all, irrespective of age, sex, disability, race, ethnicity, origin, religion or economic or other status

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Proportion of people living below 50% of median income disaggregated by age and sex**	**National income and expenditure surveys.**	**UNDESA. OECD.** **Widely available for OECD and EU countries.**	**Tier I**		**1.2**

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

Indicator 10.2.1 Measure the progressive reduction of inequality gaps over time, disaggregated by groups as defined above, for selected social, economic, political and environmental SDG targets (at least one target per goal where relevant should be monitored using this approach) (BBB)							
	UNCDF	Propose a Multi-Purpose Indicator: **[Adults owning an account either through a financial institution or mobile money provider, disaggregated by income level, geography location gender, age and education]**	Global Findex	World Bank - Data is available for 142 countries		2	Targets 1.4 , 2.3 , 5.a, 8.10
Indicator 10.2.2 Proportion of people living below 50% of median income (AAA)							
	UNICEF	[Amended to disaggregate for age and gender] **[Proportion of people living below 50% of median income disaggregated by age and gender]**. This would enable capturing children living in relative poverty including in higher income countries.	National income and expenditure surveys.	UNDESA. OECD. Widely available for OECD and EU countries.		1	1.2
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for this indicator to be disaggregated by sex and other context specific characteristics.					

Target 10.3 Ensure equal opportunity and reduce inequalities of outcome, including by eliminating discriminatory laws, policies and practices and promoting appropriate legislation, policies and action in this regard

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**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**	**Survey**	**Data available at regional level, e.g. EU Fundamental Rights Agency collects for all 28 EU Member States. No current global collector.**	**Tier II**		**10.2, 10.3, 16.3, 16b**
Indicator 10.3.1 Percentage of population reporting perceived existence of discrimination based on all grounds of discrimination prohibited by international human rights law (CBB)							
	OHCHR	**[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]**	Survey	Data available at regional level, e.g. EU Fundamental Rights Agency collects for all 28 EU Member States. No current global collector.		1	10.2, 10.3, 16.3, 16b
	GlobalMigrationWG		NB! Disaggregate by migratory status				
Indicator 10.3.2 Existence of an independent body responsible for promoting and protecting the right to non-discrimination (BBB)							
	OHCHR	**[Existence of independent National Human Rights Institution in compliance with the Paris Principles]**	OHCHR, International Coordinating Committee of National Human Rights Institutions	OHCHR, International Coordinating Committee of National Human Rights Institutions		2	10.3, 16a, 16b

Target 10.4 Adopt policies, especially fiscal, wage and social protection policies, and progressively achieve greater equality

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Labour share of GDP, comprising wages and social protection transfers.**	**SNA, IMF Government Finance Statistics, ILO**	**Responsible entities: IMF, ILO. Availability: 200 countries.**	**Tier I**		**8.b.1**
Indicator 10.4.1 % of people covered by minimum social protection floor, that include basic education and health packages, by age, sex, economic status, origin, place of residence, disability, and civil status (widows, partners in union outside of marriage, divorced spouses, orphan children) and other characteristics of relevance for each country (BBB)							
	ILO	Alternative indicator: **[Labour share of GDP, comprising wages and social protection transfers.]** Justification: Social protection floor coverage is already captured in the indicator 1.3. The alternative provides a more accurate picture of the income distribution.	SNA, IMF Government Finance Statistics, ILO	Responsible entities: IMF, ILO. Availability: 200 countries.		1	8.b.1
	WB	Indicator 10.4.1 should be simple to identify. Suggest changing along the lines of: "**[Percent of total population covered by quality basic health and education services (public or private)"]**, with quality being assessed by internationally recognized standard test scores (eg PISA).					
	GlobalMigrationWG		NB! Disaggregate by migratory status				
Indicator 10.4.2 Progressivity of tax and social expenditures e.g. Proportion of tax contributions from bottom 40%, Proportion of social spending going to bottom 40% (CBB)							
	ILO	Alternative indicator: **[Shares of tax revenue coming from indirect and direct taxes]**. Justification: While indirect taxations is seen as regressive and direct taxation is progressive, the proportion of both provides a measure of the tax system's impact on inequality. If inequality is reduced only by only catering for the bottom 40% of income earners, the proposal is biased. It overlooks the amount of public spending that benefits the top 10% of income earners, a major factor in the persistent income inequalities.	SNA, IMF Government Finance Statistics, ILO	Responsible entities: IMF, ILO. Availability: 200 countries.		2	
	WB	Indicator 10.4.2 should read: **["Improvements in the Gini coefficient due to the incidence of tax policy and public spending reform, and proportion of tax revenues paid by the richest quintiles."]** Reasons: progressivity should be measured jointly (taxes and expenditures); also not only social expenditures impact the poor. Third, it is not a good idea to tax mainly the middle class, which could be the result if we want to reduce the burden on the poorest 40%.					

Target 10.5 Improve the regulation and monitoring of global financial markets and institutions and strengthen the implementation of such regulations

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Adoption of a financial transaction tax (Tobin tax) at a world level**			**Tier III**		

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

Indicator 10.5.1 Adoption of a financial transaction tax (Tobin tax) at a world level (CBB)							
	WB	The indicator proposed (10.5.1) is technically not sound. What is the baseline? What is the target? How is it quantified, measured? Instead, any indicator for this target should cover financial stability, efficiency, and depth. However, these areas are difficult to measure, especially stability. A suggestion for an indicator for this target would be to use the World Bank's Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA) indicators for the financial sector (however the data are not publicly available). These include two sub-indicators that cover financial sector stability and efficiency & depth. A standard deviation measure to indicate whether countries are converging or diverging from meeting international standards, based on these ratings, could serve as a proxy for measuring this target. Further consultation is needed on an adequate indicator for this target.					

Target 10.6 Ensure enhanced representation and voice for developing countries in decision-making in global international economic and financial institutions in order to deliver more effective, credible, accountable and legitimate institutions

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Percentage of members or voting rights of developing countries in international organizations.**	**Administrative data of international organizations.**	**United Nations/DESA. Data would be available for all international organizations.**	**Tier I**		**Target 16.3 (rule of law at international level). Target 16.7 (which focuses on inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making AT ALL LEVELs). Target 17.10 (non-discriminatory and equitable multilateral trading system).**
Indicator 10.6.1 Percentage of voting rights in international organizations of developing countries, compared to population or GDP as appropriate (CBB)							

Target 10.7 Facilitate orderly, safe, regular and responsible migration and mobility of people, including through the implementation of planned and well-managed migration policies

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Recruitment cost born by employee as percentage of yearly income earned in country of destination.**	**Annual cost surveys based on household surveys, labour force surveys or ad hoc surveys.**	**National Statistical offices, Ministries of Labour. GMG**	**Tier III**		**8.8; 10.7**
Suggested Indicator		**International Migration Policy Index**	**Government agencies, including reporting to follow-up mechanisms of relevant human rights instruments. The United Nations Inquiry among Governments on Population and Development. World Population Policies Database. Migration Profiles. Existing migration policy indices**	**Collective effort by members of the Global Migration Group, supported by national governments and statistical agencies**	**Tier III**		**5.2; 8.8; 10.7; 16.1; 16.2**
Suggested Indicator		**Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age and form of exploitation**	**National governments/Field studies**	**UNODC, Data on the number of detected victims of TIP is available for over 130 countries**	**Tier II**		**5.2, 16.2**
Indicator 10.7.1 Index on Human Mobility Governance measuring key features of good-governance of migration (CBB)							
	ILO	Alternative indicator: **[Ratification and implementation of the ILO Labour Migration Conventions]**	NORMLEX (Information System on International Labour Standards of the ILO).	Responsible entity: ILO. Availability: Information on all ILO member states (185), of which 49 ratified convention n<U+00B0>97 and 23 ratified convention n<U+00B0>143.		1	
	GlobalMigrationWG	**[International Migration Policy Index]**. See full specification in attached meta-data word file	Government agencies, including reporting to follow-up mechanisms of relevant human rights instruments. The United Nations Inquiry among Governments on Population and Development. World Population Policies Database. Migration Profiles. Existing migration policy indices	Collective effort by members of the Global Migration Group, supported by national governments and statistical agencies		1	5.2; 8.8; 10.7; 16.1; 16.2
Indicator 10.7.2 Number of migrants killed, injured or victims of crime while attempting to cross maritime, land, air borders (CBB)							
	OHCHR	See attached metadata	Multiple data sources - see attached metadata			1	10.7, 16.1, 16.2, 16.3, 16b
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for this indicator to be disaggregated by sex and age.					
	WB	Change to **[Number of victims of human trafficking per 100,000 persons.]*" Also, a new indicator 10.7.3 is proposed: **"[Recruitment costs borne by agricultural workers' employee, domestic workers' employee and construction workers' employee]"**					
	GlobalMigrationWG	**[Recruitment cost born by employee as percentage of yearly income earned in country of destination]**. See full specification in attached meta-data word file	Annual cost surveys based on household surveys, labour force surveys or ad hoc surveys.	National Statistical offices, Ministries of Labour. GMG		2	8.8; 10.7
	UNODC	**[Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age and form of exploitation]**	National governments/Field studies	UNODC, Data on the number of detected victims of TIP is available for over 130 countries		1	Target 5.2

Target 10.a Implement the principle of special and differential treatment for developing countries, in accordance with World Trade Organization agreements

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

Suggested Indicator		**Share of tariff lines applied to imports from LDCs/developing countries with zero-tariff**	**Computed with data from TRAINS-UNCTAD.**	**TRAINS data is available for 180+ countries**	**Tier I**		**17.10**
Indicator 10.a.1	**Degree of utilization and of implementation of SDT measures in favour of LDCs (CBB)**						
	WB	An alternate indicator is proposed: **["Share of tariff lines applied to imports from LDCs/developing countries with zero-tariff."]**	Computed with data from TRAINS-UNCTAD.	TRAINS data is available for 180+ countries		1	"17.10"
Indicator 10.a.2	**List of government actions (by LDCs) that can be covered under the S&D of the WTO agreements, with a view to measuring the "policy space" available to them (CBB)**						
	WB	An alternate indicator is proposed: **["Services Trade Restrictions."]** The Services Trade Restrictions Database covers 103 countries that represent all regions and income groups of the world. For each country, five major services sectors are covered that encompass a total of 19 subsectors Each subsector in turn covers the most relevant modes of supplying the respective services, yielding overall 34 country-subsector-mode combinations: Mode 1: financial services, transportation and professional services Mode 3: all subsectors Mode 4: professional services. The Eight WTO Ministerial Conference in 2011 adopted a waiver, enabling WTO members to provide preferential treatment to services and service suppliers of LDCs. The services sector has become a key driver of growth and development, accounting for 47 percent of all LDCs' overall GDP in 2011. However compared with the value of world services trade, LDC services trade is still marginal. Hence, over the coming years, the waiver can provide significant opportunities to further enhance the growth of service sectors in LDCs	World Bank. Data available for http://iresearch.worldbank.org/servicetrade/aboutData.htm	World Bank. Data available for up to 103 countries http://iresearch.worldbank.org/servicetrade/aboutData.htm		2	17.10-17.11

Target 10.b Encourage official development assistance and financial flows, including foreign direct investment, to States where the need is greatest, in particular least developed countries, African countries, small island developing States and landlocked developing countries, in accordance with their national plans and programmes

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**OECD ODA data, disaggregated by recipient and donor countries**	**OECD**	**OECD**	**Tier II**		
Indicator 10.b.1	**FDI inflows as a share of GDP to developing countries, broken down by group (LDCs, African countries, SIDS, LLDCS) and by source country (BAA)**						
Indicator 10.b.2	**OECD ODA data, disaggregated by recipient and donor countries (BBB)**						

Target 10.c By 2030, reduce to less than 3 per cent the transaction costs of migrant remittances and eliminate remittance corridors with costs higher than 5 per cent

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Remittance costs as a percentage of the amount remitted**	**Data already collected through quarterly surveys in 226 migration corridors. Information is compiled in existing remittance price database: http://remittanceprices.worldbank.org/en, (survey based, mystery shopping)**	**World Bank**	**Tier I**		**10.7; 17.3**
Indicator 10.c.1	**Percentage of remittances spent as transfer cost less than 3% (CBB)**						
	WB	Firstly, If possible we suggest target 10.c. be made more specific to ""By 2030, reduce to less than 3% the transaction cost of migrant remittances, with at least one reliable and accessible service available in each corridor at a cost significantly lower than the average for that corridor, through enhanced information, transparency, competition and cooperation with partners." Regarding the indicators we have following comments. The indicator proposed (10.c.1) is not fully addressing this target. In addition, putting a limit on the price may be harmful for the supply of formal remittance services, causing informal methods to sprout. Instead, we suggest the following 3 indicators, the data for which are readily available. Please note that these 3 proposed indicators are also in line with the global 5x5 objective on remittances: 10.c.1. Global average total cost of sending $200 (or equivalent in local sending currency, adjusted for inflation and expressed as % of amount sent) (Source: Remittance Prices Worldwide database by the World Bank; Same figure has been used as reference for 5x5 objective; This is the simple average of all services included in the RPW database; Target is max 3%) 10.c.2. Average total cost of sending $200 (or equivalent in local sending currency, adjusted for inflation) in each country corridor (expressed as % of amount sent)	World Bank Remittance Prices Worldwide database. (Data are available for 226 corridors in Remittance Prices Worldwide database by the World Bank; Target is max 5% by 2030 in each corridor) 10.c.3. Global average total cost of sending $200 (or equivalent in local sending currency, adjusted for inflation) with the three cheapest services available in each market and accessible to the large majority of senders and recipients (This can be calculated from Remittance Prices Worldwide database by the World Bank; This is the simple average of the three cheapest available services in each corridor meeting requirements of availability and reach; This will allow to monitor the cost of services that are available to senders for a minimum price, regardless of the presence in the market of other more expensive services) Please note that setting a target on prices may lead to price regulations, and in turn, may have unintended consequences such as market distortions that encourage the illegal sector. The current global average price of sending $200 remittances is 7.9% as per the World Bank Remittance Prices Worldwide database, available at http://remittanceprices.worldbank.org.	World Bank			

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	GlobalMigrationWG	**[Remittance costs as a percentage of the amount remitted].** See full specification in attached meta-data word file	Data already collected through quarterly surveys in 226 migration corridors. Information is compiled in existing remittance price database: http://remittanceprices.worldbank.org/en, (survey based, mystery shopping)	World Bank		1	10.7; 17.3
	WB	**[Global average total cost of sending $200 (or equivalent in local sending currency, adjusted for inflation and expressed as % of amount sent).]** Same figure has been used as reference for 5x5 objective; This is the simple average of all services included in the RPW database; Target is max 3%	World Bank Remittance Prices Worldwide database	World Bank		1	
	WB	**[Average total cost of sending $200 (or equivalent in local sending currency, adjusted for inflation) in each country corridor (expressed as % of amount sent)]** Data are available for 226 corridors in Remittance Prices Worldwide database by the World Bank; Target is max 5% by 2030 in each corridor	World Bank Remittance Prices Worldwide database	World Bank		1	
	WB	**[Global average total cost of sending $200 (or equivalent in local sending currency, adjusted for inflation) with the three cheapest services available in each market and accessible to the large majority of senders and recipients]** This can be calculated from Remittance Prices Worldwide database by the World Bank; This is the simple average of the three cheapest available services in each corridor meeting requirements of availability and reach; This will allow to monitor the cost of services that are available to senders for a minimum price, regardless of the presence in the market of other more expensive services. Please note that setting a target on prices may lead to price regulations, and in turn, may have unintended consequences such as market distortions that encourage the illegal sector. The current global average price of sending $200 remittances is 7.9% as per the World Bank Remittance Prices Worldwide database, available at http://remittanceprices.worldbank.org.	World Bank Remittance Prices Worldwide database	World Bank		1	

Goal 11 Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable

Target 11.1 By 2030, ensure access for all to adequate, safe and affordable housing and basic services and upgrade slums

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Proportion of urban population living in slums**	**Census, DHS, MICs and household surveys**	**UN-HABITAT. The data is available for all countries in the world. Global Urban Observatory and City Prosperity Initiative.**	**Tier I**		**1.4, 1.a, 5.4, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4.**
Indicator 11.1.1	**Percentage of urban population living in slums or informal settlements (BBA)**						
	UNHABITAT	**[Proportion of urban population living in slums]**	Census, DHS, MICs and household surveys	UN-HABITAT. The data is available for all countries in the world. Global Urban Observatory and City Prosperity Initiative.		1	(1.4.1 / 1.4.2 / 1.a.1 /5.4.2/ 6.1.1 / 6.2.1 / 6.3.1/6.4.1)
Indicator 11.1.2	**Proportion of population that spends more than 30% of its income on accommodation (BAA)**						
	UNHABITAT	same indicator	Household surveys	no agency. Data is available for many countries. Household surveys on income and consumption.		2	(10.1.2/ 10.1.2)

Target 11.2 By 2030, provide access to safe, affordable, accessible and sustainable transport systems for all, improving road safety, notably by expanding public transport, with special attention to the needs of those in vulnerable situations, women, children, persons with disabilities and older persons

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Proportion of the population that has a public transit stop within 0.5 km**	**Administrative city information and private/public transport companies. Community-based information**	**Potential lead Agency UN-Habitat. Data is not yet available.**	**Tier II**		**3.9, 7.3**
Indicator 11.2.1	**Percentage of people living within 0.5 km of public transit [running at least every 20 minutes] in cities with more than 500,000 inhabitants (CBB)**						
	UNHABITAT	**[Proportion of the population that has a public transit stop within 0.5 km]**	Administrative city information and private/public transport companies. Community-based information	Potential lead Agency UN-Habitat. Data is not yet available.		1	(3.9.1 / 7.3.2)
Indicator 11.2.2	**Km of high capacity (BRT, light rail, metro) public transport per person for cities with more than 500,000 inhabitants (CBB)**						
	UNHABITAT	same indicator	Map of the city. Administrative city information and private/public transport companies. Community-based information	Potential lead Agency UN-Habitat - City Prosperity Initiative is already collecting this indicator in 320 cities		2	(3.9.1 / 7.3.2)
	WB	**[Share of jobs in the metropolitan area an 'average' household can access within 60/75 minutes without a private car i.e. using walking, cycling and public transport.]**	Measurable through GIS based on Open Data	World Bank - Data is currently available for an expanding set of cities		1	9.1, 11.7
	WB	**[Proportion of income spent by urban families on transport to reach employment, education, health and community services.]**	Household surveys	Data exists for some major cities , but not all cities have yet systematically collected relevant data		2	

Target 11.3 By 2030, enhance inclusive and sustainable urbanization and capacity for participatory, integrated and sustainable human settlement planning and management in all countries

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

Suggested Indicator		**Efficient land use**	**population growth (UNDESA). Satellite images of cities (open source).**	**UN-HABITAT. The data is available for all countries in the world. The City Prosperity Initiative is collecting data for this indicator in more than 300 cities. Lincoln Institute and University of New York and UN-Habitat collect for a Global Sample of Cities (200 cities)**	**Tier II**		**2.1, 3.9, 6.4, 6.6, 11.a, 11.1, 11.b, 12.1, 13.2, 15.3, 15.4**
Indicator 11.3.1	**Ratio of land consumption rate to population growth rate at comparable scale (CBB)**						
	UNHABITAT	**[Efficient land use]**	population growth (UNDESA). Satellite images of cities (open source)	UN-HABITAT. The data is available for all countries in the world. The City Prosperity Initiative is collecting data for this indicator in more than 300 cities. Lincoln Institute and University of New York and UN-Habitat collect for a Global Sample of Cities (200 cities)		1	(2.1.2 / 3.9.1 / 6.4.1 / 6.6.1 / 11.a / 11.1 /11.b.1/ 12.1.1 / 13.2.1 / 15.3.1 / 15.4.1)
	WB	This is a much better indicator. It has a clear methodology and can be standardized and collected on a regular basis. The growing availability of EO data, such as the GUF from DLR, the GHSL can serve as baseline, combined with WorldPop. Moving forward, the Sentinell2 will be able to provide data to monitor this indicator, systematically for the world.	Earth Observation Data- DLR GUF, ESA Sentinelle 2; Population, WorldPop			1	
	UNFPA	**[Ratio of land consumption rate to urban population growth rate at comparable scale]**	Satellite imagery (Landsat) and census data; SDSN proposed indicator			1	11.a
	UNSD	**[Efficient land use]**	Land cover account in the SEEA Land accounts in the SEEA Central Framework are useful in organization information on land use and land cover. In particular, the land cover accounts provide the statistical methodology in organization information on land cover ,which reflects the observed physical and biological cover of the Earth's source that is a function of natural changes in the environment and of previous and current land use. The SEEA Central Framework provide a complete classification for land cover. based on the FAO Land Cover Classification, comprises 14 basis classes and is presented in full in Annex I of the SEEA Central Framework. The classification allow the derivation of statistical information on land cover. The land cover account allow an additional step in the analysis of land cover change showing reasons for land cover change, such as changes relates to urban growth and development of infrastructure (through conversion of crops or tree-covered areas), deforestation, desertification, etc. The land use account allows the compilation of indicators related to this target including the urbanization rate, etc.			1	
Indicator 11.3.2	**Cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants that implement urban and regional development plans integrating population projections and resource needs (BBB)**						
	UNHABITAT	same indicator	City reporting.	UN-Habitat.		2	same than 11.a.1
	WB	This indicator is ambiguous and does not reflect the actual coordination of planning for participatory, integrated and sustainable cities. The indicator does not require the plan to be current, or to actually adequately reflect the challenges in the city. Furthermore 'implementing' the development plan is also unclear, as there can be many levels of implementation.				2	
	UNFPA					2	11.a
Target 11.4	**Strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world's cultural and natural heritage**						
	Contributor Name	**Specification**	**Source**	**Entity**	**Tier**	**Priority**	**Interlinkages**
Suggested Indicator		**Share of national (or municipal) budget which is dedicated to preservation, protection and conservation of national cultural natural heritage including World Heritage sites**	**Ministry of Finance/Budget and National Statistical Offices**	**UNESCO-UIS (but there are no current data collections for this), UN-HABITAT**	**Tier II**		**8.9, 11,7, 12.b**
Indicator 11.4.1	**Percentage of budget provided for maintaining cultural and natural heritage (BBA)**						
	UNESCO	**[Share of national (or municipal) budget which is dedicated to preservation, protection and conservation of national cultural natural heritage including World Heritage sites]**. Disaggregations: none	Ministry of Finance/Budget and National Statistical Offices	UNESCO-UIS (but there are no current data collections for this)		2	
	UNHABITAT	same indicator	National accounts and state, provincial and local budgets	UNESCO, UN-Habitat		1	(8.9.1 / 8.9.2 / 11.7.1 / 12.b.1 / 12.b.2)

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	UNSD	**[Share of national (or municipal) budget which is dedicated to preservation, protection and conservation of national cultural natural heritage including World Heritage sites]**	Environmental Protection Expenditure Accounts (EPEA) in the SEEA Cultural and natural heritage are considered as ecosystem assets and hence efforts to protect and safeguard the world's cultural and natural heritage is considered as an environmental protection activities EPEA in the SEEA Central Framework provide information on the output of environmental protection specific services produced across the economy and on the expenditure of resident units on all goods and services for environmental protection purposes. The SEEA Central Framework provide a complete classification for environmental protection activities (Classification of Environmental Activities) comprises 16 basis classes and is presented in full in Annex I of the SEEA Central Framework. The classification allow the derivation of statistical information on environmental protection activities including the protection of biodiversity, landscape and cultural and natural heritage site.			1	
Indicator 11.4.2	**Percentage of urban area and percentage of historical/cultural sites accorded protected status (BAA)**						
	UNESCO	**[Historical/cultural sites and urban area which are subject to protection by law (legislative regulation?) ensuring their integrity.]** Disaggregations: none	Municipal/national data and heritage office records; National inventories	UNESCO-UIS (but there are no current data collections for this)		3	
	UNHABITAT	same indicator	National government and state/provincial inventory	UNESCO, UN-Habitat		2	(8.9.1 / 8.9.2 / 12.b.1 / 12.b.2)
	IUCN	Proposed additional/alternative indicator: IUCN recommends that **["Change in aggregate World Heritage Outlook ratings"]** would be a useful complementary indicator here.	Data sources: World Heritage Outlook (http://www.worldheritageoutlook.iucn.org).	IUCN. Available globally, and can be disaggregated to national and regional levels.		1	
	UNESCO	**[Number and Percentage of the labour force that holds a heritage occupation or is employed in the heritage sector]** Disaggregations: sex (and others where data are available)	Labour Force Surveys	UNESCO-UIS from the Cultural Employment Survey which will be launched in July 2015		1	

Target 11.5 By 2030, significantly reduce the number of deaths and the number of people affected and substantially decrease the direct economic losses relative to global gross domestic product caused by disasters, including water-related disasters, with a focus on protecting the poor and people in vulnerable situations

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters per 100,000 people.**	**National Disaster Loss Databases, 85 (will be more than 115 by 2016)**	**UNISDR**	**Tier II**		**1.5, 13.1, 14.2, 15.3**
Indicator 11.5.1	**Number of people killed, injured, displaced, evacuated, relocated or otherwise affected by disasters (BBA)**						
	UNEP	Multi-purpose indicator: **[Proportion of population resilient/robust to hazards and climate -related events]**					
	UNHABITAT	**[Number of people killed, injured, displaced, or otherwise affected by critical and slow onset events.]**	Government data, OCHA, NGO sources, UNHCR, IOM and IDMC	World Bank, OCHA, UN-Habitat		1	(1.4.1 / 1.4.2 / 1.5.1 / 1.5.2 / 6.1.1 / 6.2.1 / 6.3.1/ 6.4.1 / 7.1.1 / 11.1.1/ 11.b.1)
	UNISDR	UNISR proposes the refinement into **\[Number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters per 100,000 people.]"**. Please see UNISDR input paper attached."	National Disaster Loss Databases, 85 (will be more than 115 by 2016)	UNISDR		1	13.1, 1.5, 14.2, 15.3
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for this indicator to be disaggregated by sex.					
	ECE	This indicator comprises 6 separate categories where each requires monitoring. The trends in numbers mentioned other than number of people killed or injured are reflective of government DRR strategies and are not absolute indications of their effectiveness. A zero evacuation rate might imply a high level of protective structural measures or a high number of people killed due to inaction. Impact of each category is different, that is one death is not equivalent to one person evacuated, making a composite metric for the indicator 11.5.1 difficult to attain. To make this easier to measure and monitor, it could be reduced to the indicator:**["Number of deaths per year resulting from each disaster type."]** At the global level, the core indicator should be able to be disaggregated by disaster type (floods, droughts, tsunamis, earthquakes, landslides etc.) and could be disaggregated by income, gender, and age of victims; further disaggregation at national level to include frequency of event and its magnitude would be insightful.	A new monitoring framework is needed drawing upon existing monitoring programmes/databases such as EM-DAT (CRED) and DesInventor.	WMO, on behalf of UN-Water. Under the UN-Water umbrella, the GEMI monitoring framework (see further description under 6.3.1) will draw on existing monitoring programmes/databases such as EM-DAT (CRED) and DesInventor for this target.		1	This indicator can inform on the following targets: 1.5 by 2030 build the resilience of the poor and those in vulnerable situations, and reduce their exposure and vulnerability to climate-related extreme events and other economic, social and environmental shocks and disasters. 13.1 strengthen resilience and adaptive capacity to climate related hazards and natural disasters in all countries
	GlobalMigrationWG		NB! Disaggregate by displacement status				

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

JointSubmissionDisplacementIndicators	REFORMULATED INDICATOR: [**Number of people killed, injured, displaced or otherwise affected by disasters]** EXPANDED REFORMULATED INDICATOR: [**Number of people killed, injured, displaced or otherwise affected by disasters, crises and other shocks]** \Displaced" to replace / encompass both "evacuated" and "relocated" as data on displacement per se more readily available at global level than in the case of evacuations and relocations. However, should be noted that the effectiveness of evacuations and resulting reduced loss of lives is one of the main ways to confirm reduced disaster risk/impacts. At the same time, while evacuations are mostly temporary and often coordinated, displacement encompasses the more longer-term forced uprooting of people and resulting uncertainty and impacts on their lives and vulnerability. Also, the category and definition of "affected" needs to be clarified and, where possible, harmonized. Current indicators 1.5.1 and 1.5.2 should be replaced as they are covered more comprehensively by/under 11.5.1 and 11.5.2. However, whereas 11.5 and its indicators cover only disasters, 1.5 covers a wider range of hazards, such as social, economic and environmental shocks. Hence a multi-purpose global indicator covering the number of people killed, injured, displaced or otherwise affected by disasters, crises and other (social, economic and environmental) shocks (linked to 1.5, 11.5, 13.1, 16.1 as well as 10.7) would be advisable, complemented by the above alternative indicator 1 for 1.5 (linked also to 11.5, 13.1, 16.1 as well as 10.7) that would measure the (number and) percentage of forcibly displaced people who have found a durable solution to their displacement as a measure of resilience among particularly vulnerable and marginalized groups (i.e. refugees and internally displaced persons). See metadata for more detailed information.	Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters (CRED) EM-DAT International Disaster Database National disaster loss databases and other government data and statistics OCHA situation reports (in ongoing humanitarian emergencies) Existing/developing (national level) Government statistics and population data. Registration and documentation of IDPs and refugees, in particular UNHCR registration (figures disaggregated by age, gender and disabilities - AGD mainstreaming) and profiling exercises, , annual refugee flow and stock figures and number of asylum applications, participatory needs assessments and population surveys by humanitarian actors. UNHCR registration data IOM Displacement Tracking Matrix Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC) IDP Database and Annual Global Estimates Reports for displacement induced by conflict/generalized violence and disasters, as well as UN Population Fund (UNFPA) figures to normalize displacement estimates. Joint IDP Profiling Service (collects data disaggregated by sex, age, location and diversity) [If expanded to cover also crises and other shocks:] Uppsala Conflict Data Programme (counts annual number of people killed as a result of conflict, wars etc.)	Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters (CRED) EM-DAT International Disaster Database (global coverage) OCHA (ongoing humanitarian emergencies) Displacement: UNHCR (global coverage, with data generally provided by Governments, based on their own definitions and methods of data collection) Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (Currently internal displacement profiles for 50 countries. Global reports since 1998.)		1	1.5, 13.1
WB	Modify to **['Number of people killed, injured, displaced, evacuated, relocated, or otherwise affected by disasters PER YEAR'; or can be normalized by population size.]**					
Indicator 11.5.2 Number of housing units damaged and destroyed (BBA)						
UNHABITAT	same indicator				2	(1.5.1/ 15.2/ 6.4.1 / 7.1.1)
UNISDR	UNISR proposes **[Direct disaster economic loss in relation to global gross domestic product]"**. UNISDR also proposes "**[Number of housing units damaged and destroyed by disasters**]" though priority is lower compared to economic loss indicators. Please see UNISDR input paper attached. "	National Disaster Loss Databases, 85 (will be more than 115 by 2016)	UNISDR		2	13.1, 1.5, 14.2, 15.3, 2.4
ECE	Indicator will be highly variable depending on variability of family income in the local society; and it is difficult to measure most vulnerable sectors of communities living in informal settlements. Many of the most vulnerable do not live in formal "housing units". It would be more advantageous to focus on major permanent structures of critical importance such as hospitals, schools, and water treatment plants. The preferred indicator would be: **["Damages by disaster type per year to critical infrastructure such as health (hospitals), educational (schools), and water treatment plants.]**	A new monitoring framework is needed drawing upon existing monitoring programmes/databases such as EM-DAT (CRED) and DesInventor.	WMO, on behalf of UN-Water: Under the UN-Water umbrella, the GEMI monitoring framework (see further description under 6.3.1) will draw on existing monitoring programmes/databases such as EM-DAT (CRED) and DesInventor for this target.			
JointSubmissionDisplacementIndicators	11.5.2 encompasses health and education facilities mentioned in 1.5.2. Overall, important to include aforementioned (and other) critical public structures and homes.				2	1.5, 13.1
WB	Modify to **["Number of housing units damaged or destroyed PER YEAR". or can be normalized by population size.]**					

Target 11.6 By 2030, reduce the adverse per capita environmental impact of cities, including by paying special attention to air quality and municipal and other waste management

Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator	**Percentage of urban solid waste regularly collected and well managed (disaggregated by type of waste)**	**Municipal bodies or private contractors. Informal collection data from NGOs and community organizations**	**UN-Habitat and WHO**	**Tier III**		**12.3, 12.5**
Suggested Indicator	**Level of ambient particulate matter (PM 10 and PM 2.5)**	**Municipal bodies or private contractor**	**UNEP, UN-Habitat**	**Tier I**		**3.9.1**
Indicator 11.6.1 Percentage of urban solid waste regularly collected and recycled (disaggregated by E-waste and non-E-waste) (BAA)						
UN-Habitat	**[Percentage of urban solid waste regularly collected and well managed]**	Municipal bodies or private contractors. Informal collection data from NGOs and community organizations	UN-Habitat and WHO		1	(12.3.1 / 12.3.2 / 12.5.1 / 12.5.2)
WB	As an alternative indicator **["Urban greenhouse gas emissions per capita and per US$ of urban GDP"]** can be considered.	For existing indicator, however, E-waste collection rate data exists, and is collected by UNU	UNU			9.1, 9.2, 11.b

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	UNSD	**[Percentage of urban solid waste regularly collected and well managed (disaggregated by type of waste)]**	Solid waste accounts in the SEEA Solid waste accounts in the SEEA Central Framework are useful in organizing information on the generation of solid waste and the management of flows of solid waste to recycling facilities, to controlled landfills or directly to the environment. Measures of the amount of waste in aggregate or of quantities of specific waste materials are important indicators of environmental pressures. The construction of solid waste accounts allows these indicators to be place in a broader context with economic data in both physical and monitoring terms. The accounts highlight various activities of the waste collection, treatment and disposal industry that include landfill operation, incineration of solid waste, recycling and reuse activities and other treatment of solid waste In sum, the accounts allows the compilation of indicators related to this target including the volume of solid waste recycled, the volume of national waste generation disaggregated by industry, etc.			1	
Indicator 11.6.2	**Level of ambient particulate matter (PM 10 and PM 2.5) (BBA)**						
	UN-Habitat	same indicator	Municipal bodies or private contractor	UNEP, UN-Habitat		2	(3.9.1.)
	WB	An alternative indicator **["Size of urban environmental footprint"]** can be considered as well.	For existing indicator, particulate matter from transport estimable by ICCT using Roadmap Model or IEA using MoMo model				3.9

Target 11.7 By 2030, provide universal access to safe, inclusive and accessible, green and public spaces, in particular for women and children, older persons and persons with disabilities

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**The average share of the built-up areas of cities in open space in public ownership and use.**	**Satellite imagery (open sources), legal documents outlining publicly owned land, community-based maps**	**UN-Habitat**	**Tier III**		**12.b, 16.1**
Indicator 11.7.1	**Area of public space as a proportion of total city space (BBB)**						
	UNHABITAT	**[The average share of the built-up areas of cities in open space in public ownership and use.]**	Satellite imagery (open sources), legal documents outlining publicly owned land, community-based maps	UN-Habitat		1	(12.b.1 / 16.1.1)
	IUCN	Currently proposed indicator: IUCN supports adoption of this indicator.	Data sources: Protected Planet (http://www.protectedplanet.net/) for protected areas data, overlaid onto urban spatial data.	Responsible entities and national availability: IUCN & UNEP-WCMC. Available globally since 1950s, and can be disaggregated to national and regional levels.		1	
	WB	This target should not only target the total number of green and public spaces, but also the distribution of those spaces along the city. This proposed indicator fails to highlight the spatial distribution of green and public spaces. We note the critical importance of public spaces, which include the street network, for providing the main channel through which infrastructure such as water pipes can be laid. Intersections per km is one way to measure the adequacy of the street network.				2	
	UNSD	**[The average share of the built-up areas of cities in open space in public ownership and use.]**	Land use account in the SEEA Central Framework Land accounts in the SEEA Central Framework are useful in organization information on land use and land cover. In particular, the land use accounts provide the statistical methodology in organization information on land use ,which reflects both the activities undertaken and the institutional arrangements put in place, for a given area for the purposes of economic production, human activities or the main maintenance and restoration of environment function The SEEA Central Framework provide a complete classification for land use comprises 46 basis classes and is presented in full in Annex I of the SEEA Central Framework. The classification allow the derivation of statistical information on land use of built up and related areas for recreational facilities. In sum, the land use account allows the compilation of indicators related to this target including the average share of the built-up areas of cities in open space for recreational use, etc. Please refer to Chapter 5.6 in the SEEA Central Framework for more information on the land accounts			1	
Indicator 11.7.2	**Proportion of residents within 0.5 km of accessible green and public space (CBB)**						

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	UNHABITAT	same indicator	Satellite imagery (open sources), legal documents outlining publicly owned land, community-based maps	UN-Habitat		2	-
	WB	This indicator is better, but still does not adequately capture the target. This indicator does not highlight the connectivity (and services) that should be provided by green and specially public spaces. The buffer is too big to be considered accessible. Furthermore, it will be hard to get high resolution spatially representative socio-demographic data which includes older persons and people with disabilities as is being proposed by some.				1	
Target 11.a	**Support positive economic, social and environmental links between urban, peri-urban and rural areas by strengthening national and regional development planning**						
	Contributor Name	**Specification**	**Source**	**Entity**	**Tier**	**Priority**	**Interlinkages**
Suggested Indicator		**Cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants that implement urban and regional development plans integrating population projections and resource needs**	**UNDESA, Census information, city data**	**UNFPA , UN-Habitat, DESA**	**Tier I**		
Indicator 11.a.1	**Cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants that implement urban and regional development plans integrating population projections and resource needs (CBB)**						
	UNHABITAT	same indicator	UNDESA, Census information, city data	UNFPA , UN-Habitat		1	no link
	UNFPA					1	11.3
Indicator 11.a.2	**Ratio of land consumption rate to population growth rate at comparable scale (CBB)**						
	UNHABITAT	used as indicator 11.3.1 and modified as efficient land use		UN-Habitat and World Bank		2	already covered by indicator 11.3.1 that is a multi-purpose indicator (2.1.2 / 3.9.1 / 6.4.1 / 6.6.1 / 11.a / 11.1 /11.b.1/ 12.1.1 / 13.2.1 / 15.3.1 / 15.4.1)
	WB	Land consumption vs. population growth has probably hit a ceiling in some countries, where there are simply no more land resources to distribute (e.g. Bangladesh, Rwanda, Burundi(. Thus this will have to be looked at with a clear context to the current country baseline.					
	UNFPA					2	11.3
Target 11.b	**By 2020, substantially increase the number of cities and human settlements adopting and implementing integrated policies and plans towards inclusion, resource efficiency, mitigation and adaptation to climate change, resilience to disasters, and develop and implement, in line with theSendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030, holistic disaster risk management at all levels**						
	Contributor Name	**Specification**	**Source**	**Entity**	**Tier**	**Priority**	**Interlinkages**
Suggested Indicator		**Percentage of cities implementing risk reduction and resilience policies that include vulnerable and marginalized groups.**	**Government data, OCHA, NGO sources, UNHCR, IOM and IDMC**	**UN-Habitat, World Bank, ICLEI, UNISDR, Rockefeller Foundation, 100 Resilient Cities, Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Reconstruction, Interamerican Development Bank, and C40 Climate Leadership Group**	**Tier I**		**13.3**
Indicator 11.b.1	**Percent of cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants that are implementing risk reduction and resilience strategies aligned with accepted international frameworks (such as the successor to the Hyogo Framework for Action on Disaster Risk Reduction) that include vulnerable and marginalized groups in their design, implementation and monitoring (CBB)**						
	UNHABITAT	**[Percentage of cities implementing risk reduction and resilience policies that include vulnerable and marginalized groups.]**	Government data, OCHA, NGO sources, UNHCR, IOM and IDMC	UN-Habitat, World Bank, ICLEI, UNISDR, Rockefeller Foundation, 100 Resilient Cities, Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Reconstruction, Interamerican Development Bank, and C40 Climate Leadership Group		1	(13.3.1)
	UNISDR	UNISDR proposes **[Number of local governments with more than 100,000 inhabitants and capital cities that adopt and implement local DRR strategies in line with Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, in relation to total number of local governments with more than 100,000 inhabitants and capital cities"]**. Please see UNISDR input paper attached."	SFDRR Monitor (to be developed), 0 (but HFA Monitor covered 133 countries in 2013)	UNISDR		1	13.1, 9.1, 11.5, 14.2
Indicator 11.b.2	**Population density measured over continuous urban footprint (BBB)**						
	UNHABITAT	covered by Indicator 11.3.1 that has been modified as follows:**[Efficient land use]**		refer to indicator 11.3.1		2	refer to indicator 11.3.1
Target 11.c	**Support least developed countries, including through financial and technical assistance, in building sustainable and resilient buildings utilizing local materials**						
	Contributor Name	**Specification**	**Source**	**Entity**	**Tier**	**Priority**	**Interlinkages**
Suggested Indicator		**Percentage of financial support that is allocated to the construction and retrofitting of sustainable, resilient and resource-efficient buildings**	**National accounts and state, provincial and local budgets**	**UN-Habitat, World Bank**	**Tier II**		
Indicator 11.c.1	**Percentage of financial support that is allocated to the construction and retrofitting of sustainable, resilient and resource-efficient buildings (CBB)**						
	UNHABITAT	same indicator	National accounts and state, provincial and local budgets	UN-Habitat, World Bank		1	no link
Indicator 11.c.2	**Sub-national government revenues and expenditures as a percentage of general government revenues and expenditures, including for buildings; own revenue collection (source revenue) as a percentage of total city revenue (CBB)**						
	UNHABITAT	same indicator				2	
Goal 12	**Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns**						

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

Target 12.1 Implement the 10-year framework of programmes on sustainable consumption and production, all countries taking action, with developed countries taking the lead, taking into account the development and capabilities of developing countries

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Number of countries with SCP National Actions Plans or SCP mainstreamed as a priority or target into national policies, poverty reduction strategies and sustainable development strategies**	**Data not available currently – quantitative data will be provided by mid-2015 as a result of the first Global Survey on SCP, and conducted on a regular basis**	**UNEP**	**Tier II**		**2.4, 4.7, 8.4, 8.9, 9a, 11c, 12.3, 12.7, 12.8, 12.a, 12.b, 14.7, 17.16, 17.19**
Indicator 12.1.1	**Number of countries with SCP National Actions Plans or SCP mainstreamed as a priority or target into national policies, poverty reduction strategies and sustainable development strategies (BBB)**						
	UNEP		Good – Quantitative data will be provided by mid-2015 as a result of the first Global Survey on SCP, and conducted on a regular basis thereafter			1	2.4, 4.7, 8.4, 8.9, 9a, 11c, 12.3, 12.7, 12.8, 12.a, 12.b, 14.7, 17.16, 17.19
Indicator 12.1.2	**Number of countries with inter-ministerial coordination and multi-stakeholder mechanisms supporting the shift to SCP, as well as organizations with agreed monitoring, implementation and evaluation arrangements (CBB)**						
	UNEP	Replace with: Number of countries / organizations actively engaged in regional cooperation supporting the implementation of SCP activities at the regional, sub-regional and national levels	Quantitative data will be provided by mid-2015 as a result of the Global Survey on SCP and conducted on a regular basis			2	2.4, 4.7, 8.4, 8.9, 9a, 11c, 12.3, 12.7, 12.8, 12.a, 12.b, 14.7, 17.16, 17.19

Target 12.2 By 2030, achieve the sustainable management and efficient use of natural resources

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Material footprint (MF) and MF/capita**	**For MF doable for the last two decades based on material extraction satellite accounts and standard MRIOs such as EXIOBASE, EORA or GTAP-WDIO; for DMI: reliable data available from UNEP and Eurostat for the last four decades**	**UNEP/OECD. The OECD's Input/output tables could be used to compute this; see http://www.oecd.org/trade/input-outputtables.htm.**	**Tier II**		**8.4, 12.5**
Indicator 12.2.1	**Domestic Material Consumption (DMC) and DMC/capita (BBB)**						
	UNEP	DMC is defined as the total amount of materials directly used in the economy (used domestic extraction plus imports), minus the materials that are exported. This indicator informs policy about the amount of materials required to produce the national product. Data is available for most countries of the world for the last 4 decades. DMC is measured in metric tons				1	8.4, 12.5
Indicator 12.2.2	**Material footprint (MF) and MF/capita (BBB)**						
	UNEP	MF is defined as the global allocation of used raw material extraction to the final demand of an economy. It is calculated using a consumption approach based on the attribution of global materials extraction to final consumption. MF is measured in metric tons. In addition, Domestic Material Input (DMI) incl. per capita rates.	For MF doable for the last two decades based on material extraction satellite accounts and standard MRIOs such as EXIOBASE, EORA or GTAP-WDIO; for DMI: reliable data available from UNEP and Eurostat for the last four decades	UNEP/OECD. The OECD's Input/output tables could be used to compute this; see http://www.oecd.org/trade/input-outputtables.htm.		2	8.4, 12.5
	IUCN	Proposed additional/alternative indicator: Indicators of sustainable use of non-living resources could usefully be supplemented by an indicator of sustainable use of species, such as the **["Red List Index (impacts of biological resource use)"]**. The indicator is used by the BIP as an indicator towards Aichi Target 4 (http://www.bipindicators.net/redlistindexforbirdsmammalsandamphibians).	Data sources: IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (http://www.iucnredlist.org/); specifically for species coded under "5 Biological resource use" in the Threats Classification Scheme (http://www.iucnredlist.org/technical-documents/classification-schemes/threats-classification-scheme).	Responsible entities and national availability: IUCN Red List Partnership (http://www.iucnredlist.org/partners/partners-and-technical-support). Available globally since 1980s, and can be disaggregated to national and regional levels (Rodrigues et al. 2014 PLoS ONE 9(11): e113934).		2	15.5 (and disaggregated versions for other targets)

Target 12.3 By 2030, halve per capita global food waste at the retail and consumer levels and reduce food losses along production and supply chains, including post-harvest losses

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Global Food Loss Index (GFLI)**	**The indicator is primarily model-based. The calculation of the indicator relies on primary data collected from government agencies in the Agricultural Production Questionnaire or harvested from official publications and other sources.**	**FAO will compile the indicator on a regular basis as part of the Food Balance Sheets in FAOSTAT**	**Tier II**		
Indicator 12.3.1	**Global Food Loss Index (GFLI) (CBB)**						
	IFAD	The indicator measures the totality of losses occurring from the time at which production of an agricultural product is recorded until it reaches the final consumer as food.	The indicator is primarily model-based. The calculation of the indicator relies on primary data collected from government agencies in the Agricultural Production Questionnaire or harvested from official publications and other sources.	FAO will compile the indicator on a regular basis as part of the Food Balance Sheets in FAOSTAT		1	
	FAO	The indicator measures the totality of losses occurring from the time at which production of an agricultural product is recorded until it reaches the final consumer as food.	The indicator is primarily model-based. The calculation of the indicator relies on primary data collected from government agencies in the Agricultural Production Questionnaire or harvested from official publications and other sources.	FAO will compile the indicator on a regular basis as part of the Food Balance Sheets in FAOSTAT		1	
Indicator 12.3.2	**Per capita food waste (kg/year), measured using Food Loss and Waste Protocol (CBB)**						
	UNEP		data availability and quality currently poor, baseline needs to be established in order to track percentage reduction. The Food Loss Index will be integrated into the Protocol, and it includes good data on food loss.			1	1.5, 2.4, 8.4

Target 12.4 By 2020, achieve the environmentally sound management of chemicals and all wastes throughout their life cycle, in accordance with agreed international frameworks, and significantly reduce their release to air, water and soil in order to minimize their adverse impacts on human health and the environment

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Number of Parties to international multilateral environmental agreements on hazardous and other chemicals and waste that meet their commitments and obligations in transmitting information as required by each relevant agreement**	**Very good availability of information through the Secretariat of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions, SAICM, Minamata Convention, and Montreal Protocol(Ozone).**	**Secretariat of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions, Interim Secretariat of the Minamata Convention, SAICM Secretariat . Countries covered: 183 Parties of the Basel Convention, 154 Parties to the Rotterdam Convention and 179 countries to the Stockholm Convention; Montreal Protocol Data are available for up to 196 countries.**	**Tier I**		**Applicable to target 17.14**
Indicator 12.4.1	**Number of Parties to, and number of national reports on the implementation of, international multilateral environmental agreements on hazardous chemicals and waste (BBB)**						
	UNEP	Modified : **[Number of Parties to international multilateral environmental agreements on hazardous and other chemicals and waste that meet their commitments and obligations in transmitting information as required by each relevant agreement]**	Very good availability of information through the Secretariat of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions, SAICM, Minamata Convention, and Montreal Protocol(Ozone).	Secretariat of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions, Interim Secretariat of the Minamata Convention, SAICM Secretariat . Countries covered: 183 Parties of the Basel Convention, 154 Parties to the Rotterdam Convention and 179 countries to the Stockholm Convention; Montreal Protocol Data are available for up to 196 countries.		1	Applicable to target 17.14
	IUCN	Proposed additional/alternative indicator: Indicators of pollution control could usefully be supplemented by an indicator of pollution impacts on nature, such as the **["Red List Index (impacts of pollution)"]**. The Red List Index is used as an indicator towards Aichi Target 12 (http://www.bipindicators.net/rli/2010).	Data sources: IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (http://www.iucnredlist.org/); specifically for species coded under "9 Pollution" in the Threats Classification Scheme (http://www.iucnredlist.org/technical-documents/classification-schemes/threats-classification-scheme).	Responsible entities and national availability: IUCN Red List Partnership (http://www.iucnredlist.org/partners/partners-and-technical-support). Available globally since 1980s, and can be disaggregated to national and regional levels (Rodrigues et al. 2014 PLoS ONE 9(11): e113934).		1	15.5 (and disaggregated versions for other targets)
Indicator 12.4.2	**Annual average levels of selected contaminants in air, water and soil from industrial sources, energy generation, agriculture, transport and wastewater and waste treatment plants (BBA)**						
	UNEP		Data on nitrogen surplus, nitrogen deposition, loss of reactive nitrogen to the environment can be obtained from : http://bipindicators.net/nitrogendposition Data on POPs and hazardous wastes can be obtained from National reports under the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions .	International Nitrogen Initiative (Indicator under the BIP) and Secretariat of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions (partly). Countries covered: 183 Parties of the Basel Convention, 154 Parties to the Rotterdam Convention and 179 countries to the Stockholm Convention			Targets 6.3, 12.4, 14.1
	WB	Indicator 12.4.2 will need a lot of careful thinking about the data sources and processing. There will be big differences in monitoring and analytical quality between countries, and data may be diverse and hard to standardize and compare. It may be necessary to issue very details instructions on which parameters to measure, where, how, how frequently and how to format the data.					
Target 12.5	**By 2030, substantially reduce waste generation through prevention, reduction, recycling and reuse**						
	Contributor Name	**Specification**	**Source**	**Entity**	**Tier**	**Priority**	**Interlinkages**
Suggested Indicator		**National recycling rate, tonnes of material recycled**	**For national recycling rate: poor data availability and quality, waste and recycling statistics not well standardized, waste amount often underestimated; for 're-used goods': data availability and quality unknown, no info about such data collection so far. But Basel Convention (National reports) include information on the generation of hazardous and other wastes, also with the indication which wastes are destined for recycling and which are for disposal).**	**Secretariat of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions (partly). Countries covered: 183 Parties of the Basel Convention, 154 Parties to the Rotterdam Convention and 179 countries to the Stockholm Convention, UNSD**	**Tier II**		**Applicable to target 11.6**
Indicator 12.5.1	**National waste generation (solid waste to landfill and incineration and disaggregated data for e-waste) in kg per capita/year (BAA)**						
	UNEP	Alternatives: **[Waste generation rates (kg per capita/year, overall and by economic sector and waste type); Percentage of hazardous wastes and other wastes, including obsolete stockpiles of pesticides, recovered, reused and recycled, and disposed; Number of facilities for environmentally sound management of hazardous waste; E-waste collection rate]**	Basel Convention (National reports include information on the generation of hazardous and other wastes, also with the indication which wastes are destined for recycling and which are for disposal) and UNU (Step Initiative)	Secretariat of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions (partly). Countries covered: 183 Parties of the Basel Convention, 154 Parties to the Rotterdam Convention and 179 countries to the Stockholm Convention			Applicable to target 11.6
Indicator 12.5.2	**National recycling rate, tonnes of material recycled (BAA)**						

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	UNEP	ADD: Share of the re-used goods on the market	For national recycling rate: poor data availability and quality, waste and recycling statistics not well standardized, waste amount often underestimated; for 're-used goods': data availability and quality unknown, no info about such data collection so far. But Basel Convention (National reports) include information on the generation of hazardous and other wastes, also with the indication which wastes are destined for recycling and which are for disposal).	Secretariat of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions (partly). Countries covered: 183 Parties of the Basel Convention, 154 Parties to the Rotterdam Convention and 179 countries to the Stockholm Convention			Applicable to targets 8.4, 11.6, 12.3
	WB	Indicator 12.5.2 could include percentage of waste going towards waste to energy schemes (waste incinerators with coupled power or heat generation)					
	UNSD	National recycling rate, tonnes of material recycled	Solid waste accounts in the SEEA Central Framework are useful in organizing information on the generation of solid waste and the management of flows of solid waste to recycling facilities, to controlled landfills or directly to the environment. Measures of the amount of waste in aggregate or of quantities of specific waste materials are important indicators of environmental pressures. The construction of solid waste accounts allows these indicators to be place in a broader context with economic data in both physical and monitoring terms. The SEEA accounts highlight various activities of the waste collection, treatment and disposal industry that include landfill operation, incineration of solid waste, recycling and reuse activities and other treatment of solid waste In sum, the accounts allows the compilation of indicators related to this target including the volume of solid waste recycled, the volume of national waste generation disaggregated by industry, etc. Please refer to Chapter 3.6.5 in the SEEA Central Framework for more information on the solid waste accounts			1	

Target 12.6 Encourage companies, especially large and transnational companies, to adopt sustainable practices and to integrate sustainability information into their reporting cycle

Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator	**Number of companies publishing sustainability reporting**	**Very Good; GRI, IIRC, UNGC or SASB all have data on company reporting and reporting content (though this would need to be pulled together and mapped against the companies listed in the Fortune Global 500**	**UNEP, GRI**	**Tier I**		**12.8**
Indicator 12.6.1 Sustainability reporting rate and quality: 1) Percentage of the world's largest companies disclosing sustainability information 2) the % of such reporting which is addressing the entire supply chain ; 3) % of the reporting companies with information in their sustainability reporting aligned with relevant indicators in the SDGs (CBB)						
UNEP	replace with: **[Market share of goods and services certified by independently verified sustainability labelling scheme]** (covering 12.8 as well)	related to 'market share' indicator: Poor; lack of data from retailers and consumer goods manufacturers, especially on a per country basis			2	market share' indicator: 8.5
UNWOMEN	UN Women fully supports this indicator.					
WB	Would it make sense to define the size of the targeted companies? If so, by which criteria? E.g. Output? Employees? Turnover?					
Indicator 12.6.2 Number or % of companies that produce sustainability reports or include sustainability information in integrated reporting (CBB)						
UNEP	revise: **[Number of companies publishing sustainability reporting]**	Very Good; GRI, IIRC, UNGC or SASB all have data on company reporting and reporting content (though this would need to be pulled together and mapped against the companies listed in the Fortune Global 500			1	12.8
WB	Would it make sense to define the size of the targeted companies? If so, by which criteria? E.g. Output? Employees? Turnover?					

Target 12.7 Promote public procurement practices that are sustainable, in accordance with national policies and priorities

Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator	**Number of countries implementing Sustainable Public Procurement policies and action plans**	**Medium. Easy access to adopted policies and action plans – more difficult to have proof of implementation**	**UNEP**	**Tier II**		**8.4, 12.2**
Indicator 12.7.1 Number of countries implementing Sustainable Public Procurement policies and action plans (CBB)						
UNEP		Medium. Easy access to adopted policies and action plans – more difficult to have proof of implementation			1	8.4, 12.2
Indicator 12.7.2 % of Sustainable Public Procurement in total public procurement for a set of prioritized product groups (CBB)						

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	UNEP	ADD: Impact of SPP on CO2 Emissions	for %of SPP: Poor; developed at a pilot level. Issues with availability of procurement data, selection of criteria and product groups; for CO2 emissions: Poor; developed at a pilot level. Issue with the availability of procurement data			2	% of SPP in total PP': 8.4, 12.2; 'CO2 emissions: 8.4, 7.2
Target 12.8	**By 2030, ensure that people everywhere have the relevant information and awareness for sustainable development and lifestyles in harmony with nature**						
	Contributor Name	**Specification**	**Source**	**Entity**	**Tier**	**Priority**	**Interlinkages**
Suggested Indicator		**Number of countries reporting inclusion of sustainable development and lifestyles topics in formal education curricula**	**Data availability is poor. One source focusing on biodiversity is the Biodiversity Barometer (http://www.bipindicators.net/biodiversitybarometer) but other sources are still under development.**	**Union for Ethical Biotrade (Indicator under the BIP)**	**Tier III**		**Targets 4.1, 4.7 , 8.4, 12.1, and 12.8**
Indicator 12.8.1	**Number of countries reporting inclusion of sustainable development and lifestyles topics in formal education curricula (BBB)**						
	UNEP		Data availability is poor. One source focusing on biodiversity is the Biodiversity Barometer (http://www.bipindicators.net/biodiversitybarometer) but other sources are still under development.	Union for Ethical Biotrade (Indicator under the BIP)		1	Targets 4.1, 4.7 , 8.4, 12.1, and 12.8
	WB	We refer to earlier comments on indicator 4.7.1, and the need to 'ask the right questions in the right way" to really find out about people's awareness and understanding of "sustainability". The term might have very different shades and meanings across countries and cultures.					
	UNFPA	Suggested specification of 12.8.1 (or alternative to 12.8.2 to help improve rating): **[Percentage of education institutions providing Education for Sustainable Development UNESCO global module (all eleven components, ranging from biodiversity and climate, to disaster risk reduction and sustainable lifestyles, to health promotion and cultural diversity, together offering a holistic approach).]**	UNESCO ESD is a global mechanism (as compared to UNECE ESD, which is regional). UNESCO ESD: http://www.unesco.org/new/en/education/themes/leading-the-international-agenda/education-for-sustainable-development/ UNECE ESD: http://www.unece.org/environmental-policy/education-for-sustainable-development/about-the-strategy-for-esd/the-strategy.html				
Indicator 12.8.2	**Frequency of researches online for key words with direct links with sustainable development and lifestyles (CBB)**						
	UNEP		No data for now – but data could be easily gathered through a search engine, analysing search query data			2	4.7, 8.4,
	WB	Excellent approach for data collection. Can this be done for other indicators dealing with "popular awareness"? The only caveat we see is that it should be normalized by the rate of internet access, and a presumed bias of higher education levels having better www access.					
Target 12.a	**Support developing countries to strengthen their scientific and technological capacity to move towards more sustainable patterns of consumption and production**						
	Contributor Name	**Specification**	**Source**	**Entity**	**Tier**	**Priority**	**Interlinkages**
Suggested Indicator		**Number of qualified green patent applications**	**Poor; however, different patent granting norms prevail across countries Green/SCP related patents can be selected from these databases**	**WIPO**	**Tier III**		**8.9, 14.7**
Indicator 12.a.1	**Amount of spending on R&D in developing countries, for SCP (BBB)**						
	UNEP	revise: **[R&D spending in environmentally sound technologies]**	Poor; reported on an annual basis, but there is a paucity of data for developing countries. R&D for environmentally sound technologies need to be selected from R&D spending for the environment			2	17.7, 17.8, 17.18
Indicator 12.a.2	**Number of patents granted annually in developing countries, for SCP products / innovations (BBB)**						
	UNEP	revise: **[Number of qualified green patent applications]**	Poor; however, different patent granting norms prevail across countries Green/SCP related patents can be selected from these databases	WIPO		1	17.7, 17.8
Target 12.b	**Develop and implement tools to monitor sustainable development impacts for sustainable tourism that creates jobs and promotes local culture and products**						
	Contributor Name	**Specification**	**Source**	**Entity**	**Tier**	**Priority**	**Interlinkages**
Suggested Indicator		**Residual flows generated as a result of tourism direct GDP (derived from an extended version of the System of Environmental-Economic Accounting (SEEA) for tourism)**	**to be developed: National Statistical Offices**	**World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO) does not collect this data since the conceptual framework is not yet in place.**	**Tier III**		
Indicator 12.b.1	**Percentage of the destinations with a sustainable tourism strategy/action plan, with agreed monitoring, development control and evaluation arrangement (CBB)**						
	UNEP		Good in Europe, Eurostat already monitors energy and emissions by sector, as well as municipal waste. However, in many countries tourism is not disaggregated from services, and data may be misleading			2	8.9, 14.7

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	UNWTO	Proposed alternative and to be developed indicator: **[Residual flows generated as a result of tourism direct GDP (derived from an extended version of the System of Environmental-Economic Accounting (SEEA) for tourism)]**	to be developed: National Statistical Offices	World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO) does not collect this data since the conceptual framework is not yet in place.		1	
Indicator 12.b.2	**Adopted national legislation to integrate sustainability objectives in tourism operations (BBB)**						
	UNEP	Revise: **[ADOPTED NATIONAL POLICIES TO FRAME SUSTAINABILITY IN TOURISM OPERATION]**	Poor; opportunity to monitor this on the national level together with other areas on tourism			1	8.9, 14.7
	UNWTO	Proposed alternative and to be developed indicator: **[Resources used and resource efficiency in the production of tourism products and services (derived from an extended version of the System of Environmental-Economic Accounting (SEEA) for tourism)]**	to be developed: National Statistical Offices	World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO) does not collect this data since the conceptual framework is not yet in place.		2	

Target 12.c Rationalize inefficient fossil-fuel subsidies that encourage wasteful consumption by removing market distortions, in accordance with national circumstances, including by restructuring taxation and phasing out those harmful subsidies, where they exist, to reflect their environmental impacts, taking fully into account the specific needs and conditions of developing countries and minimizing the possible adverse impacts on their development in a manner that protects the poor and the affected communities

Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator	**Amount of fossil fuel subsidies, per unit of GDP (production and consumption), and as proportion of total national expenditure on fossil fuels**	**Good; EA is estimating fossil fuel subsidies in a regular manner, within the framework of the World Energy Outlook with database. Considerably less information on producer subsidies.**	**IEA**	**Tier II**		**13.2**
Indicator 12.c.1	**Amount of fossil fuel subsidies, per unit of GDP (production and consumption), and as proportion of total national expenditure on fossil fuels (BBB)**					
UNEP		Good; EA is estimating fossil fuel subsidies in a regular manner, within the framework of the World Energy Outlook with database. Considerably less information on producer subsidies, no agreed methodology to benchmark them	IEA		1	13.2
UNSD		SEEA Energy Methodology related to data on energy taxes and subsidies are discussed in Ch 4 of SEEA CF as well as in SEEA Energy. Input data to populate the various energy taxes and subsidies tables come from the national accounts.	UNSD		1	

Goal 13 Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts (Acknowledging that the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change is the primary international, intergovernmental forum for negotiating the global response to climate change.)

Target 13.1 Strengthen resilience and adaptive capacity to climate-related hazards and natural disasters in all countries

Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator	**Number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters per 100,000 people.**	**National Disaster Loss Databases, 85 (will be more than 115 by 2016)**	**UNISDR**	**Tier II**		**1.5, 11.5, 14.2, 15.3**
Indicator 13.1.1	**# of countries that report having progressed from a perceived low to an intermediate or from an intermediate to a high level of adaptive capacity in relation to a two-degree world (CBB)**					
UNEP	**[Decrease in the ratio of vulnerable vs resilient (in terms of death and impact) sub-population (disaggregated+D12, poor) to exposure of climate-related extreme events and other economic, social and environmental shocks and disasters, (and food safety, cf target 2.1 and 2.4)]**	National Population Areas (geographically defined) ** Area impacted by drought event/risk: - http://www.munichre.com/en/homepage/index.html ; - http://preview.grid.unep.ch/index.php?preview=data&lang=eng ; - http://www.pdc.org/ ; - https://www.ifrc.org/en/what-we-do/disaster-management/about-disasters/definition-of-hazard/industrial-accidents/ ** Area impacted by flooding event/risk ; - http://www.dartmouth.edu/~floods/Dataaccess.htm ; - http://preview.grid.unep.ch/index.php?preview=data&lang=eng ; - http://www.munichre.com/en/homepage/index.html ; - http://www.pdc.org/ ; - https://www.ifrc.org/en/what-we-do/disaster-management/about-disasters/definition-of-hazard/industrial-accidents/ ** Area impacted by storm surge event/ risk ; - http://preview.grid.unep.ch/index.php?preview=data&lang=eng ; - http://www.munichre.com/en/homepage/index.html ; - http://www.pdc.org/ ; - https://www.ifrc.org/en/what-we-do/disaster-management/about-disasters/definition-of-hazard/industrial-accidents/ ** Area im+E265pacted by tsunami event/risk+E258 ; - http://preview.grid.unep.ch/index.php?preview=data&lang=eng ; - http://www.munichre.com/en/homepage/index.html ; - http://www.tsunami.noaa.gov/observations_data.html ; - http://www.pdc.org/ ; - https://www.ifrc.org/en/what-we-do/disaster-management/about-disasters/definition-of-hazard/industrial-accidents/ ** Area impacted by heat wave event/risk: - http://www.pdc.org/ ; - https://www.ifrc.org/en/what-we-do/disaster-management/about-disasters/definition-of-hazard/industrial-accidents/				Multi-purpose Indicator Targets 1.5 - 2.1 - 2.4 - 11.5 - 13.1

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	UNISDR	UNISR proposes **[Number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters per 100,000 people]**. Please see UNISDR input paper attached."	National Disaster Loss Databases, 85 (will be more than 115 by 2016)	UNISDR		1	11.5, 1.5, 14.2, 15.3
	UNWOMEN	Suggested addition to indicator from UN Women:**[also monitor number of countries that identify women as key stakeholders and gender equality as a priority.]**					
	IUCN	Proposed additional/alternative indicator: Indicators of climate change adaptation could usefully be supplemented by an indicator of climate change vulnerability, such as the **["Red List Index (impacts of climate change)"]**. The Red List Index is used as an indicator towards Aichi Target 12 (http://www.bipindicators.net/rli/2010).	Data sources: IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (http://www.iucnredlist.org/); specifically for species coded under "11 Climate change & severe weather" in the Threats Classification Scheme (http://www.iucnredlist.org/technical-documents/classification-schemes/threats-classification-scheme).	Responsible entities and national availability: IUCN Red List Partnership (http://www.iucnredlist.org/partners/partners-and-technical-support). Available globally since 1980s, and can be disaggregated to national and regional levels (Rodrigues et al. 2014 PLoS ONE 9(11): e113934).		2	15.5 (and disaggregated versions for other targets)
	WB	It is unclear what stands behind "adaptive capacity", but it looks like a complex amalgamate of a plethora of information, criteria, sub-indicators and subjective judgment. We are not sure it will be workable or meaningful. Would it be possible to define sectoral indicators, that could serve as proxies for overall adaptive capacity in a country? E.g. pick out agriculture / irrigation, water supply / management, and energy production as representative sectors?					
Indicator 13.1.2 # of casualties and amount of economic losses (BBB)							
	UNISDR	UNISR proposes refinement into **[\Direct disaster economic loss in relation to global gross domestic product"]**. Please see UNISDR input paper attached. "	National Disaster Loss Databases, 85 (will be more than 115 by 2016)	UNISDR		2	11.5, 1.5, 14.2, 15.3, 2.4

Target 13.2 Integrate climate change measures into national policies, strategies and planning

Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator	**Number of countries that have formally communicated the establishment of integrated low-carbon, climate-resilient, disaster risk reduction development strategies (e.g. a national adaptation plan process, national policies and measures to promote transition to environmentally-friendly substances and technologies).**	**Comment: The additional text proposed in the modified indicator aims to highlight the mitigation aspects of the relevant strategies. Information from National reports of relevant conventions**	**Secretariats for IMEAs. Under the Montreal Protocol, such policies have been communicated by over 40 countries so far.**	**Tier II**		**Target 17.16**
Indicator 13.2.1 # of countries which have formally communicated the establishment of integrated low-carbon, climate-resilient, disaster risk reduction development strategies (e.g. a national adaptation plan process) (BAA)						
UNEP	MODIFIED: **[Number of countries that have formally communicated the establishment of integrated low-carbon, climate-resilient, disaster risk reduction development strategies (e.g. a national adaptation plan process, national policies and measures to promote transition to environmentally-friendly substances and technologies).]**	Comment: The additional text proposed in the modified indicator aims to highlight the mitigation aspects of the relevant strategies. Information from National reports of relevant conventions	Secretariats for IMEAs. Under the Montreal Protocol, such policies have been communicated by over 40 countries so far.			Target 17.16
UNICEF	**[# of countries which have formally communicated the establishment of integrated low-carbon, climate-resilient, disaster risk reduction development strategies (e.g. a national adaptation plan process)]**					
UNISDR	UNISR proposes \[Number of countries with national DRR strategies in line with Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction"]. Please see UNISDR input paper attached."	SFDRR Monitor (to be developed), 0 (but HFA Monitor covered 133 countries in 2013)	UNISDR		1	13.1,9.1,11.5
UNWOMEN	Suggested addition to indicator from UN Women:**[also monitor number of countries that identify women as key stakeholders and gender equality as a priority.]**					

Target 13.3 Improve education, awareness-raising and human and institutional capacity on climate change mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning

Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator	**Number of countries that have integrated mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning into primary, secondary and tertiary curricula**		**UNICEF**	**Tier III**		
Indicator 13.3.1 # of countries that have integrated mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning into primary, secondary and tertiary curricula (CBB)						
UNICEF	**[Number of countries that have integrated mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning into primary, secondary and tertiary curricula]**					
UNISDR	UNISR proposes **[Number of countries that have probabilistic risk assessment profile and early warning system against major hazards that the country faces"]**. Please see UNISDR input paper attached."	SFDRR Monitor (to be developed), 0 (but HFA Monitor covered 133 countries in 2013)	UNISDR		1	15.3, 2.4, 11.5, 13.1
Indicator 13.3.2 % of population with increased knowledge on climate change, disaggregated by sex and age (BBB)						
UNICEF	**[% of population with increased knowledge on climate change, disaggregated by sex and age]**					

Target 13.a Implement the commitment undertaken by developed-country parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change to a goal of mobilizing jointly $100 billion annually by 2020 from all sources to address the needs of developing countries in the context of meaningful mitigation actions and transparency on implementation and fully operationalize the Green Climate Fund through its capitalization as soon as possible

Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

Suggested Indicator		**Mobilized amount of USD per year starting in 2020 accountable towards the USD 100 billion commitment**		**UNFCCC**	**Tier I**		
Indicator 13.a.1	**Mobilized amount of USD per year starting in 2020 accountable towards the USD 100 billion commitment (CBB)**						
	WB	This indicator assumes that someone actually knows how to best spent the 100 Billion commitment. Else this indicator does not really relate to "implementation" but mainly to "intention".					
Indicator 13.a.2	**% of GCF funded projects finalized and sustained afterwards through national funding to produce climate neutral solutions (CBB)**						

Target 13.b Promote mechanisms for raising capacity for effective climate change-related planning and management in least developed countries, including focusing on women, youth and local and marginalized communities

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Number of LDCs that are receiving specialized support for mechanisms for raising capacities for effective climate change related planning and management, including focusing on women, youth, local and marginalized communities**		**OECD**	**Tier III**		
Indicator 13.b.1	**# of LDCs that are receiving specialized support for mechanisms for raising capacities for effective climate change related planning and management, including focusing on women, youth, local and marginalized communities (CBB)**						

Goal 14 Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development

Target 14.1 By 2025, prevent and significantly reduce marine pollution of all kinds, in particular from land-based activities, including marine debris and nutrient pollution

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Nitrogen use efficiency composite indicator**	**GPNM and the European Nitrogen Expert Panel)**	**(sources will be identified)**	**Tier III**		
Indicator 14.1.1	**Fertilizer consumption (kg/ha of arable land) (BBA)**						
	UNEP	Alternative: **[Nitrogen use efficiency composite indicator]** - reflects the N input, the N output, the output/input ratio, and the N surplus/deficit.	GPNM and the European Nitrogen Expert Panel)	(sources will be identified)			
	WB	Inaccurate measure of nutrient pollution. Fertilizer consumption in some African countries will likely increase (currently consumption is very low), so would not include this as indicator with target that fertilizer consumption will decline in all countries.					
Indicator 14.1.2	**Metric tonnes per year of plastic materials entering the ocean from all sources (CBB)**						
	IUCN	Proposed additional/alternative indicator: Indicators of pollution sources could usefully be supplemented by an indicator of pollution impacts on nature, such as the **["Red List Index (impacts of pollution on marine species)"]**. The Red List Index is used as an indicator towards Aichi Target 12 (http://www.bipindicators.net/rli/2010).	Data sources: IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (http://www.iucnredlist.org/); specifically for species coded as "Marine" and under "9 Pollution" in the Threats Classification Scheme (http://www.iucnredlist.org/technical-documents/classification-schemes/threats-classification-scheme).	Responsible entities and national availability: IUCN Red List Partnership (http://www.iucnredlist.org/partners/partners-and-technical-support). Available globally since 1980s, and can be disaggregated to national and regional levels (Rodrigues et al. 2014 PLoS ONE 9(11): e113934).		2	15.5 (and disaggregated versions for other targets)

Target 14.2 By 2020, sustainably manage and protect marine and coastal ecosystems to avoid significant adverse impacts, including by strengthening their resilience, and take action for their restoration in order to achieve healthy and productive oceans

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**% of coastal and marine development (to be defined) with formulated or implemented ICM/MSP plans (that are harmonized where applicable), based on an ecosystem approach, that builds resilient human communities and ecosystems and provides for equitable benefit sharing and decent work**	**UNEP will be monitoring a similar indicator under its Programme of Work 2016-2017 adopted by Member States. The process can support monitoring of revised indicator 14.2.1.**	**(sources will be identified)**	**Tier III**		
Indicator 14.2.1	**Percentage of coastline with formulated and adopted ICM/MSP plans (CBB)**						
	UNISDR	UNISR proposes **[Number of mortality, missing, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters per 100,000"]**. Please see UNISDR input paper attached."	National Disaster Loss Databases, 85 (will be more than 115 by 2016)	UNISDR		1	11.5, 13.1, 1.5, 15.3
	UNEP	**[% of coastal and marine development (to be defined) with formulated or implemented ICM/MSP plans (that are harmonized where applicable), based on an ecosystem approach, that builds resilient human communities and ecosystems and provides for equitable benefit sharing and decent work]**	UNEP will be monitoring a similar indicator under its Programme of Work 2016-2017 adopted by Member States. The process can support monitoring of revised indicator 14.2.1.	(sources will be identified)			
	IUCN	Proposed additional/alternative indicator: IUCN suggests strengthening indicators proposed for 14.2 with the **["Red List Index (marine species)"]**. The Red List Index is used as an indicator towards Aichi Target 12 (http://www.bipindicators.net/rli/2010).	Data sources: IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (http://www.iucnredlist.org/); specifically for species coded as "Marine".	Responsible entities and national availability: IUCN Red List Partnership (http://www.iucnredlist.org/partners/partners-and-technical-support). Available globally since 1980s, and can be disaggregated to national and regional levels (Rodrigues et al. 2014 PLoS ONE 9(11): e113934).		1	15.5 (and disaggregated versions for other targets)
Indicator 14.2.2	**Ocean Health Index (CBB)**						

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	UNEP	[**Ocean Health Index**] (http://www.bipindicators.net/oceanhealthindex)	http://www.oceanhealthindex.org/	National Centre for Ecological Analysis and Synthesis (NCEAS) (Indicator under the BIP) (https://www.nceas.ucsb.edu/)			Targets 14.1 and 14.2
	UNISDR	UNISR proposes change into **[Direct disaster economic loss in relation to global gross domestic product]"**. Please see UNISDR input paper attached. "	National Disaster Loss Databases, 85 (will be more than 115 by 2016)	UNISDR		2	11.5, 13.1, 1.5, 15.3, 2.4
	IUCN	Proposed additional/alternative indicator: IUCN suggests strengthening indicators proposed for 14.2 with **["Coverage by protected areas of marine sites of particular importance for biodiversity"]**, using Key Biodiversity Areas to identify these. The indicator is used by the BIP as an indicator towards Aichi Target 11 (http://www.bipindicators.net/paoverlays).	Data sources: Protected Planet (http://www.protectedplanet.net/) for protected areas data; Important Bird & Biodiversity Areas (http://www.birdlife.org/datazone/site) and Alliance for Zero Extinction sites (http://www.zeroextinction.org/) for Key Biodiversity Areas data; indicator developed by Butchart et al. (2012) PLoS ONE 7(3): e32529.	Responsible entities and national availability: IUCN & UNEP-WCMC, BirdLife International, AZE. Available globally since 1950s, and can be disaggregated to national and regional levels.		2	15.1 (and disaggregated versions for other targets)

Target 14.3 Minimize and address the impacts of ocean acidification, including through enhanced scientific cooperation at all levels

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Average marine acidity (pH) measured at agreed suite of representative sampling stations**	**Marine acidity – SEEA Experimental Ecosystem Accounting condition accounts for Marine and coastal areas can be used as measurement framework for acidity.**		**Tier II**		
Indicator 14.3.1	**Average marine acidity (pH) measured at agreed suite of representative sampling stations (CBB)**						
	IUCN	Proposed additional/alternative indicator: IUCN suggests strengthening indicators proposed for 14.3 with the **["Red List Index (corals)"]**. The Red List Index is used as an indicator towards Aichi Target 12 (http://www.bipindicators.net/rli/2010).	Data sources: IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (http://www.iucnredlist.org/); specifically for coral species (Carpenter et al. 2008 Science 321: 560–563).	Responsible entities and national availability: IUCN Red List Partnership (http://www.iucnredlist.org/partners/partners-and-technical-support). Available globally since 1980s, and can be disaggregated to national and regional levels (Rodrigues et al. 2014 PLoS ONE 9(11): e113934).		2	15.5 (and disaggregated versions for other targets)
	UNSD	Average marine acidity (pH) measured at agreed suite of representative sampling stations	Marine acidity – SEEA Experimental Ecosystem Accounting condition accounts for Marine and coastal areas can be used as measurement framework for acidity.			1	
Indicator 14.3.2	**Coral coverage (CBB)**						
	UNEP	Modification: **[Change in area coverage of coral functional groups. (Total coral cover itself provides limited information on health/productivity in context of acidification.)]**					
	WB	Important to verify if there is a baseline available, against which to compare? Same goes for indicator 14.1.1. Else this would mean that we are only starting to observe a trend, that could take years to become clear and attributable to causal factors					

Target 14.4 By 2020, effectively regulate harvesting and end overfishing, illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing and destructive fishing practices and implement science-based management plans, in order to restore fish stocks in the shortest time feasible, at least to levels that can produce maximum sustainable yield as determined by their biological characteristics

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Proportion of fish stocks within biologically sustainable level**	**FAO has estimates for 584 fish stocks around world, representing 70% of global landings.**	**FAO has maintained and reported this indicator since 1974. The assessment is done at global level, not at country level, so is not comparable among countries**	**Tier I**		
Indicator 14.4.1	**Fish species, threatened (BAA)**						

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	IFAD	During the Sixteenth Meeting of the UN Open-ended informal consultative process on Oceans and the Law of the Sea, April 6-10, member states frequently mentioned the omission of an indicator on IUU fishing for SDG 14, an issue cited as being directly relevant to the three dimensions of sustainability. In view of this, FAO proposes the following indicator for target 14.6, which is also relevant for target 14.6:[**\Progress by countries in the implementation of international instruments aiming to combat IUU fishing**"]. The indicator focuses on the effort to combat IUU fishing through the effective implementation of key international instruments related to IUU fishing. The indicator is based on FAO member country responses to the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (CCRF) survey questionnaire which is circulated by FAO every two years to members and IGOs and INGOs. This indicator is calculated on the basis of the efforts being made by countries to implement key international instruments aiming to combat IUU fishing, as reported in a given year of the survey. The indicator variables are the development and implementation of national plan of action (NPOA) to combat IUU fishing in line with the IPOA-IUU; Ratification and implementation of the 2009 FAO Agreement on Port State Measures; Ratification and implementation of the 1993 FAO Compliance Agreement. The weight given to each of the variables in calculating the indicator value are as follows: Variable 1 - 40%; Variable 2 - 40%; Variable 3 - 20%. The absence of an NPOA and the lack of ratification of the binding Agreements will automatically result in a "zero" score for the respective variables, unless there is evidence that efforts to address the matter are being made (in which case some points are awarded). For each variable, the maximum score will be obtained if implementation is also present."	This new proposed indicator is not currently being monitored, but FAO's biannual survey on CCRF implementation already compiles responses by Members on the above mentioned instruments. Therefore, survey responses and results on this indicator could be reported and presented every two years to FAO's Committee on Fisheries (COFI). This information could serve the purposes of monitoring on Targets 14.4 and 14.6.	FAO		2	14.6
	FAO	During the Sixteenth Meeting of the UN Open-ended informal consultative process on Oceans and the Law of the Sea, April 6-10, member states frequently mentioned the omission of an indicator on IUU fishing for SDG 14, an issue cited as being directly relevant to the three dimensions of sustainability. In view of this, FAO proposes the following indicator for target 14.6, which is also relevant for target 14.6:[**"Progress by countries in the implementation of international instruments aiming to combat IUU fishing"**]. The indicator focuses on the effort to combat IUU fishing through the effective implementation of key international instruments related to IUU fishing. The indicator is based on FAO member country responses to the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (CCRF) survey questionnaire which is circulated by FAO every two years to members and IGOs and INGOs. This indicator is calculated on the basis of the efforts being made by countries to implement key international instruments aiming to combat IUU fishing, as reported in a given year of the survey. The indicator variables are the development and implementation of national plan of action (NPOA) to combat IUU fishing in line with the IPOA-IUU; Ratification and implementation of the 2009 FAO Agreement on Port State Measures; Ratification and implementation of the 1993 FAO Compliance Agreement. The weight given to each of the variables in calculating the indicator value are as follows: Variable 1 – 40%; Variable 2 – 40%; Variable 3 – 20%. The absence of an NPOA and the lack of ratification of the binding Agreements will automatically result in a "zero" score for the respective variables, unless there is evidence that efforts to address the matter are being made (in which case some points are awarded). For each variable, the maximum score will be obtained if implementation is also present.	This new proposed indicator is not currently being monitored, but FAO's biannual survey on CCRF implementation already compiles responses by Members on the above mentioned instruments. Therefore, survey responses and results on this indicator could be reported and presented every two years to FAO's Committee on Fisheries (COFI). This information could serve the purposes of monitoring on Targets 14.4 and 14.6.	FAO		2	14.6
	UNEP	Marine Stewardship Council engaged fisheries (Tonnage) (http://www.bipindicators.net/certifiedfisheries)	http://www.bipindicators.net/certifiedfisheries	MSC (Indicator under the BIP)			Targets 12.1, 12.6 and 14.4
	IUCN	Modify currently proposed indicator: IUCN supports the adoption of this indicator, but the current formulation of this indicator as "Fish species, threatened" would be better framed as **["Red List Index (impacts of biological resource use on marine species)"]**. The indicator is used by the BIP as an indicator towards Aichi Target 4 (http://www.bipindicators.net/redlistindexforbirdsmammalsandamphibians).	Data sources: IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (http://www.iucnredlist.org/); specifically for species coded as "Marine" and under "5 Biological Resource Use" in the Threats Classification Scheme (http://www.iucnredlist.org/technical-documents/classification-schemes/threats-classification-scheme).	Responsible entities and national availability: IUCN Red List Partnership (http://www.iucnredlist.org/partners/partners-and-technical-support). Available globally since 1980s, and can be disaggregated to national and regional levels (Rodrigues et al. 2014 PLoS ONE 9(11): e113934).		1	15.5 (and disaggregated versions for other targets)

Indicator 14.4.2 Proportion of fish stocks within biologically sustainable limits (BBA)

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	IFAD	Propose improved formulation: **["Proportion of fish stocks within biologically sustainable levels"]**, not limits. It is therefore slightly different from the FAO indicator 7.4 currently included in the Millennium Development Goals. The FAO Committee on Fisheries has requested changes (see the Reports of the 30th and 31st Sessions of the Committee on Fisheries (2012 and 2014) in the description of the status of the stocks based on sustainability to ensure clarify and reduce misunderstandings by the general public. The concept of "within biologically sustainable levels" means that abundance of the fish stock is at or higher than the level that can produce the maximum sustainable yield. Hence the new formulation is more in keeping with the objective of the target	FAO has estimates for 584 fish stocks around world, representing 70% of global landings.	FAO has maintained and reported this indicator since 1974. The assessment is done at global level, not at country level, so is not comparable among countries		1	
	FAO	Propose improved formulation: **[“Proportion of fish stocks within biologically sustainable levels”]**, not limits. It is therefore slightly different from the FAO indicator 7.4 currently included in the Millennium Development Goals. The FAO Committee on Fisheries has requested changes (see the Reports of the 30th and 31st Sessions of the Committee on Fisheries (2012 and 2014) in the description of the status of the stocks based on sustainability to ensure clarify and reduce misunderstandings by the general public. The concept of “within biologically sustainable levels” means that abundance of the fish stock is at or higher than the level that can produce the maximum sustainable yield. Hence the new formulation is more in keeping with the objective of the target	FAO has estimates for 584 fish stocks around world, representing 70% of global landings.	FAO has maintained and reported this indicator since 1974. The assessment is done at global level, not at country level, so is not comparable among countries		1	
	UNEP	**[Proportion of fish stocks within biologically sustainable limits (http://www.bipindicators.net/fishstocksinsafebiologicallimits)]**	State of the World Marine Fishery Resources (http://www.fao.org/fishery/sofia/en)	FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Department - Data available from 1974 onwards (Indicator under the BIP) (http://www.fao.org/fishery/sofia/en)			
	IUCN	Currently proposed indicator: IUCN supports adoption of this indicator, which is used by the BIP as an indicator towards Aichi Target 6 (http://www.bipindicators.net/fishstocksinsafebiologicallimits).				2	

Target 14.5 By 2020, conserve at least 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, consistent with national and international law and based on the best available scientific information

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Coverage of protected areas**	**World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA)**	**UNEP-WCMC (Indicator under the BIP)**	**Tier I**		**Targets 6.6, 14.2, 14.5, 15.1 and 15.4**
Indicator 14.5.1	**Percentage area of each country's EEZ in MPA Percentage area of ABNJ in MPA Percentage area of global ocean under MPA (CBB)**						
	UNEP	14.5.1 and 14.5.2 are very similar. See our supplemental note for suggestions on how to differentiate them.					
Indicator 14.5.2	**Coverage of protected areas (BBA)**						
	UNEP	**[Coverage of protected areas]**	World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA) (http://www.protectedplanet.net/)	UNEP-WCMC (Indicator under the BIP) (http://www.unep-wcmc.org/news/new-unep-report-unveils-world-on-track-to-meet-2020-target-for-protected-areas-on-land-and-sea)			Targets 6.6, 14.2, 14.5, 15.1 and 15.4
	IUCN	Modify currently proposed indicator: "Coverage of protected areas" focuses solely on numeric coverage, but this is a poor measure of whether the most important places for biodiversity are protected. Suggest rewording as **["Coverage by protected areas of marine sites of particular importance for biodiversity"]**, using Key Biodiversity Areas to identify this. The indicator is used by the BIP as an indicator towards Aichi Target 11 (http://www.bipindicators.net/paoverlays).	Data sources: Protected Planet (http://www.protectedplanet.net/) for protected areas data; Important Bird & Biodiversity Areas (http://www.birdlife.org/datazone/site) and Alliance for Zero Extinction sites (http://www.zeroextinction.org/) for Key Biodiversity Areas data; indicator developed by Butchart et al. (2012) PLoS ONE 7(3): e32529.	Responsible entities and national availability: IUCN & UNEP-WCMC, BirdLife International, AZE. Available globally since 1950s, and can be disaggregated to national and regional levels.		1	15.1 (and disaggregated versions for other targets)

Target 14.6 By 2020, prohibit certain forms of fisheries subsidies which contribute to overcapacity and overfishing, eliminate subsidies that contribute to illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing and refrain from introducing new such subsidies, recognizing that appropriate and effective special and differential treatment for developing and least developed countries should be an integral part of the World Trade Organization fisheries subsidies negotiation

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Dollar value of negative fishery subsidies against 2015 baseline**	**The SEEA Central Framework provides the measurement framework for environmental subsidies. Further disaggregation may be needed for negative fishery subsidies depending on how they are defined.**	**UNSD**	**Tier III**		
Indicator 14.6.1	**Dollar value of negative fishery subsidies against 2015 baseline (CBB)**						
	UNSD	**[Dollar value of negative fishery subsidies against 2015 baseline]**	The SEEA Central Framework provides the measurement framework for environmental subsidies. Further disaggregation may be needed for negative fishery subsidies depending on how they are defined.	UNSD		1	
Indicator 14.6.2	**Legal framework or tax/trade mechanisms prohibiting certain forms of fisheries subsidies (CBB)**						

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

Target 14.7 By 2030, increase the economic benefits to Small Island developing States and least developed countries from the sustainable use of marine resources, including through sustainable management of fisheries, aquaculture and tourism

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Fisheries as a % of GDP**	**SEEA Central Framework and the SEEA Agriculture Forestry and Fisheries provide information on the contribution to GDP of fisheries. The Tourism Satellite Accounts provide information on the contribution of GDP to tourism.**	**UNSD**	**Tier I**		
Indicator 14.7.1. Fisheries as a % of GDP (AAA)							
	UNSD	**[Fisheries as a % of GDP]**	SEEA Central Framework and the SEEA Agriculture Forestry and Fisheries provide information on the contribution to GDP of fisheries. The Tourism Satellite Accounts provide information on the contribution of GDP to tourism.	UNSD		1	
Indicator 14.7.2 Level of revenue generated from sustainable use of marine resources (CBB)							
	IFAD	Propose alternative to be used as second tier indicator: "**[Productivity of aquaculture in utilizing natural resources (land, water and wild stock)"]**. Target 14.7 implies that economic benefits can be derived from the sustainable use of marine resources, including through aquaculture. In fact aquaculture can generate economic benefits, and increase in aquaculture production can increase economic benefits. Increases in aquaculture productivity can further contribute to economic benefits when the natural resources are utilized more efficiently, i.e. when aquaculture yield is enhanced while the use of natural resources is better managed."	While data on aquaculture production are regularly provided by members, data sets on the use of natural resources in aquaculture are still being developed, with coverage and quality of data on land area use being much more advanced than water use and use of wild stocks.	The proposed aquaculture productivity indicator has not yet been established as a standard and readily available indicator, though FAO continues to collect data on aquaculture natural resource use.		2	
	FAO	Propose alternative to be used as second tier indicator: "Productivity of aquaculture in utilizing natural resources (land, water and wild stock)". Target 14.7 implies that economic benefits can be derived from the sustainable use of marine resources, including through aquaculture. In fact aquaculture can generate economic benefits, and increase in aquaculture production can increase economic benefits. Increases in aquaculture productivity can further contribute to economic benefits when the natural resources are utilized more efficiently, i.e. when aquaculture yield is enhanced while the use of natural resources is better managed.	While data on aquaculture production are regularly provided by members, data sets on the use of natural resources in aquaculture are still being developed, with coverage and quality of data on land area use being much more advanced than water use and use of wild stocks.	The proposed aquaculture productivity indicator has not yet been established as a standard and readily available indicator, though FAO continues to collect data on aquaculture natural resource use.		2	

Target 14.a Increase scientific knowledge, develop research capacity and transfer marine technology, taking into account the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission Criteria and Guidelines on the Transfer of Marine Technology, in order to improve ocean health and to enhance the contribution of marine biodiversity to the development of developing countries, in particular small island developing States and least developed countries

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Budget allocation to research in the field of sustainable marine technology as a percentage of all research in field of marine technology**		**UNEP**	**Tier III**		
Indicator 14.a.1 Number of researchers working in this area (BBB)							
Indicator 14.a.2 Budget allocated to research in the field of marine technology (BBB)							
	UNEP	Modification : **[Budget allocation to research in the field of sustainable marine technology as a percentage of all research in field of marine technology]**					

Target 14.b Provide access for small-scale artisanal fishers to marine resources and markets

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Percentage of catches that are subject to a catch documentation scheme or similar traceability system as a percentage of the total catches that are less than x tons and traded in major markets.**	**The indicator does not exist, but the information does exist for some countries where such catch documentation schemes already exist, which is primarily the case for developed countries. However, FAO is leading the development of guidelines for such schemes and it is anticipated that the guidelines will be discussed and possibly endorsed in 2016 (at COFI). There is sufficient interest in CDS to begin to discuss/develop a globally agreed indicator for products traded through major markets. A catch documentation scheme will provide the framework on which to build and manage the indicator.**	**The feasibility of the indicator will primarily be determined by countries and regions that put in place a CDS, and if instituted the cost of data collection will be a part of the CDS, and will operate on a continuing basis. The information in a CDS is collected along the value chain and to precisely calculate the indicator, the country where distribution of the product ends will be the collector of the information since they will have the point of origin and destination and will be able to determine the total volume of product landed and the volume of product landed that is subject to a CDS for catch less than X tons."**	**Tier III**		

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

Indicator 14.b.1 By 2030, X% of small scale fisheries certified as sustainable; Y% increase in market access for small scale fisheries (CBB)							
	IFAD	Propose improved alternative: **["Percentage of catches that are subject to a catch documentation scheme or similar traceability system as a percentage of the total catches that are less than x tons and traded in major markets"]**. This indicator measures the "access to markets" aspect of the target by using the % of the catch that is subject to some form of a catch document scheme (or similar traceability system) traded in major markets. It is assumed this level of catch is associated with small scale artisanal fisheries since catches of less than x tons are characteristic of such fisheries and that this catch is traceable and legally caught, and changes in the % will reflect changes in access to markets by small scale artisanal fisheries. In terms of the development agenda, fishers are more likely to have improved incomes when they can access major markets either directly or indirectly, and this access to major markets is increasingly dependent on being able to document that the fish were caught legally and/or sustainably. A catch documentation scheme (or similar), and especially one that follows the developing guidelines, will provide the means to track the changes in access to markets."	The indicator does not exist, but the information does exist for some countries where such catch documentation schemes already exist, which is primarily the case for developed countries. However, FAO is leading the development of guidelines for such schemes and it is anticipated that the guidelines will be discussed and possibly endorsed in 2016 (at COFI). There is sufficient interest in CDS to begin to discuss/develop a globally agreed indicator for products traded through major markets. A catch documentation scheme will provide the framework on which to build and manage the indicator.	\The feasibility of the indicator will primarily be determined by countries and regions that put in place a CDS, and if instituted the cost of data collection will be a part of the CDS, and will operate on a continuing basis. The information in a CDS is collected along the value chain and to precisely calculate the indicator, the country where distribution of the product ends will be the collector of the information since they will have the point of origin and destination and will be able to determine the total volume of product landed and the volume of product landed that is subject to a CDS for catch less than X tons."		1	
	FAO	Propose improved alternative: **["Percentage of catches that are subject to a catch documentation scheme or similar traceability system as a percentage of the total catches that are less than x tons and traded in major markets".]** This indicator measures the “access to markets” aspect of the target by using the % of the catch that is subject to some form of a catch document scheme (or similar traceability system) traded in major markets. It is assumed this level of catch is associated with small scale artisanal fisheries since catches of less than x tons are characteristic of such fisheries and that this catch is traceable and legally caught, and changes in the % will reflect changes in access to markets by small scale artisanal fisheries. In terms of the development agenda, fishers are more likely to have improved incomes when they can access major markets either directly or indirectly, and this access to major markets is increasingly dependent on being able to document that the fish were caught legally and/or sustainably. A catch documentation scheme (or similar), and especially one that follows the developing guidelines, will provide the means to track the changes in access to markets.	The indicator does not exist, but the information does exist for some countries where such catch documentation schemes already exist, which is primarily the case for developed countries. However, FAO is leading the development of guidelines for such schemes and it is anticipated that the guidelines will be discussed and possibly endorsed in 2016 (at COFI). There is sufficient interest in CDS to begin to discuss/develop a globally agreed indicator for products traded through major markets. A catch documentation scheme will provide the framework on which to build and manage the indicator.	The feasibility of the indicator will primarily be determined by countries and regions that put in place a CDS, and if instituted the cost of data collection will be a part of the CDS, and will operate on a continuing basis. The information in a CDS is collected along the value chain and to precisely calculate the indicator, the country where distribution of the product ends will be the collector of the information since they will have the point of origin and destination and will be able to determine the total volume of product landed and the volume of product landed that is subject to a CDS for catch less than X tons.		1	
Indicator 14.b.2 By 2030, increase by X% the proportion of global fish catch from sustainably managed small scale fisheries (CBB)							
	IFAD	During the Sixteenth Meeting of the UN Open-ended informal consultative process on Oceans and the Law of the Sea, April 6-10, member states generally agreed that the preliminary indicators on small-scale fisheries are deemed inadequate to measure the social dimensions of Target 14.b. Concern was also expressed that the target's preliminary indicators do not seem to provide a comprehensive monitoring mechanism for the implementation of the FAO's Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication. In view of these concerns, FAO proposes an alternative indicator formulated as **\[Progress by countries in adopting and implementing a legal/regulatory/policy/institutional framework which recognizes and protects access rights for small-scale fisheries"]**. This indicator measures the "access rights" aspect of the target. Due to the diverse nature of small-scale fisheries in different countries, there is no globally agreed definition for small-scale fisheries, which became also evident during the development process of the Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication (SSF Guidelines) recently endorsed by the FAO Committee on Fisheries (COFI). See metadata for a more detailed explanation.	There is currently no such indicator but the biennial FAO survey questionnaire on the CCRF implementation will include new questions in relation to small-scale fisheries and the implementation of the SSF Guidelines. The first results will become available for FAO's Committee on Fisheries (COFI) in 2016. COFI 2016 can provide an opportunity to sharpen the questions if needed. In addition, there will be a specific COFI agenda item on small-scale fisheries. Data could therefore be produced at country level every two years for COFI through the electronic questionnaire.	FAO/COFI		1	

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	FAO	During the Sixteenth Meeting of the UN Open-ended informal consultative process on Oceans and the Law of the Sea, April 6-10, member states generally agreed that the preliminary indicators on small-scale fisheries are deemed inadequate to measure the social dimensions of Target 14.b. Concern was also expressed that the target's preliminary indicators do not seem to provide a comprehensive monitoring mechanism for the implementation of the FAO's Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication. In view of these concerns, FAO proposes an alternative indicator formulated as **["Progress by countries in adopting and implementing a legal/regulatory /policy/institutional framework which recognizes and protects access rights for small-scale fisheries".]** This indicator measures the "access rights" aspect of the target. Due to the diverse nature of small-scale fisheries in different countries, there is no globally agreed definition for small-scale fisheries, which became also evident during the development process of the Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication (SSF Guidelines) recently endorsed by the FAO Committee on Fisheries (COFI). See metadata for a more detailed explanation.	There is currently no such indicator but the biennial FAO survey questionnaire on the CCRF implementation will include new questions in relation to small-scale fisheries and the implementation of the SSF Guidelines. The first results will become available for FAO's Committee on Fisheries (COFI) in 2016. COFI 2016 can provide an opportunity to sharpen the questions if needed. In addition, there will be a specific COFI agenda item on small-scale fisheries. Data could therefore be produced at country level every two years for COFI through the electronic questionnaire.	FAO/COFI		1	

Target 14.c Enhance the conservation and sustainable use of oceans and their resources by implementing law as reflected in UNCLOS, which provides the legal framework for the conservation and sustainable use of oceans and their resources, as recalled in paragraph 158 of The Future We Want.

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Number of countries implementing either legally or programmatically the provisions set out in regional seas protocols and ratification and implementation of the ILO Maritime and Fisheries Conventions**		**ILO**	**Tier II**		
Indicator 14.c.1	**Adoption of a legal framework and number of associated court cases (CBB)**						
Indicator 14.c.2	**Number of countries implementing either legally or programmatically the provisions set out in regional seas protocols (BBB)**						
	ILO	Alternative indicator: **[Number of countries implementing either legally or programmatically the provisions set out in regional seas protocols and ratification and implementation of the ILO Maritime and Fisheries Conventions]**					

Goal 15 Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss

Target 15.1 By 2020, ensure the conservation, restoration and sustainable use of terrestrial and inland freshwater ecosystems and their services, in particular forests, wetlands, mountains and drylands, in line with obligations under international agreements

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Forest area as a percentage of total land area**	**FAO: Retain as most relevant indicator. The indicator is already included among the indicators for the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) (indicator 7.1 "Proportion of land covered by forest"). In order to provide a precise definition of the indicator, it is crucial to provide a definition of "Forest" and "Total Land Area". According to the FAO definitions, Forest is defined as "land spanning more than 0.5 hectares with trees higher than 5 meters and a canopy cover of more than 10 percent, or trees able to reach these thresholds in situ. It does not include land that is predominantly under agricultural or urban land use.**	**FAO carries out global forest resources assessments at 5 year intervals, the results of the FRA 2015 will be released in September 2015 and next assessment will most likely be in 2020**	**Tier I**		**6.6**
Indicator 15.1.1	**Coverage of protected areas broken down by ecosystem type, including total area of forests in protected areas (thousands of hectares) (BAA)**						
	UNEP	**[Protected area overlays with biodiversity (http://www.bipindicators.net/paoverlays)]**	http://www.bipindicators.net/paoverlays	UNEP-WCMC, Alliance for Zero Extinction, Conservation International, BirdLife International (Indicator under the BIP)			Targets 6.6, 14.2, 14.5, 15.1 and 15.4
	IUCN	Modify currently proposed indicator: "Coverage of protected areas broken down by ecosystem type" is a more useful indicator than coverage alone (see comments on indicator 14.5.2 above), but it would be much better to use **["Coverage by protected areas of important sites for terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity"]** as these are the precise locations where effective conservation is needed to "halt the decline in biodiversity" (Butchart et al PLoS ONE 7(3): e32529). The indicator is used by the BIP as an indicator towards Aichi Target 11 (http://www.bipindicators.net/paoverlays).	Data sources: Protected Planet (http://www.protectedplanet.net/) for protected areas data; Important Bird & Biodiversity Areas (http://www.birdlife.org/datazone/site) and Alliance for Zero Extinction sites (http://www.zeroextinction.org/) for Key Biodiversity Areas data; indicator developed by Butchart et al. (2012) PLoS ONE 7(3): e32529.	Responsible entities and national availability: IUCN & UNEP-WCMC, BirdLife International, AZE. Available globally since 1950s, and can be disaggregated to national and regional levels.		1	Disaggregated versions for 6.6, 14.2, 14.5, 15.4
Indicator 15.1.2	**Forest area as a percentage of total land area (AAA)**						

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	IFAD	Retain as most relevant indicator. The indicator is already included among the indicators for the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) (indicator 7.1 "Proportion of land covered by forest"). In order to provide a precise definition of the indicator, it is crucial to provide a definition of "Forest" and "Total Land Area". According to the FAO definitions, Forest is defined as "land spanning more than 0.5 hectares with trees higher than 5 meters and a canopy cover of more than 10 percent, or trees able to reach these thresholds in situ. It does not include land that is predominantly under agricultural or urban land use.	The national figures in the global assessments are reported by the countries themselves following standardized format, definitions and reporting years	FAO carries out global forest resources assessments at 5 year intervals, the results of the FRA 2015 will be released in September 2015 and next assessment will most likely be in 2020		1	6.6
	FAO	Retain as most relevant indicator. The indicator is already included among the indicators for the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) (indicator 7.1 "Proportion of land covered by forest"). In order to provide a precise definition of the indicator, it is crucial to provide a definition of "Forest" and "Total Land Area". According to the FAO definitions, Forest is defined as "land spanning more than 0.5 hectares with trees higher than 5 meters and a canopy cover of more than 10 percent, or trees able to reach these thresholds in situ. It does not include land that is predominantly under agricultural or urban land use.	The national figures in the global assessments are reported by the countries themselves following standardized format, definitions and reporting years	FAO carries out global forest resources assessments at 5 year intervals, the results of the FRA 2015 will be released in September 2015 and next assessment will most likely be in 2020		1	6.6
	UNEP	**[Management Effectiveness of Protected Areas (http://www.bipindicators.net/pamanagement)]**	Global Database on Protected Area Management Effectiveness (GD-PAME)	UNEP-WCMC (Indicator under the BIP)			Targets 14.2, 14.4, 14.5, 15.1, 15.2
	IUCN	Currently proposed indicator: IUCN supports adoption of this indicator, which is used by the BIP as an indicator towards Aichi Target 5 (http://www.bipindicators.net/forestextent).				2	

Target 15.2 By 2020, promote the implementation of sustainable management of all types of forests, halt deforestation, restore degraded forests and substantially increase afforestation and reforestation globally.

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Forest cover under sustainable forest management**	**A quality descriptor is associated with the forest area, forest management planning and operational stakeholder involvement components of the index. Coverage is aggregated to the country level in the country reports. In 2015 some 155 countries reported for most of the elements in the index that add to a total of 2.200 M ha (55% global forest area). A common definition is used for each element so comparability across countries is good.**	**FAO maintains this index based on country reporting beginning with the Global Forest Resources Assessment (FRA) 2015. Data is collected globally every 5 years with reporting anticipated in 2015, 2020, 2025 and 2030.**	**Tier II**		**15.3**
Indicator 15.2.1	**Net forest emissions (BBB)**						
	IFAD	Propose alternative: **[Carbon stock in woody biomass"]**. Carbon stocks in woody biomass reflect both forest extent and quality, and change in these stocks indicate changes relevant not only to greenhouse gas emissions but also trends related to production, conservation and management. The implementation of sustainable forest management, a reduction of deforestation, an increase in restored forest and increased afforestation are all directly linked to increased biomass carbon stocks - as success is achieved in each of these areas, biomass carbon stocks should remain stable or increase."	The national figures in the global assessments are reported by countries following a standardized format, definitions and reporting years to provide a means of comparability across countries.	FAO carries out global forest resources assessments at 5 year intervals. The indicator is aggregated to the national scale.		1	
	FAO	Propose alternative: **["Carbon stock in woody biomass"].** Carbon stocks in woody biomass reflect both forest extent and quality, and change in these stocks indicate changes relevant not only to greenhouse gas emissions but also trends related to production, conservation and management. The implementation of sustainable forest management, a reduction of deforestation, an increase in restored forest and increased afforestation are all directly linked to increased biomass carbon stocks - as success is achieved in each of these areas, biomass carbon stocks should remain stable or increase.	The national figures in the global assessments are reported by countries following a standardized format, definitions and reporting years to provide a means of comparability across countries.	FAO carries out global forest resources assessments at 5 year intervals. The indicator is aggregated to the national scale.		1	
	WB	Important to specify what "net forest emissions' means? Carbon emissions from deforestation? An alternate key indicator to watch would be net forest loss					
Indicator 15.2.2	**Forest cover under sustainable forest management (BBA)**						
	IFAD	The value computed for each country will be in the form of "percentage (%) of forest area", which is calculated as follows: Numerator: Total area (in hectares) of forests under Forest Management Plans, Denominator: Total area (in hectares) of forest cover	Data quality and completeness are still very low. All underlying data is collected via the Global Forest Resources Assessment (FRA), administered by FAO's Forestry Department every 5 years	FAO/Forest Resources Assessment (FRA)		2	15.3

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	FAO	Also known as **["Sustainable Forest Management Index"]**, this indicator is defined as the area of permanent forest use as modified by the presence of: A) Policies and legislation supporting SFM; B) A national stakeholder platform for input to forest policy; C) National forest inventory data; D) National forest reporting; E) Forest management plans that include soil and water conservation, high conservation value forest and social engagement, and; F) Stakeholder involvement in operational planning, operations and review. The unit of measure is the number of hectares covered by these attributes.	A quality descriptor is associated with the forest area, forest management planning and operational stakeholder involvement components of the index. Coverage is aggregated to the country level in the country reports. In 2015 some 155 countries reported for most of the elements in the index that add to a total of 2.200 M ha (55% global forest area). A common definition is used for each element so comparability across countries is good.	FAO maintains this index based on country reporting beginning with the Global Forest Resources Assessment (FRA) 2015. Data is collected globally every 5 years with reporting anticipated in 2015, 2020, 2025 and 2030.		1	15.3
	UNEP	**[Area of forest under sustainable management: certification (http://www.bipindicators.net/forestcertification)]**	Area of Forest under Sustainable Management: Certification (http://www.bipindicators.net/forestcertification)	FAO, FSC, PEFC (Indicator under the BIP)			Targets 15.2 and 15b
	IUCN	Currently proposed indicator: IUCN supports adoption of this indicator, which is used by the BIP as an indicator towards Aichi Target 5 (http://www.bipindicators.net/forestdegradation).					

Target 15.3 By 2030, combat desertification, restore degraded land and soil, including land affected by desertification, drought and floods, and strive to achieve a land degradation-neutral world

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Trends in land degradation**	**** Trends in Land Cover/Land Use: (1) Global: e.g. http://www.glcn.org/databases/se_change_en.jsp, http://www.esa-landcover-cci.org/ (2) Regional: e.g. http://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/data/corine-land-cover ** Trends in Land Productivity: remote sensing data bases of NDVI and other Vegetation Indices/Variables, e.g. http://gcmd.gsfc.nasa.gov/index.html, http://land.copernicus.eu/global/themes/Vegetation, http://wad.jrc.ec.europa.eu/ ** Trends in Soil Organic Carbon: global spatial layers: Harmonized World Soil Database (HWSD), http://eusoils.jrc.ec.europa.eu/ESDB_Archive/octop/Global.html ** More detail on all elements of data sources may be found in the attached document on meta-data**	**UNCCD, UNSD**	**Tier II**		**1.5, 2.3, 2.4, 6.6, 12.2, 13.1, 14.1, 15.1, 15.2 and 15.5**
Indicator 15.3.1		**Trends in land degradation (BBA)**					
	UNCCD	**[Trends in land degradation]:** The indicator provides trends in the areal extent of degrading versus stable/improving land at global, regional and national levels. The trends would be built upon and refer to a baseline of the current areal extent of actually degrading and stable/improving land. The measurement unit of the indicator is total spatial area (e.g. ha, km2) of land showing degrading trend/stability/improving trend per reference land unit (e.g. global land surface, continental/regional/national land surface) or the respective proportion (% of land surface of spatial reference unit). In a tiered approach the indicator derivation is based on the synoptic utilization of trends in land cover/land use (Tier 1), trends in land productivity (Tier 2a) and soil organic carbon (SOC) (Tier 2b) primarily available through widely used global data sources. ** Tier 1: Trends in land use/cover; Tier 2a: Trends in land productivity; Tier 2b: Trends in soil organic carbon stocks. ** This indicator will be used by UNCCD country Parties to set nationally voluntary targets on land degradation neutrality and report on progress towards achieving these targets.	** Trends in Land Cover/Land Use: (1) Global: e.g. http://www.glcn.org/databases/se_change_en.jsp, http://www.esa-landcover-cci.org/ (2) Regional: e.g. http://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/data/corine-land-cover ** Trends in Land Productivity: remote sensing data bases of NDVI and other Vegetation Indices/Variables, e.g. http://gcmd.gsfc.nasa.gov/index.html, http://land.copernicus.eu/global/themes/Vegetation, http://wad.jrc.ec.europa.eu/ ** Trends in Soil Organic Carbon: global spatial layers: Harmonized World Soil Database (HWSD), http://eusoils.jrc.ec.europa.eu/ESDB_Archive/octop/Global.html ** More detail on all elements of data sources may be found in the attached document on meta-data	The United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) compiles data for this indicator. The necessary data are obtained primarily from remote sensing data acquired and processed by various international organizations. As part of the reporting and review process, national estimates derived from global datasets are validated by UNCCD country Parties or replaced with national estimates using data sourced/computed nationally/locally.		1	1.5, 2.3, 2.4, 6.6, 12.2, 13.1, 14.1, 15.1, 15.2 and 15.5
	UNISDR	UNISR proposes**[\Agricultural loss due to disasters"].** Please see UNISDR input paper attached."	National Disaster Loss Databases, 85 (will be more than 115 by 2016)	UNISDR		1	2.4, 1.5, 13.1, 11.5, 14.2
	WB	Are there reliable remote sensing techniques to capture these? Else it may be difficult to define, let alone capture degradation, especially as this often is a gradual process with a strong cyclical overlay (e.g. a long term trend masked by strong fluctuations of a few years)					
	UNSD	Trends in land degradation	SEEA EEA - provides the statistical framework for measuring land degradation.	UNSD			
Indicator 15.3.2		**Area of land/soils under sustainable management (BBA)**					
	IFAD	This indicator aims to assess the adoption of sustainable land management practices pertaining to land use/management of crops, pastures and forestry of which Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) is a subset. It is therefore proposed that this indicator is produced as an aggregation of the new indicator proposal for target 2.4, **["Percentage of agricultural area under sustainable agricultural practices" and the current indicator proposal for 15.2.2, "Forest cover under sustainable forest management". "]**	At global level, currently there is no data available. However many if not most of the countries record areas which are the object of practices contributing to environmental sustainability under various schemes, from which the data could be computed.	FAO		1	2.4 and 15.2 - see definition

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	FAO	This indicator aims to assess the adoption of sustainable land management practices pertaining to land use/management of crops, pastures and forestry of which Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) is a subset. It is therefore proposed that this indicator is produced as an aggregation of the new indicator proposal for target 2.4, "Percentage of agricultural area under sustainable agricultural practices" and the current indicator proposal for 15.2.2, "Forest cover under sustainable forest management".	At global level, currently there is no data available. However many if not most of the countries record areas which are the object of practices contributing to environmental sustainability under various schemes, from which the data could be computed.	FAO		1	2.4 and 15.2 - see definition
	UNEP	**[Area of agricultural Ecosystems under Sustainable Management (http://www.bipindicators.net/sustainableagriculture)]**	http://www.fao.org/nr/lada/	FAO (Indicator under the BIP)			
	UNISDR	UNISR proposes **[\Number of countries that have probabilistic risk assessment profile and early warning system against major hazards that the country faces".]** Please see UNISDR input paper attached."	SFDRR Monitor (to be developed), 0 (but HFA Monitor covered 133 countries in 2013)	UNISDR		2	13.3, 2.4, 11.5, 13.1
	IUCN	Currently proposed indicator: IUCN supports adoption of this indicator, which is used by the BIP as an indicator towards Aichi Target 7 (http://www.bipindicators.net/sustainableagriculture).				1	
	WB	Same as above					

Target 15.4 By 2030, ensure the conservation of mountain ecosystems, including their biodiversity, in order to enhance their capacity to provide benefits that are essential for sustainable development

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Coverage of protected areas**	**World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA) (http://www.protectedplanet.net/)**	**UNEP-WCMC (Indicator under the BIP) (http://www.unep-wcmc.org/news/new-unep-report-unveils-world-on-track-to-meet-2020-target-for-protected-areas-on-land-and-sea)**	**Tier I**		**Targets 6.6, 14.2, 14.5, 15.1 and 15.4**
Suggested Indicator		**Mountain Green Cover Index**	**The data set GLC SHARE developed by FAO will be used as basis for the computation of the indicator, jointly with the definition of mountain areas as provided by UNEP-WCMC.**	**Thanks to the way GLC-SHARE is structured, FAO's Mountain Green Cover Index has a global coverage and it is possible to compute the indicator at the global, regional, national and sub-national level.**	**Tier I**		**The proposed Index will provide a meaningful proxy for assessing the progress of all three mountain targets (ie., 6.6.; 15.1; and 15.4)**
Indicator 15.4.1		**Coverage of protected areas (AAA)**					
	UNEP	**[Coverage of protected areas (http://www.bipindicators.net/pacoverage)]**	World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA) (http://www.protectedplanet.net/)	UNEP-WCMC (Indicator under the BIP) (http://www.unep-wcmc.org/news/new-unep-report-unveils-world-on-track-to-meet-2020-target-for-protected-areas-on-land-and-sea)			Targets 6.6, 14.2, 14.5, 15.1 and 15.4
	IUCN	Modify currently proposed indicator: "Coverage of protected areas" focuses solely on numeric coverage, but this is a poor measure of whether the most important places for biodiversity are protected. Suggest rewording as **["Coverage by protected areas of important sites for montane biodiversity"]**, using Key Biodiversity Areas as one way of identifying the latter. The indicator is used by the BIP as an indicator towards Aichi Target 11 (http://www.bipindicators.net/paoverlays).	Data sources: Protected Planet (http://www.protectedplanet.net/) for protected areas data; Important Bird & Biodiversity Areas (http://www.birdlife.org/datazone/site) and Alliance for Zero Extinction sites (http://www.zeroextinction.org/) for Key Biodiversity Areas data; indicator developed by Butchart et al. (2012) PLoS ONE 7(3): e32529.	Responsible entities and national availability: IUCN & UNEP-WCMC, BirdLife International, AZE. Available globally since 1950s, and can be disaggregated to national and regional levels.		1	15.1 (and disaggregated versions for other targets)
	UNSD	Coverage of protected areas	The SEEA Experimental Ecosystem Accounts provides a classification of ecosystem assets included protected areas. WCMC has a data-base on protected areas/mountains which is obtained looking at elevation and slopes.	UNSD		1	
Indicator 15.4.2		**Mountain Green Cover Index (CBB)**					

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	IFAD	Even though many protected areas are found in mountains, in general they are not an adequate proxy for the overall global situation of biodiversity conservation in mountain areas. Protected areas, as they name says, are protected from overexploitation as often people are not allowed to live and have economic activities in these areas. The information gathered by monitoring only the situation of mountain protected areas would not, in our views, represent an adequate proxy for monitoring the non protected areas which in fact can experience high population pressure, deforestation, overexploitation, degradation, etc. that are not found in protected areas. Indeed, "islands" of protected areas can be surrounded by areas that are totally degraded and overexploited especially when communities are not allowed to live in protected areas and therefore tend to amass around them. By adopting the "green cover index" all mountain green cover will be assessed and used to analyse the trend. Hence the green cover index seems a more comprehensive and reliable indicator. In addition, as technology develops, it is expected that additional tools will soon be available (such as google earth) to monitor the vegetation cover changes with a very high definition (1sqm or less) and a high frequency (weekly or even daily updates).	The data set GLC SHARE developed by FAO will be used as basis for the computation of the indicator, jointly with the definition of mountain areas as provided by UNEP-WCMC.	Thanks to the way GLC-SHARE is structured, FAO's Mountain Green Cover Index has a global coverage and it is possible to compute the indicator at the global, regional, national and sub-national level.		1	The proposed Index will provide a meaningful proxy for assessing the progress of all three mountain targets (ie., 6.6.; 15.1; and 15.4)
	FAO	Even though many protected areas are found in mountains, in general they are not an adequate proxy for the overall global situation of biodiversity conservation in mountain areas. Protected areas, as they name says, are protected from overexploitation as often people are not allowed to live and have economic activities in these areas. The information gathered by monitoring only the situation of mountain protected areas would not, in our views, represent an adequate proxy for monitoring the non protected areas which in fact can experience high population pressure, deforestation, overexploitation, degradation, etc. that are not found in protected areas. Indeed, "islands" of protected areas can be surrounded by areas that are totally degraded and overexploited especially when communities are not allowed to live in protected areas and therefore tend to amass around them. By adopting the "green cover index" all mountain green cover will be assessed and used to analyse the trend. Hence the green cover index seems a more comprehensive and reliable indicator. In addition, as technology develops, it is expected that additional tools will soon be available (such as google earth) to monitor the vegetation cover changes with a very high definition (1sqm or less) and a high frequency (weekly or even daily updates).	The data set GLC SHARE developed by FAO will be used as basis for the computation of the indicator, jointly with the definition of mountain areas as provided by UNEP-WCMC.	Thanks to the way GLC-SHARE is structured, FAO's Mountain Green Cover Index has a global coverage and it is possible to compute the indicator at the global, regional, national and sub-national level.		1	The proposed Index will provide a meaningful proxy for assessing the progress of all three mountain targets (ie., 6.6.; 15.1; and 15.4)

Target 15.5 Take urgent and significant action to reduce the degradation of natural habitats, halt the loss of biodiversity, and, by 2020, protect and prevent the extinction of threatened species

Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator	**Red List Index**	**IUCN Red List Index (http://www.iucnredlist.org/about/publication/red-list-index)**	**IUCN (Indicator under the BIP)**	**Tier I**		**Targets 15.5, 12.2, 12.4,**
Indicator 15.5.1 Red List Index (BAA)						
UNEP	**[Red List Index (http://www.bipindicators.net/rli/2010)]**	IUCN Red List Index (http://www.iucnredlist.org/about/publication/red-list-index)	IUCN (Indicator under the BIP)			Targets 15.5, 12.2, 12.4,
IUCN	Currently proposed indicator: The score of B indicates that some countries think that this indicator is challenging to implement. However, an indicator based on a relevant disaggregation of the global RLI is easy to produce. IUCN and BirdLife International are facilitating this by working on making it easy to download the national RLI and data from the IUCN Red List and BirdLife International websites. This comment also applies to Indicators 15.7.1 and 15.8.2. The indicator is used by the BIP as an indicator towards Aichi Target 12 (http://www.bipindicators.net/rli/2010). (For information, note that the name "Red List Index" should not be taken to imply that the indicator is produced by aggregating a number of disparate metrics, in the same way that, e.g., the Multidimensional Poverty Index is compiled. Instead the RLI is an indicator of trends in species' extinction risk, as measured using the IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria, and is compiled from data on changes over time in the Red List Category for each species, excluding any changes driven by improved knowledge or revised taxonomy.)	Data sources: IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (http://www.iucnredlist.org/).	Responsible entities and national availability: IUCN Red List Partnership (http://www.iucnredlist.org/partners/partners-and-technical-support). Available globally since 1980s, and can be disaggregated to national and regional levels (Rodrigues et al. 2014 PLoS ONE 9(11): e113934).		1	Disaggregated versions for 2.4, 2.5, 3.9, 12.2, 12.4, 13.1, 14.1, 14.2, 14.3, 14.4, 15.7, 15.8
Indicator 15.5.2 Living Planet Index (CBB)						
UNEP	**[Living Planet Index (http://www.bipindicators.net/lpi)]**	Living Planet Index (http://wwf.panda.org/about_our_earth/all_publications/living_planet_report/living_planet_index2/)	WWF (Indicator under the BIP)			

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	IUCN	Currently proposed indicator: IUCN supports adoption of this indicator, which is used by the BIP as an indicator towards Aichi Target 12 (www.bipindicators.net/lpi).				2	
Target 15.6	**Ensure fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources and promote appropriate access to such resources**						
	Contributor Name	**Specification**	**Source**	**Entity**	**Tier**	**Priority**	**Interlinkages**
Suggested Indicator		**Number of countries that have adopted legislative, administrative and policy frameworks for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol**	**CBD Nagoya Protocol Website, List of signatures and ratifications (http://www.bipindicators.net/NagoyaProtocolratification)**	**CBD (Indicator under the BIP)**	**Tier I**		**Targets 1.4, 15.6**
Indicator 15.6.1	**Number of countries that have adopted legislative, administrative and policy frameworks for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol (BBB)**						
	UNEP	**[Ratification Status of the Nagoya Protocol (http://www.bipindicators.net/NagoyaProtocolratification)]**	CBD Nagoya Protocol Website, List of signatures and ratifications (http://www.bipindicators.net/NagoyaProtocolratification)	CBD (Indicator under the BIP)			Targets 1.4, 15.6
	IUCN	Currently proposed indicator: IUCN supports adoption of this indicator, which is used by the BIP as an indicator towards Aichi Target 16 (http://www.bipindicators.net/NagoyaProtocolratification).				1	
Indicator 15.6.2	**Number of permits or their equivalents made available to the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearinghouse established under the Nagoya Protocol and number of Standard Material Transfer Agreements, as communicated to the Governing Body of the International Treaty (CBB)**						
	IFAD	This indicator builds on concrete cases in which agreement has been reached on the transfer of genetic resources between the resource provider and the resource recipient, including on how benefits arising from the use of the genetic resources will be shared. An increase of permits or their equivalents made available to the ABS Clearinghouse and an increase of SMTAs communicated to the Governing Body of the International Treaty will indicate an increased number of cases in which access to genetic resources has been granted and in which resulting benefits will be shared on the basis of "mutually agreed terms".	The information the indicator is based on is already being collected under the International Treaty. The ABS Clearinghouse is ready to start collecting permits/ equivalents	The CBD Secretariat, through its ABS Clearinghouse, would be responsible for the ABS permits or their equivalents (https://absch.cbd.int/). FAO, through its Secretariat of the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, would track the SMTAs.		1	This indicator is also relevant to the access and benefit sharing segment of target 2.5.
	FAO	This indicator builds on concrete cases in which agreement has been reached on the transfer of genetic resources between the resource provider and the resource recipient, including on how benefits arising from the use of the genetic resources will be shared. An increase of permits or their equivalents made available to the ABS Clearinghouse and an increase of SMTAs communicated to the Governing Body of the International Treaty will indicate an increased number of cases in which access to genetic resources has been granted and in which resulting benefits will be shared on the basis of “mutually agreed terms”.	The information the indicator is based on is already being collected under the International Treaty. The ABS Clearinghouse is ready to start collecting permits/ equivalents	The CBD Secretariat, through its ABS Clearinghouse, would be responsible for the ABS permits or their equivalents (https://absch.cbd.int/). FAO, through its Secretariat of the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, would track the SMTAs.		1	This indicator is also relevant to the access and benefit sharing segment of target 2.5.
Target 15.7	**Take urgent action to end poaching and trafficking of protected species of flora and fauna and address both demand and supply of illegal wildlife products**						
	Contributor Name	**Specification**	**Source**	**Entity**	**Tier**	**Priority**	**Interlinkages**
Suggested Indicator		**Red List Index for species in trade**	**Data sources: IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (http://www.iucnredlist.org/); specifically for species coded under "5 Biological resource use" in the Threats Classification Scheme (http://www.iucnredlist.org/technical-documents/classification-schemes/threats-classification-scheme).**	**Responsible entities and national availability: IUCN Red List Partnership (http://www.iucnredlist.org/partners/partners-and-technical-support). Available globally since 1980s, and can be disaggregated to national and regional levels (Rodrigues et al. 2014 PLoS ONE 9(11): e113934).**	**Tier I**		**15.5 (and disaggregated versions for other targets)**
Suggested Indicator		**Proportion of detected trade in wildlife and wildlife products that is illegal**	**1. The records of the legal trade are collected by the CITES Secretariat and are maintained in a database by the UNEP-World Conservation Monitoring Centre, United Kingdom. All CITES Parties are required to report and data availability is good. 2.The wildlife seizure records are being collected by the CITES Secretariat and the World Customs Organization. UNODC has complied these data in a global database which contains over 125,000 seizure incidents at present. 3.Declared values for imported wildlife products. These are collected by national governments and are maintained in the World WISE database by UNODC.**	**UNODC (in cooperation with the CITES Secretariat)**	**Tier II**		
Indicator 15.7.1	**Red List Index for species in trade (BBB)**						
	UNEP	**[Status of Species in Trade (http://www.bipindicators.net/speciestrade)]**	IUCN Red List of Threatened Species	CITES, IUCN (Indicator under the BIP)			
	UNODC			2 (UNODC comment: This indicator tracks species decline due to all causes, and is not specific to poaching and trafficking)			

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	IUCN	Data sources: IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (http://www.iucnredlist.org/); specifically for species coded under “5 Biological resource use” in the Threats Classification Scheme (http://www.iucnredlist.org/technical-documents/classification-schemes/threats-classification-scheme).	Data sources: IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (http://www.iucnredlist.org/); specifically for species coded under "5 Biological resource use" in the Threats Classification Scheme (http://www.iucnredlist.org/technical-documents/classification-schemes/threats-classification-scheme).	Responsible entities and national availability: IUCN Red List Partnership (http://www.iucnredlist.org/partners/partners-and-technical-support). Available globally since 1980s, and can be disaggregated to national and regional levels (Rodrigues et al. 2014 PLoS ONE 9(11): e113934).		1	15.5 (and disaggregated versions for other targets)
Indicator 15.7.2	**Ratio of indexed value of total CITES-listed wildlife seizures to indexed value of total CITES wild-sourced export permits issued. (CBB)**						
	UNODC	Indicator of poaching: **[Proportion of detected trade in wildlife and wildlife products that is illegal]** (PIT) Definition: The proportion of detected trade in wildlife and wildlife products that is illegal is defined as the proportion of total CITES-listed wildlife seizures to the total CITES wild-sourced export permits issued. The different wildlife products traded and seized are compared and aggregated by applying a value index.	1. The records of the legal trade are collected by the CITES Secretariat and are maintained in a database by the UNEP-World Conservation Monitoring Centre, United Kingdom. All CITES Parties are required to report and data availability is good. 2.The wildlife seizure records are being collected by the CITES Secretariat and the World Customs Organization. UNODC has complied these data in a global database which contains over 125,000 seizure incidents at present. 3.Declared values for imported wildlife products. These are collected by national governments and are maintained in the World WISE database by UNODC.	UNODC (in cooperation with the CITES Secretariat)		1	n/a

Target 15.8 By 2020, introduce measures to prevent the introduction and significantly reduce the impact of invasive alien species on land and water ecosystems and control or eradicate the priority species

Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator	**Adoption of national legislation relevant to the prevention or control of invasive alien species**		**IUCN ISSG (Indicator under the BIP)**	**Tier I**		
Indicator 15.8.1	**Adoption of national legislation relevant to the prevention or control of invasive alien species (BAA)**					
UNEP	**[Adoption of national legislation relevant to the prevention or control of invasive alien species]**		IUCN ISSG (Indicator under the BIP)			
IUCN	Currently proposed indicator: IUCN supports adoption of this indicator, which is used by the BIP as an indicator towards Aichi Target 9 (http://www.bipindicators.net/iaslegislationadoption).				2	
Indicator 15.8.2	**Red List Index for birds showing trends driven by invasive alien species (BBB)**					
UNEP	**[Red List Index for birds showing trends driven by invasive alien species]**	http://www.birdlife.org/datazone/sowb/casestudy/164	Birdlife (Indicator under the BIP)			
IUCN	Currently proposed indicator: The name of this indicator should be adjusted from “Red List Index for birds showing trends driven by invasive alien species” to be **[“Red List Index (impacts of invasive alien species)”]**. The indicator is used by the BIP as an indicator towards Aichi Target 9 (http://www.bipindicators.net/birdrlitrendsdrivenbyias). Note that this does not need to be restricted to birds: this indicator has been applied to mammals and amphibians too, so delete "for birds" from the title, making this consistent with Indicators 14.5.2,15.5.1, and 15.7.1. We support the inclusion of this indicator as one of the few global metrics illustrating the impact of invasive alien species on native biodiversity.	Data sources: IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (http://www.iucnredlist.org/); specifically for species coded under “8 Invasive & other problematic species, genes & diseases” in the Threats Classification Scheme (http://www.iucnredlist.org/technical-documents/classification-schemes/threats-classification-scheme).	Responsible entities and national availability: IUCN Red List Partnership (http://www.iucnredlist.org/partners/partners-and-technical-support). Available globally since 1980s, and can be disaggregated to national and regional levels (Rodrigues et al. 2014 PLoS ONE 9(11): e113934).		1	15.5 (and disaggregated versions for other targets)

Target 15.9 By 2020, integrate ecosystem and biodiversity values into national and local planning, development processes, poverty reduction strategies and accounts

Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator	**Number of national development plans and processes integrating biodiversity and ecosystem services values**			**Tier II**		
Indicator 15.9.1	**National programme on the measurement of values of biodiversity or on the implementation of the SEEA-EEA (BBB)**					
Indicator 15.9.2	**Number of national development plans and processes integrating biodiversity and ecosystem services values (BBB)**					

Target 15.a Mobilize and significantly increase financial resources from all sources to conserve and sustainable use biodiversity and ecosystems

Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator	**Official development assistance in support of the CBD**	**OECD (Indicator under the BIP)**	**OECD**	**Tier I**		**Targets 1.a and 15.a**
Indicator 15.a.1	**Official Development Assistance (BBB)**					
UNEP	**[Official development assistance in support of the CBD (http://www.bipindicators.net/oda)]**		OECD (Indicator under the BIP)			Targets 1.a and 15.a
IUCN	Currently proposed indicator: IUCN supports adoption of this indicator, which is used by the BIP as an indicator towards Aichi Target 20 (http://www.bipindicators.net/oda).				1	
Indicator 15.a.2	**National incentive schemes that reward positive contribution to biodiversity and ecosystem services (BBB)**					

Target 15.b Mobilize significant resources from all sources and at all levels to finance sustainable forest management and provide adequate incentives to developing countries to advance such management, including for conservation and reforestation

Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

Suggested Indicator		Forestry official development assistance and forestry FDI		OECD	Tier II		
Indicator 15.b.1	Public funding for sustainable forest management (BBB)						
Indicator 15.b.2	Forestry official development assistance and forestry FDI (BBB)						

Target 15.c Enhance global support for efforts to combat poaching and trafficking of protected species, including by increasing the capacity of local communities to pursue sustainable livelihood opportunities

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		Proportion of detected trade in wildlife and wildlife products that is illegal	1. The records of the legal trade are collected by the CITES Secretariat and are maintained in a database by the UNEP-World Conservation Monitoring Centre, United Kingdom. All CITES Parties are required to report and data availability is good. 2.The wildlife seizure records are being collected by the CITES Secretariat and the World Customs Organization. UNODC has complied these data in a global database which contains over 125,000 seizure incidents at present. 3.Declared values for imported wildlife products. These are collected by national governments and are maintained in the World WISE database by UNODC.	UNODC (in cooperation with the CITES Secretariat)	Tier II		
Indicator 15.c.1	Ratio of indexed value of total CITES-listed wildlife seizures to indexed value of total CITES wild-sourced export permits issued (CBB)						
	UNODC	See above under 15.7	See above under 15.7	See above under 15.7		See above under 15.7	See above under 15.7
Indicator 15.c.2	Extent to which sustainable practices and management by women and men pastoralists, farmers, fishers, forest dwellers on common lands, including national and trans-national mobility, are legally protected and enhanced by policies and regulations (CBB)						

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

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

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		Number of victims of intentional homicide by age, sex, mechanism and where possible type of perpetrator, per 100,000 population	Two separate sources exist at country level: a) criminal justice system b) public health/civil registration	UNODC collects and publishes data from criminal justice systems through its annual data collection (UN Crime Trends Survey, UN-CTS); WHO collects and publishes data produced by public health/civil registration. UNODC and WHO are working together to harmonize data and procedures to produce joint UNODC-WHO homicide estimates at country, regional and global level. Considering data collected by both UNODC and WHO, national data on homicide are available for 174 countries (at least one data point after 2009). Time series data on homicide suitable for monitoring are available for 141 countries (at least 3 data points, the most recent for 2011 or later). When national data on homicide are not available, estimates are produced by WHO.	Tier I/II		5.2
Suggested Indicator		Conflict-related deaths per 100,000 people (disaggregated by age, sex and cause)	Estimates of conflict related death is collected by the IISS Armed Conflict Database, the UCDP Battle-Related Deaths Dataset, PRIO Battle-Deaths Data and WHO.	Data on conflict-related deaths is collected by the IISS Armed Conflict Database, the UCDP Battle-Related Deaths Dataset, PRIO Battle-Deaths Data and WHO estimates of deaths by cause.	Tier II		16.2, 16.3, 16.4, 16.6
Indicator 16.1.1	Homicide and conflict-related deaths per 100,000 people (AAA)						
	OHCHR	[Violent crime rate (intentional homicide, assault and sexual violence, including attempts) per 100,000 population [proposed due to gender bias of homicide rate]]	National crime statistics	Data currently collected by UNODC, but other agencies could participate.			5.2, 10.3, 16.1, 16.2

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	EOSG/RoLU, PBSO, UNDP, UNODC (in consultation with others)	Retain this indicator. Disaggregate by age, sex, region and population group, displacement and migratory status (including statelessness).	This indicator contains two distinct data sources. With regards to intentional homicide, national level data is collected through the criminal justice system and the public health / civil registration. Estimates of conflict related death is collected by the IISS Armed Conflict Database, the UCDP Battle-Related Deaths Dataset, PRIO Battle-Deaths Data and WHO.	UNODC and WHO collect data on intentional homicide for 174 countries. Data on conflict-related deaths is collected by the IISS Armed Conflict Database, the UCDP Battle-Related Deaths Dataset, PRIO Battle-Deaths Data and WHO estimates of deaths by cause.		1	16.2, 16.3, 16.4, 16.6
	UNICEF	**[Homicide and conflict-related deaths per 100,000 people (disaggregated by age, sex and cause)]**					
	UNODC	**[Number of victims of intentional homicide per 100,000 population]**	Two separate sources exist at country level: a) criminal justice system b) public health/civil registration	UNODC collects and publishes data from criminal justice systems through its annual data collection (UN Crime Trends Survey, UN-CTS); WHO collects and publishes data produced by public health/civil registration. UNODC and WHO are working together to harmonize data and procedures to produce joint UNODC-WHO homicide estimates at country, regional and global level. Considering data collected by both UNODC and WHO, national data on homicide are available for 174 countries (at least one data point after 2009). Time series data on homicide suitable for monitoring are available for 141 countries (at least 3 data points, the most recent for 2011 or later). When national data on homicide are not available, estimates are produced by WHO.		1	Target 5.2: intentional homicide data, when properly disaggregated, can be used to quantify gender-based killings, a very relevant indicator to monitor violence against women (5.2.1 and 5.2.2)
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for this indicator to be disaggregated by sex and age.					
Indicator 16.1.2	**Percentage of the adult population aged 18 and older, subjected to violence within the last 12 months, by type (physical, psychological and/or sexual) (BAA)**						
	OHCHR	**[Percentage of the population subjected to physical, psychological or sexual violence within the last 12 months [proposed to avoid exclusion of an important group, children, from an indicator which aims to reduce all forms of violence]]**	Victimisation surveys				5.2, 10.3, 16.1, 16.2
	EOSG/RoLU, PBSO, UNDP, UNODC (in consultation with others)	Retain this indicator. Disaggregate by age, sex, region and population group, displacement and migratory status (including statelessness). Ensure disaggregation by type of violence.	Crime victimisation surveys.	UNODC (on selected data also WHO, UNICEF, UN Women and the International Crime Victimization Survey (ICVS)). 72 countries have implemented at least one national victimisation survey since 2009.		2	16.2.2. The indicator also monitors other targets: 5.2 (women), 10.3 (hate crimes), 16.2 (children).
	UNODC	**[Percentage of individuals who experienced violence within the last 12 months, by type (physical and sexual)]**	Victimisation surveys	UNODC collects data on prevalence respectively of sexual assault and physical assault through the annual data collection UN-CTS. In UNODC data repository, prevalence data on sexual assault are available for 25 countries. According to a recent review conducted at global level, 72 countries have implemented at least one national victimisation survey after 2009		2	16.2
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for this indicator to be disaggregated by sex and age.					
	GlobalMigrationWG	**["Percentage of refugees and IDPs who have found a durable solution"]** See full specification in attached meta-data word file"	administrative data maintained by host countries (ministries and agencies in charge of adjudication of refugee status, immigration authorities in charge of refugee resettlement, interior ministries in charge of issuing work and residents permits and naturalization procedures)	Members of the Global Migration Group. Existing reporting: UNHCR (Statistical Yearbook, online Population Database), IOM (Displacement Tracking Matrix); IDMC (annual reports on displacement)			10.7; 11.5

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	EOSG/RoLU, PBSO, UNDP, UNODC (in consultation with others)	**[Proportion of people that feel safe walking alone around the area where they live.]** Disaggregate by age, sex, region and population group.	Crime victimisation surveys. 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.	Potential for collection by the International Crime Victimization Survey (ICVS)		3	The indicator also monitors other targets: 5.2 (women), 10.2 (non-discrimination), 10.3 (hate crimes), 16.2 (children).

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

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Percentage of children aged 1-14 years who experienced any physical punishment by caregivers in the past month**	**Household surveys such as MICS that have been collecting data on this indicator in low- and middle-income countries since 2005.**	**UNICEF. Fully comparable data are available for some 60 low- and middle-income countries**	**Tier II**		**16.1.2. The indicator also monitors other targets: 5.2 (women), 10.3 (hate crimes).**
Suggested Indicator		**Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age and form of exploitation**	**National governments/Field studies**	**UNODC, Data on the number of detected victims of TIP is available for over 130 countries**	**Tier I**		**Target 5.2**
Indicator 16.2.1	**Percentage of young adults aged 18-24 years who have experienced violence by age 18, by type (physical, psychological and/or sexual) (BBA)**						
	EOSG/RoLU, PBSO, UNDP, UNODC (in consultation with others)	Replace with **["Percentage of children aged 1-14 years who experienced any physical punishment by caregivers in the past month"]**	Household surveys such as MICS that have been collecting data on this indicator in low- and middle-income countries since 2005.	UNICEF. Fully comparable data is available for some 60 low- and middle-income countries.		1	16.1.2. The indicator also monitors other targets: 5.2 (women), 10.3 (hate crimes).
	UNICEF	**[Percentage of young women and men aged 18-24 years who experienced sexual violence by age 18]**	Household surveys, including DHS that have been collecting data on this indicator in low- and middle-income countries since the late 1990s.	UNICEF. Fully comparable data are available for some 50 low- and middle-income countries		1	
	UNICEF	**[Percentage of children aged 1-14 years who experienced any physical punishment by caregivers in the past month]**	Household surveys such as MICS that have been collecting data on this indicator in low- and middle-income countries since 2005.	UNICEF. Fully comparable data are available for some 60 low- and middle-income countries		1	
	UNODC	**[Percentage of young adults aged 18-24 years subject to violence by age 18, by type (physical and sexual)]**	Victimisation surveys	UNODC collects data on prevalence of physical and sexual assault (see indicator 16.1.2), the suggested indicator 16.2.1 should be newly collected.		2	16.1.1
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for this indicator to be disaggregated by sex.					
Indicator 16.2.2	**Number of victims of human trafficking per 100,000 people (CAA)**						
	OHCHR	**[Reported number of victims of trafficking (within and across countries), slavery, exploitation and forced labour]**	Multiple data sources - see attached metadata				5.2, 8.7, 16.1, 16.2, 16.4
	EOSG/RoLU, PBSO, UNDP, UNODC (in consultation with others)	Replace with **"[Percentage of young women and men aged 18-24 years who experienced sexual violence by age 18"]**	Household surveys, including DHS that have been collecting data on this indicator in low- and middle-income countries since the late 1990s.	UNICEF. Fully comparable data is available for some 50 low- and middle-income countries.		2	16.2.2. The indicator also monitors other targets: 5.2 (women), 10.3 (hate crimes).
	UNODC	**[Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age and form of exploitation]**	National governments/Field studies	UNODC, Data on the number of detected victims of TIP is available for over 130 countries		1	Target 5.2
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for this indicator to be disaggregated by sex and age.					
	GlobalMigrationWG	See full specification in attached meta-data word file	Administrative statistics from the criminal justice system (courts, police, etc.); disaggregate by migratory status. Current data sources include the UNODC Global Report on Trafficking in Persons, the U.S. Department of State's Trafficking in Persons Report; IOM Trafficked Migrants Assistance Database	Ministries of Justice/Interior, Global Migration Group		1	10.7; 16.2
	EOSG/RoLU, PBSO, UNDP, UNODC (in consultation with others)	Disaggregate by age, sex, region and population group.	Administrative data from the criminal justice system. Current global data sources include the UNODC Global Report on Trafficking Persons, the U.S. Department of State's Trafficking in Persons Report; IOM Trafficked Migrants Assistance Database.	Global Migration Group		3	This indicator also monitors target 5.2 (women), 8.7 (worst forms of child labour and forced labour), 10.7 (migration), 16.1 (violence), 16.4 (organized crime).
	UNFPA	Alternative suggestion could be: **[Number of reported victims of human trafficking as per the Palermo Protocol, to help address possible underreporting**]. (UNODC)	??	UNODC			

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

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

Suggested Indicator		**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)**	**Victimisation surveys**	**UNODC collects data on crime reporting rate through the annual data collection UN-CTS. Data on crime reporting rates are currently available for approx. 35 countries.**	**Tier II**		**16.a**
Suggested Indicator		**Unsentenced detainees as percentage of overall prison population**	**Prison administration**	**UNODC collects data on prisons through its annual data collection (UN-CTS). Data on unsentenced and total detainees from the UN-CTS are available from 114 countries. The country coverage can improve if other sources (NGOs) are included (data for additional 70 countries are available, bringing the total to 184 countries).**	**Tier II**		
Indicator 16.3.1		**Percentage of people who have experienced a dispute, reporting access to an adequate dispute resolution mechanism (CBB)**					
	EOSG/RoLU, PBSO, UNDP, UNODC (in consultation with others)	Replace with **["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."]** 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. Disaggregate by age, sex, region and population group. Ensure disaggregation by type of mechanism."	Household surveys; data is available for 107 countries	World Bank (prospective)		1	16.6, 16.b
	UNODC	**[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).]**	Victimisation surveys	UNODC collects data on crime reporting rate through the annual data collection UN-CTS. Data on crime reporting rates are currently available for approx. 35 countries.		2	16.a
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for this indicator to be disaggregated by sex, location, income and other context specific factors.					
	WB	**[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]**	Household surveys	World Bank (prospective); 107		1	16.6; 16.b
Indicator 16.3.2		**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 (BAA)**					
	OHCHR	**[Average period of pre-trial detention]**	Administrative data				16.3, 16.6, 16.10
	EOSG/RoLU, PBSO, UNDP, UNODC (in consultation with others)	Replace with **\[Unsentenced detainees as percentage of overall prison population."]** Disaggregate by age, sex, region and population group. This indicator, with a focus on an important aspect of the criminal justice system, is complementary to the first indicator."	UNODC collects data through its annual data collection (UN Survey of Crime Trends and the Operations of Criminal Justice Systems, UN-CTS). UN-CTS includes data for 114 countries. This coverage could increase to 184 countries if other sources (research institutions and NGOs) are included.	UNODC, United Nations Survey of Crime Trends and the Operations of Criminal Justice Systems mandated by the UN General Assembly (UN-CTS).		2	This indicator monitors target 16.6 (effective institutions) and 16.10 (fundamental freedoms)
	UNODC	**[Unsentenced detainees as percentage of overall prison population]**	Prison administration	UNODC collects data on prisons through its annual data collection (UN-CTS). Data on unsentenced and total detainees from the UN-CTS are available from 114 countries. The country coverage can improve if other sources (NGOs) are included (data for additional 70 countries are available, bringing the total to 184 countries).		1	16.6
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for this indicator to be disaggregated by sex and age.					
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**					
	Contributor Name	**Specification**	**Source**	**Entity**	**Tier**	**Priority**	**Interlinkages**
Suggested Indicator		**Total value of inward and outward illicit financial flows (in current US$).**	**http://www.gfintegrity.org/issues/data-by-country/**	**Perhaps the IMF should be responsible. The FfD 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 their volume and breakdown". GFI publishes data for 151 countries."**	**Tier II**		**Target 16.5 (illicit financial flows include monies received through corruption). Target 8.3 (development-oriented policies). Target 17.1 (illicit financial flows includes tax avoidance and tax evasion, which reduces domestic tax revenues)**

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

Suggested Indicator	**Percentage of seized and collected firearms that are recorded and traced, in accordance with international standards and legal instruments**		**UNODC has been mandated by the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime to collect indicators related to firearm trafficking including the one proposed here.**	**Tier III**		
Indicator 16.4.1	**Total volume of inward and outward illicit financial flows (CBB)**					
EOSG/RoLU, PBSO, UNDP, UNODC (in consultation with others)	Replace with **[Total value of inward and outward illicit financial flows (in current US$).\"]** The indicator covers various aspects of this target, including revenues emanating from illicit arms sales and organized crime. The UN Economic Commission for Africa, UNDP, Global Financial Integrity and others have produced global country-by country estimates for illicit financial flows. See separate Technical information on methodologies. "	http://www.gfintegrity.org/issues/data-by-country/	Perhaps the IMF should be responsible. The FfD draft text of 6 May 2015 "invite[s] the United Nations, IMF and the World Bank in collaboration with regional organizations, to publish official estimates of their volume and breakdown". GFI publishes data for 151 countries."		1	Target 16.5 (illicit financial flows include monies received through corruption). Target 8.3 (development-oriented policies). Target 17.1 (illicit financial flows includes tax avoidance and tax evasion, which reduces domestic tax revenues)
WB	Additional indicators could be: **[(1) Criminal investigations and prosecutions focusing on combatting corruption, tax evasion, criminal networks and money laundering; by country (number of cases); and (2) Freezing, confiscation/recovery and return of proceeds of crime (with details on key crimes), by country (US$).]**	Sources for these indicators are: FATF - Financial Action Task Force and its affiliates; UNCAC Conference of State Parties; Country data; OECD/Global Forum data (bribery, tax, asset recovery and development).				
EOSG/RoLU, PBSO, UNDP, UNODC (in consultation with others)	**[Percentage of small arms marked and recorded at the time of import in accordance with international standards.]** Compliance with international standards (see "sources and data collection" below for further definition) will require a state to mark and record actual numbers of arms imported into the country. This is an important indicator that contributes effectively to measuring the reduction in illicit arms flows. The international standards include those agreed to by all UN Member States in the International Tracing Instrument and required of States party to the UN Firearms Protocol.	1. International standards on import marking: <U+0095> International Instrument to Enable States to Identify and Trace, in a Timely and Reliable Manner, Illicit Small Arms and Light Weapons (Article 8.b) (Note: Politically-binding agreement applicable to all UN Member States; also known as the International Tracing Instrument). <U+0095> Firearms Protocol supplementing the UN Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime (Article 8.1.b) (Note: Legally binding agreement applicable only to States Parties). <U+0095> International Small Arms Control Standards (ISACS) Module 05.30, "Marking and Recordkeeping" (Note: ISACS, developed by the UN, synthesizes the import marking standards contained in the above two instruments). 2. Data on whether States conduct import marking <U+0095> Biennial national reports on States' implementation of the International Tracing Instrument (Note: States have been reporting on their implementation of the ITI since it was negotiated in 2005. As such, data can be collected by means of an already existing reporting mechanism). <U+0095> Monitoring of States' implementation of the Firearms Protocol. "	UN Office for Disarmament Affairs (UNODA) (Note: UNODA is the repository for national reports on implementation of the International Tracing Instrument, including on import marking). UN Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) (Note: UNIDIR has conducted analyses of States' implementation of the International Tracing Instrument, including on import marking). For implementation of the Firearms Protocol: UNODC		2	16.1, 16.2, 16.3, 16.6
UNODC	Percentage of seized and collected firearms that are recorded and traced, in accordance with international standards and legal instruments		UNODC has been mandated by the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime to collect indicators related to firearm trafficking including the one proposed here.		1	

Target 16.5 Substantially reduce corruption and bribery in all their forms

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**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. Disaggregate by age, sex, region and population group. This concept of bribery prevalence makes clear that it has to be measured amongst those who had contact with a public official.**	**Household corruption surveys and victimisation surveys with a module on bribery. At least 72 countries have implemented at least one national victimisation survey after 2009. In addition, 9 African countries have already implemented or are in the process of implementing a victimisation survey module as part of the Strategy for Harmonisation of Statistics for Africa (SHaSA).**	**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).**	**Tier II**		**This indicator is proposed to monitor the following targets: 1.4 (access to basic services), 1a (resource mobilization), 10.b (ODA), 16.3 (rule of law), 16.6 (accountable institutions), 16.10 (protection of fundamental freedoms), 17.1 (domestic resource mobilization).**
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 months (CBB)**						

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	EOSG/RoLU, PBSO, UNDP, UNODC (in consultation with others)	Replace with **["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."]** Disaggregate by age, sex, region and population group. This concept of bribery prevalence makes clear that it has to be measured amongst those who had contact with a public official."	Household corruption surveys and victimisation surveys with a module on bribery. At least 72 countries have implemented at least one national victimisation survey after 2009. In addition, 9 African countries have already implemented or are in the process of implementing a victimisation survey module as part of the Strategy for Harmonisation of Statistics for Africa (SHaSA).	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).		1	This indicator is proposed to monitor the following targets: 1.4 (access to basic services), 1a (resource mobilization), 10.b (ODA), 16.3 (rule of law), 16.6 (accountable institutions), 16.10 (protection of fundamental freedoms), 17.1 (domestic resource mobilization).
	UNODC	**[Number of persons who paid a bribe to a public official, or were asked for a bribe by these public officials, during the last 12 months as a percentage of persons who had at least one contact with a public official in the same period (also called bribery prevalence)]**	Household corruption surveys or victimisation surveys with module on bribery	UNODC collects data on bribery prevalence through the annual data collection UN-CTS. Taking into account replies to UN-CTS and other bribery prevalence data produced by national statistical offices, no less than 20 countries have bribery prevalence data officially produced. This number does not include data derived from corruption surveys produced by NGOs, research institutions and others.		1	16.3: bribery prevalence is relevant to monitor rule of law. Moreover, bribery prevalence among justice/law enforcement officials is used to monitor access to justice
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 months (CBB)**						
	EOSG/RoLU, PBSO, UNDP, UNODC (in consultation with others)	Replace with **["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."]** This concept of bribery prevalence makes clear that it has to be measured amongst those businesses who had contact with a public official."	Business corruption surveys or business victimisation surveys with module on bribery.	UNODC		2	This indicator is proposed to monitor the following targets: 1a (resource mobilization), 8.3 (promotion of private enterprise, 10.b (ODA), 12.2 (sustainable development of natural resources), 16.3 (rule of law), 16.6 (accountable institutions), 16.10 (protection of fundamental freedoms), 17.1 (domestic resource mobilization).
	UNODC	**[Number of businesses that paid a bribe to a public official, or were asked for a bribe by these public officials, during the last 12 months as a percentage of all businesses who had at least one contact with a public official in the same period]**	Business corruption surveys or business victimisation surveys with module on bribery	Business bribery surveys have been carried out in a number of countries around the world and could be replicated in other countries. UNODC provides advice and technical support to interested countries.		2	16.3
Target 16.6	**Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels**						
	Contributor Name	**Specification**	**Source**	**Entity**	**Tier**	**Priority**	**Interlinkages**
Suggested Indicator	**Primary government expenditures as a percentage of original approved budget**	**Data for 149 countries (collected on 398+ occasions) available at www.pefa.org.**	**PEFA Secretariat (World Bank); 149 countries**	**Tier I**		**This indicator is also relevant for targets: 1.3 (social protection), 3.8 (health coverage), 4.1 (education), 17.1 (domestic resources), 17.9 (capacity building), 17.13 (macroeconomic stability).**	
Suggested Indicator	**Percentage of recommendations to strengthen national anti-corruption frameworks (institutional and legislative) implemented, as identified through the UNCAC Implementation Review Mechanism.**	**Review Mechanism of the United Nations Convention against Corruption**	**All 175+ States Party to the UNCAC are subject to a periodic review in the UNCAC Review Mechanism. To date, with well over 90 reviews finalised and another 30 in advanced stages.**			**16.5**	
Indicator 16.6.1	**Actual primary expenditures per sector and revenues as a percentage of the original approved budget of the government (BBB)**						

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	EOSG/RoLU, PBSO, UNDP, UNODC (in consultation with others)	Replace with **[\Primary government expenditures as a percentage of original approved budget"]**. This indicator can be based on the Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) Program (PEFA PI-2). PEFA PI-2 considers (i) the variation between approved budget and final expenditure for the year for each major function (comparable to a sector) (ii) variation in expenditure from the original budget by economic classification and (iii) the average amount charged to the contingency reserve over the last 3 years. "	Data for 149 countries (collected on 398+ occasions) available at www.pefa.org.	PEFA Secretariat (World Bank); 149 countries		1	This indicator is also relevant for targets: 1.3 (social protection), 3.8 (health coverage), 4.1 (education), 17.1 (domestic resources), 17.9 (capacity building), 17.13 (macroeconomic stability).
	UNODC	**[Percentage of recommendations to strengthen national anti-corruption frameworks (institutional and legislative) implemented, as identified through the UNCAC Implementation Review Mechanism.]**	Review Mechanism of the United Nations Convention against Corruption	All 175+ States Party to the UNCAC are subject to a periodic review in the UNCAC Review Mechanism. To date, with well over 90 reviews finalised and another 30 in advanced stages.		1	16.5
	WB	**[Composition of expenditure outturn compared to original approved budget (PEFA P1-2)]**	PEFA -www.pefa.org	PEFA Secretariat (World Bank); 149 countries			
	OECD	**[Placeholder for indicators under development: (1) Trust in institutions (focus on share of people trusting the judicial system) ; (2) Generalised trust (share of people trusting others]**	The OECD Guidelines on Measuring Trust will be completed by the end of 2016. See http://www.oecd.org/statistics/measuring-well-being-and-progress.htm	OECD		2	16.5, 16.7
Indicator 16.6.2	**Proportion of population satisfied with the quality of public services, disaggregated by service (BAA)**						
	EOSG/RoLU, PBSO, UNDP, UNODC (in consultation with others)	Replace with **["proportion of population satisfied with their last experience of public services"]**. Ensure disaggregation by service. This outcome indicator focusses on the effectiveness aspect of the target, and indirectly on the accountability aspect, drawing on population sample-surveys. This indicator seeks to cover effectiveness via population sample-surveys, in which it is a well-precedented question. It also covers accountability indirectly, in that service provision must be responsive to the needs of the population. An element of experience is also included by referring to respondent's satisfaction with their own most recent experience of public services. The results may be triangulated with public-services access or quality indicators for other goals based on administrative data, eg. water and sanitation, education, health etc. It can be buttressed with results from expert assessments on experience or satisfaction with, and quality of, public services.	The data as 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-precedented among NSOs in developed and developing countries. Regional Barometers (eg. 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). 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. See supplementary material by UNDP.	UNDP		2	16.a., 16.3., 116.6, 16.9 and all other targets with access to basic services such as health, education etc. (1.4 (access to basic services), 3.8 (health care), 4.1, 4.2, 4a (education), 7.1 (energy), 10.2 (social inclusion), 11.1 (housing).
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for this indicator to be disaggregated by sex.					

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

Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator	**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.**	**National administrative sources. Global Barometer Study: http://www.jdsurvey.net/gbs/gbs.jsp , World Values Survey: http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/wvs.jsp , Gallup World Poll: http://www.gallup.com/services/170945/world-poll.aspx , See SHaSA Harmonised Module on Democratic Governance, in the supplementary materials.**	**UN Women, OHCHR, IPU.**	**Tier II**		**Target 5.5.**
Suggested Indicator	**Proportion of countries that address young people's multisectoral needs with their national development plans and poverty reduction strategies**	**UNFPA COAR database**	**UNFPA**	**Tier III**		
Indicator 16.7.1	**Diversity in representation in key decision-making bodies (legislature, executive, and judiciary) (BBA)**					
OHCHR	**[Proportion of public service positions held by women and members of target groups]**	Administrative data	On women, UN Women.		1	5.5, 10.2, 16.7
EOSG/RoLU, PBSO, UNDP, UNODC (in consultation with others)	Replace with **["Proportions of positions (by sex, disability and population groups) in public institutions (national and local legislatures, public service, and judiciary) compared to national distributions."]** This indicator focuses on the representativeness aspect of the target, but the presence of diversity also conduces to inclusivity and responsiveness of decision-making. It is also easy to understand and communicate. Disaggregation by sex and disability are most immediately feasible, and region of origin could be specified. Ethnicity would be defined at the country level , and could include ethnic or religious groups, indigenous populations, etc. One particular disaggregation compares with Goal 5.5, namely local government by sex. [Comparison to national distributions may require affirmative action in some settings to ensure that certain populations are effectively included.]	The data was to be collected from national administrative information. Global Barometer Study: http://www.jdsurvey.net/gbs/gbs.jsp , World Values Survey: http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/wvs.jsp , Gallup World Poll: http://www.gallup.com/services/170945/world-poll.aspx , See SHaSA Harmonised Module on Democratic Governance, in the supplementary materials.	UN Women, OHCHR, IPU.		1	Target 5.5.
UNFPA	**[Diversity in representation in key decision-making bodies (legislature, executive, and judiciary).]** Disaggregation by sex, age, region and other prohibited grounds of discrimination.				1	
Indicator 16.7.2	**Percentage of population who believe decision-making at all levels is inclusive and responsive (CBB)**					

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	EOSG/RoLU, PBSO, UNDP, UNODC (in consultation with others)	"Replace with **["Turnout as a share of voting-age population in national elections."]** This outcome indicator focusses 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. This indicator seeks to measure increases in inclusion, participation and representation in terms of turn-out of eligible voters in elections. At country level, disaggregation will be possible as a matter of course by geographical area. More sophisticated systems may be required for disaggregation by sex and other characteristics whilst preserving anonymity."	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. This indicator is efficient for cross-country comparison, assuming comparability of different levels of elections - eg. Presidential, Parliamentary, local, etc. IDEA maintains databases at all levels. http://www.idea.int/vt/viewdata.cfm#"'	IPU, IDEA.		2	16.6
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for this indicator to be disaggregated by sex and age.					
	UNFPA	Alt. sugg: **[Proportion of countries that address young people's multisectoral needs within their National Development Plans and poverty reduction strategies]**	UNFPA COAR database	UNFPA			
	EOSG/RoLU, PBSO, UNDP, UNODC (in consultation with others)	**[Extent to which legislature conducts public hearings during budget cycle.]** This indicator offers a precisely definable specification in a key domain of citizen participation in decision-making. The level referred to would be categorized, or else could be treated as a yes/no treaty indicator. Support for public participation in budgeting has been affirmed by the High Level Principles on Fiscal Transparency issued by the Global Initiative for Fiscal Transparency (GIFT) and endorsed by UN General Assembly Resolution 67/218. The IMF included public participation as an indicator in its revised Fiscal Transparency Code, as did the OECD in its Principles of Budgetary Governance.	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/open-budget-survey/			3	16.3

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

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Percentage of members or voting rights of developing countries in international organizations.**	**Administrative data of international organizations.**	**United Nations/DESA. Data would be available for all international organizations.**	**Tier I**		**Target 10.6 (which focuses on global international economic and financial institutions). Target 16.3 (rule of law at international level). Target 16.7 (which focuses on inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making AT ALL LEVELs). Target 17.10 (non-discriminatory and equitable multilateral trading system).**
Indicator 16.8.1	**Percentage of voting rights in international organizations of developing countries (CBB)**						
	EOSG/RoLU, PBSO, UNDP, UNODC (in consultation with others)	Rephrase: **["Percentage of members or voting rights of developing countries in international organizations."]** Representation and participation of developing countries in international organizations, including international financial institutions, is often below their relative weight in the world. This indicator would measure the representativeness of developing countries in international organizations. This indicator would be easily measurable by way of data collected by international organizations. The indicator would require a list of international organizations that would be included in the calculation. The indicator could be calculated by taking the simple average of the international organizations on the list. The phrase "global governance" in the target would suggest that the list of international organizations should be limited to organizations with a global mandate. This is a global indicator, not a national indicator. National Statistical Offices need not be involved. The rating CBB from the survey is, therefore, odd, especially the C rating because the data on membership and voting rights is readily available. "	Administrative data of international organizations	United Nations/DESA. Data would be available for all international organizations.		1	Target 10.6 (which focuses on global international economic and financial institutions). Target 16.3 (rule of law at international level). Target 16.7 (which focuses on inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making AT ALL LEVELs). Target 17.10 (non-discriminatory and equitable multilateral trading system).

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

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Percentage of children under 5 whose births have been registered with civil authority**	**Household surveys and vital registration systems.**	**UNICEF, WHO, WB, UNSD, UNFPA**	**Tier I**		
Indicator 16.9.1	**Percentage of children under 5 whose births have been registered with civil authority (AAA)**						

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	EOSG/RoLU, PBSO, UNDP, UNODC (in consultation with others)	Retain this indicator. Disaggregate by age, sex, region and population group, displacement and migratory status (including statelessness).	Household surveys such as MICS and vital registration systems.	UNICEF. Rationale: Unisex maintains a global database on the issue since 2003. Comparable data are available for more than 160 countries		1	This indicator also relates to target 4.1 and 4.2.
	UNICEF	**[Percentage of children under 5 whose births have been registered with civil authority]**	Household surveys such as MICS and vital registration systems.	UNICEF. Rationale: Unisex maintains a global database on the issue since 2003. Comparable data are available for more than 160 countries		1	
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for this indicator to be disaggregated by sex.					
	WB	The proposed indicator 16.9.1 - Percentage of children under 5 whose births have been registered with civil authority - is not in line with the Global CRVS investment plan which the World Bank developed in consultation with several agencies and countries last year. http://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/health/publication/global-civil-registration-vital-statistics-scaling-up-investment . We propose [**Percentage of children under 1 whose births have been registered with civil authority which is in line with national laws/guidelines.**]The UN Principles and Recommendations for a Vital Statistics System states that birth registration should be "immediate" (where defined, this is usually 7-30 days); up to 12 months is viewed as "late registration" and beyond 12 months is "delayed registration." Many countries are using this to define their own laws. Measurement of implementation should be consistent with this.					
	GlobalMigrationWG		NB! Disaggregate by migratory status				
	UNFPA	**[Percentage of children under 1 whose births have been registered with civil authority]**	UNICEF, WHO, World Bank and Regional Economic Commissions databases	UNICEF, WHO, World Bank, UNSD and UNFPA			

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

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**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**	**This indicator collates data from multiple sources, including National Human Rights Institutions, national non-governmental organisations, associations of journalists, trades unions, ILO, and international non-governmental organisations. Information on the number of violations committed against human rights defenders will be compiled annually by OHCHR from these data sources and further data collected through individual complaints to human rights treaty bodies, and Special Procedures of the Human Rights Council, including the Special Rapporteurs on human rights defenders, on freedom of opinion and expression, torture, the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances, and the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention. Additional data from OHCHR field offices and UN Country Teams will also be included. These data will be verified, cross-checked to ensure no duplication, and compiled in line with the agreed international definitions outlined above. Information on the number of journalists killed are compiled annually by UNESCO from data collected through multi-sourced research, including press reports, information from monitoring groups, direct reports, and information from UNESCO field offices and other UN bodies. Reports of killings compiled by UNESCO are then transmitted for clarification on the status of judicial investigation to Member States and categorized into the following: 1) no information received so far; 2) on-going; 3) resolved; 4) killed in cross-fire; and 5) others. This information can be found at the annual report by the UNESCO Director-General on 'The Safety of Journalists and the Danger of Impunity'.**	**OHCHR, UNESCO, ILO, ITUC, IFJ. Availability: Information from ILO on all ILO member states (185); from ITUC on all United Nations member states; and from IFJ (International Federation of Journalists) on 134 countries.**	**Tier I**		**This indicator is proposed to monitor the following targets: 5.2 (violence against women), 16.1 (violence and deaths), 16.3 (rule of law), 16.6 (accountable institutions), 16.10 (protection of fundamental freedoms).**

Indicator 16.10.1 Percentage of actual government budget, procurement, revenues and natural resource concessions that are publicly available and easily accessible (BBA)

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	EOSG/RoLU, PBSO, UNDP, UNODC (in consultation with others)	Replace with **["Percentage of government revenues, procurement and natural resource concessions that are publicly available and easily accessible in open data format"]**. This indicator can be based on Indicator I-9 of Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA), \Public access to key fiscal information", which identifies the budget proposal, enacted budget, in-year execution reports and audited annual financial report as things that are basic requirements for public access - which covers the entire life-cycle of the budget documents comprehensively. It also identifies external audit reports as documents that should be made available. Where they exist, the audit reports would address matters relating to the reliability of procurement and natural resource concessions, and any other matters affecting the management and use of public resources. Ideally, public access would conform with the "open data format". The "Open Definition" [http://opendefinition.org/] sets out principles that define "openness" in relation to data and content. It makes precise the meaning of "open" in the terms "open data" and "open content" and thereby ensures quality and encourages compatibility between different pools of open material. It can be summed up in the statement that " 'open' means anyone can freely access, use, modify and share for any purpose (subject, at most, to requirements that preserve provenance and openness)". In the UK, for example, guidelines encourage government data producers to publish documents in "file formats that reflect the nature of the information they contain, and the uses to which they will likely be put" [https://www.gov.uk/service-manual/user-centred-design/choosing-appropriate-formats.html]. "	Data for 149 countries (collected on 398+ occasions) available at www.pefa.org.	PEFA Secretariat (World Bank); 149 countries			Also related to targets 16.3 and 16.6
	UNESCO	UNESCO proposes to adjust this indicator and reword it to: **[Number of countries that have adopted and implemented constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees for public access to information (yes or no)"]** Disaggregations: none"	Media regulators (including self-regulatory media associations); Academic and research institutions; Media support NGOs (national and international).	UNESCO-UIS (data currently available for 56 countries) and UNESCO Communications Sector (see metadata for more information)		1	
	WB	**[Public access to key fiscal information (PEFA PI-9)]**	PEFA -www.pefa.org	PEFA Secretariat (World Bank); 149 countries			
Indicator 16.10.2	**Number of journalists, associated media personnel and human rights advocates killed, kidnapped, disappeared, detained or tortured in the last 12 months (CBB)**						
	ILO/UNESCO	Alternative text: **[Number of journalists, associated media personnel, trade unionists and human rights advocates killed, kidnapped, disappeared, detained or tortured in the last 12 months]**	ILO/ITUC for trade unions. Media reports.	Responsible entities: ILO, ITUC, IFJ. Availability: Information from ILO on all ILO member states (185); from ITUC on all United Nations member states; and from IFJ (International Federation of Journalists) on 134 countries.			8.8
	ITU	Proposed alternative indicator: **[Proportion of individuals using the Internet.]**	Data for this indicator are collected by NSOs, through household surveys . Between 2011-2014 data for this indicator exist for 100 countries, for at least one year. For countries that do not collect data for this indicator through household surveys, ITU estimates the data, based on subscription data. In total, ITU has data for this indicator for 200 economies, and on a yearly basis.	ITU has data for this indicator for 200 economies, and on a yearly basis.			1.4, 2c, 5b, 9c, 10.3, 12.8, 16.10, 16.6, 16.7, 17.6, 17.8
	OHCHR	**[Number of verified cases of killing, enforced disappearance, arbitrary detention, assault and torture of journalists, trade unionists or human rights defenders]**	Multiple data sources - see attached metadata	OHCHR, UNESCO		1	5.2, 16.1, 16.3, 16.6, 16.10

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	EOSG/RoLU, PBSO, UNDP, UNODC (in consultation with others)	Replace with **["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"]**. Disaggregate by sex and population group. The indicator is calculated as the total number of reported cases of killing, disappearance, arbitrary detention, assault and torture of journalists, trade unionists or human rights defenders during the reporting period which are verified by an independent entity .	This indicator collates data from multiple sources, including National Human Rights Institutions, national non-governmental organisations, associations of journalists, trades unions, ILO, and international non-governmental organisations. Information on the number of violations committed against human rights defenders will be compiled annually by OHCHR from these data sources and further data collected through individual complaints to human rights treaty bodies, and Special Procedures of the Human Rights Council, including the Special Rapporteurs on human rights defenders, on freedom of opinion and expression, torture, the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances, and the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention. Additional data from OHCHR field offices and UN Country Teams will also be included. These data will be verified, cross-checked to ensure no duplication, and compiled in line with the agreed international definitions outlined above. Information on the number of journalists killed are compiled annually by UNESCO from data collected through multi-sourced research, including press reports, information from monitoring groups, direct reports, and information from UNESCO field offices and other UN bodies. Reports of killings compiled by UNESCO are then transmitted for clarification on the status of judicial investigation to Member States and categorized into the following: 1) no information received so far; 2) on-going; 3) resolved; 4) killed in cross-fire; and 5) others. This information can be found at the annual report by the UNESCO Director-General on 'The Safety of Journalists and the Danger of Impunity'.	OHCHR, UNESCO, ILO, ITUC, IFJ. Availability: Information from ILO on all ILO member states (185); from ITUC on all United Nations member states; and from IFJ (International Federation of Journalists) on 134 countries.			This indicator is proposed to monitor the following targets: 5.2 (violence against women), 16.1 (violence and deaths), 16.3 (rule of law), 16.6 (accountable institutions), 16.10 (protection of fundamental freedoms).
	UNESCO	UNESCO proposes to adjust this indicator and reword it to:**["Number of countries promoting fundamental freedoms through ensuring the protection of journalists and combatting impunity for attacks on them (yes or no)"]** Disaggregations: none	UNESCO World Trends on Freedom of Expression UNESCO's Journalist Safety Indicators Universal Periodic Review (UPR) of the Human Rights Council (with UNESCO input)	UNESCO Communications Sector		2	
	UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for this indicator to be disaggregated by sex.					
		[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 and human rights advocates))].	This indicator collates data from multiple sources, including National Human Rights Institutions, national non-governmental organisations, associations of journalists, trades unions, ILO, and international non-governmental organisations. Information on the number of violations committed against human rights defenders will be compiled annually by OHCHR from these data sources and further data collected through individual complaints to human rights treaty bodies, and Special Procedures of the Human Rights Council, including the Special Rapporteurs on human rights defenders, on freedom of opinion and expression, torture, the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances, and the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention. Additional data from OHCHR field offices and UN Country Teams will also be included. These data will be verified, cross-checked to ensure no duplication, and compiled in line with the agreed international definitions outlined above. Information on the number of journalists killed are compiled annually by UNESCO from data collected through multi-sourced research, including press reports, information from monitoring groups, direct reports, and information from UNESCO field offices and other UN bodies. Reports of killings compiled by UNESCO are then transmitted for clarification on the status of judicial investigation to Member States and categorized into the following: 1) no information received so far; 2) on-going; 3) resolved; 4) killed in cross-fire; and 5) others. This information can be found at the annual report by the UNESCO Director-General on 'The Safety of Journalists and the Danger of Impunity'.	OHCHR, UNESCO, ILO, ITUC, IFJ. Availability: Information from ILO on all ILO member states (185); from ITUC on all United Nations member states; and from IFJ (International Federation of Journalists) on 134 countries. UNESCO reports on safety of journalists and impunity	Tier I		This indicator is proposed to monitor the following targets: 5.2 (violence against women), 16.1 (violence and deaths), 16.3 (rule of law), 16.6 (accountable institutions), 16.10 (protection of fundamental freedoms).
	UNESCO	**[Number of library service points per 1,000 inhabitants,]** where a service point can be public, school and academic, but excluding special and research libraries. Disaggregations: none	National library surveys	IFLA and UNESCO-UIS		3	

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

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

Suggested Indicator		**Percentage of victims who report physical and/or sexual crime to law enforcement agencies during past 12 months Disaggregated by age, sex, region and population group**	**Crime victimisation surveys. At least 72 countries have implemented at least one national victimisation survey after 2009. In addition, 9 African countries have already implemented or are in the process of implementing a victimisation survey module as part of the Strategy for Harmonisation of Statistics for Africa (SHaSA).**	**UNODC, United Nations Survey of Crime Trends and the Operations of Criminal Justice Systems mandated by the UN General Assembly (UN-CTS).**	**Tier II**		**This indicator is proposed to monitor the following targets: 5.2 (violence against women), 16.1 (violence and deaths), 16.3 (rule of law), 16.6 (accountable institutions), 16.10 (protection of fundamental freedoms).**
Indicator 16.a.1	**Percentage of requests for international cooperation (law enforcement cooperation, mutual legal assistance and extraditions) that were met during the reporting year (BBB)**						
	EOSG/RoLU, PBSO, UNDP, UNODC (in consultation with others)	Replace with **["Percentage of victims who report physical and/or sexual crime to law enforcement agencies during past 12 months."]** Disaggregate by age, sex, region and population group.	Crime victimisation surveys. At least 72 countries have implemented at least one national victimisation survey after 2009. In addition, 9 African countries have already implemented or are in the process of implementing a victimisation survey module as part of the Strategy for Harmonisation of Statistics for Africa (SHaSA).	UNODC, United Nations Survey of Crime Trends and the Operations of Criminal Justice Systems mandated by the UN General Assembly (UN-CTS).		1	This indicator is proposed to monitor the following targets: 5.2 (violence against women), 16.1 (violence and deaths), 16.3 (rule of law), 16.6 (accountable institutions), 16.10 (protection of fundamental freedoms).
	UNODC	**[Percentage of crime victims who report their victimisation to public authorities (also called crime reporting rate)]**	Victimisation surveys	UNODC collects data on crime reporting rate through the annual data collection UN-CTS. Data on crime reporting rates are currently available for approx. 35 countries.		1	16.3.1
Indicator 16.a.2	**Existence of independent national human rights institutions (NHRIs) in compliance with the Paris Principles (BBB)**						
	OHCHR	See attached metadata	OHCHR, International Coordinating Committee of National Human Rights Institutions	OHCHR, International Coordinating Committee of National Human Rights Institutions			10.3, 16a, 16b
	EOSG/RoLU, PBSO, UNDP, UNODC (in consultation with others)	Replace with **["Percentage of requests for international cooperation (mutual legal assistance and extraditions) that were met during the reporting year."]** The concept of "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. The concept of "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."	Data can be collected through a module of the UN Survey of Crime Trends and the Operations of Criminal Justice Systems (UN-CTS). Data was available on MLA for 30 countries and on extradition for 35 countries. Universal coverage is considered feasible.	UNODC (prospective), United Nations Survey of Crime Trends and the Operations of Criminal Justice Systems mandated by the UN General Assembly (UN-CTS).		2	This indicator is proposed to monitor the following targets: 5.2 (violence against women), 16.1 (violence and deaths), 16.3 (rule of law), 16.6 (accountable institutions), 16.10 (protection of fundamental freedoms).
	UNODC	**[Percentage of requests for international cooperation (mutual legal assistance and extraditions) during the reporting year that were granted]**	Administrative records on Mutual Legal Assistance and extraditions (requests, granted, refused)	Data have been collected in an ad-hoc module of the 2013 UN-CTS on MLA requests (30 countries) and granted (13) as well as on extradition requests (35 countries) and granted (24), demonstrating the availability of data in comparable formats.		1	16.4

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

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**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. Disaggregate by age, sex, region and population group**	**The primary data source is surveys conducted at the national or regional level. In many national contexts, surveys may exclude the homeless or low-income groups without access to telephones. Face-to-face surveys often exclude non-urban populations or members of linguistic minorities. There is evidence to suggest that the most marginalised populations are less likely to respond to surveys, but this effect is reduced by ensuring their participation in the preparation of the survey.**	**Data for this indicator are collected in an increasing number of countries. At the regional level, the EU Fundamental Rights Agency has collected the data for 27 EU Member States. Relevant data is also collected in Eurobarometer and Afrobarometer surveys, and this question could easily be added.**	**Tier II**		**This indicator is proposed to monitor the following targets: 10.2 (inclusions), 10.3 and 10b (discrimination), 16.3 (rule of law), 16.6 (accountable institutions), 16.10 (protection of fundamental freedoms),**
Indicator 16.b.1	**Proportion of the population reporting and perceiving to be discriminated against directly and/or indirectly, and hate crimes (CBB)**						
	OHCHR	**[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]**	Survey	Data available at regional level, e.g. EU Fundamental Rights Agency collects for all 28 EU Member States. No current global collector.		1	10.2, 10.3, 16.3, 16b

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

EOSG/RoLU, PBSO, UNDP, UNODC (in consultation with others)	Replace with **["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"]**. The indicator is calculated as the percentage of persons 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. This will be calculated using the full survey results, with techniques of imputation, estimation and data weighting to ensure a representative sample and data reliability. Disaggregate by age, sex, region and population group."	The primary data source is surveys conducted at the national or regional level. In many national contexts, surveys may exclude the homeless or low-income groups without access to telephones. Face-to-face surveys often exclude non-urban populations or members of linguistic minorities. There is evidence to suggest that the most marginalised populations are less likely to respond to surveys, but this effect is reduced by ensuring their participation in the preparation of the survey.	Data for this indicator are collected in an increasing number of countries. At the regional level, the EU Fundamental Rights Agency has collected the data for 27 EU Member States. Relevant data is also collected in Eurobarometer and Afrobarometer surveys, and this question could easily be added.		1	This indicator is proposed to monitor the following targets: 10.2 (inclusions), 10.3 and 10b (discrimination), 16.3 (rule of law), 16.6 (accountable institutions), 16.10 (protection of fundamental freedoms),
UNODC	**[Proportion of population who report experiences of discrimination in the previous 12 months]**					
UNWOMEN	UN Women calls for this indicator to be disaggregated by sex, age and other context specific factors.					
Indicator 16.b.2	**Proportion of the population satisfied with the quality of public services, disaggregated by service (BBB)**					
EOSG/RoLU, PBSO, UNDP, UNODC (in consultation with others)	Replace with **[Existence of independent national human rights institutions (NHRIs) in compliance with the Paris Principles"]** (previously 16.a.2). 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. An Independent NHRI is an institution with 'A level' accreditation status as benchmarked against the United Nations Paris Principles. The process of accreditation is conducted through peer review by the Sub-Committee on Accreditation (SCA) of the ICC. The indicator is computed as the accreditation classification, namely A, B or C of the NHRI. See supplementary information."	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.	International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions (ICC) and OHCHR are the agencies responsible for compiling these indicators at the international level.		2	16.6 (accountable institutions)

Goal 17 Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development

Target 17.1 Strengthen domestic resource mobilization, including through international support to developing countries, to improve domestic capacity for tax and other revenue collection

Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator	**Composition of Tax Revenues (by sources), including revenues derived from environmental taxes, and as % of GDP**	**National Accounts/IMF, OECD Revenue Statistics (covers large number of countries)**	**IMF/OECD**	**Tier I**		
Indicator 17.1.1	**Total Tax/GDP (AAA)**					
OHCHR	**[Total volume of inward and outward illicit financial flows]**	UNECA, UNDP, Global Financial Integrity				Target 16.4
UNCDF	Alternative: **[Composition of Tax Revenues (by sources - including revenues derived from environmental taxes)]**	Country National Accounts			1	
UNEP	Alternatives: **[Composition of Tax Revenues (by sources), including revenues derived from environmental taxes, and as % of GDP]**	Country National Accounts; IMF			1	
WB	Need to be replaced or dropped. Maximizing taxes is not a development objective or indicator.					
Indicator 17.1.2	**Total Tax Per Capita ($ value) (AAA)**					
UNCDF	Alternative: **[Percentage of payments that are made electronically, by payment value and number of payments]**					
UNEP	Remove indicator					
WB	Need to be replaced or dropped. Maximizing taxes is not a development objective or indicator.					

Target 17.2 Developed countries to implement fully their official development assistance commitments, including the commitment by many developed countries to achieve the target of 0.7 per cent ODA/GNI to developing countries and 0.15 to 0.20 per cent of ODA/GNI to least developed countries; ODA providers are encouraged to consider setting a target to provide at least 0.20 per cent of ODA/GNI to least developed countries.

Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator	**Net ODA, total and to LDCs, as percentage of OECD/Development Assistance Committee (DAC) donors' gross national income (GNI)**	**OECD/DAC. The OECD prefers these simple indicators to the alternative "ODA gap" and "marginalised groups" suggestions below. The "raw" ODA/GNI ratios for total ODA and ODA to LDCs can be compared directly with the target levels of 0.7% and 0.15-0.20%. "Gap" data would not be comparable in this way, and, expressed as percentages as GNI, would have the effect of making the gap seem small, even where it is large (e.g. a "gap" of 0.5% of GNI means the aid provider country is only giving 28% of the 0.7% target level for total ODA). There is no universally agreed target for ODA to Basic Social Services or marginalised groups.**	**OECD**	**Tier I**		**5.2, 10.b**
Indicator 17.2.1	**Net ODA, total and to LDCs, as percentage of OECD/Development Assistance Committee (DAC) donors' gross national income (GNI) (BAA)**					
UNCDF	**[Alternative: ODA Gap i.e. Net ODA [Target 0.7% of GNI] - Net ODA][Actual]**	OECD DAC+ (http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/data.htm)			1	Target 10.b
UNEP	**[Alternative: ODA Gap i.e. Net ODA [Target 0.7% of GNI] - Net ODA][Actual]**	OECD DAC+ (http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/data.htm)			1	Target 10.b
Indicator 17.2.2	**Proportion of total bilateral, sector-allocable ODA of OECD/DAC donors to basic social services (basic education, primary health care, nutrition, safe water and sanitation) (BBB)**					
OHCHR	**[Proportion of ODA that goes to the poorest countries (countries with special needs) and marginalized and vulnerable groups within countries].**	OECD, WB, IMF etc.				

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	UNCDF	Alternative:**[ODA Recipient x Country]**	OECD DAC+ (http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/data.htm)			2	Target 10.b
	UNEP	Alternative:**[ODA Recipient x Country]**	OECD DAC+ (http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/data.htm)			2	Target 10.b
Target 17.3	**Mobilize additional financial resources for developing countries from multiple sources**						
	Contributor Name	**Specification**	**Source**	**Entity**	**Tier**	**Priority**	**Interlinkages**
Suggested Indicator		**Total Capital Inflow (TCI)**	**combined sources from WB; IMF; OECD and others**	**IMF/WB**	**Tier I/III**		**1.a, 10.b**
Indicator 17.3.1	**Cost of remittances (BBB)**						
	OHCHR	**[Total Capital Inflow (TCI)]**	combined sources from WB; IMF; OECD and others				
	UNCDF	Alternative**: [Total Capital Inflow (TCI)]**	No single measure currently exists. As a proxy, Total Financial Liabilities in National Sector Accounts might be used. Propose to develop a new conceptual measure that would incorporate Domestic Public sector investment; Domestic Private Sector investment, FDI, Foreign Portfolio Investment; Import of capital goods; International Bank Loans; International Remittances; Sovereign Wealth Funds; Specialised Funds and other funds e.g. Capital Market Bonds etc.			1	Target 1.a and Target 10.b
	UNEP	Alternative: **[Total Capital Inflow (TCI)]**	No single measure currently exists. As a proxy, Total Financial Liabilities in National Sector Accounts might be used. Propose to develop a new conceptual measure that would incorporate Domestic Public sector investment; Domestic Private Sector investment, FDI, Foreign Portfolio Investment; Import of capital goods; International Bank Loans; International Remittances; Sovereign Wealth Funds; Specialised Funds and other funds e.g. Capital Market Bonds etc.			1	Target 1.a and 10.b
	OECD	Alternative: **[Total Official Support for Sustainable Development (TOSSD).]** This would cover the total flow of official resources for development, with modules planned to also capture private flows for development that are mobilised by public schemes such as guarantees, mezzanine finance, and equity stakes. It would thus better reflect the intent to focus on mobilisation than a measure of the total flow, which will respond to many influences other than official policy action. Data should be available by sector, enabling TOSSD to also be used to monitor flows to the sector targets listed in column H.	OECD/DAC Measure already agreed in principle by 2014 High Level Meeting of OECD Development Assistance Committee. Precise specifications under discussion. See http://www.oecd.org/dac/DACHLM%202014%20Background%20paper%20Towards%20more%20inclusive%20measurement%20and%20monitoring%20of%20development%20finance%20%20Total%20Official%20support%20for%20Sustainable%20Development.pdf			1	1.a, 7.a, 9.a, 10.b, 11.c, 13.a, 15.a, 15.b
Indicator 17.3.2	**Cost of remittances in the top tier of high-cost corridors (CBB)**						
	UNCDF	Alternative: **[Percentage of remittances spent on transfer costs]**	World Bank Remittance Prices Worldwide Database	World Bank - Data is available for 226 \country corridors\"		2	Target 10.c
	UNEP	Alternative: **[Percentage of remittances spent on transfer costs]**	World Bank Remittance Prices Worldwide Database			2	Target 10.c
Target 17.4	**Assist developing countries in attaining long-term debt sustainability through coordinated policies aimed at fostering debt financing, debt relief and debt restructuring, as appropriate, and address the external debt of highly indebted poor countries to reduce debt distress**						
	Contributor Name	**Specification**	**Source**	**Entity**	**Tier**	**Priority**	**Interlinkages**
Suggested Indicator		**Debt service as a percentage of exports of goods and services**	**IMF-World Bank**	**IMF-World Bank**	**Tier I**		
Indicator 17.4.1	**Total number of countries that have reached their Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Initiative (HIPC) decision points and number that have reached their HIPC completion points (cumulative) (CBB)**						
	OHCHR	**[Number of countries assessed by the IMF as being: In/at high risk/moderate risk of debt distress]**	IMF				
	UNCDF	Alternative: **[Debt service as a percentage of exports of goods and services]**	IMF-World Bank			1	
	UNEP	ALTERNATIVE: **[Debt service as a percentage of exports of goods and services]**	IMF-World Bank			1	
	WB	Indicator should read: **["Proportion of eligible countries that have reached their Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Initiative (HIPC) decision points and number that have reached their HIPC completion points (cumulative)."]** The absolute number of countries in need of debt relief is not an objective per se.					
Indicator 17.4.2	**Debt relief committed under HIPC initiative (CBB)**						
	UNCDF	Alternative: **[International reserves (net of annual interest payments on the debt) expressed in months of imports]**	IMF-World Bank/WTO/UNCTAD			2	
	UNEP	ALTERNATIVE: **[International reserves (net of annual interest payments on the debt) expressed in months of imports]**	IMF-World Bank/WTO/UNCTAD			2	
Target 17.5	**Adopt and implement investment promotion regimes for least developed countries**						
	Contributor Name	**Specification**	**Source**	**Entity**	**Tier**	**Priority**	**Interlinkages**
Suggested Indicator		**Number of national & investment policy reforms adopted that incorporate sustainable development objectives or safeguards x country**	**UNCTAD Investment Policy Monitor (can be supplemented by other sources)**	**UNCTAD and other sources**	**Tier II**		**17.15**
Indicator 17.5.1	**Adoption/Implementation of sustainable development orientated targets by new or existing investment promotion agencies (CBB)**						
	UNCDF	Remove indicator					Target 17.15
	UNEP	Remove indicator					
Indicator 17.5.2	**Number of policy changes in investment regimes incorporating sustainable development objectives (BBB)**						
	UNCDF	Modified: **[Number of national & investment policy reforms adopted that incorporate sustainable development objectives or safeguards x country]**	UNCTAD Investment Policy Monitor (can be supplemented by other sources)			1	Target 17.15

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	UNEP	Modified: **[Number of national & investment policy reforms adopted that incorporate sustainable development objectives or safeguards x country]**	UNCTAD Investment Policy Monitor (can be supplemented by other sources)			1	Target 17.15

Target 17.6 Enhance North-South, South-South and triangular regional and international cooperation on and access to science, technology and innovation and enhance knowledge sharing on mutually agreed terms, including through improved coordination among existing mechanisms, in particular at the United Nations level, and through a global technology facilitation mechanism.

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Access to patent information (WIPO Patent Database) and use of the international IP system**	**WIPO**	**WIPO**	**Tier I**		
Indicator 17.6.1	**Access to existing patent information (creation of a patent database) (BBA)**						
	UNCDF	Alternative: **[Access to patent information (WIPO Patent Database) and use of the international IP system]**	World Intellectual Property Indicators http://www.wipo.intipstats/en/wipi/	WIPO		1	
	UNEP	Alternative: **[Percentage increase in jointly filed (international) patents and percentage increase in global revenue from technology licensing/royalties (Royalty & license fees receipts, % total trade).]**	WIPO			1	
	ESCAP	New - **[All countries should have IPR offices and 100% of the traditional knowledge available should be posted online.]**	WIPO/National IPR offices	WIPO		1	
Indicator 17.6.2	**Number of exchanges - Exchange of scientists and technological staff (CBB)**						
	ITU	Proposed alternative indicator: **[Fixed Internet broadband subscriptions broken down by speed.]**	Data are collected by national regulatory authorities or Information and Communication Technology Ministries, who collect the data from Internet service providers. By 2014, data were available for about 80 economies, from developed and developing regions, and covering all key global regions. Data on the proportion of fixed-broadband subscription (not broken down by speed) exist for almost all economies in the world and ITU publishes data on this indicator yearly.	ITU collects and reports on data for this indicator annually. By 2014, data were available for about 80 economies, from developed and developing regions, and covering all key global regions. Data on the proportion of fixed-broadband subscription (not broken down by speed) exist for almost all economies in the world and ITU publishes data on this indicator yearly.			8.2, 9.1, 9.c
	UNCDF	Proposed alternative indicator: **[Fixed Internet broadband subscriptions broken down by speed.]**	This indicator is based on an internationally agreed definition and methodology, which have been developed under the coordination of ITU, through its Expert Groups and following an extensive consultation process with countries. It is also a core indicator of the Partnership on Measuring ICT for Development's Core List of Indicators, which has been endorsed by the UN Statistical Commission (last time in 2014). ITU collects data for this indicator through an annual questionnaire from national regulatory authorities or Information and Communication Technology Ministries, who collect the data from Internet service providers. By 2014, data were available for about 80 economies, from developed and developing regions, and covering all key global regions. Data on the proportion of fixed-broadband subscription exist for almost all economies in the world. ITU publishes data on this indicator yearly.	ITU collects and reports on data for this indicator annually. Data are published in December of every year, for the end of the previous year.		2	8.2, 9.1, 9.c
	UNEP	Remove indicator					
	ESCAP	New - X% of the scientists should be exchanged every year.				2	

Target 17.7 Promote the development, transfer, dissemination and diffusion of environmentally sound technologies to developing countries on favourable terms, including on concessional and preferential terms, as mutually agreed

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Average applied tariffs imposed on environmental Goods**	**WTO/UNCTAD/ITC**	**WTO/UNCTAD/ITC**	**Tier I**		
Indicator 17.7.1	**Total STEM Investment/GDP (CBB)**						
	UNCDF	Alternative: **[Average applied tariffs imposed on environmental Goods]**	WTO/UNCTAD/ITC			1	
	UNEP	Alternative: **[Average applied tariffs imposed on environmental Goods]**	WTO/UNCTAD/ITC			1	
	ESCAP	Alternate indicator - **[Enhanced trade and investment flows by X% in climate-friendly/environmental goods, services and technologies for sustainable consumption and production and enhanced supply chains**]					
Indicator 17.7.2	**Total STEM per capita ($ value) (CBB)**						
	UNCDF	Remove indicator					

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	UNEP	ALTERNATIVE: **[Total amount of approved funding for developing countries to promote the development, transfer, dissemination and diffusion of environmentally sound technologies on favourable terms, including on concessional and preferential terms, as mutually agreed.]**	Various international, multilateral development banks, financial mechanisms and regional financial institutions including Multilateral Fund of the Montreal Protocol, GEF, Green Climate Fund, CDM, World Bank, Development Finance Institutions (DFIs), International Financial Institutions (IFIs), African Development Bank, Asian Development Bank etc.	Various international, multilateral development banks, financial mechanisms and regional financial institutions including Multilateral Fund of the Montreal Protocol, GEF, Green Climate Fund, CDM, World Bank, Development Finance Institutions (DFIs), International Financial Institutions (IFIs), African Development Bank, Asian Development Bank etc.		2	Targets: 9.4, 9.a, 9.b

Target 17.8 Fully operationalize the technology bank and science, technology and innovation capacity-building mechanism for least developed countries by 2017 and enhance the use of enabling technology, in particular information and communications technology

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Proportion of individuals using the Internet.**	**ITU-Household Surveys. Data available for 100 countries, others are estimated**	**ITU**	**Tier I**		**1.4, 2c, 5b, 9c, 10.3, 12.8, 16.6, 16.7, 16.10, 17.6, 17.8,**
Indicator 17.8.1	Internet penetration (AAA)						
	ITU	Correct indicator name: **[Proportion of individuals using the Internet]**.	Data for this indicator are collected from NSOs, through household surveys. Between 2011-2014 official data (collected through a survey) for this indicator exist for 100 countries, for at least one year. For countries that do not collect data for this indicator through official household surveys, ITU estimates the data, based on subscription data. In total, ITU has data on the proportion of individuals using the Internet for 200 economies, and on a yearly basis.	ITU collects and reports on data for this indicator annually. Between 2011-2014 official data (collected through a survey) for this indicator exist for 100 countries, for at least one year. For countries that do not collect data for this indicator through official household surveys, ITU estimates the data, based on subscription data. In total, ITU has data on the proportion of individuals using the Internet for 200 economies, and on a yearly basis.			1.4, 2c, 5b, 9c, 10.3, 12.8, 16.6, 16.7, 16.10, 17.6, 17.8,
	UNCDF	Correct indicator name: [Proportion of individuals using the Internet.]	This indicator is based on an internationally agreed definition and methodology, which have been developed under the coordination of ITU, through its Expert Groups and following an extensive consultation process with countries. It is also an MDG indicator (for Target 8F) and part of the Partnership on Measuring ICT for Development's Core List of Indicators, which has been endorsed by the UN Statistical Commission (last time in 2014). Data for this indicator are collected through official household surveys by an increasing number of countries. Between 2011-2014 official data (collected through a survey) for this indicator exist for 100 countries, for at least one year. For countries that do not collect data for this indicator through official household surveys, ITU estimates the data, based on subscription data. In total, ITU has data on the proportion of individuals using the Internet for 200 economies, and on a yearly basis.	ITU collects and reports on data for this indicator annually. Data are published in June of every year, for the end the previous year.		1	1.4, 2c, 5b, 9c, 10.3, 12.8, 16.6, 16.7, 16.10, 17.6, 17.8,
	UNEP	Modified: **[ICT penetration in terms of equality of access, quality, and affordability]**	UNCTAD & ITU - Already core Indicator for Partnership on Measuring ICT for Development			1	
	UNESCO					1	
	UPU	The UPU proposes that this indicator could interact with an indicator of actual use of the Internet on top of the access criteria (as measured by Internet penetration). Ideally, the indicator could be replaced by: **[proportion of households with broadband Internet]** * proportion of households ordering online.	UPU existing data; ITU existing data; UNCTAD existing data	UPU - big data on international e-commerce available for most countries on a real-time basis (trough consolidated tracking systems data including possibility of estimating the number of households ordering online) with real-time data potentially back to 1999 for international tonnage, volumes and with a progressive coverage of all countries by 2012 and onwards. Generalization of the capture of the value of goods (e-commerce related customs declarations) from 2016-17 onwards. On-going study of e-commerce parcels as proxy for internet penetration and use with UNSD Comtrade and UN Global Pulse.		1	

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	WB	**[Proportion of businesses using the internet, Proportion of Individuals using the internet]**	UNCTAD, ITU	UNCTAD, ITU		1	1.4, 5.b, 8.3, 8.10, 9.1, 9.3, 9.c, 10.3, 11.1, 16.7, 17.6
	ESCAP	New - **[X % of technologies that have been transferred to LDCs and developing countries.]**	UNCTAD				
Indicator 17.8.2	**Quality of internet access (bandwidth) (BAA)**						
	ITU	Correct indicator name: **[International Internet bandwidth per inhabitant]**	Data are produced by national regulatory authorities or Information and Communication Technology Ministries, who collect the data from Internet Service Providers and/or wholesale Internet connectivity providers. For countries that do not provide the information, ITU estimates the indicator based on information provided by operators/ISPs, and based on subscription data. By 2014, data were available for about 200 economies.	ITU collects and reports on data for this indicator annually. By 2014, data were available for about 200 economies.			9a
	UNCDF	Correct indicator name: **[International Internet bandwidth per inhabitant]**	This indicator is based on an internationally agreed definition and methodology, which have been developed under the coordination of ITU, through its Expert Groups and following an extensive consultation process with countries. It is also a core indicator of the Partnership on Measuring ICT for Development's Core List of Indicators, which has been endorsed by the UN Statistical Commission (last time in 2014). ITU collects data for these indicators through an annual questionnaire sent to national regulatory authorities or Information and Communication Technology Ministries, who collect the data from Internet Service Providers and/or wholesale Internet connectivity providers . For countries that do not provide the information, ITU estimates the indicator based on information provided by operators/ISPs, and based on subscription data. By 2014, data were available for about 200 economies.	ITU collects and reports on data for this indicator annually. Data are published in June of every year, for the end of the previous year.		2	9.a.
	UNEP	Alternative: **[Individuals with ICT Skills]**	\ITU - Already core Indicator for Partnership on Measuring ICT for Development"			2	
	UNESCO					2	
	UPU					2	
	WB	**[Fixed broadband subscriptions, broken down by speed]**	Existing, collected by ITU	ITU		2	8.2
	UNESCO	**[Percentage of public libraries with broadband Internet access]** Disaggregations: none	ICT surveys, library surveys	IFLA, along with partners in the library community and ICTD community, such as the Alliance for Affordable Internet (A4AI) could help with collection		3	16.10, 9c, 5b

Target 17.9 Enhance international support for implementing effective and targeted capacity-building in developing countries to support national plans to implement all the sustainable development goals, including through North-South, South-South and triangular cooperation

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**The dollar value of financial and technical assistance, including through North-South, South-South, and triangular cooperation, committed to developing countries' designing and implementing a holistic policy mix that aim at sustainable development in three dimensions (including elements such as reducing inequality within a country and governance).**	**Various international, multilateral development banks, financial mechanisms and regional financial institutions including Multilateral Fund of the Montreal Protocol, GEF, Green Climate Fund, CDM, World Bank, Development Finance Institutions (DFIs), International Financial Institutions (IFIs), African Development Bank, Asian Development Bank etc.**	**Various international, multilateral development banks, financial mechanisms and regional financial institutions including Multilateral Fund of the Montreal Protocol, GEF, Green Climate Fund, CDM, World Bank, Development Finance Institutions (DFIs), International Financial Institutions (IFIs), African Development Bank, Asian Development Bank etc.**	**Tier III**		**9.4, 9.a, 9.b**
Indicator 17.9.1	**Number (share) of national plans to implement SDGs approved by governments by end of 2016 compared to by 2020. (BBB)**						
	UNCDF	Alternative: **[Percent of indicators in national development plans and strategies that prioritize sustainable development]**				1	
	UNEP	Alternative: **[Percent of indicators in national development plans and strategies that prioritize sustainable development]**				1	
Indicator 17.9.2	**Substantial increase in capacity built through south-south cooperation (CBB)**						
	UNCDF	Alternative: **[The dollar value of financial and technical assistance, including through North-South, South-South, and triangular cooperation, committed to developing countries' designing and implementing a holistic policy mix that aim at sustainable development in three dimensions (including elements such as reducing inequality within a country and governance).]**				2	

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
	UNEP	Alternative: **[The dollar value of financial and technical assistance, including through North-South, South-South, and triangular cooperation, committed to developing countries' designing and implementing a holistic policy mix that aim at sustainable development in three dimensions (including elements such as reducing inequality within a country and governance).]**				2	
	ESCAP	Not quantifiable unless a number of CB activity is fixed for each country					
Target 17.10		**Promote a universal, rules-based, open, non-discriminatory and equitable multilateral trading system under the World Trade Organization, including through the conclusion of negotiations under its Doha Development Agenda**					
Suggested Indicator		**Worldwide weighted tariff-average** **This indicator can be disaggregated and analysed by type of tariff (MFN applied rates and preferential rates), by product sector, by region and by level of development. The unit of measurement will be in % terms. Ad valorem equivalents (AVE) will be calculated for those tariffs that are not expressed in percentage. This methodology also allows for cross-country comparisons. Calculations can be performed on a yearly basis.** **These calculations are already part of the MDG Gap task force report.**	**WTO/UNCTAD/ITC**	**WTO/UNCTAD/ITC Data is widely available for most countries**	**Tier I**		**17.12, 8.2**
Indicator 17.10.1		**Stock of potentially trade-restrictive measures in WTO members (CBB)**					
	UNCDF	Modified: **[Trade restrictiveness indicator.]** The observed reduction of trade restrictive measures worldwide can be used as an indicator of the overall degree of support for the multilateral trading system. This is a composite indicator that takes into account a large set of tariff and non tariff measures which may affect trade in goods and services. The methodology to weight the sub-measurements included in it still has to be defined. As a consequence also the unit of measure is not yet defined.	WTO-UNCTAD-WB-ITC databases. Reference to the methodology used can be found in the following reports and databases: World Bank-UNCTAD's Tariff trade restrictiveness indexes (TTRI and MA-TTRI); World Bank's Trade Costs; World Bank's Services Trade Restrictions Database; WTO's Stock of potentially trade-restrictive measures in WTO members (I-TIP portal and DG's Report for the Annual Overview of developments in the international trading environment that are having an impact on the multilateral trading system)	WTO-UNCTAD-WB-ITC. The above mentioned organizations will develop specifics in the coming months		2	Target 1.4 (as a measurement of access to new technology and financial services, including microfinance); Target 2.b (as a measurement of existing barriers and distortions in world agricultural markets); Target 17.12 (as a measurement of transparency of market access conditions, including Rules of Origin); Target 3.8 (as a measurement of restrictions imposed on the trade of essential medicines and health care services); Target 9.3 (as a measurement of the existing trade barriers that curb access financial services)
	UNEP	Modified: **[Trade restrictiveness indicator.]** Modify current indicator by measuring non-tariff measures that restrict the trade of environmental goods and also measure prevalence of environmentally harmful subsidies.	World Bank-UNCTAD's Tariff trade restrictiveness indexes (TTRI and MA-TTRI); World Bank's Trade Costs; World Bank's Services Trade Restrictions Database; WTO's Stock of potentially trade-restrictive measures in WTO members. Source: http://i-tip.wto.org/goods/default.aspx?language=en			2	Target 2.b
	ESCAP	None of these indicators actually represent the Target 17.10<U+0085> New indicator - Successful conclusion of Doha Round including acceptance of all the SDT proposals. .	WTO				
	WB	Alternate indicator: **['Services Trade Restrictions.']** This indicator can be measured using the Trade Costs Dataset which provides estimates of bilateral trade costs in agriculture and manufactured goods for the 1995-2010 period. It is built on trade and production data collected in 178 countries. Symmetric bilateral trade costs are computed using the Inverse Gravity Framework (Novy 2009), which estimates trade costs for each country pair using bilateral trade and gross national output. Trade costs are available for two sectors: trade in manufactured goods, and agriculture.	Trade Costs Dataset	http://data.worldbank.org/data-catalog/trade-costs-dataset			
Indicator 17.10.2		**Worldwide weighted tariff-average: a. MFN applied and preferential, b. Applied to Devd/Dvg/LDCs, c. Applied by Devd/Dvg/LDCs, and d. By main sectors (CBB)**					

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	UNCDF	\Modified: Worldwide weighted tariff-average. The average level of customs tariff rates applied worldwide can be used as an indicator of the degree of success achieved by multilateral negotiations. This indicator can be disaggregated and analysed by type of tariff (MFN applied rates and preferential rates), by product sector, by region and by level of development. The unit of measurement will be in % terms. Ad valorem equivalents (AVE) will be calculated for those tariffs that are not expressed in percentage. This methodology also allows for cross-country comparisons. Calculations can be performed on a yearly basis. To further refine the quality of the information, additional sub-measurements could be calculated including: a) Tariff peaks (i.e. % of tariffs on some products that are considerably higher than usual, defined as above 15 per cent) and b) Tariff escalation (i.e. wherein a country applies a higher tariff rate to products at the later stages of production). These calculations are already part of the MDG Gap task force report (see the report for further information on the methodology at http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/policy/mdg_gap/mdg_gap2014/2014GAP_FULL_EN.pdf)."	WTO-UNCTAD-ITC databases. Concerning the feasibility rating, data is already available.	WTO-UNCTAD-ITC		1	target 17.12 (to measure the degree of implementation of duty-free and quota-free market access). target 8.2 (as the reduction of tariff escalation levels will promote the production of high-value added products)
	UNEP	Worldwide weighted tariff-average by type (MFN applied and preferential), by sector (incl. tariff peaks and tariff escalation) and by level of development.	WTO-UNCTAD-ITC databases. These indicators are already part of the MDG Gap task force report.			1	
	ESCAP	Delete this indicator as it does not reflect the target.	WTO				

Target 17.11 Significantly increase the exports of developing countries, in particular with a view to doubling the least developed countries' share of global exports by 2020

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Developing country's and LDCs' exports (by partner group and key sectors), including services.**	**WTO/UNCTAD/ITC**	**WTO/UNCTAD/ITC Data is widely available for most countries**	**Tier I**		**2.3, 8.2**
Indicator 17.11.1 Monitoring the evolution of developing countries export by partner group and key sectors. Such as: a) Exports of high technological content as proportion of total exports, b) Labour-intensive exports as proportion of total exports (pro-poor exports), and c) Export diversification (by product; by market destination) (BBB)							
	UNCDF	\Modified: **[Developing country's and LDCs' exports (by partner group and key sectors), including services.]** Can be calculated on a yearly basis. The unit of measurement could be in % (developing countries' and LDCs share of global exports) or alternatively in value (i.e. USD '000). Otherwise, out of the same data, 2 clear indicators could be calculated to measure the target, i.e.: (1) least developed countries' share of global exports (in % terms), (2) exports of developing countries (in value terms). The 2 indicators can be calculated on a yearly basis. Similar calculations are already part of the MDG Gap task force report. For reference purposes see http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/policy/mdg_gap/mdg_gap2014/2014GAP_FULL_EN.pdf . To further refine the quality of the information, additional sub-measurement could be calculated including a) Exports of high technological content as proportion of total exports, b) Labour-intensive exports as proportion of total exports (pro-poor exports), and c) Export diversification (by product; by market destination).The indicator will not include export of oil and arms."	WTO-UNCTAD-ITC databases. Concerning the feasibility rating, data is already available.	WTO-UNCTAD-ITC		1	Target 8.2 (as a measurement of diversification, technological upgrading and innovation); Target 2.3 (to measure the increase of productivity of small scale food producers and the enhanced opportunities to access market and value addition segments)
	UNEP	Modified: **[Monitoring the evolution of country's export by partner group and key sectors, including services. Include as one of the sectors analysed: exports of native biodiversity products, biotrade, sustainability certified products, and environmental goods.]**	WTO-UNCTAD-ITC databases. These indicators are already part of the MDG Gap task force report. Source: national statistics.				
	UPU	The UPU proposes that this indicator could be complemented by an indicator on the development of international e-commerce. Such complementary indicator could be: Volumes and values of e-commerce related imports and exports of goods, by country, by product (UNSD Comtrade HS classification for international trade) and for each bilateral flow for any country-pair. At a latter stage, the above mentioned international e-commerce statistics could also be provided by the size of the firm (in order to monitor e-commerce related exports and imports by micro, small and medium size enterprises).	UPU existing data; UNSD Comtrade existing data; UNCTAD existing data; WTO and ITC existing data.	UPU - big data on international e-commerce available for most countries on a real-time basis (trough consolidated tracking systems data) with real-time data potentially back to 1999 for international tonnage, volumes and with a progressive coverage of all countries by 2012 and onwards. Generalization of the capture of the value of goods (e-commerce related customs declarations) from 2016-17 onwards. On-going study of e-commerce parcels as proxy for international trade with UNSD Comtrade and UN Global Pulse.		1	

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	WB	Additional indicator - 'Services Trade Restrictions.' The Services Trade Restrictions Database covers 103 countries that represent all regions and income groups of the world. For each country, five major services sectors are covered that encompass a total of 19 subsectors Each subsector in turn covers the most relevant modes of supplying the respective services, yielding overall 34 country-subsector-mode combinations: Mode 1: financial services, transportation and professional services Mode 3: all subsectors Mode 4: professional services. The Eight WTO Ministerial Conference in 2011 adopted a waiver, enabling WTO members to provide preferential treatment to services and service suppliers of LDCs. The services sector has become a key driver of growth and development, accounting for 47 percent of all LDCs' overall GDP in 2011. However compared with the value of world services trade, LDC services trade is still marginal. Hence, over the coming years, the waiver can provide significant opportunities to further enhance the growth of service sectors in LDCs	World Bank, Available from http://iresearch.worldbank.org/servicetrade/aboutData.htm	World Bank. Data available for up to 103 countries http://iresearch.worldbank.org/servicetrade/aboutData.htm		2	10.a-17.10
	OECD	Additional and eventually alternative indicator: **[Domestic value-added in a country's exports.]** Compared to the gross figure for export receipts, this will be a superior indicator of the benefit that countries derive from their exports.	OECD, see www.oecd.org/trade/valueadded	The OECD's Trade in Value Added initiative already contains data for 61 countries, with plans to expand it towards comprehensive global coverage.		2	
Indicator 17.11.2	**Value of non-oil exports from LDCs that are derived from sustainable management of natural resources (CBB)**						
	UNCDF	Remove indicator. There is not enough information available to define and quantify the amount of exports deriving from the sustainable management of natural resources					
	UNEP	Also consider measuring the proportion of exports that are considered raw materials.	Source: COMTRADE				
	UPU					2	
	ESCAP	New- **[new products and new markets to be generated by X% in LDC exports]**					

Target 17.12 Realize timely implementation of duty-free and quota-free market access on a lasting basis for all least developed countries, consistent with World Trade Organization decisions, including by ensuring that preferential rules of origin applicable to imports from least developed countries are transparent and simple, and contribute to facilitating market access

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Average tariffs faced by developing countries and LDCs by key sectors**	**WTO/UNCTAD/ITC**	**WTO/UNCTAD/ITC**	**Tier I**		**2.3, 17.10**
Indicator 17.12.1	**Average tariffs faced by developing countries and LDCs by key sectors (BBB)**						
	UNCDF	Same indicator. The unit of measurement will be in % terms. Ad valorem equivalents (AVE) will be calculated for those tariffs that are not expressed in percentage. This methodology also allows for cross-country comparisons. Calculations can be performed on an yearly basis. This indicator is already part of the MDG Gap task force report. For reference purposes see http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/policy/mdg_gap/mdg_gap2014/2014GAP_FULL_EN.pdf	WTO-UNCTAD-ITC databases. Concerning the feasibility rating, data is already available.	WTO-UNCTAD-ITC		1	target 17.10; Target 2.3 (to measure the improvement in the access of markets and opportunities for value addition)
	UNEP	Include proportion of total imports from developing countries and least developed countries admitted duty free and quota free (DFQF), giving a better measure of concession utilization than average tariff	WTO-UNCTAD-ITC databases. These indicators are already part of the MDG Gap task force report. Source: COMTRADE and WTO databases			1	
	ESCAP	DFQF is not for the developing countries. The indicator given is not correct. New Indicator proposed - **[Full implementation of DFQF by giving market access on 97% of the products by developed countries.]**	WTO/Commtrade	WTO/National governments		1	
Indicator 17.12.2	**Preferences utilization by developing and least developed countries on their export to developed countries (CBB)**						
	UNCDF	"Same indicator. Preference utilization can be defined as a proportion between the value of imports that exporters/importers claim for preferential tariff treatment under a specific trade agreement and the total value of imports eligible for the preferential tariff under the above mentioned agreement. The unit of measurement will be in % (i.e. percentage of imports sourced under preferential treatment). The rate of utilization of preferences can be a good proxy to measure the impact of obstacles (e.g. specific requirements as rules of origin, lack of transparency) over the effective use of such preferences (e.g. Duty Free Quota Free for LDCs). The calculation of this indicator might not be possible on a yearly basis. Refer to the following paper (and other related research) for more information on the methodology https://www.wto.org/ENGLISH/res_e/reser_e/ersd201212_e.pdf"	WTO-UNCTAD-ITC databases. For the time being, data is available only for the leading developed country importers and is retrieved from Eurostat, USITC and data provided to the WTO Secretariat by governments""	WTO-UNCTAD-ITC		2	target 10.a (to measure the actions taken in order to facilitate utilization of preferences granted by developed countries in order to increase trading opportunities for developing countries)

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	UNEP	Same indicator. Include average tariffs imposed on agricultural products and products of native biodiversity, from developing and least developed countries.	The rate of utilization of preferences can be a good proxy to measure the impact of obstacles (e.g. the rules of origin) over effective use of such preferences (e.g. DFQF for LDCs) that will increase LDCs' exports. Data is available for the leading importers. Source: COMTRADE and WTO databases			2	
	ESCAP	New- **[X% of exports from LDCs to developed countries should be covered under preferences. Y% of new products to be exported under the DFQF preferences to developed countries.**]	WTO/Commtrade	WTO/National governments		2	
Target 17.13	**Enhance global macroeconomic stability, including through policy coordination and policy coherence**						
	Contributor Name	**Specification**	**Source**	**Entity**	**Tier**	**Priority**	**Interlinkages**
Suggested Indicator		**GDP**	**National Accounts/IMF/DESA**	**WB/UNSD**	**Tier I**		**Targets in Goal 8**
Indicator 17.13.1	**GDP (AAA)**						
	UNCDF	Alternative: [**Macro-Economic Dashboard (annual)]** - A suite or dashboard of indicators are proposed that attempt to capture the levels of key economic indicators, and by extension, their volatility (these are not exhaustive and could be further supplemented): GDP; Current account surplus and deficit/GDP; Capital flows, inwards and outwards; Net international investment position/GDP; Current account surplus and deficit/GDP; Terms of trade; Export market shares ($) ; Nominal unit labour cost; Functional distribution of labour and capital/GDP; Minimum wage, average wage and wage dispersion; Inequality Measure; Real effective exchange rates based on CPI deflators; Interest rates (including spread);Private sector debt level and change; Short term and long-term debt level of official reserves and reserves in banks; Private sector credit/GDP; Prices of food and energy; General government revenues, expenditure and debt/GDP; Employment and unemployment (%, composition, length of term); General price changes (CPI).	Key macro-economic indicators are readily available, so this dashboard will place no additional burden on countries (see EU Macro-Economic Scoreboard as an example).				Target 17.9
	UNEP	\Alternative: **[Macro-Economic Dashboard (annual)**]. A suite or dashboard of indicators are proposed that attempt to capture the levels of key economic indicators, and by extension, their volatility (these are not exhaustive and could be further supplemented): GDP; Current account surplus and deficit/GDP; Capital flows, inwards and outwards; Net international investment position/GDP; Current account surplus and deficit/GDP; Terms of trade; Export market shares ($) ; Nominal unit labour cost; Functional distribution of labour and capital/GDP; Minimum wage, average wage and wage dispersion; Inequality Measure; Real effective exchange rates based on CPI deflators; Interest rates (including spread);Private sector debt level and change; Short term and long-term debt level of official reserves and reserves in banks; Private sector credit/GDP; Prices of food and energy; General government revenues, expenditure and debt/GDP; Employment and unemployment (%, composition, length of term); General price changes (CPI)."	Key macro-economic indicators are readily available, so this dashboard will place no additional burden on countries (see EU Macro-Economic Scoreboard as an example).				Target 17.9
	WB	Target 17.13 (enhance global stability) is laudable, but the proposed indicators GDP and CAD deficits don't measure it. Suggest to substitute with measures of variability/dispersion.					
Indicator 17.13.2	**Current account surplus and deficit/GDP (AAA)**						
	UNCDF	Remove indicator					
	UNEP	Remove indicator					
Target 17.14	**Enhance policy coherence for sustainable development**						
	Contributor Name	**Specification**	**Source**	**Entity**	**Tier**	**Priority**	**Interlinkages**
Suggested Indicator		**Number of countries that have ratified and implemented relevant international instruments including environmental, human rights, and labour instruments**	**OHCHR, UNEP, other agencies**	**OHCHR, UNEP**	**Tier I**		
Indicator 17.14.1	**Number of countries that have ratified and implemented relevant international instruments under the IMO (safety, security, environmental protection, civil liability and compensation and insurance) (BBB)**						
	ILO	Alternative text: **[Number of countries that have ratified and implemented relevant international instruments under the ILO and the IMO (safety, security, environmental protection, civil liability and compensation and insurance)]**	NORMLEX (Information System on International Labour Standards of the ILO).	Responsible entity: ILO. Availability: Information on all ILO member states (185), of which 66 ratified the Maritime Labour Convention of 2006.			
	OHCHR	**[Number of countries that have ratified and implemented relevant international instruments including environmental, human rights, and labour instruments)]**	OHCHR	OHCHR		1	

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	UNCDF	Modified: **[Number of countries that have ratified and implemented relevant international instruments including environmental, human rights, and labour instruments]**	Data, maps and metadata is available http://indicators.ohchr.org to monitor the number of countries that have ratified and implemented relevant international human rights instruments. On environmental instruments, data is available on both INFORMEA (http://www.informea.org/) for monitoring, ratification, and UNEPLive (www.unep.org/uneplive) for monitoring.	OHCHR and UNEP (number of countries depends on the instrument but it is usually more than 150)		1	
	UNEP	Modified: **[Number of countries that have ratified and implemented relevant international instruments including environmental, human rights, and labour instruments]**	Data, maps and metadata is available http://indicators.ohchr.org to monitor the number of countries that have ratified and implemented relevant international human rights instruments. On environmental instruments, data is available on both INFORMEA (http://www.informea.org/) for monitoring ratification, and UNEPLive (www.unep.org/uneplive) for monitoring implementation drawing upon the information available through Secretariats of individual agreements and instruments.	OHCHR and UNEP and ILO (number of countries depends on the instrument but is usually more than 150)			
Indicator 17.14.2	**Number of countries with multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder coordination mechanisms in place for a coordinated implementation of chemicals and wastes conventions and frameworks (BBB)**						
	UNCDF	Remove indicator					
Target 17.15	**Respect each country's policy space and leadership to establish and implement policies for poverty eradication and sustainable development**						
	Contributor Name	**Specification**	**Source**	**Entity**	**Tier**	**Priority**	**Interlinkages**
Suggested Indicator		**Numbers of constraints that are embodied in ODA or loan agreements, IIAs. RTAs etc.**	**OECD DAC+ (ODA) UNCTAD (IIAs + RTAs)**	**UNCTAD**	**Tier II**		
Indicator 17.15.1	**Number of countries signing on for sharing of fiscal information (CBB)**						
	UNCDF	Alternative: **[Numbers of constraints that are embodied in ODA or loan agreements, IIAs. RTAs etc.]**	OECD DAC+ (ODA); UNCTAD (IIAs + RTAs)			1	
	UNEP	Alternative: **[Numbers of constraints that are embodied in ODA or loan agreements, IIAs. RTAs etc.]**	OECD DAC+ (ODA) , UNCTAD (IIAs + RTAs)			1	
Indicator 17.15.2	**Automatic transfer of financial information (CBB)**						
	UNCDF	Remove indicator					
	UNEP	Remove indicator					
Target 17.16	**Enhance the global partnership for sustainable development, complemented by multi-stakeholder partnerships that mobilize and share knowledge, expertise, technology and financial resources, to support the achievement of the sustainable development goals in all countries, in particular developing countries**						
	Contributor Name	**Specification**	**Source**	**Entity**	**Tier**	**Priority**	**Interlinkages**
Suggested Indicator		**Indicator 7 from Global Partnership Monitoring Exercise: Mutual accountability among development co-operation actors is strengthened through inclusive reviews**	**OECD-UNDP Table A.7. Global Partnership Website: http://www.effectivecooperation.org/**	**UNDP**	**Tier II**		
Indicator 17.16.1	**Changes in the number of multi-stakeholder partnerships participants active in developing countries (CBB)**						
	UNCDF	Alternative: **[Indicator 7 from Global Partnership Monitoring Exercise: Mutual accountability among development co-operation actors is strengthened through inclusive reviews]**	OECD-UNDP Table A.7. Global Partnership Website: http://www.effectivecooperation.org/			1	
	UNEP	Alternative: **[Indicator 7 from Global Partnership Monitoring Exercise: Mutual accountability among development co-operation actors is strengthened through inclusive reviews]**	OECD-UNDP Table A.7. Global Partnership Website: http://www.effectivecooperation.org/			1	
Indicator 17.16.2	**Classification and trajectory of the above in terms of: a) Nature of partnership, b) Region: Global, regional, c) Objectives: Sharing technology, expertise etc. and d) Country type (where partnership is active) (CBB)**						
	UNCDF	Remove indicator					
	UNEP	Remove indicator					
Target 17.17	**Encourage and promote effective public, public-private and civil society partnerships, building on the experience and resourcing strategies of partnerships**						
	Contributor Name	**Specification**	**Source**	**Entity**	**Tier**	**Priority**	**Interlinkages**
Suggested Indicator		**Amount of US$ committed to public-private partnerships**	**World Bank**	**World Bank**	**Tier III**		
Indicator 17.17.1	**Number of PPP projects (BBB)**						
	UNCDF	Alternative: **[Ratio of stock of Public/Public-Private investment.]**	National Accounts (Government Financial Sector Accounts)				
	UNEP	Alternative: **[Ratio of stock of Public/Public-Private investment.]**	National Accounts (Government Financial Sector Accounts)				

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	WB	We would like a clarification on the definition of Public-Private partnerships. The definition that the PPP CCSA is using is \Any long-term contractual arrangement between a public entity or authority and a private entity, for providing a public asset or service, in which the private party bears significant risk and management responsibility." This is important to know to understand if the data collected for indicators 17.17 will be aligned with the information we at the World Bank are currently collecting and if we can contribute to it. Also, a relevant indicator is[**amount of US$ committed]**: Number of projects is important but the impact maybe more associated to the size of those PPPs and the share of the Private sector. Number of projects only provides partial information on the evolution of the PPPs. Under the PPI database, we collect information on US$ committed to PPP projects in the infrastructure sector that could be used. Finally, Time to account: PPPs have a project cycle so it is not obvious at what time we should account for it. The WBG PPI database includes PPP projects that have reached financial closure."	It would be important to understand what will be the data sources for these indicators. As you may know, we are already collecting data on indicator 17.17.2 for the infrastructure sector in our Private Participation in Infrastructure (PPI) database. Here the link http://ppi.worldbank.org/				
Indicator 17.17.2	**Number of PPP projects implemented by developing countries (BBB)**						
	UNCDF	Alternative: **['SDG Investment Gap' and 'Private Sector Potential']**	UNCTAD World Investment Report (2014, Table IV-2)				
	UNEP	Alternative: **['SDG Investment Gap' and 'Private Sector Potential']**	UNCTAD World Investment Report (2014, Table IV-2)				

Target 17.18 By 2020, enhance capacity-building support to developing countries, including for least developed countries and small island developing States, to increase significantly the availability of high-quality, timely and reliable data disaggregated by income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other characteristics relevant in national contexts

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Proportion of sustainable development indicators with full disaggregation produced at the national level.**	**MDG/SDG reporting databases (UNDESA and UNDP) plus baseline assessment in 2015 by UNFPA.**	**UNFPA, UNDESA, UNDP**	**Tier I**		**All targets**
Indicator 17.18.1	**Number of countries that have national statistical legislation (that [a] enshrine statistical independence; [b]mandate data collection; and [c] secure access to national administrative data) (AAA)**						
	UNCDF	Alternative: **[Proportion of sustainable development indicators with full disaggregation produced at the national level.]**	MDG/SDG reporting databases (UNDESA and UNDP) plus baseline assessment in 2015 by UNFPA.	UNFPA, UNDESA, UNDP		1	All targets
	UNEP	Alternative: **[Proportion of national sustainable development strategies that utilize essential data on the current and future characteristics of the population across the points of disaggregation defined in target 17.18]**	International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) monitoring mechanism, guidelines for review to be updated to match this indicator				
	UNFPA	**["Proportion of sustainable development indicators with full disaggregation produced at national level"]**. The ability of National Statistical Offices and other bodies within countries to report on the diversity of SDG indicators is itself a measure of capacity, particularly when we think about the eventual complexity of the indicator framework as well as the points of disaggregation. Right now, a number of the existing indicators are calculated or modelled at global level, and the purpose of this indicator is to measure the shift in that calculation process to the national level.	MDG/SDG reporting databases (UNDESA and UNDP) plus baseline assessment in 2015 by UNFPA.	UNFPA, UNDESA, UNDP		1	all targets
Indicator 17.18.2	**Number of countries that have formal institutional arrangements for the coordination of the compilation of official statistics (at international, national and regional level) (AAA)**						
	UNCDF	Alternative: **[Proportion of countries that regularly collect essential data on the population]**	Global statistical monitoring systems associated with the different data types	UN DESA, World Bank, UNFPA, UNICEF		2	All targets with population-based indicators
	UNEP	Alternative: **[Proportion of countries that regularly collect essential data on the population]**	Global statistical monitoring systems associated with the different data types, including those housed in the UN Statistical Division, World Bank, UNFPA OpenData platform, UNICEF, etc.				
	UNFPA	**[Proportion of countries that regularly collect essential data on the population]*** *Essential data on the population is defined as data generated by: Census – regularly defined as every five to 10 years and in line with internationally agreed guidelines. Civil registration and vital statistics – regularly defined as births, deaths and civil status registered and reported continually as relevant for national context. Surveys – regularly defined as every three to five years: demographic and health surveys (DHS or MICS), labour force surveys, living standards surveys, household income and expenditure surveys	Global statistical monitoring systems associated with the different data types	UNDESA, World Bank, UNFPA, UNICEF		2	all targets with population-based indicators

Target 17.19 By 2030, build on existing initiatives to develop measurements of progress on sustainable development that complement gross domestic product, and support statistical capacity-building in developing countries

	Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
Suggested Indicator		**Financial and other resources made available to strengthen the statistical capacity in developing countries**			**Tier II**		
Suggested Indicator		**Inclusive Wealth Index**	**http://inclusivewealthindex.org/#the-world-wants-to-know-how-its-doing**	**UNEP**	**Tier I**		**8.1**
Indicator 17.19.1	**Index of Sustainable Economic Welfare (Nordhaus/Tobin) (BBB)**						
	UNCDF	Alternative: **[Inclusive Wealth Index]**	Compiled by UNEP			1	

List of Proposals

*** Note on Disaggregation: All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible.**

	UNEP	Alternative: **[Inclusive Wealth Index]**	http://inclusivewealthindex.org/#the-world-wants-to-know-how-its-doing	Compiled by UNEP - 140		1	8.1
Indicator 17.19.2 Gross National Happiness (CBB)							
	UNCDF	Alternative: **[Financial and other resources made available to strengthen the statistical capacity in developing countries]**				2	
	UNEP	Alternative: **[Financial and other resources made available to strengthen the statistical capacity in developing countries]**				2	