Civil Society statement on Goal 16 at the 3rd meeting of the Inter Agency and Expert Group on SDGs indicators in Mexico city from 30 March to 1st April, 2016.


Thank you Co-chair.

We are appreciative of the work of the Expert Group on Goal 16 and the space afforded to civil society in these discussion. I will be discussing Goal 16 which has more “orphan indicators” - those without a custodian agency - than any other Goal. While developing methodologies will be led by Expert Group members, without lead agencies, we are concerned that these indicators will be sidelined, or taken forward by agencies whose mandates do not sufficiently align with the scope of the target.

The current custodian agencies for Goal 16 indicators do not comprehensively reflect the full spectrum of agencies that work on and collect data for these indicators. As the SG highlighted, no one agency should be solely responsible for any one goal. We suggest that no one agency should be solely responsible for any one target and encourage a more collaborative approach. We invite the IAEG to consider why more agencies have not volunteered for Goal 16 indicators, and to consider how to encourage more agencies to do so.

Secondly, we encourage the group to consider additional data providers for official monitoring, and call for the IAEG and the HLG to collaborate with civil society and the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development Data in this regard. We also support including other data sources into official statistical systems, and also into the metadata compilation process through the IAEG.

Thirdly, we strongly support a formal role for the Praia Group on Governance Statistics, and note that this presents an important opportunity for developing methodologies and metadata for many Goal 16 indicators. The Praia Group’s model of a multi-stakeholder space is also an example of how the official statistics community can structure engagement with all relevant stakeholders.

Fourthly, we welcome the discussions around supplementary indicators, in line with IDLOs intervention we remain concerned about target 16.3 where the reliance on criminal justice indicators completely ignores access and civil justice issues - by far the most common justice problems people face. Justice surveys have been used successfully by countries for decades, and we encourage the IAEG to consider how supplementary indicators can help to measure the full scope of 16.3. We welcome the interventions made by Italy.
Finally, regarding the Tier III indicators in Goal 16, we invite the Group to consider the following datasets:

16.1.2 - reliable data has been put together by PRIO, Uppsala Conflict Data Program, the International crime victimization survey and others

We also suggest that WHO, DPKO and PBSO should be additional custodial agencies for this indicator.

16.4.1 – We would support UNODC proposal to establish a technical working group on “illicit financial flows,” and would encourage that stakeholders including independent research institutions such as Global Financial Integrity contribute to that group.

16.6.2 - This indicator has been used by many NSOs, in partnership with civil society data producers. Data is collected by perception surveys including the World Value Survey, Gallup, and various NSOs and is globally comparable. This approach has been applied and reported by NSOs using the SHaSA questionnaire. Other data providers including Transparency International, the World Bank and others currently collect survey data on this indicator.

16.7.1 the information needed can be collected directly from the national public institutions as most countries have information with regards to their employees. For example, the USA publishes a report on Employment of People with Disabilities in the Federal Executive Branch.

16.7.1-2

16.10.1 We welcome the proposal from UNESCO, ILO and OHCHR the transparent and participatory processes in development of this work. on this indicator, and would support these agencies to be the custodial agencies for this indicator and welcome