

**Civil Society Consultation
on Indicators for the Sustainable Development Goals and Targets
as input to the Inter-agency and Expert Group
on Sustainable Development Goal Indicators**

February-May 2015

Summary Prepared by the United Nations Statistics Division

This consultation was conducted by
the United Nations Non-Governmental Liaison Service (UN-NGLS)
and the Division of Sustainable Development of UN DESA
in coordination with the United Nations Statistics Division of UN DESA

See also the compilation of all consultation inputs, prepared by UN-NGLS:
<http://bit.ly/SDG-Indicators-Proposals>

Introduction and Summary

The United Nations Non-Governmental Liaison Service (UN-NGLS) and the Division of Sustainable Development of UN DESA, in coordination with the United Nations Statistics Division of UN DESA, conducted a consultation between February and May 2015 with Major Groups and stakeholders on indicators for the Sustainable Development Goals and Targets as input to the discussions of the Inter-agency and Expert Group on Sustainable Development Goal Indicators (IAEG-SDGs). Civil society was asked to review a provisional set of proposed indicators. This set of indicators was the same that countries evaluated in a survey whose results were presented in a technical report to the intergovernmental negotiations on the post-2015 development agenda in March 2015 by the Bureau of the United Nations Statistical Commission.¹

During the consultation, comments were received from a total of 112 civil society organizations, major groups, non-governmental organizations, and other stakeholders (See Appendix 1 for a complete list of contributors). These comments focused mainly on the specific indicators proposed to measure each target, but some comments were also more general in nature. Some of the most repeated comments, highlighted throughout all 17 goals are the following:

- Data must be disaggregated to ensure that nobody and no group is left behind.
- Not only official statistics, but also data from third party sources should be used to monitor the SDGs.
- The indicators must directly measure the targets. Many comments highlighted targets that civil society organizations felt did not measure what the target was describing.
- Focusing too much on ensuring that the list of indicators is limited could be problematic as the Intergovernmental Negotiations have repeatedly stressed the necessity of measuring all targets.
- Finally, in addition to comments on the proposed indicators, many new indicators were proposed under each of the 17 goals.

This document is organized as follows. For each of the 18 areas on which civil society organizations responded (a general comments section followed by a section for each of the 17 goals), first there is a list of civil society organizations that provided comments, followed on the next page by a summary of the most repeated comments in that section.

The responses were provided in a google document/Excel spreadsheet. This summary has been prepared by the United Nations Statistics Division on the basis of this google document in order to make those inputs more accessible and usable. For full information, please refer to the Excel document accompanying this summary that contains all of the civil society contributions in their entirety.

A second open consultation with civil society organizations, major groups, NGOs, academia, and other stakeholders will take place between August 11 and September 7.

¹ See: [https://unstats.un.org/unsd/broaderprogress/pdf/technical%20report%20of%20the%20unsc%20bureau%20\(final\).pdf](https://unstats.un.org/unsd/broaderprogress/pdf/technical%20report%20of%20the%20unsc%20bureau%20(final).pdf)

Contents

Introduction and Summary	i
General Comments.....	1
Goal 1.....	3
Goal 2.....	5
Goal 3.....	7
Goal 4.....	9
Goal 5.....	11
Goal 6.....	13
Goal 7.....	15
Goal 8.....	17
Goal 9.....	19
Goal 10.....	21
Goal 11.....	23
Goal 12.....	25
Goal 13.....	27
Goal 14.....	29
Goal 15.....	31
Goal 16.....	33
Goal 17.....	35
Appendix 1:.....	37

General Comments

List of Agencies and Organizations that provided general comments:

- **Post-2015 Volunteering Working Group**
- **CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness (CPDE)**
- **TAP Network**
- **International Environment Forum**
- **United Nations Sustainable Development Solutions Network**
- **NGO Committee on Migration**
- **Advance Family Planning, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation for Population and Reproductive Health, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health**
- **Plan International**
- **Major Group for Children and Youth – Children and Youth International**
- **Countdown 2015 Europe**
- **Global Campaign: #Culture2015Goal**
- **Beyond 2015**
- **Gender Links**
- **ADD International**
- **HelpAge International (with contributions from Stakeholder Group on Ageing)**
- **International Agency for Prevention of Blindness**
- **Leonard Cheshire Disability**
- **Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues**
- **Community Emergency Response Initiative (CERI)**
- **Right to Education Project**
- **Center for Economic and Social Rights**
- **Bioregional**
- **World Animal Protection**
- **WWF International**
- **International Budget Partnership**
- **NCD Alliance**
- **Sightsavers**
- **Southeast Indigenous Peoples' Center**
- **Open Society Justice Initiative**
- **Caribbean Policy Development Centre**
- **Christian Aid**
- **International Trade Union Confederation**
- **WaterAid**
- **Partnership on Sustainable Low Carbon Transport**
- **International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions**
- **Stockholm Resilience Center**
- **British and World Medical Associations**
- **ENDA Tiers Monde**
- **Global Forum for Media Development**
- **World Youth Alliance**

The following contains a summary of the main points these civil society organizations made regarding general comments on the SDG indicator framework:

- Civil society should play a role in both the design of the indicator framework and in its implementation.
- Not only official statistics, but also third party data sources should be used to monitor the agenda: a multi-stakeholder partnership is needed.
- The indicator framework must not be viewed as a discreet document by rather a document (framework) that can be modified over the coming years.
- The SDG indicators need to not only focus on the national level, but also on the regional/local level (especially as it relates to means of implementation) as it is at this level that many of the decisions on expenditures are made.
- The framework must go beyond what is currently being measured in order to consider all goals and targets.
- Qualitative indicators must be included in the SDG indicator framework.
- Focusing on a limited set of global indicators could be problematic for Member States as it will cause many targets to not be adequately monitored.
- Many civil society organizations that work on development have statistical experts and produce data and statistics, this knowledge and information should be leveraged in the indicator framework.
- The need for disaggregated data is paramount to the development of this framework and there should be a specific group to discuss this issue.
- There is a significant need for statistical capacity building in many NSOs in order to adequately monitor progress towards achieving the SDGs.
- The fact that many indicators rated with C's in terms of feasibility are being currently produced by civil society organizations. This creates a dangerous precedent and could mean that the best indicators, that are actually being currently produced, will not be included in the final proposal.
- Concern that the currently proposed indicators do not capture the totality of the goals and targets.
- The indicator framework must take a human rights based approach to the indicators and their measurement. This means to include process and structural indicators and not just outcome indicators.
- "Feasibility" is far too narrow a criterion to use in the selection of indicators for the SDG indicator framework.
- Indicators should be developed that are crosscutting in nature in order to avoid the "silo" approach of traditional development indicators.
- The need to consider how to use methodologies that have been developed by NGOs and other civil society organizations in the SDG indicator framework and how these could potentially be incorporated into National Statistical Systems.
- Indicators should be scalable: relevant at the local level but able to be aggregated at the regional, national and global level.
- Indicators should be synchronized with those that already exist in other international monitoring frameworks.

Goal 1

List of Agencies and Organizations that provided comments on Goal 1 proposals:

- **Sightsavers**
- **International Agency for Prevention of Blindness**
- **ADD International**
- **Major Group for Children and Youth – Children and Youth International**
- **Plan International**
- **International Movement ATD Fourth World**
- **Child and Youth Finance International**
- **WWF International**
- **German NGOs and DPOs**
- **SOS Children’s Villages**
- **HelpAge International (with contributions from Stakeholder Group on Ageing**
- **Save the Children**
- **Global Campaign #Culture2015Goal**
- **Oxfam**
- **United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG)**
- **SSA Social Justice Office**

The following contains a summary of the main points these civil society organizations made regarding indicator proposals for Goal 1 of the SDGs:

- Many civil society organizations call for the indicators to be disaggregated to the greatest extent possible in order to ensure that no group is left behind and that all vulnerable groups are accounted for in the measurement of the indicator.
- Highlighting that mentions of social protection systems should include specific reference to social protection floors.
- Many organizations propose having a specific focus on children covered by social protection schemes for target 1.3 as children are often the most vulnerable population and many children may live outside the household and therefore be excluded by household surveys.
- Many civil society organizations proposed wording to enhance the indicator for target 1.4 on land tenancy and economic rights.
- Several other organizations proposed indicators for target 1.4 that measure the % of income that is spent on housing and other basic services.
- For target 1.5, many organizations stressed the importance of disaggregating by social and economic groups.
- Other organizations highlighted that the currently formulated indicator ignores people over the age of 60, who are susceptible to being affected by these disasters.
- For target 1.b, organizations highlighted the need to disaggregate by indigenous groups and by people with disability.

Goal 2

List of Agencies and Organizations that provided comments on Goal 2 proposals:

- **PHM**
- **SSA Social Justice Office**
- **HelpAge International (with contributions from Stakeholder Group on Ageing)**
- **International Coalition for Advocacy on Nutrition**
- **Global2016**
- **ESF**
- **United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG)**
- **Action Against Hunger, ACF International**
- **Generation Nutrition**
- **Major Group for Children and Youth – Children and Youth International**
- **1,000 Days**
- **German NGOs and DPOs**
- **Save the Children**
- **NCD Alliance**
- **Plan International**
- **WWF International**
- **Partnership on Sustainable Low Carbon Transport**
- **World Animal Protection**
- **Oxfam**
- **Biovision / Millennium Institute**
- **Bioregional**

The following contains a summary of the main points these civil society organizations made regarding indicator proposals for Goal 2 of the SDGs:

- There are several comments from civil society that some important indicators were left out of the proposed list of indicators, these include an indicator on wasting and the 6 WHA indicators, of which only two are currently present.
- Other organizations commented that some indicators will not be able to adequately measure whether or not the target has been achieved. One example provided by civil society organizations is the indicator for target 2.1.
- Data for all of the nutrition indicators should be disaggregated by age and sex.
- Several agencies propose additional indicators on malnutrition including indicators on different vitamin and mineral deficiencies.
- Proposals to change the measurement of agricultural productivity from dollar value to calories as this better aligns with the food security aspect of the target and goal.
- Several civil society organizations believe that the indicator for target 2.4 should be changed so that it measures greenhouse gases per unit of output rather than per hectare of land.
- Many civil society organizations stated that target 2.4 includes many different aspects and that it is difficult to adequately measure it with only one indicator. As a result, these organizations proposed additional indicators for the target.

Goal 3

List of Agencies and Organizations that provided comments on Goal 3 proposals:

- **Gender Links**
- **International Movement ATD Fourth World**
- **World Animal Protection**
- **Major Group for Children and Youth – Children and Youth International**
- **Countdown 2015 Europe**
- **Save the children**
- **Plan International**
- **WaterAid**
- **Global2016**
- **Generation Nutrition**
- **International HIV/AIDS Alliance**
- **Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists**
- **Sightsavers**
- **International Agency for Prevention of Blindness**
- **FundaMentalSDG**
- **HelpAge International (with contributions from Stakeholder Group on Ageing**
- **Framework Convention Alliance for Tobacco Control**
- **SOS Children’s Villages**
- **NCD Alliance**
- **Global Alcohol Policy Alliance**
- **Partnership on Sustainable Low Carbon Transport**
- **United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG)**
- **Global Campaign for Education**
- **Advance Family Planning, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation for Population and Reproductive Health, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health**
- **German NGOs and DPOs**
- **ADD International**
- **ESF**
- **Center for Vaccine Ethics and Policy/NYU**
- **Chair Regional Measles Elimination Verification Commission, Western Pacific**
- **SSA Social Justice Office**
- **Global2020**
- **Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves**
- **WWF International**
- **Bioregional**
- **Voluntary Services Overseas (VSO)**

The following contains a summary of the main points these civil society organizations made regarding indicator proposals for Goal 3 of the SDGs:

- Many of the indicators in goal 3 need to be disaggregated by income in order to ensure that no person is left behind and because many of the illnesses mentioned in goal 3 affect those in the bottom quintile of the income distribution at a much higher frequency than other people.
- All data in the health targets should be disaggregated by sex and age groups.
- Several indicators should be expressed as number of deaths rather than mortality rates in order to ensure ease of understanding.
- For target 3.3, there should be an additional indicator covering other communicable diseases and the death rate associated with them.
- The AIDS indicators should include an indicator on Anti-stigma and/or discrimination as this is a serious issue.
- There should be an additional indicator in target 3.3 on neglected tropical diseases in order to fully monitor the target.
- The indicators on non-communicable diseases currently exclude people over the age of 70 from measurement despite the fact they are the most likely to contract these diseases.
- Comments that the currently proposed indicators for target 3.5 do not adequately measure the target.
- In addition to the two indicators for target 3.7, many organizations suggest an additional indicator on sexual and reproductive education.
- For target 3.8, many organizations propose having an indicator on immunization/vaccination rates.
- For target 3.9, several agencies propose expanding the indicator to include not only urban areas, but people living in both urban and rural areas and to expand the types of population beyond air pollution.

Goal 4

List of Agencies and Organizations that provided comments on Goal 4 proposals:

- **Red Educacion Popular entre Mujeres America Latina y el Caribe (REPEM LAC)**
- **Global Campaign for Education**
- **Major Group for Children and Youth – Children and Youth International**
- **German NGOs and DPOs**
- **Education International**
- **Save the Children**
- **Global Campaign for Education**
- **International Trade Union Confederation**
- **Voluntary Services Overseas (VSO)**
- **United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG)**
- **International Movement ATD Fourth World**
- **ADD International**
- **International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions**
- **Plan International**
- **Children and Youth Finance International**
- **Right to Education Project**
- **SSA Social Justice Office**
- **SOS Children’s Villages**
- **HelpAge International (with contributions from Stakeholder Group on Ageing)**
- **International Agency for Prevention of Blindness**
- **Gender Links**
- **Countdown 2015 Europe**
- **Global Campaign #Culture2015Goal**
- **WaterAid**

The following contains a summary of the main points these civil society organizations made regarding indicator proposals for Goal 4 of the SDGs:

- Rights based indicators must be included as indicators under the education goal in addition to output and outcome indicators.
- Measuring quality education outcomes must go beyond basic literacy and numeracy to include more comprehensive education outcomes.
- The indicators under this goal should be disaggregated so that all groups are measured to ensure that nobody is left behind.
- Relevant learning outcomes (as stated in the target) should be defined at the national level and not designated at the global level.
- Several organizations suggested that there should be an indicator for target 4.2 that measure access to pre-primary education rather than or in addition to enrolment.
- The indicators for target 4.3 are inadequate to measure whether or not the education/training received was “quality” or not.
- Measuring participation or attendance does not adequately monitor if increased skills were obtained as a result of the training. There needs to be outcome indicators and not just output indicators.
- For target 4.7, it is unclear why the ages of 15 and 13 were chosen as those at which to monitor proficiency in the areas detailed. Suggestions to measure this at the end of secondary school.
- Several civil society organizations have suggested including an indicator on sexual/reproductive health education.
- Many organizations suggested including specific reference to children with disabilities in the indicator for target 4.a.

Goal 5

List of Agencies and Organizations that provided comments on Goal 5 proposals:

- **Gender Links**
- **SSA Social Justice Office**
- **Plan International**
- **German NGOs and DPOs**
- **HelpAge International (with contributions from Stakeholder Group on Ageing)**
- **Major Group for Children and Youth – Children and Youth International**
- **Global2020**
- **Countdown 2015 Europe**
- **MADE – Migration and Development Network**
- **International Trade Union Confederation**
- **International Association of Women’s Mental Health**
- **ESF**
- **Africa Coordinating Centre for the Abandonment of Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting (ACCAF)**
- **Guardian News and Media Ltd.**
- **FORWARD – Foundation for Women’s health, Research and Development**
- **Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists**
- **Excision parlons-en!**
- **Beyond FGM**
- **The Girl Generation: Together to End FGM**
- **Integrate Bristol**
- **Action for Women and Children (AWCC)**
- **Plan UK**
- **END FGM European Network**
- **No FGM Australia**
- **The Orchid Project (a charity working to end (FGM/C))**
- **SOS Children’s Villages UK / GAMCOTRAP**
- **WaterAid**
- **United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG)**
- **Voluntary Services Overseas (VSO)**
- **Children and Youth Finance International**
- **World Youth Alliance**
- **WWF International**

The following contains a summary of the main points these civil society organizations made regarding indicator proposals for Goal 5 of the SDGs:

- The indicators for this goal must be disaggregated in order to ensure that the rights and interests of all people are protected.
- Several organizations mentioned that the formulation of the indicators for target 5.1 are badly worded and should not include “whether or not” as the start of the language for the indicator.
- For the indicators for target 5.2, several organizations mentioned that women over the age of 49 also experience violence and that as currently constructed, the indicators exclude these women.
- There were several repeated comments on indicator 5.3.2 on female genital mutilation. The first is that for relevant countries, data is widely available through DHS and MICS surveys. The organizations suggest that the low rating given by countries may result from responses by countries where this problem is not prevalent. Second, some organizations suggest changing the age range to 20-24 years old in order to measure the change more effectively over time and to track progress.
- Several organizations mention that they do not see the connection between the proposed indicator for target 5.4 and the target itself.
- Several organizations proposed indicators on women in managerial positions and other positions of influence as the target goes far beyond just measuring women’s participation in government.

Goal 6

List of Agencies and Organizations that provided comments on Goal 6 proposals:

- **WaterAid**
- **United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG)**
- **End Water Poverty**
- **SSA Social Justice Office**
- **German NGOs and DPOs**
- **Major Group for Children and Youth – Children and Youth International**
- **HelpAge International (with contributions from Stakeholder Group on Ageing)**
- **Global Taskforce of Local and Regional Governments**
- **Plan International**
- **Community Emergency Response Initiative (CERI)**
- **Countdown 2015 Europe**
- **ESF**
- **Sustainable World Initiative**
- **WWF International**

The following contains a summary of the main points these civil society organizations made regarding indicator proposals for Goal 6 of the SDGs:

- A single core indicator for each target would be insufficient to address the multiple elements that many of the targets in this goal contain.
- Multiple indicators will be needed in order to address these targets.
- It is important that the indicators selected to monitor the targets in this goal do not diminish the level of ambition of the target.
- Sanitation and hygiene are not the same thing and as a result, indicators for each of them will be necessary.
- The indicators under this goal will have to have many levels of disaggregation in order to ensure that no person is left behind.
- There is a need for greater refining of the definitions of improved water source and to potentially classify access by type of water source as having water piped into one's home is quite different from having to use a public tap that means having to carry water sometimes a significant distance back to one's home.
- For the indicators on target 6.4, several organizations state that consideration should be given to areas that are not only urban, but rural as well.

Goal 7

List of Agencies and Organizations that provided comments on Goal 7 proposals:

- **SSA Social Justice Office**
- **CAFOD**
- **Climate Action Network**
- **Major Group for Children and Youth – Children and Youth International**
- **Hivos**
- **WWF International**
- **Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves**
- **United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG)**
- **NCD Alliance**
- **End Water Poverty**
- **Christian Aid**
- **ESF**

The following contains a summary of the main points these civil society organizations made regarding indicator proposals for Goal 7 of the SDGs:

- An inclusive consultation process on the indicators is needed.
- The current, binary nature of the indicators in goal 7 do not allow for the measurement of the range of services available at the community/household level.
- Many organizations suggest that these indicators be disaggregated to the extent possibly/necessary.
- The indicators for Target 7.1 should support the multi-tier approach presented in the SE4ALL framework.
- Any target or indicator that is measuring universal access to energy must also designate a minimum level of access that would show that the target has been achieved.
- The Global Tracking Framework and the tier system included in the SE4ALL framework should be used to monitor progress/
- On target 7.b, the indicator should monitor more than just international cooperation as the target is addressing a wider array of activities.

Goal 8

List of Agencies and Organizations that provided comments on Goal 8 proposals:

- **Gender Links**
- **International Trade Union Confederation**
- **Major Group for Children and Youth – Children and Youth International**
- **United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG)**
- **SSA Social Justice Office**
- **Global 2020**
- **WWF International**
- **International Movement ATD Fourth World**
- **Culture Committee, United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG)**
- **Child and Youth Finance International**
- **Global Campaign #Culture2015Goal**
- **Sustainable World Initiative**
- **Global2021**
- **Bioregional**
- **Sightsavers**
- **German NGOs and DPOs**
- **Post-2015 Volunteering Working Group**
- **G20 Young Entrepreneurs Alliance**
- **SOS Children’s Villages**
- **Save the Children**
- **MADE – Migration and Development Network**
- **HelpAge International (with contributions from Stakeholder Group on Ageing)**
- **International Budget Partnership**

The following contains a summary of the main points these civil society organizations made regarding indicator proposals for Goal 8 of the SDGs:

- It will be very difficult to capture the many issues that are included in the targets for goal 8 with only 2 indicators per target.
- There are only outcome indicators included, more indicators on structural/legal issues need to be included in the framework.
- None of the indicators for goal 8 incorporate the environmental or social dimensions of the targets.
- Urban/rural disaggregation is very important for the indicators in this goal. Also an effort could be made to integrate the indicators in goal 8 with those from goal 11.
- Data for the indicators for target 8.2 should be disaggregated by sector.
- Indicators proposed by SDSN for target 8.3 should be used.
- The civil society organizations have proposed a variety of new indicators for target 8.3. These can be found in the complete annex of their comments.
- For target 8.4, statistics on material efficiency alone will not inform policy makers on whether economic growth is being decoupled from environmental degradation. More dimensions of this decoupling need to be included as indicators for this target.

Goal 9

List of Agencies and Organizations that provided comments on Goal 9 proposals:

- **Gender Links**
- **Major Group for Children and Youth – Children and Youth International**
- **Partnership on Sustainable Low Carbon Transport**
- **United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG)**
- **WWF International**
- **International Trade Union Confederation**
- **Global2020**
- **Bioregional**
- **Global Campaign #Culture2015Goal**
- **International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions**

The following contains a summary of the main points these civil society organizations made regarding indicator proposals for Goal 9 of the SDGs:

- Some civil society organizations commented that there are no gender sensitive issues included in goal 9 and propose to have some indicators address gender in the goal.
- Civil society organizations commented on the fact that the social and environmental aspects of sustainable development were not included in any of the indicators for goal 9.
- There are calls to disaggregate data by at least age and sex, and by other classifications were appropriate.
- Concern surrounding the indicator for target 9.c. Not aware of any measure of affordability of access to ICT.

Goal 10

List of Agencies and Organizations that provided comments on Goal 10 proposals:

- **Gender Links**
- **Sightsavers**
- **SSA Social Justice Office**
- **Major Group for Children and Youth – Children and Youth International**
- **Center for Economic & Social Rights**
- **United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG)**
- **SOS Children’s Villages**
- **HelpAge International (with contributions from Stakeholder Group on Ageing)**
- **Global Taskforce of Local and Regional Governments**
- **Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues**
- **International Movement ATD Fourth World**
- **ESF**
- **International Trade Union Confederation**
- **Global2020**

The following contains a summary of the main points these civil society organizations made regarding indicator proposals for Goal 10 of the SDGs:

- There is no indicator that focuses on reducing the inequality between men and women.
- There will need to be full disaggregation, including by disability, in order to adequately monitor the indicators.
- Propose an indicator on wealth as many of the people with the most economic power have large amounts of wealth, and their income may not be that large.
- Believe indicator 10.2.2 should be people living below 60% of median income as this is more in line with existing definitions of relative poverty.
- The inclusion of indicators that measure the existence of legal frameworks that ensure equality and prevent discrimination.
- For many of the targets, civil society organizations proposed new indicators that can be found in the detailed Excel document.

Goal 11

List of Agencies and Organizations that provided comments on Goal 11 proposals:

- **Gender Links**
- **SSA Social Justice Office**
- **United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG)**
- **International Agency for Prevention of Blindness**
- **Major Group for Children and Youth – Children and Youth International**
- **HelpAge International (with contributions from Stakeholder Group on Ageing)**
- **Partnership on Sustainable Low Carbon Transport**
- **Sightsavers**
- **NCD Alliance**
- **Plan International**
- **Bioregional**
- **Global Campaign #Culture2015Goal**
- **Global2020**
- **WaterAid**
- **WWF International**

The following contains a summary of the main points these civil society organizations made regarding indicator proposals for Goal 11 of the SDGs:

- Not enough attention is being given to informal housing sectors in the indicators for goal 11.
- The indicators proposed under goal 11 do not capture the availability of accessibility for people with disabilities.
- Indicators should be disaggregated by geographic area and by the size of the urban agglomeration.
- The linkage between the indicators for Target 11.1 and the target itself is weak. Better indicators should be assigned to this target.
- Many new indicators to monitor the targets in Goal 11 were proposed by civil society organizations and these can be found in the comprehensive Excel document.
- Data for the indicators should be disaggregated by age and sex where appropriate.
- The Target 11.2 refers specifically to people in vulnerable situations so the indicator(s) for the target should specifically address this population.
- On the indicator for Target 11.4, the “percentage of urban area” is not at all suitable for the target.
- On Target 11.5, the indicator includes both people who were killed and who were affected by disasters. There should be two separate indicators here: one for those who were killed and the other for those that were affected.
- For Target 11.7, in order to assess “accessible” public spaces, the indicators for this target must be disaggregated by disability.

Goal 12

List of Agencies and Organizations that provided comments on Goal 12 proposals:

- **ESF**
- **SSA Social Justice Office**
- **Fairtrade in Sweden**
- **Major Group for Children and Youth – Children and Youth International**
- **United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG)**
- **Sustainable World Initiative**
- **Global2020**
- **Bioregional**
- **World Animal Protection**
- **WWF International**
- **Global Reporting Initiative (GRI)**
- **Global Taskforce of Local and Regional Governments**
- **Global Campaign #Culture2015Goal**
- **Partnership on Sustainable Low Carbon Transport**

The following contains a summary of the main points these civil society organizations made regarding indicator proposals for Goal 12 of the SDGs:

- Throughout Goal 12, there are a lack of indicators that specifically address reducing poverty, especially regarding those indicators focused on sustainable consumption.
- Indicators that measure the sustainable management and efficient use of natural resources should include data on a country's domestic consumption and overall footprint.
- The current measurement of food loss and waste (FAO) only includes human-edible food that is produced for the purpose of being used as food by humans. This means that all food (one third of all cereals, one quarter of all fish, over half of all oil crops, etc.) produced for purposes other than food (animal feed) are currently not included in the global debate on food loss and waste and/or the debate on food security.
- On Target 12.6, there is a need to quantify the term "World's Largest Companies."
- For Target 12.b, explicit references should be made to culture in one of the indicators, as culture is referenced in the language of the target.
- Many new indicators to monitor the targets in Goal 12 were proposed by civil society organizations and these can be found in the comprehensive Excel document.

Goal 13

List of Agencies and Organizations that provided comments on Goal 13 proposals:

- **SSA Social Justice Office**
- **United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG)**
- **Climate Action Network**
- **WWF International**
- **Global Campaign #Culture2015Goal**
- **Global Taskforce of Local and Regional Governments**
- **Center for Human Rights and Climate Change Research / Gender Justice and Sustainable Development Network**
- **Sustainable World Initiative**
- **Global2020**
- **Bioregional**
- **Major Group for Children and Youth – Children and Youth International**
- **Caribbean Policy Development Centre and Environmental Management for Livelihood Improvement Bwaise Facility (EMLI)**
- **Caribbean Policy Development Centre**
- **Environmental Management for Livelihood Improvement Bwaise Facility (EMLI)**

The following contains a summary of the main points these civil society organizations made regarding indicator proposals for Goal 13 of the SDGs:

- The targets under Goal 13 are not easy to operationalize and to create meaningful indicators to monitor progress towards the targets.
- Disaggregation by rural and urban areas should be included for the indicators in goal 13.
- It has been argued that national indicators fail to capture many of the processes and contextual factors that influence adaptive capacity, and thus provide little insight on adaptive capacity as the level where most adaptation will take place.
- What the second indicator for Target 13.1 is attempting to measure is unclear based on the language of the indicator.
- The indicators fail to measure what impact the policies and planning has, which ought to be the desired outcome of the goal and target. In particular, the indicators fail to address the issue of the goal objective.
- For Target 13.a, climate finance should be specifically marked and tracked in order to assure that it is predictable and additional to resources provided towards existing aid commitments (such as the 0,7% target) or to current flows where these aid commitments are already being met. Also, the \$100 billion commitment does not start in 2020, but should be reached by 2020 (scaling-up from current levels), which is why the measurement of the indicator should not only begin in 2020.
- On the indicator for target 13.b, just looking at the number of LDCs does not address the purpose of this target.
- Many new indicators to monitor the targets in Goal 13 were proposed by civil society organizations and these can be found in the comprehensive Excel document.

Goal 14

List of Agencies and Organizations that provided comments on Goal 14 proposals:

- **Nga Tirairaka o Ngati Hine**
- **ESF**
- **International Environment Forum**
- **World Animal Protection**
- **WWF International**
- **SSA Social Justice Office**
- **Fundacion Lonxanet**
- **Bioregional**

The following contains a summary of the main points these civil society organizations made regarding indicator proposals for Goal 14 of the SDGs:

- On the indicator for target 14.4, one organization was surprised by the absence of action against Illegal and destructive fishing, which is however mentioned in the text of the Target itself.
- One civil society organization commented that the Indicators for target 14.6 are confusing and that there needs to be more transparency regarding fisheries subsidies.
- The indicators proposed for target 14.b are not acceptable as fishery certification is very expensive.
- Many new indicators to monitor the targets in Goal 14 were proposed by civil society organizations and these can be found in the comprehensive Excel document.

Goal 15

List of Agencies and Organizations that provided comments on Goal 15 proposals:

- **ESF**
- **Nga Tirairaka o Ngati Hine**
- **WWF**
- **World Animal Protection**
- **Forest Stewardship Council**
- **Sustainable World Initiative**
- **SSA Social Justice Office**
- **Bioregional**
- **Global2020**
- **WWF International**
- **Land Rights Policy Advisor, Oxfam**

The following contains a summary of the main points these civil society organizations made regarding indicator proposals for Goal 15 of the SDGs:

- The 25 Biodiversity Indicator Partnership indicators are crosscutting in nature and could be used to monitor the targets of goal 15.
- Can use forest certification initiatives currently provided by NGOs as a way of measuring forest sustainability.
- Data on protected areas and forest area is not a sufficient indicator of sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems.
- Data should be disaggregated by sector in order to show flow to CBD objectives.
- Many new indicators to monitor the targets in Goal 15 were proposed by civil society organizations and these can be found in the comprehensive Excel document.

Goal 16

List of Agencies and Organizations that provided comments on Goal 16 proposals:

- **Nonviolence International**
- **Saferworld**
- **TAP Network**
- **Plan International**
- **Open Society Justice Initiative**
- **Global Forum for Media Development**
- **Seton Hall University – Center for UN and Global Governance Studies**
- **SSA Social Justice Office**
- **Major Group for Children and Youth – Children and Youth International**
- **United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG)**
- **Save the Children**
- **Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children**
- **SOS Children’s Villages**
- **MADE – Migration and Development Network**
- **International Trade Union Confederation**
- **Center for Economic & Social Rights / Christian Aid**
- **United Nations Association of the USA**
- **International Budget Partnership**
- **International Movement ATD Fourth World**
- **Global Taskforce of Local and Regional Governments**
- **HelpAge International (with contributions from Stakeholder Group on Ageing)**
- **Post-2015 Volunteering Working Group**
- **Child and Youth Finance International**
- **CIVICUS**
- **Advance Family Planning, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation for Population and Reproductive Health, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health**
- **Global Forum for Media Development (GFMD)**
- **International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions**
- **Global Campaign #Culture2015Goal**
- **ESF**

The following contains a summary of the main points these civil society organizations made regarding indicator proposals for Goal 16 of the SDGs:

- The responses made by member states on the feasibility of measuring the indicators for goal 16 was overly negative, as all of Goal 16 is measurable as the responses did not take into account existing capacities of measuring the proposed indicators (many of these capacities lie outside of the National Statistical System).
- Setting limits on the overall number of indicators per target may undermine the Member States' desire that all targets are measured. For Goal 16, a recommendation that a basket of indicators is used collectively, rather than individual indicators for each target, was made.
- The limited capacities of NSO to monitor Goal 16 call for the support of other stakeholders (international organisations, private companies, NGOs) to assist with collecting data and monitoring progress.
- Indicators under this goal should be disaggregated by all relevant groups to ensure that everyone has access to these important issues.
- For goal 16, it could be important to include some perception based indicators as people's opinion on peace, security and governance is valuable information.
- For target 16.2, a proposal to consider the indicator proposed by SDSN rather than the currently included indicator.
- For target 16.3, several organizations recommend considering the SDSN indicator proposed to replace the indicator currently listed.
- The proposed indicators for target 16.10 are not appropriate as they do not respond to what the target is seeking to measure.
- Many new indicators to monitor the targets in Goal 15 were proposed by civil society organizations and these can be found in the comprehensive Excel document.

Goal 17

List of Agencies and Organizations that provided comments on Goal 17 proposals:

- **International Budget Partnership**
- **CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness (CPDE)**
- **Centre for Socio-Economic Development (CSEND), Geneva**
- **Center for Economic and Social Rights**
- **United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG)**
- **Global Taskforce of Local and Regional Governments**
- **SSA Social Justice Office**
- **ESF**
- **Major Group for Children and Youth – Children and Youth International**
- **International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions**
- **Natural Resources Defense Council**
- **Voluntary Services Overseas (VSO)**
- **World Youth Alliance**
- **Open Society Justice Initiative**
- **Environmental Management for Livelihood Improvement Bwaise Facility (EMLI)**
- **Post-2015 Volunteering Working Group**
- **CIVICUS**
- **Caribbean Policy Development Centre**
- **Sightsavers**
- **Beyond 2015**
- **HelpAge International (with contributions from Stakeholder Group on Ageing)**
- **Bioregional**

The following contains a summary of the main points these civil society organizations made regarding indicator proposals for Goal 17 of the SDGs:

- Civil society can and should play an important role in monitoring the SDGs.
- The systemic aspect inherent in the capability approach, in measuring capacity building, and in the concept of social capital are not sufficiently accounted for in the indicators.
- The indicators for target 17.1 cannot be used to measure whether a tax system is equitable or not. Different indicators are needed.
- On Target 17.3, reducing the cost of remittances does not suffice to ease overseas transfers.
- On Target 17.4, comments were made that the HIPC initiative is nearly completed and more forward looking indicators should be considered.
- On Target 17.3, the question was raised by several organizations of whether GDP can really measure global economic stability and policy coherence?
- On target 17.14, organizations commented that policy coherence cannot be reduced to the simple fact of whether countries have ratified some international frameworks and/or agreements. There need to be assessments on how countries are implementing these frameworks in order to determine if there is actually policy coherence.
- The indicators for target 17.18 do not adequately measure the target.
-

Appendix 1: Complete List of all Major Groups and Stakeholders that provided comments on the indicator proposal

1,000 Days
 Action Against Hunger, ACF International
 Action for Women and Children (AWCC)
 ADD International
 Advance Family Planning, Bill & Melinda
 Gates Foundation for Population and
 Reproductive Health, Johns Hopkins
 Bloomberg School of Public Health
 Africa Coordinating Centre for the
 Abandonment of Female Genital
 Mutilation/Cutting (ACCAF)
 Beyond 2015
 Beyond FGM
 Bioregional
 Biovision / Millennium Institute
 British and World Medical Associations
 CAFOD
 Caribbean Policy Development Centre
 Caribbean Policy Development Centre and
 Environmental Management for
 Livelihood Improvement Bwaise Facility
 (EMLI)
 Center for Economic & Social Rights
 Center for Economic & Social Rights /
 Christian Aid
 Center for Human Rights and Climate
 Change Research / Gender Justice and
 Sustainable Development Network
 Center for Vaccine Ethics and Policy/NYU
 Centre for Socio-Economic Development
 (CSEND), Geneva
 Chair Regional Measles Elimination
 Verification Commission, Western Pacific
 Child and Youth Finance International
 Christian Aid
 CIVICUS
 Climate Action Network
 Community Emergency Response
 Initiative (CERI)
 Countdown 2015 Europe
 CSO Partnership for Development
 Effectiveness (CPDE)
 Culture Committee, United Cities and
 Local Governments (UCLG)
 Education International
 END FGM European Network
 End Water Poverty
 ENDA Tiers Monde
 Environmental Management for
 Livelihood Improvement Bwaise Facility
 (EMLI)
 ESF
 Excision parlons-en!
 Fairtrade in Sweden
 Forest Stewardship Council
 FORWARD – Foundation for Women’s
 health, Research and Development
 Framework Convention Alliance for
 Tobacco Control
 Fundacion Lonxanet
 FundaMentalSDG
 G20 Young Entrepreneurs Alliance
 Gender Links
 Generation Nutrition
 German NGOs and DPOs
 Global 2020
 Global Alcohol Policy Alliance
 Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves
 Global Campaign #Culture2015Goal
 Global Campaign for Education
 Global Forum for Media Development
 (GFMD)
 Global Initiative to End All Corporal
 Punishment of Children
 Global Reporting Initiative (GRI)
 Global Taskforce of Local and Regional
 Governments
 Global2016
 Global2020
 Global2021
 Guardian News and Media Ltd.
 HelpAge International (with contributions
 from Stakeholder Group on Ageing
 Hivos
 Integrate Bristol
 International Agency for Prevention of
 Blindness
 International Association of Women’s
 Mental Health
 International Budget Partnership
 International Coalition for Advocacy on
 Nutrition

International Environment Forum
International Federation of Library
Associations and Institutions
International HIV/AIDS Alliance
International Movement ATD Fourth
World
International Trade Union Confederation
Land Rights Policy Advisor, Oxfam
Leonard Cheshire Disability
MADE – Migration and Development
Network
Major Group for Children and Youth –
Children and Youth International
Natural Resources Defense Council
NCD Alliance
Nga Tirairaka o Ngati Hine
NGO Committee on Migration
No FGM Australia
Nonviolence International
Open Society Justice Initiative
Oxfam
Partnership on Sustainable Low Carbon
Transport
PHM
Plan International
Plan UK
Post-2015 Volunteering Working Group
Red Educacion Popular entre Mujeres
America Latina y el Caribe (REPEM
LAC)
Right to Education Project
Royal College of Obstetricians and
Gynecologists
Saferworld
Save the Children
Seton Hall University – Center for UN and
Global Governance Studies
Sightsavers
Society for the Psychological Study of
Social Issues
SOS Children’s Villages
SOS Children’s Villages UK /
GAMCOTRAP
Southeast Indigenous Peoples’ Center
SSA Social Justice Office
Stockholm Resilience Center
Sustainable World Initiative
TAP Network
The Girl Generation: Together to End
FGM

The Orchid Project (a charity working to
end (FGM/C)
United Cities and Local Governments
(UCLG)
United Nations Association of the USA
United Nations Sustainable Development
Solutions Network
Voluntary Services Overseas (VSO)
WaterAid
World Animal Protection
World Youth Alliance
WWF International