|  |
| --- |
| **Open Consultation on Grey Indicators: Compilation of Inputs by the Observers of IAEG-SDGs  and Other Stakeholders (9 Dec - 15 Dec 2015)** |
|
|

|  |
| --- |
| **Inputs provided by the Observers of IAEG-SDGs and Other Stakeholders during the Open Consultation on Grey Indicators (9 Dec - 15 Dec 2015)** |
|
|  |
| **Read Me First** |
|  |
| *(As of 18 December 2015)* |
|  |
| 1. This document contains the inputs provided by the Observers of the Inter-agency and Expert Group on Sustainable Development Goal Indicators (IAEG-SDGs) and other stakeholders during the Open Consultation on proposed SDG Indicators that are coded as "grey", indicating that additional work and discussion are needed before reaching a final agreement on them.   2. These inputs will be considered by the IAEG-SDGs Members in their final phase of preparation of the set of indicators to be submitted to the Statistical Commission. The final decision on the number, type and formulation of the indicators in the global indicator framework proposal will be taken by the IAEG-SDGs Members. |
|
|
|
|
|
|

| **Country/Organisation** | **Goal 1: End poverty in all its forms everywhere** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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. | **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 | **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 efforts. |
| *Indicator 1.4.1:* Proportion of the population living in households with access to basic services | *Indicator 1.5.1:*Number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters per 100,000 people | *Indicator 1.b.1:*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 |
|  | ***Discussion prompt:****There is a parallel process to review this indicator.* | *Discussion prompt: The IAEG-SDG Members ask for suggestions for an alternative indicator.* |
| **Total comments received** | 129 | 59 | 38 |
| Australian Bureau of Statistics |  |  | Sum of Total Grants and FDI and non-debt creating inflows - $$$ equivalent. |
| Central Statistical Office of Poland | CSO of Poland comments: Further clarification is needed.There is no information what services should be treated as basic, whether public free of charge services are taken into consideration only and whether the indicator concerns administrative data. It is difficult to design one aggreagated indicator referring to different kinds of sevices, like education, health protection, transport, social assistance etc. | CSO of Poland comments CSO of Poland collects data on number of deaths according to International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems (ICD-10) - Revision 10. It does not allow to determine, wheather the death was a result of disaster. |  |
| Government of Japan | (Comments on the overall) Japan makes its comments on the entire procedures before submission of comments on each indicators. - Prior consultations of the draft reports of IAEG-SDGs should be made amang the obserbers before submitting them to the UNSC in order to avoid confusion in UNSC. In addition to the already submitted comments from Japan, Japan submits herewith its new comments which have been consulted newly amang the relevant ministries and agencies. | Japan support the comment made by ISDR and several countries in indicated in "Summary of comments (corrected version - 19 October 2015)" that both “Number of death/ missing and affected people” and “direct economic loss” are to be prioritized. Since there are some targets regarding Disaster Risk Reduction in different goals, it is preferable that both “Number of death/ missing and affected people” and “direct economic loss” are positioned as common indicators to measure progress of targets 1.5, 11.5 and 13.1. To minimize the reporting burden on countries, indicators for DRR targets in SDGs have to be identical with those in Sendai Framework. Therefore, we propose to set the indicators for targets 1.5, 11.5 and 13.1 as “Number of death, missing and affected people due to hazardous events per 100,000” and “Direct economic loss due to hazardous events in relation to global gross domestic products”. |  |
| Hungarian Central Statistical Office |  | HU: It’s not clear what “disasters” exactly mean, what we should include in it. In our point of view it has to be clarified. The target overlaps other targets, like 11.5 and 13.1. |  |
| Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Censos | We request the determination of basic services for the estimation of this indicator, undergoing this conceptualization implies making normative judgements on what these services are. | This indicator does not measure enables resilience capacity to the poor. We recommend the addition of another indicator that would allow the estimation of the capacity of building resilience in impoverished individuals. Ecuador proposes the following: Percentage of territory that has evacuation plans or contingency plans in response to extreme environmental events. |  |
| ISTAT | ISTAT-ITALY: It is necessary to know what are the basic services | ISTAT-Italy: The SENDAI process will provide the final formulation for this indicator with economic losses also considered |  |
| National Statistical Committee, Belarus | Deem appropriate to provide the definition of "basic services" |  |  |
| Statistics Denmark | The indicator does not capture the natural resources element, however we realize that this is not the key focus of the target and hence it cannot be expected that the indicator has a specific environmental focus for this target. | In relation to Gender Equality we wish to propose that this indicator should be disaggregated by sex. The merging of “death” and “evacuation” number seams inappropriate and will give a wrong impression on the disaster impact, e.g. 1.500. per. 100.000 could cover 1.500 deaths in Bangladesh and 1.500 temporarily evacuated in Denmark. |  |
| Statistics Finland | Finland proposes that a land indicator “Percentage of people with secure tenure rights to land (out of total adult population), with legally recognized documentation and who perceive their rights to land as secure, by sex and by type of tenure" is included under Goal 1. |  | Finland suggests an alternative indicator: "The number (or share) of national action plans/strategies with ex-ante assessment of poverty & gender impacts" It seems that the original indicator proposal contains too many vague expressions and the data is likely to be difficult to gather. Why is this focused on environmental agreements? It is unlikely that environmental agreements are the most relevant ones here. |
| Statistics Lithuania |  |  | Data could be available or estimate |
| Statistics Portugal |  |  | The indicator is very ambiguous. It deserves further development in terms of the criteria for identification of national action plans related to environmental agreements. Moreover, in spite of the number of actions probably information on the expenditure with those actions per capita would be more meaningful about the efforts on the area of this goal. |
| Swiss Federal Statistical Office | Switzerland comments: Switzerland, as member of and in accordance with all other 23 members of the Global Donor Working Group on Land (GDWGL) https://www.donorplatform.org/land-governance/global-donor-working-group-on-land> highly opposes the deletion of former indicator 1.4.2 which was targeting access to secure land tenure. Switzerland therefore strongly supports the reinstatement of an appropriate land indicator under 1.4. The target explicitly refers to ownership and control over land and other forms of property, which CANNOT be measured by current indicator 1.4.1. The appropriate land indicator, under target 1.4, also supported by the Global Land Indicators Initiative (GLII), Landesa and many other partners, would read: “Percentage of people with secure tenure rights to land (out of total adult population), with legally recognized documentation and who perceive their rights to land as secure, by sex and by type of tenure". Besides the efforts of GLII, there are two ongoing initiatives that support data collection for the suggested land indicator: (1) The World Bank is collecting administrative data available within land registries and cadasters for as many countries as possible (data is currently available for 189 countries). They are conducting surveys with officials of land agencies and local experts to assess whether obtaining information is feasible, including disaggregated information. (2) A Rome data hub has recently been established jointly by FAO, IFAD and WB to document the land related information (including gendered perceptions of tenure security) in all of the household surveys of the Living Standards Measurement Study and make this information available as open data on our institutions’ data portal. These exercises are showing that collecting information is feasible - because information is already available and/or can be done at low additional cost (US$ 50K by country is often enough). The World Bank, as a member of the Global Donor WG on Land, is willing to share detailed information on these surveys. Further supportive information can be found in the following three documents: (1) Policy brief from GDWGL: http://www.scribd.com/document\_downloads/290501000? |  |  |
| TurkStat |  |  | Turkstat comments: Indicator 1.b.1 is vaguely formulated. The indicator per se is difficult to classify and measure because of the "and" conjunction resulting in two different requirements for its measurement. Turkstat suggests either to use only the part before the "and" conjunction or to replace the "and" conjunction with "with respect to" while favouring the former. A third alternative suggested would be considering the possible split of the indicator into two distinct indicators according the requirements given before and after the "and" conjunction in the sentence. |
| TURKSTAT |  |  | Turkstat comments that Indicator 1.b.1 is vaguely formulated. The indicator per se is difficult to classify and measure because of the "and" conjunction resulting in two different requirements for its measurement. Turkstat suggests either to use only the part before the "and" conjunction or to replace the "and" conjunction with "with respect to" while favouring the former. A third alternative suggested would be considering the possible split of the indicator into two distinct indicators according the requirements given before and after the "and" conjunction in the sentence. |
| United States | US: This target spans a number of dimensions that are only partly related, which creates a problem in identifying indicators because it's not clear which are the key dimensions that need to be tracked. "Access to basic services" is arguably one of those dimensions, but clearly not the only one. Focusing exclusively on "Access to basic services" would be a mistake, because (1) it is only one of the several dimensions cited in the target; (2) there's no consensus on what constitutes "basic" services; and (3) focusing on access to the exclusion of quality is problematic. Without seeing the outcome of the review mentioned in Column E, it is hard to be more specific. Therefore, we support this indicator if supplemented by 1.4.2. (See below) 1.4.2. Share of women among agricultural land owners by age and location (U/R) | US: The indicators proposed appear reasonable for this purpose. | US: The original proposed indicator is incomplete by focusing on ONLY policy frameworks focused on environmental agreements, and second by requiring somebody to pass judgment on whether or not these agrements "support accelerated investment in actions that eradicate poverty." It is very unclear who would make that call, and on what basis.  We suggest instead to go back to the basics, recognizing that the key to poverty reduction is economic growth (which accounts for 97% of cross-country differences in the rate of reduction in extreme poverty.) In practice, a pro-growth" development strategy IS a "pro-poor" strategy. That being the case, we propose to use the "Distance to the Frontier" measure tracked by the World Bank's Doing Business unit. This indicator captures the distance between actual country policies and best policy practice in the world, based on 10 different policy areas. The indicator is strongly correlated with income per capita across a wide range of countries; it also has the advantage of being objectively measured, which most policy indicators are not. The summary below provides more info:  Distance to Frontier The distance to frontier score aids in assessing the absolute level of regulatory performance and how it improves over time. This measure shows the distance of each economy to the “frontier,” which represents the best performance observed on each of the indicators across all economies in the Doing Business sample since 2005. This allows users both to see the gap between a particular economy’s performance and the best performance at any point in time and to assess the absolute change in the economy’s regulatory environment over time as measured by Doing Business. An economy’s distance to frontier is reflected on a scale from 0 to 100, where 0 represents the lowest performance and 100 represents the frontier. For example, a score of 75 in DB 2015 means an economy was 25 percentage points away from the frontier constructed from the best performances across all economies and across time. A score of 80 in DB 2016 would indicate the economy is improving. In this way the distance to frontier measure complements the annual ease of doing business ranking, which compares economies with one another at a point in time.  http://www.doingbusiness.org/data/distance-to-frontier |
| Eurostat | The development work should start with a definition of "basic services". Examples might be accessibility of grocery services, banking services, postal services, public transport, primary health care services, compulsory school etc.. Could partly be measured by multi-purpose indicator, e.g. from goals 3 & 4. The indicator does not refer to "equal rights to economic resources". More development work is needed at a later stage to achieve full coverage of the target. | Methodological development work in line with the Sendai framework required. Loss data are inadequate to report about exposure and vulnerability. Disaster Risk is about future losses. That needs to be modelled and exposure and vulnerability are the key variables together with hazards. The provision of global exposure (physical and population) information could be based on EO data delivering standardized global datasets (global high-resolution maps of settlements and population) that can make up for the lack of data in many data-poor countries. The indicator does not refer to "economic and social shocks". More development work is needed at a later stage to achieve full coverage of the target. |  |
| g7+ Secretariat | g7+ Secretariat: The indicator will be fine without breaking it into age group or gender. However "Basic services" should be defined in the country context. What might be considered "Basic services" in developed countries can be way far luxury in the LDCs and FCS. Let the countries define what basic service means for them. If we can't draw agreement on what will the "basic service" mean, we better leave this indicator be identified at the National level and should be "country level indicator". We feel strong on this notion as the service delivery, if measured at the global standard, will be difficult for us achieve | g7+ Secretariat: Should be modified as, "Number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to natural disasters, and Industry accidents per 100,000 people. (Industry accidents should include, the damage caused by drainage of chemical wastes, polluting of water used for irrigation and drinking). | g7+ Secretariat: The target is not about number of plans, but it is about the responsiveness of the plans to the need. The indicator should capture the quality of being pro-poor policy or responsive to the country needs. Again the quality standard of the plans (strategies) should be set at the country level based on countries context. |
| IFAD | There is the need to clearly define the set of services to be considered here and the relative importance. The standardization of the definition to allow for a feasible comparison across countries is critical. The spatial disaggregation of this indicator will be important as there are baseline disparities not just between urban and rural areas, but also across regions within countries. Ensuring at least urban/rural disaggregations needs to be considered. |  |  |
| IFAD | Land indicator is critical to ending poverty and must remain in SDG Goal 1 IFAD, as member of and in accordance with all other 23 members of the Global Donor Working Group on Land (GDWGL)<https: www.donorplatform.org="" land-governance="" global-donor-working-group-on-land=""> highly opposes the deletion of former indicator 1.4.2 which was targeting access to secure land tenure. IFAD therefore strongly supports the reinstatement of an appropriate land indicator under 1.4. The target explicitly refers to ownership and control over land and other forms of property, which CANNOT be measured by current indicator 1.4.1. The appropriate land indicator, under target 1.4, also supported by the Global Land Indicators Initiative (GLII), Landesa and many other partners, would read: “Percentage of people with secure tenure rights to land (out of total adult population), with legally recognized documentation and who perceive their rights to land as secure, by sex and by type of tenure". Besides the efforts of GLII, there are two ongoing initiatives that support data collection for the suggested land indicator: (1) The World Bank is collecting administrative data available within land registries and cadasters for as many countries as possible (data is currently available for 189 countries). They are conducting surveys with officials of land agencies and local experts to assess whether obtaining information is feasible, including disaggregated information. (2) A Rome data hub has recently been established jointly by FAO, IFAD and WB to document the land related information (including gendered perceptions of tenure security) in all of the household surveys of the Living Standards Measurement Study and make this information available as open data on our institutions’ data portal. These exercises are showing that collecting information is feasible - because information is already available and/or can be done at low additional cost (US$ 50K by country is often enough). The World Bank, as a member of the Global Donor WG on Land, is willing to share detailed information on these surveys. Further supportive information can be found in the following three documents: (1) Policy brief from GDWGL: http://www.scribd.com/document\_downloads/290501000?extension=pdf&from=embed&source=embed; (2) GLII’s proposed Metadata for the land indicator: http://www.scribd.com/document\_downloads/293309913?extension=pdf&from=embed&source=embed; and (3) GLII’s land governance indicators database: http://www.scribd.com/document\_downloads/293309206?extension=pdf&from=embed&source=embed |  |  |
| International Disability Alliance |  | For indicators 1.5.1, 11.5.1 and 13.1.1 we recommend aligning with the Sendai Framework for DRR and explicitly mention persons with disabilities. |  |
| International Disability and Development Consortium | IDDC recommends disaggregation of indicator 1.4.1 by the list of characteristics mentioned in 17.18 (income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other relevant characteristics) and related chapeau of the 2030 Agenda. | IDDC recommends disaggregation of indicator 1.5.1 by the list of characteristics mentioned in 17.18 (income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other relevant characteristics) and related chapeau of the 2030 Agenda. |  |
| International Land Coalition | Secure land rights for all are a critical component of the 2030 Agenda, and an integral part of the Target 1.4. It is fundamental to include an indicator on land tenure under Goal 1 (as 1.4.2). We encourage the IAEG-SDG to consider a comprehensive land indicator tracking rights “secure rights to land” and not just “ownership”; referring to “land” and not just to “agricultural land”; tracking progress for women and men, as well as for indigenous peoples and communities, as tenure can be individual or collective . To this end, we recommend to use the following indicator: Percentage of women, men, indigenous peoples, and local communities (IPLCs) with secure rights to land, property and natural resources, measured by a) percentage with legally documented or recognized evidence of tenure, and b) percentage who perceive their rights are recognized and protected. This indicator has been supported by UK and others during the negotiations, and responds to concerns expressed by Italy, South Africa and Switzerland during the consultations. It is supported by the Global Land Indicator Initiative (led by the World Bank, and UN-Habitat, and facilitated by GLTN), the Global Donor Platform on Rural Development, the IP Major Group, the Women’s Major Group, IUCN, UN-Habitat, UNEP, SDSN, and a broad coalition of civil society. |  |  |
| International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) | IUCN suggests consideration of “percentage of women, men, indigenous peoples, and local communities with secure rights to land, property and natural resources, measured by a) percentage with legally documented or recognized evidence of tenure, and b) percentage who perceive their rights are recognized and protected” as an indicator towards SDG Target 1.4. Secure land rights for all are a critical component of the 2030 Agenda, and an integral part of SDGTarget 1.4. We therefore encourage the application of a comprehensive land indicator tracking rights “secure rights to land” and not just “ownership”; referring to “land” and not just to “agricultural land”; tracking progress for women and men, as well as for indigenous peoples and communities, as tenure can be individual or collective. |  |  |
| International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs | Secure land rights for all are a critical component of the 2030 Agenda, and an integral part of the Target 1.4. It is fundamental to include an indicator on land tenure under Goal 1 (as 1.4.2). We encourage the IAEG-SDG to consider a comprehensive land indicator tracking rights “secure rights to land” and not just “ownership”; referring to “land” and not just to “agricultural land”; tracking progress for women and men, as well as for indigenous peoples and communities, as tenure can be individual or collective . To this end, we recommend to use the following indicator: Percentage of women, men, indigenous peoples, and local communities (IPLCs) with secure rights to land, property and natural resources, measured by a) percentage with legally documented or recognized evidence of tenure, and b) percentage who perceive their rights are recognized and protected. This indicator has been supported by UK and others during the negotiations, and responds to concerns expressed by Italy, South Africa and Switzerland during the consultations. It is supported by the Global Land Indicator Initiative (led by the World Bank), the Global Donor Platform on Rural Development, the IP Major Group, the Women’s Major Group, IUCN, UN-Habitat, UNEP, SDSN, and a broad coalition of civil society. |  |  |
| ITU | ITU suggests to include the "proportion of households with broadband Internet access", a TIER I indicator that is clearly defined, collected by ITU from NSOs, and that is part of the Partnership on Measuring ICT for Development's core list of indicators (endorsed by UNSC). Several countries and organisations have supported the inclusion of this indicator. |  |  |
| OCHA |  | OCHA reiterates its earlier recommendation to add (a) the number of people displaced by disasters and (b) other shocks indicated in the title of target 1.5 in the indicator 1.5.1. The title of target 1.5 includes coverage going beyond disasters and thus establishes a broader, more comprehensive picture of the myriad shocks that can affect vulnerable people and ‘test’ their resilience. The more comprehensive coverage of the target 1.5 and our proposal for indicator 1.5.1 is compatible with the corresponding counterparts currently being refined in the Sendai Framework indicator deliberations; the latter can provide the disaster data to complement the non-disaster-related data collected in the context of the SDG indicator framework. Furthermore, the inclusion of ‘displaced’ in the indicator would enable more comprehensive and technically sound reflection of human impacts caused by disasters (and other shocks) than ‘evacuated’ and ‘relocated’ (NB. the three element are mutually compatible as the latter two reflect specific aspects of displacement and are inclusive thereof; hence could include “displaced, including evacuated and relocated”). Moreover, people who become displaced by disasters and other shocks are in high danger of remaining in said situation and being left behind by the 2030 Agenda long after the event that displaced them due to heightened vulnerability caused by loss of homes, employment, livelihoods, education, etc. Displacement data and statistics are collected and compiled with established, robust methodologies by actors such as UNHCR, Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre and governments. |  |
| UN Women | Disposable income, by sex Disposable income is defined as the sum of monetary and non-monetary income from labour, monetary income from capital, monetary social security transfers (including work-related insurance transfers, universal transfers, and assistance transfers), and non-monetary social assistance transfers, as well as monetary and non-monetary private transfers, less the amount of income taxes and social contributions paid. This information is collected for some countries (mostly high income countries) but a methodology could be developed for global monitoring. This indicator would indicate whether women and men have equal access to economic resources and would therefore be directly relevant to the target. |  | Share of ODA in support of gender equality and women’s empowerment, disaggregated by principal and significant This indicator measures the extent to which development aid is gender sensitive. Data for this indicator are collected by OECD-DAC and and is regularly reported. |
| UNCDF | UNCDF: Proposed additional indicator: % of adults belonging to the poorest 40% with an account at a bank or other financial institution or with a mobile money service provider. Argument: The current indicator proposed is a partial measurement of the target, and only addresses basic services, which is not defined, nor is it indicated whether all such services must be present or one or some. Furthermore, it ignores the other services included in the target, such as access to financial services. Therefore, we suggest to include multiple indicators for this target to measure its different and most important components. An indicator already exists, is collected triennially and is available for approximately 145 countries. |  |  |
| UNDP |  | UNDP PROPOSALS \* Percentage of population with access to social protection schemes and evidence-based risk information to build resilience and to reduce the number of people killed, affected, injured, relocated or evacuated against multiple hazards and shocks per 100,000 people. \* Percentage of population vulnerable to disasters, climate-related extreme events and other environmental shocks with access to social protection schemes and programs \* Percentage of population with access to evidence-based risk information for protecting socio-economic assets and social protection schemes to build resilience against disasters, climate-related extreme events and other economic, social and environmental shocks RATIONALE While acknowledging that this indicator will be further analyzed during the indicator formulation process for the Sendai Framework for DRR, some points on the relevance and applicability of this indicator for the Target are enumerated for consideration: \* The current formulation of the Indicator is preponderantly event-centric i.e. it focuses only on impacts emanating from a disaster event. In the context of sustainable development, it misses the close nexus between risks and development i.e. how the development process contributes to risk creation which bears the potential of increasing the impact of disasters and eventually undermining development gains. This is based on the experience during the MDGs implementation when many countries reported their development progress was impeded by frequent disasters and their impacts. \* The Target seeks to address 3 key dimensions related to (i) resilience building, (ii) reducing exposure and vulnerability and (iii) social, economic and environmental aspects. The Indicator formulation. The focus of the Indicator on disaster impacts dilutes focus on these key dimensions. \* Building resilience (at individual, community and country level) in the context of poverty eradication entails building capacities at individual and community level to anticipate, reduce, absorb and adapt to a range of stressors including natural hazards, climatic change and their impacts. It will be good to instill resilience-building dimensions to the indicator. Resilience accounts for more than just the ability to bounce back to original conditions. Focus on positive attributes like capacity (adaptive, risk management, governance, social safety nets etc.) will help improve resilience to a multitude of risks. \* Increasing exposure and vulnerability due to climate change makes it essential to focus on detailed risk assessments to measure the extent of exposure and vulnerability in order to be able to risk-inform development and livelihood interventions from a disaster and climate risk management perspective. \* Measuring only the number of deaths/injured/evacuated does not provide a good indication of the level of exposure or vulnerability. For example, a country ‘X’ might report progress in the reduction of the number of deaths/injured/evacuated – however this result may have been achieved, because the country did not experience any natural hazard event. Hence the apparently positive trend cannot be linked to the successful implementation of risk reduction measures. \* In relation to the overall objective of Goal-1 and Target-1.5, the indicator needs to be strengthened by embedding a strong reference to the socio-economic impacts of disasters. The current focus of the indicator is largely on physical impacts and does not give due recognition to the vulnerable livelihoods of the poor. There is now compelling evidence that frequently reoccurring small-scale disasters and climate impacts (like alterations/variations in precipitation, temperature, seasonality etc.) have often a much larger cumulative impact on eroding the resilience of individuals and communities especially in poor countries or regions rather than the occasional large scale events. Recurring small-scale events do NOT necessarily have high mortality rates, but have been shown to have quite a long-term and incipient adverse impact on poverty, people’s coping capacities, local development and resilience. \* The socio-economic aspects can be expressed in terms of loss of socio-economic assets (community assets or development infrastructure) as a percentage of GDP or in relation to the income-poverty baselines at national or sub-national level. Such an indicator could bear a strong message for policy-makers and the private sector. The elements related to socio-economic impacts and loss of socio-economic infrastructure will also be relevant for Goal-9 (resilient infrastructure); Goal-11 (urban and human settlements), and Goal-13 in the resilience-building context. \* In view of the differential impacts of disasters on women and men, and the resulting need for gender-sensitive vulnerability reduction measures, the indicator should disaggregate the data by age, sex and other socio-economic indicators. The fact that disasters have the potential to push people back into poverty is borne out from the experience of past disasters. For example, in Aceh, Indonesia, the 2004 tsunami resulted in increase of proportion of people living below the poverty line from 30-50 percent in 2006. Similarly, data collected from the province of Rizal in Philippines, affected by Typhoons Ondoy and Pepeng in 2009, indicated that the incidence of poverty almost doubled from 5.5% to 9.5% within 3 years. The post-disaster needs assessment in Nepal estimates that over 750,000 people are likely to be pushed back into poverty due the earthquakes of April and May 2015. With regard to the need to make the Indicator measurable and verifiable, it may be mentioned that – i. There are a number of tools and methodologies currently being used by international and regional organizations to support national governments meet their reporting obligations under global agreements. For example, the HFA Monitor (under revision for the Sendai Framework), the Multi-dimensional Poverty Index, Human Development Index and others. ii. Over the years, considerable capacity and expertise has been built at national and sub-national level to monitor and report on DRR-related aspects. iii. The national damage and loss data-bases are the primary source of information for these aspects. Initiatives like the Desinventar and the partnership between UNDP and Tohoku University, Japan to set-up the Global Centre for Disaster Statistics (GCDS) are designed to support national governments and sub-national authorities to operationalize systems for tracking damages and losses. National experience from Indonesia The Government of Indonesia, with technical support from UNDP, carried out a country pilot ‘to assess and propose feasible indicators to measure disaster risk reduction progress and achievement of SDGs goals and targets’ looking at targets 1.5 and 13.1. Seven indicators were considered feasible to support the measurement of progress on building resilience of the poor to disaster and other relevant shocks for target 1.5. They included: (1) Percentage of population living below national poverty line after disaster events; (2) Damage and loss in poor people’s livelihoods and economy; (3) Multi-dimensional Poverty Index; (4) Number of poor people living in hazard prone areas; (5) Percentage of population covered by social protection program; (6) Percentage of population covered by national health protection program; and (7) Percentage of poor population that have access to basic health service. |  |
| UNEP | UNEP Comments: The UN SDG Interface Ontology Working Group is developing definitions for access and basic services. A brief note on this work is available from: http://unstats.un.org/unsd/post-2015/activities/egm-on-indicator-framework/docs/Common%20approach%20for%20developing%20SDG%20Integrated%20indicators.pdf | UNEP Comments: The Sendai Framework process will define the impacts aspect of this target. However, Target 1.5 also focuses on the “resilience of the poor” and the need to reduce their “vulnerability”. To address the need to better measure vulnerability and resilience to climate change, the following indicator can also be considered: Percentage of population exposed to climate-related extreme events and other economic, social and environmental shocks and disasters. National geo-spatial exposure/risk estimates are available for flooding, tsunami, storm surge, drought, heat wave event, earthquakes, volcanic activity, and industrial hazards/population distribution (http://preview.grid.unep.ch/index.php?preview=data&lang=eng; www.unpelive.unep.org) | UNEP Comments: a) The Global Survey on National SCP looks at progress towards the sustainable use of natural resources at the national level and on the availability and implementation of SCP policies and initiatives in countries. This tool encompasses the objective of the 10YFP to contribute to resource efficiency and decoupling economic growth from environmental degradation and increasing resource use, while creating decent jobs and economic opportunities and contributing to poverty eradication and shared prosperity, by supporting regional and national policies and initiatives. (UN Conference on Sustainable Development - Rio+20 (2012) 10YFP adopted document A/CONF.216/5.) b) The status of National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) is an indicator relating to the sustainable use of natural resources with links to poverty reduction, currently part of Aichi Target 17 on Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (https://www.cbd.int/sp/targets). UNEP and partners are conducting voluntary expert technical reviews of draft NBSAP products specifically to determine whether the links to poverty reduction plans are clearly identified, and about evidence of supporting sustainable use of natural resources. NBSAPs may also reflect Aichi Target two “…biodiversity values…incorporated into…poverty reduction strategies…and national accounting…” and Aichi Targets four, seven and twelve relating to sustainable use of natural resources. |
| UNEP | Secure land rights for all are a critical component of the 2030 Agenda, and an integral part of the Target 1.4. It is fundamental to include an indicator on land tenure under Goal 1 (as 1.4.2). We encourage the IAEG-SDG to consider a comprehensive land indicator tracking rights “secure rights to land” and not just “ownership”; referring to “land” and not just to “agricultural land”; tracking progress for women and men, as well as for indigenous peoples and communities, as tenure can be individual or collective . To this end, we recommend to use the following indicator: Percentage of women, men, indigenous peoples, and local communities (IPLCs) with secure rights to land, property and natural resources, measured by a) percentage with legally documented or recognized evidence of tenure, and b) percentage who perceive their rights are recognized and protected. This indicator has been supported by UK and others during the negotiations, and responds to concerns expressed by Italy, South Africa and Switzerland during the consultations. It is supported by the Global Land Indicator Initiative (led by the World Bank), the Global Donor Platform on Rural Development, the IP Major Group, the Women’s Major Group, IUCN, UN-Habitat, UNEP, SDSN, and a broad coalition of civil society. |  | Number of budgets and expenditure processes that integrate poverty, gender and environment objectives Means of verification: Ministry of Finance Budget and expenditure reports Local government finance and expenditure reports |
| UN-ESCAP | I think acess needs to include proximity, quality and affordability | Strongly support |  |
| UNFPA |  | UNFPA has no comment at this point. |  |
| UNICEF | UNICEF supports this indicator | UNICEF supports this indicator following the recommendations of the Sendai process |  |
| UNISDR |  | We advocate the following two indicators for targets 1.5, 11.5 and 13.1 as “twin” multi-purpose indicators. 1.Number of deaths, missing and affected people due to hazardous events per 100,000. 2. Direct economic loss due to hazardous events in relation to global gross domestic product. Since the beginning of the consultation, we have proposed “economic loss” indicator in addition to human loss indicator. Several countries expressed the support for the economic loss indicator. We believe this indicator should be added in the list of SDG indicators as it satisfies the criteria expressed by DESA that indicator supported at least one country can be added to grey indicator. Colombia, Korea, France, Japan, Canada clearly expressed adding “economic loss indicator” in the Aug-Sep consultation. UNISDR basically has proposed the same indicators for both the SDGs and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030. The details of suggested indicators are currently under review by the Member States in Sendai indicator discussion process. The Second session of the Open-ended Intergovernmental Expert Working Group to discuss Sendai indicators is scheduled to take place 10-11 February 2016. We would like to discuss bilaterally with UNDESA how to coordinate the SDG and Sendai process. |  |
| United Nations ESCAP | United Nations ESCAP, Thailand, This is a highly unrealistic proposal and difficult to implement | United Nations ESCAP, Thailand, These events are exogenous by nature and cannot be controlled, it would be more effective to have insurance schemes | United Nations ESCAP, Thailand, This sounds like waffle |
| United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) | OHCHR notes that the suggested indicator does not measure ‘ownership and control over land and other forms of property, inheritance, natural resources...’ explicitly mentioned in the target and suggests an additional indicator ‘Percentage of women, men, indigenous peoples and local communities with secure tenure rights to individually or communally held land, property and natural resources.’ |  |  |
| Universal Postal Union | The Universal Postal Union (UPU) invites member countries to build up a list/basket of inclusive regulated basic services, which should include any regulated service that does contribute to economic and social inclusion of the poor and vulnerable populations, such as financial, postal and communications services. Moreover, inclusive regulated basic services for which official statistics are regularly produced and already benefiting from a global coverage in terms of official statistics production should be given priority in the constitution of the basket of inclusive regulated basic services. For instance, the UPU, as a United Nations specialized agency, releases official postal statistics on access to a range of inclusive basic postal services (e.g. access to postal delivery) from its 192 member countries ever year and makes them publicly accessible through its website: http://pls.upu.int/pls/ap/ssp\_report.main?p\_language=AN&p\_choice=BROWSE |  |  |
| World Bank | It does not 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. We suggest to have separate indicators for this purpose. It is not clear how ownership of “basic services will be defined. Is having one of the services identified as basic enough? Or should a household have all? For access to financial services, there exists a well-established and widely available existing indicator that is comparable across countries: % adults with an account at a bank or other financial institution or with a mobile money service provider. Possible to have a break down by gender and income e.g. bottom 40% of income share. Adults: ages 15+. 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; or a mobile money account; includes adults who report receiving wages, government transfers, or payments for agricultural products in to an account, paying utility bills or school fees from an account or a card for the purposes of receiving wages or government transfers in the past 12 months. Mobile money account includes respondents who report personally using GSM Association (GSMA) Mobile Money for the Unbanked (MMU) services in the past 12 months to pay bills or to send or receive money. It includes respondents who report receiving wages, government transfers, or payments for agricultural products through a mobile phone in the past 12 months. Source: World Bank Global Findex. Data availability: ~ 145 countries. Triennial. Available for 2011 and 2014 |  |  |
| World Bank | Land indicator is critical to ending poverty and must remain in SDG Goal 1 The World Bank, as member of and in accordance with all other 23 member states of the Global Donor Working Group on Land (GDWGL)<https://www.donorplatform.org/land-governance/global-donor-working-group-on-land> opposes the deletion of former indicator 1.4.2 which was targeting access to secure land tenure. The World Bank therefore strongly supports the reinstatement of an appropriate land indicator under 1.4. The target explicitly refers to ownership and control over land and other forms of property, which cannot be measured by current indicator 1.4.1. The appropriate land indicator, under target 1.4, also supported by the Global Land Indicators Initiative (GLII), with more than 90 partners, would read: “Percentage of people with secure tenure rights to land (out of total adult population), with legally recognized documentation and who perceive their rights to land as secure, by sex and by type of tenure". Given that Goal 1 specifically mentions "equal rights to...ownership and control over land and other forms of property" in Target 1.4, we would strongly recommend keeping Indicator 1.4.2 instead of Indicator 5.a.1 but using slightly modified language as already articulated in the comments for 5.a.1, so that the revised Indicator 1.4.2 would read: "Percentage of total adult population with secure land tenure that is legally recognized and documented or perceived as secure”. (Disaggregation would be the same as for other indicators, including by sex and rural/urban, but we understand if discussions about disaggregation will be treated separately.) The sex disaggregated data collected to measure Indicator 1.4.2 could still be used to report on Target 5.a. Data is available: Besides the efforts of GLII, there are two ongoing initiatives that support data collection for the suggested land indicator: (1) The World Bank is collecting administrative data available within land registries and cadasters for as many countries as possible (data is currently available for 189 countries). The World Bank is conducting surveys with officials of land agencies and local experts to assess whether obtaining information is feasible, including disaggregated information. (2) A Rome data hub has recently been established jointly by FAO, IFAD and WB to document the land related information (including gendered perceptions of tenure security) in all of the household surveys of the Living Standards Measurement Study and make this information available as open data on our institutions’ data portal. These exercises are showing that collecting information is feasible - because information is already available and/or can be done at low additional cost (US$ 50K by country is often enough). The World Bank, as a member of the Global Donor WG on Land, is willing to share detailed information on these surveys. Further supportive information can be found in the following three documents: (1) Policy brief from GDWGL: http://www.scribd.com/document\_downloads/290501000?extension=pdf&from=embed&source=embed; (2) GLII’s proposed Metadata for the land indicator: http://www.scribd.com/document\_downloads/293309913?extension=pdf&from=embed&source=embed; and (3) GLII’s land governance indicators database: http://www.scribd.com/document\_downloads/293309206?extension=pdf&from=embed&source=embed |  |  |
| World Health Organization | Proposed indicator: Proportion of population using basic water and basic sanitation services. WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply and Sanitation has been monitoring and publishing estimates on access to water and sanitation for the last 25 years, and this particular set of indicators (separately for water and sanitation) have been the MDG indicators for the last 15 years, and therefore is readily available for country, regional and global reporting for all countries of the world, with trend estimates. This will also be part of JMP's global monitoring and reporting for the SDG period as part of water and sanitation ladders for the SDG indicators for targets 6.1 and 6.2. For more information please consult the JMP's methodological note here: http://www.wssinfo.org/fileadmin/user\_upload/resources/Methodological-note-on-monitoring-SDG-targets-for-WASH-and-wastewater\_WHO-UNICEF\_8October2015\_Final.pdf. |  |  |
| Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact | Secure land rights for all are a critical component of the 2030 Agenda, and an integral part of the Target 1.4. It is fundamental to include an indicator on land tenure under Goal 1 (as 1.4.2). We encourage the IAEG-SDG to consider a comprehensive land indicator tracking rights “secure rights to land” and not just “ownership”; referring to “land” and not just to “agricultural land”; tracking progress for women and men, as well as for indigenous peoples and communities, as tenure can be individual or collective . To this end, we recommend to use the following indicator: Percentage of women, men, indigenous peoples, and local communities (IPLCs) with secure rights to land, property and natural resources, measured by a) percentage with legally documented or recognized evidence of tenure, and b) percentage who perceive their rights are recognized and protected. This indicator has been supported by UK and others during the negotiations, and responds to concerns expressed by Italy, South Africa and Switzerland during the consultations. It is supported by the Global Land Indicator Initiative (led by the World Bank, and UN-Habitat, and facilitated by GLTN), the Global Donor Platform on Rural Development, the IP Major Group, the Women’s Major Group, IUCN, UN-Habitat, UNEP, SDSN, and a broad coalition of civil society. |  |  |
| Asia Pacific Forum on Women, Law and Development (APWLD) | Asia Pacific Forum on Women, Law and Development (APWLD) comments: APWLD proposes the following indicator in place of the grey indicator: “Proportion of the population with access to available, acceptable and quality care services, disaggregated by gender, age and disability”. This indicator is necessary to ensure that the target covers accessibility of care services. Without access to care services, women will continue to bear the burden of unpaid care work within the home and their community, which interferes with their enjoyment of a range of other rights, including participation in the workforce, and fundamentally undermines the achievement of gender equality. |  | APWLD comments: APWLD proposes the following indicators as alternatives to the grey indicator: • Existence of ex ante and periodic impact assessments to evaluate conformity of all new national policies and regional and international agreements with poverty eradication, gender equality and the sustainable use of natural resources • The number of national, regional and international agreements that are consistent with poverty eradication, gender equality and the sustainable use of natural resources • The existence and implementation of legal frameworks that ensure the primacy of national action plans and development strategies to eradicate poverty, gender equality and sustainably use natural resources over conflicting national, regional or international obligations of. The latter two indicators measure the ability of governments to exercise domestic policy space to enact laws and policies that are pro-poor and gender sensitive. |
| HEAL Africa D R Congo | D R Congo HEAL Africa: This is an essential measurement to assess poverty |  |  |
| RIGHTS | 1. Disaggregated data on access to aggregate capital assets 2. Disaggregated data on access to agricultural land and homestead land for all landless households. 3. Disaggregated data on access to non-land assets per household. 4. Disaggregated data on access to guaranteed employment with living wages for all households. 5. Targeted budgeting for inclusion of socially disadvantaged communities in infrastructure and industrial development. | 1.Disaggregated data on the number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disaster. 2. Disaggregated data on the aid and disaster response on the affected communities especially towards the marginalized communities. 3. Percentage of the household losses, especially due to the climate related extreme events and other economic, social and environmental shocks and disasters. 4. Percentage of people aware or sensitized about the hazards of the environmental and climate related shocks and disasters. |  |
| AbleChildAfrica | Disaggregation of indicators by the list of characteristics mentioned in 17.18 (income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other relevant characteristics) and related chapeau of the 2030 Agenda. | Disaggregation of indicators by the list of characteristics mentioned in 17.18 (income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other relevant characteristics) and related chapeau of the 2030 Agenda. | We recommend aligning with the Sendai Framework for DRR and explicitly mentioning persons with disabilities. |
| ADD International | Disaggregation of the promotion of population by income, sex, age, disability, geographical location, ethnicity, migratory status and other relevant characteristics | Disaggregation of the promotion of population by income, sex, age, disability, geographical location, ethnicity, migratory status and other relevant characteristics/ |  |
| Adolescent Girl and SDG Indicators Working Group\*: signatories included the UN Foundation, Plan International, Advocates for Youth, Girl Effect, Girls Thinking Global, International Center for Research on Women | Adolescent Girl SDG Indicators Working Group\*: 1.4.1 Proportion of the population with access to basic services. Basic services to be defined but should include: safe water, sanitation and hygiene including menstrual hygiene services inside and outside the home; 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 Disaggregations: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) -RATIONALE: It is important that we not limit our measurements on who is accessing basic services to those living in households. Often the most vulnerable and with the greatest need for these basic services are young people living outside of households.Improving women and girls’ access to public services is essential to poverty eradication. If all women could access the care, commodities and services recommended by the World Health Organization (WHO), maternal deaths would drop by 67%, and newborn deaths would fall by 77%. -DATA SOURCES: MICS and DHS; household surveys; WB service delivery indicators, ILO labor standards data | Adolescent Girl and SDG Indicators Working Group\*: 1.5.1 Proportion of population resilient/robust to hazards and disasters Disaggregations: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) -DATA SOURCES:Country data -GLOBAL MONITORING ENTITIES: UNEP, UNISDR -RATIONALE: Women and girls are significantly more vulnerable to climate-related extreme events and disasters. For instance, women and girls are made up to 80% of the loss of lives in the 2004 Asian Tsunami. Similarly, in 2007, an estimated 1.5 million people were left homeless due to rains and flooding in 18 African countries with women and children representing more than three quarters of those displaced by natural disasters. | Adolescent Girl and SDG Indicators Working Group\*: 1.b.1 Number of national action plans that support accelerated investment in actions that eradicate poverty and include gender responsive budgeting and policies -DATA SOURCES: Country research -GLOBAL MONITORING ENTITIES: UN Women, World Bank, INFORMEA -RATIONALE: Gender-responsive budgets can increase the allocation of resources to women and adolescent girls, thereby contributing to their independence and financial decision-making power, support gender mainstreaming in macroeconomics, strengthen civil society participation in economic policy making, and enhance the linkages between economic and social policy outcomes. |
| African Agency for Integrated Development (AAID) | Iam from Uganda, Executive Director of African Agency for Integrated Development (AAID), my comment on this proposed indicator is that People in some cultures still believe that women are not supposed to inherit the parents properties, thats its only men/sons to take over when the parents die so there is need to strengthen policies from member states regards the above, Organizations like African Agency for Integrated Development be facilitated by Development Partners to sensitize the Public or encourage the Public on the above. | Unless there is Mitigation Measures on Disaters from Member states, there will not be Change, Let all development Partners participate in disaater Preparedness to put change and hit our target. |  |
| American Society for Reproductive Medicine |  |  | American Society for Reproductive Medicine. Comment on Indicator 1.3.1. We are in support of this indication. We would like to point out that infertility, defined as a disease by World Bank and WHO, can lead to poverty first when there is a lack of support for identifying lower cost treatments, and importantly when an infertility couple has lack of support later in life. |
| Arab Center for Research and Development |  | Kassem (ACRD) A quantitative measure can't address the target alone. Resilience can't be measured by the no. of people evacuated! It is rather reflected by the effectiveness and efficiency of the national and local strategies/ policies that shape/ influence vulnerable people's behavioral biases toward risks. | Kassem (ACRD) a better measure should reflect the size of such investments and their impact in reducing poverty... |
| Articulacion Feminista Marcosur | Colombia. Inthe definition of basic services it needs to be included aspects related to sexual and reproductive health and caregiving. | Colombia. The number of deaths is not the best way to measure resilience or the reduction of exposure and vulnerability...it could be better to count the number of people living in such settings. | Colombia. In analyzing poverty from a gender perspective there are some key aspects to consider: "own income", the use of time (to capture the time that women dedicate to caregiving and household care and hiw it influence their lack of time to generate income. |
| Asia Dalit Rights Forum | 1. Disaggregated data on access to aggregate capital assets 2. Disaggregated data on access to agricultural land and homestead land for all landless households. 3. Disaggregated data on access to non-land assets per household. 4. Disaggregated data on access to guaranteed employment with living wages for all households. 5. Targeted budgeting for inclusion of socially disadvantaged communities in infrastructure and industrial development. | 1. Disaggregated data on the number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disaster. 2. Disaggregated data on the aid and disaster response on the affected communities especially towards the marginalized communities. 3. Percentage of the household losses, especially due to the climate related extreme events and other economic, social and environmental shocks and disasters. 4. Percentage of people aware or sensitized about the hazards of the environmental and climate related shocks and disasters. |  |
| Asia-Europe Foundation | ASEF Small Planet research: We proposed three indicators/indices that are based on the three pillars of SD (social, economic, environmental): o World Bank’s Human Opportunity Index (HOI) o UNDP Inequality Adjusted Human Development Index (IHDI) o Overuse of available bio-capacity by the present generation Study source: http://www.asef.org/pubs/asef-publications/3323-sustainable-development-goals-and-indicators-for-a-small-planet--part-ii-measuring-sustainability |  |  |
| Austrian Leprosy Relief Association | Disaggregate indicators by the list of characteristics mentioned in 17.18 | Disaggregate indicators by the list of characteristics mentioned in 17.18 Align with the Sendai Framework for DRR and explicitly mentioning persons with disabilities |  |
| Better Place International | USA, through international financial institutes we need to secure basic services to all population. We need to create the infrastructure and secure the service either by governments or directly working with NGOs | USA, my recommendation will be to focus on doing in this case. We need a Global Response System on top on the national response system. This teams can intervene in areas of disaster including pandemic. It is hard to predict disasters magnitude so I would not focus on numbers but first on the effective multinational response teams | USA, percentage of population that benefit from new initiatives focused on eradicating poverty. |
| Better Place International | USA, we should guarantee 100%access to basic services in any country by government or international non governmental organizations as part of a global commitment. We know that we are all interconnected today and probably more in the future. | USA, create a global response team to address events based on evaluation of the ability oof the community to self respond to such events | USA, each nation, and community should be supported to created a sustainable and attainable plan by scholars and SME from the local and international community |
| Christian Aid |  | There could be a greater emphasis on community resilience in this indicator. For example: Percentage of population exposed to climatic and environmental events by age and sex; and Percentage of population with increased resources, improved governance, stronger social safety nets and access to/availability of systems and services for responding to climate-related related extreme events and other economic, social and environmental shocks and disasters. |  |
| Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International |  | Comments from Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International, Netherlands  We would like to participate in the parallel process.  Another indicator could be the availability of public, private or community early warning systems and the percentage of the population that they can or do reach in the event.  Another indicator, after shocks or disasters, would be for economic impacts and losses, including loss of home, educational access, livelihoods and business; and the ability of the poor and vulnerability to rebuild homes, re-enter education, and continue or re-start livelihood and businesses. |  |
| CONCORD Sweden | CONCORD Sweden’s comment and suggested indicator: We welcome that this proposed indicator measures households access to baic services. However,we regret that the proposed indicator only focuses on access to basic services and hence does not successfully measure equal rights to other form of economic resources, land ownership, and control over other forms of property, inheritance, natural resources, appropriate new technology and financial services (as listed in the target). We suggest that additional indicators are added, in order to ensure that the whole breadth of the commitment made in the target is captured. |  |  |
| Culture et Développement | France, Culture et Développement It may be useful to specify the "basic services" perimeter so that a common frame is set, in reference to socio-economic and cultural rights: refuse removal and electricity primary health care, clean water and proper sanitation but basic education and access to cultural resources (cf. the notion of capability) fostering progress and self esteem. Based on the Unesco culture for development indicators suite, data could be collected on the social participation dimension of cultural activities. http://en.unesco.org/creativity/sites/creativity/files/digital-library/CDIS%20Methodology%20Manual\_0.pdf (page 83) When basic services are reflected through infrastructures, the number of infrastructures relative to the distribution of the country population can also be a measure, being health, education or cultural infrastructures. |  |  |
| Danish Institute for Human Rights | The indicator fails to address the crucial issue of ownership and control over land and natural resources, as reflected in the target. An additional indicator should be considered as follows: “Percentage of women, indigenous peoples and local communities with secure tenure rights to individually or communally held land, property and natural resources”. |  |  |
| Deutsche Welthungerhilfe | Secure land rights for all are a critical component of the 2030 Agenda, and an integral part of the Target 1.4. It is fundamental to include an indicator on land tenure under Goal 1 (as 1.4.2). We encourage the IAEG-SDG to consider a comprehensive land indicator tracking rights “secure rights to land” and not just “ownership”; referring to “land” and not just to “agricultural land”; tracking progress for women and men, as well as for indigenous peoples and communities, as tenure can be individual or collective . To this end, we recommend to use the following indicator: Percentage of women, men, indigenous peoples, and local communities (IPLCs) with secure rights to land, property and natural resources, measured by a) percentage with legally documented or recognized evidence of tenure, and b) percentage who perceive their rights are recognized and protected. This indicator has been supported by UK and others during the negotiations, and responds to concerns expressed by Italy, South Africa and Switzerland during the consultations. It is supported by the Global Land Indicator Initiative (led by the World Bank), the Global Donor Platform on Rural Development, the IP Major Group, the Women’s Major Group, IUCN, UN-Habitat, UNEP, SDSN, and a broad coalition of civil society. |  |  |
| Diyalo Pariwar | Nepal: Special focus should be given to least developed countries and land-locked countries. The lessons from the recent blockade to Nepal by the India shows the urgency of the Goal. | Special focus should be given to least developed countries and land-locked countries. The lessons from the recent devastating Earthquake in Nepal shows the urgency of the indicators and multiple indicators with facilities required needed. | Not only the national action plans elated to multi-lateral environmental agreements that support accelerated investment in actions that eradicate poverty and sustainably use natural resources is sufficient but the capacity and basic infrastructures must be in place to execute the developed action plans. For these , the series of indicators on human resources development and management need to be adjusted. |
| Dutch Coalition on Disability and Development (DCDD) | DCDD comments the disaggregation of indicators as indicated in 17.18 (income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other relevant characteristics) | DCDD comments the disaggregation of indicators as indicated in 17.18 (income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other relevant characteristics) DCDD comment to align with the Sendai Framework for DRR and explicitly mention persons with disabilities |  |
| Education International | Education International supports this as a key indicator for target 1.4. Basic services should be understood as including primary and secondary education. |  |  |
| End Water Poverty | We strongly recommend that the definition of basic services must include basic water and basic sanitation. The WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme already measures the proportion of population with access to these services (available here: http://www.wssinfo.org/fileadmin/user\_upload/resources/JMP-Update-report-2015\_English.pdf) so this does not represent an additional reporting burden. To achieve the vision of Goal 1 to eradicate poverty everywhere in all its forms, basic services must include basic water service and basic sanitation service. These are long established elements of multidimensional poverty and essential to health and dignity in ways that greater income alone cannot compensate. |  |  |
| GIZ Sector Project Land Policy and Land Management | Land indicator is critical to ending poverty and must remain in SDG Goal 1 GIZ Sector Project Land Policy and Land Management, (in accordance with all other 23 members of the Global Donor Working Group on Land (GDWGL)<https://www.donorplatform.org/land-governance/global-donor-working-group-on-land> highly opposes the deletion of former indicator 1.4.2 which was targeting access to secure land tenure. GIZ Sector Project Land Policy and Land Management, therefore strongly supports the reinstatement of an appropriate land indicator under 1.4. The target explicitly refers to ownership and control over land and other forms of property, which CANNOT be measured by current indicator 1.4.1. The appropriate land indicator, under target 1.4, also supported by the Global Land Indicators Initiative (GLII), Landesa and many other partners, would read: “Percentage of people with secure tenure rights to land (out of total adult population), with legally recognized documentation and who perceive their rights to land as secure, by sex and by type of tenure". Besides the efforts of GLII, there are two ongoing initiatives that support data collection for the suggested land indicator: (1) The World Bank is collecting administrative data available within land registries and cadasters for as many countries as possible (data is currently available for 189 countries). They are conducting surveys with officials of land agencies and local experts to assess whether obtaining information is feasible, including disaggregated information. (2) A Rome data hub has recently been established jointly by FAO, IFAD and WB to document the land related information (including gendered perceptions of tenure security) in all of the household surveys of the Living Standards Measurement Study and make this information available as open data on our institutions’ data portal. These exercises are showing that collecting information is feasible - because information is already available and/or can be done at low additional cost (US$ 50K by country is often enough). The World Bank, as a member of the Global Donor WG on Land, is willing to share detailed information on these surveys. Further supportive information can be found in the following three documents: (1) Policy brief from GDWGL: http://www.scribd.com/document\_downloads/290501000?extension=pdf&from=embed&source=embed; (2) GLII’s proposed Metadata for the land indicator: http://www.scribd.com/document\_downloads/293309913?extension=pdf&from=embed&source=embed; and (3) GLII’s land governance indicators database: http://www.scribd.com/document\_downloads/293309206?extension=pdf&from=embed&source=embed |  |  |
| Global Campaign for Education | GCE UK believes the definition of essential services must include at least primary and secondary education |  |  |
| Global Campaign For Education | We agree with the indicator, with the understanding that essential services must include at least primary and secondary education |  |  |
| Global Campaign for Education - US Chapter (GCE-US) | GCE-US Comments: We would propose adding the following wording after "services" - "with the understanding that essential services must include at least primary and secondary education." This is line with Goal 4 and recognizes that access to education is critical to the overall goal of ending poverty. |  |  |
| Global Campaign for Education UK | GCE UK believes the definition of essential services must include at least primary and secondary education |  |  |
| Global Forest Coalition (GFC) | 1.4.1.Percentage of women, men, indigenous peoples, and local communities (IPLCs) with secure rights to land, property, and natural resources, measured by: a) percentage with legally documented or recognized evidence of tenure, and b) percentage who perceive their rights are recognized and protected. |  |  |
| Global Public-Private Partnership for Handwashing | We strongly recommend that the definition of basic services must include basic water and basic sanitation. The WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme already measures the proportion of population with access to these services (available here: http://www.wssinfo.org/fileadmin/user\_upload/resources/JMP-Update-report-2015\_English.pdf) so this does not represent an additional reporting burden. To achieve the vision of Goal 1 to eradicate poverty everywhere in all its forms, basic services must include basic water service and basic sanitation service. These are long established elements of multidimensional poverty and essential to health and dignity in ways that greater income alone cannot compensate. |  |  |
| Habitat for Humanity International | Secure land rights for all are a critical component of the 2030 Agenda, and an integral part of the Target 1.4. It is fundamental to include an indicator on land tenure under Goal 1 (as 1.4.2). We encourage the IAEG-SDG to consider a comprehensive land indicator tracking rights “secure rights to land” and not just “ownership”; referring to “land” and not just to “agricultural land”; tracking progress for women and men, as well as for indigenous peoples and communities, as tenure can be individual or collective . To this end, we recommend to use the following indicator: Percentage of women, men, indigenous peoples, and local communities (IPLCs) with secure rights to land, property and natural resources, measured by a) percentage with legally documented or recognized evidence of tenure, and b) percentage who perceive their rights are recognized and protected. This indicator has been supported by UK and others during the negotiations, and responds to concerns expressed by Italy, South Africa and Switzerland during the consultations. It is supported by the Global Land Indicator Initiative (led by the World Bank), the Global Donor Platform on Rural Development, the IP Major Group, the Women’s Major Group, IUCN, UN-Habitat, UNEP, SDSN, and a broad coalition of civil society. |  |  |
| HelpAge International on behalf of the Stakeholder Group on Ageing |  | The Stakeholder Group on Ageing comments: THIS INDICATOR MUST BE DISAGGREGATED: We support comments by the EC, UN Women, UK and Africa IAEG members that this indicator needs to be disaggregated by age and sex and by disability (UK). THIS INDICATOR MUST BE ALIGNED WITH SENDAI INDICATORS: We support Australia and Mexico's comments that this indicator will need to align with the Sendai indicators (which are not yet determined). This indicator should remain grey until the process to determine indicators for Sendai is complete. THE CURRENT PROPOSAL IS NOT AN APPROPRIATE MEASURE OF RESILIENCE: WE support comments from Algeria and Ecuador that the current proposed indicator does not measure resilience adequately. As such, this indicator fails to respond to the target. MORE APPROPRIATE MEASURES OF RESILIANCE HAVE BEEN PROPOSED: We support the UN Statistical System proposal for an additional indicator to have a more resilience orientated target for 1.5 (as the current proposed indicator is more suited to measuring target 11.5) UN Statistical System Organisations propose: a. Proportion of population resilient/robust to hazards and climate - related events by sex; (this should include disaggregation by age in addition to sex). The OECD's suggestion that this target could incorporate indicators from other SDG targets in order to measure resilience, including climate change related indicators and indicators related to social protection, improved production, access to markets and financial services is a good approach to incorporating existing indicators into a more adequate measure of resilience. IF THE PROPOSED INDICATOR IS RETAINED IT SHOULD BE MODIFIED TO INCORPORATE EXPOSURE AND SUPPLEMENTED WITH A RESILIANCE FOCUSSED INDICATOR: We support Australia's suggestion that this indicator needs to incorporate a measurement of exposure if it is retained. However an additional indicator measuring resilience as per suggestions above still needed to respond to the target. Australia suggested recasting the specification to: "Number of people exposed to disasters and the number of deaths, missing people, injured relocated or evacuated due to disasters per 100,000 people". |  |
| ICMM and IPIECA |  |  | John Drexhage - ICMM/IPIECA Not sure why this is exclusively focused on multilateral environmental agreements: why not use the extent to which ALL multilateral agreements take poverty eradication into account (for example, WTO provisions would be very relevant in this case). |
| ILEP | ILEP recommends disaggregation of indicator 1.4.1, by the list of characteristics mentioned in 17.18 (income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other relevant characteristics) and related chapeau of the 2030 Agenda. | ILEP recommends disaggregation of indicators 1.5.1, by the list of characteristics mentioned in 17.18 (income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other relevant characteristics) and related chapeau of the 2030 Agenda. For indicator 1.5.1, we recommend aligning with the Sendai Framework for DRR and explicitly mentioning persons with disabilities. (The Sendai indicator process is parallel) |  |
| International Agency for the Prevention of Blindness (IAPB) | IAPB asks for disaggregation by the list of characteristics mentioned in 17.18 (income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other relevant characteristics) | IAPB asks for any indicator to measure target 1.5. to stay in line with the Sendai Framework for DRR and to be disaggregated by the list of characteristics mentioned in 17.18 (income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other relevant characteristics) |  |
| International Land Coalition | Secure land rights for all are a critical component of the 2030 Agenda, and an integral part of the Target 1.4. It is fundamental to include an indicator on land tenure under Goal 1 (as 1.4.2). We encourage the IAEG-SDG to consider a comprehensive land indicator tracking rights “secure rights to land” and not just “ownership”; referring to “land” and not just to “agricultural land”; tracking progress for women and men, as well as for indigenous peoples and communities, as tenure can be individual or collective . To this end, we recommend to use the following indicator: Percentage of women, men, indigenous peoples, and local communities (IPLCs) with secure rights to land, property and natural resources, measured by a) percentage with legally documented or recognized evidence of tenure, and b) percentage who perceive their rights are recognized and protected. This indicator has been supported by UK and others during the negotiations, and responds to concerns expressed by Italy, South Africa and Switzerland during the consultations. It is supported by the Global Land Indicator Initiative (led by the World Bank, and UN-Habitat, and facilitated by GLTN), the Global Donor Platform on Rural Development, the IP Major Group, the Women’s Major Group, IUCN, UN-Habitat, UNEP, SDSN, and a broad coalition of civil society. |  |  |
| International Movement ATD Fourth World | ATD Fourth World - Proportion of the population living in households with access to basic services defined as: water and sanitation, housing, adequate nutrition, health and education. Indicators for target 1 and 2 as they are defined now weight on the economic dimension to measure progress on poverty eradication (it is true for indicator 1 and indicator 2 for most of the countries where poverty lines are defined economically only). Indicator 1.4, if properly disaggregated as agreed in Agenda 2030 by “by income, sex, age, race, ethnicity, migration status, disability and geographic location and other characteristics relevant in national contexts” (Para 74 g) will be able to provide a better picture of progress on dimensions that are crucial “to free the human race from the tyranny of poverty” (Preambule) | ATD Fourth World – We propose, along with the number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters, add % of the injured population affected by disasters that have benefited from health care, financial support, or evacuation and relocation. As agreed in Agenda 2030 and in the spirit of “leaving no one behind” and focusing “on the poorest, most vulnerable and those furthest behind”, this indicator should be “disaggregated by income, sex, age, race, ethnicity, migration status, disability and geographic location and other characteristics relevant in national contexts” Para 74 g. |  |
| International Trade Union Confederation | Support indicator as is. |  |  |
| Landesa | Landesa's comment: Secure land rights for all are a critical component of the 2030 Agenda, and an integral part of the Target 1.4. It is fundamental to include an indicator on land tenure under Goal 1 (as 1.4.2). We encourage the IAEG-SDG to consider a comprehensive land indicator tracking rights “secure rights to land” and not just “ownership”; referring to “land” and not just to “agricultural land”; tracking progress for women and men, as well as for indigenous peoples and communities, as tenure can be individual or collective . To this end, we recommend to use the following indicator: Percentage of women, men, indigenous peoples, and local communities (IPLCs) with secure rights to land, property and natural resources, measured by a) percentage with legally documented or recognized evidence of tenure, and b) percentage who perceive their rights are recognized and protected. This indicator has been supported by UK and others during the negotiations, and responds to concerns expressed by Italy, South Africa and Switzerland during the consultations. It is supported by the Global Land Indicator Initiative (led by the World Bank, and UN-Habitat, and facilitated by GLTN), the Global Donor Platform on Rural Development, the IP Major Group, the Women’s Major Group, IUCN, UN-Habitat, UNEP, SDSN, and a broad coalition of civil society. |  |  |
| Latin American Campaign for the Right to Education | Latin American Campaign for the Right to Education (CLADE) proposes: Proportion of the population living in households with access to essential services, with the understanding that essential services must include at least primary and secondary education |  |  |
| LIGHT FOR THE WORLD | LIGHT FOR THE WORLD recommends disaggregation of indicator 1.4.1 by the list of characteristics mentioned in target 17.18 (income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other relevant characteristics) and related chapeau of the 2030 Agenda. | LIGHT FOR THE WORLD recommends disaggregation of indicator 1.5.1 by the list of characteristics mentioned in target 17.18 (income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other relevant characteristics) and the related chapeau of the 2030 Agenda. LIGHT FOR THE WORLD also recommends aligning indicator 1.5.1 with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction and explicitly mentioning persons with disabilities. |  |
| Loomba Foundation | Loomba Foundation comments that any dis-aggregation of this indicator should include widow-led households / marital status as a key group. |  |  |
| Malala Fund | Organisation: Malala Fund Suggested Indicator: Proportion of the population living in households with access to basic services, understanding that primary and secondary education (including upper secondary) are basic services. Disaggregations: sex and location and each level of education from primary to upper secondary (and others where data are available) Rationale for new text: Education must be included in basic services because (i) A/RES/70/1, paragraph 17, lists education as a development priority and (ii) States have an obligation to provide access to primary and secondary education in accordance with international human rights law. |  |  |
| Nagorik Uddyog | 1. Disaggregated data on access to aggregate capital assets for assest less population. 2. Disaggregated data on access to agricultural land and homestead land for all landless households. 3. Disaggregated data on access to non-land assets per household. 4. Disaggregated data on access to guaranteed employment with living wages for all households. 5. Targeted budgeting for inclusion of socially disadvantaged communities in infrastructure and industrial development. | 1.Disaggregated data on the number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disaster specially women and children. 2. Disaggregated data on the aid and disaster response on the affected communities especially towards the marginalized communities. 3. Percentage of the household losses, especially due to the climate related extreme events and other economic, social and environmental shocks and disasters. 4. Percentage of people aware or sensitized about the hazards of the environmental and climate related shocks and disasters. |  |
| Namati | Namati: This is not meant to replace 1.4.1. but just to voice strongly against the deletion of 1.4.2. Secure land rights for all are a critical component of the 2030 Agenda, and an integral part of the Target 1.4. It is fundamental to include an indicator on land tenure under Goal 1 (as 1.4.2). We encourage the IAEG-SDG to consider a comprehensive land indicator tracking rights “secure rights to land” and not just “ownership”; referring to “land” and not just to “agricultural land”; tracking progress for women and men, as well as for indigenous peoples and communities, as tenure can be individual or collective . To this end, we recommend to use the following indicator: Percentage of women, men, indigenous peoples, and local communities (IPLCs) with secure rights to land, property and natural resources, measured by a) percentage with legally documented or recognized evidence of tenure, and b) percentage who perceive their rights are recognized and protected. This indicator has been supported by UK and others during the negotiations, and responds to concerns expressed by Italy, South Africa and Switzerland during the consultations. It is supported by the Global Land Indicator Initiative (led by the World Bank, and UN-Habitat, and facilitated by GLTN), the Global Donor Platform on Rural Development, the IP Major Group, the Women’s Major Group, IUCN, UN-Habitat, UNEP, SDSN, and a broad coalition of civil society. |  |  |
| Navsarjan Trust | Navsarjan Trust 1. Disaggregated data on access to aggregate capital assets 2. Disaggregated data on access to agricultural land and homestead land for all landless households. 3. Disaggregated data on access to non-land assets per household. 4. Disaggregated data on access to guaranteed employment with living wages for all households. 5. Targeted budgeting for inclusion of socially disadvantaged communities in infrastructure and industrial development. | Navsarjan Trust 1.Disaggregated data on the number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disaster. 2. Disaggregated data on the aid and disaster response on the affected communities especially towards the marginalized communities. 3. Percentage of the household losses, especially due to the climate related extreme events and other economic, social and environmental shocks and disasters. 4. Percentage of people aware or sensitized about the hazards of the environmental and climate related shocks and disasters. |  |
| Navsarjan Trust | Navsarjan Trust - inclusion of discriminated groups based on caste, work and descent, ethnicity and sexual orientation | Navsarjan Trust - inclusion of discriminated groups based on caste, work and descent, ethnicity and sexual orientation |  |
| Oxfam International | Secure land rights for all are a critical component of the 2030 Agenda, and an integral part of the Target 1.4. It is fundamental to include an indicator on land tenure under Goal 1 (as 1.4.2). We encourage the IAEG-SDG to consider a comprehensive land indicator tracking rights “secure rights to land” and not just “ownership”; referring to “land” and not just to “agricultural land”; tracking progress for women and men, as well as for indigenous peoples and communities, as tenure can be individual or collective . To this end, we recommend to use the following indicator: Percentage of women, men, indigenous peoples, and local communities (IPLCs) with secure rights to land, property and natural resources, measured by a) percentage with legally documented or recognized evidence of tenure, and b) percentage who perceive their rights are recognized and protected. This indicator has been supported by UK and others during the negotiations, and responds to concerns expressed by Italy, South Africa and Switzerland during the consultations. It is supported by the Global Land Indicator Initiative (led by the World Bank), the Global Donor Platform on Rural Development, the IP Major Group, the Women’s Major Group, IUCN, UN-Habitat, UNEP, SDSN, and a broad coalition of civil society. |  |  |
| PAI |  | PAI, USA: Expand indicator to read: 1.5.1 Number of people affected by hazardous events by age, sex, and socioeconomic status (including deaths, missing people, injured, relocated, or evacuated due to disasters), disaggregated to cover marginalized groups |  |
| Pathfinder's Outreach Ministry (POM) | Ghana 80% of the population living in households with access to basic services | Ghana 80% decrease in the existing number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters per 100,000 people | Ghana increase in the 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 |
| Pathfinder's Outreach Ministry (POM) | Ghana 80% of the population living in households have equal access to basic services | Ghana 80% reduction in the number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters per 100,000 people | Ghana Create awareness and community ownership through increasing the existing 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 |
| Peacebuilding Advisory Service | Tobi Dress-Germain, Peacebuilding Advisory Service, US (Boston) Please see my comments with regard to Goal 4, Goal 16 and Goal 17. |  |  |
| Peruvian Campaign for the Right to Education | PERU Peruvian Campaign for the Right to Educaction Proportion of the population living in households with access to essential services, including at least primary and secondary education. |  |  |
| Plan International | Plan International comments: - RECOMMENDED INDICATOR: 1.4.1 Proportion of the population with access to basic services. Basic services to be defined but should include: safe water, sanitation and hygiene including menstrual hygiene services inside and outside the home; 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 - RATIONALE: Improving women and girls’ access to public services is essential to poverty eradication. If all women could access the care, commodities and services recommended by the World Health Organization (WHO), maternal deaths would drop by 67%, and newborn deaths would fall by 77%. It is important that we not limit our measurements on who is accessing basic services to those living in households. Often the most vulnerable and with the greatest need for these basic services are young people living outside of households. - DISAGGREGATIONS: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) - DATA SOURCE: MICS and DHS; household surveys; WB service delivery indicators, ILO labor standards data | Plan International Comments: - RECOMMENDED INDICATOR: 1.5.1 Proportion of population resilient/robust to hazards and disasters - RATIONALE: Women and girls are significantly more vulnerable to climate-related extreme events and disasters. For instance, women and girls are made up to 80% of the loss of lives in the 2004 Asian Tsunami. Similarly, in 2007, an estimated 1.5 million people were left homeless due to rains and flooding in 18 African countries with women and children representing more than three quarters of those displaced by natural disasters. - DISAGGREGATIONS: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) - DATA SOURCE: Country data - ENTITY RESPONSIBLE: UNEP, UNISDR - TIER: III | Plan International Comments: - RECOMMENDED INDICATOR: 1.b.1 Number of national action plans that support accelerated investment in actions that eradicate poverty and include gender responsive budgeting and policies - RATIONALE: Gender-responsive budgets can increase the allocation of resources to women and adolescent girls, thereby contributing to their independence and financial decision-making power, support gender mainstreaming in macroeconomics, strengthen civil society participation in economic policy making, and enhance the linkages between economic and social policy outcomes. - DISAGGREGATIONS: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) - DATA SOURCE: Country research - ENTITY RESPONSIBLE: UN Women, World Bank, INFORMEA - TIER: II |
| PNG Education Advocacy Network | Papua New Guinea is 95% rural population which rely on subsistence farming-the feature of this farming is mainly for daily sustenance. A few indigenous-based companies are in the highlands provinces while the rest of the major agriculture lands are not owned by indigenous people. Many people rely on their customary land however due to cash economy land is becoming a scarce commodity.The state colludes with multinational companies and buy off lands at outrageously cheap prices to an extent where people are forced off their lands in serious cases of mining and petroleum industries. While Government is providing basic services, urban migration is a result of lack of or poor service delivery in rural remote areas. Housing in major cities and towns remains a luxury and therefore this has resulted in poor housing, sanitation and illegal water and electricity connections in the urban periphery. The Government's development pillar is economic focused and by 2030, Papua New Guinea will only see the rich becoming richer and the poor becoming poorer. Nearly 60% of people are illiterate and unemployment will increase. |  | Papua New Guinea Education Advocacy Network proposes for indigenous-based documented knowledge and actions of climate change factors based on traditional and customary knowledge and not always depend on the western knowledge and practices. We propose therefore that every country must ensure that there is a Country-wide accepted environment and climate change mitigation framework that can be used as an indicator |
| Practical Action | Practical Action, along with other civil society actors, strongly recommends that the definition of basic services should include basic water and basic sanitation. These are long established elements of multidimensional poverty and essential to health and dignity in ways that greater income alone cannot compensate. |  |  |
| Rastriya Dalit Network (RDN) Nepal | Indicator 1.4.1: Proportion of the population living in households with access to basic services Indicator 2.3.2: Total Factor Productivity | 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 | 1. Disaggregated data on access to aggregate capital assets 2. Disaggregated data on access to agricultural land and homestead land for all landless households. 3. Disaggregated data on access to non-land assets per household. 4. Disaggregated data on access to guaranteed employment with living wages for all households. 5. Targeted budgeting for inclusion of socially disadvantaged communities in infrastructure and industrial development. |
| Saferworld | This is a strong indicator. We would urge the IAEG to include access to security (i.e. police services) and justice (i.e. formal and informal dispute resolution mechanisms) as basic services. Data for this indicator would therefore be linked to indicators in Goal 16. |  |  |
| Sightsavers | 1.4.1 Sightsavers comments: We recommend disaggregation of indicators 1.4.1, 1.5.1, and 11.5.1 by the list of characteristics mentioned in 17.18 (income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other relevant characteristics) and related chapeau of the 2030 Agenda. Additionally, we believe that “Proportion of the population living in households with access to essential services” must include at least primary and secondary education in the essential services. | 1.5.1 Sightsavers comments: We recommend disaggregation of indicators 1.4.1, 1.5.1, and 11.5.1 by the list of characteristics mentioned in 17.18 (income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other relevant characteristics) and related chapeau of the 2030 Agenda. Additionally, for indicators 1.5.1, 11.5.1, 11.b.1, and 13.1.1 Sightsavers also recommends aligning with the Sendai Framework for DRR and explicitly mentioning persons with disabilities (The Sendai indicator process is parallel). |  |
| Simavi | Simavi strongly recommends that the definition of basic services must include basic water and basic sanitation. The WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme already measures the proportion of population with access to these services (available here: http://www.wssinfo.org/fileadmin/user\_upload/resources/JMP-Update-report-2015\_English.pdf) so this does not represent an additional reporting burden. To achieve the vision of Goal 1 to eradicate poverty everywhere in all its forms, basic services must include basic water service and basic sanitation service. These are long established elements of multidimensional poverty and essential to health and dignity in ways that greater income alone cannot compensate. |  |  |
| SIWI (Stockholm International Water Institute) | ORGANISATION SIWI COMMENTS: It is vital that the definition of basic services includes access to safe drinking water and sanitation. Should an expansion of the indicator be considered, access to water as a productive economic and natural resource should be included. | ORGANISATION SIWI COMMENTS: For this indicator to serve as a guide to possible preventive measures, “disasters” should be disaggregated by type. Also link to 11.5.1. The vast majority of climate-related extreme events and other shocks and disasters is closely linked to water why water management is key to reduce physical risks. |  |
| Social Justice in Global Development |  |  | There is no agreed definition of "sound policy frameworks". The phrase is usually code for IMF and World Bank approved policies, in contrast to the call by the rest of the UN system for additional "policy space" in order to stop stifling "pro-poor and gender-sensitive development strategies." There is also no agreement on what "investment in poverty eradication" means, as it ranges from a narrow budget outlays for strengthening social protection systems to investment in infrastructure. Alternative: Although this target does not lend itself to any single indicator, one could count number of countries that have gender budgets, which at least means they systematically monitor the impact of government on gender. Also, "gender budgets" can be defined. |
| Stockholm Environment Institute | Stockholm Environment Institute staff are in agreement with UNEP. Access to insurance is equally important as access to microfinance. The indicator should therefore capture access to insurance as one of the services which are to be defined. |  |  |
| Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN) | SDSN comments: Target 1.4. It is fundamental to include an indicator on land tenure under Goal 1 (as 1.4.2). The SDSN encourages the IAEG-SDG to consider a comprehensive land indicator tracking rights “secure rights to land” and not just “ownership”; referring to “land” and not just to “agricultural land”; tracking progress for women and men, as well as for indigenous peoples and communities, as tenure can be individual or collective. To this end, we recommend to use the following indicator: Percentage of women, men, indigenous peoples, and local communities (IPLCs) with secure rights to land, property and natural resources, measured by a) percentage with legally documented or recognized evidence of tenure, and b) percentage who perceive their rights are recognized and protected. This indicator has been supported by UK and others during the negotiations, and responds to concerns expressed by Italy, South Africa and Switzerland during the consultations. The SDSN has noted its support of this indicator in the past, which is also supported by the Global Land Indicator Initiative (led by the World Bank), the Global Donor Platform on Rural Development, the IP Major Group, the Women’s Major Group, IUCN, UN-Habitat, UNEP, and a broad coalition of civil society. |  |  |
| Terre des hommes Lausanne | Strongly recommend that the definition of basic services must include basic water and basic sanitation. The WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme already measures the proportion of population with access to these services so this does not represent an additional reporting burden. To achieve the vision of Goal 1 to eradicate poverty everywhere in all its forms, basic services must include basic water service and basic sanitation service. These are long established elements of multidimensional poverty and essential to health and dignity in ways that greater income alone cannot compensate. |  |  |
| Terre des Hommes Netherlands | Netherlands - Important to disaggregate by sex and age. |  |  |
| The Global Poverty Project | The Global Poverty Project strongly recommends that the definition of basic services must include basic water and basic sanitation. The WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme already measures the proportion of population with access to these services (available here: http://www.wssinfo.org/fileadmin/user\_upload/resources/JMP-Update-report-2015\_English.pdf) so this does not represent an additional reporting burden. To achieve the vision of Goal 1 to eradicate poverty everywhere in all its forms, basic services must include basic water service and basic sanitation service. These are long established elements of multidimensional poverty and essential to health and dignity in ways that greater income alone cannot compensate. |  |  |
| The Hunger Project | This indicator would yield more specific and better numbers if it measures access to basic water and basic sanitation (instead of just "basic services.") Basic services is too broad. Basic water and basic sanitation also inherently helps to identify areas where good and/or improved health, nutrition and maternal morbidity rates. Even in the absence of a clinic, electricity, a rural bank, education, etc. households with access to water and sanitation will be statistically healthier, less hindered by time poverty and disease to pursue growth opportunities. Outside humanitarian cases, stats showing little or no household access to basic water and basic sanitation reflect extremely impoverished and disempowered populations. |  |  |
| Transdiaspora Network | Transdiaspora Network - Number of youth in the general population who benefit from economic resources and basic services, and/or number of private businesses that provide a sound safety net by advancing young people's social development and economic inclusion |  |  |
| Transparency International | Suggestion from Transparency International: Given the impact that bribery has to access to services and economic resources, the recommendation is to use: "Percentage of people per country/territory who paid a bribe to one of eight services in the last 12 months". This can be calculated through survey work currently done by third party data producers as well as some governments. For example, TI produces the Global Corruption Barometer. The last global survey was done in 2013 although regional surveys have been done in 2015 and will be done in 2016. For the Global Corruption Barometer 2013, approximately 1,000 people from each of 107 countries were surveyed between September 2012 and March 2013. Five hundred people were surveyed in countries with a population of less than 1,000,000. The survey sample in each country has been weighted to be nationally representative where possible. In six countries, the sample was urban only. The results by country are at: http://www.transparency.org/gcb2013/results. |  |  |
| UN Major Group for Children and Youth | The scope of this indicator it too limited. Either include additional ones, or enhance this by incorporating- Legal protection to ensure equitable inheritance access between men and women. Ratio of amount inherited my men and women. Legal provisions for women to be able to own land and manage natural resources, including the ratio of the amount of owned and managed by women. Institutional provisions allocating women specefic and equal access to assessment and adoption process for new technologies. | Resiliance is not limited to preventing 'number deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated". This is not reflective of the scope of the target. It should also include variables like loss of livelihoods and access to public space for individuals. | This proposed indicator only measures the intent and not the outcome. It should measure the amont and rajectory of investments in poverty eradication measures. A sound frame works to be counted as such should be appraised and assessed through the communities they aim to serve. This element needs to be added to the proposed indicaotr or included as an adidtional indicator |
| VENRO Working Group Disability and Development | VENRO Working Group Disability and Development, Germany, recommends disaggregation by the list of characteristics mentioned in 17.18 (income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other relevant characteristics) and related chapeau of the 2030 Agenda. | VENRO Working Group Disability and Development, Germany, recommends aligning this indicator with the Sendai Framework for DRR. The indicator should be disaggregated by the list of characteristics mentioned in 17.18 (income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other relevant characteristics) and related chapeau of the 2030 Agenda. |  |
| village water | We strongly recommend that the definition of basic services must include basic water and basic sanitation. |  |  |
| WASH United | WASH United strongly recommends that the definition of basic services must include basic water and basic sanitation. The WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme already measures the proportion of population with access to these services (available here: www.wssinfo.org/fileadmin/user\_upload/resources/JMP-Update-report-2015\_English.pdf) so this does not represent an additional reporting burden. To achieve the vision of Goal 1 to eradicate poverty everywhere in all its forms, basic services must include basic water service and basic sanitation service. These are long established elements of multidimensional poverty and essential to health and dignity in ways that greater income alone cannot compensate. |  |  |
| WaterAid | WaterAid (UK) strongly recommends that the definition of basic services must include basic water and basic sanitation. The WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme already measures the proportion of population with access to these services (available here: http://www.wssinfo.org/fileadmin/user\_upload/resources/JMP-Update-report-2015\_English.pdf) so this does not represent an additional reporting burden. To achieve the vision of Goal 1 to eradicate poverty everywhere in all its forms, basic services must include basic water service and basic sanitation service. These are long established elements of multidimensional poverty and essential to health and dignity in ways that greater income alone cannot compensate. |  |  |
| Women Deliver | Women Deliver recommends that this indictor is gender senstive the data should be disagreegated to reflect vast difference in control of land among men and women. |  |  |
| Women Deliver | Women Deliver recommends that this indictor is gender senstive the data should be disagreegate to reflect vast difference in control of land among men and women. |  |  |
| Women for Women's Human Rights - New Ways | WWHR-New Ways suggests the following: 1.4.1 Percentage of women, men, indigenous peoples, and local communities (IPLCs) with secure rights to land, property, and natural resources, measured by: a) percentage with legally documented or recognized evidence of tenure, and b) percentage who perceive their rights are recognized and protected. 1.4.2 Proportion of the population with access to available, acceptable and quality care services, disaggregated by gender, age and disability - This indicator is necessary to ensure that the target covers accessibility of care services. Without access to care services, women will continue to bear the burden of unpaid care work within the home and their community, which interferes with their enjoyment of a range of other rights, including participation in the workforce, and fundamentally undermines the achievement of gender equality. |  | WWHR- New Ways suggests the following: 1.b.1 Percentage of people who have effectively participated in the development of adaptation and disaster risk reduction and resilience policies and practices (disaggregated by gender and other categories), at local, national and regional levels. - The latter two indicators measure the ability of governments to exercise domestic policy space to enact laws and policies that are pro-poor and gender sensitive |
| Women's Major Group/ International Women's Health Coalition | Women's Major Group proposes alternative indicators to 1.4.1 and 1.4.2. 1.4.1 Percentage of women, men, indigenous peoples, and local communities (IPLCs) with secure rights to land, property, and natural resources, measured by: a) percentage with legally documented or recognized evidence of tenure, and b) percentage who perceive their rights are recognized and protected 1.4.2 Proportion of the population with access to available, acceptable and quality care services, disaggregated by gender, age and disability This indicator is necessary to ensure that the target covers accessibility of care services. Without access to care services, women will continue to bear the burden of unpaid care work within the home and their community, which interferes with their enjoyment of a range of other rights, including participation in the workforce, and fundamentally undermines the achievement of gender equality. | Women's Major Group proposes: 1.5.1 Number of people affected by hazardous events by age, sex, and socioeconomic status (including deaths, missing people, injured, relocated, or evacuated due to disasters), disaggregated to cover marginalized groups | Women's Major Group proposes the below alternative indicator. 1.b.1 Percentage of people who have effectively participated in the development of adaptation and disaster risk reduction and resilience policies and practices (disaggregated by gender and other categories), at local, national and regional levels. This indicators measures the ability of governments to exercise domestic policy space to enact laws and policies that are pro-poor and gender sensitive. |
| WWF | WWF: Secure land rights are an integral part of this target. We encourage the IAEG-SDG to reconsider a comprehensive land indicator as 1.4.2 to track “secure rights to land”: Percentage of women, men, indigenous peoples, and local communities (IPLCs) with secure rights to land, property and natural resources, measured by a) percentage with legally documented or recognized evidence of tenure, and b) percentage who perceive their rights are recognized and protected. This indicator has been supported by UK and others during the negotiations, and responds to concerns expressed by Italy, South Africa and Switzerland during the consultations. It has been supported by the Global Land Indicator Initiative (led by the World Bank, and UN-Habitat, and facilitated by GLTN), the Global Donor Platform on Rural Development, the IP Major Group, the Women’s Major Group, IUCN, UN-Habitat, UNEP, SDSN, and a broad coalition of civil society. This indicator could also be included in 17.18. |  | WWF: Number of National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans adopted and supported through adequate measures for a) resource mobilization and b) legal preparedness, as assessed by the CBD NBSAP Peer Review Framework. |
| Amiable Resource | 1/7 Canadians are under employed or poor. 4.8 million citizens below world bank poverty of 36 million demographic 2015. | Educational and employment opportunities? Community and family health? Food and shelter quality? | Partnership and project collaboration Activités? Social and intercultural exchange experiences? Participation or isolation? Assisted or inspired? |
| FMO - the Dutch development bank | In general, FMO would like to refer to the IRIS catalogue of metrics, an initiative of the Global Impact Investors Network (GIIN). FMO aligns with IRIS metrics where applicable. The SDG indicator network could build on the body of knowledge which was built for the IRIS catalogue of metrics. IRIS includes expertise and leveraged frameworks from OECD, ILO, WRI, WHO and the Greenhouse Gas Protocol. |  |  |
| GBCHealth | GBCHealth - We strongly recommend that the definition of basic services must include basic water and basic sanitation. The WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme already measures the proportion of population with access to these services (available here: http://www.wssinfo.org/fileadmin/user\_upload/resources/JMP-Update-report-2015\_English.pdf) so this does not represent an additional reporting burden. To achieve the vision of Goal 1 to eradicate poverty everywhere in all its forms, basic services must include basic water service and basic sanitation service. These are long established elements of multidimensional poverty and essential to health and dignity in ways that greater income alone cannot compensate. |  |  |
| Maestral International | Clearly an important indicator, but there are measurement issues. Which services and how many? Is this a minimum package of services, or would the indicator measure households with, say, 75% of the basic services listed? |  | National action plans with a poverty reduction objective are (I) supportive of multilateral environmental agreements; and (ii) inclusive of criteria that support the sustainable use of natural resources. |
| PwC Netherlands | PwC Netherlands: -important to define what is meant by "access" as well as what constitutes a basic service and what level of service delivery is acceptable | no comment | no comments |
| Unilever | Unilever endorses the position, put forward by others in the sector, that the definition of basic services must include basic water and basic sanitation. To realize the full health benefits of clean water and sanitation, we also suggest that the definition includes access to basic hygiene facilities as recognized in 6.2 - such as handwashing basins with soap. The WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme already measures the proportion of population with access to these services so this does not represent an additional reporting burden. To achieve the vision of Goal 1 to eradicate poverty everywhere in all its forms, basic services must include basic water service, basic sanitation service and basic hygiene service. These are long established elements of multidimensional poverty and essential to health and dignity in ways that greater income alone cannot compensate. |  |  |
| Center for Development Research (ZEF), U Bonn | Country Bangladesh comments on inclusion of basic water and basic sanitation to the basic services of human. Basic water means improved water access for all human being and basic sanitation means improved sanitation for all human being. These two rights are the basic rights along with other basic right to ensure basic health production. So more emphasis is required to add this two aspect. | Country Bangladesh comments adding indicators such as loss of assets (number of land lost, amount of crops destroyed, number of meal consumed per day, number of cattle lost, direct income loss, number of days injured) |  |
| Center on International Cooperation | Center on International Cooperation This should be disaggregated into distinct types of services: access to improved water source, sanitation, electricity, etc. These factors are not perfectly correlated, and aggregating them could ignore some important areas of deprivation | Center on International Cooperation The bundling of very different types of shocks-- death, injury, relocation, evacuation--is highly problematic. In theory a low morbidity/mortality disaster with a large impact on the built environment could be scored similarly to a disaster causing large scale loss of life. These factors should again be disaggregated |  |
| Columbia Center on Sustainable Investment | The Columbia Center on Sustainable Investment comments as follows. Secure land rights for all are a critical component of the 2030 Agenda, and an integral part of the Target 1.4. It is fundamental to include an indicator on land tenure under Goal 1 (as 1.4.2). We encourage the IAEG-SDG to consider a comprehensive land indicator tracking rights “secure rights to land” and not just “ownership”; referring to “land” and not just to “agricultural land”; tracking progress for women and men, as well as for indigenous peoples and communities, as tenure can be individual or collective . To this end, we recommend to use the following indicator: Percentage of women, men, indigenous peoples, and local communities (IPLCs) with secure rights to land, property and natural resources, measured by a) percentage with legally documented or recognized evidence of tenure, and b) percentage who perceive their rights are recognized and protected. This indicator has been supported by UK and others during the negotiations, and responds to concerns expressed by Italy, South Africa and Switzerland during the consultations. It is supported by the Global Land Indicator Initiative (led by the World Bank), the Global Donor Platform on Rural Development, the IP Major Group, the Women’s Major Group, IUCN, UN-Habitat, UNEP, SDSN, and a broad coalition of civil society. |  |  |
| Columbia Center on Sustainable Investment | (Suggestion not meant to replace 1.4.1, but adding comment here as most appropriate place.) Secure land rights for all are a critical component of the 2030 Agenda, and an integral part of the Target 1.4. It is fundamental to include an indicator on land tenure under Goal 1 (as 1.4.2). We encourage the IAEG-SDG to consider a comprehensive land indicator tracking rights “secure rights to land” and not just “ownership”; referring to “land” and not just to “agricultural land”; tracking progress for women and men, as well as for indigenous peoples and communities, as tenure can be individual or collective . To this end, we recommend to use the following indicator: Percentage of women, men, indigenous peoples, and local communities (IPLCs) with secure rights to land, property and natural resources, measured by a) percentage with legally documented or recognized evidence of tenure, and b) percentage who perceive their rights are recognized and protected. This indicator has been supported by UK and others during the negotiations, and responds to concerns expressed by Italy, South Africa and Switzerland during the consultations. It is supported by the Global Land Indicator Initiative (led by the World Bank), the Global Donor Platform on Rural Development, the IP Major Group, the Women’s Major Group, IUCN, UN-Habitat, UNEP, SDSN, and a broad coalition of civil society. |  |  |
| Harvard Medical School | What defines basic services? Are health services included in this? How would this be measured and made consistent across countries? |  |  |
| Harvard Medical School, Program in Global Surgery and Social Change | The Harvard Program in Global Surgery and Social Change (USA, partnerships in 12 countries) comments: Surgical disease presents a double-edged sword of impoverishment: On the one hand, if individuals cannot access surgical care, they might die or face lifelong disability. This loss of economic productivity will cost LMICs 12.3 trillion USD by 2030. On the other hand, 81 million individuals face catastrophic expenditure paying for surgical and anaesthesia care each year. We, therefore, argue that it is critical to both include surgery within the definition of "basic services" and supplement infrastructural access to surgery with financial risk protection through universal health coverage. |  |  |
| IASS, Institute for Advanced Sustainability Studies | Secure land rights for all are a critical component of the 2030 Agenda, and an integral part of the Target 1.4. It is fundamental to include an indicator on land tenure under Goal 1 (as 1.4.2). We encourage the IAEG-SDG to consider a comprehensive land indicator tracking rights “secure rights to land” and not just “ownership”; referring to “land” and not just to “agricultural land”; tracking progress for women and men, as well as for indigenous peoples and communities, as tenure can be individual or collective . To this end, we recommend to use the following indicator: Percentage of women, men, indigenous peoples, and local communities (IPLCs) with secure rights to land, property and natural resources, measured by a) percentage with legally documented or recognized evidence of tenure, and b) percentage who perceive their rights are recognized and protected. This indicator has been supported by UK and others during the negotiations, and responds to concerns expressed by Italy, South Africa and Switzerland during the consultations. It is supported by the Global Land Indicator Initiative (led by the World Bank), the Global Donor Platform on Rural Development, the IP Major Group, the Women’s Major Group, IUCN, UN-Habitat, UNEP, SDSN, and a broad coalition of civil society. |  |  |
| iinas | Germany, IINAS: Secure land rights for all are a critical component of the 2030 Agenda, and an integral part of the Target 1.4. It is fundamental to include an indicator on land tenure under Goal 1 (as 1.4.2). We encourage the IAEG-SDG to consider a comprehensive land indicator tracking rights “secure rights to land” and not just “ownership”; referring to “land” and not just to “agricultural land”; tracking progress for women and men, as well as for indigenous peoples and communities, as tenure can be individual or collective . To this end, we recommend to use the following indicator: Percentage of women, men, indigenous peoples, and local communities (IPLCs) with secure rights to land, property and natural resources, measured by a) percentage with legally documented or recognized evidence of tenure, and b) percentage who perceive their rights are recognized and protected. |  |  |
| Institute for Advanced Sustainability Studies | The Institute for Advanced Sustainability Studies recommends: Secure land rights for all are a critical component of the 2030 Agenda, and an integral part of the Target 1.4. It is fundamental to include an indicator on land tenure under Goal 1 (as 1.4.2). We encourage the IAEG-SDG to consider a comprehensive land indicator tracking rights “secure rights to land” and not just “ownership”; referring to “land” and not just to “agricultural land”; tracking progress for women and men, as well as for indigenous peoples and communities, as tenure can be individual or collective . To this end, we recommend to use the following indicator: Percentage of women, men, indigenous peoples, and local communities (IPLCs) with secure rights to land, property and natural resources, measured by a) percentage with legally documented or recognized evidence of tenure, and b) percentage who perceive their rights are recognized and protected. This indicator has been supported by UK and others during the negotiations, and responds to concerns expressed by Italy, South Africa and Switzerland during the consultations. It is supported by the Global Land Indicator Initiative (led by the World Bank, and UN-Habitat, and facilitated by GLTN), the Global Donor Platform on Rural Development, the IP Major Group, the Women’s Major Group, IUCN, UN-Habitat, UNEP, SDSN, and a broad coalition of civil society. |  |  |
| Lancet Commission on Global Surgery | The Lancet Commission on Global Surgery comments that the definition of "basic services" should include primary health care systems providing safe, timely, and affordable surgical and anaesthesia care. |  |  |
| LARRI Land Rights Research Initiative, University of Gothenburg | 1.4.2 Land indicator is critical to ending poverty and must remain in SDG Goal 1 In accordance with all the 23 members of the Global Donor Working Group on Land (GDWGL)<https://www.donorplatform.org/land-governance/global-donor-working-group-on-land> LARRI highly opposes the deletion of former indicator 1.4.2 which was targeting access to secure land tenure. Country/Organisation X therefore strongly supports the reinstatement of an appropriate land indicator under 1.4. The target explicitly refers to ownership and control over land and other forms of property, which CANNOT be measured by current indicator 1.4.1. The appropriate land indicator, under target 1.4, also supported by the Global Land Indicators Initiative (GLII), Landesa and many other partners, would read: “Percentage of people with secure tenure rights to land (out of total adult population), with legally recognized documentation and who perceive their rights to land as secure, by sex and by type of tenure". Besides the efforts of GLII, there are two ongoing initiatives that support data collection for the suggested land indicator: (1) The World Bank is collecting administrative data available within land registries and cadasters for as many countries as possible (data is currently available for 189 countries). They are conducting surveys with officials of land agencies and local experts to assess whether obtaining information is feasible, including disaggregated information. (2) A Rome data hub has recently been established jointly by FAO, IFAD and WB to document the land related information (including gendered perceptions of tenure security) in all of the household surveys of the Living Standards Measurement Study and make this information available as open data on our institutions’ data portal. These exercises are showing that collecting information is feasible - because information is already available and/or can be done at low additional cost (US$ 50K by country is often enough). The World Bank, as a member of the Global Donor WG on Land, is willing to share detailed information on these surveys. Further supportive information can be found in the following three documents: (1) Policy brief from GDWGL: http://www.scribd.com/document\_downloads/290501000?extension=pdf&from=embed&source=embed; (2) GLII’s proposed Metadata for the land indicator: http://www.scribd.com/document\_downloads/293309913?extension=pdf&from=embed&source=embed; and (3) GLII’s land governance indicators database: http://www.scribd.com/document\_downloads/293309206?extension=pdf&from=embed&source=embed |  |  |
| Monash Sustainability Institute | David Griggs - Monash Sustainability Institute. The first step is to agree a definition of basic services. There are several definitions that could be used, for example Zambia defines them as • Housing, • Education, • Health care, • Social welfare, • Transport, • Electricity and energy, • Water, • Sanitation and Refuse and waste removal. Some of these will be covered by other indicators so that this indicator can then focus on those basic services not covered by other indicators. |  |  |
| new York University | USA, NYU: This must be disaggregated to highlight the specific forms of poverty experienced by members of female-headed households. | USA, NYU: This has to be disaggregated by sex, age, and locally-relevant social categories such as race, caste, class etc. | usa, nyu: Proportion of funds specifically allocated for programmes addressing poverty-reduction, equitable and sustainable natural resource management, and women's empowerment, in national development plans. |
| Red de Educación de Personas Jóvenes y Adultas | Proportion of the population living in households with access to essential services, with the understanding that essential services must include at least primary and secondary education |  |  |
| University of Utah | It is critical to have access to basic surgical and anesthetic care for increasing economic status and improving life style. Surgical maintains people's ability to work, to support their families. Need to monitor access to surgical care, healthcare expenditures, surgical and anesthesia workforce, basic types of surgical care available. | It is critical to have access to basic surgical and anesthetic care for increasing economic status and improving life style. Surgical maintains people's ability to work, to support their families. Need to monitor access to surgical care, healthcare expenditures, surgical and anesthesia workforce, basic types of surgical care available. Having worked in disaster situations (Haiti, 911, etc), deaths and long term disability could have been dramatically less had surgical and anesthetic care had been strengthened.! | Surgical and Anesthesia Care must be included into every country's health plans as recommended by WHA resolution 68.15 Strengthening emergency and essential surgical and anesthesia as a component of universal health coverage (unanimous vote by 194 nations in May 2015). This is critical eradicate poverty. |
| Wayne State University School of Medicine | It is most important to focus on childhood poverty, which is always out of proportion to that in the population at large. | Focus on indicators that measure the resilience of children. | Number of children with full clothing and shoes and access to medical care and education. |
| World Trade Institute, University of Bern | Land indicator is critical to ending poverty and must remain in SDG Goal 1 The sustainable development law group of the World Trade Institute and the Centre for Development and Environment, University of Bern, highly opposes the deletion of former indicator 1.4.2 which was targeting access to secure land tenure. It strongly supports the reinstatement of an appropriate land indicator under 1.4. Besides basic services, the target explicitly refers to ownership and control over land and other forms of property, which CANNOT simply be measured by current indicator 1.4.1. The appropriate land-specific indicator, under target 1.4, also supported by the Global Land Indicators Initiative (GLII), Landesa and many other partners, would read: “Percentage of people with secure tenure rights to land (out of total adult population), with legally recognized documentation and who perceive their rights to land as secure, by sex and by type of tenure". Besides the efforts of GLII, there are two ongoing initiatives that support data collection for the suggested land indicator: (1) The World Bank is collecting administrative data available within land registries and cadasters for as many countries as possible (data is currently available for 189 countries). They are conducting surveys with officials of land agencies and local experts to assess whether obtaining information is feasible, including disaggregated information. (2) A Rome data hub has recently been established jointly by FAO, IFAD and WB to document the land related information (including gendered perceptions of tenure security) in all of the household surveys of the Living Standards Measurement Study and make this information available as open data on our institutions’ data portal. These exercises are showing that collecting information is feasible - because information is already available and/or can be done at low additional cost (US$ 50K by country is often enough). |  |  |
| independent consultant, trainer and policy adviser | Secure land rights for all are a critical component of the 2030 Agenda, and an integral part of the Target 1.4. It is fundamental to include an indicator on land tenure under Goal 1 (as 1.4.2). We encourage the IAEG-SDG to consider a comprehensive land indicator tracking rights “secure rights to land” and not just “ownership”; referring to “land” and not just to “agricultural land”; tracking progress for women and men, as well as for indigenous peoples and communities, as tenure can be individual or collective . To this end, we recommend to use the following indicator: Percentage of women, men, indigenous peoples, and local communities (IPLCs) with secure rights to land, property and natural resources, measured by a) percentage with legally documented or recognized evidence of tenure, and b) percentage who perceive their rights are recognized and protected. This indicator has been supported by UK and others during the negotiations, and responds to concerns expressed by Italy, South Africa and Switzerland during the consultations. It is supported by the Global Land Indicator Initiative (led by the World Bank, and UN-Habitat, and facilitated by GLTN), the Global Donor Platform on Rural Development, the IP Major Group, the Women’s Major Group, IUCN, UN-Habitat, UNEP, SDSN, and a broad coalition of civil society. |  |  |

| **Country/Organisation** | **Goal 2: End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition, and promote sustainable agriculture** | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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. | **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. | **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. | **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. | **Target 2.5:**By 2030, 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. | **Target 2.5:**By 2030, 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. | **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. | **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. |
| *Indicator 2.3.2:* Total Factor Productivity | *Indicator 2.4.1:* Percentage of agricultural area under sustainable agricultural practices (indicator moved to grey following results of IAEG-SDGs member consultation) | *Indicator 2.4.2:*Percentage of agricultural households using irrigation systems compared to all agricultural households | *Indicator 2.4.3:*Percentage of agricultural households using eco-friendly fertilizers compared to all agricultural households using fertilizers | *Indicator 2.5.1:*Ex-Situ Crop Collections Enrichment Index | *Indicator 2.5.2:*Percentage of local crops and breeds and their wild relatives, classified as being at-risk, not at-risk or unknown level of risk of extinction | *Indicator 2.a.1:*The Agriculture Orientation Index (AOI) for Government Expenditures | *Indicator 2.c.1:*Indicator of (food) Price Anomalies (IPA) |
| *Discussion prompt: The IAEG-SDGs Members would like to either consider the current proposal or suggestions for an alternative indicator.* | *Discussion prompt: This might also include components currently addressed in indicators 2.4.2 and 2.4.3.* | *Discussion prompt: This element can be included in indicator 2.4.1.* | *Discussion prompt: This element can be included in indicator 2.4.1.* | *Discussion prompt: The IAEG-SDG Members ask for suggestions on how to cover both aspects of the target (vegetation and animals), considered together with 2.5.2.* | *Discussion prompt: The IAEG-SDG Members ask for suggestions on how to cover both aspects of the target (vegetation and animals), considered together with 2.5.1.* |  |  |
| **Total comments received** | 48 | 35 | 28 | 26 | 18 | 10 | 18 | 13 |
| Australian Bureau of Statistics | Suggest looking at the work of the UN Evidence and Data for Gender Equality (EDGE) The Australian BUreau of Statistics has previously provided comments (through AusAID) on the proposed indicators in 2013. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Central Statistical Office of Poland | CSO of Poland comments: This indicator is not calculated and prepared in Central Statistical Office. | CSO of Poland comments: Further clarification is needed. |  | CSO of Poland comments: Further clarification on eco-friendly fertilizrers is needed. |  |  |  |  |
| Government of Japan |  | Japan considers that the definition of the suggested indicator is unclear and some examples or guidelines on what kind of practices are deemed to be “sustainable agricultural practices” should be shown for appropriate selection of data, because (1) sustainable practices differ country by country, and (2) even if a large number of countries should have some legal framework to support these practices (e.g. by subsidies), such framework does not intend to distinct area under sustainable practices from the others. As such, Japan does not support inclusion of the indicator 2.4.2 and 2.4.3 into the indicator 2.4.1. | Japan would like to suggest "proportion of agricultural land benefited by the irrigation systems compared to all agricultural land" because the number of the households using irrigation system does not always represent improvement of the coverage of irrigation system. Also, Japan does not support inclusion of this indicator into the indicator 2.4.1. (See our comments on the indicator 2.4.1.) | Japan can support this indicator if the definition of "eco-friendly fertilizers" can be set by each country which has different ecosystems and land/soil conditions, it can be coded as GREEN. Also, Japan does not support inclusion of this indicator into the indicator 2.4.1 |  |  | Japan: This target refers increase in investment in rural infrastructure, agricultural research and extension services, technology development and others, including through international cooperation. As such, the indicator should cover ODA as well as the governemnt expenditure. Also, recepient of investment inplied in the target is the developing countries. This means ther data from the other countries has no merit under the purpose of this indicator. Therfore, it is proposed that (1) ODA recipient countries add ODA amount for the agriculture sector (calculation is shown below) and (2) global level aggrigation only include the data of the developing countries (or the countires other than the developing countires do not calculate the data). Also, role and size of the private investment, either domestic or foreign investment cannot be ignored. Further discussion is needed. <Proposed calculation method of the indicator (The underlined is the modified part)> \* Calculated only by the developing countires ((Government Expenditure for Agriculture + received ODA for the Agriculture Sector) / (Government Expendicute + total received ODA)) / Agricultural share of GDP |  |
| Hungarian Central Statistical Office | HU: This grouping of population is difficult to harmonize with European practice. | HU: Ecological farming or Proportion of areas subject to agri-environmental measures would be better indicators. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Censos |  | We recommend to define what implies sustainable agricultural practices. | We recommend that the unit of analysis of this indicator should be the agricultural unit instead of agricultural households. In addition, it is important to define what implies sustainable agricultural practices. | We recommend that the unit of analysis of this indicator should be the agricultural unit instead of agricultural households. In addition, it is important to define what implies sustainable agricultural practices. |  |  |  |  |
| National Statistical Committee, Belarus | **The methodology of formation of the indicator should be specified** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Statistics Denmark |  | The indicator does not fully reflect the scope of the target. The indicator has to cover the economic, social and economic dimensions of sustainable agriculture. | Need further information on indicators. Indicator 2.4.1. is not developed. FAO definition: 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. 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. 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. | Same as Indicator 2.4.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Statistics Lithuania | Unclear definition |  |  |  | Metodology still to be defined | Data could be estimated | Available on FAO database | Partly available on FAO database |
| Statistics Portugal |  |  |  |  |  |  | Suggested alternative indicators: Proportion of total investment in public administration dedicated to cooperation, in rural infrastructure, agricultural research and extension services, technology development and plant and livestock gene banks;When appropriate:Implementation rate of the measures of rural programs dedicated to rural infrastructure, agricultural research and extension services, technology development and plant and livestock gene banks; | It is necessary information on the content of the proposed indicator to have an assessment on its suitability vis-à-vis this goal. |
| United States | US strongly supports using TFP growth as an indicator of sustainable agricultural development. We do not contend that TFP growth is a definition of sustainable agriculture. It is, however, the single best indicator of our ability to meet growing food demand with fewer resources. Use of fewer resources conveys many environmental benefits, such as reducing deforestation and nutrient runoff. Other indicators in the SDG, such as trends in land degradation, will help ensure that externalities from agricultural production are kept in check. There is no other indicator of our ability to meet growing food demand. Please edit to "Growth in total factor productivity." We are prepared to offer percentage targets. | US: US 2.4.1 The percentage of agricultural area under sustainable agricultural practices, where sustainable agriculture is measured by the ratio of total agricultural output to all inputs – where total agricultural output is an aggregation of crop and livestock products and total inputs (factors) is an aggregation of all of the land, labor, capital and materials used in production. (Total Factor Productivity). | US: We recommend deleting this indicator as redundant. 2.4.2 is covered by 6.4.1, percentage change in water use efficiency. As written, 2.4.2 would encourage greater water use for irrigation without any efficiency gain. This would not be sustainable and thus directly contradicts the target. It could be rewritten as follows, but it would still be redundant with 6.4.1: Area covered by efficient irrigation systems compared to total irrigated area. We see no valid reason to focus on agricultural households. | US: We recommend deleting this indicator as redundant. 2.4.3 is covered by 14.1.1, nitrogen use efficiency composite indicator. We are unaware of any accepted definition of eco-friendly fertilizer, and as with 2.4.2, see no valid reason to focus on agricultural households. We do not see a way re-write this indicator to make it acceptable. However, we would note that fertilizer use efficiency is included in TFP. | US: The proposed indicator is a weak conceptual fit to the target, but we offer an alternative as noted. The proposed enrichment index does not cover: Range or quality of existing collections; Diversity within a species, which is especially important to plant breeders; Diversity found within countries/regions, for example, at different ecogeographical zones; Animals, among other genetic resources for food and agriculture (aquatic, microbial).  2.5.1 Number of samples of crops and breeds placed in gene-bank collections | US: No comment | US: We do not have revisions nor an alternate indicator to propose at this time. However, we note that an increasing index score will not always represent progress. Measures of spending--and even investment--cannot indicate how well the funds are spent. | US: We do not have revisions nor an alternate indicator to propose at this time. However, we note that an increasing index score will not always represent progress. Measures of spending--and even investment--cannot indicate how well the funds are spent. |
| Department Foreign Affairs and Trade, Australia | Australia supports TFP as the most comprehensive measure of productivity. Noting that accounting for all inputs to production (capital, labour, energy, materials and services, with output and input measures adjusted for quality change). Calculating TFP requires a lot of data and is therefore only available for a small number of countries. Australia suggests having TFP as aspirational and using labour productivity as a more easily-measurable indicator in the interim. Countries who can report on TFP should. |  |  |  | This Index was developed in response to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (target 13). The index weights the pool of accessions entering a gene bank collection each year, based on their originality when compared to the accessions already collected. Any new accession increases the value of the index, but the degree of increase will depend on the originality of new accessions. Originality is based on two criteria: the taxon (genus + species fields) and the country of origin. The Index is being developed by FAO and Biodiversity, and is still a work in progress. Please see here: http://www.bipindicators.net/cropcollections. Australia suggests FAO and Biodiversity continue developing the index, noting potential data gaps in developing country gene banks. FAO and Biodiversity should also engage closely with the Global Crop Diversity Trust, who may hold relevant data. |  | AOI is a useful way to monitor this target. Australia recommends that efforts should also be made to reflect private sector or on-farm investment over the life of the SDGs. |  |
| Eurostat | Data not collected by European Statistical System (ESS). The suitability of the indicators should be reconsidered. The target clearly refers to he agricultural productivity and incomes of small-scale producers. Total factor productivity is a key measure of the economic performance of agriculture and an important driver of farm incomes. However, MFP measure should be avoided. It is not part of official statistics due to the huge assumptions (relating to production function properties) which are used in estimating MFP (regarding perfect market functioning, substitutability of factor inputs among other things). | There needs to be an overall agreement on what we mean with sustainable agriculture. | The information on irrigable areas, irrigated areas, irrigation systems and sources of water is available in European Statistical System (ESS) since many years. It would be better to use the term "farms" or "agricultural holdings" instead of "agricultural households". | Definition of the eco-friendly fertilizer needed. Alternative solution "Area under organic farming - in %". | Data not collected in European Statistical System (ESS). | Data not collected in European Statistical System (ESS). Methodological development work and capacity building is required to make data available in a comprehensive way. | There is a need to clarify whether the methodology used for this index is consistent with the SNA and SEEA, or if the indicator can be potentially redefined accordingly. |  |
| FAO | FAO suggest to drop this indicator, as it is considered not suited for monitoring Target 2.3. If understood in its proper definition, “Total Factor Productivity” is a measure of productivity for the overall national economy, and therefore it does not provide the needed indication of how the productivity of small-scale food producers evolves over time. If the use of the expression “Total Factor Productivity” is meant to be generically interpreted expressing the need to monitor the productivity of small-scale food producers not only in terms of net returns to labor, then a proposal should be articulated along the same lines in which indicator 2.3.1 has been described, or better, framed as an extension of indicator 2.3.1, considering that it will certainly be informed by the same type of farm surveys, providing information that is disaggregated by size of the food production enterprise. | FAO proposes a revised indicator, described as: “Percent of land under productive and sustainable agriculture” as appropriate to address both the concerns that have been raised with respect to the possibility to define sustainable agricultural practices, and the need to take into consideration also productivity aspects related to water and fertilizer use. This indicator is calculated as the ratio between ‘Area under productive and sustainable agriculture’ and ‘Total agricultural area’. The definition of ‘productive and sustainable agriculture’ in the numerator will capture the different dimensions of environmental, economic and social sustainability, based on agreed criteria that will be established through an open and inclusive process, to ensure relevance across the wide range of socio-economic and bio-physical conditions of different countries and regions. Existing agricultural data collection systems, including especially farm surveys, could be adapted to include the data needed to inform the agreed upon measures of sustainability as applied to observed practices. Once agreed criteria on measuring sustainability have been established, the choice of the specific aspects of agricultural sustainability to highlight in compiling the indicator could be left at national level, in order to cover the most relevant aspects within each of the sustainability dimensions. A detailed metadata sheet has been prepared and is available from FAO. | FAO proposes a revised indicator, described as: “Percent of land under productive and sustainable agriculture” as appropriate to address both the concerns that have been raised with respect to the possibility to define sustainable agricultural practices, and the need to take into consideration also productivity aspects related to water and fertilizer use. This indicator is calculated as the ratio between ‘Area under productive and sustainable agriculture’ and ‘Total agricultural area’. The definition of ‘productive and sustainable agriculture’ in the numerator will capture the different dimensions of environmental, economic and social sustainability, based on agreed criteria that will be established through an open and inclusive process, to ensure relevance across the wide range of socio-economic and bio-physical conditions of different countries and regions. Existing agricultural data collection systems, including especially farm surveys, could be adapted to include the data needed to inform the agreed upon measures of sustainability as applied to observed practices. Once agreed criteria on measuring sustainability have been established, the choice of the specific aspects of agricultural sustainability to highlight in compiling the indicator could be left at national level, in order to cover the most relevant aspects within each of the sustainability dimensions. A detailed metadata sheet has been prepared and is available from FAO. | FAO proposes a revised indicator, described as: “Percent of land under productive and sustainable agriculture” as appropriate to address both the concerns that have been raised with respect to the possibility to define sustainable agricultural practices, and the need to take into consideration also productivity aspects related to water and fertilizer use. This indicator is calculated as the ratio between ‘Area under productive and sustainable agriculture’ and ‘Total agricultural area’. The definition of ‘productive and sustainable agriculture’ in the numerator will capture the different dimensions of environmental, economic and social sustainability, based on agreed criteria that will be established through an open and inclusive process, to ensure relevance across the wide range of socio-economic and bio-physical conditions of different countries and regions. Existing agricultural data collection systems, including especially farm surveys, could be adapted to include the data needed to inform the agreed upon measures of sustainability as applied to observed practices. Once agreed criteria on measuring sustainability have been established, the choice of the specific aspects of agricultural sustainability to highlight in compiling the indicator could be left at national level, in order to cover the most relevant aspects within each of the sustainability dimensions. A detailed metadata sheet has been prepared and is available from FAO. | FAO suggests to consider an alternative indicator described as follows: “Number of plant and animal genetic resources for food and agriculture secured in either medium or long term conservation facilities”, to avoid misinterpretation of the term ‘ex-situ’ and to extend the coverage to both aspects of crops and domesticated animal genetic resources. FAO notices the following. 1. Data for genebank collections for crops and their wild relatives are already available and covered through the reporting to the FAO Commission by countries on the implementation of the Second Global Plan of Action for Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture. The already well established and used indicator “Number of accessions secured in genebank collections under medium or long-term conditions” (as adopted by the FAO Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture in April 2013, see Appendix C of CGRFA-15 Report http://www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/028/mg538e.pdf) would be used, where an ‘accession’ is defined as a distinct, uniquely identifiable sample of seeds, planting materials or plants representing a cultivar, breeding line or a population, which is maintained for conservation and use. Medium and long-term storage conditions include: a) Seed medium term (under refrigeration at 5-10 °C and relative humidity of 15 +/- 3 percent); b) Seed long term (under refrigeration at -18 +/- 3 °C and relative humidity of 15 +/- 3 percent); c) Field; d) In vitro; e) Cryopreservation; and f) DNA. 2. As per the animal genetic resources for food and agriculture, FAO just started data collection on genebanks for domesticated animals (basic information gathered from 129 countries). The number of local breeds with genetic material stored within a genebank collection required to reconstitute the breed would be counted (based on the Guidelines on Cryconservation of animal genetic resources, FAO, 2012, accessible at http://www.fao.org/docrep/016/i3017e/i3017e00.htm). However, details of the methodology need to be further developed. 3. For both crop and domesticated animal genetic resources for food and agriculture, data are officially provided by National Coordinators nominated by their respective Ministries (usually ministry of agriculture). | FAO strongly suggests to go back to the originally proposed indicator: “Percentage of local breeds, classified as being at-risk, not at-risk or unknown level of risk of extinction.” The reason is that the cost of any attempt at covering plant generic resources within an in-situ indicator would be prohibitive, as the costs for the periodic collection of the necessary data on local crops diversity, on farm, and their wild relatives, in-situ, would by far exceed the expected benefits, even without considering that the reliability of data would be very low. On the other hand, the originally proposes indicator on the “Percentage of local breeds, classified as being at-risk, not at-risk or unknown level of risk of extinction” is well established and already used by the 178 member countries of the Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture to monitor the implementation of the Global Plan of Action and is one of the indicators for Aichi-Target 13. Country level data for this indicator are officially provided by National Coordinators nominated by their respective Ministries (usually ministry of agriculture) and are already available and regularly updated | FAO suggests to keep this indicator. The target is meant to monitor the commitment of national governments and international cooperation partners in sustaining agricultural and rural development. This indicator covers the first aspect, i.e. the commitment of national governments through the monitoring of the government expenditure to agriculture. The Agriculture Orientation Index for Government Expenditures is a ratio of the agriculture share of government expenditures (government expenditures in agriculture over total government expenditures) over the agriculture contribution to the economy (value added of the agricultural sector over the GDP). It provides a measure of how strongly public expenditures is oriented towards agriculture in a way that is comparable across countries, taking into account the relative importance of the agricultural sector in the economy. FAO already provided detailed information on how the indicator can be computed rather simply from official statistics on government expenditures (a point noted by the representative of Ecuador during the 2nd IAEG-SDG meeting in Bangkok) and stands ready to provide any additional support. The second dimension of the target, i.e. the commitment of international cooperation partners, can be monitored by the share of ODA to agriculture over total ODA received by the beneficiary country. | FAO suggests to keep this indicator. FAO already provided detailed information on how the indicator is computed. It reiterates that the proposed indicator is simply a methodologically robust way to measure price volatility that can be applied to any series of monthly prices or price indexes. The method of computation is based on the observation that price anomalies should be assessed against what can be considered normal variability either cyclical or along a trend, and on the consideration that a high number of price anomalies over a certain period of time is a clear indication of market instability. Its implementation at country level requires that a country identifies one or more relevant series of national food prices on which to apply it. It can also be applied on international food price index series, such as FAO’s food price index, to provide an indication of global food market instability. |
| g7+ Secretariat | g7+ Secretariat: An alternative indicator is needed to reflect the extent of availability of Inputs. Productivity aspect of the target is covered by indicator which is in green. | g7+ Secretariat: 2.4.2 and 2.4.3 (which are good enough) covers the components, so why should we have an additional indicator? We have to reduce the number of indicators anyway |  |  |  |  | g7+ Secretariat: Need to include the proportion of ODA supporting agriculture. This is important for ODA depended countries particularly FCS. | g7+ Secretariat: Fragility assessments by g7+ members have identified the importance of avoiding food price volatility but the focus should be on the country level measurement of this indicator. |
| IFAD | Total factor productivity is problematic, but widely available and currently tracked by USDA. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) |  |  |  |  | IUCN supports adoption of “ex­-situ crop collections enrichment index” as an indicator towards SDG Target 2.5. It is based on an existing indicator used for tracking progress towards Aichi Target 13 in the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020, and mobilised through the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (http://www.bipindicators.net/cropcollections). | IUCN supports adoption of “percentage of local crops and breeds and their wild relatives, classified as being at­-risk, not at­-risk or unknown level of risk of extinction” as an indicator towards SDG Target 2.5. It is based on an existing indicator used for tracking progress towards Aichi Target 13 in the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020, and mobilised through the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (http://www.bipindicators.net/domesticatedanimals). As currently formulated on pages 522–525 of the “Compilation of Metadata Received on Indicators for Global Monitoring of the Sustainable Development Goals and Targets” (http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/Metadata%20Compilation%20for%20SDG%20Indicators%2023%20October%202015%20Update.pdf), this indicator does not yet include wild relatives (which are explicitly mentioned in the target). IUCN therefore suggests incorporation of data on wild relatives, from thematic disaggregation of the Red List Index for wild relatives of domestic animal and plant species. The Red List Index is a “green” multi-purpose indicator towards SDG Target 15.5, for which IUCN submitted metadata on 30 Jul 2015; provided on pages 366–374 of the “Compilation of Metadata Received on Indicators for Global Monitoring of the Sustainable Development Goals and Targets”. It is based on an existing indicator used for tracking progress towards Aichi Target 12 of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020, and mobilised through the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (http://www.bipindicators.net/rli/2010). IUCN stands ready to provide any further support in documentation or interpretation as useful. |  |  |
| OECD |  | The Agricultural Nutrient Balance could be used for OECD countries (see data at https://data.oecd.org/agrland/nutrient-balance.htm). |  |  |  |  | In respect of the "enhanced international co-operation" part of this target, the OECD could supply data on total official flows (official development assistance plus other official flows) to the agriculture sector (page 17 here: http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/documentupload/Creditor%20Reporting%20System%20CRS%20Aid%20Activities%20database%202017%20reporting%20on%202016%20flows.pdf) |  |
| UN ESCAP | ESCAP, Bangkok Total factor productivity cannot indicate all the above targets. Agriculture prouctivity can be measured, but it may be difficult to get the real data on small-scale food producers especially those in unorganised or informal sector. |  |  | It would beimpossible to get these data at each house hold level. Sampling may not do correct reporting. |  |  |  |  |
| UN Women | Proposed indicator: Average income of small scale food producers, by sex and indigenous status. This target is about doubling the agricultural productivity and income of small scale farmers. Total factor productivity is inadequate for monitoring this target and will not tell us whether we are making any progress towards reaching it. Instead, UN Women proposes a much more direct indicator that is directly related to the target. The proposed indicator "Average income of small scale food producers, by sex and indigenous status. The term “small scale food producers”, including in farming, fishing etc. will need to be defined and agreed and FAO could possibly lead this process. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UNCDF | UNCDF Proposed additional indicator: % of adults living in rural areas with an account at a bank or other financial institution or with a mobile money service provider Rationale: The current indicators proposed for this target do not adequately address dimensions of this target such as financial services; other indicators, e.g., access to financial services are needed. Financial inclusion is an enabler and accelerator of food security, nutrition, and rural development. Financial services such as savings, insurance, payments, credit and remittances are critical for rural people, particularly women, to meet their basic needs, invest in their farms and livestock and enterprises, and lift themselves out of poverty. When people have access to financial accounts, they are more likely to also have loans and savings, as well as building a financial history to enable them to access credit and other financial services. An indicator already exists, is collected triennially and is available for approximately 145 countries. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UNEP | UNEP Comments: Secure land rights are an integral part of achieving this target. We encourage the IAEG-SDG to reconsider a comprehensive land indicator here, under Goal 15 and Goal 1. Under Goal 15 secure land rights are also integral to sustainable land management and sustainable use of natural resources and combatting desertification and restoration of degraded land and soil. A land indicator could be as follows: Percentage of women, men, indigenous peoples, and local communities (IPLCs) with secure rights to land, property and natural resources, measured by a) percentage with legally documented or recognized evidence of tenure, and b) percentage who perceive their rights are recognized and protected. This indicator has been supported by UK and others, and concerns expressed by Italy, South Africa and Switzerland during the consultations. It has been supported by the Global Land Indicator Initiative (led by the World Bank, and UN-Habitat, and facilitated by GLTN), the Global Donor Platform on Rural Development, the IP Major Group, the Women’s Major Group, IUCN, UN-Habitat, UNEP, SDSN, and a broad coalition of civil society. | UNEP Comments: For 2.4.1, 2.4.2, 2.4.3 Proportion of land under climate smart and sustainable technologies and practices This indicator is a measure of the total area of land under climate smart and sustainable technologies and practices as a proportion of total area of productive land % of growth compared to baseline p.a. It captures sustainable food production systems inclusive of all technologies, management systems and husbandry practices that have recognized environmental sustainability elements to them ( i.e. maintaining the land's optimal productivity for the food security of future generations), including best practices such as conservation agriculture/minimum tillage both for large and small holders, alternate wet and drying rice production, agro-forestry. There are good data available from FAO STAT, CGIAR and Alliance for Climate Smart Agriculture. The UN SDG Interface Ontology Working Group is developing definitions for agricultural households, irrigation area, nutrient balance and eco-friendly. A brief note on this work is available from: http://unstats.un.org/unsd/post-2015/activities/egm-on-indicator-framework/docs/Common%20approach%20for%20developing%20SDG%20Integrated%20indicators.pdf | UNEP Comments: see 2.4.1 | UNEP Comments: see 2.4.1 | UNEP Comments: Recommend to retain Ex-situ crop collections enrichment index. This indicator is included in Aichi Target 13 in the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020, and countries have committed to monitoring this index. Currently there is no single indicator for both crops and breeds. | UNEP Comments: Percentage of breeds classified at risk. This indicator is included in Aichi Target 13 in the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020, and countries have committed to monitoring this. Currently there is no single indicator for both crops and breeds. |  |  |
| UN-ESCAP |  |  |  | Eco-friendly should be changed to organic as this has a certification basis and is stronger. It will also support organic producers/suppliers |  |  |  |  |
| UNIDO | Total factor productivity is not an indicator. You get different results by employing different methods of calculation. The indicator should be - yield rate of arable land (output per area unit of land). There are many things mentioned target but the agricultural productivity is chief. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| United Nations ESCAP | United Nations ESCAP, Thailand, This discriminates against men. Positive discrimination in favour of women simply leads inefficient suboptimal labour market allocation. United Nations ESCAP, Thailand, Humans all come from central Africa, there are no indigenous peoples. By creating a definition of 'indigenous' you perpetuate the stereotypes that they are considered to be 'other'. |  |  |  | United Nations ESCAP, Thailand, It is not necessary to duplicate seed and plant banks in every country and at every level of government, perhaps consider a global seed bank where specimens of all seeds and plants are required to be deposited, and are accessible to all. |  |  | United Nations ESCAP, Thailand, The common agricultural policy in Europe creates significant global market distortions. This indicator appears to have been selected specifically so as not to annoy the European Union. Perhaps redefine to removing subsidies across countries. |
| United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) |  |  |  |  | OHCHR notes that the suggested indicator does not address the second part of the target, related to access and benefit-sharing arising from traditional knowledge, as internationally agreed. These issues should be addressed based on internationally agreed rights and principles as reflected in the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), Convention on Biological Diversity and the related Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing. Hence, cross-reference should be made to the proposed indicator under target 15.6. on the adoption of legislative, administrative and policy frameworks for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol. |  |  |  |
| World Water Council |  | World Water Council: The definition of " sustainable agricultural practices" should consider the efficient use of water. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact | The proposed indicator broadens the measurement of productivity already measured under indicator 2.3.1., but fails to supplement it with data on the means and the rights-holders specifically mentioned in the target. Thereby, there is no indicator to uphold the aspiration of the target to ensure secure and equal access to land of women, indigenous peoples, family farmers, pastoralists etc. A better indicator would be: “Percentage of women, indigenous peoples and local communities with secure tenure rights to individually or communally held land, property and natural resources”. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asia Pacific Forum on Women, Law and Development (APWLD) | Asia Pacific Forum on Women, Law and Development (APWLD) comments: APWLD proposes the following indicator as an alternative to the grey indicator: •“Percentage of productive land owned or accessed by small-scale food producers, in particular women, indigenous peoples, family farmers, pastoralists and fishers, ”. It is critical to include a measure of concentration of land ownership to address the phenomenon of land-grabbing which has resulted in diminishing land available to local communities and which threatens local food security. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RIGHTS | Disaggregated data on the number of farmers/ small-scale entrepreneur from socially disadvantaged groups on the axis of age, sex disability, race, caste, ethnicity, origin, religion and economic and other status and rural-urban divide with respect annual turn over. | Percentage of agricultural household using irrigation owned by socially disadvantaged groups on the axis of age, sex disability, race, caste, ethnicity, origin, religion and economic and other status and rural-urban divide under sustainable agricultural practices. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| African Agency for Integrated Development (AAID) | I am from Uganda an Executive Director of African Agency for Integrated development (AAID) in aspecial Consultative status with ECOSOC since 2012, My alternative Indicator suggested is "Total Farmers facilitation" Because if farmers are facilitatated first then Goal will be achieved. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| American Society for Reproductive Medicine | American Society for Reproductive Medicine. We desire to point out an omission for Indicator 2.2.1. All stages of the life cycle are noted except for the pre-pregnancy period. It is critical to consider the need and importance for good nutrition particularly during early fetal development. Pre-pregnancy nutrition may also impact a subset of couples, particularly women, attempting pregnancy. | American Society for Reproductive Medicine. We believe that fertilizer use as well as environmental toxins and waste have potential adverse effects as hormonal disrupters and should be addressed.to avoid fetal adverse effects during development and post delivery. In addition, men and women attempting pregnancy may be adversely affected leading to infertility. Twenty year trends in semen parameters have supported such effects. | American Society for Reproductive Medicine. See 2.41 Indicator above. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asia Dalit Rights Forum | 1. Disaggregated data on the number of farmers/ small-scale entrepreneur from socially disadvantaged groups on the axis of age, sex disability, race, caste, ethnicity, origin, religion and economic and other status and rural-urban divide with respect annual turn over. | 1. Percentage of agricultural area owned by socially disadvantaged groups on the axis of age, sex disability, race, caste, ethnicity, origin, religion and economic and other status and rural-urban divide under sustainable agricultural practices. | Percentage of agricultural household using irrigation owned by socially disadvantaged groups on the axis of age, sex disability, race, caste, ethnicity, origin, religion and economic and other status and rural-urban divide under sustainable agricultural practices. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Associated Country Women of the World | Associated Country Women of the World: Total Factor Productivity is the better indicator, so long as it measures the impact of doubling agricultural productivity on sustainability (in terms of soil fertility, water conservation and women’s labour) and the benefit-cost ratio, if expensive inputs are used; the measurements also need to be disaggregated by gender. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Better Place International | USA, percentage of trained people that choose to stay in their country and support local productivity such food, health, construction, education. |  | USA, I would look at the amount of food produces per population | USA, this is a counterproductive indicator for places with tropical weather as food production will decrease and not help those country with first priority is food | USA, I will be carefully to in Luke genetics as we do not have long term knowledge about its impact especially in animals |  |  | USA, that would be critical in developing countries where people do not have access to quality food due to overpriced products |
| Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation | The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation suggests an alternative indicator to Total Factor Productivity (TFP) currently proposed. Although TFP conceptually provides a more complete picture of productivity than traditional measures of land and labor productivity, it faces substantial challenges in its realization. TFP is conceived as a measure of the aggregate of all outputs divided by the aggregate of all of inputs, so increased TFP growth conceptually would reflect not only increased input intensification but also increased efficiency in use of inputs. Practically, however, there are serious data and measurement problems, including weaknesses of the proxy measures used for capital, material, and other inputs. Most problematically, the measure is very sensitive to choices, regarding for instance, input quality and measurement methods. These sensitivities are magnified when there is incomplete, inconsistent, and inaccurate measures of agricultural input quantities, quality, and prices – which is the case in many countries. Differing methodologies for generating figures have also resulted in contradictory trends in total factor productivity growth. As an alternative, we suggest a productivity measure focused on farm household income (the total value of farm outputs minus the total value of farm inputs) per unit of farm labor. This measure most directly reflects the language of the target to increase productivity (currently proposed to be measured by a labor productivity indicator coded green by the IAEG-SDGs) and incomes of small-scale food producers. As labor productivity increases, households may choose to increasingly shift their labor away from agricultural activities to focus on higher-value (typically off-farm) income opportunities and thereby increase their incomes. Measuring net income at the farm level accounts for productivity changes in both individual commodities – importantly, covering both crops and livestock – as well as on-farm commodity substitution as the relative productivity and returns to different farm enterprises changes over time. It also avoids the measurement problems in matching on-farm input use to individual commodity outputs, as net farm income is the difference between the value of all farm inputs and the value of all farm outputs. Data underlying this measure can be derived from household surveys such as LSMS-ISA and is currently being collected in a number of countries. Such data would need to be collected more broadly and frequently. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Christian Aid |  | This indicator is welcome but needs further definition (i.e. 'sustainable agricultural practices'). Christian Aid suggests: Percentage of agricultural land that is farmed using resilient agricultural practices (considered to increase productivity and production, help maintain ecosystems, strengthen capacity for adaptation to climate change, extreme weather, drought, flooding and other disasters and progressively improve land and soil quality); and rate of agricultural production from agricultural land farmed using such resilient agricultural practices. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International |  |  |  |  | Comments from Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International, Netherlands  Indicator for climate friendly and sustainable agriculture as led by FAO, and possibility of considering broader aspects of this here, particularly use of and access to GMO technology and GMO modified crops and animals to achieve climate and sustainability goals and objectives. | Comments from Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International, Netherlands  Indicator to include to climate friendly agriculture as led by FAO, and possibility of considering use of and access to GMO technology and GMO modified crops and animals. | Comments from Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International, Netherlands  Indicator that refers to climate friendly and sustainable agriculture as led by FAO, and considering broader aspects of this here, particularly potential use of and supported access to GMO technologies and GMO crops. | Comments from Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International, Netherlands Indicator that refers to climate friendly and sustainable agriculture (as led by FAO,) and particularly use of and access to GMO- crops and animals for adapted for climate and sustainability in these food markets. |
| Danish Institute for Human Rights | The proposed indicator broadens the measurement of productivity already measured under indicator 2.3.1., but fails to supplement it with data on the means and the rights-holders specifically mentioned in the target. Thereby, there is no indicator to uphold the aspiration of the target to ensure secure and equal access to land of women, indigenous peoples, family farmers, pastoralists etc. A better indicator would be: “Percentage of women, indigenous peoples and local communities with secure tenure rights to individually or communally held land, property and natural resources”. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diyalo Pariwar | Rapid urbanization and housing plots should be discouraged in value of agricultural and productive lands. Urbanization should be in planned ways without destroying the fertile and specific areas in hill, mountains and the terrai. | The modernization in doing agriculture activities should be in center. Manual process need to be replaced by the suitable agro-machines to minimize the time and accelerate the quality cultivation/production. | Small canals and irrigation facilities should be at local level. Pump-sets and other harvesting techniques must be in line with the weather and the soil accordingly. | No comment. But provision of availability Eco-friendly fertilizers need to be available locally. | Associated traditional knowledge should be enhanced and upgrade to machinable uses. |  | Government from the developed countries need to be trained and motivated. |  |
| EU Nitrogen Expert Panel / Wageningen University | The EU Nitrogen Expert Panel (about 20 experts from science, policy, industry and farmers’ practice in the European Union) considers the proposed ‘total factor productivity’ indicator (indicator 2.3.2) useful, but notices that this indicator focuses on the economic dimension only. An indicator on food security, improved nutrition and sustainable agriculture should embrace more dimensions. Therefore, the EU Nitrogen Expert Panel propose to use also the Nitrogen Use Efficiency (NUE) indicator. This indicator has recently been described and agreed by the EU Nitrogen Expert Panel. As shown in the summary report (see link to report below), the NUE indicator is easy-to-use and applicable to all agricultural systems and food systems, and at different scales. The NUE indicator is based on sound scientific principles, i.e., the mass balance principle, using nitrogen input and nitrogen output in harvested yield for its calculation: NUE = nitrogen output divided by nitrogen input. NUE values have to be interpreted in relation to productivity level (nitrogen output in harvested yield) and to nitrogen surplus (i.e., the difference between total nitrogen input and nitrogen output in harvested yield). Thereby, the NUE indicator provides information about both (i) resource use effciency (NUE), (ii) the economy of food production (nitrogen in harvested yield), and (iii) the pressure on the environment (nitrogen surplus). The NUE indicator allows decision makers to examine differences between farms, between specific systems, between countries, and between years. Effects of technical progress and of policy measures can be identified. As such, the NUE indicator can serve as a valuable indicator for monitoring sustainable development in relation to food production and environmental challenges. By considering limits associate with both excess and insufficient N use, the NUE framework contributes towards improving N use efficiency in the food chain. For proper comparisons, a clear and approved protocol is needed for uniform data and information collection, processing and reporting. The EU Nitrogen Expert Panel has prepared an easy-to-use graphical approach for interpreting the the NUE indicator. Our approach is rather similar to (but easier to understand than) the approach of the Global Partnership on Nutriënt Management (GPNM). Our NUE indicator also links to Target 2.4. and to Target 14.11. Link to the “EU Nitrogen Expert Panel” web site and to the summary report: www.eunep.com |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fair Trade Advocacy Office |  |  |  |  |  |  | The indicator does not measure how the money that governments allocate to agriculture is spent. Considering that 500 million small-scale farmers supply 70% of the world’s population with food, it is important that the investment in agricultural productivity goes to people who need it most. Therefore, we propose that the Agricultural Orientation Index is combined with an indicator on the proportion of investment in smallholder agriculture as it stands as a proportion of agriculture in a country. | We are in favour of the suggested indicator as a good way to measure food price volatility, but we suggest to use it not only to measure food changes for staple crops but also for key crops that have an impact on food security in vulnerable communities, such as coffee and cocoa. Coffee and cocoa producers, for example, rely on a stable price of these crops for their own food security and so any volatility in prices in these staples can leave them particularly open to vulnerability. |
| Fairtrade Foundation |  |  |  |  |  |  | Fairtrade believes that whilst the Agricultural Orientation Index measures sufficiently how much money is spent by governments on agriculture in general, it fails to measure where more exactly this money is spent. With 500 million small-scale farmers who between them supply 70% of the world’s population with food, it is important that the investment in agricultural productivity is spent in areas which need the money most. Therefore in order to make sure this indicator works to increase productivity, Fairtrade believes that it is important that this includes some understanding of where the investment goes. As a suggestion, this could be by ensuring that this is spent proportionally in smallholder agriculture by ensuring that investment in smallholders matches the proportion of smallholders in a given country. By ensuring that money is spent on smallholder agriculture, it is possible to help to ensure that the investment is spent in areas where it would be particularly able to increase the agricultural productive capacity as smallholders are in particular need of investment. | Fairtrade believes that this indicator is a sensible way to measure food price volatility but that it is important that this indicator is not only used to measure food price changes for staple crops but also for key crops which have an impact on food security in vulnerable communities. For example, coffee and cocoa farmers rely on a stable price of their crops for their own food security as they rely on them for almost all their money. Thus, it is possible for price changes in crops other than staples to have a huge impact on the security of on many of the poorest communities so these also should be taken into account in this indicator. |
| Finnish NGDO platform to the EU | a) Crop yield gap (actual yield as percentage of attainable yield). b) Cereal yield growth rate. c) Number of agricultural extension workers per 1000 farmers [or share of farmers covered by agricultural extension programs and services]. d) Annual change in degraded or desertified arable land (percentage or ha). e) Livestock yield gap (actual yield as percentage of attainable yield). f) Increase in income of small-scale food producers. g) Increase in Women’s Empowerment in Agriculture Index. h) Nitrogen and phosphorus use efficiency in food systems. i) Share of women and men with legally recognized evidence of land tenure. | a) Number of producers that have received extension services for composting or other biological methods to improve nutrient values in soil. b) Increase in the market share of certified organically produced agricultural products. c) Percentage of farmland under crop rotation, mulching, agro-forestry, freerange livestock systems and other agro-ecological standards. d) Share of protein crops for food and feed grown in own country compared to import. |  |  | a) Number of local and regional gene banks. b) Number of types of seeds / plants included in gene banks. c) Increase in funding of programmes to protect local genetic diversity of agricultural plants and animals and knowledge linked to them. |  | a) Increase in funding of agricultural extension services. b) Increase in funding invested in rural infrastructure. c) Increase in investment in agricultural and forestry producer organizations. d) Increase in processing of agricultural products in LDC’s. e) Share of public budget spent on agriculture. |  |
| Global Forest Coalition (GFC) | A more adequate indicator would focus on “Status and trends in traditional occupations". Disaggregated data on the number of farmers/ small-scale entrepreneur from socially disadvantaged groups on the axis of age, sex disability, race, gender, caste, ethnicity,and economic and other status and rural-urban divide with respect to annual turnover. | There is a need to define ‘sustainable agricultural practice’. Ostensibly, the proportion of land area and agriculturally commodity production under sustainable certification (i.e. organic, Fairtrade, Rainforest alliance) could be modelled. Indicators need to be split by each crop. |  | Percentage of agricultural land farmed using resilience agricultural practices, including traditional knowledge that is safe and eco-friendly compared to all agricultural households. | The proposed indicator does not address the second part of the target, related to access and benefit-sharing as well as traditional knowledge. These issues should be addressed based on internationally agreed rights and principles as reflected in the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), CBD and the related Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing. Hence, cross-reference should be made to the proposed indicator under target 15.6. on the adoption of legislative, administrative and policy frameworks for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol. |  |  |  |
| Nagorik Uddyog | Disaggregated data on the number of farmers/ small-scale entrepreneur from socially disadvantaged groups on the axis of age, sex disability, race, caste, ethnicity, origin, religion and economic and other status and rural-urban divide with respect annual turn over. | Percentage of agricultural area owned by socially disadvantaged groups on the axis of age, sex disability, race, caste, ethnicity, origin, religion and economic and other status and rural-urban divide under sustainable agricultural practices. | Percentage of agricultural household using irrigation owned by socially disadvantaged groups on the axis of age, sex disability, race, caste, ethnicity, origin, religion and economic and other status and rural-urban divide under sustainable agricultural practices |  |  |  |  |  |
| Navsarjan Trust | Navsarjan Trust Disaggregated data on the number of farmers/ small-scale entrepreneur from socially disadvantaged groups on the axis of age, sex disability, race, caste, ethnicity, origin, religion and economic and other status and rural-urban divide with respect annual turn over. | Navsarjan Trust Percentage of agricultural area owned by socially disadvantaged groups on the axis of age, sex disability, race, caste, ethnicity, origin, religion and economic and other status and rural-urban divide under sustainable agricultural practices. | Navsarjan Trust Percentage of agricultural household using irrigation owned by socially disadvantaged groups on the axis of age, sex disability, race, caste, ethnicity, origin, religion and economic and other status and rural-urban divide under sustainable agricultural practices. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Navsarjan Trust | Navsarjan Trust - inclusion of discriminated groups based on caste, work and descent, ethnicity and sexual orientation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| One Acre Fund |  | One Acre Fund holds that while there is no common definition for “sustainable agricultural practices”, the vagueness of the term may allow for flexibility for stakeholders to implement locally appropriate solutions. It is critical that all proven methods – including sustainable intensification – be included under the definition of sustainable agricultural practices. Of all of the indicators, Proposed Indicator 1 allows for the most adaptability where needed. One Acre Fund supports the use of Proposed Indicator 1. | One Acre Fund finds Proposed Indicator 2 to be misguided in regions where there is ample rainfall or farms that are located in low watershed regions. The indicator could be appropriate in dry regions but is irrelevant in regions where adequate regular rainfall means irrigation is not required or where increasing irrigated areas is not sustainable due to water scarcity. There could be a negative impact on environmental sustainability by promoting this as a global indicator. One Acre Fund does not support the use of Proposed Indicator 2. | One Acre Fund finds Proposed Indicator 3 to be too vague and potentially harmful to smallholder farmer productivity. There is no common definition for “eco-friendly fertilizers” and this could be interpreted to restrict mineral fertilizers and exclusively focus on organic farming. In many parts of sub-Saharan Africa, poor soil fertility necessitates the use of mineral fertilizer to improve productivity as organic nutrients are insufficient to maintain current production levels. Restricting the use of mineral fertilizer or organo-mineral fertilizer could have negative consequences for the food security of millions of smallholder farmers. One Acre Fund does not support the use of Proposed Indicator 3. |  |  |  |  |
| Pathfinder's Outreach Ministry (POM) | Ghana Total Factor Productivity including alternative livelihood | Ghana 80 % of agricultural area under sustainable agricultural practices (indicator moved to grey following results of IAEG-SDGs member consultation) | Ghana 60 % of agricultural households using irrigation systems compared to all agricultural households | Ghana 80 % of agricultural households using eco-friendly fertilizers compared to all agricultural households using fertilizers | Ghana Increase the existing Ex-Situ Crop Collections Enrichment Index by 50 %. Introduce remnants to all famers | Ghana 80% of local crops and breeds and their wild relatives, classified as being at-risk, not at-risk or unknown level of risk of extinction | Ghana Increase investment in the Agriculture Orientation Index (AOI) for Government Expenditures | Ghana |
| PNG Education Advocacy Network | Papua New Guinea Education Advocacy Network agreed with the current proposal by the IAEG-SDGs and that it will remain | PNG Education Advocacy Network propose that an "additional statement can be added to this effect "% of targeted groups (youth, women and rural people/farmers) are involved in large-scale agriculture production." | PNG Education Advocacy Network agree that this indicator should remain as it is | PNG Education Advocacy Network agreed with current proposal of the IAEG-SDG proposal | PNG Education Advocacy Network agreed this to remain as it is to make effective and specific reporting easier for developing countries with contextual and language barriers. |  |  |  |
| Rastriya Dalit Network (RDN) Nepal | Indicator 2.3.2: Total Factor Productivity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIWI (Stockholm International Water Institute) | ORGANISATION SIWI COMMENTS: As water, in most economies, doesn’t carry a direct capital cost, its use and productivity is not captured by the proposed indicator. Crop yield gap for major crops (actual yields relative to the yield that can be achieved under good management conditions, taking into account climate and the sustainable use of water) is a better indicator by showing the potential for productivity increases. FAO should be lead agency for the proposed indicator. | ORGANISATION SIWI COMMENTS: The definition of sustainable agricultural practices must contain clear links to indicators 6.4.1 and 6.4.2. Water use and management by the agricultural sector are essential determinants of the sustainability and resilience of the food production systems. | ORGANISATION SIWI COMMENTS: It is unclear what this proposed indicator is set to measure. Efficient irrigation is a good way to increase productivity and production (not the least as it reduces risks and allows for other investments), but in many locations current irrigation practices are unsustainable and rather increase risks relating to climate and extreme weather. For the indicator to indicate progress it must include qualifications on the sustainability of the sources of water and energy (if used). The percentage of agricultural area under irrigation would be a better measurement than percentage of households. Suggested new formulation of indicator: “Percentage of agricultural area under efficient irrigation from sustainable water sources.” |  |  |  |  |  |
| Social Justice in Global Development | Total factor productivity is a concept that is rejected by part of the economics profession because it is based on the theoretically flawed concept of the aggregate production function, whether applied to an industry, such as agriculture, or entire economies (the neoclassical economists use it because it is something on which they can generate statistics and they claim the theoretical errors are not important). Alternative: Compile periodic survey data on net incomes of small-scale farmers, adjusted for price changes (net income comprising value added in farming plus non-farm employment). Since non-farm employment is included as a source of income, the target is not about productivity in food production but income of small-scale farmers. A "real income" measure would capture the effects of productivity increases.. |  | Propose modification to restrict denominator to agricultural households that would benefit from irrigation (it is neither necessary nor appropriate for all types of farming). If there Is a way to separate out sustainable from unsustainable irrigation systems, propose doing so.. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stockholm Environment Institute | Stockholm Environment Institute staff believe the indicators linked to target 2.3 should focus towards low-productivity systems, otherwise - since the goals are universal - the proposed indicators may promote existing high-productivity (but environmentally destructive) agriculture. Care should therefore be taken that outcomes of the proposed indicators do not undermine those under 2.4 around environmentally sound production. An additional concern is whether to emphasise an increase in income, or a move out of agriculture. If productivity is increased, farmers may acquire more land, ultimately leading to fewer farmers. Inclusion within indicators of the last two aspects of the Target would be useful as value-added products and non-farm employment can help counter-balance effects of increased productivity. If the main purpose of the indicator/target is to enhance economic value of production for smallholders, we agree with IFAD & FAO proposals to value production by labour unit, rather than by hectare. Access to local markets may also be an important aspect, but is not captured within proposed indicators. ‘% of agricultural production sold domestically’ (or within x km of production) may therefore be a useful indicator. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN) | SDSN comments: We are concerned that while Total Factor Productivity robustly measures technological efficiency, it does not adequately account for environmental impacts and is not an ideal measure for smallholders who often use little technology. We would recommend instead measuring crop yield gap, which would be the actual yield expressed as a % of water-limited yield potential. This could also be complemented by nitrogen and water use efficiency indicators. | SDSN comments: SDSN supports the EU Nitrogen Expert Panel proposal for the Nitrogen Use Efficiency (NUE) indicator. The NUE indicator is easy-to-use and applicable to all agricultural systems and food systems, and at different scales. It is based on sound scientific principles, and it provides information about both (i) resource use efficiency (NUE), (ii) the economy of food production (nitrogen in harvested yield), and (iii) the pressure on the environment (nitrogen surplus). The NUE indicator allows decision makers to examine differences between farms, between specific systems, between countries, and over years. Effects of technical progress and of policy measures can be identified. As such, the NUE indicator can serve as a valuable indicator for monitoring sustainable development in relation to food production and environmental challenges. By considering the limits associated with both excess and insufficient N use, the NUE framework contributes towards improving N use efficiency in the food chain. For proper comparisons, a clear and approved protocol is needed for uniform data and information collection, processing and reporting. The NUE indicator also tracks Target 14.1. For more information, see the EU Nitrogen Expert Panel web site and summary report: www.eunep.com |  | Please see comments under 2.4.1. |  |  |  |  |
| The Hunger Project |  |  | Can probably remove "compare to all agricultural households." That is assumed if the measurement is a percentage OF agricultural households. |  |  |  |  |  |
| UN Major Group for Children and Youth | The proposed indicatord does not measure income, but only value of the production. The absolute and relative incomes of these food producers needs to be assimilated in this indicator. The change in trajectory of usgae and access to secure and equal access ot land, [....] The "non farm employment" needs to be qualified as employment including social protection and protection of rights. | The terminology of 'sustainable food production systems' needs more elaboration in the context of the intent of this indicator. Need to trak and measure the production and productivity (agricultural practices and types of agriculture) and the trajectory of their ratio in the shot term and long term. Assess and track loss to agricultural putput due to climate change, extreme weather, drought, flooding and other... [...] Track the magnitude of ecosystem loss due to new agricultural land, and externalities of existing ones. | Elements of local environmental thresholds need to be taken into account here. In the context of irrigation systems the indicated needs to take into account the relation to ground tables as well. | Further qualification of 'eco friendly'. There needs to be a centrally determined set of compounds that constitute 'non eco friendly' fertilizers. |  |  |  |  |
| Women's Major Group/ International Women's Health Coalition | Women's Major Group proposes the below alternative indicator. 2.3.2 Percentage of productive land owned or accessed by smallscale food producers, in particular women, indigenous peoples, family farmers, pastoralists and fishers. It is critical to include a measure of concentration of land ownership to address the phenomenon of land-grabbing which has resulted in diminishing land available to local communities and which threatens local food security. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WWF | WWF: We suggest the indicator “% credibly certified sustainable production (as defined by ISEAL http://www.isealalliance.org/our-members ) of overall production”, with data from FAO and ISEAL/Credible certification schemes. An increasing body of literature shows the positive impacts of credible schemes on farmer outreach and increased yields/reduced inputs compared to conventional production, and protection of areas of High Conservation values from conversion. This indicator would also inform targets 2.5, 6a, 8.4, 12a, 14.1 & 14.2. | WWF: Indicators of sustainable agricultural practices could include: Improved resource efficiency in land use, measured as greenhouse gas emissions from land-based sectors [CIFOR]; Annual change in forest area and land under cultivation (modified MDG Indicator) [SDSN]; Annual change in degraded or desertified arable land (% or ha) [SDSN]; Improved resource efficiency in land and energy use, measured as greenhouse gas emissions from land-based sectors: agricultural gross ghg (total), tonnes of C02 equivalent / C02, CH4, N20, others (tonnes of C02 equivalent); Nitrogen and phosphorous pollution of waters balance; Water use intensity by irrigated agriculture = cubic metres of water used per unit of value added (in US $) by irrigated agricultural activity. | WWF: WWF agrees that the current proposal does not inform the sustainability elements of the target. We suggest: “% of drainage basins with agricultural activity exceeding 80% in the blue water scarcity index” (http://www.waterfootprint.org/Reports/Hoekstra-et-al-2012-GlobalMonthlyWaterScarcity.pdf). Basin health: The blue water scarcity index of any drainage basin with agricultural activity does not exceed 80%, thus indicating sustainable use (including irrigation) and allowing for environmental flow requirements. Also includes uses beyond agriculture within the basin, thus taking into account full basin water context. | WWF: The definition of "eco-friendly" fertilizers is unclear. Possible alternatives are included in the response to 2.4.1. |  |  |  |  |
| Amiable Resource | Canada Local Cultural segregation, regulation or open and equal access to traditional and conventional sources and services? | bio-geologic climates? Ecosystem capacity and integrity? | Meteorological equalibruims? Anthroplagenic influence, manipulation or intervention? | Ecological integrity? Écosystème nutrient cycling or agitated inputs? | Agro - forest models examples of balanced cross pollinating or symbiotic relations? | Naturelized islands of refuge, mixed mosaic balanced of wild and farm space with species? | Biodiversity compositions of ecologic protections ? Modest archived genetics samples or contingent strands? | Local production subsidies to Primary staple and endemic element nutrients? |
| CF Industries |  | CF Industries is a global leader in nitrogen fertilizer manufacturing and distribution through our ownership and operation of world-scale nitrogen complexes, located in the U.S., Canada and the United Kingdom. We are members of the International Fertilizer Industry Association (IFA), and we support the association’s comments on Indicator 2.4.1 which are incorporated below. The original indicator - the percentage of agricultural area under sustainable agricultural practices -closely matches the target. The issue is that there is no clear definition of "sustainable agricultural practices” yet. The term “sustainable agricultural practices” should include all forms of sustainable agriculture, including sustainably intensive agriculture. Any suggestion that sustainably intensive agriculture is undesirable would have negative impacts on food security, nutrition and biodiversity, particularly in regions with highly degraded soils and low agricultural productivity such as Africa. FAO is working on a definition and will complete this by the end of the year. We recommend that this indicator be provisionally approved by the IAEG pending the development of a measurable definition. | CF Industries is a global leader in nitrogen fertilizer manufacturing and distribution through our ownership and operation of world-scale nitrogen complexes, located in the U.S., Canada and the United Kingdom. We are members of the International Fertilizer Industry Association (IFA), and we support the association’s comments on Indicator 2.4.2 which are incorporated below. The proposed indicator 2.4.2 percentage of agricultural households using irrigation systems may be appropriate in some regions but is meaningless in regions were adequate regular rainfall means irrigation is not required or where increasing irrigated areas by pumping groundwater is not sustainable due to physical water scarcity. Therefore, it is not a suitable global indicator. | CF Industries is a global leader in nitrogen fertilizer manufacturing and distribution through our ownership and operation of world-scale nitrogen complexes, located in the U.S., Canada and the United Kingdom. We are members of the International Fertilizer Industry Association (IFA), and we support the association’s comments on Indicator 2.4.3 which are incorporated below. The proposed indicator 2.4.3 percentage of agricultural households using eco-friendly fertilizers compared to all agricultural households using fertilizers is a very vague indicator because the term “eco-friendly fertilizers” is a not an established term and is not defined. If “eco-friendly fertilizers” is defined as “fertilizers adapted to the site- and crop-specific conditions, whether of mineral, organic or organo-mineral origin” then there may be some validity in the Indicator, although it would only cover one aspect of agricultural sustainability and would be open to misinterpretation. If the term is taken to refer to organic sources of nutrients only, it would be a misleading indicator because it would focus on one form of agriculture only (organic farming) and would ignore most forms of sustainable agriculture, which should ideally integrate both organic and mineral nutrient sources. This would have negative consequences on food security, both in developed and developing nations. In most regions the availability of organic nutrients is insufficient to maintain or increase yields and maintain soil health. It is estimated that, globally, organic nutrients are sufficient to maintain around half of current agricultural production. It would also conflict with Target 2.3 as it is impossible to increase sustainably the productivity of small scale food producers without access to all forms of crop nutrients, organic and mineral. The proposed indicator would give a contra indication as countries applying sustainable integrated nutrient practices would appear to be performing badly against the indicator when in fact they would be meeting targets 2.4 and 2.3. We strongly recommend using the “percentage of agricultural area under sustainable agricultural practices” as the indicator for Target 2.4, with a broad definition of “sustainable agricultural practices” to be adopted by FAO. |  |  |  |  |
| International Fertilizer Industry Association |  | The International Fertilizer Industry Association supports this indicator as it appears to closely match the target. We have been given to understand that the FAO is working on a definition and will complete this by the end of the year. . We recommend there should be an opportunity to comment on the FAO definition when it is issued. In our view, the term “sustainable agricultural practices” should include all forms of sustainable agriculture, including sustainably intensive agriculture. Any suggestion that sustainably intensive agriculture is undesirable would have negative impacts on food security, nutrition and biodiversity, particularly in regions with highly degraded soils and low agricultural productivity such as Africa The definition should also entail the desirability of improving resource use efficiency. 2.4.2 as drafted should not be included in 2.4.1 as households using irrigation is not necessarily an indicator of sustainable agriculture and in many cases irrigation practices are unsustainable. Including indicator 2.4.3 in 2.4.1 is undesirable as agriculture using “eco fertilizers” (understood as organic nutrient sources) alone is not sustainable on a global basis. Incorporating 2.4.3 into 2.4.1 would ignore most forms of sustainable agriculture, which should ideally integrate both organic and mineral nutrient sources. Incorporating 2.4.3 in 2.4.1 would have negative consequences on food security, both in developed and developing nations. Furthermore “eco-fertilizers” is not a defined term. | The International Fertilizer Industry Association believes the proposed indicator 2.4.2 percentage of agricultural households using irrigation systems may be appropriate in some regions but is meaningless in regions were adequate regular rainfall means irrigation is not required or where increasing irrigated areas by pumping groundwater is not sustainable due to physical water scarcity. Therefore, it is not a suitable global indicator. We do not think 2.4.2 should be included in 2.4.1 as irrigation is not an indicator of sustainable agriculture and can in many cases be unsustainable due to depletion of groundwater. | The International Fertilizer Industry Association believes that the proposed indicator 2.4.3 percentage of agricultural households using eco-friendly fertilizers compared to all agricultural households using fertilizers is a very vague indicator because the term “eco-friendly fertilizers” is not an established term and is not defined. If “eco-friendly fertilizers” is defined as “fertilizers adapted to the site- and crop-specific conditions, whether of mineral, organic or organo-mineral origin” then there may be some validity in the indicator, although it would only cover one aspect of agricultural sustainability and would be open to misinterpretation. If the term is taken to refer to organic sources of nutrients only, it would be a misleading indicator because it would focus on one form of agriculture only (organic farming) and would ignore most forms of sustainable agriculture, which should ideally integrate both organic and mineral nutrient sources. This would have negative consequences on food security, both in developed and developing nations. In most regions the availability of organic nutrients is insufficient to maintain or increase yields and maintain soil health. It is estimated that, globally, organic nutrients are sufficient to maintain around half of current agricultural production. It would also conflict with Target 2.3 as it is impossible to increase sustainably the productivity of small-scale food producers without access to all forms of crop nutrients, organic and mineral. The proposed indicator would give a contra indication as countries applying sustainable integrated nutrient practices would appear to be performing badly against the indicator when in fact they would be meeting targets 2.4 and 2.3. For the above reasons, 2.4.3 should not be considered as a stand alone indicator or as part of 2.4.1. |  |  |  |  |
| Kingenta Ecological Engineering Group Co. Ltd. |  | Comments by the International Fertilizer Industry Association (IFA) on Proposed SDG Indicators for Targets 2.3 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 Following the Bangkok meeting of the Inter-Agency and Expert Group (IAEG) on SDG Indicators, three potential indicators have been proposed for Target 2.4: 2.4.1 the percentage of agricultural area under sustainable agricultural practices (the original proposed indicator) 2.4.2 the percentage of agricultural households using irrigation systems compared to all agricultural households 2.4.3 the percentage of agricultural households using eco-friendly fertilizers compared to all agricultural households using fertilizers. The original indicator - the percentage of agricultural area under sustainable agricultural practices -closely matches the target. The issue is that there is no clear definition of "sustainable agricultural practices” yet. The term “sustainable agricultural practices” should include all forms of sustainable agriculture, including sustainably intensive agriculture. Any suggestion that sustainably intensive agriculture is undesirable would have negative impacts on food security, nutrition and biodiversity, particularly in regions with highly degraded soils and low agricultural productivity such as Africa. FAO is working on a definition and will complete this by the end of the year. We recommend that this indicator be provisionally approved by the IAEG pending the development of a measurable definition. The proposed indicator 2.4.2 percentage of agricultural households using irrigation systems may be appropriate in some regions but is meaningless in regions were adequate regular rainfall means irrigation is not required or where increasing irrigated areas by pumping groundwater is not sustainable due to physical water scarcity. Therefore, it is not a suitable global indicator. The proposed indicator 2.4.3 percentage of agricultural households using eco-friendly fertilizers compared to all agricultural households using fertilizers is a very vague indicator because the term “eco-friendly fertilizers” is a not an established term and is not defined. If “eco-friendly fertilizers” is defined as “fertilizers adapted to the site- and crop-specific conditions, whether of mineral, organic or organo-mineral origin” then there may be some validity in the Indicator, although it would only cover one aspect of agricultural sustainability and would be open to misinterpretation. If the term is taken to refer to organic sources of nutrients only, it would be a misleading indicator because it would focus on one form of agriculture only (organic farming) and would ignore most forms of sustainable agriculture, which should ideally integrate both organic and mineral nutrient sources. This would have negative consequences on food security, both in developed and developing nations. In most regions the availability of organic nutrients is insufficient to maintain or increase yields and maintain soil health. It is estimated that, globally, organic nutrients are sufficient to maintain around half of current agricultural production. It would also conflict with Target 2.3 as it is impossible to increase sustainably the productivity of small scale food producers without access to all forms of crop nutrients, organic and mineral. The proposed indicator would give a contra indication as countries applying sustainable integrated nutrient practices would appear to be performing badly against the indicator when in fact they would be meeting targets 2.4 and 2.3. We strongly recommend using the “percentage of agricultural area under sustainable agricultural practices” as the indicator for Target 2.4, with a broad definition of “sustainable agricultural practices” to be adopted by FAO.   Comments by the International Fertilizer Industry Association (IFA) on Proposed SDG Indicators for Target 14.1 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 The current proposed “nitrogen use efficiency composite indicator” is an improvement compared to the initially proposed indicator for Target 14.1 (fertilizer use in kg/ha). However it is a proxy that does not provide a comprehensive picture of marine pollution. First, nitrogen use efficiency does not provide any useful information on plastic debris pollution. Second, as far as nutrient pollution is concerned, it focuses on nitrogen only, while other nutrients are also involved in eutrophication processes, especially phosphorus and silicon. In addition, it is unclear whether the proposed nitrogen use efficiency (NUE) indicator would apply to crop production only, to agricultural production (including livestock and fish farming), to the food chain (from field to fork), or to the economy as a whole (including energy combustion, industrial wastes, etc.). If the NUE indicator applies to crop production only, it is irrelevant from a marine environment point of view because fertilizers do not account for the majority of nitrogen-related marine pollution and the proposed indicator ignores nitrogen pollution from livestock manure, sewage, atmospheric deposition and other sources. The NUE indicator would be more relevant if applied to agricultural production, to the food chain, or to the whole economy. From an ocean health point of view, relevance of the NUE indicator increases with its scope. However, complexity of its monitoring also increases with its scope. This raises issues as to the capacity of countries, especially developing countries, to monitor this indicator. However, should NUE in cropping systems be retained as indicator, it should be monitored following the methodology agreed by the Global Partnership on Nutrient Management (GPNM): http://www.nutrientchallenge.org/document/position-paper-nitrogen-use-efficiency-and-nutrient-performance-indicators It should be noted that this indicator has been designed for monitoring Target 2.4, not Target 14.1. Because NUE does not provide information on other limiting nutrients in marine systems, such as phosphorus and silicon, and it does not provide information on all sources of nitrogen unless a very complicated economy-wide indicator is monitored, we recommend using the Indicator of Coastal Eutrophication Potential (ICEP) for Target 14.1. This indicator is relevant because it is based on nitrogen, phosphorus and silicon inputs in estuaries, and it measures nutrient pollution from all sources – fertilizer, manure, sewage, atmospheric deposition, etc. Ideally, ICEP should be supplemented by an indicator reflecting the plastic debris input to oceans. December 2015 For further information on the fertilizer industry, the importance of integrated nutrient management to food security, soil health and protecting biodiversity see www.fertilizer.org/aboutfertilizers |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LTO Nederland | Double production per hectare / per animal Double production per litre of water used Double production per kg of nitrogen / phosphate applied Double family income in dollars per worker on the farm, this would include farm labour Remark: clear definition needed of "small scale". Remark: >90% of farmers are still family farmers. That includes women and men. | This implies some sort of (group) certification. Best is if this is market-driven or we would only add costs to the system. | Not all farmers need irrigation systems. They often deal with floods. | What is eco-friendly? Are we talking manure? Or processed manure that could take the place of artificial (minerals based) fertiliser? | Minimum number of varieties / races produced for the market, coming from an minimum number of suppliers. Minimum % of farm owned & won seeds being used on that same farm Rational: It's not good if say 90% of maize seeds would by coming from one big company | Minimum area per farm | It should not be about investment but about output like yields and quality produced by farmers. This is an input indicator. Not a good one. | Share of the consumer dollar ending up in the farmers' purse. |
| TOROS AGRI |  | Country Turkey, Organization Toros Agri comments; The original indicator - the percentage of agricultural area under sustainable agricultural practices -closely matches the target. The issue is that there is no clear definition of "sustainable agricultural practices” yet. The term “sustainable agricultural practices” should include all forms of sustainable agriculture, including sustainably intensive agriculture. Any suggestion that sustainably intensive agriculture is undesirable would have negative impacts on food security, nutrition and biodiversity, particularly in regions with highly degraded soils and low agricultural productivity such as Africa. FAO is working on a definition and will complete this by the end of the year. We recommend that this indicator be provisionally approved by the IAEG pending the development of a measurable definition. We strongly recommend using the “percentage of agricultural area under sustainable agricultural practices” as the indicator for Target 2.4, with a broad definition of “sustainable agricultural practices” to be adopted by FAO. | Country Turkey, Organization Toros Agri comments; The proposed indicator 2.4.2 percentage of agricultural households using irrigation systems may be appropriate in some regions but is meaningless in regions were adequate regular rainfall means irrigation is not required or where increasing irrigated areas by pumping groundwater is not sustainable due to physical water scarcity. Therefore, it is not a suitable global indicator. | Country Turkey, Organization Toros Agri comments; The proposed indicator 2.4.3 percentage of agricultural households using eco-friendly fertilizers compared to all agricultural households using fertilizers is a very vague indicator because the term “eco-friendly fertilizers” is a not an established term and is not defined. If “eco-friendly fertilizers” is defined as “fertilizers adapted to the site- and crop-specific conditions, whether of mineral, organic or organo-mineral origin” then there may be some validity in the Indicator, although it would only cover one aspect of agricultural sustainability and would be open to misinterpretation. If the term is taken to refer to organic sources of nutrients only, it would be a misleading indicator because it would focus on one form of agriculture only (organic farming) and would ignore most forms of sustainable agriculture, which should ideally integrate both organic and mineral nutrient sources. This would have negative consequences on food security, both in developed and developing nations. In most regions the availability of organic nutrients is insufficient to maintain or increase yields and maintain soil health. It is estimated that, globally, organic nutrients are sufficient to maintain around half of current agricultural production. It would also conflict with Target 2.3 as it is impossible to increase sustainably the productivity of small scale food producers without access to all forms of crop nutrients, organic and mineral. The proposed indicator would give a contra indication as countries applying sustainable integrated nutrient practices would appear to be performing badly against the indicator when in fact they would be meeting targets 2.4 and 2.3. |  |  |  |  |
| Yara International |  | Comment from Yara (a Norwegian corporation manufacturing mineral fertilizers for crop nutrition and working in 150 countries). We strongly recommend using the “percentage of agricultural area under sustainable agricultural practices” as the indicator for Target 2.4, with a broad definition of “sustainable agricultural practices” to be adopted by FAO. The original indicator - the percentage of agricultural area under sustainable agricultural practices -closely matches the target. The term “sustainable agricultural practices” should include all forms of sustainable agriculture, including sustainably intensive agriculture. Any suggestion that sustainably intensive agriculture is undesirable would have negative impacts on food security, nutrition and biodiversity, particularly in regions with highly degraded soils and low agricultural productivity such as Africa. FAO is working on a definition and will complete this by the end of the year. We recommend that this indicator be provisionally approved by the IAEG pending the development of a measurable definition. | The proposed indicator 2.4.2 percentage of agricultural households using irrigation systems may be appropriate in some regions but is meaningless in regions were adequate regular rainfall means irrigation is not required or where increasing irrigated areas by pumping groundwater is not sustainable due to physical water scarcity. Therefore, it is not a suitable global indicator. | The proposed indicator 2.4.3 percentage of agricultural households using eco-friendly fertilizers compared to all agricultural households using fertilizers is a very vague indicator because the term “eco-friendly fertilizers” is a not an established term and is not defined. If “eco-friendly fertilizers” is defined as “fertilizers adapted to the site- and crop-specific conditions, whether of mineral, organic or organo-mineral origin” then there may be some validity in the Indicator, although it would only cover one aspect of agricultural sustainability and would be open to misinterpretation. If the term is taken to refer to organic sources of nutrients only, it would be a misleading indicator because it would focus on one form of agriculture only (organic farming) and would ignore most forms of sustainable agriculture, which should ideally integrate both organic and mineral nutrient sources. This would have negative consequences on food security, both in developed and developing nations. In most regions the availability of organic nutrients is insufficient to maintain or increase yields and maintain soil health. It is estimated that, globally, organic nutrients are sufficient to maintain around half of current agricultural production. It would also conflict with Target 2.3 as it is impossible to increase sustainably the productivity of small scale food producers without access to all forms of crop nutrients, organic and mineral. The proposed indicator would give a contra indication as countries applying sustainable integrated nutrient practices would appear to be performing badly against the indicator when in fact they would be meeting targets 2.4 and 2.3. |  |  |  |  |
| new York University | USA, NYU: yield per hectare of a basket of basic staple foods (nationally specific) produced on smallholder farms. |  | USA, NYU: Percentage of female-managed farms using irrigation systems as a proportion of total farms using irrigation systems. | USA, NYU: Percentage of women farmers using fertilizers |  |  | USA, NYU: percentage of women farmers accessing agricultural extension services. RAtionale; Women farmers are usually the poorest and lowest-productivity because of poor quality land, low acreage, and often complete exclusion from agricultural extension services. if their access to agricultural extension goes up, it is an indicator that the extension system has undergone a significant institutional change in attitudes, training, methods, and staffing, and is therefore an excellent indicator of investment in increased smallholder productive capacity and food security. |  |
| Wayne State University School of Medicine | Assure distribution of food to children. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

| **Country/Organisation** | **Goal 3: Ensure healthy lives and promote wellbeing for all at all ages** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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. | **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. | **Target 3.9:**By 2030, substantially reduce the number of deaths and illnesses from hazardous chemicals and air, water and soil pollution and contamination. |
| *Indicator 3.8.1:*Coverage of tracer interventions (e.g. child full immunization, ARV therapy, TB treatment, hypertension treatment, skilled attendant at birth, etc.) | *Indicator 3.8.2:* Fraction of the population protected against catastrophic/impoverishing out-of-pocket health expenditure | *Indicator 3.9.2:*Mortality rate attributed to "hazardous chemicals, water and soil pollution and contamination" |
|  |  |  |
| **Total comments received** | 163 | 75 | 37 |
| Central Statistical Office of Poland | CSO of Poland comments: The indicator is so general and capacious that it is difficult to consider it to be inappropriate. In the case of the part of indicator relating to vaccination, it needs to be recognised that immunization of children against selected infectious diseases is one of the main criteria for evaluating the preventive health care. | CSO of Poland comments: Poland could have some difficulties with the data needed to calculate this indicator, because the measures existing in the country refer to this type of risk in a very small extent. | CSO of Poland comments: CSO of Poland collects data on number of deaths according to International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems (ICD-10) - Revision 10. It does not allow to determine, wheather the death was a result of poisoning by hazardous chemicals, water and soil pollution and contamination. The alternative indicator to consider: mortality due to ambient particulate matters and household air pollution. Source of data:"Economic cost of the health impact of air pollution in Europe" - WHO 2015 (http://www.euro.who.int/en/media-centre/events/events/2015/04/ehp-mid-term-review/publications/economic-cost-of-the-health-impact-of-air-pollution-in-europe s. 8). |
| Government of Japan |  | Japan: These indicators reflect the targets and they are also in line with WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators |  |
| Hungarian Central Statistical Office | HU: We suggest to change this indicator. The recommended indicator: Rate of entitled persons to requisititon of health services. | HU: We suggest to change this indicator. The recommended indicator: Rate of entitled persons to requisititon of health services. |  |
| Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Censos |  |  | It is important to define the metadata of this indicator. |
| ISTAT | ISTAT-Italy: Even if it is a partial indicator with respect to the target Istat suggests the indicator proposed by GAVI (The Vaccine Alliance) on "Immunization coverage at national and regional level for all vaccines in national programmes". |  | ISTAT-ITALY: we suggest more methodological work. Comments made by Ministry of Environment: "UNEP has suggested a composite indicator based on Global Burden of Disease methodology, showing death and disability from indoor and outdoor air quality, water/sanitation and contaminated sites." Comments made by ISPRA : "two comments and one proposal for a new indicator: 1. ISPRA support ministry of Env. comment since air is not representative of global exposure to hazardous chemicals, although the proposal by UNEP is quite ambitious technically. 2. About WHO indicator (already developed in WHO report ) we like to stress that "household" pollution it's not representative of GLOBAL indoor air pollution since is referred to people using solid fuel at home for cooking, heating etc - mostly Africa and Asia countries . Impacts from Ambient air pollution instead can be estimated worldwide. PROPOSAL : A feaseable indicator, even if just for outdoor air quality,and more appropriate to the Target 3.9 should consider DALY's and YOLLs indicators. (Disability-Adjusted Life Year (DALY) and Years of life lost (YOLL)" |
| National Statistical Committee, Belarus | **We offer the following indicators:  - Share of revenues of health care organizations, received from the population for the rendered medical services; – Share of household expenditures on medical services** |  |  |
| National Statistical Institute, Spain | We propose the following indicators: “Proportion of population with Access to first reference’s Hospital and effective surgical services within 50 Km.” . And ““Reach and sustain 90% national coverage and 80% in every district with all vaccines in national programmes.”. |  |  |
| Singapore Department of Statistics |  |  | As per our previous comment, the revised indicator still does not address the target description as it only considers air pollution |
| Statistics Finland |  |  | Finland comments: special investigations needed. From routine statistics very difficult. |
| Statistics Lithuania | Data available | Could be estimated |  |
| Swiss Federal Statistical Office | Switzerland comments: It is not clear what is meant - if it's "one indicator whatever the intervention" or if there will be many indicators of the same kind, each relating on another intervention. |  |  |
| United States | US: Coverage of tracer interventions (e.g. child full immunization, ARV therapy, TB treatment, hypertension treatment, skilled attendant at birth, etc.) AND Median availability of selected generic medicines AND Median consumer price ratio of selected generic medicines | US: These are standard indicators described under WHO/WB (2014) book, “Monitoring progress towards universal health coverage at country and global levels Framework, measures and targets." | US: Age-adjusted mortality rate attributed to household and ambient PM2.5 air pollution. |
| Fogarty International Center, NIH, USA | USA, Fogarty International Center, NIH Targets: 1. By 2030, assure that 90% of drugs, diagnostics, and vaccines in all countries are of good quality: eliminate falsified drugs. 2. Strengthen pharmaceutical governance in all countries such that falsified drugs and breaches of supply chains by criminals are eliminated. Justification: 40% or more of antimicrobials and other drugs in some countries are of poor quality. Pharmaceutical governance, diagnostic technology and policies, including legislation, are needed urgently to combat this global peril affecting low-income countries more than others, and contributing to antimicrobial resistance. |  |  |
| HEAL Africa, Dem Rep of the Congo | In DRCongo, we agree with this indicator to be added | In DRCongo, we agree with this indicator to be added | In DRCongo, we agree with this indicator to be added |
| Ministère Santè et Action sociale, Senegal | atteindre une couverture nationale de 90 % au niveau national pour tous les antigènes du PEV et atteindre au moins 80 % de couverture pour tous les antigènes dans chaque district. |  |  |
| Norwegian Ministry of Health and Care Services, Norway | The Norwegian Ministry of Health and Care Services comments that indicators for 3.8.1 should, to the extent possible, directly or indirectly, measure health systems or the effect them. Focus should be placed on universal access to primary health care. We therefore propose the following indicators from the 100 WHO Core Health Indicators: • Demand for family planning satisified with modern methods • Births attended by skilled health personnnel • Immunization coverage rate by vaccine for each vaccine in the national schedule • Coverage of services for severe mental health disorders • Institutional maternal mortality ratio • Service utilization • Health service access • Health worker density and distribution • Output training institutions • Total current expenditure on health There should also be measurement of the performance of the national health system in combating non-communicable diseases. | The Norwegian Ministry of Health and Care Services proposes the three following indicators from the 100 WHO Core Health Indicators: • Out-of-pocket payment for health (%of current expenditure of health) • Headcount ratio of catastrophic health expenditure • Headcount ratio of impoverishing health expenditure | The Norwegian Ministry of Health and Care Sercvices comments that for 3.9 we support the indicator proposed. In addition we support the use of the burden of disease attributable to ambient air pollution. |
| Eurostat | Data not collected by European Statistical System (ESS). Simplify the indicator "Coverage of tracer interventions" and clearly define selected interventions (ideally taken from the WHO list of 100 core indicators). The list could include 1) child full immunization coverage, 2) vit A supplementation coverage, 3) ANC 4 visits coverage, 4) post partum care coverage, 5) TB treatment (coverage of new TB cases completing TB treatment), 6 and 7) ARV therapy coverage (HIV-positive adults and children receiving HIV treatment), 8) children 1–14 years sleeping under an insecticide-treated bed net (ITN), 9) related to NCDs (% of eligible persons (defined as aged 40 years and older) receiving drug therapy and counselling to prevent heart attacks and strokes, 10) related to mental health (coverage of services for severe mental health disorders), 11) hypertension and diabetes treatment. | Data not collected by European Statistical System (ESS). Alternative indicator could be 'Headcount ratio of catastrophic/ impoverishing health expenditure' as included in the WHO - Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators. | The indicator should not become GREEN as the data situation is highly problematic, even in EU countries, and in particular for indoor and household air pollution levels. Interlinkages with indicators under goal 6, 12 and 15 should be analysed. |
| g7+ Secretariat | g7+ Secretariat: To be replaced with indicator that measures the inputs; For ex. "number of villages/suku/towns/communities (per total number of villages/towns/communities) in access of well equipped health clinics" |  |  |
| IFAD | Spatial disaggregation im portant for this indicator. | Disaggregate spatially (rural/urban). |  |
| International Disability and Development Consortium | For Indicator 3.8.1 IDDC recommends adding rehabilitation services to the list of tracer interventions. It would read as: Coverage of tracer interventions (e.g. child full immunization, ARV therapy, TB treatment, hypertension treatment, skilled attendant at birth, rehabilitation services, etc.) For Indicator 3.8.1 IDDC recommends adding disability disaggregation (The World Bank and WHO World Report on Disability clearly states that less access to health services leads to a much higher chance of catastrophic health expenditure) | For Indicator 3.8.1 IDDC recommends adding disability disaggregation (The World Bank and WHO World Report on Disability clearly states that less access to health services leads to a much higher chance of catastrophic health expenditure) |  |
| OECD | For OECD countries, data exist on the "Share of the population receiving a core set of health care goods and services under public programmes and private health insurance" - see http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/sites/soc\_glance-2014-en/06/05/index.html?contentType=&itemId=%2Fcontent%2Fchapter%2Fsoc\_glance-2014-26-en&mimeType=text%2Fhtml&containerItemId=%2Fcontent%2Fserial%2F19991290&accessItemIds= This share is 100% for a majority of current OECD members. A more differentiating indicator is "Out-of-pocket expenditures borne directly by patients where neither public nor private insurance cover the full cost of the health good or service, as a share of household final consumption expenditure by resident households". For data, see http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/docserver/download/8115071ec041.pdf?expires=1450098508&id=id&accname=guest&checksum=BB23FF388963918E73C30545A9E5A697 | For OECD countries, data exist on the "Share of the population receiving a core set of health care goods and services under public programmes and private health insurance" - see http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/sites/soc\_glance-2014-en/06/05/index.html?contentType=&itemId=%2Fcontent%2Fchapter%2Fsoc\_glance-2014-26-en&mimeType=text%2Fhtml&containerItemId=%2Fcontent%2Fserial%2F19991290&accessItemIds= This share is 100% for a majority of current OECD members. A more differentiating indicator is "Out-of-pocket expenditures borne directly by patients where neither public nor private insurance cover the full cost of the health good or service, as a share of household final consumption expenditure by resident households". For data, see http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/docserver/download/8115071ec041.pdf?expires=1450098508&id=id&accname=guest&checksum=BB23FF388963918E73C30545A9E5A697 |  |
| PATH | Organisation PATH comments that for greater specificity the UHC indicator should include the a component around a universally applicable vaccine indicator. The proposed indicator is: Reach and sustain 90% national coverage and 80% in every district with all vaccines in national programmes. |  |  |
| UNAIDS | **We support the development of a tracer intervention index to measure coverage of health services. As previously suggested and as listed in this draft indicator it is a global priority to measure the coverage of antiretroviral treatment for HIV in this index.** | We support the development of an indicator measuring the proportion of the population covered by health insurance (disaggregated by age, sex and income) |  |
| UNEP |  |  | UNEP Comments: UNEP supports the WHO on including Mortality rate attributed to household and ambient air pollution. However the target refers to hazardous chemicals and contamination of air, water and soil. IAEG might wish to consider using the indicator Premature mortality and disability prevented by improving the environment, which is based on the WHO Environmental Burden of Disease methodology. (http://www.who.int/quantifying\_ehimpacts/publications/preventingdisease.pdf) which estimates the Disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) attributable to environmental factors collectively, by disease and mortality stratum, aggregated to WHO regions in one year. The affected environment should cover the hazards from chemicals and air, water and soil pollution and contamination, but exclude occupational risks at this time. There are data worldwide for lead; for persistent organic pollutants (POPs) in air, blood and human milk and emissions of mercury from major sources in reports to the Stockholm Convention (http://chm.pops.int). |
| UNFPA | UNFPA supports the explicit inclusion of the following package of essential services, including the following four components, elements of which are already reflected in the grey indicator above: modern methods of contraception; maternity care services (including antenatal care, skilled attendance at birth, emergency obstetric and neonatal care and post—partum care); treatment of complications of unsafe abortion and access to safe abortion services to the extent of the law; and prevention, diagnosis and treatment of sexually transmitted infections including HIV/AIDS (including ARV). |  |  |
| UNICEF | UNICEF supports the proposed indicator 'coverage of essential health services'. 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”, requires two indicators, one for health service coverage (3.8.1) and one for financial protection (3.8.2). UNICEF supports the WHO proposal to develop a summary index of essential health services coverage for use in global SDG reporting but notes that further work is required to establish a reliable method for computing the various elements in a manner which is useful for informing policy and programme interventions. UNICEF strongly supports the proposal to include a composite of health service indicators relating to reproductive, maternal, newborn and child health (RMNCH) and is committed to supporting countries to routinely collect and report on this essential element of Universal Health Coverage. We recommend that this indicator be based on selected indicators along the continuum of care from pre-pregnancy to childhood (under-five) and include the following elements: (1) Family planning coverage (demand satisfied with modern methods) (2) coverage of antenatal (4+ visits) (3) Skilled attendance at birth (or institutional delivery) (4) postnatal care for mother and newborn (5) full immunization coverage among infants (6) health care seeking behaviour among children with suspected pneumonia and (7) ORS treatment for diarrhoea | UNICEF supports this indicator | UNICEF supports the proposed indicator 3.9.1 ‘mortality rate attributed to household and ambient air pollution’ and supports the addition of an indicator on ‘mortality rate attributed to inadequate drinking water, sanitation and hygiene’ proposed by WHO. |
| United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) | OHCHR supports this indicator but tracer interventions would need to be listed more exhaustively, even if they will vary depending on national context and over time, in order to ensure that certain basic interventions are not left out. To this list, we suggest adding coverage of assistive devices or products among persons with disabilities, coverage of family planning and other sexual and reproductive health services, uptake of regular screening for the most common conditions, etc. | OHCHR suggests protection beyond catastrophic/impoverishing expenditure to include expenditure which may not be deemed catastrophic but which are, nevertheless, important e.g. preventative, curative, rehabilitative and palliative health services. | OHCHR suggests adding morbidity rate. |
| WHO |  | Comments from the World Health Organization and the World Bank Group to Indicator 3.8.2 “Fraction of the population experiencing catastrophic/impoverishing out-of-pocket health expenditure” 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 ”, requires two indicators, one for health service coverage (3.8.1) and one for financial protection (3.8.2). These indicators should always be monitored and interpreted together. These indicators must be disaggregated by key equity stratifiers, e.g. socio-economic status, urban/rural areas of residence, gender where relevant. The indicators have been developed by WHO and the World Bank through a three year process that included more than a dozen country case studies, consultation with academics and agencies, and several publications. Recently, these methods were applied in the joint WHO and World Bank First Global Monitoring Report on Tracking Universal Health Coverage (http://www.who.int/healthinfo/universal\_health\_coverage/report/2015/en/), launched at the UN in New York on 12 June 2015. Going forward, WHO and the World Bank will routinely publish UHC monitoring reports that track country, regional and global progress. Definition Catastrophic out-of-pocket health expenditures are defined as occurring when direct payments made to health care providers at the time of service use that are equal to or exceed 25% of household total consumption expenditure. Impoverishing out-of-pocket health expenditures are defined as occurring when such payments push a household below a poverty line. The poverty line should be defined according to national standards and also an international poverty line, consistent with SDG targets 1.1.1 and 1.2.1. The fraction of the population experiencing catastrophic[impoverishing] out-of-pocket health expenditures is then estimated as the number experiencing catastrophic[impoverishing] payments over the total population. Data sources Financial protection indicators are based on information collected from nationally representative household expenditure surveys or household multipurpose surveys implemented by or in close collaboration with national statistical offices. The three most common surveys are Household Budget Surveys, Household Income and Expenditure Surveys and Living Standards Measurement Surveys. The World Bank Group and the WHO have already identified approximately 500 relevant surveys. Method of estimation This indicator is constructed from a headcount ratio. The numerator for catastrophic health expenditures is based on those households whose health expenditures represent 25% or more of their total expenditure; the numerator for impoverishing health expenditures is based on those households whose health expenditures pushes them below a poverty line. The denominator is the total population. This requires household surveys which include questions that elicit information on a household’s total consumption expenditure (i.e. monetary and in-kind payments on all goods and services, plus the monetary value of the consumption of home-made products) following the UN Classification of Individual Consumption According to Purpose (COICOP). This classification includes expenses on food items and non-food items including health which allows for construction of two key aggregated variables, i.e. total consumption expenditure and health expenditure. These types of household surveys sometimes differ in their design. Hence, the World Bank Group conducts a series of harmonization efforts for different purposes (e.g. calculation of country specific PPP factors). For many countries, multiple surveys are available—usually covering different years, sometimes covering the same year. To generate global estimates, all datasets are used to estimate a smoothed nonparametric curve to fit the data and predict the fraction of the population experiencing catastrophic/impoverishing health expenditures. |  |
| WHO | Indicator 3.8.1: Coverage of essential health services This proposal is based on collaborative work between WHO, UNICEF and the World Bank. 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 ”, requires two indicators, one for health service coverage (3.8.1) and one for financial protection (3.8.2). These indicators should always be monitored and interpreted together. These indicators must be disaggregated by key equity stratifiers, e.g. socio-economic status, urban/rural areas of residence, gender where relevant. Definition The universal health coverage services index is defined as the average coverage of essential services based on tracer interventions that include reproductive, maternal, newborn and child health, infectious diseases, noncommunicable diseases and service capacity and access, among the general and the most disadvantaged population. Countries provide many essential services for health protection, promotion, prevention, treatment and care. Indicators of service coverage – defined as people receiving the service they need – are the best way to track progress in providing services under UHC. Since a single service indicator or simply general service utilization does not suffice for monitoring UHC, an index is constructed, including a set of tracer indicators selected based on epidemiological and statistical criteria. This includes several indicators that are already included in other SDG targets, thereby minimizing the data collection and reporting burden. The indicators are classified into four groups and combined into a single summary index of essential health services coverage for use in global SDG monitoring: •Reproductive, maternal, newborn and child health: (1) family planning coverage (demand satisfied with modern methods) (2) coverage of antenatal (4+ visits) and delivery care (institutional delivery) (3) full immunization coverage among infants (4) health care seeking behaviour among children with suspected pneumonia; •Infectious diseases: (1) coverage of successful TB treatment (2) antiretroviral therapy among HIV infected persons, (3) percent of population at risk of malaria sleeping under insecticide treated bed nets, (4) households with improved water source and sanitary facilities; •Noncommunicable diseases: (1) hypertension treatment coverage (2) diabetes treatment coverage (3) cervical cancer screening coverage (4) (non) use of tobacco; •Service capacity and access: (1) in-patient (hospital) care access (derived from admission/discharge rates) (2) health worker density: core health professionals (physicians, midwives, nurses), psychiatrists (mental health) and surgeons (surgical and emergency care) (3) access to essential medicines; (4) country level of implementation of International Health Regulations (health security). The fourth category are not strictly coverage indicators but has been added as no reliable population coverage indicators for these areas are available at present. The indicators are intended to capture low service capacity and access in comparison to a minimum threshold of capacity or access. Data sources Global data availability for the indicators is good and international databases exist. Comparable estimates have been made where needed. Countries obtain coverage and access indicators from household surveys and facility surveys, with a variety of different equity stratifiers. In 2015, the first global report on tracking UHC was published by WHO and World Bank. Method of estimation The final summary index is computed by averaging service coverage values within each of the four broad categories, and then averaging those four values. This computation is made for the general population and for the disadvantaged population. The coverage of each service indicator in disadvantaged population is defined as the average coverage among the specific disadvantaged subgroups according to economic status, education, place of residence, sex and age, depending on their relevancy and the data availability. The disadvantaged population indicators are derived from disaggregated data by economic status, education, place of residence, sex and age, depending on their relevancy and the data availability. The final summary measure is computed by averaging the index values for the whole population and for the disadvantaged population. Presentation The index should be accompanied with a dashboard to show the different components. Furthermore, countries may add indicators according to their own health priorities. |  |  |
| World Bank | Will need to define "full immunization", and specify all tracer interventions |  |  |
| World Health Organization |  |  | To address the SDG target 3.9: . By 2030, substantially reduce number of deaths and illnesses from i) hazardous chemicals, and ii) air, iii) water and iv) soil, pollution and contamination, and to complement already proposed indicator by the IAEG-SDGs “Mortality rate attributed to household and ambient air pollution”, labelled as 3.9.1, and is already green. WHO proposes to add two indicators as follows: 1. Mortality rate attributed to unsafe water, unsafe sanitation and lack of hygiene (exposure to unsafe WASH services). 2. Mortality rate attributed to unintentional poisoning Due to unavailability of data, and lack of established methodology, an indicator for “soil pollution and contamination” cannot be proposed at this point. Additionally an indicator “mortality rate attributed to hazardous chemicals” is likely to be misinterpreted, as there are significant deficiencies in the database, e.g. relating to chronic exposure to chemicals. Furthermore, the indicator relating to unsafe WASH could be a dual-purpose indicator addressing the 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”, which currently doesn't have any indicator proposed for the part of “water borne diseases”. All the above three proposed indicators, under this target (3.9) have available country data disaggregated for age group and sex, and are readily available for global monitoring purposes. WHO is striving to have further disaggregation in the future. Consistent disaggregation of indicators arising from key social determinants such as income, or education will provide important insights on whether inequalities in the SDG health targets reduce over time. The wealth of previous work on social determinants of health, can be critical for understanding the context behind the disaggregation efforts within the SDG monitoring framework. This will help us ensure that inequalities are progressively eliminated to ensure that targets are met for all socio-economic groups. |
| World Water Council |  |  | World Water Council: it would be useful to add "disaggregated by cause of death" to the last part of the indicator. |
| ASTRA Network | Two indicators should be retained for this target to monitor UHC as currently proposed – on coverage of essential services for all and on financial protection. The comments below relate to the indicator on coverage of interventions. · In response to calls for greater specificity, the definition of the UHC indicator should include the following components which should form part and parcel of any essential package of prevention and treatment services: -Essential sexual and reproductive health services, namely the following three components, elements of which are already reflected in the grey indicator above: modern methods of contraception; maternal health services (including antenatal care, skilled attendance at birth, emergency obstetric care and post-partum care); treatment of complications of unsafe abortion and access to safe abortion services to the extent of the law; and prevention, diagnosis and treatment of sexually transmitted infections and HIV/AIDS (including ARV). These services are cross-cutting enablers for achievement of the SDGs, including poverty eradication, gender equality, school completion and economic growth. -The HPV vaccine, which should be considered part of essential sexual and reproductive health services as well as of child immunization (an element already reflected in the indicator). The HPV vaccines is an exceptional medical advancement to prevent cervical cancer, which kills 275,000 women every year, over 85% of them in the developing world. -Mental health, an especially neglected health issue afflicting 1 in 4 people in their lifetime. An estimated 50-85% of people with mental illness receive no treatment, and suicide is the leading cause of death for adolescent girls worldwide. |  |  |
| b | • Two indicators should be retained for this target to monitor UHC as currently proposed – on coverage of essential services for all and on financial protection. • In response to calls for greater specificity, the definition of the UHC indicator should include the following components which should form part and parcel of any essential package of prevention and treatment services: o Essential sexual and reproductive health services, namely the following 4 components, elements of which are already reflected in the grey indicator above: modern methods of contraception; maternal health services (including antenatal care, skilled attendance at birth, emergency obstetric care and post-partum care); treatment of complications of unsafe abortion and access to safe abortion services to the extent of the law; and prevention, diagnosis and treatment of sexually transmitted infections and HIV/AIDS (including ARV). These services are cross-cutting enablers for achievement of the SDGs, including poverty eradication, gender equality, school completion and economic growth. o Cancer screening, early detection and prevention, including the HPV vaccine, which should be considered part of essential sexual and reproductive health services as well as of child immunization (an element already reflected in the indicator), mammography, cervical cancer screening, and referrals for treatment. The HPV vaccine is an exceptional medical advancement to prevent cervical cancer, which kills 275,000 women every year, over 85% of them in the developing world. o Mental health, an especially neglected health issue afflicting 1 in 4 people in their lifetime. An estimated 50-85% of people with mental illness receive no treatment, and suicide is the leading cause of death for adolescent girls worldwide. o Immediate, first-line basic services to address intimate partner violence and sexual violence, especially relevant to UHC discussions given that victims/survivors need to make more frequent use of health services, and experience more severe health and other consequences when access is lacking. Services include: treatment of injuries; post-rape care (including emergency contraception, post-exposure prophylaxis for HIV prevention, access to safe abortion to the extent of the law); psychosocial and mental health support; and forensic services. The provision of essential health services for survivors of violence against women and girls has also been agreed in various inter-governmental and technical fora. Note that there is no indicator currently in the SDGs framework on the critical role of the health sector in responding to violence (an issue unaddressed by the health goal though necessary to achieve other violence-related targets, e.g. 5.2, 16.1 and 16.2). The above proposal would help ensure policy coherence in achieving SDGs implementation, including with the WHO `Global Action Plan on the health sector role in addressing interpersonal violence, especially violence against women and violence against children’ – to be formally adopted in 2016, with a time-line through 2030 aligned with the SDGs. |  |  |
| HEAL Africa D R Congo | D R Congo HEAL Africa: We support the inclusion of the full list of tracer interventions included in the WHO List of 100 Core Health Indicators including generalist medical practitioners, specialist medical practitioners including surgeons, anaesthetists, obstetricians and gynaecologists and emergency Physicians But also Basic comprehensive surgical care and anaesthesia Blood transfusion I1. In addition to these tracer interventions we encourage IAEG to consider the recommendations made by members state representative Inclusion of an indicator to measure % of population covered by a package of essential health services (including surgical care and anaesthesia which is recognised as a core component of UHC as per WHA resolution 68.15 2. We recommend consideration of the indicator of health workforce density and distribution and this should include general medical practitioners, specialist medical practitioners (including surgeons, anaesthetists, obstetricians, gynaecologists and emergency physician) as well as nursing and midwifery professionals | Financial risk represents an important component of UHC and we urge the inclusion of this indicator with a strong definition of universal health coverage to ensure populations are protected form catastrophic expenditure from seeking essential health services , including surgical and anaesthesia care |  |
| ProHealth International | ProHealth The WHA resolution 68.15 which was approved in May 2015 and which received an outpouring of support from Member States, recognizes the critical role of emergency and essential surgery and anaesthesia care as part of the delivery of Universal Health Coverage (UHC). In reference to Target 3.8, ProHealth International is strongly supportive of the inclusion of surgical and anaesthesia care indicators. Specifically, we support the inclusion of tracer interventions for basic and comprehensive surgical care. Without safe, affordable access to life saving and disability-preventing surgical care, we will not be able to achieve UHC. |  |  |
| RIGHTS |  | Percentage of the population, especially from marginalized, vulnerable and excluded communities, protected against catastrophic/impoverishing out of pocket health expenditure. |  |
| Royal Australasian College of Surgeons | The Royal Australasian College of Surgeons, the peak body for surgical standards and education in Australia and New Zealand and leading advocate for accessible, affordable and safe surgery in the Asia-Pacific region is supportive of the inclusion of robust and specific indicators to track UHC Target 3.8. Per the recent WHA resolution 68.15, which received unanimous support from 194 WHO member states, emergency and essential surgical care and anaesthesia represent an integral component of Universal Health Coverage (UHC). In reference to Target 3.8, we support inclusion of indicators to reflect the essential role of surgical care and anaesthesia as part of UHC. Specifically, in addition to the proposed tracer interventions listed above, we suggest the removal of "etc." and the inclusion of a complete list of tracer interventions. We strongly encourage the IAEG-SDGs to consider the inclusion of the full list of tracer interventions proposed in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators for service-specific availability and readiness including: •Basic and comprehensive surgical care, including caesarean section, laparotomy and open fracture •Blood transfusion In addition to these tracer interventions, we would encourage the IAEG to consider the recommendations made by member state representatives: 1) Percentage (%) of population covered by a package of essential health services (USA): We recommend that this indicator should also include safe surgical care and anaesthesia, which is recognized as a core component of UHC as per WHA resolution 68.15. 2) Health worker density and distribution (Canada): We recommend the consideration of this indicator as an additional measure of UHC. We also encourage the IAEG-SDGs to consider including disaggregation of providers by cadre as suggested in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators. To ensure accurate reporting of health worker density and distribution, provider categories should reflect: Generalist medical practitioners, specialist medical practitioners (surgeons, anaesthetists, obstetricians, emergency medicine specialists, gynecologists etc,), as well as nursing, midwifery and non-physcian surgical, anaesthetic and obstetric providers | Financial risk protection represents an important component of UHC and we commend the IAEGSDGs for including this indicator. We would suggest that this indicator include a robust definition of "universal health coverage" to ensure that populations are protected against catastrophic and impoverishing expenditure from seeking essential health services, including surgical and anaesthesia care. Indicator 3.8.2: Fraction of the population protected against catastrophic/impoverishing out-of-pocket health expenditure Financial risk protection represents an important component of UHC and we commend the IAEGSDGs for including this indicator. We would suggest that this indicator include a robust definition of "universal health coverage" to ensure that populations are protected against catastrophic and impoverishing expenditure from seeking essential health services, including surgical and anaesthetic care |  |
| AbleChildAfrica | We recommend adding rehabilitation services to the list of tracer interventions. It would read as: Coverage of tracer interventions (e.g. child full immunization, ARV therapy, TB treatment, hypertension treatment, skilled attendant at birth, rehabilitation services, etc.) | We recommends adding disability disaggregation (The World Bank and WHO World Report on Disability clearly states that less access to health services leads to a much higher chance of catastrophic health expenditure) |  |
| ADD International | Coverage of tracer interventions (e.g. child full immunization, ARV therapy, TB treatment, hypertension treatment, skilled attendant at birth, REHABILITATION SERVICES etc |  |  |
| Adolescent Girl and SDG Indicators Working Group\*: signatories included the UN Foundation, Plan International, Advocates for Youth, Girl Effect, Girls Thinking Global, International Center for Research on Women | Adolescent Girl SDG Indicators Working Group\*: 3.8.1 Coverage of tracer interventions (e.g. child full immunization, ARV therapy, TB treatment, hypertension treatment, skilled attendant at birth, etc.) Disaggregations: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) -RATIONALE: As a result of gender inequalities in resources, capabilities, and rights, girls and women often lack equal access to health services. Gendered barriers to healthcare include accessibility (particularly in distance or travel to health facilities), gender-sensitive availability of skilled healthcare service providers, medicines, or education, and affordability (including both the direct costs of seeking treatment and the indirect costs, such as transportation or time costs). |  | Adolescent Girl and SDG Indicators Working Group\*: 3.9.1 Number of illnesses and premature deaths attributable to ambient and household air pollution Disaggregations: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) -DATA SOURCE: WHO, already measured in Burden of Disease -GLOBAL MONITORING ENTITY: WHO -RATIONALE: 4.3 million people die prematurely each year from exposure to household air pollution. Girls and women are disproportionately impacted by health issues stemming from the use of inefficient cookstoves and fuels, such as emphysema, cataracts, cancer, and heart disease. |
| African Agency for Integrated Development (AAID) | I am from Uganda and Executive Director of "African Agency for Integrated Development (AAID)" Member Organization for G4Alliance Member and In A special Consultative Status with ECOSOC since 2012. In addition to the proposed tracer interventions for measurement of UHC Target 3.8, I support inclusion the of additional tracer interventions included in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators including: Basic and comprehensive surgical care, including caesarean section, laparotomy and open fracture Blood transfusion | I am from Uganda and Executive Director of "African Agency for Integrated Development (AAID)" Member Organization for G4Alliance Member and In A special Consultative Status with ECOSOC since 2012. I Support inclusion of an indicator to measure the percentage (%) of population covered by a package of essential health services which include safe surgical care and anaesthesia, which is recognized as a core component of UHC as per WHA resolution 68.15. | I am from Uganda and Executive Director of "African Agency for Integrated Development (AAID)" Member Organization for G4Alliance Member and In A special Consultative Status with ECOSOC since 2012. I Support inclusion of Health worker density and distribution as an additional indicator to measure UHC, including disaggregation of providers as suggested in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators: By cadre, including generalist medical practitioners, specialist medical practitioners (surgeons, anaesthetists, obstetricians, emergency medicine specialists, cardiologists, paediatricians, psychiatrists, ophthalmologists, gynaecologists, etc.), nursing and midwifery professionals, traditional and complementary medicine professionals, among others. |
| American Academy of Pediatrics | The American Academy of Pediatrics encourages the adoption of this indicator. In particular, we recommend these tracer interventions: Immunization rates have previously been established as a key indicator of the strength of a country’s health system. Immunization systems combine a diverse set of core competencies, including logistics systems to transport vaccines safely to clinics where they are needed, budgeting funds for immunization programs, training health workers to target hard-to-reach and under-immunized populations and executing disease surveillance. Trained birth attendants are an equally critical linchpin for both maternal and newborn survival. The probability of maternal deaths decreases with increasing coverage by skilled attendants, while quality care by trained attendants in the hours preceding and after childbirth is key to eliminating preventable newborn deaths. Four of 5 newborn deaths result from three preventable or treatable conditions by skilled workers: (1) complications from prematurity and low birth weight; (2) complications during childbirth (including birth asphyxia); and (3) infection. Sources: Becker, Loren, Jessica Pickett, Ruth Levine. 2006. Measuring Commitment to Health: Global Health Indicators Working Group Report. Washington D.C.: Center for Global Development. Montgomery, Ann L. et al. The Effect of Health-Facility Admission and Skilled Birth Attendant Coverage on Maternal Survival in India: A Case-Control Analysis. PLOS ONE. June 2, 2014, DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0095696. http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0095696 Niermeyer, Susan et al. A New Commitment to Newborn Survival. Pediatrics. February 2015, Vol. 135, Issue 2. http://pediatrics.aappublications.org/content/135/2/211.full?rss=1%20-%20ref-3 | The American Academy of Pediatrics encourages the adoption of this indicator. The United Nations General Assembly resolution on global health and foreign policy (A/67/L.36), unanimously adopted on December 12, 2012, urged leaders to ensure access to quality health care without financial hardship. The UN resolution calls on Member States “to value the contribution of universal health coverage to achieving all interrelated Millennium Development Goals, with the ultimate outcome of more healthy lives, particularly for women and children.” The resolution also calls on Members to develop health financing systems that are inclusive, nondiscriminatory, and tailored to their particular country contexts. | The American Academy of Pediatrics encourages the adoption of this indicator. The addition of household pollution is critical because while the World Health Organization (WHO) attributed 3.7 million deaths to outdoor air pollution in 2012, it attributed 4.3 million deaths to household air pollution. Nearly half of the deaths attributed to pneumonia, which is responsible for one fifth of the deaths of children younger than five (one million children in 2013), are the result of particulate matter inhaled from indoor air pollution, a consequence of the fires and solid fuel-burning cook stoves used inside homes by three billion people worldwide. Indoor air pollution also captures secondhand smoke exposure from tobacco use, which according to some estimates contributes to up to 165,000 child and early adolescent (under-15) deaths per year. Globally, children are most likely to be exposed to secondhand smoke in homes and family vehicles. Sources: World Health Organization. “Burden of disease from Household Air Pollution for 2012.” 2014. http://www.who.int/entity/phe/health\_topics/outdoorair/databases/HAP\_BoD\_results\_March2014.pdf?ua=1 World Health Organization. “Pneumonia still responsible for one fifth of child deaths.” Nov. 12, 2013. http://www.who.int/mediacentre/news/releases/2013/world-pneumonia-day-20131112/en/ World Health Organization. “Indoor air pollution and health.” September 2011. http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs292/en/. Öberg, Mattias et al. “Worldwide burden of disease from exposure to second-hand smoke: a retrospective analysis of data from 192 countries The Lancet. Volume 377, Issue 9760, 139 – 146. 2010. |
| American Pediatric Surgical Association | APSA - USA 1) In addition to the proposed tracer interventions for measurement of UHC Target 3.8, we support inclusion the of additional tracer interventions included in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators including: • Basic and comprehensive surgical care, including caesarean section, laparotomy and open fracture • Blood transfusion 2) Support inclusion of an indicator to measure the percentage (%) of population covered by a package of essential health services (including safe surgical care and anaesthesia, which is recognized as a core component of UHC as per WHA resolution 68.15) 3) Support inclusion of Health worker density and distribution as an additional indicator to measure UHC, including disaggregation of providers as suggested in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators: • By cadre, including generalist medical practitioners, specialist medical practitioners (surgeons, anaesthetists, obstetricians, emergency medicine specialists, cardiologists, paediatricians, psychiatrists, ophthalmologists, gynaecologists, etc.), nursing and midwifery professionals, traditional and complementary medicine professionals, among others. 4) Support inclusion of a UHC indicator to track the fraction of the population protected against catastrophic and impoverishing expenditure from out-of-pocket payments for essential health services, including surgical and anaesthesia care. |  |  |
| American Society for Reproductive Medicine | American Society for Reproductive Medicine. We would like to comment on Indicator 3.3.1.The reported 2 fold increase in HIV acquisition among HIV sero-discordant couples attempting pregnancy is disturbing. Measuring HIV and Hepatitis B (3.3.2) should include sub-population data including those sero-discordant couples having unprotected coitus to become pregnant. For indicator 5.2.1 and and 5.3a. The effects of these substances on fertility and pregnancy are clear. For indicators 5.2.1 and 16.1.1 violence based on WHO data showing an increase in violence against intimate partners unable to become pregnant, sub-population data could include the ability to segregate out data on couples who desire pregnancy. | American Society for Reproductive Medicine. We would like to comment on Indicator 5.6.1. A pertinent question is how the proportion of women who make their own reproductive health decisions is being measured. This measurement should include those women who are able to make a decision to become pregnant in addition to women who desire to prevent pregnancy with contraception or interrupt a pregnancy not desired by abortion. |  |
| Arab Center for Research and Development |  |  | Kassem (ACRD) Indoor and outdoor air pollution is one of leading causes of death. It needs to be reflected in the measure |
| Articulacion Feminista Marcosur | Colombia. Essential health-care services must incorporate reproductive health tracer interventiosn such as: use of contraceptive methods, safe abortion. | Colombia. What is the universe for this indicator? It is crucial to eliminate pocket expenditures from all basic healht services including sexual and reproductive health. |  |
| Asia Dalit Rights Forum |  | Percentage of the population, especially from marginalized, vulnerable and excluded communities, protected against catastrophic/impoverishing out of pocket health expenditure. |  |
| Austrian Leprosy Relief Association | 1. disaggregate by disability and 2. add rehabilitation services to the list of tracer interventions. --> specify rehabilitation services |  |  |
| Better Place International | USA, the indicator I suggest would be at the microeconomics level the number of people that have financial ability to receive the treatment they need. |  |  |
| CCCUN | tracer for the treatment of comprehensive mental disorders |  |  |
| CHOICE for Youth and Sexuality | CHOICE for Youth and Sexuality: Two indicators should be retained for this target to monitor UHC as currently proposed – on coverage of essential services for all and on financial protection. The proposed indicator below relates to the indicator on coverage of interventions. 3.8.1 Percentage of population disaggregated by age, sex, gender, geographic location, income, disability, race and ethnicity, with access to essential quality basic health services including essential medicines and vaccines. The package should include at a minimum: essential sexual and reproductive health services (modern contraceptives, comprehensive maternity care, safe abortion services and post-abortion care, prevention and treatment of STIs, including HIV); cancer screening, treatment and prevention; mental health services; emergency services to respond to gender-based violence, including sexual violence; child full immunization; prevention, diagnosis and treatment of TB, malaria and hepatitis C; prevention and treatment of hypertension). Specific provisions for adolescents to be exempt from user fees for all health care in UHC schemes should be considered to ensure that they are not prevented or excluded from accessing key health services. When health insurance is tied to parents’ or husband’s coverage, adolescent girls and women in many settings will be deterred from using services in the absence of protections of their privacy and confidentiality. Monitoring of the UHC target should pay particular attention to adolescents’ service access and removal of such barriers for their health and well-being. |  |  |
| Christian Aid | Christian Aid supports this indicator along with 3.8.2 and would just add the word 'effective' to capture quality i.e. 'Effective coverage of tracer interventions'. We would like to emphasise the importance of disaggregated data, including by nationally relevant characteristics, to cover this indicator and 3.8.2. | Christian Aid supports this indicator and we would like to emphasise the importance of disaggregated data, including by nationally relevant characteristics, to measure progress. |  |
| College of Surgeons of East, Central, and Southern Africa | The College of Surgeons of East, Central and Southern Africa (COSECSA) is an independent body that fosters postgraduate education in surgery and provides surgical training throughout the region of East, Central and Southern Africa. COSECSA is a non-profit making body that currently operates in 10 countries in the Sub-Saharan region: Burundi, Ethiopia, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Rwanda, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe. Our primary objective is to advance education, training, standards, research & practice in surgical care in this region. COSECSA shapes and leads the training of surgeons in the Sub-Saharan region. The WHA resolution 68.15 which was approved in May 2015 and which received an outpouring of support from Member States, recognizes the critical role of emergency and essential surgery and anaesthesia care as part of the delivery of Universal Health Coverage (UHC). In reference to Target 3.8, COSECSA is strongly supportive of the inclusion of surgical and anaesthesia care indicators. According to a recent report by the Lancet Commission on Global Surgery, surgical conditions represent as much as one third (1/3) of the global burden of disease. Without safe, affordable access to life saving and disability-preventing surgical care, we will not be able to achieve UHC. Specific recommendation for the indicators for UHC target 3.8: 1) Remove "etc." and include of a complete list of tracer interventions including access to essential surgical care and anaesthesia. We recommend that the IAEG-SDGs to consider the inclusion of the full list of tracer interventions proposed in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators for service-specific availability and readiness including: •Basic and comprehensive surgical care, including caesarean section, laparotomy and open fracture •Blood transfusion In addition to these tracer interventions, we are also supportive of the following indicator recommendations: 1) Percentage (%) of population covered by a package of essential health services: We recommend that this indicator should also include safe surgical care and anaesthesia, which is recognized as a core component of UHC as per WHA resolution 68.15. 2) Health worker density and distribution: We recommend the consideration of this indicator as an additional measure of UHC. We also encourage the IAEG-SDGs to consider including disaggregation of providers by cadre as suggested in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators. To ensure accurate reporting of health worker density and distribution, provider categories should reflect: Generalist medical practitioners, specialist medical practitioners (surgeons, anaesthetists, obstetricians, emergency medicine specialists, gynaecologists etc,), as well as nursing and midwifery professionals. | College of Surgeons of East, Central, and Southern Africa (COSECSA): Indicator 3.8.2: Fraction of the population protected against catastrophic/impoverishing out of-pocket health expenditure. Financial risk protection represents an important component of UHC and we commend the IAEGSDGs for including this indicator. We would suggest that this indicator include a robust definition of "universal health coverage" to ensure that populations are protected against catastrophic and impoverishing expenditure from seeking essential health services, including surgical and anaesthesia care. |  |
| CoNGO Committee on Mental Health, New York | tracer for the treatment of comprehensive mental disorders |  |  |
| dance4life | Country: The Netherlands Organization: dance4life • Data would be drawn from and/or can build upon available health facility data and survey instruments, and should be disaggregated by sex, age, location, income quintile, disability and other characteristics to address equity gaps. • In response to calls for greater specificity, the definition of the UHC indicator should include the following components, which should form part and parcel of any essential package of prevention and treatment services: Essential sexual and reproductive health services, namely the following 4 components, elements of which are already reflected in the grey indicator above: modern methods of contraception; maternal health services (including antenatal care, skilled attendance at birth, emergency obstetric care and post-partum care); treatment of complications of unsafe abortion and access to safe abortion services to the extent of the law; and prevention, diagnosis and treatment of sexually transmitted infections and HIV/AIDS (including ARV). These services are cross-cutting enablers for achievement of the SDGs, including poverty eradication, gender equality, school completion and economic growth. o Immediate, first-line basic services to address intimate partner violence and sexual violence, especially relevant to UHC discussions given that victims/survivors need to make more frequent use of health services and experience more severe health and other consequences when access is lacking. Services include: treatment of injuries; post-rape care (including emergency contraception, post-exposure prophylaxis for HIV prevention, access to safe abortion to the extent of the law); psychosocial and mental health support; and forensic services. The provision of essential health services for survivors of violence against women and girls has also been agreed in various inter-governmental and technical fora. Note that there is no indicator currently in the SDGs framework on the critical role of the health sector in responding to violence (an issue unaddressed by the health goal though necessary to achieve other violence-related targets, e.g. 5.2, 16.1 and 16.2). The above proposal would help ensure policy coherence in achieving SDGs implementation, including with the WHO `Global Action Plan on the health sector role in addressing interpersonal violence, especially violence against women and violence against children’ – to be formally adopted in 2016, with a timeline through 2030 aligned with the SDGs. • Specific provisions for adolescents to be exempt from user fees for all health care in UHC schemes should be considered to ensure that they are not prevented or excluded from accessing key health services. When health insurance is tied to parents’ or husband’s coverage, adolescent girls and women in many settings will be deterred from using services in the absence of protections of their privacy and confidentiality. Monitoring of the UHC target should pay particular attention to adolescents’ service access and removal of such barriers for their health and well-being. |  |  |
| DITTA: Global Medical Technology, Healthcare IT and Radiation Therapy Trade Association | This indicator needs to include access to essential and affordable medical technologies. In order to achieve universal health coverage there needs to be a continuum of care approach to ensure there is a focus on prevention, diagnosis, treatment, monitoring and control of diseases. In order for the tracer interventions to be achieved; diagnosis needs to firstly occur. Every condition needs to be diagnosed so that the appropriate treatment is given and medical technologies are critical to diagnosis and treatment. “No medical treatment can or should be considered or given until a proper diagnosis has been established.” -WHO Development of Medical Devices Policy (2011). A sub indicator of this should be the proportion of health settings and population with access to affordable technologies. Indicator: Percentage of people who present at any basic health care setting are diagnosed using medical technologies. The measurement could also include number of medical technologies to support emergency care, acute care and general primary and secondary care. |  |  |
| Diyalo Pariwar |  |  | Work-place safety should be developed and implemented from the level of legislative in each country. |
| DSW (Deutsche Stiftung Weltbevoelkerung) | DSW states the following: - Two indicators should be retained for this target to monitor UHC as currently proposed – on coverage of essential services for all and on financial protection. - In response to calls for greater specificity, the definition of the UHC indicator should include the following components which should form part and parcel of any essential package of prevention and treatment services: o Essential sexual and reproductive health services, namely the following 4 components, elements of which are already reflected in the grey indicator above: modern methods of contraception; maternal health services (including antenatal care, skilled attendance at birth, emergency obstetric care and post-partum care); treatment of complications of unsafe abortion and access to safe abortion services to the extent of the law; and prevention, diagnosis and treatment of sexually transmitted infections and HIV/AIDS (including ARV). These services are cross-cutting enablers for achievement of the SDGs, including poverty eradication, gender equality, school completion and economic growth. o Cancer screening, early detection and prevention, including the HPV vaccine, which should be considered part of essential sexual and reproductive health services as well as of child immunization (an element already reflected in the indicator), mammography, cervical cancer screening, and referrals for treatment. The HPV vaccine is an exceptional medical advancement to prevent cervical cancer, which kills 275,000 women every year, over 85% of them in the developing world. o Mental health, an especially neglected health issue afflicting 1 in 4 people in their lifetime. An estimated 50-85% of people with mental illness receive no treatment, and suicide is the leading cause of death for adolescent girls worldwide. o Immediate, first-line basic services to address intimate partner violence and sexual violence, especially relevant to UHC discussions given that victims/survivors need to make more frequent use of health services, and experience more severe health and other consequences when access is lacking. Services include: treatment of injuries; post-rape care (including emergency contraception, post-exposure prophylaxis for HIV prevention, access to safe abortion to the extent of the law); psychosocial and mental health support; and forensic services. The provision of essential health services for survivors of violence against women and girls has also been agreed in various inter-governmental and technical fora. Note that there is no indicator currently in the SDGs framework on the critical role of the health sector in responding to violence (an issue unaddressed by the health goal though necessary to achieve other violence-related targets, e.g. 5.2, 16.1 and 16.2). The above proposal would help ensure policy coherence in achieving SDGs implementation, including with the WHO `Global Action Plan on the health sector role in addressing interpersonal violence, especially violence against women and violence against children’ – to be formally adopted in 2016, with a time-line through 2030 aligned with the SDGs. | DSW states the following: • Two indicators should be retained for this target to monitor UHC as currently proposed – on coverage of essential services for all and on financial protection. • Specific provisions for adolescents to be exempt from user fees for all health care in UHC schemes should be considered to ensure that they are not prevented or excluded from accessing key health services. When health insurance is tied to parents’ or husband’s coverage, adolescent girls and women in many settings will be deterred from using services in the absence of protections of their privacy and confidentiality. |  |
| Dutch Coalition on Disability and Development (DCDD) | DCDD recommends adding rehabilitation services to the list of tracer interventions. It would read as: Coverage of tracer interventions (e.g. child full immunization, ARV therapy, TB treatment, hypertension treatment, skilled attendant at birth, rehabilitation services, etc.) DCDD recommends adding disability disaggregation |  |  |
| End Water Poverty | It is impossible for people to receive quality essential health care services in health centres if these facilities do not use safely managed water, sanitation and hygiene services (WASH). According to the World Bank and World Health Organisation first Global Monitoring Report on Tracking Universal Health Coverage (UHC) (available here: http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/174536/1/9789241564977\_eng.pdf), access to WASH is critical to delivering quality health services, including ensuring patient safely, effectiveness of interventions, prevention of health care acquired infections and the provision of care that responds to people’s preferences, needs and desires. As a vital component of quality health services, access to WASH in health care facilities is therefore central to one of the pillars of UHC. The recent World Health Organization and UNICEF report (available here: http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/154588/1/9789241508476\_eng.pdf) on WASH in health care facilities states that 38% of health care facilities do not have an improved water source, 19% do not have improved sanitation and 35% do not have water and soap for handwashing. We strongly recommend that tracer interventions for UHC must include the following, and these should be explicitly stated within the document endorsed by the UN statistical commission in March 2016: “Percentage of health care facilities with safely managed water, sanitation and hygiene.” This data will be captured as part of the WHO/UNICEF WASH in health care facilities Global Action Plan: therefore adapting indicator 3.8.1 in this way does not represent an additional reporting burden. We also support the health sector recommendations that target 3.8 is tracked using two indicators covering i) financial risk protection and ii) service coverage. Effective tracking of both components will be vital to the realisation of UHC and the SDGs. In order to deliver the commitment to “Leave No-One Behind”, we urge the IAEG-SDGs to strongly reaffirm the commitment by Member States to disaggregate data by all of the groups set out in agenda 2030 across all indicators. |  |  |
| Engender Health | Engender Health: 5 billion people around the world lack access to safe, affordable surgical care, including over 950 million women who do not have access to emergency obstetric care. In 2013 alone, 289 000 women died in childbirth, with approximately 1/4 of these maternal deaths resulting from conditions that could be avoided if safe surgical, obstetric and anaesthesia care were universally available. The WHO recently approved a resolution recognizing the role of emergency and essential surgical care and anaesthesia as part of universal health coverage, ensuring that all people have access to the health care they need without suffering financial hardship. In reference to Target 3.8, Engender Health is strongly supportive of the inclusion of surgical and anaesthesia care indicators. According to a recent report by the Lancet Commission on Global Surgery, surgical conditions represent as much as one third (1/3) of the global burden of disease. Without safe, affordable access to life saving and disability-preventing surgical, obstetric, trauma and anaesthesia care, we will not be able to achieve UHC. Specific recommendation for the indicators for UHC target 3.8.1: 1) Include a full list of tracer interventions for UHC: •Emergency and essential surgical care, including caesarean section, laparotomy and open fracture •Blood transfusion (Source: WHO Core 100 Health Indicators List) In addition to these tracer interventions, we are also supportive of the following indicator recommendations: 1) Percentage (%) of population covered by a package of essential health services including surgical and anaesthesia care 2) Health worker density and distribution including disaggregation of providers by cadre as suggested in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators. To ensure accurate reporting of health worker density and distribution, provider categories should reflect: Generalist medical practitioners, specialist medical practitioners (surgeons, anaesthetists, obstetricians, emergency medicine specialists, gynaecologists etc,), as well as nursing and midwifery professionals. | Engender Health: Financial risk protection represents an important component of UHC and we commend the IAEGSDGs for including this indicator. We would suggest that this indicator include a robust definition of "universal health coverage" to ensure that populations are protected against catastrophic and impoverishing expenditure from seeking essential health services, including surgical and anaesthesia care. |  |
| Family Care International | Data would be drawn from and/or can build upon available health facility data and survey instruments, and should be disaggregated by sex, age, location, income quintile, disability and other characteristics to address equity gaps. The amendment proposed (United States) should be considered: Proportion of population covered by a package of essential health services. Indicator 3.8.1: Coverage of tracer interventions (e.g. child full immunization, ARV therapy, TB treatment, hypertension treatment, skilled attendance at birth, etc.) To measure coverage, data would be drawn from and/or can build upon available health facility data and survey instruments, and should be disaggregated by sex, age, location, income quintile, disability and other characteristics to address equity gaps. In response to calls for greater specificity, the tracer interventions should include the following components, which should form part and parcel of any essential package of prevention and treatment services: o Essential sexual and reproductive health services, namely the following four components, elements of which are already reflected in the grey indicator above: modern methods of contraception; maternal health services (including antenatal care, skilled attendance at birth, emergency obstetric care and post-partum care); treatment of complications of unsafe abortion and access to safe abortion services to the extent of the law; and prevention, diagnosis and treatment of sexually transmitted infections and HIV/AIDS (including ARV). These services are cross-cutting enablers for achievement of the SDGs, including poverty eradication, gender equality, school completion and economic growth. o Universally applicable vaccine indicator, Reach and sustain 90% national coverage and 80% in every district with all vaccines in national programmes. Immunization rates have previously been established as a key indicator of the strength of a country’s health system, combining a diverse set of core competencies, including logistics systems to transport vaccines safely to clinics where they are needed, budgeting funds for immunization programs, training health workers to target hard-to-reach and under-immunized populations and executing disease surveillance. o Trained birth attendants are an equally critical linchpin for both maternal and newborn survival. The probability of maternal deaths decreases with increasing coverage by skilled attendants, while quality care by trained attendants in the hours preceding and after childbirth is key to eliminating preventable newborn deaths. Four of 5 newborn deaths result from three preventable or treatable conditions by skilled workers: (1) complications from prematurity and low birth weight; (2) complications during childbirth (including birth asphyxia); and (3) infection. o Cancer prevention and screening, including HPV vaccination , which should be considered part of essential sexual and reproductive health services as well as of immunization (as included above), HBV vaccination, and early detection of breast and cervical cancer, and appropriate referral for treatment. (The HPV vaccine is a rare medical advancement to prevent cervical cancer, which kills 275,000 women every year, over 85% of them in the developing world.) o Mental health, an especially neglected health issue afflicting one in four people in their lifetime. An estimated 50-85% of people with mental illness receive no treatment, and suicide is the leading cause of death for adolescent girls worldwide. o Coverage of Rehabilitation Services, defined within the package of essential services is a vital step within the care continuum and not reflected in standard tracer indicators. The WHO Disability Action Plan 2014-21 is a blueprint for UHC and contains a number of possible indicators including rehabilitation policy, health workforce and service indicators. | • Specific provisions for adolescents to be exempt from user fees for all health care in UHC schemes should be considered to ensure that they are not prevented or excluded from accessing key health services on financial grounds. When health insurance is tied to parents’ or husband’s coverage, adolescent girls and women in many settings will be deterred from using services in the absence of protection of their privacy and confidentiality. Monitoring of the UHC target should pay particular attention to adolescents’ service access and removal of such barriers for their health and well-being. |  |
| Finnish NGDO platform to the EU | a) % of national budget’s expenditure on health and health expenditure per capita. b) Out of pocket expenditures. c) Proportion of births attended by skilled health personnel. d) % of individuals in community/facility catchment area reporting awareness of, access to, and satisfaction with health services (disaggregated by gender, age, marital status, urban/rural, wealth quintile). | a) % of national budget’s expenditure on health and health expenditure per capita. b) Out of pocket expenditures. c) Proportion of births attended by skilled health personnel. d) % of individuals in community/facility catchment area reporting awareness of, access to, and satisfaction with health services (disaggregated by gender, age, marital status, urban/rural, wealth quintile). |  |
| Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei |  | FEEM suggests to think to alternative indicators such as physicians density (per 1000 inhabitants, already in the WHO list) and/or actual distance to hospitals |  |
| Fundación para Estudio e Investigación de la Mujer -FEIM | FEIM comments that 3.8.1 grey indicator should be disaggregated by sex, age, gender and ethnicity with access to essential medicines and vaccines. The package should include minimum essential sexual and reproductive health services including safe abortion service and post-abortion care, prevention and treatment for STI, including HIV, cancer screening and emergency services for all forms of gender-based violence. |  |  |
| FundaMentalSDG | FundaMentalSDG comments: Mental health issues were completely excluded from the MDGs. For the SDGs, the mental health sector has been largely disregarded in the consultation process for the indicators. We are therefore writing to you, as a matter of urgency, on behalf of the FundaMentalSDG global consortium to surge you, in the strongest possible terms, to give full and detailed consideration to our proposal to include treatment for people with severe mental disorders (SMD) in the indicator for Service Coverage (indicator for target 3.8.1). Our proposal is fully aligned with the WHO recommendations for the indicators, and the WHO Global Mental Health Action Plan 2013-2020. No additional effort on the part of the UN member States is required for the data collection, as these indicators are already included in WHO’s Mental Health Action Plan-2013-2020, agreed by all countries in the WHO General Assembly in 2013 (11). I. CASE for the Indicator: Proven feasibility, suitability and relevance The Mental Health Action Plan 2013-2020 Appendix 1 provides information on the definition of each target/indicator, as well as means of verification. See www.who.int/mental\_health/publications/action\_plan/en/ Objective 2: To provide comprehensive, integrated and responsive mental health and social care services in community-based settings Global target 2: Service coverage for severe mental disorders will have increased by 20% (by the year 2020). Indicator: Proportion of persons with a severe mental disorder (psychosis; bipolar affective disorder; moderate-severe depression) who are using services [%]. Means of verification: Numerator: Cases of severe mental disorder in receipt of services, derived from routine information systems or, if unavailable, a baseline and follow-up survey of health facilities in one or more defined geographical areas of a country. Denominator: Total cases of severe mental disorder in the sampled population, derived from national surveys or, if unavailable, sub-regional global prevalence estimates. Comments/assumptions: Estimates of service coverage are needed for all mental disorders, but are restricted here to severe mental disorders to limit measurement effort. Health facilities range from primary care centres to general and specialised hospitals; they may offer social care and support as well as psychosocial and/or pharmacological treatment on an outpatient or inpatient basis. To limit measurement effort, and where needed, countries may restrict the survey to hospital-based and overnight facilities only (with some loss of accuracy, due to omission of primary care and other service providers). Baseline survey in 2014, with follow-up undertaken at 2020 (and preferably also at mid-point in 2017); the survey questionnaire can be supplemented to also address service readiness and quality, as desired. Secretariat can provide guidance and technical assistance to Member States regarding survey design and instrumentation. Quality/feasibility: As part of its 2014 mental health ATLAS survey, WHO has requested information on the number of persons with (severe and also any) mental disorder who received mental health care in the last year. This represents the numerator of the coverage indicator. Disaggregated information has been requested for specific diagnostic categories (non-affective psychosis; bipolar disorder; moderate-severe depression). To date, WHO has obtained coverage data from more than 50 Member States, including information on the source of these estimates. WHO believe this level of response – particularly as it has not been requested before via earlier ATLAS surveys – indicates the global viability of this indicator. Concerning the denominator for this coverage indicator/target, the gold standard would be local and nationally-representative population surveys, but a relevant / usable fall-back is the most recent estimates from the global burden of disease study since – as known, and confirmed in the summary Figure below - the degree of variation between countries / sub-regions for schizophrenia and bipolar disorder is rather low. All persons with these disorders – and with moderate/severe depressive episode for that matter – would be expected to need some form of care, even if only basic psychosocial treatment. Therefore the observed prevalence can be taken as a robust measure of population need. The variation between countries for depression is higher, but here WHO has more data – including World Mental Health survey and World Health Survey data – and the GBD group have actually produced estimates of depression prevalence for every country (see attached for the relevant on-line supplementary table from the paper by Ferarri et al, PLoS Medicine 2013). II. The global impact of mental illness Today more than 450 million people are affected by mental illness worldwide, with a far greater number involved in providing care and support for their affected family members. Across the world about three quarters of us know someone within our own families who has experienced mental illness. In summary the key global mental health issues are: • the economic cost of mental disorder worldwide amount to over 4% of GDP (1), • in 2010 mental, neurological and substance use disorders accounted for 10.4% of global disability adjusted life years (DALYs) and, 28.5% of global years lived with disability (YLDs) (2) • 3000 people commit suicide every day, although effective interventions exist to reduce suicide (3) • costs of providing scaled-up cost-effective interventions for mental health conditions in low- and middle-income countries is estimated at US$3–4 per head of population per year (4) • over 80% of people with severe mental illness experience discrimination and social exclusion (5, 6) • effective and cost-effective interventions developed by the WHO are available at the primary care level to identify and treat people with mental disorders (7) • comorbid physical and mental disorders are so common worldwide that it needs to be appreciated that ‘there is no health without mental health’ (8) . • people with mental illness die 15-30 years earlier than other members of our communities in low, middle and high income countries worldwide (9, 10). III. Mental health and the SDG Goals and Targets Mental health is included in two sections of the SDG Preamble and 2 of the health SDG Goal 3 targets as follows: SDG Preamble Paragraph 7: To promote physical and mental health and well-being, and to extend life expectancy for all, we must achieve universal health coverage and access to quality health care. Paragraph 26: We are committed to the prevention and treatment of NCDs, including behavioural, developmental and neurological disorders, which constitute a major challenge for sustainable development. SDG Goal 3 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. Target 3.5 Strengthen the prevention and treatment of substance abuse, including narcotic drug abuse and harmful use of alcohol A clear advantage of the indicators we propose is that they require no additional effort on the part of the member States, as these indicators are already included in WHO’s Mental Health Action Plan-2013-2020, agreed by all countries in the WHO General Assembly in 2013 (11). IV. Mental health as a cross cutting issue for development, health and wealth Mental health is an essential and cross-cutting component to many aspects of personal, social and economic wellbeing, for example: • mental health is a predictor and a consequence of worse outcomes following period of conflict (12) (13) • in relation to economic growth and employment, people with mental illness have far lower rates of employment than those of the whole population (14) • periods of economic recession are related to worse mental health in the population, especially among men and for increasing rates of suicide (15) • educational stressors are risk factors for suicidality among college students (16) • poor food security is a risk factor for depression, e.g. among women of child-bearing age (17) V. Exclusion of the mental health sector from the SDG Indicator consultation process Mental health issues were completed excluded from the Millennium Development Goals process, goals, targets and indictors. Mental health stakeholder groups worldwide have not been included in the SDG consultation processes. Indeed Kofi Annan has stated: “As the world is thinking about a development framework to build on the Millennium Development Goals, we need to place mental health in general and depression in particular within the post-2015 agenda.” Of the 68 national and international organisations included in the FundaMentalSDG Consortium, none were specifically consulted by the United Nations in relation to mental health and the SDGs. We therefore ask that you consider this letter as a formal submission by FundaMentalSDG Consortium proposing that these two specific WHO indicators are included in the final UN SDG Indicators list, and that this submission is included in the Agenda for the UN IAEG Group meeting Agenda at the Bangkok Meeting 26-28 October 2015 for full and formal discussion. We greatly appreciate your consideration of these proposals and we look forward to your reply. With kind regards, Professor Graham Thornicroft, Director, FundaMentalSDG Consortium Nicole Votruba, Co-ordinator FundaMentalSDG Consortium References 1. OECD. Making Mental Health Count: The Social and Economic Costs of Neglecting Mental Health Care. Paris2014. 2. Whiteford HA, Ferrari AJ, Degenhardt L, Feigin V, Vos T. The global burden of mental, neurological and substance use disorders: an analysis from the global burden of disease study 2010. PLoS One. 2015;10(2):e0116820. 3. WHO. Preventing suicide: A global imperative. Geneva: WHO; 2014. 4. Patel V, Chisholm D, Parikh R, Charlson FJ, Degenhardt L, Dua T, et al. Addressing the burden of mental, neurological, and substance use disorders: key messages from Disease Control Priorities, 3rd edition. Lancet. 2015. 5. Thornicroft G, Brohan E, Rose D, Sartorius N, Leese M, Grp IS. Global pattern of experienced and anticipated discrimination against people with schizophrenia: a cross-sectional survey. Lancet. 2009;373(9661):408-15. 6. Lasalvia A, Zoppei S, Van Bortel T, Bonetto C, Cristofalo D, Wahlbeck K, et al. Global pattern of experienced and anticipated discrimination reported by people with major depressive disorder: a cross-sectional survey. Lancet. 2013;381(9860):55-62. 7. World Health Organization. mhGAP intervention guide for mental, neurological and substance use disorders in non-specialized health settings: mental health Gap Action Programme (mhGAP). Geneva: WHO; 2010. 8. Prince M, Patel V, Saxena S, Maj M, Maselko J, Phillips MR, et al. No health without mental health. Lancet. 2007;370(9590):859-77. 9. Fekadu A, Medhin G, Kebede D, Alem A, Cleare A, Prince M, et al. Excess mortality in severe mental illness: 10-year population-based cohort study in rural Ethiopia. British Journal of Psychiatry. 2014;206( 1–8. doi: 10.1192/bjp.bp.114.149112). 10. Wahlbeck K, Westman J, Nordentoft M, Gissler M, Laursen TM. Outcomes of Nordic mental health systems: life expectancy of patients with mental disorders. BrJPsychiatry. 2011;199(6):453-8. 11. WHO. Mental Health Action Plan 2013-2020. Geneva: 2013. 12. Kohrt BA, Hruschka DJ, Worthman CM, Kunz RD, Baldwin JL, Upadhaya N, et al. Political violence and mental health in Nepal: prospective study. Br J Psychiatry. 2012;201(4):268-75. 13. Kessler RC, Galea S, Gruber MJ, Sampson NA, Ursano RJ, Wessely S. Trends in mental illness and suicidality after Hurricane Katrina. Mol Psychiatry. 2008;13(4):374-84. 14. Heslin M, Howard L, Leese M, McCrone P, Rice C, Jarrett M, et al. Randomized controlled trial of supported employment in England: 2 year follow-up of the Supported Work and Needs (SWAN) study. World Psychiatry. 2011;10(2):132-7. 15. Katikireddi SV, Niedzwiedz CL, Popham F. Trends in population mental health before and after the 2008 recession: a repeat cross-sectional analysis of the 1991-2010 Health Surveys of England. BMJ Open. 2012;2(5). 16. Zhang X, Wang H, Xia Y, Liu X, Jung E. Stress, coping and suicide ideation in Chinese college students. JAdolesc. 2012;35(3):683-90. 17. Bodnar LM, Wisner KL. Nutrition and depression: implications for improving mental health among childbearing-aged women. BiolPsychiatry. 2005;58(9):679-85. |  |  |
| Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance | Sinead Andersen, Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance While appreciate that a suggested tracer intervention in the draft indicator is child full immunisation, we are concerned that while vaccines for all is part of the target there is no well defined ambitious standalone immunisation indicator included to measure this target. It is unclear how the tracer interventions will be measured and if the suggested list will be applicable to all countries. Gavi is suggesting that this target include a robust and SMART immunisation indicator such as: “Reach and sustain 90% national coverage and 80% in every district with all vaccines in national programmes.”Ø The proposed indicator is universal in its application. Every country measures immunisation coverage. As it focuses on the scale up of access to vaccines in the national schedule, the indicator reinforces country-led development. The indicator is already agreed by all UN member states through the Global Vaccine Action Plan (GVAP), which was endorsed at the 2012 World Health Assembly. No additional monitoring is required at country level. As immunisation depends on all of the core components of a health system (e.g. planning, financing, supply chain, trained health workers, infrastructure), the proposed indicator is multi-purpose and is a good proxy measure for the strength and reach of a health system. Every year immunisation averts 2 to 3 million infant deaths globally from deadly diseases such as diphtheria, hepatitis B, measles, mumps, pertussis, polio and tetanus. Vaccines save lives, but 1 in 5 children, an estimated 21.8 million infants worldwide, still miss out on basic vaccines. This indicator is recognition that every child has the right to lead a healthy life, and vaccination is a vital step. The proposed indicator addresses equitable access within countries, aiming for 90% national coverage and 80% coverage in all districts. It seeks to ensure a focus on reaching the unreached – the underserved children living in remote areas and in deprived urban and other settings. The proposed indicator addresses equitable access within countries, aiming for 90% national coverage and 80% coverage in all districts. It seeks to ensure a focus on reaching the unreached – the underserved children living in remote areas and in deprived urban and other settings. Immunisation coverage is a widely used measure of public health. In the past it has often focussed on a single antigen or vaccine, such as the last dose of diphtheria-tetanus-pertussis vaccine. An added value of the proposed indicator is that it is responsive to scientific and development advances by measuring coverage of all vaccines in national programmes. It aligns with the intent of the SDGs to have relevance at the national level, across all countries, and be able to be meaningfully aggregated. Immunisation coverage is collected by governments everywhere and regularly disaggregated by critical stratifiers such as gender, geography and poverty, in order to better understand the reach of routine immunisation and health systems more broadly to the most vulnerable communities and households. Thanks to the determination of developing country and donor governments, Gavi has recently mobilised the resources to significantly scale up new vaccine use and expand coverage of vaccines in lower income countries, where the majority of babies are born. The coming years will see significant shifts in vaccine use and coverage, with a potentially transformational impact globally on people’s health and well-being. While the proposed indicator is ambitious, with strong leadership at country level and the partnership of Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance, it is attainable. |  |  |
| Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves |  |  | We would like to make a comment on 3.9.1, which is also grey on the latest indicator framework draft. Recommended indicator language: 3.9.1 Population exposed to air pollution (fine particulate matter) levels above WHO guideline values Rationale: Measuring the population exposed to air pollution is more feasible, and a necessary first step to estimating mortality. Encouraging measurement of population exposure to air pollution will also strengthen environmental health systems and inform actionable interventions to reduce air pollution. |
| Global Alliance for Surgical, Obstetric, Trauma, and Anaesthesia Care (The G4 Alliance) | The G4 Alliance, a coalition of 60+ global organizations united in their commitment to advocating for the neglected surgical patient is supportive of the inclusion of robust and specific indicators to track UHC Target 3.8. Per the recent WHA resolution 68.15, which received unanimous support from 194 WHO member states, emergency and essential surgical care and anaesthesia represent an integral component of Universal Health Coverage (UHC). In reference to Target 3.8, we support inclusion of indicators to reflect the essential role of surgical care and anaesthesia as part of UHC. Specifically, in addition to the proposed tracer interventions listed above, we suggest the removal of "etc." and the inclusion of a complete list of tracer interventions. We strongly encourage the IAEG-SDGs to consider the inclusion of the full list of tracer interventions proposed in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators for service-specific availability and readiness including: •Basic and comprehensive surgical care, including caesarean section, laparotomy and open fracture •Blood transfusion In addition to these tracer interventions, we would encourage the IAEG to consider the recommendations made by member state representatives: 1) Percentage (%) of population covered by a package of essential health services (USA) We recommend that this indicator should also include safe surgical care and anaesthesia, which is recognized as a core component of UHC as per WHA resolution 68.15. 2) Health worker density and distribution (Canada) We recommend the consideration of this indicator as an additional measure of UHC. We also encourage the IAEG-SDGs to consider including disaggregation of providers by cadre as suggested in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators. To ensure accurate reporting of health worker density and distribution, provider categories should reflect: Generalist medical practitioners, specialist medical practitioners (surgeons, anaesthetists, obstetricians, emergency medicine specialists,, gynaecologists etc,), as well as nursing and midwifery professionals. | G4 Alliance: Financial risk protection represents an important component of UHC and we commend the IAEG-SDGs for including this indicator. We would suggest that this indicator include a robust definition of "universal health coverage" to ensure that populations are protected against catastrophic and impoverishing expenditure from seeking essential health services, including surgical and anaesthesia care. |  |
| Global Pediatric Surgical Technology and Education Project | 1) In addition to the proposed tracer interventions for measurement of UHC Target 3.8, we support inclusion the of additional tracer interventions included in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators including: Basic and comprehensive surgical care, including caesarean section, laparotomy and open fracture Blood transfusion 2) Support inclusion of an indicator to measure the percentage (%) of population covered by a package of essential health services (including safe surgical care and anaesthesia, which is recognized as a core component of UHC as per WHA resolution 68.15) | 3) Support inclusion of Health worker density and distribution as an additional indicator to measure UHC, including disaggregation of providers as suggested in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators: By cadre, including generalist medical practitioners, specialist medical practitioners (surgeons, anaesthetists, obstetricians, emergency medicine specialists, cardiologists, paediatricians, psychiatrists, ophthalmologists, gynaecologists, etc.), nursing and midwifery professionals, traditional and complementary medicine professionals, among others. 4) Support inclusion of a UHC indicator to track the fraction of the population protected against catastrophic and impoverishing expenditure from out-of-pocket payments for essential health services, including surgical and anaesthesia care. |  |
| Global Public-Private Partnership for Handwashing | It is impossible for people to receive quality essential health care services in health centres if these facilities do not use safely managed water, sanitation and hygiene services (WASH). According to the World Bank and World Health Organisation first Global Monitoring Report on Tracking Universal Health Coverage (UHC) (available here: http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/174536/1/9789241564977\_eng.pdf), access to WASH is critical to delivering quality health services, including ensuring patient safely, effectiveness of interventions, prevention of health care acquired infections and the provision of care that responds to people’s preferences, needs and desires. As a vital component of quality health services, access to WASH in health care facilities is therefore central to one of the pillars of UHC. The recent World Health Organization and UNICEF report (available here: http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/154588/1/9789241508476\_eng.pdf) on WASH in health care facilities states that 38% of health care facilities do not have an improved water source, 19% do not have improved sanitation and 35% do not have water and soap for handwashing. We strongly recommend that tracer interventions for UHC must include the following, and these should be explicitly stated within the document endorsed by the UN statistical commission in March 2016: “Percentage of health care facilities with safely managed water, sanitation and hygiene.” This data will be captured as part of the WHO/UNICEF WASH in health care facilities Global Action Plan: therefore adapting indicator 3.8.1 in this way does not represent an additional reporting burden. We also support the health sector recommendations that target 3.8 is tracked using two indicators covering i) financial risk protection and ii) service coverage. Effective tracking of both components will be vital to the realisation of UHC and the SDGs. In order to deliver the commitment to “Leave No-One Behind”, we urge the IAEG-SDGs to strongly reaffirm the commitment by Member States to disaggregate data by all of the groups set out in agenda 2030 across all indicators. |  |  |
| Gradian Health Systems | Gradian Health Systems, a nonprofit social enterprise that equips hospitals around the world to deliver anaesthesia safely, is supportive of the inclusion of robust and specific indicators to track UHC Target 3.8. Per the recent WHA resolution 68.15, which received unanimous support from 194 WHO member states, emergency and essential surgical care and anaesthesia represent an integral component of UHC. In reference to Target 3.8, we support inclusion of indicators to reflect the essential role of surgical care and anaesthesia as part of UHC. Specifically, in addition to the proposed tracer interventions listed above, we suggest the removal of "etc." and the inclusion of a complete list of tracer interventions. We strongly encourage the IAEG-SDGs to consider the inclusion of the full list of tracer interventions proposed in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators for service-specific availability and readiness, including: •Basic and comprehensive surgical care, including caesarean section, laparotomy and open fracture •Blood transfusion | Gradian Health Systems: Financial risk protection represents an important component of UHC and we commend the IAEG-SDGs for including this indicator. We would suggest that this indicator include a robust definition of "universal health coverage" to ensure that populations are protected against catastrophic and impoverishing expenditure from seeking essential health services, including surgical and anaesthesia care. |  |
| Handicap International | Handicap International, a disability focussed NGO working in over 60 countries, is supportive of this indicator. However, we suggest The addition of a tracer indicator meauring coverage of rehabilitation servcies is essential. These are important services, included within the definition of UHC, yet missing from any current proposed measurement. A group of actors working on rehabilitation signed a joint statement on Dec 12th 2015 calling for the greater inclusion of rehabilutation and assistive health technologies within the UHC framework: http://blog.handicap-international.org/influenceandethics/2015/12/12/a-global-call-for-rehabilitation-on-universal-health-coverage-day/ (see also http://iddcconsortium.net/sites/default/files/resources-tools/files/bp-\_why\_should\_rehabilitation\_be\_integrated\_into\_healht\_systems.pdf) The WHO Disability Action Plan 2014-21, objective 2 calls for strengthening rehabilitation services and this is also stipulated in the UN Convention of Rights for Persons with Disabilities (article 26) ratified by 160 countries globally (source: UN Enable) Further, we recommend that coverage indicators are disagreggated by age, gender, disability, income and otehr quintiles that would provide information on health access equity. |  |  |
| Handicap International | Rehabilitation services must be included as a tracer indicator. These are specified within |  |  |
| Health in Post-2015 NGO Coalition | The Health in Post-2015 NGO Coalition, a network of organistions across the globe, SUPPORT this indicator. However, we suggest: For coverage, proportion of population covered by a package of essential health services should be measured. To measure this data would be drawn from and/or can build upon available health facility data and survey instruments, and should be disaggregated by sex, age, location, income quintile, disability and other characteristics to address equity gaps. The tracer interventions should include at least the following components, which should form part and parcel of any essential package of prevention and treatment services: > Essential sexual and reproductive health services, namely the following four components, elements of which are already reflected in the grey indicator above: modern methods of contraception; maternal health services (including antenatal care, skilled attendance at birth, emergency obstetric care and post-partum care); treatment of complications of unsafe abortion and access to safe abortion services to the extent of the law; and prevention, diagnosis and treatment of sexually transmitted infections and HIV/AIDS (including ARV). These services are cross-cutting enablers for achievement of the SDGs, including poverty eradication, gender equality, school completion and economic growth. > Universally applicable vaccine indicator, Reach and sustain 90% national coverage and 80% in every district with all vaccines in national programmes. Immunization rates have previously been established as a key indicator of the strength of a country’s health system, combining a diverse set of core competencies, including logistics systems to transport vaccines safely to clinics where they are needed, budgeting funds for immunization programs, training health workers to target hard-to-reach and under-immunized populations and executing disease surveillance. > Trained birth attendants are an equally critical linchpin for both maternal and newborn survival. The probability of maternal deaths decreases with increasing coverage by skilled attendants, while quality care by trained attendants in the hours preceding and after childbirth is key to eliminating preventable newborn deaths. Four of 5 newborn deaths result from three preventable or treatable conditions by skilled workers: (1) complications from prematurity and low birth weight; (2) complications during childbirth (including birth asphyxia); and (3) infection. > Cancer prevention and screening, including HPV vaccination , which should be considered part of essential sexual and reproductive health services as well as of immunization (as included above), HBV vaccination, and early detection of breast and cervical cancer, and appropriate referral for treatment. (The HPV vaccine is a rare medical advancement to prevent cervical cancer, which kills 275,000 women every year, over 85% of them in the developing world.) > Coverage of Rehabilitation Services, defined within the package of essential services is a vital step within the care continuum and not reflected in standard tracer indicators. The WHO Disability Action Plan 2014-21 is a blueprint for UHC and contains a number of possible indicators including rehabilitation policy, health workforce and service indicators. > Access to Palliative Care, global need for palliative care is estimated at 40 million annually. An NCD indicator measuring strong analgesic use per cancer death is in place but there is no tracer indicator for palliative care access under the health goal, which is needed as palliative care is part of the essential continuum of universal health coverage. > Mental health, an especially neglected health issue afflicting one in four people in their lifetime. An estimated 50-85% of people with mental illness receive no treatment, and suicide is the leading cause of death for adolescent girls worldwide. > Immediate, first-line basic services to address intimate partner violence and sexual violence, especially relevant to UHC discussions given that victims/survivors need to make more frequent use of health services and experience more severe health and other consequences when access is lacking. Services include: treatment of injuries; post-rape care (including emergency contraception, post-exposure prophylaxis for HIV prevention, access to safe abortion to the extent of the law); psychosocial and mental health support; and forensic services. The provision of essential health services for survivors of violence against women and girls has also been agreed in various inter-governmental and technical fora. Note that there is no indicator currently in the SDGs framework on the critical role of the health sector in responding to violence(an issue unaddressed by the health goal though necessary to achieve other violence-related targets, e.g. 5.2, 16.1 and 16.2). The above proposal would help ensure policy coherence in achieving SDGs implementation, including with the WHO `Global Action Plan on the health sector role in addressing interpersonal violence, especially violence against women and violence against children’ – to be formally adopted in 2016, with a timeline through 2030 aligned with the SDGs. | The Health in Post-2015 NGO Coalition, a network of organistions across the globe are supportive of this indicator The United Nations General Assembly resolution on global health and foreign policy (A/67/L.36), unanimously adopted on December 12, 2012, urged leaders to ensure access to quality health care without financial hardship. The UN resolution calls on Member States “to value the contribution of universal health coverage to achieving all interrelated Millennium Development Goals, with the ultimate outcome of more healthy lives, particularly for women and children.” The resolution also calls on Members to develop health financing systems that are inclusive, nondiscriminatory, and tailored to their particular country contexts. In particular we suggest specific provisions for adolescents or other vulnerable groups to be exempt from user fees for all health care in UHC schemes to ensure that they are not prevented or excluded from accessing key health services on financial grounds. When health insurance is tied to parents’ or husband’s coverage, adolescent girls and women in many settings will be deterred from using services in the absence of protection of their privacy and confidentiality. Monitoring of the UHC target should pay particular attention to adolescents’ service access and removal of such barriers for their health and well-being. | The Health in Post-2015 NGO Coalition, a network of organistions across the globe, SUPPORT this indicator: The addition of household pollution is critical because while the World Health Organization (WHO) attributed 3.7 million deaths to outdoor air pollution in 2012, it attributed 4.3 million deaths to household air pollution. Nearly half of the deaths attributed to pneumonia, which is responsible for one fifth of the deaths of children younger than five (one million children in 2013), are the result of particulate matter inhaled from indoor air pollution, a consequence of the fires and solid fuel-burning cook stoves used inside homes by three billion people worldwide. Indoor air pollution also captures secondhand smoke exposure from tobacco use, which according to some estimates contributes to up to 165,000 child and early adolescent (under-15) deaths per year. Globally, children are most likely to be exposed to secondhand smoke in homes and family vehicles. |
| Health NGOs Network | Health NGOs Network (HENNET) Kenya As a way of making the immunization broad indicator SMART within the SDGs goal 3.8.1, i would suggest that it is made clear through the statement below: “Reach and sustain 90% national coverage and at least 80% in every district with all vaccines in national programmes.” Regards Johnpaul Omollo |  |  |
| Health NGOs Network | Health NGOs Network (HENNET) Kenya As a way of making the immunization broad indicator SMART within the SDGs goal 3.8.1, i would suggest that it is made clear through the statement below: “Reach and sustain 90% national coverage and at least 80% in every district with all vaccines in national programmes.” Regards Johnpaul Omollo |  |  |
| Health Volunteers Overseas | Health Volunteers Overseas World Health Assembly Resolution 68.15 recognizes the critical role of emergency and essential surgery and anaesthesia care as part of the delivery of Universal Health Coverage (UHC). In reference to Target 3.8, HVO supports inclusion of surgical and anaesthesia care indicators. Recommendation for Indicator 3.8.1: 1) Please expand the current list of tracer interventions to include a complete list of UCH tracer interventions including access to essential surgical care and anaesthesia. Specifically, we recommend the inclusion of the following tracer interventions (supported in WHO Core 100 Reference List): •Basic and comprehensive surgical care, including caesarean section, laparotomy and open fracture •Blood transfusion |  |  |
| HelpAge International on behalf of the Stakeholder Group on Ageing | The Stakeholder Group on Ageing comments: While we would welcome a measure that includes treatment for hypertension and diabetes, the current data source is population based surveys including DHS and STEPS. With DHS restricted to people between the ages of 15 and 49 (or 59 for men) and STEPS recommended for people between the ages of 25 and 64, the data collected for these health interventions risks being exclusive of people in older age despite the fact that they are most affected by NCDs. Hypertension and diabetes treatment should be included in the indicator, but alternate data sources and methods of collection should be identified that ensure data is collected for the age group most affected by NCDs. This indicator and any additional indicators discussed in response to universal health coverage must by definition be inclusive of all people and all ages and supported by comprehensive data sources that collect data throughout the lifecourse. |  |  |
| High-Level Task Force for the ICPD | HLTF for ICPD on 3.8.1: Target requires 2 indicators, coverage of essential services and financial protection, disaggregated by sex, age, location, income quintile, disability, race, ethnicity, other, to address equity gaps. US amendment should be considered (% population covered by package of essential health services). The definition of the coverage indicator should include essential SRH, cancer prevention, mental health, violence: - essential SRH services (4 components: contraception, MH (antenatal care, skilled attendance at birth, emergency obstetric care, post-partum care), treatment of complications of unsafe abortion/safe abortion services to extent of the law, STIs/HIV-AIDS (prevention, diagnosis, treatment/inc. ARV). These services are cross-cutting enablers for achievement of the SDGs, including poverty eradication, gender equality, school completion and economic growth. - Cancer prevention/screening (HPV vaccine/prevents cervical cancer, early detection of breast and cervical cancer, referrals for treatment). - Mental health - 1 in 4 people are affected in their lifetime, est. 50-85% of people with mental illness receive no treatment; suicide is the leading cause of death for adolescent girls worldwide. - Intimate partner and sexual violence (treatment of injuries, post-rape care, mental health, forensic services), especially relevant to UHC given that survivors make frequent use of health services and experience severe health consequences. There is no indicator currently in the SDGs framework on the critical role of the health sector in responding to violence (necessary for targets 5.2, 16.1,16.2). |  |  |
| ICPD | • Two indicators should be retained for this target to monitor UHC as currently proposed – on coverage of essential services for all and on financial protection. The recommendations below relate to the indicator on coverage of interventions.  • Data would be drawn from and/or can build upon available health facility data and survey instruments, and should be disaggregated by sex, age, location, income quintile, race, ethnicity, disability and other characteristics to address equity gaps.  • The amendment proposed (United States) should be considered: Proportion of population covered by a package of essential health services. • In response to calls for greater specificity, the definition of the UHC indicator should include the following components, which should form part and parcel of any essential package of prevention and treatment services:  o Essential sexual and reproductive health services, namely the following 4 components, elements of which are already reflected in the grey indicator above: modern methods of contraception; maternal health services (including antenatal care, skilled attendance at birth, emergency obstetric care and post-partum care); treatment of complications of unsafe abortion and access to safe abortion services to the extent of the law; and prevention, diagnosis and treatment of sexually transmitted infections and HIV/AIDS (including ARV). These services are cross-cutting enablers for achievement of the SDGs, including poverty eradication, gender equality, school completion and economic growth. o Cancer prevention and screening, including the HPV vaccine (which should be considered part of essential sexual and reproductive health services as well as of immunization), early detection of breast and cervical cancer, and referrals for treatment. The HPV vaccine is a rare medical advancement to prevent cervical cancer, which kills 275,000 women every year, over 85% of them in the developing world.  o Mental health, an especially neglected health issue afflicting 1 in 4 people in their lifetime. An estimated 50-85% of people with mental illness receive no treatment, and suicide is the leading cause of death for adolescent girls worldwide.  o Immediate, first-line basic services to address intimate partner violence and sexual violence, especially relevant to UHC discussions given that victims/survivors need to make more frequent use of health services and experience more severe health and other consequences when access is lacking. Services include: treatment of injuries; post-rape care (including emergency contraception, post-exposure prophylaxis for HIV prevention, access to safe abortion to the extent of the law); psychosocial and mental health support; and forensic services. The provision of essential health services for survivors of violence against women and girls has also been agreed in various inter-governmental and technical fora.  Note that there is no indicator currently in the SDGs framework on the critical role of the health sector in responding to violence (an issue unaddressed by the health goal though necessary to achieve other violence-related targets, e.g. 5.2, 16.1 and 16.2). The above proposal would help ensure policy coherence in achieving SDGs implementation, including with the WHO `Global Action Plan on the health sector role in addressing interpersonal violence, especially violence against women and violence against children’ – to be formally adopted in 2016, with a timeline through 2030 aligned with the SDGs.   • Specific provisions for adolescents to be exempt from user fees for all health care in UHC schemes should be considered to ensure that they are not prevented or excluded from accessing key health services. When health insurance is tied to parents’ or husband’s coverage, adolescent girls and women in many settings will be deterred from using services in the absence of protections of their privacy and confidentiality. Monitoring of the UHC target should pay particular attention to adolescents’ service access and removal of such barriers for their health and well-being. |  |  |
| ILEP | For Indicator 3.8.1 ILEP recommends adding rehabilitation services to the list of tracer interventions. It would read as: Coverage of tracer interventions (e.g. child full immunization, ARV therapy, TB treatment, hypertension treatment, skilled attendant at birth, rehabilitation services, etc.) ILEP recommends adding disability disaggregation (The World Bank and WHO World Report on Disability clearly states that less access to health services leads to a much higher chance of catastrophic health expenditure) |  |  |
| International Agency for the Prevention of Blindness (IAPB) | IAPB supports to use 'coverage of tracer interventions' as indicator for target 3.8. and suggests to align with the list of "indicators, candidate and promising indicators" for health services published in the WHO/Worldbank first Global Monitoring Report on tracking Universal Health Coverage [June 2015]. | IAPB asks for disaggregation by the list of characteristics mentioned in 17.18 (income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other relevant characteristics), as persons with disabilities, poor and those in vulnerable situations are more likely to experience catastrophic out-of-pocket health expenditure. |  |
| International Association of Applied Psychology |  |  | I am suggesting this Indicator be replaced by Indicators relevant to the title of Goal #3 but does not have Indicators. The terms Mental Health and Well-Being do not have Indicators and they should. We are suggesting the Mental Health Indicators designed by the World Health Organization be incorporated into the Indicators of Goal #3. Specifically:(1) By 2030 80% of countries will have developed or updated their policies or plans for mental health in line with human rights instruments: (2) By 2030 80% of the counties will have at least two mental health promotion and prevention programs: (3) By 2030 80% of countries will be routinely collecting and reporting a set of mental health indicators. For Indicators of Well -Being we suggest using the UNDP Human Development Index, adjusted for per capita inequality -HD1. These indicators were developed by UN associated groups and will not require the collection of additional data. |
| International College of Surgeons | International College of Surgeons (ICS) We would like to suggest the following amendments to this indicator: 1) Removal of the term "ect." and inclusion of a complete list of tracer intervention including "basic and comprehensive surgical care, including caesarean section, laparotomy and open fracture, as well as blood banking (Source: WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators) As recognized by the World Health Organization during the 68th World Health Assembly, "emergency and essential surgical care and anesthesia" represent an integral component of universal health coverage (WHA Resolution 68.15). As such we strongly encourage the IAEG-SDGs to incorporate surgical and anesthesia care indicators as part of the SDGs particularly with regard to UHC target 3.8. | We encourage the IAEG-SDGs to consider including specific conditions that will be included under this indicator as part of UHC. As emergency and essential surgical care and anesthesia are recognized as an indispensable element of UHC, we recommend that catastrophic/impoverishing OOP expenditure should also include a focus on surgical care and anesthesia as well as other services recognized under the UHC umbrella. |  |
| International Council of AIDS Service Organizations | The current WHO recommendation for an indicator on coverage of key tracer interventions is not sufficient, as the tracer intervention for AIDS only includes ARV treatment. It should be the whole package of HIV services (prevention, treatment, care and support). Additionally, older persons must be included in overall health coverage. Excluding them is inhumane and indefensible. As a group, health costs increase as one ages. Ensuring broad universal health coverage equalizes costs across all members of a nation's society and improves access to heal-care for people of all ages. Healthy life expectancy measures quantity and quality of life and can be used to describe and monitor the health status of populations. HLE can be used to predict future health services needs, evaluating health programs, identifying trends and inequalities in accessing basic services | We would like to recommend the addition “including access to life-saving medicines” to reflect access, for example, to medicines including HIV medications. |  |
| International Movement ATD Fourth World | ATD Fourth World - Coverage of tracer interventions defined as: Antenatal care, 4 or more visits Skilled birth attendance Sick child with diarrhea receiving ORT / ORS Chronic condition treatment (arthritis, asthma, chronic respiratory disease, diabetes, HIV) Non-chronic condition treatment (cancer, tuberculosis) Affordable hospitalization Injury treatment In line with the proposal made by the US this indicator should include: % of population covered by a package of essential health services (measured through the tracer interventions proposed above) % of bottom two quintiles covered by such a package % of out of pocket spending on health in the country |  |  |
| International Planned Parenthood Federation | Indicator 3.8.1: Coverage of tracer interventions (e.g. child full immunization, ARV therapy, TB treatment, hypertension treatment, skilled attendance at birth, etc.) • Two indicators should be retained for this target to monitor UHC as currently proposed – on coverage of essential services for all and on financial protection. The comments below relate to the indicator on coverage of interventions. • The amendment proposed (United States) should be considered: “Proportion of population covered by a package of essential health services”. • In response to calls for greater specificity, the definition of the UHC indicator should include the following components which should form part and parcel of any essential package of prevention and treatment services: o Essential sexual and reproductive health services, namely the following 4 components, elements of which are already reflected in the grey indicator above: modern methods of contraception; maternal health services (including antenatal care, skilled attendance at birth, emergency obstetric care and post-partum care); treatment of complications of unsafe abortion and access to safe abortion services to the extent of the law; and prevention, diagnosis and treatment of sexually transmitted infections and HIV/AIDS (including ARV). These services are cross-cutting enablers for achievement of the SDGs, including poverty eradication, gender equality, school completion and economic growth. o Cancer screening, early detection and prevention, including the HPV vaccine, which should be considered part of essential sexual and reproductive health services as well as of child immunization (an element already reflected in the indicator), mammography, cervical cancer screening, and referrals for treatment. The HPV vaccine is an exceptional medical advancement to prevent cervical cancer, which kills 275,000 women every year, over 85% of them in the developing world. o Mental health, an especially neglected health issue afflicting 1 in 4 people in their lifetime. An estimated 50-85% of people with mental illness receive no treatment, and suicide is the leading cause of death for adolescent girls worldwide. |  |  |
| International Women's Health Coalition | IWHC: We propose a reworking of the indicator to ensure appropriate disaggregation and an elaboration of the basic package of interventions, as follows: 3.8.1 Percentage of population disaggregated by age, sex, gender, geographic location, income, disability, race and ethnicity, with access to essential quality basic health services including essential medicines and vaccines. The package should include at a minimum: essential sexual and reproductive health services (modern contraceptives, comprehensive maternity care, safe abortion services and post-abortion care, prevention and treatment of STIs, including HIV); cancer screening, treatment and prevention; mental health services; emergency services to respond to gender-based violence, including sexual violence; child full immunization; prevention, diagnosis and treatment of TB, malaria and hepatitis C; prevention and treatment of hypertension; palliative care and pain relief). | This should include expenditure for essential medicines and vaccines, as well as for services. |  |
| Ipas | Ipas- USA and Global The Essential Package of Health Services should include sexual and reproductive health services that cover the full range of evidence-based interventions for sexual, reproductive, maternal and neonatal health including: Provision of care for both unsafe and safe abortion, to the full extent the law permits, should be a part of any of maternal health services. Unsafe abortion is almost entirely preventable and remains a significant cause of maternal mortality that has been overlooked and underutilized in interventions to improve maternal health and prevent maternal deaths, as cited by the the Independent Experts Review Group iERG in their first year review of the Global Strategy for Women’s and Children’s health. The service package should also include provision of modern contraceptive methods; prevention, diagnosis and treatment of STIs and HIV/AIDS and services to address intimate partner and sexual violence. These services are essential for protecting both health AND human rights. Monitoring of the UHC target should pay particular attention to adolescents’ service access and removal of such barriers for their health and well-being., such as third-party consent requirements for contraceptive services, abortion, treatment of sexual violence or STIs. All essential services should be made available for adolescents and young women, without regard to age or marital status. |  |  |
| Ipas | The Essential Package of Health Services should include sexual and reproductive health services that cover the full range of evidence-based interventions for sexual, reproductive, maternal and neonatal health including: Provision of care for both unsafe and safe abortion, to the full extent the law permits, should be a part of any of maternal health services. Unsafe abortion is almost entirely preventable and remains a significant cause of maternal mortality that has been overlooked and underutilized in interventions to improve maternal health and prevent maternal deaths, as cited by the the Independent Experts Review Group iERG in their first year review of the Global Strategy for Women’s and Children’s health. The service package should also include provision of modern contraceptive methods; prevention, diagnosis and treatment of STIs and HIV/AIDS and services to address intimate partner and sexual violence. Monitoring of the UHC target should pay particular attention to adolescents’ service access and removal of such barriers for their health and well-being., such as requirements for third-party consent for contraceptive care or abortion. All essential services should be made available for adolescents and young women. These services are essential for protecting both health AND human rights. |  |  |
| Ipas | • In response to calls for greater specificity, the definition of the UHC indicator should include the following components, which should form part and parcel of any essential package of prevention and treatment services: o Essential sexual and reproductive health services, namely the following 4 components, elements of which are already reflected in the grey indicator above: modern methods of contraception; maternal health services (including antenatal care, skilled attendance at birth, emergency obstetric care and post-partum care); treatment of complications of unsafe abortion and access to safe abortion services to the extent of the law; and prevention, diagnosis and treatment of sexually transmitted infections and HIV/AIDS (including ARV). These services are cross-cutting enablers for achievement of the SDGs, including poverty eradication, gender equality, school completion and economic growth. o Immediate, first-line basic services to address intimate partner violence and sexual violence, especially relevant to UHC discussions given that victims/survivors need to make more frequent use of health services and experience more severe health and other consequences when access is lacking. Services include: treatment of injuries; post-rape care (including emergency contraception, post-exposure prophylaxis for HIV prevention, access to safe abortion to the extent of the law); psychosocial and mental health support; and forensic services. The provision of essential health services for survivors of violence against women and girls has also been agreed in various inter-governmental and technical fora. Note that there is no indicator currently in the SDGs framework on the critical role of the health sector in responding to violence (an issue unaddressed by the health goal though necessary to achieve other violence-related targets, e.g. 5.2, 16.1 and 16.2). The above proposal would help ensure policy coherence in achieving SDGs implementation, including with the WHO `Global Action Plan on the health sector role in addressing interpersonal violence, especially violence against women and violence against children’ – to be formally adopted in 2016, with a timeline through 2030 aligned with the SDGs. |  |  |
| Irish Family Planning Association | Comment by the Irish Family Planning Association: Two indicators should be retained for this target to monitor UHC as currently proposed – on coverage of essential services for all and on financial protection. The comments below relate to the indicator on coverage of interventions. • In response to calls for greater specificity, the definition of the UHC indicator should include the following components which should form part and parcel of any essential package of prevention and treatment services: ü Essential sexual and reproductive health services, namely the following three components, elements of which are already reflected in the grey indicator above: modern methods of contraception; maternal health services (including antenatal care, skilled attendance at birth, emergency obstetric care and post-partum care); treatment of complications of unsafe abortion and access to safe abortion services to the extent of the law; and prevention, diagnosis and treatment of sexually transmitted infections and HIV/AIDS (including ARV). These services are cross-cutting enablers for achievement of the SDGs, including poverty eradication, gender equality, school completion and economic growth. ü The HPV vaccine, which should be considered part of essential sexual and reproductive health services as well as of child immunization (an element already reflected in the indicator). The HPV vaccines is an exceptional medical advancement to prevent cervical cancer, which kills 275,000 women every year, over 85% of them in the developing world. ü Mental health, an especially neglected health issue afflicting 1 in 4 people in their lifetime. An estimated 50-85% of people with mental illness receive no treatment, and suicide is the leading cause of death for adolescent girls worldwide. |  |  |
| Jhpiego | Jhpiego: The WHA resolution 68.15 which was approved in May 2015 and which received an outpouring of support from Member States, recognizes the critical role of emergency and essential surgery and anaesthesia care as part of the delivery of Universal Health Coverage (UHC). In reference to Target 3.8, Jhpiego is strongly supportive of the inclusion of surgical and anaesthesia care indicators. According to a recent report by the Lancet Commission on Global Surgery, surgical conditions represent as much as one third (1/3) of the global burden of disease. Without safe, affordable access to life saving and disability-preventing surgical care, we will not be able to achieve UHC. Specific recommendation for the indicators for UHC target 3.8: 1) Include of a complete list of UHC tracer interventions including access to emergency and essential surgical care and anaesthesia, as well as blood transfusion. In addition to these tracer interventions, we are also supportive of the following indicator recommendations: 1) Percentage (%) of population covered by a package of essential health services including emergency and essential surgical care and anaesthesia. 2) Health worker density and distribution as an additional measure of UHC. We also encourage the IAEG-SDGs to consider including disaggregation of providers by cadre including: Generalist medical practitioners, specialist medical practitioners (surgeons, anaesthetists, obstetricians, emergency medicine specialists, gynaecologists etc,), as well as nursing and midwifery professionals. | Financial risk protection represents an important component of UHC and we commend the IAEG-SDGs for including this indicator. We would suggest that this indicator include a robust definition of "universal health coverage" to ensure that populations are protected against catastrophic and impoverishing expenditure from seeking essential health services, including surgical and anaesthesia care. |  |
| Korean American Medical Association | Korean American Medical Association recommends inclusion the of additional tracer interventions included in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators including: Basic and comprehensive surgical care, including caesarean section, laparotomy and open fracture Blood transfusion Inclusion of an indicator to measure the percentage (%) of population covered by a package of essential health services (including safe surgical care and anaesthesia, which is recognized as a core component of UHC as per WHA resolution 68.15) Support inclusion of Health worker density and distribution as an additional indicator to measure UHC, including disaggregation of providers as suggested in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators: By cadre, including generalist medical practitioners, specialist medical practitioners (surgeons, anaesthetists, obstetricians, emergency medicine specialists, cardiologists, paediatricians, psychiatrists, ophthalmologists, gynaecologists, etc.), nursing and midwifery professionals, traditional and complementary medicine professionals, among others. Support inclusion of a UHC indicator to track the fraction of the population protected against catastrophic and impoverishing expenditure from out-of-pocket payments for essential health services, including surgical and anaesthesia care. |  |  |
| Kupona Foundation | In addition to the proposed tracer interventions for measurement of UHC Target 3.8, we support the inclusion of the additional tracer interventions included in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators including: > Basic and comprehensive surgical care, including caesarean section, laparotomy and open fracture > Blood transfusion We also support inclusion of 'Health Worker Density and Distribution' as an additional indicator to measure UHC, including disaggregation of providers as suggested in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators: > By cadre, including generalist medical practitioners, specialist medical practitioners (surgeons, anaesthetists, obstetricians, emergency medicine specialists, cardiologists, paediatricians, psychiatrists, ophthalmologists, gynaecologists, etc.), nursing and midwifery professionals, traditional and complementary medicine professionals, among others. | We support inclusion of an indicator to measure the percentage (%) of population covered by a package of essential health services (including safe surgical care and anaesthesia, which is recognized as a core component of UHC as per WHA resolution 68.15) We support inclusion of a UHC indicator to track the fraction of the population protected against catastrophic and impoverishing expenditure from out-of-pocket payments for essential health services, including surgical and anaesthesia care. |  |
| Lifebox Foundation | Lifebox Foundation: Following WHA resolution 68.15 - which received unanimous support from 194 WHO member states - it has been accepted that emergency and essential surgical care and anaesthesia represent an integral component of Universal Health Coverage (UHC). In reference to Target 3.8, we support inclusion of indicators to reflect the essential role of surgical care and anaesthesia as part of UHC. Specifically, in addition to the proposed tracer interventions listed above, we suggest the removal of "etc." and the inclusion of a complete list of tracer interventions. We strongly encourage the IAEG-SDGs to consider the inclusion of the full list of tracer interventions proposed in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators for service-specific availability and readiness, including: • Basic and comprehensive surgical care, including caesarean section, laparotomy and open fracture • Blood transfusion In addition to these tracer interventions, we would encourage the IAEG to consider these recommendations made by member state representatives: 1) Percentage (%) of population covered by a package of essential health services (USA): We recommend that this indicator should also include safe surgical care and anaesthesia, which is recognized as a core component of UHC as per WHA resolution 68.15. 2) Health worker density and distribution (Canada): We recommend the consideration of this indicator as an additional measure of UHC. We also encourage the IAEG-SDGs to consider including disaggregation of providers by cadre as suggested in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators. To ensure accurate reporting of health worker density and distribution, provider categories should reflect: Generalist medical practitioners, specialist medical practitioners (surgeons, anaesthetists,obstetricians, emergency medicine specialists, gynaecologists etc.), as well as nursing and midwifery professionals. | Lifebox Foundation: Financial risk protection represents an important component of UHC and we commend the IAEG-SDGs for including this indicator. We would suggest that this indicator include a robust definition of "universal health coverage" to ensure that populations are protected against catastrophic and impoverishing expenditure from seeking essential health services, including surgical and anaesthesia care. \*Indicator 3.8.2: Fraction of the population protected against catastrophic/impoverishing out-of- pocket health expenditure\* Financial risk protection represents an important component of UHC and we commend the IAEGSDGs for including this indicator. We would suggest that this indicator include a robust definition of "universal health coverage" to ensure that populations are protected against catastrophic and impoverishing expenditure from seeking essential health services, including surgical and anaesthesia care. |  |
| LIGHT FOR THE WORLD | LIGHT FOR THE WORLD recommends adding rehabilitation services to the list of tracer interventions for indicator 3.8.1 The indicator would read as: Coverage of tracer interventions (e.g. child full immunization, ARV therapy, TB treatment, hypertension treatment, skilled attendant at birth, rehabilitation services, etc.) | LIGHT FOR THE WORLD recommends to add disability disaggregation to indicator 3.8.2. The 2011 World Report on Disability clearly states that poor access to health services leads to a much higher chance of people to catastrophic health expenditure. |  |
| Marie Stopes International | Recommendation to include: contraceptives to trace efficiency of the supply chain |  |  |
| Marie Stopes International | Recommendation to include: contraceptives to trace efficiency of the supply chain |  |  |
| Mercy Ships | Mercy Ships, a organizations that has been providing services to the neglected surgical patient for over 35 years is strongly supportive of the inclusion of robust and specific indicators to track UHC Target 3.8. Per the recent WHA resolution 68.15, which received unanimous support from 194 WHO member states, emergency and essential surgical care and anaesthesia represent an integral component of Universal Health Coverage (UHC). In reference to Target 3.8, we support inclusion of indicators to reflect the essential role of surgical care and anaesthesia as part of UHC. Specifically, in addition to the proposed tracer interventions listed above, we suggest the removal of "etc." and the inclusion of a complete list of tracer interventions. We strongly encourage the IAEG-SDGs to consider the inclusion of the full list of tracer interventions proposed in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators for service-specific availability and readiness including: •Basic and comprehensive surgical care, including caesarean section, laparotomy and open fracture •Blood transfusion In addition to these tracer interventions, we would encourage the IAEG to consider the recommendations made by member state representatives: 1) Percentage (%) of population covered by a package of essential health services (USA): We recommend that this indicator should also include safe surgical care and anaesthesia, which is recognized as a core component of UHC as per WHA resolution 68.15. 2) Health worker density and distribution (Canada): We recommend the consideration of this indicator as an additional measure of UHC. We also encourage the IAEG-SDGs to consider including disaggregation of providers by cadre as suggested in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators. To ensure accurate reporting of health worker density and distribution, provider categories should reflect: Generalist medical practitioners, specialist medical practitioners (surgeons, anaesthetists, obstetricians, emergency medicine specialists, gynaecologists etc,), as well as nursing and midwifery professionals. | Mercy Ships feels financial risk protection represents an important component of UHC and we commend the IAEG-SDGs for including this indicator. We would suggest that this indicator include a robust definition of "universal health coverage" to ensure that populations are protected against catastrophic and impoverishing expenditure from seeking essential health services, including surgical and anaesthesia care. |  |
| Nagorik Uddyog |  | Percentage of the population, especially from marginalized, vulnerable and excluded communities, protected against catastrophic/impoverishing out of pocket health expenditure. |  |
| Navsarjan Trust |  | Navsarjan Trust Percentage of the population, especially from marginalized, vulnerable and excluded communities, protected against catastrophic/impoverishing out of pocket health expenditure. |  |
| Navsarjan Trust | Navsarjan Trust - inclusion of maternal health |  | Navsarjan Trust - inclusion of hazardous work |
| NCD Alliance | The NCD Alliance strongly supports this indicator and encourages the IAEG-SDGs to provide greater specificity in regards to the list of potential tracer interventions. The 2015 Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators includes approximately 60 indicators that are widely accepted indicators of intervention coverage and risk factor prevalence, and could serve as a point of reference. Common tracer interventions will facilitate global monitoring of progress towards achieving and implementation of UHC. To measure coverage, data should be drawn from and/or can build upon available health facility data and survey instruments, and should be disaggregated by sex, age, location, income quintile, disability and other characteristics to address equity gaps. In response to calls for greater specificity, the tracer interventions should include the following components, which should form part and parcel of any essential package of prevention and treatment services: o Essential sexual and reproductive health services, namely the following four components, elements of which are already reflected in the indicator currently marked grey: modern methods of contraception; maternal health services (including antenatal care, skilled attendance at birth, emergency obstetric care and post-partum care); treatment of complications of unsafe abortion and access to safe abortion services to the extent of the law; and prevention, diagnosis and treatment of sexually transmitted infections and HIV/AIDS (including ARV). These services are cross-cutting enablers for achievement of the SDGs, including poverty eradication, gender equality, school completion and economic growth. o Universally applicable vaccine indicator, Reach and sustain 90% national coverage and 80% in every district with all vaccines in national programmes. Immunization rates have previously been established as a key indicator of the strength of a country’s health system, combining a diverse set of core competencies, including logistics systems to transport vaccines safely to clinics where they are needed, budgeting funds for immunization programs, training health workers to target hard-to-reach and under-immunized populations and executing disease surveillance. o Trained birth attendants are an equally critical linchpin for both maternal and newborn survival. The probability of maternal deaths decreases with increasing coverage by skilled attendants, while quality care by trained attendants in the hours preceding and after childbirth is key to eliminating preventable newborn deaths. Four of 5 newborn deaths result from three preventable or treatable conditions by skilled workers: (1) complications from prematurity and low birth weight; (2) complications during childbirth (including birth asphyxia); and (3) infection. o Cancer prevention and screening, including HPV vaccination , which should be considered part of essential sexual and reproductive health services as well as of immunization (as included above), HBV vaccination, and early detection of breast and cervical cancer, and appropriate referral for treatment. o Mental health, an especially neglected health issue afflicting one in four people in their lifetime. An estimated 50-85% of people with mental illness receive no treatment, and suicide is the leading cause of death for adolescent girls worldwide. The inclusion of suicide mortality as an indicator for Target 3.4 is an important step towards monitoring and evaluating the mental health of populations, and mental health care should be included as part of an essential package of UHC services. o Coverage of Rehabilitation Services, defined within the package of essential services is a vital step within the care continuum and not reflected in standard tracer indicators. The WHO Disability Action Plan 2014-21 is a blueprint for UHC and contains a number of possible indicators including rehabilitation policy, health workforce and service indicators. o Access to Palliative Care. Studies show that mean availability of essential NCD medicines in many low- and middle-income countries is very low; in the public sector, availability for NCDs was 36% compared to 54% for acute diseases. WHO estimates there are approximately 5.5 billion people living with little or no access to adequate pain treatment. | The NCD Alliance supports this indicator, as many people living with NCDs are driven into chronic poverty by direct or out-of-pocket payments for health care costs. Three essential elements to improving financial risk protection are: expansion of prepayment and risk pooling over time to cover everyone, elimination of out-of-pocket expenses at the point of service delivery for the poor for high-value health interventions, and provision of a more comprehensive benefit package as resources grow. Prepayment and risk sharing through tax-based or obligatory health insurance are the most efficient and equitable ways to increase population coverage and promote equity simultaneously. The United Nations General Assembly resolution on global health and foreign policy (A/67/L.36) urged leaders to ensure access to quality health care without financial hardship. The UN resolution calls on Member States “to value the contribution of universal health coverage to achieving all interrelated Millennium Development Goals, with the ultimate outcome of more healthy lives, particularly for women and children.” The resolution also calls on MS to develop health-financing systems that are inclusive, nondiscriminatory, and tailored to their particular country contexts. With regard to the amendment proposed by the United States “proportion of population covered by a package of essential health services,” there is a potential for the definition of ‘proportion of population’ to not reflect marginalized populations, having broad implications for equity of availability of and access to services. | The NCD Alliance supports this indicator, as well as Indicator 3.9.1 "Mortality rate attributed to household and ambient air pollution." |
| Netherlands Society for International Surgery | Matthijs Botman Netherlands Society for International Surgery Netherlands Per the recent WHA resolution 68.15, which received unanimous support from194 WHO member states, emergency and essential surgical care and anaesthesia represent an integral component of Universal Health Coverage (UHC). SDG Target 3.8 specifically focuses on achieving UHC including financial risk protection and access to quality essential health-care services. In reference to Target 3.8, we support inclusion of indicators to reflect the essential role of surgical care and anaesthesia as part of UHC. Specific recommendations include: 1) Tracer Interventions In addition to the proposed tracer interventions for measurement of UHC Target 3.8, we support inclusion the of the full list of tracer interventions included in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators service-specific availability and readiness indicator including: • Basic and comprehensive surgical care, including caesarean section, laparotomy and open fracture • Blood transfusion 2) Essential Health Services Inclusion of an indicator to measure the Percentage (%) of population covered by a package of essential health services (including safe surgical care and anaesthesia, which is recognized as a core component of UHC as per WHA resolution 68.15) 3) Health Workforce Inclusion of Health worker density and distribution as an additional indicator to measure UHC, including disaggregation of providers as suggested in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators by cadre, including generalist medical practitioners, specialist medical practitioners (surgeons, anaesthetists, obstetricians, emergency medicine specialists,, gynaecologists etc,) nursing and midwifery professionals, among others 4) Protection from Financial Impoverishment Support inclusion of a UHC indicator to track the fraction of the population protected against catastrophic and impoverishing expenditure from out-of-pocket payments for essential health services, including surgical and anaesthesia care. |  |  |
| Netherlands Society for International Surgery | Netherlands Society for International Surgery: Per the recent WHA resolution 68.15, which received unanimous support from194 WHO member states, emergency and essential surgical care and anaesthesia represent an integral component of Universal Health Coverage (UHC). SDG Target 3.8 specifically focuses on achieving UHC including financial risk protection and access to quality essential health-care services. In reference to Target 3.8, we support inclusion of indicators to reflect the essential role of surgical care and anaesthesia as part of UHC. Specific recommendations include: 1) Tracer Interventions In addition to the proposed tracer interventions for measurement of UHC Target 3.8, we support inclusion the of the full list of tracer interventions included in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators service-specific availability and readiness indicator including: • Basic and comprehensive surgical care, including caesarean section, laparotomy and open fracture • Blood transfusion 2) Essential Health Services Inclusion of an indicator to measure the Percentage (%) of population covered by a package of essential health services (including safe surgical care and anaesthesia, which is recognized as a core component of UHC as per WHA resolution 68.15) 3) Health Workforce Inclusion of Health worker density and distribution as an additional indicator to measure UHC, including disaggregation of providers as suggested in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators by cadre, including generalist medical practitioners, specialist medical practitioners (surgeons, anaesthetists, obstetricians, emergency medicine specialists,, gynaecologists etc,) nursing and midwifery professionals, among others 4) Protection from Financial Impoverishment Support inclusion of a UHC indicator to track the fraction of the population protected against catastrophic and impoverishing expenditure from out-of-pocket payments for essential health services, including surgical and anaesthesia care. |  |  |
| NIGERIAN SOCIETY OF ANAESTHETISTS | Basic and comprehensive surgical care, including caesarean section, laparotomy and open fracture Blood transfusion Support inclusion of an indicator to measure the percentage (%) of population covered by a package of essential health services (including safe surgical care and anaesthesia, which is recognized as a core component of UHC as per WHA resolution 68.15) 3) Support inclusion of Health worker density and distribution as an additional indicator to measure UHC, including disaggregation of providers as suggested in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators: By cadre, including generalist medical practitioners, specialist medical practitioners (surgeons, anaesthetists, obstetricians, emergency medicine specialists, cardiologists, paediatricians, psychiatrists, ophthalmologists, gynaecologists, etc.), nursing and midwifery professionals, traditional and complementary medicine professionals, among others. | Support inclusion of a UHC indicator to track the fraction of the population protected against catastrophic and impoverishing expenditure from out-of-pocket payments for essential health services, including surgical and anaesthesia care. |  |
| Operation Smile | Availability of safe, well timed, and effective surgery should be considered from the patients perspective using patient reported outcomes. |  |  |
| P&D Factor | • Two indicators should be retained for this target to monitor UHC as currently proposed – on coverage of essential services for all and on financial protection. The recommendations below relate to the indicator on coverage of interventions. • Data would be drawn from and/or can build upon available health facility data and survey instruments, and should be disaggregated by sex, age, location, income quintile, disability and other characteristics to address equity gaps. • The amendment proposed (United States) should be considered: Proportion of population covered by a package of essential health services. • In response to calls for greater specificity, the definition of the UHC indicator should include the following components, which should form part and parcel of any essential package of prevention and treatment services: o Essential sexual and reproductive health services, namely the following 4 components, elements of which are already reflected in the grey indicator above: modern methods of contraception; maternal health services (including antenatal care, skilled attendance at birth, emergency obstetric care and post-partum care); treatment of complications of unsafe abortion and access to safe abortion services to the extent of the law; and prevention, diagnosis and treatment of sexually transmitted infections and HIV/AIDS (including ARV). These services are cross-cutting enablers for achievement of the SDGs, including poverty eradication, gender equality, school completion and economic growth. o Cancer prevention and screening, including the HPV vaccine (which should be considered part of essential sexual and reproductive health services as well as of immunization), mammography, cervical cancer screening, and referrals for treatment. The HPV vaccine is a rare medical advancement to prevent cervical cancer, which kills 275,000 women every year, over 85% of them in the developing world. o Mental health, an especially neglected health issue afflicting 1 in 4 people in their lifetime. An estimated 50-85% of people with mental illness receive no treatment, and suicide is the leading cause of death for adolescent girls worldwide. o Immediate, first-line basic services to address intimate partner violence and sexual violence, especially relevant to UHC discussions given that victims/survivors need to make more frequent use of health services and experience more severe health and other consequences when access is lacking. Services include: treatment of injuries; post-rape care (including emergency contraception, post-exposure prophylaxis for HIV prevention, access to safe abortion to the extent of the law); psychosocial and mental health support; and forensic services. The provision of essential health services for survivors of violence against women and girls has also been agreed in various inter-governmental and technical fora. Note that there is no indicator currently in the SDGs framework on the critical role of the health sector in responding to violence (an issue unaddressed by the health goal though necessary to achieve other violence-related targets, e.g. 5.2, 16.1 and 16.2). The above proposal would help ensure policy coherence in achieving SDGs implementation, including with the WHO `Global Action Plan on the health sector role in addressing interpersonal violence, especially violence against women and violence against children’ – to be formally adopted in 2016, with a timeline through 2030 aligned with the SDGs. • Specific provisions for adolescents to be exempt from user fees for all health care in UHC schemes should be considered to ensure that they are not prevented or excluded from accessing key health services. When health insurance is tied to parents’ or husband’s coverage, adolescent girls and women in many settings will be deterred from using services in the absence of protections of their privacy and confidentiality. Monitoring of the UHC target should pay particular attention to adolescents’ service access and removal of such barriers for their health and well-being. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Data on the proportion of adolescent girls 9-15 years who have received the recommended number of doses of the HPV vaccine is compiled from national Ministries of Health at global level annually from all Member States by the WHO-UNICEF immunization monitoring system. See also the WHO Clinical and Policy Guidelines: Responding to intimate partner violence and sexual violence against women, http://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/publications/violence/9789241548595/en/; and the UN Women/UNFPA Global Joint Programme on Essential Services for Women and Girls Subject to Violence—both of which define essential services for the health sector, among other sectors (e.g. justice, police, social services, etc.): http://www.unwomen.org/~/media/headquarters/attachments/sections/library/publications/2014/brief-essential%20services-web.pdf Note the WHO MNCHA survey includes a question on whether “all adolescents (15-19) are exempt from user fees from all health care”. See: http://www.who.int/maternal\_child\_adolescent/documents/countries/indicators/7\_note\_mncah\_policy\_indicator\_survey\_indicators\_in\_dashb.pdf?ua=1 Waddington, Catriona and Claudia Sambo (2014) Financing health care for adolescents: a necessary part of universal health coverage: World Health Organization: http://www.who.int/bulletin/volumes/93/1/14-139741/en/ |  |  |
| PAI | PAI, USA: Indicator should be expanded to: 3.8.1 Percentage of population disaggregated by age, sex, gender, geographic location, income, disability, race and ethnicity, with access to essential quality basic health services including essential medicines and vaccines. The package should include at a minimum: essential sexual and reproductive health services (modern contraceptives, comprehensive maternity care, safe abortion services and post-abortion care, prevention and treatment of STIs, including HIV); cancer screening, treatment and prevention; mental health services; emergency services to respond to gender-based violence, including sexual violence; child full immunization; prevention, diagnosis and treatment of TB, malaria and hepatitis C; prevention and treatment of hypertension; palliative care and pain relief). the definition of the UHC indicator should include the following components, which should form part and parcel of any essential package of prevention and treatment services: o Essential sexual and reproductive health services, namely the following 4 components: modern methods of contraception; maternal health services (including antenatal care, skilled attendance at birth, emergency obstetric care and post-partum care); treatment of complications of unsafe abortion and access to safe abortion services to the extent of the law; and prevention, diagnosis and treatment of sexually transmitted infections and HIV/AIDS (including ARV). These services are cross-cutting enablers for achievement of the SDGs, including poverty eradication, gender equality, school completion and economic growth. o Cancer prevention and screening, including the HPV vaccine (which should be considered part of essential sexual and reproductive health services as well as of immunization), mammography, cervical cancer screening, and referrals for treatment. The HPV vaccine is a rare medical advancement to prevent cervical cancer, which kills 275,000 women every year, over 85% of them in the developing world. o Mental health, an especially neglected health issue afflicting 1 in 4 people in their lifetime. An estimated 50-85% of people with mental illness receive no treatment, and suicide is the leading cause of death for adolescent girls worldwide. o Immediate, first-line basic services to address intimate partner violence and sexual violence, especially relevant to UHC discussions given that victims/survivors need to make more frequent use of health services and experience more severe health and other consequences when access is lacking. Services include: treatment of injuries; post-rape care (including emergency contraception, post-exposure prophylaxis for HIV prevention, access to safe abortion to the extent of the law); psychosocial and mental health support; and forensic services. The provision of essential health services for survivors of violence against women and girls has also been agreed in various inter-governmental and technical fora. | PAI, USA: Change in3.8.2 Fraction of the population protected against catastrophic/impoverishing out­ of­ pocket health expenditure, including spending on life-saving medicines. Add “including spending on life-saving medicines” to the original to reflect access, for example, to HIV medications. |  |
| Pathfinder's Outreach Ministry (POM) | Ghana 90% increase in Coverage of tracer interventions (e.g. child full immunization, ARV therapy, TB treatment, hypertension treatment, skilled attendant at birth, etc.) | Ghana 30% of the population protected against catastrophic/impoverishing out-of-pocket health expenditure | Ghana 60% decrease in mortality rate attributed to "hazardous chemicals, water and soil pollution and contamination" |
| Plan International | Plan International Comments: - RECOMMENDED INDICATOR: 3.8.1 Coverage of tracer interventions (e.g. child full immunization, ARV therapy, TB treatment, hypertension treatment, skilled attendant at birth, etc.) - RATIONALE: As a result of gender inequalities in resources, capabilities, and rights, girls and women often lack equal access to health services. Gendered barriers to healthcare include accessibility (particularly in distance or travel to health facilities), gender-sensitive availability of skilled healthcare service providers, medicines, or education, and affordability (including both the direct costs of seeking treatment and the indirect costs, such as transportation or time costs). - DISAGGREGATIONS: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) - DATA SOURCE: Household surveys and facility data - ENTITY RESPONSIBLE: 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 |  | \*\* COMMENTS APPLY TO 3.9.1 \*\* Plan International Comments: - RECOMMENDED INDICATOR: 3.9.1 Number of illnesses and premature deaths attributable to ambient and household air pollution - RATIONALE: 4.3 million people die prematurely each year from exposure to household air pollution. Girls and women are disproportionately impacted by health issues stemming from the use of inefficient cookstoves and fuels, such as emphysema, cataracts, cancer, and heart disease. - DISAGGREGATIONS:Disaggregations: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) - DATA SOURCE: WHO, already measured in Burden of Disease - ENTITY RESPONSIBLE: WHO - TIER: I |
| PNG Education Advocacy Network | PNG Education Advocacy Network agreed that these indicators are specific and therefore must remain as they are. |  |  |
| Practical Action | Practical Action, along with other civil society agencies such as WaterAid, strongly recommends that tracer interventions for UHC must include the following, and these should be explicitly stated within the document endorsed by the UN statistical commission in March 2016: “Percentage of health care facilities with safely managed water, sanitation and hygiene.” Similarly, we believe that UHC cannot be achieved without access to reliable electricity, whether from grid or off-grid sources. |  | Practical Action recommends that, building on WHO recommendations, this should include a measure of air pollution for all populations - with a measure of deaths from air pollution, and measures of air quality (population exposed to indoor and outdoor air pollution levels (PM10 and PM2.5) above WHO guideline levels. This is crucial in recognition of the enormous burden of disease attributable to indoor and outdoor air pollution. |
| Preah Kossamak Hospital | Surgeons from Cambodia recommend inclusion of the following tracers: Basic and comprehensive surgical care, including caesarean section, laparotomy and open fracture Blood transfusion Support inclusion of an indicator to measure the percentage (%) of population covered by a package of essential health services (including safe surgical care and anaesthesia, which is recognized as a core component of UHC as per WHA resolution 68.15) Support inclusion of Health worker density and distribution as an additional indicator to measure UHC, including disaggregation of providers as suggested in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators: By cadre, including generalist medical practitioners, specialist medical practitioners (surgeons, anaesthetists, obstetricians, emergency medicine specialists, cardiologists, paediatricians, psychiatrists, ophthalmologists, gynaecologists, etc.), nursing and midwifery professionals, traditional and complementary medicine professionals, among others. | Surgeons from Cambodia recommend a UHC indicator to track the fraction of the population protected against catastrophic and impoverishing expenditure from out-of-pocket payments for essential health services, including surgical and anaesthesia care |  |
| Public Services International |  |  | Public Services International Suggested indicator: 3.9.2b Mortality due to occupational exposure to hazardous chemicals References: ILO List of occupational diseases (revised 2010): 1.Occupational diseases caused by exposure to agents arising from work activities; Diseases 1.1.1 to 1.1.41; Diseases caused by chemical agents (see http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed\_protect/---protrav/---safework/documents/publication/wcms\_125137.pdf) Sources: Household surveys; labour inspectorates; cancer registries; chemical industry records; records of industries that utilize hazardous chemicals; administrative records. |
| ReAct - Action on Antibiotic Resistance | ReAct – Action on Antibiotic Resistance comments the wording of the indicator for the Target 3.8.1. Indicator 3.8.1: Coverage of tracer interventions (e.g. child full immunization, ARV therapy, TB treatment, ADD [rational use of antibiotics], hypertension treatment, skilled attendant at birth, etc.) The underlying dimension of an access to affordable essential medicines, especially in certain pharmacological groups such as those bearing antimicrobial features, is their effectiveness. Committed to address growing issue of antimicrobial resistance in the Outcome Document of SDGs, it is essential, sustainability-wise, for Member States to establish relevant national policies. These policies need to both enable action on antimicrobial resistance resulting in conservation of effectiveness of antibiotics as well as establish surveillance infrastructure supporting actual reporting on the indicator. We suggest adding the words RATIONAL USE OF ANTIBIOTICS to this indicator implying the need for recognition of the critically steep increase in development of antimicrobial resistance globally, which dramatically lowers the effectiveness of essential antimicrobial medicines in return. If not controlled, AMR threatens the viability of global health programs to reduce the burden of malaria, TB, HIV or other infectious and viral diseases, as well as to endanger the concept of universal health coverage. This global health security threat can make numerous SDGs, including target 3.8, impossible to achieve, while it can additionally undo the progress gained while working toward the MDGs. Simultaneously, we suggest this wording amendment in recognition of the need for lasting high-level political leadership through inter-agency and inter-governmental synergistic action, both technical and financial, aligned around Global Action Plan on Antimicrobial Resistance, adopted at the 68th World Health Assembly in May 2015, through which reporting on the indicator can be conducted as well. |  |  |
| RESULTS UK | Vaccination coverage is an essential indicator to whether a health system is functioning. Without trained health workers, the infrastructure for vaccine cold chain (importantly in the hardest to reach areas), sustainable government procurement procedures, coordination of health service policies and policies which support finance for health vaccinations would not be possible. These are all functions which impact on the wider health service and therefore vaccine coverage rates are often an indicator of how well the health system is functioning, from Government level right down to health services in the most rural areas. These systems can then be utilised for other health interventions, but are unlikely to exist without a strong focus on vaccines. Data collection and disaggregation is required to see equitable access to vaccines, and understand where more targeted interventions are needed. It is important that any indicator has disaggregated data as a sub-indicator. Countries already report annually on their immunisation rates and therefore there is no need to create a whole new reporting system. Immunisations avert millions of death every year. Good immunisation coverage is a sign of a good health and is an essential part of the journey to UHC. Therefore, an indicator of routine immunisation (DTP3 coverage) is imperative. |  |  |
| ReSurge | ReSurge/United States. Education for and provision of basic surgical and anesthetic care is a foundation of health and well-being. For instance, cesarian sections, the most common procedure in developing countries, requires "skilled attendants at birth." These include both surgical and anesthetic care givers. Basic surgical and anesthesia care should be considered in the promotion and well-being for all at all ages. |  |  |
| ReSurge International | USA ReSurge International Access to safe surgical care begins with a safe anesthetic. Training of anesthesia care providers, equipping them, and keeping them supplied with the consumables required for patient care should be a high priority. |  |  |
| Resurge International | Please include the right to high quality surgical and anaesthetic care. |  |  |
| ReSurge International | ReSurge International, a founding member of the G4 Alliance (a coalition of 60+ global organizations united in their commitment to advocating for the neglected surgical patient) is supportive of the inclusion of robust and specific indicators to track UHC Target 3.8. Per the recent WHA resolution 68.15, which received unanimous support from 194 WHO member states, emergency and essential surgical care and anaesthesia represent an integral component of Universal Health Coverage (UHC). In reference to Target 3.8, we support inclusion of indicators to reflect the essential role of surgical care and anesthesia as part of UHC. Specifically, in addition to the proposed tracer interventions listed above, we suggest the removal of "etc." and the inclusion of a complete list of tracer interventions. We strongly encourage the IAEG-SDGs to consider the inclusion of the full list of tracer interventions proposed in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators for service-specific availability and readiness including: •Basic and comprehensive surgical care, including caesarean section, laparotomy and open fracture •Blood transfusion In addition to these tracer interventions, we would encourage the IAEG to consider the recommendations made by member state representatives: 1) Percentage (%) of population covered by a package of essential health services (USA): We recommend that this indicator should also include safe surgical care and anaesthesia, which is recognized as a core component of UHC as per WHA resolution 68.15. 2) Health worker density and distribution (Canada): We recommend the consideration of this indicator as an additional measure of UHC. We also encourage the IAEG-SDGs to consider including disaggregation of providers by cadre as suggested in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators. To ensure accurate reporting of health worker density and distribution, provider categories should reflect: Generalist medical practitioners, specialist medical practitioners (surgeons, reconstructive surgeons, anesthetists, obstetricians, emergency medicine specialists, gynecologists etc,), as well as nursing and midwifery professionals. | ReSurge International: Financial risk protection represents an important component of UHC and we commend the IAEGSDGs for including this indicator. ReSurge would suggest that this indicator include a robust definition of "universal health coverage" to ensure that populations are protected against catastrophic and impoverishing expenditure from seeking essential health services, including surgical and anesthesia care. Indicator 3.8.2: Fraction of the population protected against catastrophic/impoverishing out-of-pocket health expenditure Financial risk protection represents an important component of UHC and we commend the IAEGSDGs for including this indicator. We would suggest that this indicator include a robust definition of "universal health coverage" to ensure that populations are protected against catastrophic and impoverishing expenditure from seeking essential health services, including surgical and anesthesia care. |  |
| RFSU | RFSU, Sweden comments: - Retain two indicators for this target to monitor UHC as proposed – on coverage of essential services for all and on financial protection. - Data should be drawn from and/or can build upon available health facility data and survey instruments, and should be disaggregated by sex, age, location, income quintile, disability and other characteristics to address equity gaps. The definition of the UHC indicator should include the following components and form part of the essential package of prevention and treatment services: - Essential sexual and reproductive health services, modern methods of contraception; maternal health services (including antenatal care, skilled attendance at birth, emergency obstetric care and post-partum care); treatment of complications of unsafe abortion and access to safe abortion services to the extent of the law; and prevention, diagnosis and treatment of sexually transmitted infections and HIV/AIDS (including ARV). These services are cross-cutting enablers for achievement of the SDGs, including poverty eradication, gender equality, school completion and economic growth. - The HPV vaccine, should be part of essential sexual and reproductive health services as well as of child immunization, since the vaccine is an effective medical advancement to prevent cervical cancer, which kills 275,000 women every year, over 85% of them in the developing world. -Mental health, is a neglected health issue afflicting 1 in 4 people in their lifetime. An estimated 50-85% of people with mental illness receive no treatment, and suicide is the leading cause of death for adolescent girls worldwide. Immediate, first-line basic services to address intimate partner violence and sexual violence, especially relevant to UHC discussions given that victims/survivors need to make more frequent use of health services and experience more severe health and other consequences when access is lacking. Services include: treatment of injuries; post-rape care (including emergency contraception, post-exposure prophylaxis for HIV prevention, access to safe abortion to the extent of the law); psychosocial and mental health support; and forensic services. --The provision of essential health services for survivors of violence against women and girls has also been agreed in various inter-governmental and technical fora. We are concerned that there is no indicators in the SDGs framework on the critical role of the health sector in responding to violence (an issue unaddressed by the health goal though necessary to achieve other violence-related targets, e.g. 5.2, 16.1 and 16.2).. Specific provisions for adolescents to be exempt from user fees for all health care in UHC schemes should be considered to ensure that they are not prevented or excluded from accessing key health services. When health insurance is tied to parents’ or husband’s coverage, adolescent girls and women in many settings will be deterred from using services in the absence of protections of their privacy and confidentiality. Monitoring of the UHC target should pay particular attention to adolescents’ service access and removal of such barriers for their health and well-being. |  |  |
| Rotaplast International | Rotaplast International, as a member of the G4 Alliance, a coalition of 60+ global organizations united in their commitment to advocating for the neglected surgical patient is supportive of the inclusion of robust and specific indicators to track UHC Target 3.8. Per the recent WHA resolution 68.15, which received unanimous support from 194 WHO member states, emergency and essential surgical care and anesthesia represent an integral component of Universal Health Coverage (UHC). In reference to Target 3.8, we support inclusion of indicators to reflect the essential role of surgical care and anesthesia as part of UHC. Specifically, in addition to the proposed tracer interventions listed above, we suggest the removal of "etc." and the inclusion of a complete list of tracer interventions. We strongly encourage the IAEG-SDGs to consider the inclusion of the full list of tracer interventions proposed in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators for service-specific availability and readiness including: •Basic and comprehensive surgical care, including caesarean section, laparotomy and open fracture •Blood transfusion In addition to these tracer interventions, we would encourage the IAEG to consider the recommendations made by member state representatives: 1) Percentage (%) of population covered by a package of essential health services (USA): We recommend that this indicator should also include safe surgical care and anesthesia, which is recognized as a core component of UHC as per WHA resolution 68.15. 2) Health worker density and distribution (Canada): We recommend the consideration of this indicator as an additional measure of UHC. We also encourage the IAEG-SDGs to consider including disaggregation of providers by cadre as suggested in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators. To ensure accurate reporting of health worker density and distribution, provider categories should reflect: Generalist medical practitioners, specialist medical practitioners (surgeons, anesthetists, obstetricians, emergency medicine specialists, gynecologists etc,), as well as nursing and midwifery professionals. | Financial risk protection represents an important component of UHC and we commend the IAEG-SDGs for including this indicator. We would suggest that this indicator include a robust definition of "universal health coverage" to ensure that populations are protected against catastrophic and impoverishing expenditure from seeking essential health services, including surgical and anesthesia care. Indicator 3.8.2: Fraction of the population protected against catastrophic/impoverishing out-of-pocket health expenditure Financial risk protection represents an important component of UHC and we commend the IAEG-SDGs for including this indicator. We would suggest that this indicator include a robust definition of "universal health coverage" to ensure that populations are protected against catastrophic and impoverishing expenditure from seeking essential health services, including surgical and anesthesia care. |  |
| Rutgers | • Two indicators should be retained for this target to monitor UHC as currently proposed – on coverage of essential services for all and on financial protection. The comments below relate to the indicator on coverage of interventions. • In response to calls for greater specificity, the definition of the UHC indicator should include the following components which should form part and parcel of any essential package of prevention and treatment services: -ü Essential sexual and reproductive health services, namely the following three components, elements of which are already reflected in the grey indicator above: modern methods of contraception; maternal health services (including antenatal care, skilled attendance at birth, emergency obstetric care and post-partum care); treatment of complications of unsafe abortion and access to safe abortion services to the extent of the law; and prevention, diagnosis and treatment of sexually transmitted infections and HIV/AIDS (including ARV). These services are cross-cutting enablers for achievement of the SDGs, including poverty eradication, gender equality, school completion and economic growth. -ü The HPV vaccine, which should be considered part of essential sexual and reproductive health services as well as of child immunization (an element already reflected in the indicator). The HPV vaccines is an exceptional medical advancement to prevent cervical cancer, which kills 275,000 women every year, over 85% of them in the developing world. -ü Mental health, an especially neglected health issue afflicting 1 in 4 people in their lifetime. An estimated 50-85% of people with mental illness receive no treatment, and suicide is the leading cause of death for adolescent girls worldwide. |  |  |
| Save the Children | Save the Children REVISE INDICATOR to read: Coverage of essential services This indicator is an index measuring universal health coverage based on tracer interventions that include reproductive, maternal, newborn and child health, infectious diseases, noncommunicable diseases and service capacity and access, among the general and the most disadvantaged population. The indicators have been developed by WHO and the World Bank with academics and other agencies. | Save the Children RETAIN INDICATOR Methods for monitoring financial protection have existed for decades and are well-documented in the published literature. This indicator can be measured annually or bi-annually. Methods are scientifically robust and based on internationally agreed definitions such that financial protection entails out-of-pocket payments for health services that exceed a given fraction of total household available resources, or that pushes a household below or further below the poverty line. A most recent application of these methods is in the joint WHO and World Bank First Global Monitoring Report on Tracking Universal Health Coverage. |  |
| Sensoa | • Two indicators should be retained for this target to monitor UHC as currently proposed – on coverage of essential services for all and on financial protection. The comments below relate to the indicator on coverage of interventions. • In response to calls for greater specificity, the definition of the UHC indicator should include the following components which should form part and parcel of any essential package of prevention and treatment services: (1) Essential sexual and reproductive health services, namely the following three components, elements of which are already reflected in the grey indicator above: modern methods of contraception; maternal health services (including antenatal care, skilled attendance at birth, emergency obstetric care and post-partum care); treatment of complications of unsafe abortion and access to safe abortion services to the extent of the law; and prevention, diagnosis and treatment of sexually transmitted infections and HIV/AIDS (including ARV). These services are cross-cutting enablers for achievement of the SDGs, including poverty eradication, gender equality, school completion and economic growth. (2) The HPV vaccine, which should be considered part of essential sexual and reproductive health services as well as of child immunization (an element already reflected in the indicator). The HPV vaccines is an exceptional medical advancement to prevent cervical cancer, which kills 275,000 women every year, over 85% of them in the developing world. (3) Mental health, an especially neglected health issue afflicting 1 in 4 people in their lifetime. An estimated 50-85% of people with mental illness receive no treatment, and suicide is the leading cause of death for adolescent girls worldwide. |  |  |
| Sex og Politikk | The Norwegian civil society organization Sex og Politikk suggests: · Two indicators should be retained for this target to monitor UHC as currently proposed – on coverage of essential services for all and on financial protection. The comments below relate to the indicator on coverage of interventions. · In response to calls for greater specificity, the definition of the UHC indicator should include the following components which should form part and parcel of any essential package of prevention and treatment services: \* Essential sexual and reproductive health services, namely the following three components, elements of which are already reflected in the grey indicator above: modern methods of contraception; maternal health services (including antenatal care, skilled attendance at birth, emergency obstetric care and post-partum care); treatment of complications of unsafe abortion and access to safe abortion services to the extent of the law; and prevention, diagnosis and treatment of sexually transmitted infections and HIV/AIDS (including ARV). These services are cross-cutting enablers for achievement of the SDGs, including poverty eradication, gender equality, school completion and economic growth. \* The HPV vaccine, which should be considered part of essential sexual and reproductive health services as well as of child immunization (an element already reflected in the indicator). The HPV vaccines is an exceptional medical advancement to prevent cervical cancer, which kills 275,000 women every year, over 85% of them in the developing world. \* Mental health, an especially neglected health issue afflicting 1 in 4 people in their lifetime. An estimated 50-85% of people with mental illness receive no treatment, and suicide is the leading cause of death for adolescent girls worldwide. |  |  |
| Sightsavers | 3.8.1 Sightsavers comments: We recommend adding rehabilitation services to the list of tracer interventions. It would read as: Coverage of tracer interventions (e.g. child full immunization, ARV therapy, TB treatment, hypertension treatment, skilled attendant at birth, rehabilitation services, etc.) Additionally, Sightsavers recommends adding disability disaggregation. In fact, the World Bank and WHO World Report on Disability clearly states that less access to health services leads to a much higher chance of catastrophic health expenditure. |  |  |
| Simavi | It is impossible for people to receive quality essential health care services in health centres if these facilities do not use safely managed water, sanitation and hygiene services (WASH). According to the World Bank and World Health Organisation first Global Monitoring Report on Tracking Universal Health Coverage (UHC) (available here: http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/174536/1/9789241564977\_eng.pdf), access to WASH is critical to delivering quality health services, including ensuring patient safely, effectiveness of interventions, prevention of health care acquired infections and the provision of care that responds to people’s preferences, needs and desires. As a vital component of quality health services, access to WASH in health care facilities is therefore central to one of the pillars of UHC. The recent World Health Organization and UNICEF report (available here: http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/154588/1/9789241508476\_eng.pdf) on WASH in health care facilities states that 38% of health care facilities do not have an improved water source, 19% do not have improved sanitation and 35% do not have water and soap for handwashing. Simavi strongly recommends that tracer interventions for UHC must include the following, and these should be explicitly stated within the document endorsed by the UN statistical commission in March 2016: “Percentage of health care facilities with safely managed water, sanitation and hygiene.” Simavi is also supportive of health sector recommendations that UHC indicators include i) financial risk protection and ii) access. In order to deliver the commitment to “Leave No-One Behind”, we urge the IAEG-SDGs to strongly reaffirm the commitment by Member States to disaggregate data by all of the groups set out in agenda 2030 across all indicators. |  |  |
| Smile Train | Smile Train (United States) In reference to SDG Target 3.8, we support inclusion of indicators to reflect the essential role of surgical care and anesthesia as part of universal health coverage (as per World Heath Assembly resolution 68.15): 1) In addition to the proposed tracer interventions for measurement of UHC Target 3.8, we support inclusion the of additional tracer interventions included in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators, including basic and comprehensive surgical care 2) We support inclusion of an indicator to measure the percentage (%) of population covered by a package of essential health services including safe surgical care and anesthesia, which is recognized as a core component of UHC as per WHA resolution 68.15 3) We support inclusion of Health worker density and distribution as an additional indicator to measure UHC, including disaggregation of providers as suggested in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators: By cadre, including generalist medical practitioners, specialist medical practitioners (surgeons, anesthetists, obstetricians, emergency medicine specialists, cardiologists, pediatricians, psychiatrists, ophthalmologists, gynecologists, etc.), nursing and midwifery professionals, traditional and complementary medicine professionals, among others. 4) We support inclusion of a UHC indicator to track the fraction of the population protected against catastrophic and impoverishing expenditure from out-of-pocket payments for essential health services, including surgical and anesthesia care. | Smile Train (United States) In reference to SDG Target 3.8, we support inclusion of indicators to reflect the essential role of surgical care and anesthesia as part of universal health coverage (as per World Heath Assembly resolution 68.15): 1) In addition to the proposed tracer interventions for measurement of UHC Target 3.8, we support inclusion the of additional tracer interventions included in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators, including basic and comprehensive surgical care 2) We support inclusion of an indicator to measure the percentage (%) of population covered by a package of essential health services including safe surgical care and anesthesia, which is recognized as a core component of UHC as per WHA resolution 68.15 3) We support inclusion of Health worker density and distribution as an additional indicator to measure UHC, including disaggregation of providers as suggested in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators: By cadre, including generalist medical practitioners, specialist medical practitioners (surgeons, anesthetists, obstetricians, emergency medicine specialists, cardiologists, pediatricians, psychiatrists, ophthalmologists, gynecologists, etc.), nursing and midwifery professionals, traditional and complementary medicine professionals, among others. 4) We support inclusion of a UHC indicator to track the fraction of the population protected against catastrophic and impoverishing expenditure from out-of-pocket payments for essential health services, including surgical and anesthesia care. |  |
| Stockholm Environment Institute |  |  | Stockholm Environment Institute staff would like further clarification on what ‘Hazardous chemicals’ would be covered. i.e. Does it mainly cover deaths caused by pollution/toxins, or also health outcomes from drugs/smoking? Further, which air pollutants are proposed? Particulate matter - soot (black carbon), PM2.5 and ozone all important to include, e.g. ‘No. of premature deaths attributable to ambient/household air pollution in urban/rural populations’. Disaggregating indoor-outdoor air pollution and linked health outcomes is important but not proposed. We recommend the inclusion of water and soil pollution within this indicator and suggest satellite observations may be sufficient for some pollutants, but presence of bioindicators (lichens for air pollution) and ground-level monitoring may also be useful. |
| Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN) | SDSN comments: We support tracking coverage of tracer interventions, or a package of key services, to determine progress on UHC. We recommend choosing several interventions to ensure that the entire population is covered. For example, using immunization alone focuses on children, potentially missing shortfalls in other demographic groups. We would recommend using some combination of the following indicators: The following indicator is absolutely critical to measure access to services by all people, and should be disaggregated by urban and rural areas to ensure equal access. We would recommend a target of around 4 for this indicator. A lower value would indicate barriers to service, such as distance to care, high cost of care, or low quality of care. Average of all consultations (preventative and curative) with a licensed provider in a health facility or the community (including Community Health Workers but excluding pharmacists), per person, per year For Maternal & Child Health: -Percentage of births attended by skilled health personnel -Antenatal care coverage (at least one visit and at least four visits) -Post-natal care coverage (one visit) For Child Health: -Percent of children receiving full immunization (as recommended by national vaccination schedules) For Women & Adolescent Girls : -Percentage of women with cervical cancer screening For the General Population : -Percentage with hypertension diagnosed & receiving treatment -Waiting time for elective surgery -Healthy life expectancy at birth -Percentage of health facilities meeting service specific readiness requirements -Percentage of population with access to affordable essential drugs and commodities on a sustainable basis -Percentage of new health care facilities built in compliance with building codes and standards -Ratio of health professionals to population (MDs, nurse midwives, nurses, community health workers, EmOC caregivers) | SDSN comments: The current formulation does not measure an outcome, which we would find preferable. We want to know that financial protection programs not only exist, but are functioning. We would recommend using the following indicators in combination. Number of persons falling below the poverty line or pushed deeper into poverty due to out of pocket heath expenditures annually. This would track how effective financial protection schemes are for the most vulnerable. Out-of-pocket and private/voluntary health insurance (as percentage of total health expenditure). This would capture how much the average household is spending on healthcare. |  |
| Sustainable World Initiative | The Sustainable World Initiative supports the UNFPA's proposal to explicitly include the following package of essential services, including the following four components, elements of which are already reflected in the grey indicator above: modern methods of contraception; maternity care services (including antenatal care, skilled attendance at birth, emergency obstetric and neonatal care and post—partum care); treatment of complications of unsafe abortion and access to safe abortion services to the extent of the law; and prevention, diagnosis and treatment of sexually transmitted infections including HIV/AIDS (including ARV). |  |  |
| Tanzania Trauma Care System Project | On behalf of the Tanzania Trauma System Project, I submit the following comments that urge the inclusion of Surgical and Anesthesia Indicators. Recognizing that road traffic crashes and other mechanisms of trauma are the second leading cause of death and disability in Tanzania the Ministry of Health and Social Welfare has approved the creation of a national effort to develop a trauma system that will address prevention, prehospital care, acute trauma care, and rehabilitation of injured people. The project, that will launch shortly, is under the leadership of the Muhimbili Orthopaedic Institute with advisory support from Duke University. We will begin with system development in Dar es Salaam and the coastal region and extend to the remainder off the country. It is hope that the model established may be utilized in other East African countries through cooperation with the College of Surgeons of East,Central and South Africa (COSECS). Epidemiological surveillance and data collection and analysis will be key to accurately establishing a base line and monitoring effects of interventions. We feel strongly that inclusion of specific indicators for surgical and anesthesia care in the post 2015 sustainable development goals will significantly aid our efforts. Our specific comments follow: Per the recent WHA resolution 68.15, which received unanimous support from194 WHO member states, emergency and essential surgical care and anaesthesia represent an integral component of Universal Health Coverage (UHC). SDG Target 3.8 specifically focuses on achieving UHC including financial risk protection and access to quality essential health-care services. In reference to Target 3.8, we support inclusion of indicators to reflect the essential role of surgical care and anaesthesia as part of UHC. Specific recommendations include: 1) Tracer Interventions In addition to the proposed tracer interventions for measurement of UHC Target 3.8, we support inclusion the of the full list of tracer interventions included in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators service-specific availability and readiness indicator including: • Basic and comprehensive surgical care, including caesarean section, laparotomy and open fracture • Blood transfusion 2) Essential Health Services Inclusion of an indicator to measure the Percentage (%) of population covered by a package of essential health services (including safe surgical care and anaesthesia, which is recognized as a core component of UHC as per WHA resolution 68.15) 3) Health Workforce Inclusion of Health worker density and distribution as an additional indicator to measure UHC, including disaggregation of providers as suggested in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators by cadre, including generalist medical practitioners, specialist medical practitioners (surgeons, anaesthetists, obstetricians, emergency medicine specialists,, gynaecologists etc,) nursing and midwifery professionals, among others 4) Protection from Financial Impoverishment Support inclusion of a UHC indicator to track the fraction of the population protected against catastrophic and impoverishing expenditure from out-of-pocket payments for essential health services, including surgical and anaesthesia care. |  |  |
| Tanzania Trauma Care System Project | On behalf of the Tanzania Trauma System Project, I submit the following comments that urge the inclusion of Surgical and Anesthesia Indicators. Recognizing that road traffic crashes and other mechanisms of trauma are the second leading cause of death and disability in Tanzania the Ministry of Health and Social Welfare has approved the creation of a national effort to develop a trauma system that will address prevention, prehospital care, acute trauma care, and rehabilitation of injured people. The project, that will launch shortly, is under the leadership of the Muhimbili Orthopaedic Institute with advisory support from Duke University. We will begin with system development in Dar es Salaam and the coastal region and extend to the remainder off the country. It is hope that the model established may be utilized in other East African countries through cooperation with the College of Surgeons of East,Central and South Africa (COSECS). Epidemiological surveillance and data collection and analysis will be key to accurately establishing a base line and monitoring effects of interventions. We feel strongly that inclusion of specific indicators for surgical and anesthesia care in the post 2015 sustainable development goals will significantly aid our efforts. Our specific comments follow: Per the recent WHA resolution 68.15, which received unanimous support from194 WHO member states, emergency and essential surgical care and anaesthesia represent an integral component of Universal Health Coverage (UHC). SDG Target 3.8 specifically focuses on achieving UHC including financial risk protection and access to quality essential health-care services. In reference to Target 3.8, we support inclusion of indicators to reflect the essential role of surgical care and anaesthesia as part of UHC. Specific recommendations include: 1) Tracer Interventions In addition to the proposed tracer interventions for measurement of UHC Target 3.8, we support inclusion the of the full list of tracer interventions included in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators service-specific availability and readiness indicator including: • Basic and comprehensive surgical care, including caesarean section, laparotomy and open fracture • Blood transfusion 2) Essential Health Services Inclusion of an indicator to measure the Percentage (%) of population covered by a package of essential health services (including safe surgical care and anaesthesia, which is recognized as a core component of UHC as per WHA resolution 68.15) 3) Health Workforce Inclusion of Health worker density and distribution as an additional indicator to measure UHC, including disaggregation of providers as suggested in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators by cadre, including generalist medical practitioners, specialist medical practitioners (surgeons, anaesthetists, obstetricians, emergency medicine specialists,, gynaecologists etc,) nursing and midwifery professionals, among others 4) Protection from Financial Impoverishment Support inclusion of a UHC indicator to track the fraction of the population protected against catastrophic and impoverishing expenditure from out-of-pocket payments for essential health services, including surgical and anaesthesia care. |  |  |
| Terre des hommes Lausanne | It is impossible for people to receive quality essential health care services in health centres if these facilities do not use safely managed water, sanitation and hygiene services (WASH). According to the World Bank and World Health Organisation first Global Monitoring Report on Tracking Universal Health Coverage (UHC), access to WASH is critical to delivering quality health services, including ensuring patient safely, effectiveness of interventions, prevention of health care acquired infections and the provision of care that responds to people’s preferences, needs and desires. As a vital component of quality health services, access to WASH in health care facilities is therefore central to one of the pillars of UHC. The recent World Health Organization and UNICEF report on WASH in health care facilities states that 38% of health care facilities do not have an improved water source, 19% do not have improved sanitation and 35% do not have water and soap for handwashing. Strongly recommend that tracer interventions for UHC must include the following, and these should be explicitly stated within the document endorsed by the UN statistical commission in March 2016: “Percentage of health care facilities with safely managed water, sanitation and hygiene.” This data will be captured as part of the WHO/UNICEF WASH in health care facilities Global Action Plan: therefore adapting indicator 3.8.1 in this way does not represent an additional reporting burden. | Also support the health sector recommendations that target 3.8 is tracked using two indicators covering i) financial risk protection and ii) service coverage. Effective tracking of both components will be vital to the realisation of UHC and the SDGs. In order to deliver the commitment to “Leave No-One Behind”, the IAEG-SDGs are urged to strongly reaffirm the commitment by Member States to disaggregate data by all of the groups set out in agenda 2030 across all indicators. |  |
| The Danish Family Planning Association | In response to calls for greater specificity, the definition of the UHC indicator should include the following components which should form part and parcel of any essential package of prevention and treatment services: • Essential sexual and reproductive health services, namely the following three components, elements of which are already reflected in the grey indicator above: modern methods of contraception; maternal health services (including antenatal care, skilled attendance at birth, emergency obstetric care and post-partum care); treatment of complications of unsafe abortion and access to safe abortion services to the extent of the law; and prevention, diagnosis and treatment of sexually transmitted infections and HIV/AIDS (including ARV). These services are cross-cutting enablers for achievement of the SDGs, including poverty eradication, gender equality, school completion and economic growth • The HPV vaccine, which should be considered part of essential sexual and reproductive health services as well as of child immunization (an element already reflected in the indicator). The HPV vaccine is an exceptional medical advancement to prevent cervical cancer, which kills 275,000 women every year, over 85% of them in the developing world. • Mental health, an especially neglected health issue afflicting 1 in 4 people in their lifetime. An estimated 50-85% of people with mental illness receive no treatment, and suicide is the leading cause of death for adolescent girls worldwide. |  |  |
| The G4 Alliance | Per the recent WHA resolution 68.15, which received unanimous support from 194 WHO member states, emergency and essential surgical care and anaesthesia represent an integral component of Universal Health Coverage (UHC). In reference to Target 3.8, we support inclusion of indicators to reflect the essential role of surgical care and anaesthesia as part of UHC. Specifically, in addition to the proposed tracer interventions listed above, we suggest the removal of "etc." and the inclusion of a complete list of tracer interventions. We strongly encourage the IAEG-SDGs to consider the inclusion of the full list of tracer interventions proposed in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators for service-specific availability and readiness including: •Basic and comprehensive surgical care, including caesarean section, laparotomy and open fracture •Blood transfusion In addition to these tracer interventions, we would encourage the IAEG to consider the recommendations made by member state representatives: 1) Percentage (%) of population covered by a package of essential health services (USA) We recommend that this indicator should also include safe surgical care and anaesthesia, which is recognized as a core component of UHC as per WHA resolution 68.15. 2) Health worker density and distribution (Canada) We recommend the consideration of this indicator as an additional measure of UHC. We also encourage the IAEG-SDGs to consider including disaggregation of providers by cadre as suggested in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators. To ensure accurate reporting of health worker density and distribution, provider categories should reflect: Generalist medical practitioners, specialist medical practitioners (surgeons, anaesthetists, obstetricians, emergency medicine specialists,, gynaecologists etc,), as well as nursing and midwifery professionals. | Financial risk protection represents an important component of UHC and we commend the IAEG-SDGs for including this indicator. We would suggest that this indicator include a robust definition of "universal health coverage" to ensure that populations are protected against catastrophic and impoverishing expenditure from seeking essential health services, including surgical and anaesthesia care. |  |
| The Global Poverty Project | It is impossible for people to receive quality essential health care services in health centres if these facilities do not use safely managed water, sanitation and hygiene services (WASH). According to the World Bank and World Health Organisation first Global Monitoring Report on Tracking Universal Health Coverage (UHC) (available here: http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/174536/1/9789241564977\_eng.pdf), access to WASH is critical to delivering quality health services, including ensuring patient safely, effectiveness of interventions, prevention of health care acquired infections and the provision of care that responds to people’s preferences, needs and desires. As a vital component of quality health services, access to WASH in health care facilities is therefore central to one of the pillars of UHC. The recent World Health Organization and UNICEF report (available here: http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/154588/1/9789241508476\_eng.pdf) on WASH in health care facilities states that 38% of health care facilities do not have an improved water source, 19% do not have improved sanitation and 35% do not have water and soap for handwashing. The Global Poverty Project strongly recommends that tracer interventions for UHC must include the following, and these should be explicitly stated within the document endorsed by the UN statistical commission in March 2016: “Percentage of health care facilities with safely managed water, sanitation and hygiene.” This data will be captured as part of the WHO/UNICEF WASH in health care facilities Global Action Plan: therefore adapting indicator 3.8.1 in this way does not represent an additional reporting burden. The Global Poverty Project is also supportive of health sector recommendations that target 3.8 is tracked using two indicators covering i) financial risk protection and ii) service coverage. Effective tracking of both components will be vital to the realisation of UHC and the SDGs. In order to deliver the commitment to “Leave No-One Behind”, we urge the IAEG-SDGs to strongly reaffirm the commitment by Member States to disaggregate data by all of the groups set out in agenda 2030 across all indicators. |  |  |
| The Hunger Project | This would ideally include the percentage of health care facilities with safely managed water, sanitation and hygiene services. |  |  |
| The International Society of Nephrology | Comments of the International Society of Nephrology (ISN), a non-governmental organisation, formed of more than 9000 nephrologists worldwide, committed to advancing nephrology globally (www.theisn.org): ISN supports the use of Indicator 3.8.1. “Coverage of tracer interventions” as an appropriate and effective way of monitoring progress towards the Universal Health Coverage (UHC) target. In order to provide a good indication of the ‘health’ of the healthcare system, ISN also recommends that the defined package of tracer interventions should cover the full spectrum of health services that should be made available to the population. This package should include interventions targeted at disease prevention, diagnosis, treatment and rehabilitation. Kidney disease, a non-communicable disease (NCD) with a growing global burden, particularly in low and middle-income countries (LMICs), is a good example of how such a package of interventions might be developed. While the greatest health benefit will come from delivery of the whole package, limited resources may require prioritization of interventions and a phased approach to implementation in order to achieve scale-up over time. As an example, the package of interventions for kidney care might include: 1. Primary prevention – Interventions targeted at obesity prevention, smoking cessation, improving access to clean water and sanitation, maternal health, and prevention of infectious diseases 2. Screening – Interventions targeted at detecting Chronic Kidney Disease (CKD), including urine protein (albumin), serum creatinine and urinalysis testing (the latter has the advantage of also being a measure of overall cardiovascular disease (CVD), including microvascular health) 3. Secondary prevention – Interventions targeted at the treatment of CKD and CVD risk resulting from CKD (hypertension treatment is already mentioned as a potential tracer indicator, diabetes management of metabolic syndrome and access to medications known to modify the course of CKD should also be considered here) 4. Treatment (acute) – Interventions targeted at detecting and treating reversible causes of Acute Kidney Injury (AKI) through access to supportive fluid resuscitation and, as necessary, short-term, life-saving Renal Replacement Therapy (RRT) e.g. dialysis, ultrafiltration 5. Transplantation – Interventions to support the delivery of kidney transplantation through access to living or deceased organ donors and access to immunosuppressive therapy 6. Treatment (chronic) - Interventions to support and maintain access to medications and education to prevent progression and the provision of dialysis for End-Stage Kidney Disease (ESKD) if that should occur Interventions 1-3 (and 4) might be considered as the ‘minimum package’ of interventions to be made available to the entire population in countries around the world. Where resources are limited, recommended scale up should extend to interventions 5 and 6 as the health system capacity develops over time. With a growing middle class and expectations of access to life saving therapies, there is now increasing demand for dialysis in many LMIC countries. This is especially the case for younger individuals with ESKD, where treatment is not only life-saving and life-supporting, but also improves the quality of life of the family (through reduced mortality of the breadwinner) Data Sources: • The ISN is currently preparing to launch a global research exercise through its extensive network on the access to and provision of kidney health services around the world. This includes many of the interventions and treatments listed in the package above. The Global Kidney Atlas is expected to be published in 2016/17. ISN would be delighted to make this data available as a contribution to the monitoring of the UN SDGs. • There are a number of renal registries available worldwide, which provide comparable data on kidney health services, mainly focused on the provision of dialysis and transplantation. • In a recent study, 144 Renal Registries were identified worldwide (www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2369/16/31). Although the study does underline the gaps in renal registry coverage, particularly in emerging economies, many of the registries analysed were considered to provide good public access to information such as detailed reports and publications, and access to individual-level patient data. Several of these registries offer data analysis services through registry statisticians. • The European Renal Association (ERA-EDTA), for example, provides one of the most established and comprehensive renal registries available (http://www.era-edta-reg.org/index.jsp?p=10). The African Association of Nephrology (AFRAN) and the African Paediatric Nephrology Association (AFPNA) have also initiated important steps to coordinate efforts and develop an African Renal Registry (http://ckj.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2015/11/25/ckj.sfv122.full). ANZA (Australia and New Zealand), CORR (Canadian Organ Replacement Registry), USRDS (US Renal Dialysis System) and the UK Renal Registry are examples of other national registries with extensive data on multiple aspects of kidney care, focused mostly on dialysis and transplantation, but recently committed to improved collection of information relating to earlier stages of CKD. Other Relevant Information: • Renal Replacement Therapy (RRT) plays an essential, life-saving and life-supporting role in the treatment of severe acute kidney injury (AKI) and end-stage kidney disease (ESKD), which represent a growing health burden across High, Middle and Low Income countries. • However, poor access to RRT - including dialysis and kidney transplantation - is a major barrier to the provision of high quality kidney care across the world, particularly in Low and Middle Income countries (LMIC) where large numbers of people die from kidney failure without receiving any treatment. This treatment gap – of those needing but not receiving RRT - was highlighted in a recent study published in the Lancet in March 2015 (www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(14)61601-9/abstract). • The resource-intensive nature of RRT, budgetary constraints and limited trained healthcare personnel in many LMICs often result in the strict rationing of kidney treatment. This causes considerable inequalities in the population and often restricts access to those with health insurance coverage or other financial means (e.g. loans, ability to sell home, charity). In some jurisdictions, poor families will pay out of pocket for life-saving therapy for a loved one, or bread winner. • Given such disparities, access to high quality kidney care, specifically RRT, becomes an ideal tracer indicator and ‘barometer’ for monitoring the health of a healthcare system and assessing progress towards universal health coverage. | Comments of the International Society of Nephrology (ISN), a non-governmental organisation, formed of more than 9000 nephrologists worldwide, committed to advancing nephrology globally (www.theisn.org): ISN supports the use of Indicator 3.8.2. as an essential component of monitoring progress towards the Universal Health Coverage (UHC) target. In the case of kidney care, the potential financial impact of needing a life-saving treatment like dialysis can be devastating. Therefore, protecting individuals and families from financial hardship is of particular concern. Some countries such as US, UK, Canada and Australia provide full coverage of dialysis treatment to their population. However, in many LMIC countries this is not the case and many of these patients suffer extreme economic hardship when forced to pay for their own treatment. Financial protection in these situations should be provided, particularly in the case of Acute Kidney Injury (AKI) where only short-term access to renal replacement therapy (e.g. dialysis) may be required. |  |
| The Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues; The Psychology Coalition of NGOs Accredited at the UN | The Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI) and the Psychology Coalition of NGOs Accredited at the UN propose the use of WHO indicators for target 3.4.l, to promote Mental Health and Well Being for which no indicators are provided: E.g. 1) By 2030 80% of countries will have developed or updated their policies or plans for mental health promotion and prevention in line with international and regional human rights instruments and will be routinely collecting and reporting outcomes every two years through their national health and social information systems. (2) For indicators of Well Being, we propose the use of the UNDP HDI which focuses on life expectancy, years of education, and gross income per capita or the Happy Planet Index measured in terms of happy life expectancy and ecological footprint. Data for these assessments are already being collected; therefore governments would not have to collect these additional data. | The Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI) and the Psychology Coalition of NGOs Accredited at the UN propose the use of the following indicator for target 3.4.l, to promote Mental Health and Well Being for which no indicators are provided: By 2030 the national budgets of all countries will show the proportion of their budgets allocated for expenditures on various categories of expenditures for physical health and mental health, including (1) access to physical and mental health care services and (2) the recruitment, training, distribution, and retention of physical health care and mental health care workers. |  |
| THET (The Tropical Health & Education Trust) |  | In reference to SDG Target 3.8, we support inclusion of indicators to reflect the essential role of surgical care and anaesthesia as part of UHC (as per WHA resolution 68.15): 1) In addition to the proposed tracer interventions for measurement of UHC Target 3.8, we support inclusion the of additional tracer interventions included in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators including: • Basic and comprehensive surgical care, including caesarean section, laparotomy and open fracture • Blood transfusion 2) Support inclusion of an indicator to measure the percentage (%) of population covered by a package of essential health services (including safe surgical care and anaesthesia, which is recognized as a core component of UHC as per WHA resolution 68.15) 3) Support inclusion of Health worker density and distribution as an additional indicator to measure UHC, including disaggregation of providers as suggested in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators: • By cadre, including generalist medical practitioners, specialist medical practitioners (surgeons, anaesthetists, obstetricians, emergency medicine specialists, cardiologists, paediatricians, psychiatrists, ophthalmologists, gynaecologists, etc.), nursing and midwifery professionals, traditional and complementary medicine professionals, among others. 4) Support inclusion of a UHC indicator to track the fraction of the population protected against catastrophic and impoverishing expenditure from out-of-pocket payments for essential health services, including surgical and anaesthesia care. |  |
| Transdiaspora Network | Transdiaspora Network - number of healthcare initiatives promoting prevention and alternative health education in their curriculum that bring innovation to traditional practices, and bridge the wellness gap among young people of low-income and/or immigrant backgrounds |  |  |
| Transparency International | Suggestion from Transparency International: Given the impact that bribery has to access to health services, the recommendation is to use: "Percentage of people per country/territory who paid a bribe to access health services in the last 12 months". This can be calculated through survey work currently done by third party data producers as well as some governments. For example, TI produces the Global Corruption Barometer. The last global survey was done in 2013 although regional surveys have been done in 2015 and will be done in 2016. For the Global Corruption Barometer 2013, approximately 1,000 people from each of 107 countries were surveyed between September 2012 and March 2013. Five hundred people were surveyed in countries with a population of less than 1,000,000. The survey sample in each country has been weighted to be nationally representative where possible. In six countries, the sample was urban only. The results by country are at: http://www.transparency.org/gcb2013/results. |  |  |
| UN Major Group for Children and Youth | Indicator does not measure for quality or disparity in access to quality The list of treatments is very narrow in scope. | What will the parameters of 'catastrophic/impoverishing' expenditure be? It needs to be on a progressive scale- a lower percentage of total income for lower income groups. | Improvement from last version that only measured exosure and does not trak actual illness caused by these variables. Disaggerated by, age income groups, type of human settlement, migratory/displacement status, 'any other status' etc/ |
| United Nations Association of Tanzania | United Nations Association of Tanzania, Tanzania UNA Tanzania supports the explicit inclusion of the following package of essential services, including the following four components, elements of which are already reflected in the grey indicator above: modern methods of contraception; maternity care services (including antenatal care, skilled attendance at birth, emergency obstetric and neonatal care and post—partum care); treatment of complications of unsafe abortion and access to safe abortion services to the extent of the law; and prevention, diagnosis and treatment of sexually transmitted infections including HIV/AIDS (including ARV). |  |  |
| Vanderbilt International Anesthesia | Basic and comprehensive surgical care, including caesarean section, laparotomy and open fracture Blood transfusion All children less than 15 yo access to safe surgery and anesthesia for elective and emergency surgery trauma centers located along each corridor for transportation (location of accidents) with surgery, anesthesia, PACU/Critical care nursing capabilities | percentage (%) of population covered by a package of essential health services (including safe surgical care and anaesthesia, which is recognized as a core component of UHC as per WHA resolution 68.15) percentage of population impacted by trauma and treated with essential services for this plague in LMIC's |  |
| VENRO Working Group Disability and Development | VENRO Working Group Disability and Development,Germany, recommends adding disability disaggregation. Furthermore rehabilitation services shall be added to the list of tracer interventions. It would read as: Coverage of tracer interventions (e.g. child full immunization, ARV therapy, TB treatment, hypertension treatment, skilled attendant at birth, rehabilitation services, etc.) |  |  |
| village water | It is impossible for people to receive quality essential health care services in health centres if these facilities do not use safely managed water, sanitation and hygiene services (WASH). |  |  |
| WASH United | It is impossible for people to receive quality essential health care services in health centres if these facilities do not use safely managed water, sanitation and hygiene services (WASH). According to the World Bank and World Health Organisation first Global Monitoring Report on Tracking Universal Healh Coverage (UHC) (available here: apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/174536/1/9789241564977\_eng.pdf), access to WASH is critical to delivering quality health services, including ensuring patient safety, effectiveness of interventions, prevention of health care acquired infections and the provision of care that responds to people's preferences, needs and desires. As a vital component of quality health services, access to WASH in health facilities is therefore central to one of the pillars of UHC. The recent World Health Organization and UNICEF report (available here: apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/154588/1/9789241508476\_eng.pdf) on WASH in health care facilities states that 38% of health care facilities do not have an improved water source, 19% do not have improved sanitation and 35% do not have water and soap for handwashing. WASH United strongly recommends that tracer interventions for UHC must include the following, and these should be explicitly stated within the document endorsed by the UN statistical commission in March 2016: "Percentage of health care facilities with safely managed water, sanitation and hygiene." This date will be captured as part of the WHO/UNICEF WASH in health care facilities Global Action Plan. Therefore, adapting indicator 3.8.1 in this way does not represent an additional reporting burden. WASH United is also supportive of health sector recommendations that target 3.8 is tracked using two indicators covering i) financial risk protection and ii) service coverage. Effective tracking of both components will be vital to the realisation of UHC and the SDGs. In order to deliver the commitment to "Leave No-One Behind", we urge the IAEG-SDGs to strongly reaffirm the commitment by Member States to disaggregate data by all of the groups set out in the agenda 2030 across all indicators. |  |  |
| WaterAid | It is impossible for people to receive quality essential health care services in health centres if these facilities do not use safely managed water, sanitation and hygiene services (WASH). According to the World Bank and World Health Organisation first Global Monitoring Report on Tracking Universal Health Coverage (UHC) (available here: http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/174536/1/9789241564977\_eng.pdf), access to WASH is critical to delivering quality health services, including ensuring patient safely, effectiveness of interventions, prevention of health care acquired infections and the provision of care that responds to people’s preferences, needs and desires.[Ref 1] As a vital component of quality health services, access to WASH in health care facilities is therefore central to one of the pillars of UHC. The recent WHO and UNICEF report (available here: http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/154588/1/9789241508476\_eng.pdf) on WASH in health care facilities states that 38% of health care facilities do not have an improved water source, 19% do not have improved sanitation and 35% do not have water and soap for handwashing. [Ref 2] WaterAid strongly recommends that tracer interventions for UHC must include the following, and these should be explicitly stated within the document endorsed by the UN statistical commission in March 2016: “Percentage of health care facilities with safely managed water, sanitation and hygiene.” This data will be captured as part of the WHO/UNICEF WASH in health care facilities Global Action Plan: therefore adapting indicator 3.8.1 in this way does not represent an additional reporting burden. WaterAid is also supportive of health sector recommendations that target 3.8 is tracked using two indicators covering i) financial risk protection and ii) service coverage. Effective tracking of both components will be vital to the realisation of UHC and the SDGs. In order to deliver the commitment to “Leave No-One Behind”, we urge the IAEG-SDGs to strongly reaffirm the commitment by Member States to disaggregate data by all of the groups set out in agenda 2030 across all indicators. [Ref 1: Consensus exists between the WHO Health Systems and Innovation team and the WHO WASH team on the importance of WASH in health care facilities, and “WASH in health care facilities as a tracer indicator for UHC” is listed as one of their joint actions here: http://www.washinhcf.org/fileadmin/user\_upload/documents/WASH-and-qualityUHC.pdf] [Ref 2: The draft list of core indicators being developed by WHO and UNICEF for collecting data on WASH in health care facilities is available here: http://www.washinhcf.org/fileadmin/user\_upload/documents/Core-Questions-for-WASH-in-HCF-October-2015.pdf] |  |  |
| Wemos |  | Wemos/Netherlands: financial protection is an essential element in Universal Health Coverage, therefore this indicator or a very similar one should be included. |  |
| WFSA: World Federation of Societies of Anaesthesiologists | Niki O'Brien on behalf of the WFSA: World Federation of Societies of Anaesthesiologists: As a member of The G4 Alliance, a coalition of 60+ global organizations united in their commitment to advocating for the neglected surgical patient, we, along with these other organisations are supportive of the inclusion of robust and specific indicators to track UHC Target 3.8. In reference to Target 3.8, we support inclusion of indicators to reflect the essential role of surgical care and anaesthesia as part of UHC. Specifically, in addition to the proposed tracer interventions listed above, we suggest the removal of "etc." and the inclusion of a complete list of tracer interventions. We strongly encourage the IAEG-SDGs to consider the inclusion of the full list of tracer interventions proposed in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators for service-specific availability and readiness including: •Basic and comprehensive surgical care, including caesarean section, laparotomy and open fracture •Blood transfusion In addition to these tracer interventions, we would encourage the IAEG to consider the recommendations made by member state representatives: 1) Percentage (%) of population covered by a package of essential health services (USA): We recommend that this indicator should also include safe surgical care and anaesthesia, which is recognized as a core component of UHC as per WHA resolution 68.15 (passed in May this year). 2) Health worker density and distribution (Canada): We recommend the consideration of this indicator as an additional measure of UHC. The WFSA are currently compiling this data from our member societies, and have found it extremely useful in understanding health care needs in countries and regions. We also encourage the IAEG-SDGs to consider including disaggregation of providers by cadre as suggested in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators. To ensure accurate reporting of health worker density and distribution, provider categories should reflect:Generalist medical practitioners, specialist medical practitioners (surgeons, anaesthetists, obstetricians, emergency medicine specialists, gynaecologists etc,), as well as nursing and midwifery professionals. | The Lancet Comission on Global Surgery report (2015) found that 33 million people face catastrophic health expenditure due to payment for surgery and anaesthesia care each year. Financial risk protection represents an important component of UHC and we commend the IAEG-SDGs for including this indicator. We would suggest that this indicator include a robust definition of "universal health coverage" to ensure that populations are protected against catastrophic and impoverishing expenditure from seeking essential health services, including surgical and anaesthesia care. |  |
| WFSA: World Federation of Societies of Anaesthesiologists | Niki O'Brien on behalf of the World Federation of Societies of Anaesthesiologists (WFSA): There is no doubt that Target 3.8 is essential part of working towards SDG 3: Good health and wellbeing. However, Indicator 3.8.1 ignores an extremely important indicator of ‘access to quality essential health-care services’ – specifically, access to safe, timely and affordable anaesthesia and surgical care. Indeed the Lancet Commission on Global Surgery’s most recent report (2015) found that 5 billion people do not currently have access to safe and affordable anaesthesia and surgical care when needed. This shows just how far global healthcare is from achieving the universal ‘essential health care services’ that Target 3.8 seeks to work towards. According to The Lancet Commission on Global Surgery, 16.9 million lives were lost from conditions needing surgical care in 2010. This is over 4x the number of people who died from HIV/AIDS, TB and Malaria combined. Therefore it is absolutely essential that anaesthesia and surgery are reflected when discussing essential health-care services. In May 2015 the World Health Assembly passed resolution 68.15, which received unanimous support from WHO member states, affirming that emergency and essential surgical care and anaesthesia represent an integral component of Universal Health Coverage (UHC). With non-communicable diseases (NCDs) set to continue to rise between now and 2030, it is so important to recognise that the need for surgical care will also rise dramatically. Without including specific anaesthesia and surgical indicators, 3.8.1 will simply not fully capture the progress towards Target 3.8. |  |  |
| Women Deliver | Women Deliver recommends that reproductive health services be listeds as "tracer interventions" and part of the "essential package of health services" Our other comments are as follows: •Two indicators should be retained for this target to monitor UHC as currently proposed – on coverage of essential services for all and on financial protection. The recommendations below relate to the indicator on coverage of interventions. • Data would be drawn from and/or can build upon available health facility data and survey instruments, and should be disaggregated by sex, age, location, income quintile, disability and other characteristics to address equity gaps. • The amendment proposed (United States) should be considered: Proportion of population covered by a package of essential health services. • In response to calls for greater specificity, the definition of the UHC indicator should include the following components, which should form part and parcel of any essential package of prevention and treatment services: o Essential sexual and reproductive health services, namely the following 4 components, elements of which are already reflected in the grey indicator above: modern methods of contraception; maternal health services (including antenatal care, skilled attendance at birth, emergency obstetric care and post-partum care); treatment of complications of unsafe abortion and access to safe abortion services to the extent of the law; and prevention, diagnosis and treatment of sexually transmitted infections and HIV/AIDS (including ARV). These services are cross-cutting enablers for achievement of the SDGs, including poverty eradication, gender equality, school completion and economic growth. o Screening and treatment for gestational diabetes during antenatal visits (see the new FIGO guidelines for more specificity) o Cancer prevention and screening, including the HPV vaccine (which should be considered part of essential sexual and reproductive health services as well as of immunization), mammography, cervical cancer screening, and referrals for treatment. The HPV vaccine is a rare medical advancement to prevent cervical cancer, which kills 275,000 women every year, over 85% of them in the developing world. o Mental health, an especially neglected health issue afflicting 1 in 4 people in their lifetime. An estimated 50-85% of people with mental illness receive no treatment, and suicide is the leading cause of death for adolescent girls worldwide. o Immediate, first-line basic services to address intimate partner violence and sexual violence, especially relevant to UHC discussions given that victims/survivors need to make more frequent use of health services and experience more severe health and other consequences when access is lacking. Services include: treatment of injuries; post-rape care (including emergency contraception, post-exposure prophylaxis for HIV prevention, access to safe abortion to the extent of the law); psychosocial and mental health support; and forensic services. The provision of essential health services for survivors of violence against women and girls has also been agreed in various inter-governmental and technical fora. Note that there is no indicator currently in the SDGs framework on the critical role of the health sector in responding to violence (an issue unaddressed by the health goal though necessary to achieve other violence-related targets, e.g. 5.2, 16.1 and 16.2). The above proposal would help ensure policy coherence in achieving SDGs implementation, including with the WHO `Global Action Plan on the health sector role in addressing interpersonal violence, especially violence against women and violence against children’ – to be formally adopted in 2016, with a timeline through 2030 aligned with the SDGs. • Specific provisions for adolescents to be exempt from user fees for all health care in UHC schemes should be considered to ensure that they are not prevented or excluded from accessing key health services. When health insurance is tied to parents’ or husband’s coverage, adolescent girls and women in many settings will be deterred from using services in the absence of protections of their privacy and confidentiality. Monitoring of the UHC target should pay particular attention to adolescents’ service access and removal of such barriers for their health and well-being. |  |  |
| Women Deliver | Women Deliver believes that access to repoductive services should also be considered a "tracer intervention" and part of the "essential package of prevention and treatment services" • Two indicators should be retained for this target to monitor UHC as currently proposed – on coverage of essential services for all and on financial protection. The recommendations below relate to the indicator on coverage of interventions. • Data would be drawn from and/or can build upon available health facility data and survey instruments, and should be disaggregated by sex, age, location, income quintile, disability and other characteristics to address equity gaps. • The amendment proposed (United States) should be considered: Proportion of population covered by a package of essential health services. • In response to calls for greater specificity, the definition of the UHC indicator should include the following components, which should form part and parcel of any essential package of prevention and treatment services: o Essential sexual and reproductive health services, namely the following 4 components, elements of which are already reflected in the grey indicator above: modern methods of contraception; maternal health services (including antenatal care, skilled attendance at birth, emergency obstetric care and post-partum care); treatment of complications of unsafe abortion and access to safe abortion services to the extent of the law; and prevention, diagnosis and treatment of sexually transmitted infections and HIV/AIDS (including ARV). These services are cross-cutting enablers for achievement of the SDGs, including poverty eradication, gender equality, school completion and economic growth. o Cancer prevention and screening, including the HPV vaccine (which should be considered part of essential sexual and reproductive health services as well as of immunization), mammography, cervical cancer screening, and referrals for treatment. The HPV vaccine is a rare medical advancement to prevent cervical cancer, which kills 275,000 women every year, over 85% of them in the developing world. o Gestational diabetes for pregnant women (please see FIGOs) new global guidlines for screeing women. o Mental health, an especially neglected health issue afflicting 1 in 4 people in their lifetime. An estimated 50-85% of people with mental illness receive no treatment, and suicide is the leading cause of death for adolescent girls worldwide. o Immediate, first-line basic services to address intimate partner violence and sexual violence, especially relevant to UHC discussions given that victims/survivors need to make more frequent use of health services and experience more severe health and other consequences when access is lacking. Services include: treatment of injuries; post-rape care (including emergency contraception, post-exposure prophylaxis for HIV prevention, access to safe abortion to the extent of the law); psychosocial and mental health support; and forensic services. The provision of essential health services for survivors of violence against women and girls has also been agreed in various inter-governmental and technical fora. Note that there is no indicator currently in the SDGs framework on the critical role of the health sector in responding to violence (an issue unaddressed by the health goal though necessary to achieve other violence-related targets, e.g. 5.2, 16.1 and 16.2). The above proposal would help ensure policy coherence in achieving SDGs implementation, including with the WHO `Global Action Plan on the health sector role in addressing interpersonal violence, especially violence against women and violence against children’ – to be formally adopted in 2016, with a timeline through 2030 aligned with the SDGs. • Specific provisions for adolescents to be exempt from user fees for all health care in UHC schemes should be considered to ensure that they are not prevented or excluded from accessing key health services. When health insurance is tied to parents’ or husband’s coverage, adolescent girls and women in many settings will be deterred from using services in the absence of protections of their privacy and confidentiality. Monitoring of the UHC target should pay particular attention to adolescents’ service access and removal of such barriers for their health and well-being. |  |  |
| Women's Major Group/ International Women's Health Coalition | Women's Major Group proposes the below alternative indicator. 3.8.1 Percentage of population disaggregated by age, sex, gender, geographic location, income, disability, race and ethnicity, with access to essential quality basic health services including essential medicines and vaccines. The package should include at a minimum: essential sexual and reproductive health services (modern contraceptives, comprehensive maternity care, safe abortion services and post-abortion care, prevention and treatment of STIs, including HIV); cancer screening, treatment and prevention; mental health services; emergency services to respond to gender-based violence, including sexual violence; child full immunization; prevention, diagnosis and treatment of TB, malaria and hepatitis C; prevention and treatment of hypertension; palliative care and pain relief). | Women's Major Group supports this indicator with the addition of life-saving medicines. 3.8.2 Fraction of the population protected against catastrophic/impoverishing out­ of­ pocket health expenditure, including spending on life-saving medicines | Women's Major Group supports the WHO proposal, with an additional indicator: 3.9.2. Population exposed to air pollution (fine particulate matter) levels above WHO guideline values Measuring the population exposed to air pollution is more feasible, and a necessary first step to estimating mortality. Encouraging measurement of population exposure to air pollution will also strengthen environmental health systems and inform actionable interventions to reduce air pollution. |
| World Heart Federation | HYPERTENSION - hypertension must be retained as a major tracer intervention. It is one of the leading shared risk factors for NCDs , which together carry the biggest morbidity and mortality health burden in all 6 regions of the world. As the World Bank and WHO recognise in the first global monitoring report 'Tracking Universal Health Coverage', the indicator of hypertension treatment coverage allows for a fairly robust estimate of effective coverage because population need and effectiveness of treatment can be measured through household surveys. Hypertension is a disease of the life-course, and affects all ages, genders and ethnicities, therefore it is highly indicative of a wide demographic band’s use of the health system. In particular, hypertension has reached epidemic proportions in countries of all income levels, so is suitable as an indicator for systems at all stages of UHC. Screening for hypertension should occur at all stages of the continuum of care (and constitute or complement primary to tertiary level interventions), so is highly indicative of the strength of a health system at all levels. We support the existing proposed tracer indicator on hypertension: Proportion of people with hypertension (>140/90) who are currently taking medication. |  | We are dismayed that household and ambient air pollution has not been secured as an indicator for Target 3.9. We strongly support the WHO’s proposal of a revised indicator for Target 3.9: ‘Mortality rate attributed to household and ambient air pollution’. The addition of household pollution is critical: the World Health Organization (WHO) attributed 4.3 million deaths to household air pollution in 2012, 600,000 more deaths than the 3.7 million deaths attributed to outdoor air pollution. Nearly half of the deaths attributed to pneumonia, which is responsible for one fifth of the deaths of children younger than five (one million children in 2013), are the result of particulate matter inhaled from indoor air pollution, a consequence of the fires and solid fuel-burning cook stoves used inside homes by three billion people worldwide. Indoor air pollution also captures secondhand smoke exposure from tobacco use, which according to some estimates contributes to up to 165,000 child and early adolescent (under-15) deaths per year. Globally, children are most likely to be exposed to secondhand smoke in homes and family vehicles. |
| WWF |  |  | WWF: This indicator is important to fully representing environmental risks to health. If current data allows only tracking of air pollution impacts, a programme of work should be established to rapidly advance methodologies to track the health burden from the broader set of hazards identified. |
| Youth Engage | Zimbabwe, Youth Engage: Can this indicator also consider disaggregating data for ART especially into age and gender related aspects to enable monitoring of age related uptake. This will enable a further assessment of adherence especially for Young People. |  |  |
| ACC (American Chemistry Council) and CEFIC (European Chemical Industry Council) |  |  | ACC and CEFIC - ALTERNATIVE: Incidence of mortality and disability attributable to indoor and outdoor airborne pollution; waterborne pollution and soilborne pollution (contaminated sites). COMMENT: These should be considered separately (though some waterborne pollution may originate from leachate from contaminated sites that are not properly controlled), as they are indicative of different societal challenges and often the responsibility of separate ministries or sections of ministries. |
| Amiable Resource | Active Lifestyle motives and nutritional education supports? | Canada 1:7 or 4.6 million... Basic food, shelter, mitigations standards to make informed decisions, find work, learn skills, advance self? | Basic needs, inspired interpersonal skills or developmental education, environment and community respects? |
| DITTA | This indicator needs to include access to essential and affordable medical technologies. In order to achieve universal health coverage there needs to be a continuum of care approach to ensure there is a focus on prevention, diagnosis, treatment, monitoring and control of diseases. In order for the tracer interventions to be achieved; diagnosis needs to firstly occur. Every condition needs to be diagnosed so that the appropriate treatment is given and medical technologies are critical to diagnosis and treatment. “No medical treatment can or should be considered or given until a proper diagnosis has been established.” -WHO Development of Medical Devices Policy (2011). A sub indicator of this should be the proportion of health settings and population with access to affordable technologies. Indicator: Percentage of people who present at any basic health care setting are diagnosed using medical technologies. The measurement could also include number of medical technologies to support emergency care, acute care and general primary and secondary care. |  |  |
| GBCHealth | It is impossible for people to receive quality essential health care services in health centers if these facilities do not use safely managed water, sanitation and hygiene services (WASH). According to the World Bank and World Health Organisation first Global Monitoring Report on Tracking Universal Health Coverage (UHC) (available here: http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/174536/1/9789241564977\_eng.pdf), access to WASH is critical to delivering quality health services, including ensuring patient safely, effectiveness of interventions, prevention of health care acquired infections and the provision of care that responds to people’s preferences, needs and desires. As a vital component of quality health services, access to WASH in health care facilities is therefore central to one of the pillars of UHC. The recent World Health Organization and UNICEF report (available here: http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/154588/1/9789241508476\_eng.pdf) on WASH in health care facilities states that 38% of health care facilities do not have an improved water source, 19% do not have improved sanitation and 35% do not have water and soap for handwashing. We strongly recommend that tracer interventions for UHC must include the following, and these should be explicitly stated within the document endorsed by the UN statistical commission in March 2016: “Percentage of health care facilities with safely managed water, sanitation and hygiene.” This data will be captured as part of the WHO/UNICEF WASH in health care facilities Global Action Plan: therefore adapting indicator 3.8.1 in this way does not represent an additional reporting burden. We also support the health sector recommendations that target 3.8 is tracked using two indicators covering i) financial risk protection and ii) service coverage. Effective tracking of both components will be vital to the realization of UHC and the SDGs. In order to deliver the commitment to “Leave No-One Behind”, we urge the IAEG-SDGs to strongly reaffirm the commitment by Member States to disaggregate data by all of the groups set out in agenda 2030 across all indicators. |  |  |
| GSK | GSK: In line with GAVI, we recommend the inclusion of immunization coverage as an indicator to measure UHC and believe that if this is as part of a composite group of ‘tracer indicators’ then it should be recognised that some of these tracers (such as immunization) carry more weight than others. |  |  |
| Philips | Philips: Suggestions for tracer interventions for mother and childcare: - % of pregnant women that uses antenatal care services; - % of identified high-risk pregnancies that receives correct referral and follow up; - % of deliveries attended by skilled birth attendants; - % of deliveries taking place at labor and delivery services (institutional deliveries); - Indicators above could be specifically measured for non-urban populations, as access to the health chain is markedly different compared to urban populations; - Measurements rates of exclusive breastfeeding at 3, 6, 9, 12 months; - % of women with access to family planning consult and contraception; - Number of skilled community health volunteers per 1,000 women (or families); - % of population with access to well-equiped primary/community based health clinics. | Philips: - % of population with health insurance or other access to healthcare scheme not paid out of pocket; - Availability of reasonably priced schemes for health financing through remittances; - Inclusion of health prevention in health insurance coverage. | Philips - Availability of incentives or legislation that obliges companies to measure and minimize the use of hazardous chemicals, water and soil polution and contamination. |
| Unilever | Unilever calls for all health centers to use safely managed water, sanitation and hygiene services (WASH) as a critical underpinning of quality essential health care. According to the World Bank and World Health Organisation first Global Monitoring Report on Tracking Universal Health Coverage (UHC), access to WASH is critical to delivering quality health services, including ensuring patient safely, effectiveness of interventions, prevention of health care acquired infections and the provision of care that responds to people’s preferences, needs and desires. As a vital component of quality health services, access to WASH in health care facilities is therefore central to one of the pillars of UHC. The recent World Health Organization and UNICEF report on WASH in health care facilities states that 38% of health care facilities do not have an improved water source, 19% do not have improved sanitation and 35% do not have water and soap for handwashing. Unilever endorses WaterAid's position that tracer interventions for UHC must include the following, and these should be explicitly stated within the document endorsed by the UN statistical commission in March 2016: “Percentage of health care facilities with safely managed water, sanitation and hygiene.” This data will be captured as part of the WHO/UNICEF WASH in health care facilities Global Action Plan: therefore adapting indicator 3.8.1 in this way does not represent an additional reporting burden. We are also supportive of health sector recommendations that target 3.8 is tracked using two indicators covering i) financial risk protection and ii) service coverage. Effective tracking of both components will be vital to the realisation of UHC and the SDGs. In order to deliver the commitment to “Leave No-One Behind”, we urge the IAEG-SDGs to strongly reaffirm the commitment by Member States to disaggregate data by all of the groups set out in agenda 2030 across all indicators. |  |  |
| Center for Development Research (ZEF), U Bonn | Country Bangladesh comments on access to WASH in health care facilities is a must for universal health coverage. |  |  |
| Center for Vaccine Ethics and Policy/NYU | Center for Vaccine Ethics and Policy/New York University/USA: We are extremely concerned that immunization – which held a specific and free-standing Indicator in the MDG architecture [Indicator 4.3 Proportion of 1 year-old children immunised against measles] has been relegated to a potential “tracer intervention (e.g. child full immunization…) in the proposed Indicator formulation for 3.8.1. The current language of the Indicator is the only apparent example in the Indicator Framework which references use of “tracer interventions”, and is not further well-defined in terms of what the specific and global immunization performance metric might be in this context [what “full childhood immunization” is defined to be], what its weighting might be in the broader mix of tracer intervention suggested, what the final full list of tracer interventions might comprise, and how this complex of tracer intervention indicators might evolve and by what means. Further, while other SDG Indicators reference global conventions, protocols, agreements et al which have standing and to which member states have already committed, the proposed Indicator for 3.8.1 makes no reference to the Global Vaccine Action Plan (GVAP), which was approved by 194 member states and commits them to a general movement to life course immunization (not limited to child immunization) and specific immunization performance goals to 2020. We urge [1] specific articulation around the tracer intervention approach proposed for 3.8.1 which addresses the questions above, and [2] that reference to an “immunization” tracer intervention include mention of the GVAP [Global Vaccine Action Plan] as the basis for specific metrics on immunization to be used for 3.8.1. We recommend consideration the following language which would act as an amended 3.8.1. Indicator: Proposed Indicator Proposal - 3.8.1 Coverage of tracer interventions (e.g. full immunization coverage per the Global Vaccine Action Plan (GVAP), ARV therapy, TB treatment, hypertension treatment, skilled attendant at birth, etc.) |  |  |
| Chatham House | Chatham House, UK. 3.8 is an excellent target because achieving it will achieve the majority of the other sub-goals and will be the best way to reach the overall health goal. Also in addition to improving health indicators and reducing financial impoverishment people worldwide value the security and peace of mind that having effective health coverage entails. It is therefore a worthy goal in its own right. Regarding the specific indicator 3.8.1 it is relatively straightforward to measure the coverage of these tracer interventions using routine data from health information surveys backed up by survey data. Furthermore the World Bank and WHO are consulting with global stakeholders to determine which specific service coverage indicators would be the most appropriate to track | Chatham House UK 3.8 is an excellent target because achieving it will achieve the majority of the other sub-goals and be the best way to reach the overall health goal. Also in addition to improving health indicators and reducing financial impoverishment people worldwide value the security and peace of mind that having effective health coverage entails. It is therefore a worthy goal in its own right. It is also fairly straightforward to track indicator 3.8.2 using standard household expenditure surveys |  |
| Harvard Medical School | Harvard Medical School (Department of Global Health and Social Medicine)- These tracer interventions do not include |  |  |
| Harvard Medical School, Program in Global Surgery and Social Change | The Harvard Program in Global Surgery and Social Change (USA, partnerships in 12 countries) comments: The SDGs will not achieve their aims without universal access to safe, affordable surgical and anaesthesia care when needed. A third of the world’s burden of disease is surgical, and this burden is disproportionately borne by the world’s poor: Only 6% of the world’s surgery is performed in the poorest countries in which one third of the world’s population lives. To fully address global inequity in access to health care, surgery must be included in the list of “tracer interventions”. This can simply be done by including surgical volume per 100,000 population (for which modeled data are readily available) as numerator,\* and 5000 procedures per 100,000 population as denominator. This minimum threshold for surgical delivery is correlated with good population-level health outcomes. Including this indicator would signal to governments that comprehensive health systems, including surgery as an indivisible, indispensable treatment modality, should be prioritized during the era of the SDGs. \*Available at http://www.lancetglobalsurgery.org/#!indicators/o217z | The Harvard Program in Global Surgery and Social Change (USA, partnerships in 12 countries) comments: As important as access to surgery is for population health and economic development, claiming universal access to surgery without addressing financial risk protection perpetuates a cruel cycle of poverty. Through our work, we have found that up to 81 million individuals face the threat of catastrophic expenditure for surgical and anaesthesia care each year. This makes surgery one of the most important causes of medical impoverishment around the world. Including a surgical disaggregate for financial risk protection would be simple: these data have been assembled and will be available shortly at http://www.lancetglobalsurgery.org/#!indicators/o217z. |  |
| Johns Hopkins University | Johns Hopkins University Global Surgery Initiative: Emergency and essential surgical care have been recognized as a core component of UHC as per WHA resolution 68.15. We are supportive of indicator 3.8.1 but strongly encourage the IAEG-SDGs to expand indicator 3.8.1 to include a more comprehensive list of tracer interventions for UHC. Specifically, in addition to the proposed tracer interventions listed above, we suggest the inclusion of the following tracer interventions: •Basic and comprehensive surgical care, including caesarean section, laparotomy and open fracture •Blood transfusion These tracer interventions are drawn from the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators for service-specific availability and readiness. We would also be supportive of the inclusion of additional tracer interventions included in this list. In addition to these tracer interventions, we would encourage the IAEG to consider including the percentage (%) of population covered by a package of essential health services including safe surgical care and anaesthesia. | Johns Hopkins University Global Surgical Initiative: We are supportive of indicator 3.8.2 which reflects financial risk protection. However, we would recommend that the IAEG-SDGs consider including a proposed list of services or conditions that would be included under this umbrella of financial risk protection. As part of this list, we encourage you to include surgical and anaesthesia care as a core component of UHC. |  |
| Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine | In reference to SDG Target 3.8, we support inclusion of indicators to reflect the essential role of surgical care and anaesthesia as part of UHC (as per WHA resolution 68.15): 1) In addition to the proposed tracer interventions for measurement of UHC Target 3.8, we support inclusion the of additional tracer interventions included in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators including: • Basic and comprehensive surgical care, including caesarean section, laparotomy and open fracture • Blood transfusion 2) Support inclusion of an indicator to measure the percentage (%) of population covered by a package of essential health services (including safe surgical care and anaesthesia, which is recognized as a core component of UHC as per WHA resolution 68.15) 3) Support inclusion of Health worker density and distribution as an additional indicator to measure UHC, including disaggregation of providers as suggested in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators: • By cadre, including generalist medical practitioners, specialist medical practitioners (surgeons, anaesthetists, obstetricians, emergency medicine specialists, cardiologists, paediatricians, psychiatrists, ophthalmologists, gynaecologists, etc.), nursing and midwifery professionals, traditional and complementary medicine professionals, among others. 4) Support inclusion of a UHC indicator to track the fraction of the population protected against catastrophic and impoverishing expenditure from out-of-pocket payments for essential health services, including surgical and anaesthesia care. |  |  |
| Lancet Commission on Global Surgery | The Lancet Commission on Global Surgery (UK, USA, & Sweden, with collaborators in >110 countries) comments that this indicator does not yet include coverage of surgical disease. Surgical disease represents 28-32% of the global burden of disease, causing an estimated 16.9 million deaths annually.[1] Surgical disease will cost low- and middle-income countries at least 12.3 trillion USD by 2030 without an urgent scale-up of surgical services.[2] Furthermore, safe surgical and anesthesia care can be delivered in a cost-effective manner.[3] Coverage of surgical care can be estimated using data presently available. Country-level estimates of the number of surgical procedures done per 100,000 population are available.[4] This would serve as the numerator. As a denominator, we suggest 5,000 procedures per 100,000 population, a target correlated with improved life expectancy and reduced maternal mortality.[5] We would encourage the explicit inclusion of this surgical indicator. Other targets in this framework, including 3.1.1, 3.2.1, 3.4.1, and 3.6.1 depend heavily on the delivery of safe, affordable surgical and anesthesia care when needed. However, no process measures documenting the provision of surgical care are currently included. See http://www.lancetglobalsurgery.org/#!indicators/o217z for more on surgical indicators. References: 1. Shrime MG, Bickler SW, Alkire BC, et al. Global burden of surgical disease: an estimation from the provider perspective. The Lancet Global health 2015;3 Suppl 2:S8-9 doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(14)70384-5[published Online First: Epub Date]|. 2. Alkire BC, Shrime MG, Dare AJ, et al. Global economic consequences of selected surgical diseases: a modelling study. The Lancet Global health 2015;3 Suppl 2:S21-7 doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(15)70088-4[published Online First: Epub Date]|. 3. Chao TE, Sharma K, Mandigo M, et al. Cost-effectiveness of surgery and its policy implications for global health: a systematic review and analysis. The Lancet Global health 2014;2(6):e334-45 doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(14)70213-X[published Online First: Epub Date]|. 4. Weiser TG, Haynes AB, Molina G, et al. Estimate of the global volume of surgery in 2012: an assessment supporting improved health outcomes. Lancet 2015;385 Suppl 2:S11 doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(15)60806-6[published Online First: Epub Date]|. 5. Esquivel MM, Molina G, Uribe-Leitz T, et al. Proposed Minimum Rates of Surgery to Support Desirable Health Outcomes: An Observational Study Based on Three Strategies. World J Surg 2015 doi: 10.1007/s00268-015-3092-7[published Online First: Epub Date]|. | The Lancet Commission on Global Surgery (UK, USA, & Sweden, with collaborators in >110 countries) comments that accessing surgical care causes up to 81 million cases of catastrophic expenditure each year. Including surgical and anaesthesia care early in pathways to universal health coverage is, therefore, critical to improving health and ending extreme poverty. Catastrophic and impoverishing expenditure secondary to surgical care is, therefore, an important disaggregate for this indicator. Country-level estimates for 186 countries are available.[6] See http://www.lancetglobalsurgery.org/#!indicators/o217z for more on surgical indicators. Finally, we were pleased to see that specialist surgical provider (surgeon, anaesthetist, and obstetrician) density is being considered as a disaggregate for indicator 3.c.1. A robust surgical workforce is necessary for the delivery of surgical services. References: 6. Shrime MG, Dare AJ, Alkire BC, et al. Catastrophic expenditure to pay for surgery worldwide: a modelling study. The Lancet Global health 2015;3 Suppl 2:S38-44 doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(15)70085-9[published Online First: Epub Date]|. |  |
| Massachusetts General Hospital | Massachusetts General Hospital: Five billion people around the world lack access to safe, affordable surgical care and anaesthesia. According to the Lancet Commission on Global Surgery, only 6% of surgical procedures are provided to the poorest 1/3 of the world's population. Surgically preventable conditions contribute to as many 18 million deaths each year. The World Health Assembly resolution 68.15 which was approved in May 2015 and which received an outpouring of support from Member States, recognizes the integral role of emergency and essential surgery and anaesthesia care as part of the delivery of Universal Health Coverage (UHC). In reference to indicator 3.8.1, we are strongly supportive of the inclusion of a tracer indicator for essential surgical care. Surgical conditions represent as much as one third (1/3) of the global burden of disease. Without safe, affordable access to life saving and disability-preventing surgical care, we will not be able to achieve UHC. |  |  |
| new York University | USA, NYU: Indicator of the extent and frequency of demands for unofficial payments by health providers for essential services. | USA, NYU: Extent to which complications in childbirth trigger catastrophic financial demands on mothers. |  |
| Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland | Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland - Ireland In addition to the proposed tracer interventions, we support the inclusion of additional tracer interventions included in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators including: Basic and comprehensive surgical care, including caesarean section, laparotomy and open fracture and blood transfusion. We support the inclusion of an indicator to measure the percentage of population covered by a package of essential health services (including safe surgical care and anaesthesia, which is recognized as a core component of UHC as per WHA resolution 68.15) We support the inclusion of Health worker density and distribution as an additional indicator to measure UHC, including disaggregation of providers as suggested in the WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators: By cadre, including generalist medical practitioners, specialist medical practitioners (surgeons, anaesthetists, obstetricians, emergency medicine specialists, cardiologists, paediatricians, psychiatrists, ophthalmologists, gynaecologists, etc.), nursing and midwifery professionals, traditional and complementary medicine professionals, among others. | Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland - Ireland We support the inclusion of a UHC indicator to track the fraction of the population protected against catastrophic and impoverishing expenditure from out-of-pocket payments for essential health services, including surgical and anaesthesia care. |  |
| University of Utah | University of Utah Center for Global Surgery, USA Needs much stronger language to recognize the critical role for surgery in decreasing mobility ad mortality of mothers and children from birth related complications. Work force, access. Skilled attendant is not adequate. Need surgery, anesthesia, and obstetrical work force #s. | Important aspect to monitor and implement ways to decrease catastrophic health expenditures. | It is critical to have access to basic surgical and anesthetic care for increasing economic status and improving life style. Surgical maintains people's ability to work, to support their families. Need to monitor access to surgical care, healthcare expenditures, surgical and anesthesia workforce, basic types of surgical care available. Hazardous chemicals monitoring important. |
| University of Utah Center for Global Surgery | The University of Utah Center for Global Surgery (CGS) is dedicated to improving healthcare worldwide, training the next generation of global healthcare leaders. The WHA resolution 68.15 which was approved in May 2015 and which received an outpouring of support from Member States, recognizes the critical role of emergency and essential surgery and anaesthesia care as part of the delivery of Universal Health Coverage (UHC). In reference to Target 3.8, the University of Utah CGS supports the inclusion of surgical and anaesthesia care indicators. Specifically, we encourage the IAEG-SDG to consider including tracer interventions for basic and comprehensive surgical care as part of indicator 3.8.1. Without safe, affordable access to life saving and disability-preventing surgical care, we will not be able to achieve UHC. |  |  |
| Vanderbilt University | Tracer interventions should be expanded to include basic surgical interventions and anesthesia -- Cesarean Section with safe anesthesia may be an appropriate tracer intervention |  |  |
| Wayne State University School of Medicine | The first thousand days of any human life are the most important determinants of progress. They should have the greatest investment. |  |  |

| **Country/Organisation** | **Goal 4: Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all** |
| --- | --- |
| **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 cultureâ€™s contribution to sustainable development. |
| *Indicator 4.7.1:*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 topic will depend on the survey or assessment in which the indicator is collected (Disaggregations: sex and location (and others where data are available)) |
| *Discussion prompt: The IAEG-SDG Members ask for suggestions for an alternative indicator.* |
| **Total comments received** | 116 |
| Hungarian Central Statistical Office | HU: In the target one can find sustainable development, sustainable lifestyles, human rights, gender equality, promotion of a culture of peace etc. On the contrary, in the indicator only environmental science and geoscience are mentioned. We suggest to include other fields of social sciences into the indicator. |
| Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Censos | We suggest a change in the posed indicator to the determination of whether a country has or does not have a curriculum that includes subjects related to natural sciences and earth science. |
| ISTAT | Istat-Italy: it is necessary more methodological work, but we support this indicator also according to the UN CEDAW Treaty |
| National Statistical Institute, Spain | The indicator is ambiguous and remains very open and subject to interpretations. It will be difficult to measure; even more if there will not be consistency of approach between countries. Completion (referred to national education system) could be a better indicator about the acquisition of knowledge. |
| Statistics Denmark | We find that there is a need for further reflection and methodological development of the indicator in relation to education goal 4.7.The proposed indicator for this target, focusing on the knowledge of 15-year old students of i.a. environmental science and geoscience, doesn’t capture the overall sense and objective of the target. We thus support the grey status of this indicator First of all, education systems around the world differ a lot, and it doesn’t make sense to link a specific age group to specific subjects or content. Secondly the topics proposed or highlighted don’t capture the overall sense and objective of the target. Admittedly, it is not a simple task to identify an appropriate indicator that does, but it is recommended that the search continues. We find also that the proposed target should also capture “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” as stated in the target. Support for UNFPAs proposal regarding insertion of language regarding life skills-based HIV and sexuality education. |
| Statistics Finland | Finland suggests a new formulation “Percentage of 15year old students enrolled in secondary school demonstrating at least a fixed level of knowledge and skills across a selection of topics in environmental science and geoscience and in human rights.” The exact choice/range of topic will depend on the survey or assessment in which the indicator is collected (Disaggregations: sex and location (and others where data are available)). Knowledge and skills go hand in hand. Human rights should also be included in the indicator. How to define "fixed level"? |
| Statistics Lithuania | Move to green.PISA sutvey conducted every 3 years |
| United States | US: No comment at this time. |
| Department Foreign Affairs and Trade, Australia | Australia considers that this target would require greater specification of numerous concepts, and thinks the relevance of the proposed indicator] to the target is limited. For example: - 15 year olds enrolled in secondary school is not a good proxy for 'all learners' - how would we specify 'a fixed level of knowledge'? Would an indicator around national curriculums' inclusion of environmental science and geoscience be a viable alternative? It may not be fully relevant to the target either, but it would be easier to measure. |
| g7+ Secretariat | g7+ Secretariat: We suggest that this indicator be excluded and instead strengthen the indicator (4.3.1.) to cover higher education (enrolmnt in university)a bit better. |
| International Disability Alliance | IDA recommends disaggregating by disability. It would read as: Disaggregations: sex, disability, and location (and others where data are available) |
| International Disability and Development Consortium | For indicator 4.7.1 IDDC recommends disaggregating by disability It would read as: Disaggregations: sex, disability, and location (and others where data are available) |
| OECD | We support the UNESCO-UIS proposal for "Extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education for sustainable development are mainstreamed in (a) national education policies (b) curricula (c) teacher education and (d) student assessment". |
| UN Women | Proposed indicator: “Extent to which (i) global citizenship education, (ii) education for sustainable development, (iii) gender equality, and (iv) human rights are mainstreamed at all levels in (a) national education policies (b) curricula (c) teacher education and (d) student assessment”. UNESCO and others are proposing an indicator measuring the “Extent to which (i) global citizenship education, (ii) education for sustainable development are mainstreamed in (a) national education policies (b) curricula (c) teacher education and (d) student assessment”. UN Women thinks that this addresses only part of the target. Therefore we propose to add the terms “(iii) gender equality, and (iv) human rights” and “at all levels”. |
| UNAIDS | The SDGs are referencing access to information and life-skills on several occasions but the indicator framework includes no proposed indicators to measure comprehensive sexuality education. We therefor suggest that the following indicator be included under Target. 4.7 "Percentage of schools that provided life-skills based HIV and CSE in the previous academic year" (UNAIDS Strategy 2016-2021)  Comprehensive sexuality education (or CSE) is defined as “an age-appropriate, culturally relevant approach to teaching about sex and relationships by providing scientifically accurate, realistic, non-judgmental information. Sexuality education provides opportunities to explore one’s own values and attitudes and to build decision making, communication and risk reduction skills about many aspects of sexuality.” Source: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), UNAIDS, United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) and WHO. International technical guidance on sexuality education. Volume I. Paris: UNESCO; 2009. |
| UNEP | UNEP Comments in collaboration with UNESCO: propose the following two priority indicators: a) Percentage of students that have acquired sustainability literacy; b) Percentage of universities that have integrated environment and sustainability in their curriculum as an interdisciplinary manner. Sustainability literacy will be measured using the sustainability literacy text (available at: http://www.sulite.org/en/the\_test). The test is administered by higher education institutions to assess and verify the sustainability literacy of their students when they graduate. It assesses the minimum level knowledge in economic, social and environmental responsibility for higher education students, applicable all over the world, in any kind of Higher Education Institution (HEI), in any country, studying any kind of tertiary-level course (Bachelors, Masters, MBAs, PhD). The SuLiTest is recognized as Partners for SDGs at the UN, (https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/partnership/?p=9551), and has partners including UNESCO, UNDP, UNEP, UN DESA, UN PRME, ULSF, CEEMAN, MEDIES, GRLI, ARIUSA, AMFORHT, HEASC, WFCP, GUPES, IDDRI, IAU, Copernicus alliance and many national and regional partners. The Sustainability Literacy Test Report is available at https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/index.php?page=view&type=400&nr=1592&menu=35 |
| UN-ESCAP | This indicator should not be subject specific |
| UNESCO Institute for Statistics | Comments from UNESCO-UIS Targets 4.7 and 12.8 are linked and could be addressed by the same global indicator. Target 13.3 deals with similar issues and may be addressed by the same indicator. For Target 4.7 there was general concern about the original indicator and lack of consensus on others proposed during the consultation processes so far. While an outcome-based indicator may be preferred, UNESCO-UIS recommends a new provision- and process-based indicator instead which could also be used for Target 12.8 and possibly Target 13.3. It is more comprehensive than the original indicator proposed by the IAEG-SDGs for Target 4.7. The new indicator is included in the proposed thematic set of education indicators developed by the Technical Advisory Group for the Post-2015 Education Indicators (TAG) and is the TAG’s recommended global reporting indicator for Target 4.7. The indicator is: Extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education for sustainable development (including climate change education) are mainstreamed in (a) national education policies (b) curricula (c) teacher education and (d) student assessment It is a qualitative indicator. Unlike the other indicators proposed so far for Target 4.7 the new indicator captures a broader range of concepts in this complex target. A mechanism needs to be developed to collect the information needed for this indicator. At the global level, UNESCO has the mandate for both global citizenship education and education for sustainable development and therefore would be the body responsible for collecting this information. Metadata for this indicator are available and have been submitted today to UNSD. If the IAEG Members have questions about this proposal please contact UIS Director, Silvia Montoya (uis.director@unesco.org) and Alison Kennedy (a.kennedy@unesco.org). |
| UNFPA | UNFPA supports the alternative proposal by UNESCO with suggested inputs from UNWomen, which would offer a composite indicator that looks not only at global citizenship, but integrates gender and human rights. The suggested formulation would be: Extent to which (i) global citizenship education, (ii) education for sustainable development, (iii) gender equality, and (iv) human rights are mainstreamed at all levels in (a) national education policies, (b) curricula, (c) teacher education and (d) student assessment. UNFPA also recommends due consideration of the following options as a supplementary indicator: Percentage of schools that provided life skills-based HIV and sexuality education in the previous academic year (Education 2030 Framework for Action indicator proposed by the Technical Advisory Group based on the existing accountability framework of Measuring the education sector response to HIV and AIDS: Guidelines for the construction and use of core Indicators (UNESCO 2013)); Existence of national strategies for comprehensive sexuality education in schools including promotion of gender equitable attitudes and behaviours (UNAIDS Strategy 2016-2020 ‘On the Fast-Track to end AIDS’ proposed indicator); “Number of high-prevalence countries where over 70% of schools provided life skills-based HIV and CSE in the previous academic year” (UNAIDS Strategy 2016-2020 ‘On the Fast-Track to end AIDS’ proposed indicator). |
| UNICEF | UNICEF proposes the following indicator based on the recommendation of the Technical Advisory Group for the Post-2015 Education Indicators (TAG): Extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education for sustainable development are mainstreamed in (a) national education policies (b) curricula (c) teacher education and (d) student assessment While this is an indicator on provision rather than outcomes, it captures a broader range of concepts than the other indicators proposed so far for Target 4.7. We support the metadata provided by UNESCO on this indicator. |
| United Nations | The Office of the Secretary-General's Envoy on Youth, reiterates its position that the proposed indicator is too narrowly defined and doesn't sufficiently cover the target. A replacement indicator should consider an expansion of the scope of topics to include important elements on global citizenship, human rights, gender equality and comprehensive education on human sexuality, which are all extremely relevant for the acquisition of knowledge and skills for sustainable development and lifestyles. |
| United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) | OHCHR urges the inclusion of ‘human rights’ in the indicator that will measure target 4.7. Human rights are indeed explicitly mentioned in the target. This inclusion and its measurement will have to be consistent with the World Programme on Human Rights Education (GA RES 59/113), which has been implemented in many countries since 2005. OHCHR also suggests the following indicator, ‘Number of countries implementing human rights education in line with the World Programme for Human Rights Education as per GA resolution 59/113. (Data source: Universal Periodic Review, Concluding Observations of UN Treaty Monitoring Bodies, UN agencies and national policy/programme data sources). |
| Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact | The suggested indicator only addresses a few of the knowledge and skills areas mentioned in the target. One key area left out is human rights, in spite of very explicit requirements in the Universal Declaration on Human Rights and a range of other human rights instruments for education to strengthen the respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. Further, the proposed indicator requires the measurement of comparable learning outcomes, which may be challenging while an assessment of the learning objectives of curricula will be easier to monitor. Given the universality of human rights, it will also be feasible to identify a selection of universal human rights topics, against which curricula can be assessed. A feasible indicator would be: “Proportion of primary and secondary education curricula that include learning objectives concerning human rights (including human rights relating to gender equality, peace and non-violence, cultural diversity) as well as environmental science and geoscience”. |
| Asia South Pacific Association of Basic and Adult Education | 4.7.1: Percentage of children, youth and adult students and learners in formal and non formal educational institutions demonstrating knowledge and skills on sustainable livelihood, human rights, participatory and democratic society, healthy and productive life in harmony with nature. 4.7.2: Percentage of formal and non formal educational institutions mainstreaming global citizenship education, education for sustainable development and human rights in the national education policies, curricula and teacher development. |
| ASTRA Network | In addition, or as an alternative, to the proposed indicator for this target, we recommend the inclusion of an indicator that reflects the “sustainable lifestyle” and “gender equality” components through using the following as a proxy indicator for comprehensive sexuality education (CSE): “Proportion of young people (10-24) who demonstrates desired level of knowledge and reject major misconceptions about sexual and reproductive health, including HIV and AIDS (modified MDG indicator, school based surveys)” Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE) is central to enable individuals to safely and responsibly navigate their sexuality and relationships, and empower them to be active members of their community. It tackles misconceptions about gender equality and aims to equip children and adolescents with the skills they require to realize sexual health and reproductive rights. This indicator is outcome focused, but reflects the process of CSE that would need to take place to achieve this knowledge outcome. |
| Red de educación popular entre mujeres REPEM | Red de educación popular entre mujeres REPEM Possible indicator: Teachers training programs and institutional accreditation (colleges and universities) that promote the teaching and learning aimed at adopting sustainable lifestyles, knowledge and respect for human rights, gender equality, culture peace and non-violence, world citizenship and cultural diversity Annual percentage increase budgets by country, aimed at promoting teacher training students in adopting sustainable lifestyles, knowledge and respect for human rights, gender equality, culture of peace and non-violence, global citizenship and cultural diversity. |
| Red Educacion Popular entre Mujeres, A. Latina el Caribe REPEM | Percentage of 15 year old students enrolled in formal education and trained in sustainable lifestyles, knowledge and respect for human rights, gender equality, peace and culture non-violence, citizenship and cultural diversity Percentage of Teacher training programs and institutional accreditation (colleges and universities) that promote the teaching and learning aimed at adopting sustainable lifestyles, knowledge and respect for human rights, gender equality, peace and culture non-violence, world citizenship and cultural diversity Annual percentage increase budgets by country, aimed at promoting teacher training students in adopting sustainable lifestyles, knowledge and respect for human rights, gender equality, culture of peace and non-violence, global citizenship and cultural diversity. ( proposed by REPEM) |
| RIGHTS | Creating awareness and sensitizing the students of secondary school and above about promotion of sustainable development and lifestyle, human rights, gender equality, promotion of culture and non violence, global citizenship and appreciation of cultural diversity and of cultural contribution to sustainable development. |
| AbleChildAfrica | We recommend disaggregating by disability . It would read as: Disaggregations: sex, disability, and location (and others where data are available) |
| ADD International | Disaggregations: sex, DISABILITY and location (and others where data are available |
| Adolescent Girl and SDG Indicators Working Group\*: signatories included the UN Foundation, Plan International, Advocates for Youth, Girl Effect, Girls Thinking Global, International Center for Research on Women | Adolescent Girl and SDG Indicators Working Group\*: 4.7.1 Extent to which (i) global citizenship education, (ii) education for sustainable development, (iii) gender equality, and (iv) human rights are mainstreamed at all levels in (a) national education policies (b) curricula (c) teacher education and (d) student assessment -DATA SOURCE: Disaggregated country data; National Education Information Systems -GLOBAL MONITORING ENTITY: UNESCO 4.7.2 Proportion of young people who demonstrate desired levels of knowledge about sexual and reproductive health, including at a minimum: 1. knowledge of three common types of contraceptive measures: oral contraceptive (pill), condom, and at least one longer-acting reversible contraceptive (injection, IUD, implant); 2. Knowledge of two ways to reduce sexual transmission of HIV; 3. A measure related to gender, power relation, and perceptions of gender equality (i.e. belief that a husband/partner is justified in beating his wife/partner if they refuse sex. Disaggregations: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) -DATA SOURCE: Indices created based on data collected in population-based surveys, to include 10-14 year olds. Most data (aged 15-19 or 15-24) currently available from DHS and other surveys, allowing for disaggregation by age and other characteristics. -GLOBAL MONITORING ENTITY: UNAIDS, UNESCO, UNFPA -RATIONALE: Ensuring that adolescents have access to comprehensive sexual and reproductive health information and services can ensure their right to health and help prevent unintended pregnancy, STI infection (including HIV). Sexuality education can increase knowledge and improve attitudes, delay or decrease risky sexual behaviors, and/or increase condom/contraceptive use. This indicator directly measures individual level knowledge (rather than policy at facility or government level, which may not translate to individuals). It is also not restricted to individuals in schools and so may capture the most vulnerable individuals. Note: This indicator would be a cross-cutting measure for target 3.7 |
| All for Education national CS Coalition | Tungalag, Mongolia I am proposing an indicator for this to be "extent that global citizenship education abd ESD are mainstreamed in education policy, curriculum, teacher training, and student assessment" UNESCO ASPnet schools or eco schools, australian initiatives can be used for initial measure |
| Articulacion Feminista Marcosur | Colombia. Ensuring gender perspective into this, to avoid gender reproduction of stereotypes. |
| Asia Dalit Rights Forum | 1. Creating awareness and sensitizing the students of secondary school and above about promotion of sustainable development and lifestyle, human rights, gender equality, promotion of culture and non violence, global citizenship and appreciation of cultural diversity and of cultural contribution to sustainable development. |
| Austrian Leprosy Relief Association | Also, disaggregate by disability |
| Better Place International | USA, number of country that can provide a national plan for training and retaining the manpower |
| Brookings | Jasodhara Bhattacharya, Brookings, USA. The proposed indicator (extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education for sustainable development are mainstreamed in (a) national education policies (b) curricula (c) teacher education and (d) student assessment) is rich in capturing the broad set of concepts that encompass global citizenship education and education for sustainable development. However, it is open to very broad interpretation and thus may need to be more specific to be useful from a comparative M&E perspective. For example, one nation may include a few topics around global citizenship education such as global governance structures into a civics curriculum without touching on the transformative heart and intent of global citizenship education. Where does that fall on the 'extent of mainstreaming', for the purposes of comparative M&E? Given that global citizenship education is a transformative ethos rather than a set of topics, if we imagine mainstreaming along a continuum from 'mentioned' to 'integrated within hidden and enacted curricula at all levels', it might be useful to specify the 'best-case scenario' i.e. extent to which it is mainstreamed by integrating within all subject areas. Also, given the behavioral and socio-emotional domains of the ethos of global citizenship education, it would be useful to track the implementation of learner centered pedagogies and continuous formative assessment (e.g. opportunities for building self-efficacy through learner-centered pedagogies and assessment for learning opportunities) and the impact on learning outcome. We would surface a richer picture with three indicators: one that refers to the extent of systems level integration of global citizenship education (which of the following is it present in and to what extent: curriculum, teacher education, national education policies); one that refers to learner-centered pedagogies and transformative assessment practices to support this transformative paradigm (this should incorporate tracking competences such as empathy, critical thinking, collaboration/communication/conflict resolution, shared universal values and respect for diversity); one that refers to the learning outcomes in the three domains as a result of this structural integration e.g. the percentage of 15 year olds who demonstrate a) knowledge of a selection of topics in environmental science and geoscience (climate change is only one portion of geoscience) c) knowledge of a selection of topics around personal development, social structure and dynamics (this would incorporate ideas of identity, positive interactions, interdependence and interconnectedness, governance, power structures, diversity) d)participation in identifying, planning, implementing and reflecting on action plans to address long-term individual and community well-being at the local/ national/ global level (depending on how deep we want the indicator to be, we could specify addressing needs and priorities, addressing inequality, addressing social cohesion; also, we could disaggregate for local, national and global levels). Let us measure what matters: in addition to content knowledge around 'global issues', if we want students to gain some self-efficacy with basic leadership skills, basic understandings of social dynamics, basic self-efficacy with taking critical action towards positive social change for themselves and their communities, then we should track these components specifically, including opportunities for learners to plan, implement, and reflect on such actions. It is important that we specify that these actions are done with an eye towards the long-term wellbeing of themselves and their communities so that these are not a compounding of one-off events that cumulate in social chaos rather than ending poverty, protecting the planet, and ensuring prosperity for all. In addition, it would be preferable if we incorporate the terminology of human rights and respect for diversity within this indicator. Otherwise, we are not addressing some root fundamental inequalities and injustices. |
| Brookings | Jasodhara Bhattacharya, Brookings, USA. The proposed indicator (extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education for sustainable development are mainstreamed in (a) national education policies (b) curricula (c) teacher education and (d) student assessment) is rich in capturing the broad set of concepts that encompass global citizenship education and education for sustainable development. However, it is open to very broad interpretation and thus may need to be more specific to be useful from a comparative M&E perspective. For example, one nation may include a few topics around global citizenship education such as global governance structures into a civics curriculum without touching on the transformative heart and intent of global citizenship education. Where does that fall on the 'extent of mainstreaming', for the purposes of comparative M&E? Given that global citizenship education is a transformative ethos rather than a set of topics, if we imagine mainstreaming along a continuum from 'mentioned' to 'integrated within hidden and enacted curricula at all levels', it might be useful to specify the 'best-case scenario' i.e. extent to which it is mainstreamed by integrating within all subject areas. Also, given the behavioral and socio-emotional domains of the ethos of global citizenship education, it would be useful to track the implementation of learner centered pedagogies and continuous formative assessment (e.g. opportunities for building self-efficacy through learner-centered pedagogies and assessment for learning opportunities) and the impact on learning outcome. We would surface a richer picture with three indicators: one that refers to the extent of systems level integration of global citizenship education (which of the following is it present in and to what extent: curriculum, teacher education, national education policies); one that refers to learner-centered pedagogies and transformative assessment practices to support this transformative paradigm; one that refers to the learning outcomes in the three domains as a result of this structural integration e.g. the percentage of 15 year olds who demonstrate a) knowledge of a selection of topics in environmental science and geoscience (climate change is only one portion of geoscience) c) knowledge of a selection of topics around personal development, social structure and dynamics (this would incorporate ideas of identity, positive interactions, interdependence and interconnectedness, governance, power structures, diversity) d)participation in identifying, planning, implementing and reflecting on action plans to address long-term individual and community well-being at the local/ national/ global level (depending on how deep we want the indicator to be, we could specify addressing needs and priorities, addressing inequality, addressing social cohesion; also, we could disaggregate for local, national and global levels). Let us measure what matters: in addition to content knowledge around 'global issues', if we want students to gain some self-efficacy with basic leadership skills, basic understandings of social dynamics, basic self-efficacy with taking critical action towards positive social change for themselves and their communities, then we should track these components specifically, including opportunities for learners to plan, implement, and reflect on such actions. It is important that we specify that these actions are done with an eye towards the long-term wellbeing of themselves and their communities so that these are not a compounding of one-off events that cumulate in social chaos rather than ending poverty, protecting the planet, and ensuring prosperity for all. |
| Brookings | The proposed indicator (extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education for sustainable development are mainstreamed in (a) national education policies (b) curricula (c) teacher education and (d) student assessment) is rich in capturing the broad set of concepts that encompass global citizenship education and education for sustainable development. However, it is open to very broad interpretation and thus may need to be more specific to be useful from a comparative M&E perspective. For example, one nation may include a few topics around global citizenship education such as global governance structures into a civics curriculum without touching on the transformative heart and intent of global citizenship education. Where does that fall on the 'extent of mainstreaming', for the purposes of comparative M&E? Given that global citizenship education is a transformative ethos rather than a set of topics, if we imagine mainstreaming along a continuum from 'mentioned' to 'integrated within hidden and enacted curricula at all levels', it might be useful to specify the 'best-case scenario' i.e. extent to which it is mainstreamed by integrating within all subject areas. Also, given the behavioral and socio-emotional domains of the ethos of global citizenship education, it would be useful to track the implementation of learner centered pedagogies and continuous formative assessment (e.g. opportunities for building self-efficacy through learner-centered pedagogies and assessment for learning opportunities) and the impact on learning outcome. We would surface a richer picture with three indicators: one that refers to the extent of systems level integration of global citizenship education (which of the following is it present in and to what extent: curriculum, teacher education, national education policies); one that refers to learner-centered pedagogies and transformative assessment practices to support this transformative paradigm; one that refers to the learning outcomes in the three domains as a result of this structural integration e.g. the percentage of 15 year olds who demonstrate a) knowledge of a selection of topics in environmental science and geoscience (climate change is only one portion of geoscience) c) knowledge of a selection of topics around personal development, social structure and dynamics (this would incorporate ideas of identity, positive interactions, interdependence and interconnectedness, governance, power structures, diversity) d)participation in identifying, planning, implementing and reflecting on action plans to address long-term individual and community well-being at the local/ national/ global level (depending on how deep we want the indicator to be, we could specify addressing needs and priorities, addressing inequality, addressing social cohesion; also, we could disaggregate for local, national and global levels). Let us measure what matters: in addition to content knowledge around 'global issues', if we want students to gain some self-efficacy with basic leadership skills, basic understandings of social dynamics, basic self-efficacy with taking critical action towards positive social change for themselves and their communities, then we should track these components specifically, including opportunities for learners to plan, implement, and reflect on such actions. It is important that we specify that these actions are done with an eye towards the long-term wellbeing of themselves and their communities so that these are not a compounding of one-off events that cumulate in social chaos rather than ending poverty, protecting the planet, and ensuring prosperity for all. |
| CBM UK | This goal recognises the need for inclusive education for all, and therefore This indicator should be disaggregated by disability. |
| CHOICE for Youth and Sexuality | CHOICE for Youth and Sexuality: Please note more than one indicator may be needed to track Target 4.7 to ensure that the scope of this multi-component target is better reflected and not reduced. Education is a core pillar for achieving the level of transformation Agenda 2030 aspires to: Too many critical elements of this target and its enabling effects across the SDGs as a whole could remain omitted with only one indicator. SUBSTITUTE with new multi-purpose indicator proposal for Target 4.7: Percentage of schools that provided comprehensive sexuality education (CSE) in the previous academic year. Why? o Multi-purpose indicator that responds to five elements of Target 4.7: human rights, gender equality, culture of peace, non-violence, and knowledge and skills to promote sustainable development and lifestyles (e.g. by contributing to reducing early and unwanted pregnancies, family size, and instilling values and skills of responsible parenthood). o Links: Targets 3.1, 3.3, 3.7, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.6, 16.1 and 16.2 with broad enabling effects for the health, education, gender equality, and employment goals. o Coherence and convergence with other SDGs global implementation frameworks & indicators: “Comprehensive sexuality education” (CSE) features in the following recently adopted global frameworks, including with related indicators, directly linked to SDGs implementation: - Education 2030 Framework for Action, with the proposed indicator on “Percentage of schools that provided life skills-based HIV and sexuality education in the previous academic year”; - UNAIDS Strategy 2016-2020 “On the Fast-Track to end AIDS”, with proposed indicators on “Existence of national strategies for CSE in schools including promotion of gender equitable attitudes and behaviours” and “Number of high-prevalence countries where over 70% of schools provided life skills-based HIV and CSE in the previous academic year”; and the Secretary-General’s Strategy on Women’s, Children’s and Adolescent Health. o International Agreements: The proposed indicator responds to various global and regional UN inter-governmental agreements. o Evidence-base: By international expert standards, central elements of quality, effective comprehensive sexuality education are: respect for human rights, equitable gender relations, non-violence and respect of others and appreciation of diversity – key elements of the target. Programmes that ensure a gender equality approach and curricula are five times more effective than those that do not. Comprehensive sexuality education – ‘comprehensive’ in that it goes beyond a focus on biology alone – enables young people to acquire knowledge and skills, and is associated with delayed sexual debut, fewer sexual partners, increased use of condoms and prevention of sexually-transmitted infections and unintended pregnancies. It also shows the largest impacts on HIV-related behaviours by comparison to other approaches, and is also a cost-effective investment. o Data: Data from this indicator could be drawn from school-based surveys and education management information systems, building on related methodological development underway for the Education 2030 Framework for Action. • Whichever final indicator/s are selected for Target 4.7, human rights, gender equality and non-violence should be prioritized for measurement as core educational priorities universally and essential for young people’s wellbeing, alongside health issues such as tobacco use, sexual and reproductive health and HIV prevention. |
| Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International | Comments from Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International, Netherlands  Public availability of environmental and sustainability science information and learning across all ages and genders, in formal and informal settings, and through educational institutions curriculums. |
| CONCORD Sweden | CONCORD Sweden’s belives that this indicator does not measure all the knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development as listed in the target. Therefore, in addition, or as an alternative, to the proposed indicator for this target, we recommend the inclusion of two indicators which reflects the sustainable lifestyle, gender equality and human rights components of the targets. First, we suggest using the following as a proxy indicator for comprehensive sexuality education (CSE): “Proportion of young people (10-24) who demonstrates desired level of knowledge and reject major misconceptions about sexual and reproductive health, including HIV and AIDS” (modified MDG indicator, school based surveys). Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE) is central to enable individuals to safely and responsibly navigate their sexuality and relationships, and empower them to be active members of their community. It tackles misconceptions about gender equality and aims to equip children and adolescents with the skills they require to realize sexual health and reproductive rights and to promote non-violence and anti-discrimination. This indicator is outcome focused, but reflects the process of CSE that would need to take place to achieve this knowledge outcome. Second, another key area left out of suggested indicators is human rights. The proposed indicator requires the measurement of comparable learning outcomes, which may be challenging while an assessment of the learning objectives of curricula will be easier to monitor. Given the universality of human rights, it will also be feasible to identify a selection of universal human rights topics, against which curricula can be assessed. A feasible additional indicator would be: “Proportion of primary and secondary education curricula that include learning objectives concerning human rights (including human rights relating to gender equality, peace and non-violence, cultural diversity)” |
| Culture Committee, United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG) | The Committee on Culture of United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG) believes that the draft indicator’s focus on environmental science and geoscience is too narrow when compared to the target. In this respect, we agree with the suggestion made by the UN Statistical System Organizations, drawing on the recommendations from the Technical Advisory Group on Post-2015 Education Indicators, for the following indicator: “Extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education for sustainable development are mainstreamed in (a) national education policies, (b) curricula, (c) teacher education, and (d) student assessment.” |
| Culture et Développement | France, Culture et Développement (based on UNESCO CDIS Methodology Manual) Percentage of instructional hours dedicated to arts education in relation to the total number of instructional hours in the first two years of secondary school (grades 7-8) and/or Percentage of staff in primary and secondary education with specific training in artistic or cultural disciplines and/or Index of coherency and coverage of technical and vocational education and training (TVET) and tertiary education systems in the field of culture, environmental science and geoscience see also Global Cultural Participation Index (and related indicators) |
| dance4life | Country: The Netherlands Organization: dance4life Proposal: Percentage of schools that provided comprehensive sexuality education (CSE) in the previous academic year Rationale: o This indicator responds to five elements of Target 4.7: human rights, gender equality, culture of peace, non-violence, and knowledge and skills to promote sustainable development and lifestyles (e.g. by contributing to reducing early and unwanted pregnancies, family size, and instilling values and skills of responsible parenthood). o Links: Targets 3.1, 3.3, 3.7, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.6, 16.1 and 16.2 with broad enabling effects for the health, education, gender equality, and employment goals. The ‘grey’ indicator on ‘knowledge of environmental science’ could be moved and considered alongside the proposals also categorized as ‘grey’ under Targets 12.8 (‘awareness of sustainable development and lifestyles in harmony with nature’) or 13.3 (climate change education). Both targets speak directly to this (environmental) element of Target 4.7, whereas other aspects of Target 4.7 may have no other ‘home’ in the SDG targets. This would allow space for indicators under Target 4.7 to cover other key elements, especially human rights, gender equality and non-violence, as proposed. |
| Danish Institute for Human Rights | The suggested indicator only addresses a few of the knowledge and skills areas mentioned in the target. One key area left out is human rights, in spite of very explicit requirements in the Universal Declaration on Human Rights and a range of other human rights instruments for education to strengthen the respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. Further, the proposed indicator requires the measurement of comparable learning outcomes, which may be challenging while an assessment of the learning objectives of curricula will be easier to monitor. Given the universality of human rights, it will also be feasible to identify a selection of universal human rights topics, against which curricula can be assessed. The World Programme on Human Rights Education (GA RES 59/113) can offer guidance in this regard. A feasible indicator would be: “Proportion of primary and secondary education curricula that include learning objectives concerning human rights (including human rights relating to gender equality, peace and non-violence, cultural diversity) as well as environmental science and geoscience”. |
| Diyalo Pariwar | Life-skills which are based in vocational and monetary benefit in comparing the market need to be promoted. |
| DSW (Deutsche Stiftung Weltbevoelkerung) | DSW states the following: In addition, or as an alternative, to the proposed indicator for this target, we recommend the inclusion of an indicator that reflects the “sustainable lifestyle” and “gender equality” components through using the following as a proxy indicator for comprehensive sexuality education (CSE): “Proportion of young people (10-24) who demonstrates desired level of knowledge and reject major misconceptions about sexual and reproductive health, including HIV and AIDS (modified MDG indicator, school based surveys)” Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE) is central to enable individuals to safely and responsibly navigate their sexuality and relationships, and empower them to be active members of their community. It tackles misconceptions about gender equality and aims to equip children and adolescents with the skills they require to realize sexual health and reproductive rights. This indicator is outcome focused, but reflects the process of CSE that would need to take place to achieve this knowledge outcome. |
| Dutch Coalition on Disability and Development (DCDD) | DCDD comments the desegregation by sex, disability, and location (and others where data are available) |
| Education International | Education International disagrees with the proposed indicator 4.7.1 as it does not correspond to the target as a whole, but merely to a small part of the 'education for sustainable development' element of the target. Given the sizeable scope of the target, we propose two alternative indicators, one process indicator that looks at the mechanisms in place to ensure implementation, and one outcome indicator that looks at the extent to which these subjects are covered in formal and non-formal education. The former builds on the proposal submitted by UNESCO. 4.7.1 Extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education for sustainable development iii) gender equality and iv) human rights education are mainstreamed in (a) national education policies and plans (b) curricula (c) teacher education and (d) student assessment. 4.7.2 Percentage of teaching hours dedicated to education for sustainable development, global citizenship education, and human rights education (as per UNGA resolution 59/113) in formal and non-formal education. |
| Equilibres & Populations | In addition, or as an alternative, to the proposed indicator for this target, we recommend the inclusion of an indicator that reflects the “sustainable lifestyle” and “gender equality” components through using the following as a proxy indicator for comprehensive sexuality education (CSE): “Proportion of young people (10-24) who demonstrates desired level of knowledge and reject major misconceptions about sexual and reproductive health, including HIV and AIDS (modified MDG indicator, school based surveys)” Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE) is central to enable individuals to safely and responsibly navigate their sexuality and relationships, and empower them to be active members of their community. It tackles misconceptions about gender equality and aims to equip children and adolescents with the skills they require to realize sexual health and reproductive rights. This indicator is outcome focused, but reflects the process of CSE that would need to take place to achieve this knowledge outcome. |
| Fair Travel International | this indicator is very narrow to check about sustainable development. It gives too much emphasis to knowledge and skills. suggestion is that percentage of students enrolled in secondary school who increased understanding about sustainable lifestyle, cultural diversity, gender equality, human right. |
| Family Care International | MOVE the current grey indicator to be considered under Targets 12.8 or 13.3:Targets 4.7, 12.8 and 13.3 are inter-related with overlapping elements and could be considered together. SUBSTITUTE with new multi-purpose indicator proposal for Target 4.7: Percentage of schools that provided comprehensive sexuality education (CSE) in the previous academic year • The ‘grey’ indicator on ‘knowledge of environmental science’ could be moved and considered alongside the proposals also categorized as ‘grey’ under Targets 12.8 (‘awareness of sustainable development and lifestyles in harmony with nature’) or 13.3 (climate change education). Both targets speak directly to this (environmental) element of Target 4.7, whereas other aspects of Target 4.7 may have no other ‘home’ in the SDG targets. This would allow space for indicators under Target 4.7 to cover other key elements, especially human rights, gender equality and non-violence, as proposed below. • More than one indicator may be needed to track Target 4.7 to ensure that the scope of this multi-component target is better reflected and not reduced. Education is a core pillar for achieving the level of transformation Agenda 2030 aspires to: Too many critical elements of this target and its enabling effects across the SDGs as a whole could remain omitted with only one indicator. • RATIONALE of proposal for Target 4.7:Percentage of schools that provided comprehensive sexuality education (CSE) in the previous academic year o Multi-purpose indicator that responds to five elements of Target 4.7: human rights, gender equality, culture of peace, non-violence, and knowledge and skills to promote sustainable development and lifestyles (e.g. by contributing to reducing early and unwanted pregnancies, family size, and instilling values and skills of responsible parenthood). o Links: Targets 3.1, 3.3, 3.7, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.6, 16.1 and 16.2 with broad enabling effects for the health, education, gender equality, and employment goals. o Coherence and convergence with other SDGs global implementation frameworks & indicators:“Comprehensive sexuality education” (CSE) features in the following recently adopted global frameworks, including with related indicators, directly linked to SDGs implementation: - Education 2030 Framework for Action, with the proposed indicator on “Percentage of schools that provided life skills-based HIV and sexuality education in the previous academic year”; - UNAIDS Strategy 2016-2020“On the Fast-Track to end AIDS”, with proposed indicators on “Existence of national strategies for CSE in schools including promotion of gender equitable attitudes and behaviours” and “Number of high-prevalence countries where over 70% of schools provided life skills-based HIV and CSE in the previous academic year”; - andthe Secretary-General’s Strategy on Women’s, Children’s and Adolescent Health. o International Agreements: The proposed indicator responds to various global and regional UN inter-governmental agreements. o Evidence-base: By international expert standards, central elements of quality, effective comprehensive sexuality education are: respect for human rights, equitable gender relations, non-violence and respect of others and appreciation of diversity – key elements of the target. Programmes that ensure a gender equality approach and curricula are five times more effective than those that do not. Comprehensive sexuality education– ‘comprehensive’ in that it goes beyond a focus on biology alone –enables young people to acquire knowledge and skills, and is associated with delayed sexual debut, fewer sexual partners, increased use of condoms and prevention of sexually-transmitted infections and unintended pregnancies. It also shows the largest impacts on HIV-related behaviours by comparison to other approaches, and is also a cost-effective investment. o Data: Data from this indicator could be drawn from school-based surveys and education management information systems, building on related methodological development underway for the Education 2030 Framework for Action. • Whichever final indicator/s are selected for Target 4.7, human rights, gender equality and non-violence should be prioritized for measurement as core educational priorities universally and essential for young people’s wellbeing, alongside health issues such as tobacco use, sexual and reproductive health and HIV prevention. |
| FEDERACION PLANIFICACION FAMILIAR ESTATAL | In addition, or as an alternative, to the proposed indicator for this target, we recommend the inclusion of an indicator that reflects the “sustainable lifestyle” and “gender equality” components through using the following as a proxy indicator for comprehensive sexuality education (CSE): “Proportion of young people (10-24) who demonstrates desired level of knowledge and reject major misconceptions about sexual and reproductive health, including HIV and AIDS (modified MDG indicator, school based surveys)” Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE) is central to enable individuals to safely and responsibly navigate their sexuality and relationships, and empower them to be active members of their community. It tackles misconceptions about gender equality and aims to equip children and adolescents with the skills they require to realize sexual health and reproductive rights. This indicator is outcome focused, but reflects the process of CSE that would need to take place to achieve this knowledge outcome. |
| Finnish NGDO platform to the EU | Knowledge and skills for sustainable peaceful societies: a) Percentage of girls and boys who acquire skills and values needed for global citizenship and sustainable development (national benchmarks to be developed) by age 14. b) Percentage of 15-year-old students showing proficiency in knowledge of global issues including knowledge of environmental science, climate change adaptation and mitigation and geoscience. Values and attitudes for sustainable peaceful societies: a) Percentage of 13-year-old students endorsing values and attitudes promoting equality, trust and participation in governance. b) Percentage of adults who respond positively to the statement: “Protecting the environment should be given priority even if it causes slower economic growth and some loss of jobs”. Global citizenship education (GCE): a) Percentage of 13-year- old students participating in citizenship education (incl. climate change adaptation and mitigation and peace). b) % of formal and in-service teacher education includes pedagogical tools to teach global citizenship skills (incl. climate change adaptation and mitigation and peace). Life skills: a) Percentage of schools that provide life-skills based HIV and sexuality education within the previous academic year. b) Proportion of young people (10-24) who demonstrates desired level of knowledge and reject major misconceptions about sexual and reproductive health, including HIV and AIDS. |
| Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei | FEEM suggests to consider also peace and civilness, not only environmental science and geoscience |
| Fundación para Estudio e Investigación de la Mujer -FEIM | FEIM comments 1) to move grey indicator 4.7.1 to 12.8 and 13.3 because they are the environmental indicators; 2) change grey indicator to Percentage of schools that provided comprehensive sexuality education (CSE) in the previous academic year because it is more effective to ensure gender equality according to our experience in Argentina and worldwide. This indicator also was in the recently adopted UNAIDS Strategy 2016-2020, “On the fast-track to end AIDS”. The data will be collected from school-based information systems or surveys build up for the Education 2030 Framework for Action. |
| German Commission for UNESCO | The German Commission for UNESCO suggests revising this draft indicator on target 4.7, since it does not give any indication whether the target will be achieved or not. The German Commission for UNESCO suggests the following input indicator to replace the draft indicator: “Extent to which (i) high quality education for sustainable development and (ii) global citizenship education are mainstreamed in (a) national education policies (b) curricula (c) teacher education and (d) student assessment”. With this suggestion we support UNESCO´s proposal. From decades of experience of advising the German government, we are fully convinced that this alternative indicator is adequate and can be appropriately monitored through procedures well established by UNESCO, e.g. monitoring UNESCO’s pertinent 1974 recommendation. Another alternative indicator that would be more adequate than the current one is ”Percentage of students of a given age group (or education level) showing adequate understanding of issues relating to sustainability and global citizenship”. |
| Global Campaign for Education | 4.7.1 : Extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education for sustainable development iii) human rights education and iv) comprehensive sexuality education are mainstreamed in (a) national education policies and plans (b) curricula (c) teacher education and (d) student assessment (Structure) Rationale: The proposed articulation includes human rights education which is part of the original target. At the same time, the indicator would be strengthened through inclusion of implementation plans apart from mention of policies. GCE UK Suggested Indicator 2: 4.7.2: Percentage of teaching hours dedicated to education for sustainable development, global citizenship education, comprehensive sexuality education, human rights education (as per UNGA resolution 59/113) in formal and non-formal education (process indicator) This can be disaggregated by rural and urban location; disaggregation by province/region is desirable at the national level. Rationale: This process indicator would complement the earlier structure indicator and assess the extent to which these domains are actually transacted in educational settings as measured through dedicated teaching hours to these issues. |
| Global Campaign For Education | Suggested indicator 1 4.7.1 : Extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education for sustainable development and iii) human rights education are mainstreamed in (a) national education policies and plans (b) curricula (c) teacher education and (d) student assessment (Structure) Rationale: The proposed articulation includes human rights education which is part of the original target. At the same time, the indicator would be strengthened through inclusion of implementation plans apart from mention of policies. Suggested indicator 2 4.7.2 % of teaching hours dedicated to education for sustainable development, global citizenship education, human rights education (as per UNGA resolution 59/113) in formal and non-formal education (process indicator) This can be disaggregated by rural and urban location; disaggregation by province/region is desirable at the national level. Rationale: This process indicator would complement the earlier structure indicator and assess the extent to which these domains are actually transacted in educational settings as measured through dedicated teaching hours to these issues. |
| Global Campaign for Education - US Chapter (GCE-US) | GCE-US Comments: Suggested indicator could read: "Extent to which (i) global citizenship education (ii) education for sustainable development and (iii) human rights education are mainstreamed in (a) national education policies and plans (b) curricula (c) teacher education and (d) student assessment. Rationale: The proposed articulation includes human rights education which is part of the original target. At the same time, the indicator would be strengthened through inclusion of implementation plans apart from mention of policies. |
| Global Campaign for Education UK | GCE UK suggested Indicator 1: 4.7.1 : Extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education for sustainable development iii) human rights education and iv) comprehensive sexuality education are mainstreamed in (a) national education policies and plans (b) curricula (c) teacher education and (d) student assessment (Structure) Rationale: The proposed articulation includes human rights education which is part of the original target. At the same time, the indicator would be strengthened through inclusion of implementation plans apart from mention of policies. GCE UK Suggested Indicator 2: 4.7.2: Percentage of teaching hours dedicated to education for sustainable development, global citizenship education, comprehensive sexuality education, human rights education (as per UNGA resolution 59/113) in formal and non-formal education (process indicator) This can be disaggregated by rural and urban location; disaggregation by province/region is desirable at the national level. Rationale: This process indicator would complement the earlier structure indicator and assess the extent to which these domains are actually transacted in educational settings as measured through dedicated teaching hours to these issues. |
| Global Forest Coalition (GFC) | GFC suggests, |
| Health in Post-2015 NGO Coalition | The Health in Post-2015 NGO Coalition suggests: MOVE the current grey indicator to be considered under Targets 12.8 or 13.3:Targets 4.7, 12.8 and 13.3 are inter-related with overlapping elements and could be considered together. SUBSTITUTE with new multi-purpose indicator proposal for Target 4.7: Percentage of schools that provided comprehensive sexuality education (CSE) in the previous academic year • The ‘grey’ indicator on ‘knowledge of environmental science’ could be moved and considered alongside the proposals also categorized as ‘grey’ under Targets 12.8 (‘awareness of sustainable development and lifestyles in harmony with nature’) or 13.3 (climate change education). Both targets speak directly to this (environmental) element of Target 4.7, whereas other aspects of Target 4.7 may have no other ‘home’ in the SDG targets. This would allow space for indicators under Target 4.7 to cover other key elements, especially human rights, gender equality and non-violence, as proposed below. • More than one indicator may be needed to track Target 4.7 to ensure that the scope of this multi-component target is better reflected and not reduced. Education is a core pillar for achieving the level of transformation Agenda 2030 aspires to: Too many critical elements of this target and its enabling effects across the SDGs as a whole could remain omitted with only one indicator. • RATIONALE of proposal for Target 4.7:Percentage of schools that provided comprehensive sexuality education (CSE) in the previous academic year o Multi-purpose indicator that responds to five elements of Target 4.7: human rights, gender equality, culture of peace, non-violence, and knowledge and skills to promote sustainable development and lifestyles (e.g. by contributing to reducing early and unwanted pregnancies, family size, and instilling values and skills of responsible parenthood). o Links: Targets 3.1, 3.3, 3.7, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.6, 16.1 and 16.2 with broad enabling effects for the health, education, gender equality, and employment goals. o Coherence and convergence with other SDGs global implementation frameworks & indicators:“Comprehensive sexuality education” (CSE) features in the following recently adopted global frameworks, including with related indicators, directly linked to SDGs implementation: - Education 2030 Framework for Action, with the proposed indicator on “Percentage of schools that provided life skills-based HIV and sexuality education in the previous academic year”; - UNAIDS Strategy 2016-2020“On the Fast-Track to end AIDS”, with proposed indicators on “Existence of national strategies for CSE in schools including promotion of gender equitable attitudes and behaviours” and “Number of high-prevalence countries where over 70% of schools provided life skills-based HIV and CSE in the previous academic year”; - and the Secretary-General’s Strategy on Women’s, Children’s and Adolescent Health. o International Agreements: The proposed indicator responds to various global and regional UN inter-governmental agreements. o Evidence-base: By international expert standards, central elements of quality, effective comprehensive sexuality education are: respect for human rights, equitable gender relations, non-violence and respect of others and appreciation of diversity – key elements of the target. Programmes that ensure a gender equality approach and curricula are five times more effective than those that do not. Comprehensive sexuality education– ‘comprehensive’ in that it goes beyond a focus on biology alone –enables young people to acquire knowledge and skills, and is associated with delayed sexual debut, fewer sexual partners, increased use of condoms and prevention of sexually-transmitted infections and unintended pregnancies. It also shows the largest impacts on HIV-related behaviours by comparison to other approaches, and is also a cost-effective investment. o Data: Data from this indicator could be drawn from school-based surveys and education management information systems, building on related methodological development underway for the Education 2030 Framework for Action. • Whichever final indicator/s are selected for Target 4.7, human rights, gender equality and non-violence should be prioritized for measurement as core educational priorities universally and essential for young people’s wellbeing, alongside health issues such as tobacco use, sexual and reproductive health and HIV prevention. |
| High-Level Task Force for the ICPD | HLTF for ICPD on 4.7.1: MOVE the current grey indicator to be considered under Targets 12.8 or 13.3: Targets 4.7, 12.8 and 13.3 are inter-related with overlapping elements and could be considered together; and SUBSTITUTE with new multi-purpose indicator proposal (see below) • The ‘grey’ indicator on ‘knowledge of environmental science’ could be moved/considered alongside the ‘grey’ proposals under Targets 12.8 or 13.3, both on the environmental element of Target 4.7; other Target 4.7 elements may have no other ‘home’ in the SDG targets. This allows space for indicators to cover key elements, especially human rights, gender equality, non-violence (see below) • More than one indicator may be needed to track Target 4.7 to ensure the scope of this target is better reflected and not reduced. • If only one indicator is adopted, it should be a multi-component, multi-issue indicator such as this UNESCO proposal that more fully reflects the scope of the target: Extent to which (i) global citizenship education, (ii) education for sustainable development, and education on (iii) gender equality and (iv) human rights are mainstreamed in (a) national education policies (b) curricula (c) teacher education and (d) student assessment. • Whichever indicator/s are selected, the contents of education on global citizenship and sustainable development should be clearly defined, with human rights, gender equality, non-violence and appreciation of diversity prioritized for measurement, alongside health issues such as tobacco use, SRH and HIV prevention. • Proposal: Percentage of schools that provided comprehensive sexuality education (CSE) in the previous academic year. This is a multi-purpose indicator, responding to 5 target elements (human rights, gender equality, culture of peace, non-violence, knowledge/skills on SD and lifestyles), with links to Targets 3.1, 3.3, 3.7, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.6, 16.1 and 16.2, and enabling effects for the health, education, gender equality, and employment goals. It is also reflected in inter-governmental agreements at global and regional levels (e.g. GA and HRC resolutions, CPD, CSW, economic commissions). Coherence/convergence with other SDGs global implementation frameworks & indicators containing CSE would be ensured (Education 2030 Agenda--including proposed indicator on “% schools that provided life skills-based HIV and sexuality education in the previous academic year”; new UNAIDS Strategy - “Existence of national strategies for CSE in schools including promotion of gender equitable attitudes and behaviours” and “No. of high-prevalence countries where over 70% of schools provided life skills-based HIV and CSE in the previous academic year”; and SG’s Strategy on Women’s, Children’s and Adolescent Health). By international expert standards, central elements of quality, effective comprehensive sexuality education are: respect for human rights, equitable gender relations, non-violence and respect of others and appreciation of diversity – key elements of the target. Programmes that ensure a gender equality approach and curricula are five times more effective than those that do not; CSE evidence-base shows largest impacts on HIV-related behaviours by comparison to other approaches, and is also cost-effective. o Data could be drawn from school-based surveys, education management information systems, building on related methodological development underway for the Education 2030 Framework for Action. |
| ICPD | MOVE the current grey indicator to be considered under Targets 12.8 or 13.3: Targets 4.7, 12.8 and 13.3 are inter-related with overlapping elements and could be considered together. SUBSTITUTE with new multi-purpose indicator proposal for Target 4.7: Percentage of schools that provided comprehensive sexuality education (CSE) in the previous academic year • The ‘grey’ indicator on ‘knowledge of environmental science’ could be moved and considered alongside the proposals also categorized as ‘grey’ under Targets 12.8 (‘awareness of sustainable development and lifestyles in harmony with nature’) or 13.3 (climate change education). Both targets speak directly to this (environmental) element of Target 4.7, whereas other aspects of Target 4.7 may have no other ‘home’ in the SDG targets. This would allow space for indicators under Target 4.7 to cover other key elements, especially human rights, gender equality and non-violence, as proposed below. • More than one indicator may be needed to track Target 4.7 to ensure that the scope of this target is better reflected and not reduced. Education is a core pillar for achieving the level of transformation Agenda 2030 aspires to: Too many critical elements of this target and its enabling effects across the SDGs as a whole could remain omitted with only one indicator.   • If only one indicator is adopted, it should be a multi-component, multi-issue indicator such as the UNESCO proposal that more fully reflects the scope of the target, and inclusive of key issues as underlined here: Extent to which (i) global citizenship education, (ii) education for sustainable development, and education on (iii) gender equality and (iv) human rights are mainstreamed in (a) national education policies (b) curricula (c) teacher education and (d) student assessment.  • Whichever final indicator/s are selected, the contents of education on global citizenship and sustainable development should be clearly defined, with human rights, gender equality, non-violence and appreciation of diversity prioritized for measurement, alongside health issues such as tobacco use, sexual and reproductive health and HIV prevention. These are core educational priorities universally and essential for young people’s wellbeing.  RATIONALE of proposal for Target 4.7: Percentage of schools that provided comprehensive sexuality education (CSE) in the previous academic year o Multi-purpose indicator that responds to five elements of Target 4.7: human rights, gender equality, culture of peace, non-violence, and knowledge and skills to promote sustainable development and lifestyles (e.g. by contributing to reducing early and unwanted pregnancies, family size, and instilling values and skills of responsible parenthood).  o Links: Targets 3.1, 3.3, 3.7, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.6, 16.1 and 16.2 with broad enabling effects for the health, education, gender equality, and employment goals.  o Coherence and convergence with other SDGs global implementation frameworks & indicators: “Comprehensive sexuality education” (CSE) features in the following recently adopted global frameworks, including with related indicators, directly linked to SDGs implementation: - Education 2030 Framework for Action, with the proposed indicator on “Percentage of schools that provided life skills-based HIV and sexuality education in the previous academic year”;  - UNAIDS Strategy 2016-2020 “On the Fast-Track to end AIDS”, with proposed indicators on “Existence of national strategies for CSE in schools including promotion of gender equitable attitudes and behaviours” and “Number of high-prevalence countries where over 70% of schools provided life skills-based HIV and CSE in the previous academic year”;  - and the Secretary-General’s Strategy on Women’s, Children’s and Adolescent Health.  o International Agreements: The proposed indicator responds to various global and regional UN inter-governmental agreements.  o Evidence-base: By international expert standards, central elements of quality, effective comprehensive sexuality education are: respect for human rights, equitable gender relations, non-violence and respect of others and appreciation of diversity – key elements of the target. Programmes that ensure a gender equality approach and curricula are five times more effective than those that do not. Comprehensive sexuality education – ‘comprehensive’ in that it goes beyond a focus on biology alone – enables young people to acquire knowledge and skills, and is associated with delayed sexual debut, fewer sexual partners, increased use of condoms and prevention of sexually-transmitted infections and unintended pregnancies. It also shows the largest impacts on HIV-related behaviours by comparison to other approaches, and is also a cost-effective investment.  o Data: Data from this indicator could be drawn from school-based surveys and education management information systems, building on related methodological development underway for the Education 2030 Framework for Action. |
| ILEP | ILEP recommends disaggregating by disability. It would read as: Disaggregations: sex, disability, and location (and others where data are available) |
| International Council of AIDS Service Organizations | 4.7.1 Percentage of learners by age, sex, gender, ethnicity, urban/rural participating in formal and non formal education for sustainable development, social and cultural values, human rights, non-violence, gender equality, sexual and reproductive health, respect for diversity and global citizenship towards contribution of sustainable development AND/OR Percentage of schools that provided comprehensive sexuality education (CSE) in the previous academic year OR 4.7.2 Proportion of young people and adolescents who demonstrate desired levels of knowledge about sexual and reproductive health and human rights, including at a minimum: gender equality and respect for diversity; knowledge of three common types of contraceptive measures: oral contraceptive (pill), condom, and at least one longer-acting reversible contraceptive (injection, IUD, implant); knowledge of two ways to reduce sexual transmission of HIV; a measure related to gender, power, and perceptions of gender equality |
| International Music Council | International Music Council: Percentage of instructional hours dedicated to arts education in relation to the total number of instructional hours in the first two years of secondary school (grades 7-8). Percentage of staff in primary and secondary education with specific training in artistic or cultural disciplines. Percentage of the population having participated at least once in a going-out cultural activity in the last 12 months. Global Cultural Participation Index (and related indicators) Comment: this index is currently being developed by the UNESCO Institute for Statistics and Gallup, with a world poll planned to start in 2015/16 in approximately 150 countries |
| International Planned Parenthood Federation | Indicator 4.7.1: 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. In addition to the proposed indicator for this target, we recommend the inclusion of an indicator that reflects the “sustainable lifestyle” and “gender equality” components through using the following as a proxy indicator for comprehensive sexuality education (CSE): “Proportion of young people (10-24) who demonstrates desired level of knowledge and reject major misconceptions about sexual and reproductive health, including HIV and AIDS (modified MDG indicator, school based surveys)” Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE) is central to enable individuals to safely and responsibly navigate their sexuality and relationships, and empower them to be active members of their community. It tackles misconceptions about gender equality and aims to equip children and adolescents with the skills they require to realize sexual health and reproductive rights. This indicator is outcome focused, but reflects the process of CSE that would need to take place to achieve this knowledge outcome |
| International Trade Union Confederation | 4.7.1 Extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education for sustainable development iii) gender equality and iv) human rights education are mainstreamed in (angel) national education policies and plans (beer) curricula (coffee) teacher education and (d) student assessment. 4.7.2 Percentage of teaching hours dedicated to education for sustainable development, global citizenship education, and human rights education (as per UNGA resolution 59/113) in formal and non-formal education. |
| International Women's Health Coalition | IWHC: IWHC proposes three potential indicators, as follows: 4.7.1 Percentage of learners by age, sex, gender, ethnicity, urban/rural participating in formal and non formal education for sustainable development, social and cultural values, human rights, non-violence, gender equality, sexual and reproductive health, respect for diversity and global citizenship towards contribution of sustainable development 4.7.2 Percentage of schools that provided comprehensive sexuality education (CSE) in the previous academic year 4.7.3 Proportion of young people and adolescents who demonstrate desired levels of knowledge about sexual and reproductive health and human rights, including at a minimum: gender equality and respect for diversity; knowledge of three common types of contraceptive measures: oral contraceptive (pill), condom, and at least one longer-acting reversible contraceptive (injection, IUD, implant); knowledge of two ways to reduce sexual transmission of HIV; a measure related to gender, power, and perceptions of gender equality Comprehensive sexuality education is most successful when it provides education on human rights, gender and gender equality, power in relationships, as well as education on sexual and reproductive health, sexuality, and related rights. As such, including a measure on comprehensive sexuality education, either in the revised target 4.7.1 above, or separately, could address a number of the elements included in this target. It can also contribute to improved health, reduced incidences of gender-based violence, and ending harmful practices such as child marriage and FGM, and hence has a cross-cutting impact on other SDGs and targets. On proposed indicator 4.7.3, 14 year olds. Most data (aged 15-19 or 15-24) currently available from DHS and other surveys, allowing for disaggregation by age and other characteristics. Possible to construct from measures already collected in DHS surveys (though not for 10-14 year olds). Directly measures individual level knowledge (rather than policy at facility or government level, which may not translate to individuals). Not restricted to individuals in schools (e.g. may capture the most vulnerable individuals). It is essential that this indicator capture all three components indicated. This indicator should be calculated and monitored separately for females and for males. Potential weaknesses include the fact that this indicator doesn't necessarily measure receipt of CSE; there is a potential danger of fiving the false impression that CSE can be defined by a few variables. Unfortunately, DHS doesn't currently survey individuals younger than 15. Note that some countries do not survey men and some countries that do survey men may not ask some of the component questions above. Such surveys need to be expanded to cover a larger number of countries. The indicator should be calculated and monitored separately for females and for males. This indicator could also be considered under target 3.7. |
| Ipas | Ipas - USA and Global Percentage of schools that provided comprehensive sexuality education in the previous academic year. |
| IPPF European Network/Countdown 2015 Europe | Countdown 2015 Europe: In addition, or as an alternative, to the proposed indicator for this target, we recommend the inclusion of an indicator that reflects the “sustainable lifestyle” and “gender equality” components through using the following as a proxy indicator for comprehensive sexuality education (CSE): “Proportion of young people (10-24) who demonstrates desired level of knowledge and reject major misconceptions about sexual and reproductive health, including HIV and AIDS (modified MDG indicator, school based surveys)” Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE) is central to enable individuals to safely and responsibly navigate their sexuality and relationships, and empower them to be active members of their community. It tackles misconceptions about gender equality and aims to equip children and adolescents with the skills they require to realize sexual health and reproductive rights. This indicator is outcome focused, but reflects the process of CSE that would need to take place to achieve this knowledge outcome. |
| IPPF European Network/Countdown 2015 Europe | Countdown 2015 Europe: In addition, or as an alternative, to the proposed indicator for this target, we recommend the inclusion of an indicator that reflects the “sustainable lifestyle” and “gender equality” components through using the following as a proxy indicator for comprehensive sexuality education (CSE): “Proportion of young people (10-24) who demonstrates desired level of knowledge and reject major misconceptions about sexual and reproductive health, including HIV and AIDS (modified MDG indicator, school based surveys)” Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE) is central to enable individuals to safely and responsibly navigate their sexuality and relationships, and empower them to be active members of their community. It tackles misconceptions about gender equality and aims to equip children and adolescents with the skills they require to realize sexual health and reproductive rights. This indicator is outcome focused, but reflects the process of CSE that would need to take place to achieve this knowledge outcome. |
| Irish Family Planning Association | Comment by the Irish Family Planning Association: In addition, or as an alternative, to the proposed indicator for this target, we recommend the inclusion of an indicator that reflects the “sustainable lifestyle” and “gender equality” components through using the following as a proxy indicator for comprehensive sexuality education (CSE): “Proportion of young people (10-24) who demonstrates desired level of knowledge and reject major misconceptions about sexual and reproductive health, including HIV and AIDS (modified MDG indicator, school based surveys)” Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE) is central to enable individuals to safely and responsibly navigate their sexuality and relationships, and empower them to be active members of their community. It tackles misconceptions about gender equality and aims to equip children and adolescents with the skills they require to realize sexual health and reproductive rights. This indicator is outcome focused, but reflects the process of CSE that would need to take place to achieve this knowledge outcome. |
| Japan NGO Network for Education (JNNE) | Proposed indicator is very narrow and against the holistic, relevant and contextual nature of ESD and GCED. We suggest to use the current the proposal by technial working grourp by Unesco (http://www.unescobkk.org/fileadmin/user\_upload/efa/TWG/39th\_TWG/06\_43-indicators-to-monitor-education2030.pdf) – “Extent that GCED and ESD are mainstreamed in (1) education policy, (2) curriculum, (3) teacher training and (4) student assessment.” as this is more holistic and consistent with the principles of ESD and GCED. If we are looking for an initial indicator that may be replaced - then let us use an indicator that can be deepened rather than replaced. We also suggest "% of schools that practice Whole School Approaches to ESD or GCED like Unesco Associated Schools. These programs have existing national or international accreditation mechanism often based on the development of a school policy - like a School Environmental Management Plan - which can be used as evidence. The strength of using current Whole School Approaches as a global measure is that it will not be a measure as an end goal itself - but it will motivate a whole range of players to get involved in achieving Target 4.7 in locally relevant and holistic actions. |
| Latin American Campaign for the Right to Education | Latin American Campaign for the Right to Education (CLADE) proposes: 4.7.1 : Extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education for sustainable development and iii) human rights education are mainstreamed in (a) national education policies and plans (b) curricula (c) teacher education and (d) student assessment (Structure) 4.7.2 % of teaching hours dedicated to education for sustainable development, global citizenship education, human rights education (as per UNGA resolution 59/113) in formal and non-formal education (process indicator) |
| LIGHT FOR THE WORLD | IGHT FOR THE WORL recommends adding disaggregation by disability to indicator 4.7.1, which would would read as: It would read as: Disaggregations: sex, disability, and location (and others where data are available) |
| Malala Fund | Organisation: Malala Fund Suggested Indicator Percentage of 11-year, 16-year and 18-year old students enrolled in secondary school demonstrating at least a minimum proficiency level of knowledge across a selection of topics in environmental science, geoscience, human rights, peace education and global citizenship. Disaggregations: sex and location, and at each level of education from primary through to upper secondary, (and others where data are available) Rationale: (i) Human rights and peace education should be mainstreamed to meet State obligations in accordance with Article 13 of ICESCR, which calls on “The States Parties to the present Covenant recognize the right of everyone to education. They agree that education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and the sense of its dignity, and shall strengthen the respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. They further agree that education shall enable all persons to participate effectively in a free society, promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations and all racial, ethnic or religious groups, and further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.” (ii)The commitment to provide human rights education is also set out in the Human Rights Council Resolution 24/15. (iii) UNESCO Member States should formulate and apply national policies aimed implementing to 1974 Recommendation concerning Education for International Understanding, Co-operation and Peace and Education relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, which reflects education for peace and international understanding (global citizenship). |
| Nagorik Uddyog | Creating awareness and sensitizing the students of secondary school and above about promotion of sustainable development and lifestyle, human rights, gender equality, promotion of culture and non violence, global citizenship and appreciation of cultural diversity and of cultural contribution to sustainable development. |
| National Campaign for Education Nepal | This is more specific. How knowledge can be measured only in the competence of environment and geoscience. Therefore, this indicator should be modified and should include overall aspect of knowledge of socio-cultural aspects, information technology etc. |
| Navsarjan Trust | Navsarjan Trust Creating awareness and sensitizing the students of secondary school and above about promotion of sustainable development and lifestyle, human rights, gender equality, promotion of culture and non violence, global citizenship and appreciation of cultural diversity and of cultural contribution to sustainable development. |
| NGO Education Partnership | Percentage of 15 year old students are proficiency in sustainable development, global citizenship |
| P&D Factor | MOVE the current grey indicator to be considered under Targets 12.8 or 13.3: Targets 4.7, 12.8 and 13.3 are inter-related with overlapping elements and could be considered together. SUBSTITUTE with new multi-purpose indicator proposal for Target 4.7: Percentage of schools that provided comprehensive sexuality education (CSE) in the previous academic year • The ‘grey’ indicator on ‘knowledge of environmental science’ could be moved and considered alongside the proposals also categorized as ‘grey’ under Targets 12.8 (‘awareness of sustainable development and lifestyles in harmony with nature’) or 13.3 (climate change education). Both targets speak directly to this (environmental) element of Target 4.7, whereas other aspects of Target 4.7 may have no other ‘home’ in the SDG targets. This would allow space for indicators under Target 4.7 to cover other key elements, especially human rights, gender equality and non-violence, as proposed below. • More than one indicator may be needed to track Target 4.7 to ensure that the scope of this multi-component target is better reflected and not reduced. Education is a core pillar for achieving the level of transformation Agenda 2030 aspires to: Too many critical elements of this target and its enabling effects across the SDGs as a whole could remain omitted with only one indicator. • RATIONALE of proposal for Target 4.7: Percentage of schools that provided comprehensive sexuality education (CSE) in the previous academic year o Multi-purpose indicator that responds to five elements of Target 4.7: human rights, gender equality, culture of peace, non-violence, and knowledge and skills to promote sustainable development and lifestyles (e.g. by contributing to reducing early and unwanted pregnancies, family size, and instilling values and skills of responsible parenthood). o Links: Targets 3.1, 3.3, 3.7, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.6, 16.1 and 16.2 with broad enabling effects for the health, education, gender equality, and employment goals. o Coherence and convergence with other SDGs global implementation frameworks & indicators: “Comprehensive sexuality education” (CSE) features in the following recently adopted global frameworks, including with related indicators, directly linked to SDGs implementation: - Education 2030 Framework for Action, with the proposed indicator on “Percentage of schools that provided life skills-based HIV and sexuality education in the previous academic year”; - UNAIDS Strategy 2016-2020 “On the Fast-Track to end AIDS”, with proposed indicators on “Existence of national strategies for CSE in schools including promotion of gender equitable attitudes and behaviours” and “Number of high-prevalence countries where over 70% of schools provided life skills-based HIV and CSE in the previous academic year”; - and the Secretary-General’s Strategy on Women’s, Children’s and Adolescent Health. o International Agreements: The proposed indicator responds to various global and regional UN inter-governmental agreements. o Evidence-base: By international expert standards, central elements of quality, effective comprehensive sexuality education are: respect for human rights, equitable gender relations, non-violence and respect of others and appreciation of diversity – key elements of the target. Programmes that ensure a gender equality approach and curricula are five times more effective than those that do not. Comprehensive sexuality education – ‘comprehensive’ in that it goes beyond a focus on biology alone – enables young people to acquire knowledge and skills, and is associated with delayed sexual debut, fewer sexual partners, increased use of condoms and prevention of sexually-transmitted infections and unintended pregnancies. It also shows the largest impacts on HIV-related behaviours by comparison to other approaches, and is also a cost-effective investment. o Data: Data from this indicator could be drawn from school-based surveys and education management information systems, building on related methodological development underway for the Education 2030 Framework for Action. • Whichever final indicator/s are selected for Target 4.7, human rights, gender equality and non-violence should be prioritized for measurement as core educational priorities universally and essential for young people’s wellbeing, alongside health issues such as tobacco use, sexual and reproductive health and HIV prevention In addition, or alternative, to the proposed indicator for this target, we recommend the inclusion of an indicator that reflects the “sustainable lifestyle” and “gender equality” components through using the following as a proxy indicator for comprehensive sexuality education (CSE): “Proportion of young people (10-24) who demonstrates desired level of knowledge and reject major misconceptions about sexual and reproductive health, including HIV and AIDS” Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE) is central to enable individuals to safely and responsibly navigate their sexuality and relationships, and empower them to be active, responseblies and healthy members of their community. It tackles misconceptions about gender equality and aims to equip children and adolescents with the skills they require to realize sexual health and reproductive rights. This indicator is outcome focused, but reflects the process of CSE that would need to take place to achieve this knowledge outcome. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ For example, the term “comprehensive sexuality education” was explicitly adopted in the July 2015 Human Rights Council Resolution on Accelerating efforts to eliminate all forms of violence against women: eliminating domestic violence, and all the ICPD Beyond 2014 regional outcomes (in the case of ESCWA, using the term “sexual education”); and with the term “comprehensive evidence-based education on human sexuality” in various agreements of the Commission on the Status of Women and the Commission on Population and Development, and in the most recently adopted 2015 General Assembly Resolution on the Rights of the Child, dedicated to the theme of children’s right to education. Haberland, Nicole A. The Case for Addressing Gender and Power in Sexuality and HIV Education: A Comprehensive Review of Evaluation Studies in International Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health, 2015, 41(1):31–42: https://www.guttmacher.org/pubs/journals/4103115.html By contrast, approaches that fail to address gender dynamics have been shown by research to be five times less effective in preventing unwanted outcomes than truly comprehensive programmes that address gender issues. See Haberland, Nicole A. The Case for Addressing Gender and Power in Sexuality and HIV Education: A Comprehensive Review of Evaluation Studies in International Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health, 2015, 41(1):31–42: https://www.guttmacher.org/pubs/journals/4103115.html Fonner, Virginia A., Kevin S. Armstrong, Caitlen E. Kenney, Kevin R. O’Reilly, Michael D. Sweat (2014) School Based Sex Education and HIV Prevention in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis: http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0089692 UNESCO (2011) Cost and Cost-effective analysis of School-based Sexuality Education Programs in Six Countries: http://www.resource-allocation.com/content/11/1/17 |
| PAI | PAI, USA Suggest the following three indicators: Percentage of learners by age, sex, gender, ethnicity, urban/rural participating in formal and non formal education for sustainable development, social and cultural values, human rights, non-violence, gender equality, sexual and reproductive health, respect for diversity and global citizenship towards contribution of sustainable development Percentage of schools that provided comprehensive sexuality education (CSE) in the previous academic year Proportion of young people and adolescents who demonstrate desired levels of knowledge about sexual and reproductive health and human rights, including at a minimum: gender equality and respect for diversity; knowledge of three common types of contraceptive measures: oral contraceptive (pill), condom, and at least one longer-acting reversible contraceptive (injection, IUD, implant); knowledge of two ways to reduce sexual transmission of HIV; a measure related to gender, power, and perceptions of gender equality |
| Pathfinder's Outreach Ministry (POM) | Ghana 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 topic will depend on the survey or assessment in which the indicator is collected (Disaggregations: sex and location (and others where data are available)) |
| Peace Education Project MOMO | PROPOSED INDICATOR is an outdated science-proficiency criteria, not reflecting at all the closely interconnected objectives of the target 4.7. This indicator has a danger of encouraging the familiar competitive knowledge education in the name of ESD or GCED SUGGEST to use the current thematic Indicator of PROVISION – “Extent that GCED and ESD are MAINSTREAMED in Education Policy, Curriculum, Teacher Training and Student Assessment,” as this is more holistic and consistent with the principles of ESD and GCED. This indicator must not be replaced by any technical ones. A good initial indicator for this provision will be government’s stated commitment to the educational frameworks agreed in UNESCO and educational clauses in international human rights treaties, policy statement at national and local levels, pre-service and in-service teachers training curriculum, and school curriculum. SUGGEST to use and integrate into the existing School Programs and education policies that fully or partially incorporate ESD, GCED, HRE, EIU, Inter-Cultural Education and Peace Education in the frameworks set by UNESCO. A good secondary indicator to this would be the use of the current Whole School Approaches as a measure of holistic, integrative, and transformative pedagogical approaches in achieving Target 4.7 SUGGEST to keep in mind that education for peace is the most important safeguard for sustainable development, as violence and armed conflict are the most sustained and serious threats to it. SUGGEST also to keep in mind the importance of education for peace as one of the main indicators of the quality of HRE, ESD, and GCED as well as culture of peace, to be developed during the next 15 years. The school-community joint peace education will be an important indicator of mainstreaming ESD and GCED as well as that of education contributing to peaceful community building. |
| Peacebuilding Advisory Service | This target is excellent, and the indicator should be much broader and more inclusive, to be able to measure the achievements under this target. The indicator is much too narrow and fails to include measurement related to most of the target, including: .... 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. |
| Peruvian Campaign for the Right to Education | PERU Peruvian Campaign for the Right to Education 4.7.1 Extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education for sustainable development and iii) human rights education are mainstreamed in (a) national education policies and plans (b) curricula (c) teacher education and (d) student assessment (Structure) 4.7.2 % of teaching hours dedicated to education for sustainable development, global citizenship education, human rights education (as per UNGA resolution 59/113) in formal and non-formal education (process indicator) |
| Plan International | \*\* ADDITIONAL INDICATOR RECOMMENDED 4.7.2\*\* Plan International comments: - RECOMMENDED INDICATOR: 4.7.1 –Extent to which (i) global citizenship education, (ii) education for sustainable development, (iii) gender equality, and (iv) human rights are mainstreamed at all levels in (a) national education policies (b) curricula (c) teacher education and (d) student assessment - RATIONALE: Providing young people with comprehensive education on sexuality and sexual and reproductive health is central to enable them to safely and responsibly navigate their sexuality and relationships and equip them with the skills they require to realize their sexual health and reproductive rights. - DISAGGREGATIONS: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) - DATA SOURCE: Disaggregated country data; National Education Information Systems. UNICEF work on curricular review will have data on this - ENTITY RESPONSIBLE: UNESCO - TIER: II \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ - RECOMMENDED INDICATOR: 4.7.2 Proportion of young people who demonstrate desired levels of knowledge about sexual and reproductive health, including at a minimum: 1. knowledge of three common types of contraceptive measures: oral contraceptive (pill), condom, and at least one longer-acting reversible contraceptive (injection, IUD, implant); 2. Knowledge of two ways to reduce sexual transmission of HIV; 3. A measure related to gender, power relation, and perceptions of gender equality (i.e. belief that a husband/partner is justified in beating his wife/partner if they refuse sex. - RATIONALE: Ensuring that adolescents have access to comprehensive sexual and reproductive health information and services can ensure their right to health and help prevent unintended pregnancy, STI infection (including HIV). Sexuality education can increase knowledge and improve attitudes, delay or decrease risky sexual behaviors, and/or increase condom/contraceptive use. This indicator directly measures individual level knowledge (rather than policy at facility or government level, which may not translate to individuals). It is also not restricted to individuals in schools and so may capture the most vulnerable individuals. Note: This indicator would be a cross-cutting measure for target 3.7 - DISAGGREGATIONS: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) DATA SOURCE: Indices created based on data collected in population-based surveys, to include 10-14 year olds. Most data (aged 15-19 or 15-24) currently available from DHS and other surveys, allowing for disaggregation by age and other characteristics. ENTITY RESPONSIBLE: UNAIDS, UNESCO, UNFPA TIER: II |
| RFSU | RFSU, Sweden comments: This indicator must reflect the full content of the target, in particular human rights and gender equality, as clearly pointed out in Agenda 2030 as central for the achievements of all targets and goals. If human rights and gender equality as core educational elements of a sustainable development, are not ensured and measured under 4.7, less progress will be achieved in the majority of targets. More than one indicator may therefore be needed to ensure that the scope of this multi-component target is better reflected and not reduced. We recommend the inclusion of an indicator that reflects the “sustainable lifestyle”, “gender equality” and "human rights components through using the following as a proxy indicator for comprehensive sexuality education (CSE) and propose a multi-purpose indicator for Target 4.7 namely: - Percentage of schools that provided comprehensive sexuality education (CSE) in the previous academic year - Proportion of young people (10-24) who demonstrates desired level of knowledge and reject major misconceptions about sexual and reproductive health, including HIV and AIDS (modified MDG indicator, school based surveys)” Rationale: Evidence based Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE) is central to enable individuals to safely and responsibly navigate their sexuality and relationships without violence and discrimination, and empower them to be active members of their community. It tackles and changes gender inequality and aims to equip young people with the sustainable life skills they require to realize gender equal relations and human rights in practice, linked to their own sexual and reproductive health and reproductive rights, which also effectively contributes to reducing early and unwanted pregancies and new HIV infections and the achievement of the completion of education. CSE program as well as representing a sensitive to whether education promotes and protects gender equality and human rights in general, could be effectively combined with a link and expansion of the 4.a indicator, to addresses the gender sensitive and the physical and the psychosocial safety of the school environment, which also could be measured by: % students who report bullying or harassment. Alternative indicator: 4.7.1 – Extent to which (i) global citizenship education, (ii) education for sustainable development and life styles, (iii) gender equality, and (iv) human rights are mainstreamed at all levels in (a) national education policies (b) curricula (c) teacher education and (d) student assessment. Coherence and convergence with other SDGs global implementation frameworks & indicators: “Comprehensive sexuality education” (CSE) features in the following recently adopted global frameworks, including with related indicators, directly linked to SDGs implementation: Education 2030 Framework for Action, with the proposed indicator on “Percentage of schools that provided life skills-based HIV and sexuality education in the previous academic year”; UNAIDS Strategy 2016-2020 “On the Fast-Track to end AIDS”, with proposed indicators on “Existence of national strategies for CSE in schools including promotion of gender equitable attitudes and behaviours” and “Number of high-prevalence countries where over 70% of schools provided life skills-based HIV and CSE in the previous academic year”; the Secretary-General’s Strategy on Women’s, Children’s and Adolescent Health. International Agreements: The ‘grey’ indicator on ‘knowledge of environmental science’ could be moved and considered alongside the proposals also categorized as ‘grey’ under Targets 12.8 (‘awareness of sustainable development and lifestyles in harmony with nature’) or 13.3 (climate change education). Both targets speak directly to this (environmental) element of Target 4.7. |
| Right to Education Project | Alternatively it would be useful to have a structural or process indicator looking at what the States have put in place to reach this goal. It could be for instance: the number of countries who have adopted a specific curriculum for sustainable development which includes human rights, gender equality, promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence, global citizenship and appreciation of cultural diversity. See our publication on Applying Right to Education Indicators to the post-2015 education agenda for explanations on the importance of having structural and process indicators: http://www.right-to-education.org/resource/applying-right-education-indicators-post-2015-education-agenda |
| Rutgers | In addition, or as an alternative, to the proposed indicator for this target, we recommend the inclusion of an indicator that reflects the “sustainable lifestyle” and “gender equality” components through using the following as a proxy indicator for comprehensive sexuality education (CSE): “Proportion of young people (10-24) who demonstrates desired level of knowledge and reject major misconceptions about sexual and reproductive health, including HIV and AIDS (modified MDG indicator, school based surveys)” Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE) is central to enable individuals to safely and responsibly navigate their sexuality and relationships, and empower them to be active members of their community. It tackles misconceptions about gender equality and aims to equip children and adolescents with the skills they require to realize sexual health and reproductive rights. This indicator is outcome focused, but reflects the process of CSE that would need to take place to achieve this knowledge outcome. |
| Sensoa | In addition, or as an alternative, to the proposed indicator for this target, we recommend the inclusion of an indicator that reflects the “sustainable lifestyle” and “gender equality” components through using the following as a proxy indicator for comprehensive sexuality education (CSE): “Proportion of young people (10-24) who demonstrates desired level of knowledge and reject major misconceptions about sexual and reproductive health, including HIV and AIDS (modified MDG indicator, school based surveys)” Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE) is central to enable individuals to safely and responsibly navigate their sexuality and relationships, and empower them to be active members of their community. It tackles misconceptions about gender equality and aims to equip children and adolescents with the skills they require to realize sexual health and reproductive rights. This indicator is outcome focused, but reflects the process of CSE that would need to take place to achieve this knowledge outcome. |
| Sex og Politikk | The Norwegian Civil Society organization Sex og Politikk suggests the following: In addition, or as an alternative, to the proposed indicator for this target, we recommend the inclusion of an indicator that reflects the “sustainable lifestyle” and “gender equality” components through using the following as a proxy indicator for comprehensive sexuality education (CSE): “Proportion of young people (10-24) who demonstrates desired level of knowledge and reject major misconceptions about sexual and reproductive health, including HIV and AIDS (modified MDG indicator, school based surveys)” Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE) is central to enable individuals to safely and responsibly navigate their sexuality and relationships, and empower them to be active members of their community. It tackles misconceptions about gender equality and aims to equip children and adolescents with the skills they require to realize sexual health and reproductive rights. This indicator is outcome focused, but reflects the process of CSE that would need to take place to achieve this knowledge outcome. |
| Sightsavers | 4.7.1 Sightsavers comments: We recommends disaggregating by disability. It would read as: Disaggregations: sex, disability, and location (and others where data are available). |
| Sustainable World Initiative | The Sustainable World Initiative supports the alternative proposal by UNESCO with suggested inputs from UNWomen, which would offer a composite indicator that looks not only at global citizenship, but integrates gender and human rights. The suggested formulation would be: Extent to which (i) global citizenship education, (ii) education for sustainable development, (iii) gender equality, and (iv) human rights are mainstreamed at all levels in (a) national education policies, (b) curricula, (c) teacher education and (d) student assessment. We also recommend due consideration of the following options as a supplementary indicator: Percentage of schools that provided life skills-based HIV and sexuality education in the previous academic year (Education 2030 Framework for Action indicator proposed by the Technical Advisory Group based on the existing accountability framework of Measuring the education sector response to HIV and AIDS: Guidelines for the construction and use of core Indicators (UNESCO 2013)); Existence of national strategies for comprehensive sexuality education in schools including promotion of gender equitable attitudes and behaviours (UNAIDS Strategy 2016-2020 ‘On the Fast-Track to end AIDS’ proposed indicator); “Number of high-prevalence countries where over 70% of schools provided life skills-based HIV and CSE in the previous academic year” (UNAIDS Strategy 2016-2020 ‘On the Fast-Track to end AIDS’ proposed indicator). |
| The Danish Family Planning Association | In addition, or as an alternative, to the proposed indicator for this target, we recommend the inclusion of an indicator that reflects the “sustainable lifestyle” and “gender equality” components through using the following as a proxy indicator for comprehensive sexuality education (CSE): “Proportion of young people (10-24) who demonstrates desired level of knowledge and reject major misconceptions about sexual and reproductive health, including HIV and AIDS (modified MDG indicator, school based surveys)” Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE) is central to enable individuals to safely and responsibly navigate their sexuality and relationships, and empower them to be active members of their community. It tackles misconceptions about gender equality and aims to equip children and adolescents with the skills they require to realize sexual health and reproductive rights. This indicator is outcome focused, but reflects the process of CSE that would need to take place to achieve this knowledge outcome. |
| Transdiaspora Network | Transdiaspora Network - level of underprivileged local young leaders receiving capacity building training in international development and global citizenship, and number of national projects that foster global partnerships and technology/knowledge transfer among governmental dependencies, civil society entities and local community leaders as well as other stakeholders |
| UN Major Group for Children and Youth | Number of national education plans that mandate the universal inclusion of these topics in ciricula in all types of schools at promary, secondry and tertiary levels. The focus here should not be on formal education alone but also include non-formal youth settings. In addition, the focus should be on all learners and not just 15 year olds. Indicators should include those working with/educating young people - teachers, youth workers, policy makers. For those of us working in the area of development and human rights education, this is an important indicator |
| United Nations Association of Tanzania | United Nations Association of Tanzania, Tanzania We support the alternative proposal by UNESCO with suggested inputs from UNWomen, which would offer a composite indicator that looks not only at global citizenship, but integrates gender and human rights. The suggested formulation would be: Extent to which (i) global citizenship education, (ii) education for sustainable development, (iii) gender equality, and (iv) human rights are mainstreamed at all levels in (a) national education policies, (b) curricula, (c) teacher education and (d) student assessment. We also recommend due consideration of the following options as a supplementary indicator: Percentage of schools that provided life skills-based HIV and sexuality education in the previous academic year (Education 2030 Framework for Action indicator proposed by the Technical Advisory Group based on the existing accountability framework of Measuring the education sector response to HIV and AIDS: Guidelines for the construction and use of core Indicators (UNESCO 2013)); Existence of national strategies for comprehensive sexuality education in schools including promotion of gender equitable attitudes and behaviours (UNAIDS Strategy 2016-2020 ‘On the Fast-Track to end AIDS’ proposed indicator); “Number of high-prevalence countries where over 70% of schools provided life skills-based HIV and CSE in the previous academic year” (UNAIDS Strategy 2016-2020 ‘On the Fast-Track to end AIDS’ proposed indicator). |
| Väestöliitto ry | In addition, or as an alternative, to the proposed indicator for this target, we recommend the inclusion of an indicator that reflects the “sustainable lifestyle” and “gender equality” components through using the following as a proxy indicator for comprehensive sexuality education (CSE): “Proportion of young people (10-24) who demonstrates desired level of knowledge and reject major misconceptions about sexual and reproductive health, including HIV and AIDS (modified MDG indicator, school based surveys)” Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE) is central to enable individuals to safely and responsibly navigate their sexuality and relationships, and empower them to be active members of their community. It tackles misconceptions about gender equality and aims to equip children and adolescents with the skills they require to realize sexual health and reproductive rights. This indicator is outcome focused, but reflects the process of CSE that would need to take place to achieve this knowledge outcome. |
| VENRO Working Group Disability and Development | VENRO Working Group Disability and Development, Germany, recommends disaggregation by disability. It would read as: Disaggregations: sex, disability, and location (and others where data are available). |
| Vietnam Association for Education for All | The proposed indicator is quite narrow. For example how this kind of indicator can capture the cultural aspect? The nature of ESD is contextual and holistic. It is suggested to use the current Thematic indicator of provision “Extent that GCED and ESD are MAINSTREAMED in Education Policy, Curriculum, Teacher Training and Student Assessment.” as it is more holistic and consistent with the principles of ESD and GCED. Please keep in mind the importance of the community learning of ESD and GCED in the development of the indicator during the years to come. |
| Women Deliver | Women Deliver supports the alternative proposal by UNESCO with suggested inputs from UNWomen and UNFPA, which would offer a composite indicator that looks not only at global citizenship, but integrates gender and human rights. The suggested formulation would be: Extent to which (i) global citizenship education, (ii) education for sustainable development, (iii) gender equality, and (iv) human rights are mainstreamed at all levels in (a) national education policies, (b) curricula, (c) teacher education and (d) student assessment. We also recommend due consideration of the following options as a supplementary indicator: Percentage of schools that provided life skills-based HIV and sexuality education in the previous academic year (Education 2030 Framework for Action indicator proposed by the Technical Advisory Group based on the existing accountability framework of Measuring the education sector response to HIV and AIDS: Guidelines for the construction and use of core Indicators (UNESCO 2013)); Existence of national strategies for comprehensive sexuality education in schools including promotion of gender equitable attitudes and behaviours (UNAIDS Strategy 2016-2020 ‘On the Fast-Track to end AIDS’ proposed indicator); “Number of high-prevalence countries where over 70% of schools provided life skills-based HIV and CSE in the previous academic year” (UNAIDS Strategy 2016-2020 ‘On the Fast-Track to end AIDS’ proposed indicator). |
| Women for Women's Human Rights - New Ways | WWHR - New Ways suggests the following three indicators for 4.7: 4.7.1. Percentage of learners by age, sex, gender, ethnicity, urban/rural participating in formal and non formal education for sustainable development, social and cultural values, human rights, non-violence, gender equality, sexual and reproductive health, respect for diversity and global citizenship towards contribution of sustainable development 4.7.2. Percentage of schools that provided comprehensive sexuality education (CSE) in the previous academic year 4.7.3. Proportion of young people and adolescents (including 10 – 14 year olds) who demonstrate desired levels of knowledge about sexual and reproductive health and human rights, including at a minimum: gender equality and respect for diversity; knowledge of three common types of contraceptive measures: oral contraceptive (pill), condom, and at least one longer-acting reversible contraceptive (injection, IUD, implant); knowledge of two ways to reduce sexual transmission of HIV; a measure related to gender, power, and perceptions of gender equality |
| Women's Major Group/ International Women's Health Coalition | The Women's Major Group suggests the following three indicators for 4.7: Percentage of learners by age, sex, gender, ethnicity, urban/rural participating in formal and non formal education for sustainable development, social and cultural values, human rights, non-violence, gender equality, sexual and reproductive health, respect for diversity and global citizenship towards contribution of sustainable development Percentage of schools that provided comprehensive sexuality education (CSE) in the previous academic year Proportion of young people and adolescents who demonstrate desired levels of knowledge about sexual and reproductive health and human rights, including at a minimum: gender equality and respect for diversity; knowledge of three common types of contraceptive measures: oral contraceptive (pill), condom, and at least one longer-acting reversible contraceptive (injection, IUD, implant); knowledge of two ways to reduce sexual transmission of HIV; a measure related to gender, power, and perceptions of gender equality |
| WWF | WWF: The suggested indicator is too narrow, with a limited view of ESD while suggested tools such as PISA need to be revised. WWF suggests replacing it with “Percentage of 10 and 15-year old students enrolled in education for sustainable development demonstrating at least a fixed level of knowledge and skills to argue, take a stand, and take action for sustainable development across a selection of topics.” (Source: UNESCO country reports/ ICCS reports next to be updated 2016). An additional indicator could include: “Number of countries with ESD integrated in national curricula (including efforts for entrepreneurial skills for sustainable development and active participation in other programmes for SDGs) (Same source). |
| Amiable Resource | Social inclusion and interactions? Environmental health and relationships? |
| Maestral International | Assessing this at the student level will be impossible in many countries. Consider: "Percentage of secondary schools offering environmental science in their curriculum." |
| new York University | USA, NYU: Percentage of 15-year old students aware of the universal declaration of human rights and able to list at least three of its core components. |
| Red de Educación de Personas Jóvenes y Adultas | 4.7.1 : Extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education for sustainable development and iii) human rights education are mainstreamed in (a) national education policies and plans (b) curricula (c) teacher education and (d) student assessment (Structure) 4.7.2 % of teaching hours dedicated to education for sustainable development, global citizenship education, human rights education (as per UNGA resolution 59/113) in formal and non-formal education (process indicator) |
| RMIT University | PROPOSED INDICATOR is narrow and against the holistic, relevant and contextual nature of ESD and GCED. SUGGEST to use the current Thematic Indicator of PROVISION – “Extent that GCED and ESD are MAINSTREAMED in Education Policy, Curriculum, Teacher Training and Student Assessment.” as this is more holistic and consistent with the principles of ESD and GCED. If we are looking for an initial indicator that may be replaced - then let us use an indicator that can be deepened rather than replaced. SUGGEST to use existing School Programs – like UNESCO ASPnet Schools (with a focus on ESD and Intercultural Learning, and Peace and Human Rights), Eco Schools or similar programs (like Australian Sustainable Schools Initiatives - AuSSi) that practice WHOLE SCHOOL APPROACHES to ESD as an initial measure. These programs have existing national or international accreditation mechanism often based on the development of a School Policy - like a School Environmental Management Plan - which can be used as evidence. The strength of using current Whole School Approaches as a global measure is that it will not be a measure as an end goal in itself - but it will motivate a whole range of players to get involved in achieving Target 4.7 in locally relevant and holistic actions. SUGGEST to keep in mind the importance of the community learning of ESD and GCED in the development of the indicator during the next 15 years. These Schools can then become SEEDS to embed ESD and GCED in the communities where these schools are situated in. |
| University of Cambridge | All indicators need to be tracked by the most disadvantaged group, not just parity (as suggested in 4.5.1). 4.1.1 Learning should be tracked from the early years in which children should be in primary school - and should be by age not grade/level of education, given many children are not in school. For a full analysis, and proposed approach see: http://www.heart-resources.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/Rose-and-Alcott-2015.pdf 4b on scholarships is fundamentally flawed and should be removed. Already too much is spent on scholarships at the expense of building capacity of higher education in poor countries (75% of higher education aid is spent on scholarships, and 25% of overall aid to education is spent on scholarships). I am not aware of anyone agreeing with the indicator as specified as green in the list currently so wonder where it has come from - this seems a political proposal for those who are likely to benefit from scholarships. It contradicts the proposal of the SDGs of noone left behind, In general more information is needed to substantiate how each of the indicators has been arrived at - this needs to be based on a technical understanding of data and measurement issues related to achieving the targets, rather than just providing a list of the indicators |
| Wayne State University School of Medicine | Focus on first 1000 days, e.g. Quality pre-kindergarten. |

**Goal 5: NO GREY INDICATORS**

| **Country/Organisation** | **Goal 6: Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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. | **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. | **Target 6.5:**By 2030, implement integrated water resources management at all levels, including through transboundary cooperation as appropriate. |
| *Indicator 6.4.1:* Percentage change in water use efficiency over time | *Indicator 6.4.2:* Percentage of total available water resources used, taking environmental water requirements into account (Level of Water Stress) | *Indicator 6.5.1:*Degree of Integrated water resources management (IWRM) implementation (0-100) |
|  |  |  |
| **Total comments received** | 37 | 30 | 27 |
| Central Statistical Office of Poland | CSO of Poland comments: The indicator is appropriate in sense of monitoring established goal. | CSO of Poland comments: The indicator is appropriate in sense of monitoring established goal. |  |
| Government of Japan | Japan: Indicators should be simple and undestandable. We propose a new indicator. "The number of days or affected people suffered by droughts." |  | Japan support this suggested indicator, however, member states should be consulted in drafting the national questionnaires (proposed by ECE) to calculate "Degree" so that diverse conditions relating to IWRM (e.g. lack of transboundary water in a country) are reflected in evaluating the degree. |
| Hungarian Central Statistical Office | HU: Together, water use efficiency and water stress are essential for monitoring the ambition of target 6.4, and we therefore strongly recommend keeping both indicators. For indicator 6.4.1 on water use efficiency, UN-Water has suggested a clear methodology based on available data on four major water use sectors but we acknowledge that more thorough consultations may be required to test the methodology over the coming months led by UN Water. | HU: Together, water use efficiency and water stress are essential for monitoring the ambition of target 6.4, and we therefore strongly recommend keeping both indicators. Indicator 6.4.2 is a continuation of MDG monitoring on water stress with data available from 1994 through FAO AQUASTAT – we recommend that the 6.4.2 indicator be moved into “green”. | HU: We strongly support the inclusion of transboundary water management indicator on the list. The 6.5.1 indicator on integrated water resources management (IWRM) speaks directly to the wording of the target, and the suggested methodology is a continuation of the monitoring of the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation, based on years of methodology and reporting collecting data from 134 countries. We recommend that the 6.5.1 indicator be moved into “green”. |
| ISTAT | Istat-Italy: we propose two Indicators : 1) Percentage of water losses over time 2)Water use by supply category over time |  | Istat-Italy: it is necessary to have a clear definition of IWRM |
| National Statistical Committee, Belarus | To characterize the efficiency of water use, it is necessary to specify the list of indicators. It could be "the proportion of water reuse and water recycling systems in the total water use for production needs, “water use for household needs, per person" | To characterize the rational use of water resources add the indicator "index of exploitation of water resources separately ground and surface waters", defined as the ratio of annual total freshwater abstraction to long-term average annual volume of renewable resources of fresh surface and groundwater |  |
| Singapore Department of Statistics | We would like to seek clarifications on whether "water use efficiency" has the same meaning as "water productivity" |  |  |
| Statistics Denmark |  |  | The indicator on IWRM implementation is essential, relevant and useful. “Degree ..”, why not say “Percentage of watersheds having IWRM implemented” |
| Statistics Finland |  |  | Finland proposes an additional indicator regarding transboundary cooperation: "Percentage of transboundary basin area with an operational arrangement for water cooperation." A dedicated indicator measuring progress in transboundary cooperation is necessary, taking into account the recent global opening of the UNECE Water Convention as well as the entering into force of the UN Watercourses Convention in 2014. The progress related to the ratifications of these important milestones of international water law cannot be sufficiently monitored by the indicator on Integrated Water Resources Management alone. Approximately 40 % of the world's population live in transboundary river basins. With the increasing shortage of the water resources, the two global Conventions as well as other operational arrangements for water cooperation significantly improve water security. |
| Statistics Lithuania | Metodology still to be defined | Data available |  |
| Statistics Portugal | The target is clear, but the indicator does not seem the most appropriate. We also doubt about the existence of appropriate sources to build such an indicator. Thus, we suggest the following alternative indicators: i) Difference between water abstraction and water effectively supplied. (Water losses along the water supply network). ii) Number of days/hours on which the water supply is unavailable or interrupted due to water scarcity or rationing policy. |  | We can support the indicator, but clear guidelines for this indicator will be necessary. |
| Swiss Federal Statistical Office |  |  | Switzerland comments: Concerning the indicator for target 6.5 which explicitly mentions transboundary cooperation, the full political ambition of the target cannot be captured without monitoring transboundary cooperation in water management with a devoted indicator. Various countries support this, as well as : i) The seventh session of the Meeting of the Parties to the UNECE Water Convention (held in Budapest 17-19 November 2015), which was attended by some 40 Parties and 30 non-Parties (the latter with a broad global distribution), among its decisions explicitly called for the inclusion of an indicator to measure transboundary water cooperation as part of the framework of indicators to measure progress towards the SDGs. ii) Indicator 6.5.2 proposed by UN-Water, “Percentage of transboundary basin area with an operational arrangement for water cooperation”, is well suited for this purpose. More than 60% of transboundary basins in the world are not covered by a cooperation agreement". Without the political attention that a devoted indicator on transboundary cooperation brings, a valuable opportunity to motivate progress towards better coordinated and more sustainable management of water resources is lost. The transboundary indicator the UN-Water is advocating for is titled " “Percentage of transboundary basin area with an operational arrangement for water cooperation”. Its description can be found in the UN-Water metadata note under indicator 6.5.2 (page 31) at http://www.unwater.org/publications/publications-detail/en/c/296330/ - The Meeting of the Parties to the UNECE Water Convention, which was attended by some 40 Parties and 30 non-Parties (the latter with a broad global distribution), explicitly called for the inclusion of an indicator to measure transboundary water cooperation as part of the framework of indicators to measure global progress towards the SDGs. - Having transboundary cooperation underlined in the SDGs is highly beneficial, as it increases the political profile and international attention to the issue, which are important prerequisite for progress. - There were extensive discussions in the negotiations of the SDGs on transboundary cooperation and not having an indicator on the issue would not reflect the political ambition of target 6.5. - More than 60% of transboundary basins in the world are not covered by a cooperation agreement. If there is no specific indicator, it won't be possible to monitor and foster progress in this area. |
| United States | US: No comment at this time. | US: No comment at this time. | US: No comment at this time. |
| Ministry of Interior, Hungary | Hungary, Ministry of Interior 'Together, water use efficiency and water stress are essential for monitoring the ambition of target 6.4, and we therefore strongly recommend keeping both indicators. | Hungary, Ministry of Interior 'Together, water use efficiency and water stress are essential for monitoring the ambition of target 6.4, and we therefore strongly recommend keeping both indicators. | Hungary, Ministry of Interior The 6.5.1 indicator on integrated water resources management (IWRM) speaks directly to the wording of the target, and the suggested methodology is a continuation of the monitoring of the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation, based on years of methodology and reporting collecting data from 134 countries. 'We strongly support the inclusion of transboundary water management indicator on the list. We reiterate the need for an indicator 6.5.2 on transboundary water management, respectively, in order to meet the full ambition of these two targets. As target 6.5 also explicitly mentions “transboundary cooperation as appropriate” we support, in line with a number of Member States, the reconsideration of including as indicator 6.5.2 “Percentage of transboundary basin area with an operational arrangement for water cooperation” among the indicators to be reviewed in the “grey process”. The indicator proposed by UN Water is measurable and feasible. A global baseline comparative assessment of transboundary river basins and aquifers exists. |
| Eurostat | Both indicators (6.4.1 & 6.4.2) needed to fully cover the target. However, there is no international consensus yet how to define and measure/calculate water use effciency. Methodological development work and capacity building is required to make reliable data available in a comprehensive way. | Both indicators (6.4.1 & 6.4.2) needed to fully cover the target. However, there is no international consensus yet how to define and measure/calculate environmental flows and water stress, i.e. no data available in short term. Methodological development work and capacity building is required to make reliable data available in a comprehensive way. | Data coverage is problematic. Methodological development work and capacity building is required to make data available in a comprehensive way. Implementation of SEEA-Water should be seen as a tool in achieving this target. |
| FAO | FAO would like to underscore that target 6.4 addresses three issues related to the sustainability of water utilization: 1. Water use efficiency 2. Sustainable water withdrawal 3. People suffering from water scarcity These three issues refer to different aspects of water management: 1. Efficiency refers to “how” water is used 2. Water withdrawal refers to “how much” water is withdrawn by different sectors 3. Scarcity refers to the impact of water usage on people’s livelihoods FAO acknowledges the inclination by some countries in Bangkok to consider the third aspect as the most important one, as it refers to the actual impact on people’s lives. However, in order to assess this aspect we would need to know both “how” and “how much” water is used in the first place. Indicator 6.4.1, “Percentage of change in water use efficiency over time”, is based on an estimation of the outcome gained from the utilization of a single unit of water volume. This concept has not been challenged in Bangkok, and UN-Water has now revised the metadata and definition in order to address the comments expressed during the IAEG-SDG meeting. In particular, we are proposing a new title: “Trend in water use efficiency”. Indicator 6.4.2, “Level of water stress: freshwater withdrawal in percentage of available freshwater resources” is an indicator of fundamental importance for assessing the sustainability of the outcome considered by 6.4.1, and to evaluate the consequent impact on livelihoods. Indeed, it is possible that while efficiency increases, withdrawals also increase to the point of jeopardizing the sustainability of water resources and thus putting at risk the entire development effort. This is why both indicators are indispensable. Finally, an indicator directly reflecting the impact of water usage on humans is surely attractive. Nonetheless, one should consider that such an indicator could only be established by countries capable of analysing water scarcity at subnational level, such as to identify the affected population. As we cannot expect that this is always the case, and as this appears to go beyond the scope of SDG indicators as determined through the IAEG process, we would instead be eager to work with interested countries to develop a relevant methodology, based on the two main indicators, in order to produce this additional information which is certainly very useful for internal planning and development purposes. | FAO would like to underscore that target 6.4 addresses three issues related to the sustainability of water utilization: 1. Water use efficiency 2. Sustainable water withdrawal 3. People suffering from water scarcity These three issues refer to different aspects of water management: 1. Efficiency refers to “how” water is used 2. Water withdrawal refers to “how much” water is withdrawn by different sectors 3. Scarcity refers to the impact of water usage on people’s livelihoods FAO acknowledges the inclination by some countries in Bangkok to consider the third aspect as the most important one, as it refers to the actual impact on people’s lives. However, in order to assess this aspect we would need to know both “how” and “how much” water is used in the first place. Indicator 6.4.1, “Percentage of change in water use efficiency over time”, is based on an estimation of the outcome gained from the utilization of a single unit of water volume. This concept has not been challenged in Bangkok, and UN-Water has now revised the metadata and definition in order to address the comments expressed during the IAEG-SDG meeting. In particular, we are proposing a new title: “Trend in water use efficiency”. Indicator 6.4.2, “Level of water stress: freshwater withdrawal in percentage of available freshwater resources” is an indicator of fundamental importance for assessing the sustainability of the outcome considered by 6.4.1, and to evaluate the consequent impact on livelihoods. Indeed, it is possible that while efficiency increases, withdrawals also increase to the point of jeopardizing the sustainability of water resources and thus putting at risk the entire development effort. This is why both indicators are indispensable. Finally, an indicator directly reflecting the impact of water usage on humans is surely attractive. Nonetheless, one should consider that such an indicator could only be established by countries capable of analysing water scarcity at subnational level, such as to identify the affected population. As we cannot expect that this is always the case, and as this appears to go beyond the scope of SDG indicators as determined through the IAEG process, we would instead be eager to work with interested countries to develop a relevant methodology, based on the two main indicators, in order to produce this additional information which is certainly very useful for internal planning and development purposes. |  |
| International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) |  | IUCN supports adoption of “percentage of total available water resources used, taking environmental water requirements into account” as an indicator towards SDG Target 6.4 with the understanding that robust and harmonized methodologies would be adopted across countries to measure its parameters (and in particular the EWR component) in order to ensure comparability and scale-appropriate recordings that will enhance the ability of the indicator to be used for policy making at basin, national and transboundary levels. This indicator appears essential to fulfil the purpose of the SDGs, as it indicates whether the limits of sustainable use of water have been surpassed and thus whether water security thresholds are being crossed. It includes a crucial parameter on environmental water requirement (EWR), i.e., how much water must remain within ecosystems in order to continue to provide the ecosystem services that society depends on. Currently, this is the only indicator among the draft selection of water-related indicators for SDG Targets 6.1–6.6 that shows how much water resource is actually available to support development that is sustainable. We believe that this indicator helps to convey the point that nature sits within the SDGs as part of the solution for sustainable development. This indicator would be catalytic for concrete policy action relating to sustainable water management. |  |
| UNDP | UN-Water: Indicator 6.4.1 addresses “how efficiently” water is used by major sectors. This indicator together with the indicator on water stress water are essential for monitoring the environmental and economic components of target 6.4. Indicator 6.4.1 encapsulates the output over time of a given major sector per volume of (net) water withdrawn. Following ISIC 4 coding, sectors are defined as agriculture, forestry and fishing (ISIC 4-A); manufacturing, constructions, mining and quarrying (ISIC 4-B, 4-C and 4-F); electricity industry (ISIC 4-D); and municipal water supply (the service sector formed by all remaining ISIC 4 sections). Together these four dimensions provide a measure of overall efficiency across sectors. The indicator provides incentives for countries to improve water use efficiency in major sectors, and facilitates to focus on those sectors within each country that represent the largest (net) withdrawals and toward those sectors where water use efficiency is lagging behind. The rationale behind this indicator consists in providing information on the efficiency of the economic and social usage of the water resources. In fact, it gives an idea of the economic output generated by the use of water in the different main sectors of the economy. Energy production has been disaggregated from the industrial sector due to its specific importance for the general development of a country. The distribution efficiency of water systems is explicitly considered only for the municipal sector, but it is nonetheless present within the calculations also for the other sectors, and could be made explicit if needed and where data are available. This indicator addresses specifically maximising the output per unit of water from productive uses of water and minimizing losses for municipal water use. It is computed using data on withdrawals disaggregated by major sectors, and is thus of highest relevance also for the Goals on agriculture, energy, industry and production and consumption. The name of the indicator could be simplified to “change in water use efficiency over time”. A full definition of the indicator is available in the UN-Water metadata note, which is regularly reviewed and updated, available at http://bit.ly/1MPjiTZ. | UN-Water: Indicator 6.4.2 addresses the level of water stress i.e. “how much” water is withdrawn in relation to sustainably available water resources. Both the water stress water the water use efficiency indicator are essential for monitoring the environmental and economic components of target 6.4. UN-Water suggest that indicator 6.4.2 is of fundamental importance for assessing the environmental sustainability of water use across all sectors, and required in order to evaluate the consequent impact on livelihoods and degree of water scarcity. Indeed, it is possible that, as efficiency increases, withdrawals could also increase, to the point of jeopardizing the sustainability of water resources and thus putting at risk the entire development effort. Indicator 6.4.2 builds directly on methodologies and data collection processes from the MDGs, and in this regard we therefore suggest that it be transferred to the green category. We acknowledge the inclination by some IAEG-SDGs members to consider the social component to be the most important one; an indicator directly reflecting the impact of water usage on humans is surely attractive. However, in order to assess this aspect one would first of all need to know both “how” and “how much” water is being used. We are eager to work with interested countries to develop a relevant methodology, based on the two main indicators (6.4.1 and 6.4.2), in order to produce this additional information, which is certainly useful for internal planning and development purposes. A full definition of the indicator is available in the UN-Water metadata note, which is regularly reviewed and updated, available at http://bit.ly/1MPjiTZ. | UN-Water notes that the suggested indicator 6.5.1 is based on the proven, official UN Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) status reporting from 2008 and 2012 towards the Commission on Sustainable Development of the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation from the UN World Summit for Sustainable Development (1992). Data are available for 134 countries. The indicator reflects the extent to which IWRM is implemented at the national level, and can be used to support decision-making by diagnosing the national situation for water resources management, including the identification of enabling and constraining factors for implementing SDG 6. National estimates can be aggregated to present regional and global estimates. The indicator builds on national surveys structured in four components: policies, institutions, management tools and financing. It therefore captures the target well by taking into account the various users and uses of water with the aim of promoting positive social, economic and environmental impacts on all levels. Detailed information about the methodology and full definitions, as requested by several IAEG-SDGs members, are available in our metadata note. We note that indicator 6.5.1 received broad support from many Member States, it also provides the data for indicator 6b (in the green category) and we therefore suggest that it is transferred to the green category. As target 6.5 also explicitly mentions “transboundary cooperation as appropriate” we support, in line with a number of Member States, the reconsideration of including as indicator 6.5.2 “Percentage of transboundary basin area with an operational arrangement for water cooperation” among the indicators to be reviewed in the “grey process”. Full definitions of the indicators are available in the UN-Water metadata note, which is regularly reviewed and updated, available at http://bit.ly/1MPjiTZ. |
| UNECE |  |  | UNECE supports inclusion of the indicator 6.5.1 , proposed by UN-Water, into the SDGs monitoring framework. Moreover, we believe that the full political ambition of the negotiators of the SDGs and targets regarding Goal 6, as reflected by target 6.5 which explicitly mentions transboundary cooperation, cannot be captured without monitoring transboundary cooperation in water management with a devoted indicator. Various countries support this: The seventh session of the Meeting of the Parties to the UNECE Water Convention (held in Budapest 17-19 November 2015), which was attended by some 40 Parties and 30 non-Parties (the latter with a broad global distribution), among its decisions explicitly called for the inclusion of an indicator to measure transboundary water cooperation as part of the framework of indicators to measure progress towards the SDGs. Indicator 6.5.2 proposed by UN-Water, “Percentage of transboundary basin area with an operational arrangement for water cooperation”, is well suited for this purpose. More than 60% of transboundary basins in the world are not covered by a cooperation agreement. Without the political attention that a devoted indicator on transboundary cooperation brings, a valuable opportunity to motivate progress towards better coordinated and more sustainable management of water resources is lost. |
| UNEP | UNEP comments: UNEP supports the UN-Water submitted indicator Change in water use efficiency over time which addresses “how efficiently” water is used by major sectors (see http://bit.ly/1MPjiTZ.).This indicator, together with the indicator on water stress (6.4.2), are essential for monitoring the environmental and economic components of target 6.4. Indicator 6.4.1 encapsulates the output over time of a given major sector per volume of (net) water withdrawn. Following ISIC 4 coding, sectors are defined as agriculture, forestry and fishing (ISIC 4-A); manufacturing, constructions, mining and quarrying (ISIC 4-B, 4-C and 4-F); electricity industry (ISIC 4-D); and municipal water supply (the service sector formed by all remaining ISIC 4 sections). Together these four dimensions provide a measure of overall efficiency across sectors. The indicator provides incentives for countries to improve water use efficiency in major sectors, and it focuses on those sectors within each country that represent the largest (net) withdrawals and toward those sectors where water use efficiency is lagging behind. The rationale behind this indicator consists in providing information on the efficiency of the economic and social usage of the water resources. In fact, it gives an idea of the economic output generated by the use of water in the different main sectors of the economy. Energy production has been disaggregated from the industrial sector due to its specific importance for the general development of a country. The distribution efficiency of water systems is only explicitly considered for the municipal sector, but it is nonetheless present within the calculations for the other sectors, and could be made explicit if needed and where data are available. | UNEP Comments: UNEP supports the UN-Water submitted indicator of measure Level of Water Stress: Freshwater withdrawal in percentage of freshwater resources available (http://bit.ly/1MPjiTZ.). This indicator addresses “how much” water is withdrawn in relation to sustainably available water resources. Both the water stress and the water use efficiency indicators are essential for monitoring the environmental and economic components of target 6.4. The UN-Water partnership suggests that indicator 6.4.2 is of fundamental importance for assessing the environmental sustainability of water use across all sectors, and required in order to evaluate the consequent impact on livelihoods and degree of water scarcity. Indeed, it is possible that, as efficiency increases, withdrawals could also increase, to the point of jeopardizing the sustainability of water resources and thus putting at risk the entire development effort. Indicator 6.4.2 builds directly on methodologies and data collection processes from the MDGs. We acknowledge the comments by IAEG-SDGs members to consider the social component as the most important one, and consider that an indicator directly reflecting the impact of water usage on humans is very attractive. However, in order to assess this aspect it would first be necessary to know both “how” and “how much” water is being used. UNEP as a partner in UN-Water is keen to work with interested countries to develop a relevant methodology, based on the two main indicators (6.4.1 and 6.4.2), in order to produce this additional information, which is certainly useful for internal planning and development purposes. A full definition of the indicator is available in the UN-Water metadata note, which is regularly reviewed and updated. | UNEP Comments: UNEP supports the UN-Water submitted indicator of Degree of water resource integrated management (0-100) (http://bit.ly/1MPjiTZ.). As UN-Water notes the suggested indicator 6.5.1 is based on the proven, official UN Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) status reporting from 2008 and 2012 towards the Commission on Sustainable Development of the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation from the UN World Summit for Sustainable Development (2002). Data are available for 134 countries. The indicator reflects the extent to which IWRM is implemented at the national level, and can be used to support decision-making by diagnosing the national situation for water resources management, including the identification of enabling and constraining factors for implementing SDG 6. National estimates can be aggregated to present regional and global estimates. The indicator builds on national surveys structured in four components: policies, institutions, management tools and financing. It therefore captures the target well by taking into account the various users and uses of water with the aim of promoting positive social, economic and environmental impacts on all levels. It also provides the data for indicator 6b. As target 6.5 also explicitly mentions “transboundary cooperation as appropriate” we support, in line with a number of Member States, the reconsideration of including as indicator 6.5.2 Percentage of transboundary basin area with an operational arrangement for water cooperation as another worthwhile indicator. Full definitions of the indicators are available in the UN-Water metadata note, which is regularly reviewed and updated. |
| UN-ESCAP | This indicator gives no indication or weight to what water use efficiency is. This should be quantified and be measured per capita |  | What defines 0-100? |
| UNIDO | Water use efficiency is not defined. Water use in household can be measured as per person but in industry it would be per unit of output and in agriculture per unit of land area. Shall we use a weighted index for calculating aggregate change? |  |  |
| UN-Water | UN-Water: Indicator 6.4.1 addresses “how efficiently” water is used by major sectors. This indicator together with the indicator on water stress are essential for monitoring the environmental and economic components of target 6.4. Indicator 6.4.1 encapsulates the output over time of a given major sector per volume of (net) water withdrawn. Following ISIC 4 coding, sectors are defined as agriculture, forestry and fishing (ISIC 4-A); manufacturing, constructions, mining and quarrying (ISIC 4-B, 4-C and 4-F); electricity industry (ISIC 4-D); and municipal water supply (the service sector formed by all remaining ISIC 4 sections). Together these four dimensions provide a measure of overall efficiency across sectors. The indicator provides incentives for countries to improve water use efficiency in major sectors, and it focuses on those sectors within each country that represent the largest (net) withdrawals and toward those sectors where water use efficiency is lagging behind. The rationale behind this indicator consists in providing information on the efficiency of the economic and social usage of the water resources. In fact, it gives an idea of the economic output generated by the use of water in the different main sectors of the economy. Energy production has been disaggregated from the industrial sector due to its specific importance for the general development of a country. The distribution efficiency of water systems is explicitly considered only for the municipal sector, but it is nonetheless present within the calculations for the other sectors, and could be made explicit if needed and where data are available. This indicator addresses specifically maximising the output per unit of water from productive uses of water and minimizing losses for municipal water use. It is computed using data on withdrawals disaggregated by major sectors, and is thus of highest relevance also for the Goals on agriculture, energy, industry and production and consumption. The name of the indicator could be simplified be removing the word “percentage”. A full definition of the indicator is available in the UN-Water metadata note, which is regularly reviewed and updated, available at http://bit.ly/1MPjiTZ. | UN-Water: Indicator 6.4.2 addresses the level of water stress i.e. “how much” water is withdrawn in relation to sustainably available water resources. Both the water stress and the water use efficiency indicator are essential for monitoring the environmental and economic components of target 6.4. UN-Water suggests that indicator 6.4.2 is of fundamental importance for assessing the environmental sustainability of water use across all sectors, and required in order to evaluate the consequent impact on livelihoods and degree of water scarcity. Indeed, it is possible that, as efficiency increases, withdrawals could also increase, to the point of jeopardizing the sustainability of water resources and thus putting at risk the entire development effort. Indicator 6.4.2 builds directly on methodologies and data collection processes from the MDGs, and in this regard we therefore suggest that it be transferred to the green category. We acknowledge the inclination by some IAEG-SDGs members to consider the social component to be the most important one; an indicator directly reflecting the impact of water usage on humans is surely attractive. However, in order to assess this aspect one would first of all need to know both “how” and “how much” water is being used. We are eager to work with interested countries to develop a relevant methodology, based on the two main indicators (6.4.1 and 6.4.2), in order to produce this additional information, which would certainly be useful for internal planning and development purposes. A full definition of the indicator is available in the UN-Water metadata note, which is regularly reviewed and updated, available at http://bit.ly/1MPjiTZ. | UN-Water notes that the suggested indicator 6.5.1 is based on the proven, official UN Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) status reporting from 2008 and 2012 towards the Commission on Sustainable Development of the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation from the UN World Summit for Sustainable Development (2002). Data are available for 134 countries. The indicator reflects the extent to which IWRM is implemented at the national level, and can be used to support decision-making by diagnosing the national situation for water resources management, including the identification of enabling and constraining factors for implementing SDG 6. National estimates can be aggregated to present regional and global estimates. The indicator builds on national surveys structured in four components: policies, institutions, management tools and financing. It therefore captures the target well by taking into account the various users and uses of water with the aim of promoting positive social, economic and environmental impacts on all levels. Detailed information about the methodology and full definitions, as requested by several IAEG-SDGs members, are available in our metadata note. We note that indicator 6.5.1 received broad support from many Member States, it also provides the data for indicator 6b (in the green category) and we therefore suggest that it is transferred to the green category. As target 6.5 also explicitly mentions “transboundary cooperation as appropriate” we support, in line with a number of Member States, the reconsideration of including as indicator 6.5.2 “Percentage of transboundary basin area with an operational arrangement for water cooperation” among the indicators to be reviewed in the “grey process”. Full definitions of the indicators are available in the UN-Water metadata note, which is regularly reviewed and updated, available at http://bit.ly/1MPjiTZ. |
| World Water Council | World Water Council: it would be useful to add " disaggregated by sector" in the last part of the indicator. Additionally, it will important to better define how efficiency is measured. | World Water Council: - It would be maybe more useful if the percentage of total available water resources used could be disaggregated by sector. This will allow to have a better picture of the effective use of water and help Countries toward a more efficient use of resources. - it will be needed to define how environmental water requirements are measured. Both Indicators (6.4.1 and 6.4.2) are necessary, since they measure different aspects of the Target. | World Water Council: The indicator seems to excessively generic. In order to have a clear and objective result of the degree of IWRM implementation it would be necessary to have at least 4 indicators following the related Dublin Principles. Since this this doesn't seem to be feasible, it would be better to reformulate the indicator. A suggestion could be: "Percentage of plans/strategies/process in place that incorporate the main elements of IWRM". The above suggestion could be considered generic as well, but at least focuses on actual plans or strategies that consider all the most important elements of IWRM. |
| African Agency for Integrated Development (AAID) | Iam from Uganda called Kisembo Asuman, Executive Director of African Agency for Integrated Development (AAID) under A special Consultative Status with ECOSOC since 2012. I support the Inclusion of an Indicator " Provision of sufficient Funding to Implementers of Water Suply and Sanitation services especially NGOs who relies on Donor Funding" | Iam from Uganda called Kisembo Asuman, Executive Director of African Agency for Integrated Development (AAID) under A special Consultative Status with ECOSOC since 2012. I support the Inclusion of an Indicator " Number of Un functional water Sources rehabilitated to Provide safe water supply in developing countries " |  |
| Better Place International | USA, percentage of recycled water relative to the total water utilization in the country |  |  |
| Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International | Comments from Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International, Netherlands  Consider groundwater and aquifers in this and all indicators for water | Comments from Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International, Netherlands  Consider groundwater and aquifers in this and all indicators for water | Comments from Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International, Netherlands  Include groundwater and aquifers in in this and all proposed indicators for water. |
| Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial research Organisation (CSIRO) | The economic efficiency of water use can be measured as water extraction per unit of GDP. National data on water extraction is available from AQUASTAT for some years. There is some sectoral dis-aggregation into broad use categories including agriculture, industry and households which allows for additional information. More needs be done, however, to further improve data availability. |  |  |
| Diyalo Pariwar | Arsenic and other bacterial issues should be in focus. Ground sources and rain harvesting should be promoted in developing countries. | Like, Nepal where the high volume of rivers, springs and natural sources are need to be promoted to supply others of in difficult conditions. |  |
| Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei |  | FEEM is not sure on the indicator, maybe we can use the FAO established "Freshwater withdrawal as % of total renewable water resources" that also incorporates reduction in future water availability due to climate change |  |
| French Water Partnership | The current list suggests a Water productivity indicator measured as the “% of change in water use efficiency over time”. We approve this notion. However, the metadata document suggests to calculate this change in main sectors by using economic outputs such as GDP, which is not appropriate because difficult to interpret as measuring change in water efficiency. We recommend measuring sectors efficiencies with physical outputs such as: - KWh for energy production - Kcal for agriculture. - For drinking water : ratio between the amount of water resources withdrawn and the number of people served. | The level of water stress indicator gives a simple observation of water availability, but does not give information about the sustainability of the water management, and it does not take into account water reuse and net consumptions. As this indicator is unable to measure progress towards sustainability of water resource, we suggest a new indicator measuring withdrawals from unsustainable water resources. | We strongly favor a general indicator of degree measuring Integraged Water resources at all management at all level. But considering that 40% of the world population lives in basins shared by several countries, and that the 263 transboundary basins cover nearly 60% of global freshwater supplies we also strongly suggest that this IWRM degree indicator includes a parameter on shared transboundary basins such as "% of shared transboundary basin area with cooperation agreement". |
| ICMM and IPIECA | John Drexhage ICMM/IPIECA For the extractives sector, a more useful indicator would be percentage change in water use as compared to the Business as Usual case for specific investments. For one thing, water use (vs. water use efficiency) is easier to define and hence measure. Secondly, by the nature of extractives' activities, relative water (and energy) use will always increase over the length of a project. | John Drexhage ICMM/IPIECA Not clear there is an accepted definition of water stress. | John Drexhage ICMM/IPIECA Again, is there an internationally acceptable definition/understanding of the elements of what constitutes integrated water resource management? |
| International Network of Basin Organizations | We support this indicator, but we raise concerns on the methodology used to measure it. We do not think that a ratio Water use/Gross domestic product is relevant, as water efficiency differs greatly from one sector to another. We would support ratio of Water use/Physical outputs per sector, for instance: kilowatt-hours for the industry of energy production, kilocalories for agriculture, etc. | Water stress is a good indicator to get a picture of the situation at a given time and place. However, it doesn't help assess the sustainability of the water use (reuse, collection of rainwater, etc.). We suggest either a revised indicator, or an additional one, measuring withdrawals from unsustainable water resources. | The degree of IWRM should be assessed on the basis of the knowledge base produced by - the OECD's Initiative on Water governance (http://www.oecd.org/gov/regional-policy/OECD-Principles-on-Water-Governance-brochure.pdf) and its Forthcoming OECD Working Paper on Water Governance Indicators, - INBO, ANBO, IOWater and Ecologic institute on Key Performance Indicators for Transboundary Basins in Africa (http://www.inbo-news.org/IMG/pdf/KPI\_Final\_Report.pdf) Since 40% of the world population lives in basins shared by several countries, transboundary cooperation is rightfully mentioned in the target. However, it is not included in the current indicator. It is crucial that this current indicator be revised to include in its final version transboundary aspects. We suggest an indicator on "% of shared transboundary basins with cooperation agreement". |
| IRC | Water use efficiency may need to be defined differently in different water using sectors: - In urban water supply systems, this may be straightforward, using the "non-revenue water" indicator, which takes into account physical and commercial losses. For many urban water utilities, this is a key performance indicator, so it should be a relatively easy one to collect - In small drinking water systems, this indicators is usually not collected, simply because most small water systems don't have any form of water metering, as the cost of metering is higher than the benefits. Also in small handpump systems, this indicator doesn't make much sense - For irrigation, this is a particularly difficult indicator. Traditional irrigation efficiency indicators could be used, but much research has shown that at a basin level, it doesnt make much sense, when you don't include the factors of how seepage water can be used downstream. The degree of overall basin closure is a better one - similar to 6.4.2. |  | The target talks about implementing IWRM at all levels. So, one needs to be clear at which levels the indicator will be measured: at hydrological units: river basin, catchment, sub-catchment, catchment or rather administrative units, like a country. There are lots of pros and cons for both options. It is impossible to comment on the substance of this indicator, if the 0-100 scale is not known. Presumably it would include then factors such as presence of a river basin organisation, the existence of mechanisms through which users can participate, the mechanisms to allocate water are in place, etc. Also, this indicator may be most relevant only in river basins that are experiencing some form of scarcity or regular flooding. IWRM should be problem driven and not be implemented in any river basin, but prioritised in those basins where there are real water management challenges |
| ONGAWA | ONGAWA (Spain) |  |  |
| Pathfinder's Outreach Ministry (POM) | Ghana 70% change in water use efficiency over time | Ghana 80% of total available water resources used, taking environmental water requirements into account (Level of Water Stress) | Ghana Increase in the degree of Integrated water resources management (IWRM) implementation (0-100) |
| SIWI (Stockholm International Water Institute) | ORGANISATION SIWI COMMENTS: We support the proposal by UN-Water: Indicator 6.4.1 addresses “how efficiently” water is used by major sectors. This indicator together with the indicator on water stress are essential for monitoring the environmental and economic components of target 6.4. Indicator 6.4.1 encapsulates the output over time of a given major sector per volume of (net) water withdrawn. Following ISIC 4 coding, sectors are defined as agriculture, forestry and fishing (ISIC 4-A); manufacturing, constructions, mining and quarrying (ISIC 4-B, 4-C and 4-F); electricity industry (ISIC 4-D); and municipal water supply (the service sector formed by all remaining ISIC 4 sections). Together these four dimensions provide a measure of overall efficiency across sectors. The indicator provides incentives for countries to improve water use efficiency in major sectors, and it focuses on those sectors within each country that represent the largest (net) withdrawals and toward those sectors where water use efficiency is lagging behind. The rationale behind this indicator consists in providing information on the efficiency of the economic and social usage of the water resources. In fact, it gives an idea of the economic output generated by the use of water in the different main sectors of the economy. Energy production has been disaggregated from the industrial sector due to its specific importance for the general development of a country. The distribution efficiency of water systems is explicitly considered only for the municipal sector, but it is nonetheless present within the calculations for the other sectors, and could be made explicit if needed and where data are available. This indicator addresses specifically maximising the output per unit of water from productive uses of water and minimizing losses for municipal water use. It is computed using data on withdrawals disaggregated by major sectors, and is thus of highest relevance also for the Goals on agriculture, energy, industry and production and consumption. The name of the indicator could be simplified to “change in water use efficiency over time”. | ORGANISATION SIWI COMMENTS: We support the proposal by UN-Water: Indicator 6.4.2 addresses the level of water stress i.e. “how much” water is withdrawn in relation to sustainably available water resources. Both the water stress and the water use efficiency indicator are essential for monitoring the environmental and economic components of target 6.4. UN-Water suggests that indicator 6.4.2 is of fundamental importance for assessing the environmental sustainability of water use across all sectors, and required in order to evaluate the consequent impact on livelihoods and degree of water scarcity. Indeed, it is possible that, as efficiency increases, withdrawals could also increase, to the point of jeopardizing the sustainability of water resources and thus putting at risk the entire development effort. Indicator 6.4.2 builds directly on methodologies and data collection processes from the MDGs, and in this regard we therefore suggest that it be transferred to the green category. We acknowledge the inclination by some IAEG-SDGs members to consider the social component to be the most important one; an indicator directly reflecting the impact of water usage on humans is surely attractive. However, in order to assess this aspect one would first of all need to know both “how” and “how much” water is being used. We are eager to work with interested countries to develop a relevant methodology, based on the two main indicators (6.4.1 and 6.4.2), in order to produce this additional information, which would certainly be useful for internal planning and development purposes | ORGANISATION SIWI COMMENTS support the position by UN-Water: UN-Water notes that the suggested indicator 6.5.1 is based on the proven, official UN Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) status reporting from 2008 and 2012 towards the Commission on Sustainable Development of the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation from the UN World Summit for Sustainable Development (2002). Data are available for 134 countries. The indicator reflects the extent to which IWRM is implemented at the national level, and can be used to support decision-making by diagnosing the national situation for water resources management, including the identification of enabling and constraining factors for implementing SDG 6. National estimates can be aggregated to present regional and global estimates. The indicator builds on national surveys structured in four components: policies, institutions, management tools and financing. It therefore captures the target well by taking into account the various users and uses of water with the aim of promoting positive social, economic and environmental impacts on all levels. Detailed information about the methodology and full definitions, as requested by several IAEG-SDGs members, are available in our metadata note. We note that indicator 6.5.1 received broad support from many Member States, it also provides the data for indicator 6b (in the green category) and we therefore suggest that it is transferred to the green category. As target 6.5 also explicitly mentions “transboundary cooperation as appropriate” we support, in line with a number of Member States, the reconsideration of including as indicator 6.5.2 “Percentage of transboundary basin area with an operational arrangement for water cooperation” among the indicators to be reviewed in the “grey process”. |
| Stockholm Environment Institute | Stockholm Environment Institute staff believe, given the temporal and spatial aspects of water availability versus water use, that it is highly unlikely that national-level information on water stress will be sufficient as a sole indicator. This should therefore be supplemented with an indicator linked to basin-level and temporal statistics so that a better understanding of water-stress is encouraged within countries. Additionally we recommend: ‘Investment ($) in sub-national water monitoring activities’. Also, transboundary considerations should - ideally - be integrated into the indicator, or included as a sub-indicator. We recommend: ‘Potential reduction in water availability to downstream countries (due to in-country abstraction) as a percentage of downstream country requirements’. It is also Important to recognise that water use efficiency will naturally vary in different sectors (e.g. industrial/agricultural/household consumption) due to the nature of activities. Water use efficiency is also likely to vary across regions. Any use of weighting coefficients proportional to each sector’s share of total water withdrawal/consumption should consider the spatial distribution of activities. | Stockholm Environment Institute staff recommend the use of an indicator of total water availability which is linked to localised water requirements and existential water stress. | The Stockholm Environment Institute still maintains its support for the proposed indicator. |
| Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN) | SDSN comments: please include "disaggregated by sector" | SDSN comments: "Proportion of total water resources used" is MDG Indicator that measures water stress and is defined as the total volume of groundwater and surface water abstracted (withdrawn) from their sources for human use (e.g. in sectors such as agriculture, industry, or municipal), expressed as a percentage of the total annual renewable water resources. This indicator shows whether a country abstracts more than its sustainable supply of freshwater resources. It can be used to track progress in the sustainable, integrated, and transparent management of water resources. |  |
| Sustainable World Initiative |  | We fully support this indicator because it compares the availability and use of water resources. |  |
| Transparency International |  |  | Transparency International: The suggested indicators should be aligned with the OECD Water Governance Principles: http://www.oecd.org/governance/oecd-principles-on-water-governance.htm |
| UN Major Group for Children and Youth | Include ratio of usage and regenration based on location and type of water source. Number and distribution of people living in water scarce situations calculated by disaggregation based on along sex, income groups, type of human settlement, migratory/displacement status, 'any other status' etc/ . | Environmental thresholds and Planetary boundaries approach. |  |
| WWF |  | WWF supports the following indicator: “Freshwater withdrawal as a percentage of available, sustainable freshwater supply, which includes allocation of water for the environment.” This indicator builds on that being supported by UN-Water. The concept of sustainability is central to this target and therefore is explicitly included in WWF’s proposed indicator to ensure that environmental requirements are accounted for. Basin-level and temporal information will both be important in measuring the sustainability of water withdrawals. WWF suggests disaggregation to basins, with country-level data to then be developed using proportional averages within country boundaries. To address the need to include temporal water withdrawal information, WWF suggests that a third metric around spatio-temporal monitoring of supply and demand would be highly useful. | WWF: WWF strongly supports the inclusion of both IWRM and transboundary indicators as priorities in order to accurately capture the full intention of target 6.5. In addition to an IWRM indicator, we also support the following transboundary indicator: “Percentage of international watercourses with a formal operational arrangement between all riparians for water cooperation disaggregated by inclusiveness of gender-specific arrangements, objectives and commitments.” This indicator builds on that being proposed by UN-Water, but includes alterations to make the terminology consistent with the UN Watercourses Convention, a global treaty adopted by the UN General Assembly in 1997, and to bring it in line with suggestions for gender-sensitive indicators by World Water Assessment Program/UNESCO. |
| Amiable Resource | Learn respects and conservation principals? Monitored, metered and minimized exploitation? | Fundament and elementary lessons and inspirations to mature conservation respects and use processes? | Focused conservation and relationship respects or honour of resource? Monitored and measured minimizational standards? |
| LTO Nederland | More crop per drop: farm yield per litre of water irrigated | Number of calamities involving floods destroying harvests |  |
| Monash Sustainability Institute |  | David Griggs - Monash Sustainability Institute. In order to maintain the health of watersheds indicators need to be included to restrict global water runoff to less than 4000 cubic kilometres a year and limit volumes withdrawn from river basins to no more than 50–80% of their mean annual flow. |  |
| new York University | USA, NYU: number of hours per day that women and men spend collecting water for household use. |  |  |
| University of Utah | University of Utah Center for Global Surgery, USA Should there be an indicator of potable water access at 1st level hospitals? Cannot provide adequate medical/surgical care without good water supply. |  |  |

| **Country/Organisation** | **Goal 7: Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable, and modern energy for all** |
| --- | --- |
| **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 |
| *Indicator 7.b.1:*Ratio of value added to net domestic energy use, by industry |
| *Discussion prompt: The IAEG-SDG Members ask for suggestions for an alternative indicator.* |
| **Total comments received** | 27 |
| Government of Japan | Japan: There is no valid data for this target at this moment since it is still unclarified what kind of numerical value is taken into consideration. It should be based on indicator provided by International Organization such as IEA and World Bank. |
| National Statistical Committee, Belarus | “Ratio of value added to net domestic energy use, by industry” is not calculated. The calculation will be in 2017 (for the year 2016) |
| Statistics Denmark | Unclear how 7.b.1. would be measured. Denmark would prefer a quantifiable indicator, e.g.: “Rate of improvement in energy productivity (the amount of economic output achieved for a given amount of energy consumption).” |
| Statistics Finland | Finland comments: ”Percentage of people having access to modern and sustainable energy services” would be more accurate. |
| Statistics Portugal | We support the inclusion of this indicator. |
| TurkStat | Turkstat comments: Proposed Indicator : Financial support from the government or outside groups or institutions (World Bank etc.) for developing indigenous renewable source and infrastructure. Comment: Billions of people still lack access to basic, modern and sustainable energy. Proposed indicator would be used not only for determining the way of country's direction in terms of accessing to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy but also transition to low carbon energy systems of that country. |
| TURKSTAT | TURKSTAT- Proposed Indicator : Financial support from the government or outside groups or institutions (World Bank etc.) for developing indigenous renewable source and infrastructure. Comment: Billions of people still lack access to basic, modern and sustainable energy. Proposed indicator would be used not only for determining the way of country's direction in terms of accessing to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy but also transition to low carbon energy systems of that country. |
| United States | US: No comments at this time. Since COPS 21 has just concluded, we may have more comments to convey. |
| Eurostat | If retained, methodological work is needed, most importantly an alignment between energy and national accounts categories. |
| g7+ Secretariat | g7+ Secretariat: For FCS it is very much the question of availability of resources from donors to construct dams to generate electricity. Alternative indicator should be proposed to measure the proportion of ODA spent on infrastructure facility such as dams |
| UNDESA / UN-Energy | On behalf of UN-Energy, SE4ALL and the Global Tracking Framework, please find below an alternative proposal for the only “grey” indicator of SDG7, which is the indicator for Target 7b. We do not support the “grey” indicator currently listed for this target: Ratio of value added to net domestic energy use, by industry. NEW PROPOSED INDICATOR FOR TARGET 7.b: Indicator 7.b.1: "Volume of trade (imports + exports) of a basket of clean technology products." The basket includes the following 12 clean technology products: solar photo-voltaic (PV), light emitting diodes (LEDs), small hydro turbines (capacity below 1 MW and 1–10 MW), wind turbines, biodiesel, insulation materials, fluorescent lamps, heat pumps, reversible heat pumps for air conditioning, electric vehicles, portable electric lamps, and parts of portable electric lamps. The data for this indicator is available annually for all countries. The source of the data is the World Bank’s World Integrated Trade Solution, which derives merchandise trade data from UN Comtrade. The website is: http://wits.worldbank.org/about\_wits.html |
| UNDESA / UN-Energy | On behalf of UN-Energy, SE4ALL and the Global Tracking Framework, please find below an alternative proposal for the only “grey” indicator of SDG7, which is the indicator for Target 7b. We do not support the “grey” indicator currently listed for this target: Ratio of value added to net domestic energy use, by industry. NEW PROPOSED INDICATOR FOR TARGET 7.b: Indicator 7.b.1: "Volume of trade (imports + exports) of a basket of clean technology products." The basket includes the following 12 clean technology products: solar photo-voltaic (PV), light emitting diodes (LEDs), small hydro turbines (capacity below 1 MW and 1–10 MW), wind turbines, biodiesel, insulation materials, fluorescent lamps, heat pumps, reversible heat pumps for air conditioning, electric vehicles, portable electric lamps, and parts of portable electric lamps. The data for this indicator is available annually for all countries. The source of the data is the World Bank’s World Integrated Trade Solution, which derives merchandise trade data from UN Comtrade. The website is: http://wits.worldbank.org/about\_wits.html |
| UNEP | UNEP Comments: to supplement Indicator 7.2, an indicator to measure Financial investment in infrastructure and technology for supplying sustainable energy services will need to be put in place. The new Technology Platform under the new Paris Agreement will be a key source of data and information. The UN SDG Interface Ontology Working Group is developing definitions for renewable energy and services. A brief note on this work is available from: http://unstats.un.org/unsd/post-2015/activities/egm-on-indicator-framework/docs/Common%20approach%20for%20developing%20SDG%20Integrated%20indicators.pdf |
| UN-ESCAP | As with water and sanitation this should measure househld access/supply, and also capture quality and affordability |
| United Nations ESCAP | United Nations ESCAP, Thailand, This appears to promote fuel subsidies - not a good idea. |
| Better Place International | USA, Same but of clean energy |
| Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International | Comments from Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International, Netherlands  Indicator based on per capita increase in spending on energy infrastructure and upgraded technology for modern and sustainable energy services. |
| Diyalo Pariwar | Bio-diesel and lithium as well as LPG might be the issues for the developing countries. |
| German Institute for Human Rights | Current and previous indicators for this target carry the risk of incentivizing large-scale energy generation projects (e.g. dams) without impact assessments which have led to documented cases of serious human rights infringements (e.g. forced resettlements). In order to avoid such negative incentives through the 7.b.1 indicator it is highly recommended to also measure related safeguards as previously recommended by the Government of Germany and others, e.g. by adding a process indicator such as "Proportion of energy infrastructure contracts with explicit human rights safeguards or impacts assessments". |
| ICMM and IPIECA | John Drexhage ICMM/IPIECA Suggestion: develop a comprehensive, indicative list of what is included in 'modern and sustainable energy services' and then ask countries to list which of those technologies have been introduced: for example, Carbon Capture and Storage, Super Critical Coal Plants, Run of the River Hydro, Nuclear and traditional renewables would be part of that list.....must be sure not to limit this list to only traditional renewables, as it is clear that is not what was intended by Parties when they agreed to this list. Also need to include improvements/investments in energy systems (e.g.. grid integration). |
| Practical Action | Practical Action, along with other agencies signing up to a joint statement on this goal and targets, feels that this indicator is not adequate to measure the target. We suggest the alternative: Total international development and climate finance spent on renewables, energy efficiency, and decentralised energy solutions and % change from previous year. |
| TAPNetwork | The consultation is open to observers (non-IAEG Member States and representatives of regional commissions and regional and international agencies) and other stakeholders (civil society, academia and private sector). The consultation focuses on indicators that are coded 'grey', indicating that additional work and discussion are needed before reaching a final agreement on them. For some indicators, discussion prompts are provided based on comments by IAEG-SDG members. Inputs on these indicators should focus to the extent possible on responding to the prompts. As a reference, the open consultation questionnaire in PDF format is available for download here. The inputs and comments provided will be considered by the IAEG-SDG Members in their final phase of preparation of the indicator proposal for submission to the Statistical Commission. Please note that the final decision on the number, type and formulation of the indicators in the final proposal of the set of global indicators will be taken by the IAEG-SDG Members. The deadline for submitting your inputs is 9 pm EST, Tuesday, 15 December 2015. While acknowledging that this is a very short turnaround, a timely completion of this consultation will ensure the IAEG-SDG Members are able to consider these inputs forThe consultation is open to observers (non-IAEG Member States and representatives of regional commissions and regional and international agencies) and other stakeholders (civil society, academia and private sector). The consultation focuses on indicators that are coded 'grey', indicating that additional work and discussion are needed before reaching a final agreement on them. For some indicators, discussion prompts are provided based on comments by IAEG-SDG members. Inputs on these indicators should focus to the extent possible on responding to the prompts. As a reference, the open consultation questionnaire in PDF format is available for download here. The inputs and comments provided will be considered by the IAEG-SDG Members in their final phase of preparation of the indicator proposal for submission to the Statistical Commission. Please note that the final decision on the number, type and formulation of the indicators in the final proposal of the set of global indicators will be taken by the IAEG-SDG Members. The deadline for submitting your inputs is 9 pm EST, Tuesday, 15 December 2015. While acknowledging that this is a very short turnaround, a timely completion of this consultation will ensure the IAEG-SDG Members are able to consider these inputs for the the The consultation is open to observers (non-IAEG Member States and representatives of regional commissions and regional and international agencies) and other stakeholders (civil society, academia and private sector). The consultation focuses on indicators that are coded 'grey', indicating that additional work and discussion are needed before reaching a final agreement on them. For some indicators, discussion prompts are provided based on comments by IAEG-SDG members. Inputs on these indicators should focus to the extent possible on responding to the prompts. As a reference, the open consultation questionnaire in PDF format is available for download here. The inputs and comments provided will be considered by the IAEG-SDG Members in their final phase of preparation of the indicator proposal for submission to the Statistical Commission. Please note that the final decision on the number, type and formulation of the indicators in the final proposal of the set of global indicators will be taken by the IAEG-SDG Members. The deadline for submitting your inputs is 9 pm EST, Tuesday, 15 December 2015. While acknowledging that this is a very short turnaround, a timely completion of this consultation will ensure the IAEG-SDG Members are able to consider these inputs for the The consultation is open to observers (non-IAEG Member States and representatives of regional commissions and regional and international agencies) and other stakeholders (civil society, academia and private sector). The consultation focuses on indicators that are coded 'grey', indicating that additional work and discussion are needed before reaching a final agreement on them. For some indicators, discussion prompts are provided based on comments by IAEG-SDG members. Inputs on these indicators should focus to the extent possible on responding to the prompts. As a reference, the open consultation questionnaire in PDF format is available for download here. The inputs and comments provided will be considered by the IAEG-SDG Members in their final phase of preparation of the indicator proposal for submission to the Statistical Commission. Please note that the final decision on the number, type and formulation of the indicators in the final proposal of the set of global indicators will be taken by the IAEG-SDG Members. The deadline for submitting your inputs is 9 pm EST, Tuesday, 15 December 2015. While acknowledging that this is a very short turnaround, a timely completion of this consultation will ensure the IAEG-SDG Members are able to consider these inputs for the |
| UN Major Group for Children and Youth | Include patters of infrastructure investment in the mentioned area |
| Amiable Resource | Geologic social diffrences and demands? Balanced ratios of yet adaptive and diversified or suitable sources? |
| LTO Nederland | Fossile Energy use per kg of food produced |
| Philips | Philips: - Rates of energy efficiency improvement. An indicator could be a country's energy productivity, e.g. billions of Euros of GDP per Exojoule of energy consumed, see http://www.ecofys.com/files/files/the-2015-energy-productivity-and-economic-prosperity-index.pdf - Availability of carbon pricing or other methods of internalizing the cost of carbon AND % of the carbon-revenues that are used on financing mechanisms for carbon / climate mitigation. - |
| new York University | USA, NYU: percentage of domestic energy consisting of clean sources of energy (solar, wind, water) |

| **Country/Organisation** | **Goal 8: Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 for sustainable consumption and production, with developed countries taking the lead | **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 | **Target 8.9:**By 2030, devise and implement policies to promote sustainable tourism that creates jobs and promotes local culture and products |
| *Indicator 8.4.1:*Resource Productivity | *Indicator 8.8.2:*Number of ILO conventions ratified by type of convention | *Indicator 8.9.1:*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 sex) |
| *Discussion prompt: The IAEG-SDG Members ask for suggestions for an alternative indicator, in particular one considering both consumption and production.* |  |  |
| **Total comments received** | 29 | 25 | 29 |
| Central Statistical Office of Poland | CSO of Poland comments: CSO od Poland understands this indicator as one elaborated by Eurostat. |  |  |
| Government of Japan |  |  | Japan: Number of jobs(all employees) in tourism is estimated from SNA(The system of national accounts) data by "TSA Recommended Methodological Framework 2008"(UNWTO) . Number of employees　by industry in SNA doesn't distinguish by gender, so the number in tourism indutries is estimated without distinction of gender.　We can show the other indicators. |
| Hungarian Central Statistical Office | HU: The water and raw material consumption (demand) combining with energy intensity is very relevant incicator. |  |  |
| Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Censos | The metadata of this indicator does not indicate on what specific variable efficiency and sustainable developmental are measured. |  |  |
| ISTAT | Istat-Italy: we support the definition alligned with SEEA and use the ratio GDP/DMC |  | Istat-Italy: we support the Tourism Satellite Accounts and the SEEA for developping this indicator, that is connected also to 12.b.1 |
| National Statistical Committee, Belarus | To characterize the impact of economic activities on the environment deem appropriate additionally specify the indicators: waste production and waste recycling/management, areas of disturbed lands |  |  |
| Statistics Denmark | Indicator includes resource productivity but does not cover environmental degradation. Priority to maintain resource productivity as indicator with a preference to use DMC/BNP as key indicator, possibly supplemented with DMC/GVA for selected sectors. Important to include indicator for environmental degradation. Eurostat proposes to includethe following indicators "Trade in environmental goods and services in USD/year", "Investments in environmental goods and services in USD/year" and/or the "Global Competitiveness Index". World Bankproposes two additional indicators "Adjusted Net Savings indicator",which, as a percentage of the Gross National Income, measures gross savings minus consumption of fixed capital, plus education expenditures, minus energy depletion, mineral depletion, et forest depletion, and particulate emissions and carbon dioxide damage and "Adjusted Net National income per capita, which equals gross national income minus consumption of fixed capital, energy depletion, mineral depletion, and net forest depletion, divided by midyear population." |  | Indicator should be changed. Indicator does not at all cover the sustainability element and thus does not respond to the target. We strongly encourage that outreach is made to the UNEP Programme on Sustainable Tourism (under the 10 YFP-SCP) and the World Tourism Organisation to identify a more appropriate indicator. The focus of the target is on policy. Thus, if no better indicator can be found, one solution could be to use “No of countries with dedicated strategies/programmes/action plans for sustainable tourism”. |
| Statistics Finland | Finland comments that resource productivity is a mass based indicator with several differing calculation possibilities. It does not give a picture of real resource efficiency even at a global level. Mass based lead indicators should not be used to indicate performance on resource efficiency. "Resource productivity" as an indicator does not take into account various different resources and their different aspects such as renewability, recyclability, scarcity, wide availability or environmental impacts of its use (emissions, hazardousness etc.). The target is important but needs broader analysis on the basis of several indicators for relevant aspects, such as sectoral environmental issues, systemic circularity and innovation topics that are still evolving. |  |  |
| Statistics Lithuania |  |  | Move to green |
| Statistics Portugal | We support the inclusion of this indicator. |  | These indicators do not have a clear and objective relation with sustainable tourism, an increase of indicators can mean or not an increase in unsustainable tourism. |
| Swiss Federal Statistical Office | Switzerland comments: Suggested indicator: Final Demand or GDP divided by Raw Material consumption RMC. Rationale: Since the target refers to both consumption and production, it should not address exclusively a production perspective (represented by GDP/DMC) but should include also the consumption perspective, represented by the material footprint MF (RMC or TMC) | Switzerland comments that the indicator has limited relevance as the ratification of a convention does not yield any information on their actual implementation. | Switzerland comments: The suggested indicator is merely quantitative. Its significance for sustainability purposes is not apparent. |
| United States | US: We offer an alternate indicator, "effective tax rate on energy use" as shown. OECD produced a volume in 2011 or 2012 that tracks "resource productivity;" the approach developed there might be applied here. However, the OECD volume does not seem to offer a way to aggregate up from indicators of the productivity with which individual resources are being used to an overall indicator of resource productivity. The most plausible approach would involve weighting each natural resource by its value in each country, but getting the data for such calculations in poor countries could be daunting. http://www.oecd.org/env/waste/47944428.pdf | US: This proposal appropriately addresses the four fundamental principles and rights at work contained in the ILO’ s 1998 Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work. While the number of ratifications of conventions is useful insofar as it draws attention to the importance of protecting rights at work, this proposed substitute could give a more accurate picture of how well workers’ rights are being protected because if focuses on actual implementation. Data sources: Reports of the ILO Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations (CEACR), the ILO Committee on Freedom of Association, and the ILO Conference Committee on the Application of Standards.  8.8.2. Number of systemic problems of implementation, as noted by ILO supervisory mechanisms, with regard to any of the following: (a) freedom of association and collective bargaining; (b) forced labor; (c) child labor, (d) discrimination in employment. | US: We recommend deleting 8.9.1.a Tourism direct GDP (as % of total GDP and in growth rate) and retaining 8.9.1.b Number of jobs in tourism industries (as % total jobs and growth rate of jobs, by gender). |
| Eurostat | Indicator can be moved to GREEN. But as indicator does not take the "consumption" perspective and does not address decoupling "economic growth from environmental degradation", more development work is needed at a later stage to achieve full coverage of the target. |  | More development work needed to achieve full coverage of the target (qualitative dimension on sustainability not covered; measurement of environmental impacts of tourism activity)in a later stage. Possible direction of development as indicated by UNCEEA : indicator defined in alignment with SNA satelite account for tourism, and eventually with the SEEA-tourism when it is developed; Tourism consumption and Employment in Tourism industries as derived from the Tourism Satellite Account (TSA) at national and sub-national level, combined with an eventual extended version of the System of Environmental-Economic Accounting (SEEA) for Tourism. |
| g7+ Secretariat |  | g7+ Secretariat: Ratification of ILO convention may not mean the result (improvement of working condition). We suggest this indicator be the matte of national consultation and should be identified at the country level |  |
| ICAO |  |  | More than half of all tourists currently arrive by air. Improved air transport connectivity is, therefore, a key element to sustainable tourism development, especially for Least Developed Countries (LDCs), Landlocked Developing Countries (LLDCs) and Small Island Developing States (SIDS). In order to optimize air transport connectivity, a strong supporting policy framework is required. Continuous opening-up of air transport market through liberalizing measures leads to better tourist experiences, including increased air transport connectivity and lower fares, which in turn stimulates additional tourist traffic and can bring about increased economic growth and employment. A stand alone indicator measuring tourism contribution to GDP and or Jobs by itself does not capture the policy implementation needed to promote sustainable tourism which is what Goal 8 intends to achieve.. It is therefore suggested that ICAO working with other related UN agencies like UNWTO, ILO and UNCTAD develop a merged indicator that combines crucial policy drivers to promote sustainable tourism i.e. connectivity indicators with the indicators of tourism's contribution to the economy. This would be a better indicator to monitor progress of policy making and its implementation to promote sustainable tourism. |
| ICAO |  |  | More than half of all tourists currently arrive by air. Improved air transport connectivity is, therefore, a key element to sustainable tourism development, especially for Least Developed Countries (LDCs), Landlocked Developing Countries (LLDCs) and Small Island Developing States (SIDS). In order to optimize air transport connectivity, a strong supporting policy framework is required. Continuous opening-up of air transport market through liberalizing measures leads to better tourist experiences, including increased air transport connectivity and lower fares, which in turn stimulates additional tourist traffic and can bring about increased economic growth and employment. A stand alone indicator measuring tourism contribution to GDP and or Jobs by itself does not capture the policy implementation needed to promote sustainable tourism which is what Goal 8 intends to achieve.. It is therefore suggested that ICAO working with other related UN agencies like UNWTO, ILO and UNCTAD develop a merged indicator that combines crucial policy drivers to promote sustainable tourism i.e. connectivity indicators with the indicators of tourism's contribution to the economy. This would be a better indicator to monitor progress of policy making and its implementation to promote sustainable tourism. |
| ICAO |  |  | More than half of all tourists currently arrive by air. Improved air transport connectivity is, therefore, a key element to sustainable tourism development, especially for Least Developed Countries (LDCs), Landlocked Developing Countries (LLDCs) and Small Island Developing States (SIDS). In order to optimize air transport connectivity, a strong supporting policy framework is required. Continuous opening-up of air transport market through liberalizing measures leads to better tourist experiences, including increased air transport connectivity and lower fares, which in turn stimulates additional tourist traffic and can bring about increased economic growth and employment. A stand alone indicator measuring tourism contribution to GDP and or Jobs by itself does not capture the policy implementation needed to promote sustainable tourism which is what Goal 8 intends to achieve.. It is therefore suggested that ICAO working with other related UN agencies like UNWTO, ILO and UNCTAD develop a merged indicator that combines crucial policy drivers to promote sustainable tourism i.e. connectivity indicators with the indicators of tourism's contribution to the economy. This would be a better indicator to monitor progress of policy making and its implementation to promote sustainable tourism. |
| ILO- International Labour Organization |  | ILO proposes the following alternative: "Increase in national compliance of labour rights (freedom of association and collective bargaining) based on ILO textual sources and national legislation" This indicator is based on the coding by the ILO of compliance of ILO Convention 87 on Freedom of association and protection of the right to organize (both for workers and employers) and Convention 98 on Right to organize and collective bargaining. It is based on the ILO's Report on the committee on Freedom of Association and other complementary sources. The ILO has established a partnership with the Penn State University for some components and includes evaluation criteria based on coding the violations in laws and in practices by the ILO supervisory mechanisms. A partial contents of this indicator can be consulted in http://tur.la.psu.edu/ Metadata is available in "New Indicator of Labour Rights: Method and Results" buy D.Kucera and D. Sari (ILO) upon request to diez@ilo.org. This indicator addresses the compliance aspect raised by the IAEG on SDG and covers the two more important components of labour rights. The metadata on collective bargaining rates has already been submitted to the platform. |  |
| OECD | We suggest using the material footprint, i.e. "Raw material consumption/net disposable income". |  |  |
| UN ESCAP |  |  | One indicator could be the number of tourists travelled. The World Tourism Barometer maitians such data. Determination by sex could also be pssible but need to be checked from WTO. |
| UN Women |  | Proposed indicators: (1) Collective bargaining coverage rate, by sex, age and migrant status; and (2) The trade union density rate, by sex age and migrant status Collective bargaining coverage rate, by sex, age and migrant status This indicator indicates the proportion of workers in employment whose pay and/or conditions of employment are directly or indirectly (e.g. through extension clauses) determined by one or more collective agreement(s). Through collective bargaining, employers and employers through their representatives can reach agreements to regulate working conditions, including wages, working hours, norms related to health and safety, severance procedures and other rights at work. This indicator thus provides a measure of the reach of collective bargaining agreements and, as such, can help in assessing people’s rights at work. The collective bargaining coverage rate (CBA) is the percentage of workers in employment whose pay and/or conditions of employment are determined by one or more collective agreement(s). The trade union density rate, by sex, age and migrant status The trade union density rate provides a proxy measure of workers’ representation and the influence of trade unions. Trade unions are important and, as independent worker’s organizations, can significantly defend and improve the interests of workers. Metadata for these two indicators can be found here http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---integration/documents/publication/wcms\_229374.pdf |  |
| UN World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO) |  |  | UNWTO comments: The useful discussion during the last IAEG-SDG meeting in Bangkok regarding target 8.9 gave valuable inputs to clarify countries’ views and needs to measure tourism in all three aspects of sustainability (economic, social, and environmental). The two indicators discussed during the meeting related to the economic and social dimension: “GDP in tourism” and “Jobs in tourism”, both are rooted in existing international methodological frameworks (SNA2008, IRTS2008 and TSA:RMF2008). The IAEG-SDG acknowledged that these indicators are highly relevant but still miss an important aspect of sustainability in tourism and, therefore, asked for a third indicator. The additional indicator related to the environmental dimension could be “energy use in tourism”, in terms of “net domestic energy use” as recommended by the SEEA-Energy. This would further complement the tourism GDP and jobs, and hence point towards a decoupling of tourism activity from environmental impacts. The additional indicator is linked to proposed indicator for target 7.b (Ratio of value added to net domestic energy use, by industry). Data will therefore be available. In addition, aspects of “sustainable tourism policies” should be assessed, whether they address the sustainable use of resources and whether countries have implemented regular monitoring tools, like the TSA and the SEEA. On all of these aspects there is a substantial and strong link between targets 8.9 and 12.b. |
| UNEP | UNEP Comments: UNEP would like to propose the following indicators for 8.4 and 12.2: a) Material intensity of production = computed as DMC (domestic material consumption) per GDP. An exchange based measure of GDP at constant prices is used and the indicator reported in kg per US$ and b) Material intensity of consumption = computed as MF (material footprint) per GDP. Material intensity relates the amount of materials used in an economy to the GDP of that economy and reports how efficiently the economy uses natural resources. Material intensity of production is computed as DMC per GDP. An exchange based measure of GDP at constant prices is used and the indicator reported in kg per US$. Material intensity of consumption is computed as MF per GDP. Material intensity of consumption is adjusted for the impact of trade on the material intensity of an economy. The DMC indicator is a proxy for overall environmental pressure of national economy and has a clear link with environmental impacts of various kinds. There are studies that have applied impact factors to DMC data and they show that the DMC is also a very good proxy for environmental impact. Material intensity is a measure for the efficiency at which materials are used in an economy to produce products and services. If the inverse of intensity is expressed, i.e. material productivity (GDP/DMC) or (GDP/MF) it is possible to compare material productivity to other factor productivity such as e.g. labour productivity. The OECD reports a total factor productivity which includes material productivity. The indicator is important because it shows how successful a country has been in decoupling economic growth from material use. DMC and MF are established using standard MFA methods as described in the metadata for target 12.2. Exchange rate based GDP data is available from UNSD at constant prices for a certain base year. Material intensity can be reported for the whole economy or for economic sectors where the material use of the sector is related to the added value of the sector to establish material intensity. Material intensity is well established in the scientific literature and policy community. UNEP is publishing a global material flow dataset which includes the DMC indicator. DMC is available for about 180 countries, the seven UNEP world regions and the world for the time period 1970 – 2010. It also publishes material intensity data. Data are available at the UNEP online data platform UNEP Live www.uneplive.unep.org on each country page in the section ‘UNEP resources’ under the category ‘natural resources’. The UNEP International Resource Panel (IRP) is an expert panel providing information for decoupling of economic growth form material use and sustainable materials management and has produced numerous sectoral reports which are made available at http://www.unep.org/resourcepanel/ The European Union, the government of Japan, the Asia Pacific Office of UNEP and the OECD are using material intensity indicators for their policy assessment. |  | UNEP Comments: UNEP, OECD and UNWTO are proposing the following priority indicator for 12.b as well: Number of sustainable tourism strategies or policies, and implemented action plans, with agreed monitoring, and evaluation tools. This indicator would help to form the basis for determining percentage of GDP and jobs; it can rely on policy surveys and tools such as the Tourism Satellite Account, the System of Environmental-Economic Accounting, and other tools to monitor the development at destination level and will be possible for a large group of countries to implement. UNWTO will provide additional information on the metadata. |
| UN-ESCAP | This should be captured through per capita waste production and consumption patterns. These should be tracked over time. |  |  |
| UNIDO | Material consumption (total quantity measures) per unit of output. This is the only indicator that combines production and consumption dimension. Reverse will be material efficiency that is value of output produced per unit of materials used. |  |  |
| United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) |  | OHCHR urges the inclusion of ‘human rights treaties’, as they also contain relevant provisions regarding working conditions. In order to strengthen consistency in the SDG indicator framework, OHCHR also urges the inclusion of ‘human rights treaties’ in the indicator that will measure target 17.14. OHCHR also recommends expanding the indicator to better measure implementation of accepted standards and commitments made. Thus, the indicator would read “ratification of ILO conventions and human rights treaties, timeliness and quality of reporting and follow-up on recommendations issued by associated international mechanisms”. Data on ratification and timeliness of reporting is already compiled and publically made available by internationally approved mechanisms with the support of OHCHR. Data on quality of reporting and follow-up on recommendations is partially available and would need to be developed further. |  |
| World Bank |  |  | Of course, this is really two indicators |
| World Water Council |  |  | World Water Council: the Indicator is generally adequate, but seems to consider only economic aspects and has no reflection on sustainability, including water uses. |
| Asia Pacific Forum on Women, Law and Development (APWLD) |  | Asia Pacific Forum on Women, Law and Development (APWLD) comments: APWLD proposes the following indicators as an alternative to the grey indicator: ➢ Percentage of workers covered by ILO-compliant labour codes (disaggregated by migration status, gender) Ø Percentage of migrant workers in debt. ➢ Wage gap between employed migrants and employed nationals ➢ Share of migrant workers in regular employment, by gender ➢ Number of social security agreements ensuring the portability of social security benefits. We agree with the proposed indicator measuring ratification of ILO Conventions on the proviso that this is not limited to core ILO conventions. It should be inclusive of all Conventions, particularly Convention 189, and the Convention on Migrant Workers and their Families. |  |
| Bread for the World |  |  | Bread for the World: please consider not just the jobs rate, but the quality of work regarding to the ILO Decent Work Concept. Also seasonality of jobs in tourism should be reflected. |
| Christian Aid | In order to consider both consumption and production, Christian Aid would recommend a supply-chain approach i.e. resource productivity and efficiency in the global value chain. | As an alternative, or in addition to this indicator, Christian Aid would urge consideration of: Percentage of workers covered by ILO-compliant labour codes (disaggregated including by migration status, gender, disability, age and other nationally relevant characteristics) |  |
| Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International |  |  | Comments from Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International, Netherlands  Indicator for sustainable tourism destinations rating and accreditations at national, regional and local level, with references to UN GSTC recognized and approved standards for destinations tourism. Information and examples found at https://www.gstcouncil.org/en/ |
| Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial research Organisation (CSIRO) | Resource Efficiency is best measured as material intensity (material productivity) and can be based on indicators from material flow accounts. These accounts have been developed for the last 20 years, have now a sound methodological base thanks to EUROSTAT, OECD and UNEP and are available for all countries of the world. The accounts are compatible with economic accounts, provide a proxy for environmental pressure and impact and have a close link to the human development index. They allow to measure progress for production and consumption based resource efficiency by using the DMC (domestic material consumption) indicator for production/territorial material use and MF (material footprint) for consumption based material use. Efficiency is derived by DMC/MF per unit of GDP. An alternative to DMC would be the DMI indicator (Domestic Material Input). The MF indicator is also a proxy for material standard of living and has a close link to social indicators. The UNEP International Resource Panel has developed a global data set for DMC and MF which is available at UNEP Live. Countries of the European Union report those indicators on a yearly basis, Japan and China use those indicators to monitor the success of their circular economy policies. Indicators can be easily established. The OECD leads a global harmonization activity for the material footprint indicator. |  |  |
| CONCORD Sweden |  | CONCORD Sweden’s comment and proposed modification to indicator 8.8.2: We support his indicator since it is key to recognize the importance of the ILO Conventions. However, we regret that the proposed indicator is not made more specific. Therefore, CONCORD Sweden suggest the following clarification and modification of the proposed indicator 8.8.2: “Percentage of employees covered by national labour codes aligned with ILO Core conventions, by sex and migration status.” |  |
| Culture Committee, United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG) |  |  | The Committee on Culture of United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG), as already pointed out by several organisations and governments, thinks that the two draft indicators fail to refer to the sustainable dimension of tourism and the promotion of local culture and products. Whilst being aware that relevant indicators may not exist at present and could require mid-term efforts, we would favour an indicator based on policies, similar to that proposed by Denmark, e.g.: “Number of countries with dedicated strategies/programmes/action plans for sustainable tourism, including the promotion of local culture and products.” |
| Culture et Développement |  |  | France, Culture et Développement (ngo) Tourism direct GDP (as % of total GDP and in growth rate),number of jobs in tourism industries (as % total jobs and growth rate of jobs, by sex) and Percentage of national and local governments which have integrated a specific socio-cultural impact assessment’ as a prerequisite of all tourism development plans (cf also campaign "culture as a goal") In order to protect and promote the diversity of cultural expressions as indicated in the preambule, it is important to assess and limit the negative impact of tourism and mass tourism on the local cultural and natural resources, while promoting them as driver of development |
| Danish Institute for Human Rights |  | The indicator should reflect the range of ILO Conventions directly implicated across the agenda (see www.humanrights.dk/sdg-guide ). Furthermore, it should measure elements of implementation and follow-up to the adopted treaties, for which data is already partially available. A suitable indicator could therefore be as follows: “Number of countries that have ratified fundamental ILO Conventions concerning forced labour, child labour, discrimination and freedom of association, as well as technical Conventions relating to occupational safety and health, social security and indigenous and tribal peoples, and timeliness and quality of reporting and follow-up on recommendations issued by ILO supervisory bodies”. |  |
| Diyalo Pariwar | In-country job market should be create locally at national level and all rights and provisions for the decent work for all must be in practice. | follow-up and progress on ratification need to be tracked. |  |
| Education International |  | Education International proposes an alternative indicator that looks at process rather than structure, i.e. national level implementation rather than just ratification: 8.8.2 Increase in national compliance with international labour standards based on the findings of the ILO supervisory mechanisms, collective bargaining coverage and union density. We consider collective bargaining a proxy for social dialogue, and union density a proxy for freedom of association, while the reference to the ILO supervisory mechanisms ensure alignment with labour rights and provides a clear monitoring framework. |  |
| Fair Trade Advocacy Office |  | We propose a reformulation of the indicator in order to specify how it would measure the translation of the conventions into national law or practice. We welcome that the indicator encourages countries to sign up to the ILO conventions, but we recognise that signing up to these conventions may not be sufficient for countries to act on them. |  |
| Fairtrade Foundation |  | Fairtrade welcomes that this indicator encourages countries to sign up to the ILO conventions but recognises that signing up to these conventions may not be sufficient for countries to act on them and so would argue that the indicator should include aspects which also measure whether the ILO convention has been adequately translated into national law or practice. |  |
| Finnish NGDO platform to the EU |  | a) Minimum living wages established (set at the national level). b) Reduction of proportion of employed people living in poverty with a salary that cannot cover a minimum living standard. c) Ratification and implementation of the eight ILO Core Labor Standards and Ratification and implementation of the ILO Convention No. 155 on Occupational Safety and Health and compliance in law and practice. d) Percentage of workplaces with Collective Bargaining Agreements and Supporting Policies. e) Number of youth with capacity to develop business ideas which contribute to the wellbeing of themselves, the societies and the planet. |  |
| Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei | How is it measured? FEEM supports the use of the standard indicator in Europe, e.g. Direct Material Consumption (amount of material inputs to produce 1 € of output in sector X or commodity Y) |  | FEEM suggests that the indicator should also consider the impact of eco-tourism (both supply - infrastructure and demand - tourist travelling to country x for this motivation) |
| ICMM and IPIECA | John Drexhage ICMM/IPIECA Would reference work being done in 10 year framework program and simply use development of that framework as the basis for developing relevant indicators for this goal. |  |  |
| International Music Council |  |  | International Music Council: Percentage of national and local governments which have integrated a specific ‘cultural impact assessment’ as a prerequisite of all tourism development plans. Comment: the objective of job creation and promotion of local culture and products should take into consideration the cultural context in which development is planned to happen. Development can be achieved in a sustainable manner only if there is a prior assessment of the cultural impact the planned measures. |
| International Trade Union Confederation |  | Increase in national compliance with international labour standards based on the findings of the ILO supervisory mechanisms, collective bargaining coverage and trade union density. |  |
| MADE Civil Society Network |  | Migration and Development civil society network (MADE) Target 8.8 refers to the protection of labour rights and promotion of safe and secure working environments for all workers, including migrant workers, in particular women migrants, and those in precarious employment. The proposed global indicator is formulated as follows: “Number of ILO conventions ratified by type of convention”. However, we see some limitations of this indicator. Firstly, the ILO conventions need not only be ratified, but also implemented into national legal frameworks. Secondly, besides the ILO conventions, this indicator must refer to the 1990 UN Convention on Migrant Worker Rights, an important legal instrument to promote workers right, which needs global ratification and implementation into national legal frameworks. We would also suggest possible indicators that relate to improved outcomes: • Frequency rates of fatal and non-fatal occupational injuries and time lost due to occupational injuries by gender and migration status • Number of countries in which all migrant workers, regardless of migration status, enjoy equal wages for equal work relative to nationals by 2020. • Number of countries in which all migrant workers, regardless of migration status, can exercise the right to form and participate in trade unions and other worker associations by 2020. • Proportion of migrant workers reporting discrimination and abuse at work who initiated legal or administrative action by 2020. • Number of migrant workers that regularized their status based on a work relationship by 2020. |  |
| Rastriya Dalit Network (RDN) Nepal |  |  | 2. UN convention on the elimination of discrimination based on work and descent based on the principles and guidance ensuring equal access to justice to communities which are affected by inter-generational discrimination based on work and descent, caste and analogous forms of hierarchy. Encompassing access to public and private recourses, institutions, and markets. |
| SIWI (Stockholm International Water Institute) | ORGANISATION SIWI COMMENTS: As it is hard to find an objective metric for consumption efficiency (it seems to have be based on the amount of resources appropriated for a certain level of quality of life). For traded goods and services, the resource use in raw material equivalents could be accounted on the importing country. It is suggested that the indicator 8.4.1 is called Resource Productivity and is calculated on the basis of indicators for target 6.4, 7.3, 9.4, and 12.2. The current resource productivity (measured as unit of resource per unit of value added) should be indexed for all resources and used as a baseline. |  |  |
| Stockholm Environment Institute |  |  | Stockholm Environment Institute staff believe the proposed indicator is inadequate. Firstly, it is not sensitive to the ‘sustainability’ of tourism. Secondly, given that the target is about policies, we recommend an indicator ‘Presence/submission of national policy on sustainable tourism, covering job-creation and local cultural aspects'. A standardised framework for such a policy would - presumably - be possible via requests made to countries to provide (regularly updated) policies on a regular basis |
| Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN) |  | SDSN comments: SDSN supports the inclusion of an indicator tracking ILO convention ratification, but this is insufficient. Implementation must also be measured, so we recommend: "Ratification and implementation of fundamental ILO labor standards and compliance in law and practice." Our proposed indicator tracks countries’ ratification of and compliance with the 8 fundamental ILO conventions. Countries are required to report on ratified conventions every two years. The monitoring system is backed up by a supervisory system that helps to ensure implementation. The ILO regularly reviews the application of standards in member states and makes recommendations. |  |
| Sustainable World Initiative |  |  | This indicator does not address whether the tourism industries are sustainable. |
| Terre des Hommes Netherlands |  | Netherlands: Ratification doesn't imply implementation. |  |
| UN Major Group for Children and Youth | The suggested indicator is extremely limited in scope. Total natural resource use and ecological foot print needs to be calculated and tracked Contextualise this decoupling in line with local environmental thresholds. | In addition to ratification, the indicators should take into account the implementation and progress plan of the conventions | Limited in scope. To asertain 'sustainable tourism' the indicators need to track the impact of the tourism industry on the three dimensions of the sustainable development- Ecological footprint of tourism intustries % total natural resourse use on account of the sector Social impact along the supply chain of the sector. Jobs created disaggeragated by gender, sex, location, etc. |
| Vanderbilt International Anesthesia | women in healthcare as professionals in safe surgery and anesthesia |  |  |
| Women for Women's Human Rights - New Ways |  | WWHR - New Ways proposes the following indicators as an alternative to the grey indicator: ➢ Percentage of workers covered by ILO-compliant labour codes (disaggregated by migration status, gender) ¬ Percentage of migrant workers in debt. ➢ Wage gap between employed migrants and employed nationals ➢ Share of migrant workers in regular employment, by gender ➢ Number of social security agreements ensuring the portability of social security benefits. We agree with the proposed indicator measuring ratification of ILO Conventions on the proviso that this is not limited to core ILO conventions. It should be inclusive of all Conventions, particularly Convention 189, and the Convention on Migrant Workers and their Families. |  |
| Women's Major Group/ International Women's Health Coalition |  | The Women's Major Group agrees with the proposed indicator measuring ratification of ILO Conventions on the provision that this is not limited to core ILO conventions. It should be inclusive of all Conventions, particularly Convention 189, and the Convention on Migrant Workers and their Families. The WMG also proposes the following indicators as an alternative to the grey indicator: ➢ Percentage of workers covered by ILO-compliant labour codes (disaggregated by migration status, gender) Ø Percentage of migrant workers in debt. ➢ Wage gap between employed migrants and employed nationals ➢ Share of migrant workers in regular employment, by gender ➢ Number of social security agreements ensuring the portability of social security benefits. |  |
| WWF |  | WWF: WWF supports the suggested indicator “Number of ILO conventions ratified by type of convention” but recommends that it be broadened to other relevant labour codes, to read: “Number of ILO conventions and other relevant labour safety instruments that are ratified and implemented”. Other conventions and instruments would include the Cape Town Agreement of 2012 on the Implementation of the Provisions of the 1993 Torremolinos Protocol and IMO International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Fishing Vessel Personnel. The indicator should also be disaggregated by sector of activity. | WWF: The current proposal does not reflect sustainability elements. WWF strongly supports the UNWTO proposal “Environmental pressure indicator; residual flows and natural inputs...derived from a SEEA for Tourism” which would better reflect the intent of this target. |
| ACC (American Chemistry Council) and CEFIC (European Chemical Industry Council) | ACC and CEFIC - SUPPLEMENTAL INDICATOR: Number of industry-wide and sector-specific voluntary programs advancing global standards that systematically enable more sustainable use of resources through environmentally sound technologies, industrial processes, products and consumption practices. COMMENT: Many global industries have recognized common challenges in enhancing sustainability and established voluntary programs to systemically upgrade performance. These are often extended globally and can significantly upgrade standards in developing countries, accelerating progress toward more sustainable production and more sustainable products (consumption). Accounting for such initiatives where they are consistent with national aims would encourage both their development and global propagation. |  |  |
| Amiable Resource | Focused on basic needs and essential services? Adaptive with demographics and required demands? | ?? Equality opportunities of transformative skills and positions? | Positive Low impact social services of hospitality, transport and amusements to raise efficiency and Environment standards? Canada was world destination around 2010..? About 10-15% of gdp..? |
| International Federation of Freight Forwarders Association (FIATA) | Resource efficiency can be measured through the number of trade related agreements bi-laterially and regionally. As more trading options become available to members states, so does the ability to better allocated resources where is most required and therefore most efficiently. Logistics providers play an important role in the transport of waste and packaging material, and can as such accelerate the circular economy and enable fair access, production, and trade. |  |  |
| IOE |  | The ratification rate for some conventions may not be indicative of the targets set by the SDG because the convention itself may be difficult to ratify under certain national contexts. |  |
| Monash Sustainability Institute |  |  | David Griggs - Monash Sustainability Institute. This indicator as it stands does not address the target, namely promoting sustainable tourism, not just tourism. The indicator should be more like "the percentage of tourism that is accredited to meet sustainable tourism standards". Some countries will need to develop these standards so the development of a standard could be a supplementary indicator. |
| University of Utah | University of Utah Center for Global Surgery, USA Access to quality surgical and anesthesia care is critical for community economic growth. May need indicator of # surgery cases/5000 people, #surgeon/anesthesia/obtectric caregivers per population. |  |  |
| Wayne State University School of Medicine | It has been demonstrated (James J. Heckman, Nobel Laureate) that investing in children at a young age is more likely to produce economic growth than any other activity. |  |  |
| Other | The target is ambitious and admirable, by aiming to ‘decouple economic growth from environmental degradation’ it aims to tackle one of the most intractable difficulties in the development agenda – how to promote economic growth (particular modes of economic growth that generate decent work and support poverty and inequality reducing social policies), whilst also tackling environmental degradation? The OECD has outlined a number of indicators that aim to measure ‘decoupling’ of economic growth from environmental degradation, e.g. SOx emissions from energy use versus GDP (decoupling of GDP and air pollution). See here for full list: http://www.oecd.org/officialdocuments/publicdisplaydocumentpdf/?cote=sg/sd(2002)1/final&doclanguage=en However, the target also calls for indicators that monitor unsustainable production and consumption. To address this component of the target, the IAEG-SDG could consider an indicator that measures whether countries are taking action against ‘planned obsolescence’ practices in product production. With this in mind, indicator 8.4.1 could measure: “Number of countries with laws in place which require manufacturers to: 1. Tell consumers how long their appliances are intended to last; and 2. How long spare parts for the product will be available.” The indicator proposed would monitor the extent to which countries are taking action against production practices which promote unsustainable consumption patterns. Relevant background: 'Planned obsolescence' is the practice of planning and designing products with artificial short or restricted life spans to ensure consumers will buy more. To target ‘planned obsolescence’ practices some countries are requiring manufacturers inform consumers about the life span of their products (e.g. France). |  |  |

**Goal 9: NO GREY INDICATORS**

| **Country/Organisation** | **Goal 10: Reduce inequality within and among countries** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Target 10.5:**Improve the regulation and monitoring of global financial markets and institutions and strengthen the implementation of such regulations. | **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 | **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 |
| *Indicator 10.5.1:* Adoption of a financial transaction tax (Tobin tax) at world level | *Indicator 10.7.2:*International Migration Policy Index | *Indicator 10.7.3:*Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age and form of exploitation |
| *Discussion prompt: The IAEG-SDG Members ask for suggestions for an alternative indicator that measures financial stability.* |  |  |
| **Total comments received** | 20 | 27 | 42 |
| Central Statistical Office of Poland | CSO of Poland comments: Polish tax system does not apply a tax on financial transactions (modeled on Tobin Tax), therefore it is not possible to present data in this respect. | CSO of Poland comments: Further clarification is needed. |  |
| Hungarian Central Statistical Office |  |  | HU: The Crime statistics does not provides information on undetected victims. If data focused on human trafficking only the crime statistics does not provide information the form of exploitation. |
| Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Censos | We recommend indicators to measure financial stability such as the liquidity ratio: total available funds over short term deposits and total deposits over total loans plus equity. |  | The methodology to calculate this indicator should be determined. |
| ISTAT |  | Istat-Italy: more methodological work is required under the OIM guidance | Istat-Italy: more methodological work is required under the OIM guidance |
| Singapore Department of Statistics |  | As indicated previously, we are unable to find from open sources any information regarding the International Migration Policy Index. More information would be required regarding this index such as the information/statistics that Singapore would need to feed into the Index. |  |
| Statistics Denmark | OK, support for indicator that measures financial stability, but earlier Danish opposition to an indicator mentioning a Tobin Tax still stands. |  |  |
| Statistics Finland |  | Finland supports the alternative proposal “Number of migrants killed, injured or victims of crime while attempting to cross maritime, land or air borders” made by OHCHR's. |  |
| Statistics Lithuania |  | Metodology needed |  |
| TurkStat | Turkstat comments: Rate of tax in financial transaction would be better indicator instead of "Adoption of financial transaction tax" |  |  |
| TURKSTAT | Rate of tax in financial transaction would be better indicator instead of "Adoption of financial transaction tax". |  |  |
| United States | US: As a reminder, the ""Tobin tax"" indicator originally proposed would not be acceptable to the US. The most plausible single indicator of financial stability that is currently being collected for most/all countries is the ""ratio of regulatory capital to risk-weighted assets,"" available from the IMF here: http://data.imf.org/?sk=f15905b8-c65e-4aff-abc8-41c925a3aad7&sId=1390030109571. This indicator helps measure financial stability by gauging the extent to which banks and other financial institutions can absorb losses without collapsing. Reasonable people can argue about the ideal measure, but this one is available, and does the job.  10.5.1. Ratio of regulatory capital to risk-weighted assets (IMF) | US: We understand that this index is not yet developed. We recommend the indicator remain as grey until the index is developed and can be evaluated for this particular purpose, or an alternate indicator be proposed. | US: if the index is created, we anticipate that it would only be able to measure detected victims (rather than non-detected victims also). Suggest this remains grey for the time being. |
| Eurostat | We support the development of an alternative indicator, as the current proposal is (a) not really an indicator and (b) not suited to measure financial stability. In the search for an alternative, the IMF and the Financial Stability Board should be consulted. | Needs to be clearly defined in order to establish feasibility. As a general principle, Eurostat is reluctant to endorse composite indicators. As a possible short term solution, we advocate the use of existing asylum and migration statistics. At ESS level, these are in the areas of asylum, managed migration (residence permits issued to non-EU citizens, enforcements statistics, EU Blue Cards) and in the area of migrant integration (so called Zaragoza indicators and additional statistics on integration of migrants covering employment, social inclusion and housing, active citizenship). | This is a mix of official data (registered detected victims) and estimates (non-detected victims) and so we advise to retain these two elements as separate indicators. The second part (non-detected victims) would require serious development efforts. Human trafficking is also measured under goal 16 so possible interlinkages should be analysed. |
| International Disability and Development Consortium |  |  | For indicator 10.7.3 IDDC recommends adding disability It would read as: Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age, disability and form of exploitation |
| International Monetary Fund | Comments from Martin Cihak, Advisor, International Monetary Fund, Monetary and Capital Markets Department: It is presently not feasible to have one numeric indicator that adequately captures target 10.5 as formulated, i.e. “improve the regulation and monitoring of global financial markets and institutions and strengthen the implementation of such regulations". This is certainly a worthy and important target. And given its importance, it is crucial to resist the urge to come up with one or two indicators. Such simplified measures are bound to be rather flawed and efforts to target them counterproductive. There are major conceptual and practical issues with the originally proposed indicator, that is "Adoption of a financial transaction tax (Tobin tax) at a world level". Such an indicator would have very little or no relationship with this SDG target. It would not be technically sound and would not measure the “improvement of the regulation and monitoring of financial markets and institutions”. In comments from the previous rounds, there were various suggestions, in particular a financial stability indicator or an indicator of implementation of international standards. At the same time, commentators have observed that these areas are difficult to measure, especially financial stability. Regarding the indicator for financial stability, there are two main issues. - First, financial stability is a complex concept, which makes coming up with a single universally applicable (and universally acceptable) measure has been very hard. One option to consider is using the IMF’s Financial Soundness Indicators (http://fsi.imf.org). On the positive side, it is the authoritative source of cross-country data on financial soundness, a major effort has gone into coming up with consistent definitions and metadata, and it is publicly available and easy to download. On the negative side, it would be misleading to focus on any single one indicator and try to target it. There is a sub-set of “core FSIs”, but going to a single indicator would be problematic. Academic literature has used measures such as distance to distress and z-scores. The z-score is defined as the sum of capital/assets plus return/assets, divided by standard deviation of return/assets. In principle, such z-scores can be—and sometimes are—calculated from the FSI data (see for example the recent IMF Staff Discussion Notes 15/08 and 15/17 on financial deepening and financial inclusion, which used such a measure). But these measures have their drawbacks that need to be taken into consideration. - Second, the indicator would not necessarily measure the target i.e. “improvements in regulation and monitoring of global financial markets and institutions and strengthening the implementation of such regulations”. Many factors, including macroeconomic developments, influence financial stability indicators, so this would be a rather indirect and potentially misleading way of measuring progress vis-a-vis the target. For example, financial stability indicators may be deteriorating despite improved regulations, if there a major macroeconomic downswing. In other words, a simplified use of such indicators can be very misleading. Regarding the idea of measuring improvements in regulation more directly (e.g., via measuring compliance with international standards), this is useful in principle, but it has important practical constraints. One could potentially envisage monitoring based on the Financial Sector Assessment Program (FSAP) undertaken by the IMF with the World Bank. The FSAP includes very rigorous country-level assessments of financial stability, financial sector policy framework, and financial safety nets. The program has broad country coverage. However, the frequency of country assessments is relatively low (once in 5 years for 29 countries with systemically important financial systems, and lower in other countries). An even more importantly, FSAP are not easily amenable to simplifying into a single indicator. The assessments are rather complex in nature. One needs to read the FSAP documents to understand whether there has been a relevant improvement or not. It cannot be credibly simplified to one or two indicators. Over time, it may be possible to move towards indicator-like reporting. For example, the Financial Stability Board (FSB)’s November 2015 annual report on the implementation of global financial regulatory reforms ( http://www.financialstabilityboard.org/2015/11/implementation-and-effects-of-the-g20-financial-regulatory-reforms/ ) contains a useful color-coded table on page 3, summarizing implementation in priority areas. One could envisage that an extension of this kind of reporting could go some way towards monitoring progress under target 10.5. However, this reporting at present (i) focuses on a relatively small number of countries from the SDG perspective, and (ii) is still far away from the idea of having a single indicator under this target. Bottom line: Given the universal nature of the SDG document, it may be useful to keep this as a “below the line item” for the time being, with a descriptive or a qualitative statement. In other words, keep this useful target, but carve it out of being indicator-based. |  |  |
| International Monetary Fund | Comments from Martin Cihak, International Monetary Fund, Monetary and Capital Markets Department: It is presently not feasible to have one numeric indicator that adequately captures target 10.5 as formulated, i.e. “improve the regulation and monitoring of global financial markets and institutions and strengthen the implementation of such regulations". This is certainly a worthy and important target. And given its importance, it is crucial to resist the urge to come up with one or two indicators. Such simplified measures are bound to be rather flawed and efforts to target them counterproductive. There are major conceptual and practical issues with the originally proposed indicator, that is "Adoption of a financial transaction tax (Tobin tax) at a world level". Such an indicator would have very little or no relationship with this SDG target. It would not be technically sound and would not measure the “improvement of the regulation and monitoring of financial markets and institutions”. In comments from the previous rounds, there were various suggestions, in particular a financial stability indicator or an indicator of implementation of international standards. At the same time, commentators have observed that these areas are difficult to measure, especially financial stability. Regarding the indicator for financial stability, there are two main issues. - First, financial stability is a complex concept, which makes coming up with a single universally applicable (and universally acceptable) measure has been very hard. One option to consider is using the IMF’s Financial Soundness Indicators (http://fsi.imf.org). On the positive side, it is the authoritative source of cross-country data on financial soundness, a major effort has gone into coming up with consistent definitions and metadata, and it is publicly available and easy to download. On the negative side, it would be misleading to focus on any single one indicator and try to target it. There is a sub-set of “core FSIs”, but going to a single indicator would be problematic. Academic literature has used measures such as distance to distress and z-scores. The z-score is defined as the sum of capital/assets plus return/assets, divided by standard deviation of return/assets. In principle, such z-scores can be—and sometimes are—calculated from the FSI data (see for example the recent IMF Staff Discussion Notes 15/08 and 15/17 on financial deepening and financial inclusion, which used such a measure). But these measures have their drawbacks that need to be taken into consideration. - Second, the indicator would not necessarily measure the target i.e. “improvements in regulation and monitoring of global financial markets and institutions and strengthening the implementation of such regulations”. Many factors, including macroeconomic developments, influence financial stability indicators, so this would be a rather indirect and potentially misleading way of measuring progress vis-a-vis the target. For example, financial stability indicators may be deteriorating despite improved regulations, if there a major macroeconomic downswing. In other words, a simplified use of such indicators can be very misleading. Regarding the idea of measuring improvements in regulation more directly (e.g., via measuring compliance with international standards), this is useful in principle, but it has important practical constraints. One could potentially envisage monitoring based on the Financial Sector Assessment Program (FSAP) undertaken by the IMF with the World Bank. The FSAP includes very rigorous country-level assessments of financial stability, financial sector policy framework, and financial safety nets. The program has broad country coverage. However, the frequency of country assessments is relatively low (once in 5 years for 29 countries with systemically important financial systems, and lower in other countries). An even more importantly, FSAP are not easily amenable to simplifying into a single indicator. The assessments are rather complex in nature. One needs to read the FSAP documents to understand whether there has been a relevant improvement or not. It cannot be credibly simplified to one or two indicators. Over time, it may be possible to move towards indicator-like reporting. For example, the Financial Stability Board (FSB)’s November 2015 annual report on the implementation of global financial regulatory reforms ( http://www.financialstabilityboard.org/2015/11/implementation-and-effects-of-the-g20-financial-regulatory-reforms/ ) contains a useful color-coded table on page 3, summarizing implementation in priority areas. One could envisage that an extension of this kind of reporting could go some way towards monitoring progress under target 10.5. However, this reporting at present (i) focuses on a relatively small number of countries from the SDG perspective, and (ii) is still far away from the idea of having a single indicator under this target. Bottom line: Given the universal nature of the SDG document, it may be useful to keep this as a “below the line item” for the time being, with a descriptive or a qualitative statement. In other words, keep this useful target, but carve it out of being indicator-based. |  |  |
| International Organization for Migration |  | IOM and UN DESA propose that all the indicators proposed for the SDG target 10.7 (including the indicator 10.7.2 on recruitment costs) should be re-formulated and combined into one single indicator which would read: "The number of countries that have implemented well-managed migration policies." The definition of "well-managed migration policies" is described in the section below on data source, method of computation and international consensus. This indicator would measure and track the evolution of the number of countries which are implementing well-managed migration policies and can demonstrate progress on key outcomes. The indicator include both measures to reduce recruitment costs and measures to reduce the number of victims of trafficking and migrant deaths which already have been given support in the IAEG. The new migration indicator monitors the core dimensions of well-managed migration policies, including migrant rights, institutional capacities, recruitment costs, international cooperation, humanitarian dimensions of migration and measures to promote safe migration. Such an indicator could complement or even act as a multi-purpose indicator for several targets; 4.b, 5.2, 8.8, 16.2 and 17.18. Data source, method of computation and international consensus: The source of data will be the UN Inquiry among governments on Population and Development, which has been surveying global migration policies since 1976. The inquiry will analyse measures across six migration policy domains, based on the “Migration Governance Framework” acknowledged by IOM’s 157 Member States. Each policy domain will include one key sub-indicator essential to its domain . For the purpose of a global indicator on SDG Target 10.7 a country replying positively to taking action in all six policy domains will have been deemed “implementing well-migration policies”. While the purpose of this indicator is not to rank countries, there are a number of interesting findings that can result from this simple survey such as the policy domains most in need of institution building support or the regions where most policy gaps are found. Such a reformulated indicator for SDG Target 10.7 will be complemented by a thematic review as migration is a cross-cutting issue mentioned explicitly or implicitly across a number of SDG Targets. The relevant specialized commission under ECOSOC that would look at the major part of migration issues in a thematic review would be the Commission on Population and Development. Another multilateral forum that could play a role in this regard is the Global Forum on Migration and Development which at its latest summit meeting in October in Istanbul agreed to look into how it could contribute to the 2030 Agenda follow-up and review. Framework for Well-Managed Migration Policy Indicator: Domain 1: Institutional capacity and policy – Is there at least one dedicated government entity responsible for designing and periodic reporting on an overall migration policy? Domain 2: Migrant Rights – Has the country ratified core international conventions pertaining to migrants, refugees and stateless persons? Domain 3: Safe and Orderly Migration – Does the government collect and release data on the number of victims of trafficking, and migrant fatalities? Domain 4: Labour migration and recruitment costs – Recruitment costs have at the national level decreased as a percentage of the average yearly income for the first three years. Domain 5: International Partnerships – Has the country signed bi-lateral labour agreements concerning the movement of workers? Domain 6: Humanitarian Crises and Migration Policy – Does the government’s humanitarian policy include measures in relation to forced displacement of persons? | IOM and UN Desa/population Division believe that tracking the evolution of the numbers of trafficked persons would be an important proxy indicator for making progress on SDG target 10.7 since it speaks to an important aspect of “safe and orderly migration”. However, global figures for the number of persons who are trafficked are currently based on estimates and global numbers are aggregate numbers of detected victims, but this is widely regarded to be a gross under-estimate of the true figure, as so many cases of trafficking are never reported and give little if any empirical evidence of the phenomenon and where resources and engagement should be directed. Most of all, this suggested indicator has a narrow scope and does not cover most aspects of a “well-managed migration policy” in SDG target 10.7. (cf. IOM and UN Desa comments on Indicator 10.7.2) |
| UN ESCAP |  | National level data on permissons granted for migration can be used. |  |
| UN-ESCAP |  | Strongly support | Strongly support |
| UNFPA |  | UNFPA has no comment at this point. | UNFPA has no comment at this point. |
| United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) |  | OHCHR: The composite indicator suggested by IOM for SGD target 10.7 relies, according to a draft paper seen in October, on 5 domains (each domain is comprised of 4-6 indicators and 9-11 sub-indicators) as components of “well-managed migration policies”. These core components have not been formally presented or discussed within the Global Migration Group. We appreciate that one of the domains relates to “migrants’ rights and integration”. However, we are concerned that in the absence of an effective mainstreaming of human rights standards through all 5 domains, it will not be possible effectively to measure the progress of migration policies that involve full respect for human rights and the humane treatment of migrants regardless of migration status - as agreed in the SDG Declaration (para. 29). We note also that almost all of the indicators proposed under this index are structural, and that the domains/components of this index as well as the data sources available to measure these indicators remain unclear. We would urgently request greater clarification on the final domains and corresponding metadata. We note in this regard that OHCHR has proposed an indicator to measure the “Number of migrants killed, injured or victims of crime while attempting to cross maritime, land or air borders” to measure the outcome of migration management policies for vulnerable migrants. Data for this indicator is already being collected at the national level, including through administrative records. |  |
| UNODC |  |  | UNODC suggests to replace the current indicator with Number of detected and non-detected migrants who are smuggled per 100,000; by sex, age and citizenship. Similarly to the indicator proposed on Trafficking in Persons for 16.2, this indicator could be initially operationalized for detected migrants for which data are currently collected by Member States and later be refined to include the non-detected migrants once a proper methodology is developed. |
| UNODC |  |  | UNODC suggests to replace the current indicator with "Number of detected and non-detected migrants who are smuggled per 100,000; by sex, age and citizenship". Similarly to the indicator proposed on Trafficking in Persons for target 16.2, this indicator could be initially operationalized for detected migrants for which data are currently collected by Member States and later be refined to include the non-detected migrants once a proper methodology is developed. |
| Asia Pacific Forum on Women, Law and Development (APWLD) | Asia Pacific Forum on Women, Law and Development (APWLD) comments: APWLD endorse the grey indicator. In addition, it proposes the following indicators to measure financial stability. • Existence of effective capital controls and other measures that enable governments to regulate flows into and out of domestic capital markets. • Proportion of wealth held in offshore bank accounts (by country of origin and destination) | APWLD comments: APWLD proposes the following indicator as an alternative to the grey indicator: ➢ Percentage of workers covered by ILO-compliant labour codes (disaggregated by migration status, gender) Ø Percentage of migrant workers in debt. ➢ Wage gap between employed migrants and employed nationals ➢ Share of migrant workers in regular employment, by gender ➢ Number of social security agreements ensuring the portability of social security benefits. |  |
| Red Educacion Popular entre Mujeres, A. Latina el Caribe REPEM |  | A planned and well managed migration policies that include desegregation by age, sex and ethnicity ( suggested by REPM) | include ethnicity |
| RIGHTS |  |  | Disaggregation of detected and non detected victims of human trafficking including traditional practices of forced prostitution, by sex, age, caste and other forms |
| AbleChildAfrica |  |  | We recommends adding disability. It would read as: Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age, disability and form of exploitation |
| ADD International |  |  | Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, DISABILITY, age and form of exploitation |
| Adolescent Girl and SDG Indicators Working Group\*: signatories included the UN Foundation, Plan International, Advocates for Youth, Girl Effect, Girls Thinking Global, International Center for Research on Women |  |  | Adolescent Girl and SDG Indicators Working Group\*: 10.7.3 Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age and form of exploitation Disaggregations: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) -DATA SOURCE: Based on “International Migration Policy Index” -RATIONALE: Trafficked youth face an increased risk of multiple mental and physical health problems, including unwanted pregnancy, exposure to HIV and other sexually transmitted infections, malnutrition, post-traumatic stress disorder, and depression, among many others. Women and girls together account for about 75 per cent of all trafficking victims detected globally. What is more, out of every three child victims of human trafficking, two are girls and one is a boy. |
| American Society for Reproductive Medicine |  |  | American Society for Reproductive Medicine. This indicator should include cross border reproductive care with consideration of the trafficking of reproductive health products or for reproduction , i.e, sperm, surrogacy, embryos. |
| Articulacion Feminista Marcosur |  | Colombia. All the indicators on inequalities needs to incorporate the gender perspective in order to raelly tackled the root of inequalities. As learnt by the implementation of the MDG's, disparities are mostly explained by differences among territories and by sex. | As mentioned aboved. |
| Asia Dalit Rights Forum |  |  | Disaggregation of detected and non detected victims of human trafficking including traditional practices of forced prostitution, by sex, age, caste and other forms |
| Bread for the World | Bread for the World: 1. supports indicator 10.5.1.: Adoption of the financial transaction tax at world level. 2. proposes to develop a securitisation framework: develop criteria to identify simple, standardised and transparent securitisation (STS) which aims to make securitisation sustainable and measure them. (Basel Committee on Banking Supervision (BCBS) and International Organization of Securities Commissions (IOSCO) jointly leading a cross-sectorial Task Force on the impediments of securitisation.) |  |  |
| Center for Economic and Social Rights | No single indicator will accurately measure policy and regulatory efforts to ensure financial market stability and equitable outcomes, which is an essential but neglected global policy priority to prevent devastating economic crises. We do not agree with the World Bank’s suggestion to use the Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA) indicators for the financial sector. Although an indicator on financial transaction taxes does not holistically measure progress on this target, we do support this indicator in the absence of proposals which could more broadly measure financial regulation and stability. We would propose a small amendment, changing ‘at a world level’ to ‘in all major financial centers’. Proposal 1 (slight modification of existing grey indicator): Adoption of a financial transaction tax in all major financial centers The adoption of financial transactions taxes across major financial centers is one important step toward empowering governments to safeguard against financial crises, and stabilize financial markets and institutions. It would also have the effect of mobilizing a significant source of resources to contribute to sustainable development and the realization of human rights. This indicator would also be fairly easy to measure, allowing for rates and applicable transactions to be determined in different national contexts. |  |  |
| Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International | Comments from Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International, Netherlands   Adoption of recognized and reputable regulatory and monitoring framework for global financial markets and institutions at regional, national and sub-national levels |  |  |
| CONCORD Sweden |  | CONCORD Sweden’s comment and suggested additional indicator 10.7.2: We suggest that the indicator proposed by OHCHR should be considered: “Percentage of migrants who lost their lives, are injured or are victims of crime while attempting to cross borders as a percentage of total migrants, disaggregated by age, sex and region". |  |
| Danish Institute for Human Rights |  | There is currently no public information available as to the substance of this indicator. It is therefore impossible to assess to what extent this indicator will allow for monitoring of progress regarding the human rights of migrants. Alternatively, the indicator proposed by OHCHR should be considered: “Percentage of migrants killed, injured or victims of crime while attempting to cross borders.” This outcome indicator is highly relevant to the target, and data should be available from the national level and existing alternative sources. |  |
| Diyalo Pariwar |  | Complication like Bhutanese refugees and Syria crisis need to be considered further with clear and agreed vision at international level. | The serious consideration need to be focused on Women and Children (Girls) trafficking. For example, a high volume of Nepalese women are in various Indian brothels. The issue of cross-border transition need to be reviewed specially to minimize such activities. |
| Dutch Coalition on Disability and Development (DCDD) |  |  | DCDD recommends to add disability. It would read as: Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age, disability and form of exploitation |
| Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei |  | FEEM also suggests "Number of voluntary non-forced migrants over total migrants (from origin country)" |  |
| German Institute for Human Rights |  | Neither this nor other indicators proposed under this target adequately covers the target with regard to “safe migration” from the perspective of migrants and their human rights. More specifically, there is no public information available on the elements of the proposed International Migration Policy Index, in particular on whether and how the protection of migrants’ human rights will be measured. In addition, the use of composite indices has been discouraged by statisticians because of weighting and subjectivity issues. We therefore strongly encourage to delete this indicator and to replace it with the indicator proposed by UNWomen, OHCHR, the Government of Germany and others: “Number of migrants killed, injured or victims of crime while attempting to cross maritime, land, air borders”. Data for this proposed indicator is already partially available (Eurostat; EU FRA; European Observatory on Access to Healthcare, an initiative of Médecins du monde) and can be drawn from administrative records at the national level maintained by border agencies, medical facilities, police, social services and other government institutions, records maintained by National Human Rights Institutions or ombudspersons; collected by the members Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement working at borders; collected by UN Country Teams; and collected by national and international NGOs. The data could also be collected through targeted surveys of recently arrived migrants. | Neither this nor other indicators proposed under this target adequately covers the target with regard to “safe migration” from the perspective of migrants and their human rights. We therefore strongly encourage the additional indicator proposed by UNWomen, OHCHR, the Government of Germany and others: “Number of migrants killed, injured or victims of crime while attempting to cross maritime, land, air borders”. Data for this proposed indicator is already partially available (Eurostat, EU FRA). Data for this proposed indicator is already partially available (Eurostat; EU FRA; European Observatory on Access to Healthcare, an initiative of Médecins du monde) and can be drawn from administrative records at the national level maintained by border agencies, medical facilities, police, social services and other government institutions, records maintained by National Human Rights Institutions or ombudspersons; collected by the members Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement working at borders; collected by UN Country Teams; and collected by national and international NGOs. The data could also be collected through targeted surveys of recently arrived migrants. |
| ICMM and IPIECA | John Drexhage - ICMM/IPIECA Would reference the ECOSOC's "Committee of Experts on International Cooperation in Tax Matters" work in this area and reflect relevant indictors as they are being developed by this Committee. |  |  |
| ILEP |  |  | For indicator 10.7.3 ILEP recommends adding disability . It would read as: Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age, disability and form of exploitation |
| Institute for Economics and Peace |  |  | Global Slavery Index |
| International Council of AIDS Service Organizations | Civil society working on HIV and related issues supports an indicator based on a financial transaction tax, and would like to add "dedicated to health and development spending." | 10.7.2 Share of migrant workers in regular employment, by gender | Population size estimations of trafficked persons are unreliable and have been used as target numbers for deportations of female migrants, leading to human rights violations including abuse by authorities. Efforts to arrest migrants have lead to interference with health programs particularly for people who sell sex, and this has compromised both HIV and health programmes. For these reasons, we oppose the inclusion of this indicator. |
| LIGHT FOR THE WORLD |  |  | LIGHT FOR THE WORLD recommends adding disability to indicator 10.7.3 which would read as: Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age, disability and form of exploitation. |
| Loomba Foundation |  |  | The Loomba Foundation would like to see the number of victims disaggregated by more than sex and age. Widowhood often leads to poverty and social exclusion making widows and their children particularly vulnerable to human trafficking - so we would like to see this indicator disaggregated by marital status as well. |
| MADE Civil Society Network |  | Migration and Development civil society network (MADE) Target 10.7 refers to the facilitation of orderly, safe, regular and responsible migration and mobility of people, including through the implementation of planned and well- managed migration policies. There are two proposed global indicators formulated, the first reads as follows: “Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age, and form of exploitation.” We are concerned that the data for this proposed indicator are not available for all countries, only for those countries included in the annual Trafficking In Persons (TIP) report. The second proposed indicator refers to the “International Migration Policy Index” (IMPI). We are concerned that the IMPI does little to measure the so much needed decrease in human suffering and death related to migration. We would therefore suggest possible indicators that relate to improved outcomes: • Number of migrants killed, injured or victims of crime while in closed detention centers, attempting to cross maritime, land, air borders, or be forcibly returned to their countries of origin, disaggregated by sex and age • Number of international migrants reported to have died or disappeared on crossing of land or and sea borders 2015-2020 compared to 2010-2015. • Percentage of refugees and IDPs who have found a durable solution, disaggregated by sex and age • Number of countries providing regular migration channels for labour market access across skill levels, family reunification, and refuge to migrants and asylum seekers by 2020. • Number of countries implementing protection-sensitive training for law enforcement personnel on migration movements especially at the borders by 2020. • Number of countries that have banned the charging of migrant workers for recruitment fees by 2020. • Recruitment costs borne by employee as percentage of yearly income earned in country of destination, disaggregated by sex and age | Migration and Development civil society network (MADE) Target 10.7 refers to the facilitation of orderly, safe, regular and responsible migration and mobility of people, including through the implementation of planned and well- managed migration policies. There are two proposed global indicators formulated, the first reads as follows: “Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age, and form of exploitation.” We are concerned that the data for this proposed indicator are not available for all countries, only for those countries included in the annual Trafficking In Persons (TIP) report. The second proposed indicator refers to the “International Migration Policy Index” (IMPI). We are concerned that the IMPI does little to measure the so much needed decrease in human suffering and death related to migration. We would therefore suggest possible indicators that relate to improved outcomes: • Number of migrants killed, injured or victims of crime while in closed detention centers, attempting to cross maritime, land, air borders, or be forcibly returned to their countries of origin, disaggregated by sex and age • Number of international migrants reported to have died or disappeared on crossing of land or and sea borders 2015-2020 compared to 2010-2015. • Percentage of refugees and IDPs who have found a durable solution, disaggregated by sex and age • Number of countries providing regular migration channels for labour market access across skill levels, family reunification, and refuge to migrants and asylum seekers by 2020. • Number of countries implementing protection-sensitive training for law enforcement personnel on migration movements especially at the borders by 2020. • Number of countries that have banned the charging of migrant workers for recruitment fees by 2020. • Recruitment costs borne by employee as percentage of yearly income earned in country of destination, disaggregated by sex and age |
| Nagorik Uddyog |  |  | Disaggregation of detected and non detected victims of human trafficking including traditional practices of forced prostitution, by sex, age, caste and other forms |
| Navsarjan Trust |  |  | Navsarjan Trust Disaggregation of detected and non detected victims of human trafficking including traditional practices of forced prostitution, by sex, age, caste and other forms |
| Plan International |  |  | Plan International Comments: - RECOMMENDED INDICATOR: 10.7.3 Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age and form of exploitation - RATIONALE: Trafficked youth face an increased risk of multiple mental and physical health problems, including unwanted pregnancy, exposure to HIV and other sexually transmitted infections, malnutrition, post-traumatic stress disorder, and depression, among many others. Women and girls together account for about 75 per cent of all trafficking victims detected globally. What is more, out of every three child victims of human trafficking, two are girls and one is a boy. - DISAGGREGATIONS: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) - DATA SOURCE: Based on “International Migration Policy Index” |
| Rastriya Dalit Network (RDN) Nepal |  |  | Percentage 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. Disaggregate by age, sex, region, caste, race and other population groups |
| Saferworld |  |  | This indicator is currently ranked green in Goal 16 (16.2.2). It is actually better for the indicator to sit here than under Goal 16. It is not clear why the IAEG accepted it for Goal 16 but not for this Goal. UNODC has started to do some interesting research on estimating "non-detected" victims and should be consulted on the methodology for this. While it may be easier to simply measure detected victims of human trafficking, the risk is that the indicator in reality is a measure of the capacity of migration and security authorities and reporting rates. The number will increase in countries making significant efforts to clamp down on human trafficking. In countries where there is no capacity or willingness to deal with the issue, the numbers of detected victims will be low. The worse outcome is that the indicator becomes a disincentive for countries to address the issue, i.e. they will not make an effort to detected victims. |
| Sightsavers |  |  | 10.7.3 Sightsavers comments: We recommend adding disability. It would read as: Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age, disability and form of exploitation. |
| Social Justice in Global Development | This target does not address inequality and should have been classified as part of MoI in goal 17 under the "systemic issues" sub-head. Instability in global financial markets has no necessary relationship to inequality. it depends on the policies countries adopt to respond to it. The proposed indicator has a value of either zero or one and will probably forever be zero. The IAEG-SDG request would address the hoped-for outcome of target 10.5 and not the implementation of the target itself. One possible indicator of financial instability at international level could be quarterly variation in global reserve holdings, as governments tend to lean against volatile financial flows by intervention in their foreign exchange markets. |  |  |
| Terre des Hommes Netherlands |  |  | Netherlands: "% of migrants who lose their lives, injured or are victims of crime while attempting to cross borders as a percentage of total migrants, disaggregated by age, sex, region, and crime". |
| The Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues; The Psychology Coalition of NGOs Accredited at the UN |  |  | The Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues and the Psychology Coalition of NGOs Accredited at the UN propose the following: Number of victims of human trafficking per 100,000 and form of exploitation by sex, age race, ethnicity, indigenous identity, income, disability rural/urban/suburban residence, national origin, migratory status, language, and religion. We comment further that indicators for all goals and targets need to be disaggregated in terms of groups protected by human rights standards as shown in the paragraph above, leaving no one behind. |
| UN Major Group for Children and Youth | Regulations on vulture funds, policies on tackling illicit finanial flows and tax havens. |  | What will numbers for "non detected" people be based on. In disaggregation, also add 'decent' |
| VENRO Working Group Disability and Development |  |  | VENRO Working Group Disability and Development, Germany, recommends adding disability. It would read as:Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age, disability and formof exploitation. |
| Women for Women's Human Rights - New Ways |  | WWHR - New Ways suggests that the International Migration Index should have a clear gender perspective at its core, as the women migrants are always at a more disadvantaged position in the host countries, in terms of economic participation, access to governmental institutions, access to basic services such as health, education, security etc. |  |
| Women's Major Group/ International Women's Health Coalition | The Women's Major Group supports this indicator with a slight modification. Indicator 10.5.1: Adoption of a financial transaction tax (Tobin tax) at world level, with proceeds dedicated to sustainable development spending The WMG also proposes the following indicators to measure financial stability. • Existence of effective capital controls and other measures that enable governments to regulate flows into and out of domestic capital markets. • Proportion of wealth held in offshore bank accounts (by country of origin and destination) | Women's Major Group proposes the below indicator. 10.7.2 Share of migrant workers in regular employment, by gender The International Migration Policy Index from IOM should have a gender perspective at its core, as the female migrant populations are very much disproportionately affected by migration and are at a more disadvantaged position in the host countries in terms of economic participation, access to governmental institutions, access to basic services such as health, education, security etc. | The Women's Major Group proposes the below indicator. 10.7.3 Share of migrant workers in irregular employment, including in especially exploitative conditions, in all economic sectors, by gender Population size estimations of trafficked persons are unreliable and have been used as target numbers for deportations of female migrants, leading to human rights violations including abuse by authorities. |
| Amiable Resource | Individual interest trends, community happiness index, professional ambition obtainability?? | Humane conditions, compassion capacities, demographic directions?? | Assumed majorities younger adolesances motivated and capable, also venerable to violence? Femmes and children more stable, resourceful and restricted? |
| LTO Nederland |  | Number of youth going into farming |  |
| Maestral International |  |  | This appears to be a critical indicator and it is unclear why it would be marked gray. |
| new York University |  | number of deaths of migrants through drowning, exposure, or violence during the migration process | Usa, nyu: sub-indicator: number of girls and boys employed in sex work |
| Other | 1. "Levels of indebtedness as a % of GDP by public and private agents (disaggregated by public, corporate, household and financial)" and 2. Given the paucity in data currently available, and under the principle of promoting statistical capacity, the IAEG-SDG and the High-level Group for Partnership, Coordination and Capacity-Building working together should create a task force, in collaboration with IMF and Central Banks that would be tasked with developing a process for improving the timeliness and availability of Balance of Payment statistics for monitoring of financial stability. Indicators proposed through this process should include measures aimed at tracking activities of hedge funds and other highly leveraged institutions which have a direct impact on volatility of capital flows, exchange rates and stock markets. |  |  |

| **Country/Organisation** | **Goal 11: Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable** | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 | **Target 11.4:**Strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the worldâ€™s cultural and natural heritage. | **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 gross domestic product caused by disasters, including water-related disasters, with a focus on protecting the poor and people in vulnerable situations. | **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 | **Target 11.a:**Support positive economic, social and environmental links between urban, peri-urban and rural areas by strengthening national and regional development planning | **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 the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030, holistic disaster risk management at all levels | **Target 11.c:**Support least developed countries, including through financial and technical assistance, in building sustainable and resilient buildings utilizing local materials. |
| *Indicator 11.3.2:* Percentage of cities with direct participation structure of civil society in urban planning and management, which operates regularly and democratically (IAEG-SDG Members added this indicator during the green indicator consultation) | *Indicator 11.4.1:* Share of national (or municipal) budget which is dedicated to preservation, protection and conservation of national cultural natural heritage, including World Heritage sites | *Indicator 11.5.1:* Number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters per 100,000 people | *Indicator 11.7.2:*Proportion of women subjected to physical or sexual harassment by perpetrator and place of occurrence (last 12 months) | *Indicator 11.a.1:*Cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants that implement urban and regional development plans integrating population projections and resource needs | *Indicator 11.b.1:*Percent of cities 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 | *Indicator 11.c.1:* Percentage of financial support that is allocated to the construction and retrofitting of sustainable, resilient and resource-efficient buildings |
|  |  | *Discussion prompt: There is a parallel process to review this indicator.* |  |  | *Discussion prompt: There is a parallel process to review this indicator.* |  |
| **Total comments received** | 27 | 22 | 49 | 43 | 16 | 22 | 17 |
| Central Statistical Office of Poland |  |  | CSO of Poland comments: CSO of Poland collects data on number of deaths according to International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems (ICD-10) - Revision 10. It does not allow to determine, wheather the death was a result of disaster. |  |  |  |  |
| Government of Japan |  |  | Japan supports the comment made by ISDR and several countries in indicated in "Summary of comments (corrected version - 19 October 2015)" that both “Number of death/ missing and affected people” and “direct economic loss” are to be prioritized. Since there are some targets regarding Disaster Risk Reduction in different goals, it is preferable that both “Number of death/ missing and affected people” and “direct economic loss” are positioned as common indicators to measure progress of targets 1.5, 11.5 and 13.1. To minimize the reporting burden on countries, indicators for DRR targets in SDGs have to be identical with those in Sendai Framework. Therefore, we propose to set the indicators for targets 1.5, 11.5 and 13.1 as “Number of death, missing and affected people due to hazardous events per 100,000” and “Direct economic loss due to hazardous events in relation to global gross domestic products”. |  |  | Japan: "The successor to the Hyogo Framework for Action on Disaster Risk Reduction" should be changed to "the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction". |  |
| Hungarian Central Statistical Office |  | HU: The definition is not proper here for budget levels. Since municipal budget can here other sources than central/national budget and the comparison on this base can be misleading. The definition on cultural heritage and natural heritage are needed as well, since those can be different in many countries. | HU: The indicator overlaps the indicator 1.5, and 13.1. |  |  |  |  |
| Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Censos | The methodology to calculate this indicator should be determined. |  | Ecuador proposes the following indicator: Percentage of territories that have evacuation or contingency plans in response to extreme environmental events | A precise definition of sexual harassment in different scopes needs to be defined as well as how it can be measured, avoiding subjectivity and that is indeed proven to cause physical or psychological damage aside from whatever the socio-cultural environment of the country where it has happened. |  |  |  |
| ISTAT |  | Istat-Italy: we suggest to divide natural heritage and cultural heritage. They are different heritages. Still we support this indicator according to the UNESCO methodology but we recognise that more methodological work is needed. | Istat-Italy: The SENDAI process will provide the final formulation for this indicator with economic losses also considered | Istat-Italy: it is not clear what it means "sexual harassment", so it better to speak of physical or sexual violence. Moreover data for the last 12 months are not always reliable; would it be better to have indicator for the past five years? |  | Istat-Italy: we suggest to look also at the DRR/SENDAI framework indicators | ISTAT-Italy: the definition of sustainable buildings is missing |
| National Statistical Committee, Belarus |  |  | Number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters per 100,000 people. |  |  |  |  |
| Singapore Department of Statistics |  |  |  | We would like to seek further clarifications on what constitutes “physical or sexual harassment” in the context of the SDG as what constitutes “physical or sexual harassment” may be interpreted differently across countries’ due to differences in legislation. |  |  |  |
| Statistics Denmark |  |  | Indicator should be changed however not a priority. In relation to Gender Equality we wish to propose that this indicators should be disaggregated by sex. Usefulness in DK: The merging of “death” and “evacuation” number seams inappropriate and will give a wrong impression on the disaster impact, e.g. 1.500. per. 100.000 could cover 1.500 deaths in Bangladesh and 1.500 temporarily evacuated in Denmark. Suggesting an indicator having more focus on the impact on livelihoods (this will be critical for all, including the most vulnerable groups and hence have a strong poverty focus). |  |  |  |  |
| Statistics Lithuania |  |  | Already mentioned in target 1.5.1 | Move to green |  |  |  |
| Statistics Portugal | Percentage of cities with direct participation structure of civil society in urban planning and management, which operates regularly and democratically (IAEG-SDG Members added this indicator during the green indicator consultation)  Additional clarification of indicator is needed in particular regarding the scope of ‘civil society participation’ as it could encompass open consultations on urban planning and management instruments, the existence of participatory budgets or simply, the existence of local elections by direct universal suffrage. | Grey, ask UNESCO for guidance  It is a relevant indicator and we support its inclusion subject to specific guidance from UNESCO for operationalization |  |  | We suggest to consider other criteria than population threshold to be relevant and applicable to a variety of countries such as the notion of metropolitan area (administrative) or functional urban area (empirical). In Portugal according to Census 2011 data there are only seven cities with more than 100 000 inhabitants. In the case of Habitat III Portuguese report we are considering the administrative metropolitan and cities (outside the metropolitan areas). Additionally, for comparability, it is important to ensure the use of the same type of urban and regional development plans. In this vein, it might be useful to provide a definition and/or description of the ‘type of urban and regional development plans to be taken into consideration. |  | For this indicator it is necessary to have specific methodological guidance from UNESCO |
| United States | US: No comment at this time. | US: No comment at this time. | US: No comment at this time. See parallel process of review of this indicator. | US: No comments at this time. | US: No comments at this time. | US: No comments at this time. | US: No comments at this time. |
| Department Foreign Affairs and Trade, Australia |  |  | Ideally the indicators would address the economic aspect of the target, and the target’s focus on ‘the poor and people in vulnerable situations.’ |  |  |  |  |
| Eurostat | Data not collected by European Statistical System (ESS). The indicator does not refer to "inclusive and sustainable urbanization". More development work is needed at a later stage to achieve full coverage of the target. | Natural and cultural heritage should be dealt with separate indicators. Data not collected by European Statistical System (ESS). | The issue of displacement should be included and methodological development work in line with the Sendai framework required. The indicator does not measure the economic loss as claimed in the target. Development of a separate indicator needed to achieve full coverage of the target. | We have doubts about the suitability of this indicator. |  |  |  |
| g7+ Secretariat |  |  |  | g7+ Secretariat: Isn't this related to SDG 16? And we have indicator on "people feeling safe". |  |  |  |
| International Disability Alliance |  |  | For indicators 1.5.1, 11.5.1 and 13.1.1 we recommend aligning with the Sendai Framework for DRR and explicitly mention persons with disabilities. |  |  |  |  |
| International Disability and Development Consortium |  |  | IDDC recommends disaggregation of indicator 11.5.1 by the list of characteristics mentioned in 17.18 (income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other relevant characteristics) and related chapeau of the 2030 Agenda. For indicator 11.5.1 IDDC recommends aligning with the Sendai Framework for DRR and explicitly mention persons with disabilities. |  |  | For indicator 11.b.1 IDDC recommends aligning with the Sendai Framework for DRR and explicitly mentioning persons with disabilities. |  |
| International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) |  | IUCN suggests consideration of “percentage of World Heritage Sites documented as facing problems according to the State of Conservation reports” as an indicator towards SDG Target 11.4. State of Conservation reports (http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc/) are available from UNESCO for World Heritage sites in 136 out of 163 countries which have inscribed properties on World Heritage List, and can be disaggregated between natural, cultural, and mixed World Heritage Sites. IUCN stands ready to provide any further support in documentation or interpretation as useful. |  |  |  |  |  |
| OCHA |  |  | OCHA reiterates its earlier recommendation to add the number of people displaced by disasters in the indicator 11.5.1. The inclusion of ‘displaced’ in the indicator would enable more comprehensive and technically sound reflection of human impacts caused by disasters (and other shocks) than ‘evacuated’ and ‘relocated’ (NB. the three element are mutually compatible as the latter two reflect specific aspects of displacement and are inclusive thereof; hence could include “displaced, including evacuated and relocated”). Moreover, people who become displaced by disasters and other shocks are in high danger of remaining in said situation and being left behind by the 2030 Agenda long after the event that displaced them due to heightened vulnerability caused by loss of homes, employment, livelihoods, education, etc. Displacement data and statistics are collected and compiled with established, robust methodologies by actors such as UNHCR, Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre and governments. |  |  |  |  |
| UN Women |  |  |  | Proposed indicator: Proportion of women subjected to physical or sexual harassment in public spaces in the last 12 months, by perpetrator and by place of occurrence Access to safe public spaces is a basic human right. If women and girls are to enjoy a life free from violence, authorities need to ensure that public spaces are free from any form of violence, including sexual violence. Sexual harassment in particular, and other forms of sexual violence in public spaces, are an everyday occurrence for women and girls around the world. In urban and rural areas, developed or developing countries, women and girls are constantly subjected to these forms of violence on streets, public transport and parks, in and around schools and workplaces, in public sanitation facilities and water and food distribution sites, or in their own neighborhoods. In order to distinguish between harassment that happens in workplaces or in public spaces such as streets and parks, this indicator should be disaggregated by perpetrator and place of occurrence. |  |  |  |
| UNCDF |  |  |  |  | UNCDF would like to add an additional component (h) to the good indicator proposed by UNHABITAT. This is mainly to highlight that to effectively implement any development plan, it will require an increase in fiscal space. So, the indicator would read: "The number of countries that are developing or implementing a National Urban Policy that (a) responds to population dynamics, (b) ensures balanced territorial development, (c) prepares for infrastructure development, (d) promotes urban land-use efficiency, (e) enhances resilience to climate change, (f) protects public space, (g) develops effective urban governance systems, and (h) increases local fiscal space." While we are in support of the indicator proposed by UN HABITAT, we also would like to note that Local Fiscal Space could be an indicator on its own to measure this target. Effective implementation of any development planning requires an increase in local fiscal space. The indicator would read: "Local Fiscal Space: % of intergovernmental transfers to local governments, local government own revenues and local government expenditures as a percentage of GDP". Fiscal Space: room in a government’s budget that allows it to provide resources for a desired purpose without jeopardizing the sustainability of its financial position or the stability of the economy (source: IMF). This indicator would also be a cross-cutting indicator that addresses Target 17.1. The level of integration between national and sub national plans and those of cities and peri-urban areas has been challenging especially within LDCs and emerging economies. National plans over the last decades have placed focus upon human development and MDG achievement. However, there is more emphasis needed on sustainable, balanced and equitable economic growth. This has since been addressed with the adoption of the SDGs, which acknowledge that societies and economies cannot undergo transformative change without utilizing the comparative advantage of local governments, which are now development actors in their own right. Additionally, the concepts of structural transformation of broad sectors of national economies to foster inclusivity and sustainability of economic growth has been acknowledged as providing a sustainable planning methodology for developing countries (reference UNCTAD Least Developed Countries Report 2014). Joined up planning (national and regional) provides a catalyst for effective structural transformation where regions act as the transformative engines of change. In order to support positive economic, social and environmental links between urban, peri-urban and rural areas and strengthen national and regional development planning, local governments will require financial resources, public investments and pipeline of bankable projects that would enable them to promote local economic development and essential services and infrastructure. While some bigger cities may be able to cope with these pressures, many secondary cities, peri-urban and rural areas find themselves on the frontlines of meeting the SDGs, but lacking the financial resources to fulfil their mandates and responsibilities. This will require an increase in local fiscal space to enable local governments to fulfil their mandates and responsibilities, and so they can meet growing demands faced for clean energy, efficient public transportation, decent jobs, resilient infrastructure and basic services. When decisions about resources are made locally, and those resources are invested locally, there is potential for an accelerator effect for inclusive and equitable growth. |  |  |
| UNDP |  |  | UNDP PROPOSALS \* Number of cities integrating multi-hazard risk assessments into their development plans and the proportion of vulnerable and poor with access to social protection schemes in the event of a disaster. \* Number of cities integrating multi-hazard risk assessments into their development plans and with community-based risk management plans to reduce the number of deaths, injured, relocated and evacuated due to disasters per 100,000 people. \* Number of cities integrating evidence-based risk assessments into their development plans for protecting socio-economic assets and implementing social protection schemes to reduce the number of deaths, injured, relocated and evacuated due to disasters per 100,000 people. RATIONALE While acknowledging that this indicator will be further analyzed during the indicator formulation process for the Sendai Framework for DRR and also informed by the Habitat-III Conference, some perspectives related to the indicator’s relevance and applicability for the Target are enumerated for consideration: \* Target-11.5 has three key dimensions viz. (i) reducing the number of deaths and people affected by disasters in urban areas, (ii) reduce direct economic losses and (iii) protecting the poor and people in vulnerable situations. \* The current formulation of the Indicator is preponderantly event-centric i.e. it focuses only on losses and impacts resulting from disaster events. This event-centric formulation tends to ignore the other two dimensions inherent in the Target. In the context of sustainable development, it misses the close nexus between risks and development especially in the context of urban development i.e. how the development process contributes to risk creation which bears the potential of increasing the impact of disasters and eventually undermining development gains. \* The world is rapidly urbanizing with nearly 54% of the population now living in urban areas and likely to increase to 66% by 2050 [UNDESA, 2014]. Much of this urban growth is also likely to occur in developing countries which are already facing high exposure and vulnerability to disaster risks and climate change impacts. \* In a rapidly urbanizing world, the level, scale and magnitude of disaster and climate risk is becoming more pronounced in cities. This is largely linked to the higher concentration of people, economic activities, development assets and critical infrastructure in cities. \* The indicator should seek to recognize the linkage between risk and urban development with the objective to set incentives for risk management efforts. These could entail, for example, facilitating risk-informed urban development through land-use planning, building codes, multi-hazard approach and promotion of green infrastructure etc. \* In relation to the overall objective of Goal-11 and the Target-11.5, the indicator needs to be strengthened by incorporating references to socio-economic impacts and losses as well as to the need to expand risk management and social protection measures to cover the poor, marginalized and vulnerable segments of urban population. \* The socio-economic aspects can be expressed in terms of loss of socio-economic assets (community assets or social infrastructure like schools, hospitals etc.), development infrastructure like roads, bridges, water, power and other services) as a percentage of GDP or in relation to the income-poverty baselines at national or city level. Such an indicator could bear a strong message for policy-makers and the private sector. The elements related to socio-economic impacts and loss of socio-economic infrastructure will also be relevant for Goal-9 (resilient infrastructure); Goal-1 (poverty eradication), and Goal-13 (climate change) in the resilience-building context. It is well recognized that the frequency and magnitude of urban disasters is increasing with an exponential spike in economic losses. (UNISDR Global Assessment Report 2013, 2011 and IFRC 2010, World Disaster Report, 2010). In recent years, the Bangkok floods inflicted a loss of US$54.7bn [GAR 2013], the Hurricane Sandy in New York caused a loss of US$ 65bn and mega-disasters like the Japan earthquake and tsunami caused heavy economic losses, disrupted national and global business processes and undermined national and societal development. In terms of increasing exposure and vulnerability of people living in urban areas, the World Bank report of 2013 projects that the number of people exposed to cyclone and earthquake risks in cities in developing countries will double between the years 2000 and 2050. Proposed elements for a comprehensive indicator for Target-11.5: \* Number of cities integrating multi-hazard risk considerations into their development plans \* Number of cities with community-based risk management plans \* Number of cities with xxx percentage of area under green infrastructure \* Proportion of urban area with informal settlements \* Proportion of vulnerable and poor with access to social protection schemes in the event of disasters UN-WATER COMMENTS For target 11.5, UN-Water notes that the proposed indicator actually includes several aspects that would be difficult to aggregate into one numerical value, and we would thus welcome the replacement of the proposed indicator with new indicators that allow reporting on different types of losses (e.g., number of deaths and missing people; number of people displaced; and economic losses). Countries would benefit from this approach as it allows increased understanding of the dimensions of the losses from disasters. Any indicator should disaggregate by type of disaster. We acknowledge that this indictor needs to be harmonized with the on-going indicator development of the Sendai process. Further information is available in our metadata note, which is regularly updated and revised, and available at http://bit.ly/1MPjiTZ. |  |  |  |  |
| UNEP |  |  |  |  |  |  | UNEP Comments: The current indicator, using percentage, could be very difficult to report---- is it from country budgets, bilateral support, % of support to LDCs by sector, etc?. It would seems that an absolute number tied to defined sources might be better and easier to track. UNEP would therefore propose to use absolute numbers as follows: Value of investment from international financial and technology mechanisms committed/spent to support energy efficient, sustainable, and resilient building projects in LDCs. Existing platforms and mechanisms would include GCF, GEF, CTCN, and data would be extracted from investment and/or project portfolios. Supporting Data would be referenced from: • World Bank Global Tracking Framework • International Energy Agency market studies • World Green Building Council reports on Market shares of green buildings • Report on World coverage of building energy policies from Global Buildings Performance Network (GBPN) |
| UN-ESCAP | Strongly support | Is budget the best indicator? Why not increase/maintain proportion of WHS in cities? | Strongly support |  | It should be those cities which integrate cross-boundary plans and policy frameworks. We should measure those urban places that develop broader and more inclusive planning frameworks |  | Are we measuring actual buildings (which should be proportional?). Budget alone won't capture this. It could simply be one expensive mega-project |
| UNESCO Institute for Statistics |  | Comments from UNESCO-UIS The original indicator 11.4.1 considered by the IAEG-SDGs has been classified as ‘grey’ meaning it requires further discussion or methodological development. There was concern regarding the scope and the lack of precision of the original indicator. The UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS) recommends a modified indicator which is still financial in nature as following: Total expenditure (public and private) per capita spent on the preservation, protection and conservation of all cultural and natural heritage. It is a quantitative indicator. Unlike the previous indicator proposed, the new indicator captures a broader range of concepts in referring to heritage in all its forms and is more inclusive by considering both public and private expenditure. In addition, expenditure is a better measure than budget as in the original indicator because it measures actual spending. The primary disaggregation’s proposed will include: by type of heritage (cultural, natural, mixed, World Heritage Centre designation); by level of government (national, regional, and local/municipal); by type of expenditure: operating expenditure/investment and; by type of private funding: donations in kind, private non-profit sector, sponsorship. Heritage expenditure data should be available at national level (availability will vary between countries) however; internationally comparable data are currently not being collected and as such a data collection mechanism will need to be developed. At the global level, the UIS is the lead international organization for culture statistics and consequently, the UIS will be responsible for the data collection and international monitoring of this indicator. Metadata for this indicator are available and have been submitted to UNSD. If the IAEG Members have questions about this proposal, please contact UIS Director, Silvia Montoya (uis.director@unesco.org), Alison Kennedy (a.kennedy@unesco.org) and José Pessoa (j.pessoa@unesco.org). |  |  |  |  |  |
| UNFPA | UNFPA has no comment at this point. |  |  |  | UNFPA has no comment at this point. |  |  |
| UN-Habitat |  |  |  | In order for this indicator to be more relevant to the target, it is suggested to change "and place of occurrence" for "in public spaces". Another possibility, since this indicator is already collected in several countries, is to specify in the metadata that "place of occurrence" refer to 'public spaces" this will ensure comparability among cities and countries and clear computation of the indicator with regards to the target. When the reference is made to specific public spaces, it will be possible to map where "physical and sexual harassment" is taking place in different parts of the city. This will introduce a clear spatial component to the measurement of the indicator and thus to the formulation of targeted policies. | Indicator 11.a.1 was considered as a priority indicator for the first meeting of the IG-EG in NY. However, prior to the Bangkok meeting and as a result of the consultation process, there was a request to change the indicator by UN-Habitat, the UN Statistical System Organizations and various organizations and stakeholders. UN-Habitat suggests to replace the indicator as follows: 11.a.1 The number of countries that are developing or implementing a National Urban Policy that (a) responds to population dynamics, (b) ensures balanced territorial development, (c) prepares for infrastructure development, (d) promotes urban land-use efficiency, (e) enhances resilience to climate change, (f) protects public space, and (g) develops effective urban governance systems. |  | Prior to the Bangkok meeting, indicator 11.c.1 was color-coded as 'grey'. Therefore, it was not discussed. The proposed indicator had obvious problems in its definition, structure and ways of computation. In view of this, and with the aim of suggesting a more solid and relevant indicator, UN-Habitat opened consultations with various partners and as a result of this process, we propose a better indicator that reads as follows: 11.c.1 Number of jobs in the construction industry of LDCs involved in the manufacture of local building materials, out of the total number of jobs in the construction industry. The indicator is relevant to Target 11.c as it addresses the production of 'sustainable and resilient buildings' in LDCs using local materials. Being measurable and realistic, the indicator is also feasible as it relies on official census data as well as estimates of informal employment in construction following established ILO methodology [1]. It also lends itself to disaggregation by gender, age, income group, location and other criteria. Lastly, the indicator is suitable to Target 11.c. By highlighting the importance of local production, the indicator would support local economic development, reduce hard costs of housing production and increase the environmental sustainability of building material supply chains. In addition, the manufacture of building materials has the potential to make a substantial contribution to aggregate labor demand in LDCs and would thus also contribute to targets 8.3.1, 8.5.2, 8.6.1 and others. UN-Habitat is ready to provide any additional information required to demonstrate the importance, relevance and suitability of this new proposed indicator. [1] ILO (2013) Measuring informality: a statistical manual on the informal sector and informal employment. |
| UNISDR |  |  | We advocate the following two indicators for targets 1.5, 11.5 and 13.1 as “twin” multi-purpose indicators. 1.Number of deaths, missing and affected people due to hazardous events per 100,000. 2. Direct economic loss due to hazardous events in relation to global gross domestic product. Since the beginning of the consultation, we have proposed “economic loss” indicator in addition to human loss indicator. Several countries expressed the support for the economic loss indicator. We believe this indicator should be added in the list of SDG indicators as it satisfies the criteria expressed by DESA that indicator supported at least one country can be added to grey indicator. Colombia, Korea, France, Japan, Canada clearly expressed adding “economic loss indicator” in the Aug-Sep consultation. UNISDR basically has proposed the same indicators for both the SDGs and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030. The details of suggested indicators are currently under review by the Member States in Sendai indicator discussion process. The Second session of the Open-ended Intergovernmental Expert Working Group to discuss Sendai indicators is scheduled to take place 10-11 February 2016. We would like to discuss bilaterally with UNDESA how to coordinate the SDG and Sendai process. |  |  | We propose modifying the indicator as "Percentage of local governments that adopt and implement local DRR strategies in line with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030". There are similar proposals including the currently proposed indicator but only the above indicator proposed by UNISDR has potential for global coverage due to the linkage with Sendai Framework Monitoring Mechanism. UNISDR basically has proposed the same indicators for both the SDGs and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030. The details of suggested indicators are currently under review by the Member States in Sendai indicator discussion process. The Second session of the Open-ended Intergovernmental Expert Working Group to discuss Sendai indicators is scheduled to take place 10-11 February 2016. We would like to discuss bilaterally with UNDESA how to coordinate the SDG and Sendai process. |  |
| United Nations Mine Action Service |  |  | This indicator should disaggregate/ consider deaths due to landmines and other explosive remnants of war, even in conflict is not considered within disasters since natural disasters (e.g. floods, earthquakes) often displace landmines so that they move to areas that were thought to be mine-free. Data available on this. |  |  |  |  |
| UNODC |  |  |  | UNODC advise is to reformulate the current indicator as following: ´Proportion of persons victim of physical or sexual harassment by sex, age and place of occurrence (last 12 months)´ which is more comprehensive and more suitable for comparisons. The term ´physical and sexual harassment´ needs some clarification to be operationally measured, building on standard concepts and definitions already widely used in victimisation surveys. |  |  |  |
| UNODC |  |  |  | UNODC suggestion is to replace the current indicator with ´Proportion of persons victim of physical or sexual harassment by sex, age and place of occurrence (last 12 months)´ which is more comprehensive and more suitable for comparisons. The term ´physical and sexual harassment´ needs some clarification to be operationally measured, building on standard concepts and definitions already widely used in victimization surveys. |  |  |  |
| UN-Water |  |  | For target 11.5, UN-Water notes that the proposed indicator actually includes several aspects that cannot be coherently aggregated into one numerical value, and we thus highly recommend the replacement of the proposed indicator with new indicators that allow reporting incorporating disaggregation by type of disaster and different types of losses (e.g., number of deaths and missing people; functional losses of critical infrastructure such as water supply and treatment plants, emergency shelters, power plants, and health-related facilities; and population with access to early warnings of disasters). Countries would benefit from this approach as it allows increased understanding of the dimensions of the losses from disasters and the ability of the country to have advanced warnings of disasters. Any indicator should disaggregate by type of disaster. We acknowledge that this indictor needs to be harmonized with the on-going indicator development of the Sendai process. Further information is available in our metadata note, which is regularly updated and revised, and available at http://bit.ly/1MPjiTZ. |  |  |  |  |
| World Bank |  |  |  | Consider deletion - it should be linked to green public spaces, otherwise it is not a useful measure of safety or inclusive public locations. |  |  | Needs better context e.g. should this be donor support or ODA rather than financial support? |
| World Water Council |  |  | World Water Council: same indicator as 1.5.1. It could be useful to focus more on measurement of economic losses as a consequence of disasters. | World Water Council: the indicator should consider also other groups of vulnerable people, like old people, children and people with disabilities. |  |  | World Water Council: it would be useful to add the word "infrastructures" after "buildings" |
| Red Educacion Popular entre Mujeres, A. Latina el Caribe REPEM |  |  | when possible by sex, age ethnicity , urban/rural | Proportion of women and girls under 15 years subjected to physical or sexual harassment by perpetrator and place of occurrence. ( proposed by REPEM) |  |  |  |
| RIGHTS |  |  | Disaggregated data on the deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters, especially for the people from poor and vulnerable communities. | Disaggregated data of women who have faced physical or sexual harassment by perpetrators and place of occurrence, by age, sex, caste, race, class and other forms. |  | Percentage 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, develop and implement in line with the forthcoming Hyogo Framework holistic disaster risk management at all levels. |  |
| ADD International |  |  | (Disaggregated by income, sex, age, disability, ethnicity, location) |  |  |  |  |
| Adolescent Girl and SDG Indicators Working Group\*: signatories included the UN Foundation, Plan International, Advocates for Youth, Girl Effect, Girls Thinking Global, International Center for Research on Women |  |  | Adolescent Girl and SDG Indicators Working Group\*: 11.5.1 Number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters per 100,000 people. Disaggregations: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) -RATIONALE: Inequalities in social relations, economic assets and political power exacerbate human vulnerabilities, as a result, the impact of disasters worsens the unequal conditions faced by women, children, indigenous peoples and the elders, among others. | Adolescent Girl and SDG Indicators Working Group\*: 11.7.2 Proportion of women and girls subjected to physical or sexual harassment by perpetrator and place of occurrence (last 12 months) Further disaggregation: age Disaggregations: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) RATIONALE: Girls and women are subject to and fear physical and sexual harassment in public spaces every day. This restricts freedom of movement, impacts their ability to participate in public life, and negatively impacts their health and well-being. 11.7.3 Percentage of women and girls who say they ever feel safe when in public spaces, noting under what circumstances they do and do not feel safe Disaggregations: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) DATA SOURCE: This has been piloted by Plan International in their research on safer cities in 3 countries. The baseline report is being developed. GLOBAL MONITORING ENTITY: Suggestion would be to further develop this in conjunction with UN Women and UN Habitat. RATIONALE: In public spaces and settlements across many parts of the world, girls and women report feeling unsafe. In some cities, one in five girls chooses not to venture outside the home alone for fear of violence. 11.7.4 Percentage of women and girls who say they have access to safe public spaces Disaggregations: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) DATA SOURCE: This has been piloted by Plan International in their research on safer cities in 3 countries. The baseline report is being developed. GLOBAL MONITORING ENTITY: Suggestion would be to further develop this in conjunction with UN Women and UN Habitat. RATIONALE: Across 3 countries, 27% of girls said that they never feel safe in public spaces throughout their community. |  |  |  |
| Articulacion Feminista Marcosur | Colombia. Including women. |  | Colombia. Disaggregated by sex. | Colombia. And by age |  |  |  |
| Asia Dalit Rights Forum |  |  | Disaggregated data on the deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters, especially for the people from poor and vulnerable communities. | Disaggregated data of women who have faced physical or sexual harassment by perpetrators and place of occurrence, by age, sex, caste, race, class and other forms. |  | Percentage 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, develop and implement in line with the forthcoming Hyogo Framework holistic disaster risk management at all levels. |  |
| Austrian Leprosy Relief Association |  |  | Align with the Sendai Framework for DRR and explicitly mentioning persons with disabilities |  |  | Align with the Sendai Framework for DRR and explicitly mentioning persons with disabilities |  |
| Christian Aid |  |  | Christian Aid would suggest an additional indicator which relates to economic loss: Number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters per 100,000 people; and % of economic and non-economic loss and damages reduced resulting from extreme weather and slow onset events compare to previous years. |  |  | Christian Aid supports an indicator along these lines, ensuring alignment with Sendai. |  |
| Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International | Comments from Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International, Netherlands  Assessments and evaluation, with particularly focus on those E-Government indicators with implications for civil society engagement and sustainability, such as UN E-Government Survey for 2014 and proposed E-Government Survey for 2016. See https://publicadministration.un.org/egovkb/reports/un-e-Government-survey-2014 |  | Comments from Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International, Netherlands  We would like to participate in the parallel process.  Another indicator could be the availability of public, private or community early warning systems and the percentage of the population that they can or do reach in the event.  Another indicator, after shocks or disasters, would be for economic impacts and losses, including loss of home, educational access, livelihoods and business; and the ability of the poor and vulnerability to rebuild homes, re-enter education, and continue or re-start livelihood and businesses. |  |  | Comments from Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International, Netherlands  Another indicator could be the availability within cities of public and private early warning systems, and the percentage of the population that they can or do reach in the event.  Another indicator, after shocks or disasters, would be for economic impacts and losses at the city level, including loss of home, educational access, livelihoods and business; and the ability of the poor and vulnerability to rebuild homes, re-enter education, and continue or re-start livelihood and businesses. |  |
| Communitas Coalition & Tellus Institute | Communitas Coalition: This is a useful additional indicator to address sub-national planning and capture the participatory aspect of Target 11.3. However, the proposed language includes some terms that are rather subjective (e.g., direct, regularly, democratically). To be more robust, these terms should be defined or guidance provided on their meaning for this indicator. |  | Communitas Coalition: Because disasters occur periodically rather than on a regular basis, at the national and especially sub-national level this indicator is most meaningful when considered over time (perhaps decades), not year by year. Also, it is unclear how this indicator will be tracked and reported: are the “number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters” added up and reported together, or is each impact tracked and reported separately. It is important to consider these impacts separately not only because they are qualitatively different, but also because relocation and evacuation can be positive elements of disaster response and actually result from effective preparation and reflect resilience. With the above concerns in mind, we suggest stating that at the national and sub-national level this is a longer-term indicator and specifying that the focus is unplanned relocation or evacuation. Suggested Indicator: Number of deaths, missing people, injured, and the number of people who experienced unplanned relocation or evacuation due to disasters per 100,000 people |  | Communitas Coalition: While city/regional development plans are critical for supporting the economic, social and environmental links between urban, peri-urban and rural areas, it is important that these plans are created and implemented within the context of robust national urban development policies. Therefore, we support UN-Habitat's proposed indicator to track the number of countries that are developing and implementing national urban policies that promote sustainable urban development. We agree with UN-Habitat's attempt to go beyond a simple binary indicator and reflect the content/quality of national urban policies. We suggest that some details of UN-Habitat's proposed criteria and disaggregation need improvement by reducing the number of criteria, making the criteria more objective and linked to existing data sources, and by focusing squarely on the national level. |  | Communitas Coalition: The proposed indicator is problematic in its definition, structure, and means of computation. It is not clear as to what the percentage refers to: is it domestic or foreign support, or both? Does it include all financial support to least developed countries (bilateral and multilateral, public and private), or is the focus more narrow? In addition, it will be difficult to identify reliable data sources for financial support specifically targeted at construction and retrofitting of sustainable, resilient and resource-efficient buildings, however these may be defined (e.g. exceeding the energy efficiency and perhaps other parts of the 2015 International Building Code?). For the above reasons, Communitas supports an alternative indicator along the lines of that proposed by UN-Habitat. Suggested indicator: The number of jobs in the construction industry of LDCs involved in the manufacture of local building materials out of the total number of jobs in the construction industry. This indicator is relevant to Target 11.c as it relates to "sustainable and resilient buildings utilizing local materials." It is also a measurable indicator utilizing census (employment) data plus estimates of informal employment in construction based on established ILO methodology. This indicator would be relevant to several other goals and targets relating to economic development (8.3.1, 8.5.2, 8.6.1), housing (11.1), and environmental sustainability. |
| Culture Committee, United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG) |  | The Committee on Culture of United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG) thinks that the draft indicator is acceptable, although, as noted by ICOMOS, there seems to be a typographical error, so that the text should read “national cultural AND natural heritage”, to be in line with the target. We are also aware that this indicator may be reductive when compared to the overall aim of the target and would suggest that the IAEG-SDG consider the need to measure not only budgets but also the meaningful incorporation of the safeguarding of natural and cultural heritage into metropolitan or city regulatory and legal development frameworks (as suggested in ICOMOS’ response to the current consultation). Alternatively, the suggestion made by UNESCO for an indicator focusing on public expenditure on culture would also be acceptable. Ultimately, we believe that this indicator should contribute to raising awareness of the importance of local cultural policies in making cities and human settlements ‘inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable’. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Culture et Développement | France, Culture et Développement Percentage of cities AND human settlements > XXXX inhabitants with direct participation structure of civil society in urban planning and management, which operates regularly and democratically | France, Culture et Développement Index of development of the policy and institutional framework for the protection and promotion of culture cultural rights and cultural diversity and share of national (or municipal) budget which is dedicated to preservation, protection and conservation of national cultural natural heritage, including World Heritage sites and/or Index of development of a multidimensional framework for heritage sustainability (Unesco 2014) (cf see also http://www.agenda21culture.net/images/a21c/culturegoal/Indicators\_ENG.pdf) |  | France, Culture et Développement Proportion of urban land allocated to public open spaces and sheltered facilities and proportion of GIRLS AND women subjected to physical or sexual harassment by perpetrator and place of occurrence (last 12 months) (see also other wording in culture as a goal, http://www.agenda21culture.net/images/a21c/culturegoal/Indicators\_ENG.pdf) | France, Culture et Développement Cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants that implement urban and regional development plans integrating population projections and resource needs and share of participatory planning practices |  | France, Culture et Développement Percentage of financial support that is allocated to the construction and retrofitting of sustainable, resilient and resource-efficient buildings AND share of local materials and techniques used For the importance of using local materials especially in some specific geographical and cultural contexts as added value for identity and local sustainable development see for example : http://www.lavoutenubienne.org/en/home http://www.acroterre.org/ |
| Diyalo Pariwar |  | world’s cultural and natural heritage should be categorized as they valued and stands Nationally and internationally. |  | Child friendly and women friendly spaces and facilities need to be explored, developed and construct at downward level of each provincial / district level. |  |  |  |
| Dutch Coalition on Disability and Development (DCDD) |  |  | DCDD recommends to disaggregate by the list of characteristics mentioned in 17.18 (income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other relevant characteristics) DCDD recommends to allign with the Sendai Framework for DRR |  |  | DCDD recommend aligning with the Sendai Framework for DRR |  |
| FIA Foundation | Target 11.2 is not listed here but it should be reconsidered as follows: "The proportion of the population that has safe infrastructure for pedestrians and children, as well as a public transit stop within .5 km." This would ensure that children, a vulnerable population, have a safe route to school. Additionally, given the high rates of pedestrian fatalities around the world, this language is crucial to ensuring their safety. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei |  | FEEM: Also number of workers in the sector | FEEM believes that it needs to measure also direct economic losses, in terms of number of (private and public) assets affectef | FEEM believes that this additional indicator does not fit the scope of the target |  |  | FEEM suggest that only financial support is misleading, the most effective indicator is counting the share of sustainable and resilient buildings |
| German Institute for Human Rights | We strongly support this indicator. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Health in Post-2015 NGO Coalition |  |  |  | The Health in Post-2015 NGO Coalition SUPPORTS Indicator 11.7.2. However, • The element of ‘safe public spaces’ should be reflected at the indicator level, and seriously considered to avoid reducing the scope of this target and help fill critical measurement gaps under other related targets. This is especially relevant in relation to women and girls who experience sexual harassment and assault worldwide on a daily basis as they go about their routines, as well as safety for children in schools. • Multi-purpose/Multiple Targets: Disaggregation ‘by place of occurrence’ – such as parks, transportation, educational institutions, places of work, among others – would help satisfy not only this indicator on ‘public spaces’ in this target, but also elements of Target 4.a. on education (“gender sensitive…safe, non-violent…learning environments”), Target 5.2 on violence against women and girls(‘all forms of violence …in the public spheres’, complementing the indicators in green), Target 8.8on work places (“safe and secure working environments”),Target 11.2 on transportation (“safe transport systems…with special attention to…women”), and Targets 16.1 on violence (´all forms of violence”) and 16.2 on violence against children. • Data for this indicator for several countries is available and can be collected from specialized violence against women surveys or survey modules (e.g. MICS, DHS), and would be monitored at global level by UN Women. The metadata submission is available on the IAEG site. Alternative indicator: Proportion of people who report feeling safe walking alone around the area where they live, by sex, age sub-groups, location, among other characteristics. Metadata is available on the IAEG website. This indicator is relevant and welcome for this target, as proposed by stakeholders, but may not respond as fully to multiple targets. |  |  |  |
| HelpAge International on behalf of the Stakeholder Group on Ageing |  |  | The Stakeholder Group on Ageing comments: THE INDICATOR SHOULD INCLUDE DISPLACEMENT: We support OCHA's suggestion to include displacement within measure of “affected” within in this indicator. OCHA suggests using "displaced (including evacuated and relocated)" or "forced to leave their homes or places of habitual residence (including evacuated and relocated)" among the elements collectively comprising "affected." THE INDICATOR DOES NOT MEASURE THE TARGET IN FULL: We support the inclusion of a measure of economic loss as recommended by a number of states. THIS INDICATOR MUST BE DISAGGREGATED: This indicator should be disaggregated by age and sex. Numbers of people exposed, deaths, missing, injured and displaced should also be reported separately. THIS INDICATOR MUST BE ALIGNED WITH SENDAI INDICATORS: This indicator will need to align with the Sendai indicators (which are not yet determined). This indicator should remain grey until the process to determine indicators for Sendai is complete. | The proposed indicator does not measure the entirety of the target. We support The UN Statistical System Organisations previous proposal to add an additional indicator, "The average share of built up areas (of communities) that are accessible and safe for all, including women, children, older persons and those with disabilities.” If this indicator is retained, it should be expanded to include the other groups mentioned in the target or additional indicators should be added. Gallup Analytics currently provides data on perceptions of safety of older persons: Percentage of people aged 50-plus who responded “yes” to the survey question: “Do you feel safe walking alone at night in the city or area where you live?” Gallup Analytics: https://analytics.gallup.com |  |  |  |
| High-Level Task Force for the ICPD |  |  |  | HLTF for ICPD on 11.7.2: SUPPORT Indicator 11.7.2: Proportion of women subjected to physical or sexual harassment, by perpetrator and place of occurrence, and by age/5-year bands, in the last 12 months • The element of ‘safe public spaces’ should be reflected at the indicator level, and seriously considered to avoid reducing the scope of this target and help fill critical measurement gaps under other related targets. This is especially relevant in relation to women and girls who experience sexual harassment and assault worldwide on a daily basis as they go about their routines, as well as safety for children in schools. • Multi-purpose/Multiple Targets: Disaggregation ‘by place of occurrence’ – such as parks, transportation, educational institutions, places of work, among others – would help satisfy not only this indicator on ‘public spaces’ in this target, but also elements of Target 4.a. on education (“gender sensitive…safe, non-violent…learning environments”), Target 5.2 on violence against women and girls (‘all forms of violence …in the public spheres’, complementing the indicators in green), Target 8.8 on work places (“safe and secure working environments”), Target 11.2 on transportation (“safe transport systems…with special attention to…women”), and Targets 16.1 on violence (´all forms of violence”) and 16.2 on violence against children. • Data for this indicator for several countries is available and can be collected from specialized violence against women surveys or survey modules (e.g. MICS, DHS), and would be monitored at global level by UN Women. The metadata submission is available on the IAEG site. Alternative indicator: Proportion of people who report feeling safe walking alone around the area where they live, by sex, age sub-groups, location, among other characteristics. Metadata is available on the IAEG website. This indicator is relevant and welcome for this target, as proposed by stakeholders, but may not respond as fully to multiple targets. |  |  |  |
| ICOMOS |  | The International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) is a Paris-based international Non-Governmental Organization. We are pleased to provide this comment on the proposed indicator for Target 11.4. These comments expand upon the comment we submitted in the spring of 2015 during the earlier UN Non-Governmental Liaison Service’s online Indicator consultation. ICOMOS believes there are four key tests against which any proposed indicator for Target 11.4 should be measured: (1) Is the Indicator based on sound methodology and is the methodology behind the indicator (data sources, method of computation, treatment of missing values, regional estimates, etc.) well documented and readily available? Is the indicator recommended by a well-established and recognized peer review mechanism or through international mechanisms? (2) Does the indicator expressly correlate to the broader aims of SDG Goal 11, to make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable? (3) Does it recognize the inter-linkages of natural and cultural heritage, implicit in the text of Target 11.4 and explicit in contemporary heritage policy and philosophy? (4) Does it operate at a landscape or regional scale, recognizing the pervasive and multifaceted nature of heritage, including tangible and intangible, movable and immovable, natural and cultural. The current proposal is “Share of national (or municipal) budget which is dedicated to preservation, protection and conservation of national cultural natural heritage including World Heritage sites.” As we wrote in the UN-NGLS consultation in March, we believe a different approach would better address the four key tests we have outlined. Also, ICOMOS notes the current draft seems to have a typographical error. Presumably, it was intended to read “protection and conservation of national cultural and natural heritage.” ICOMOS writes in support of the following Indicator for Target 11.4: “the percentage of urban areas supported by development and financing governance frameworks that include the safeguarding of natural and cultural heritage.” Such an Indicator would use existing methodologies to establish a baseline definition for inclusion of the safeguarding of natural and cultural heritage into metropolitan or urban regulatory and legal development and financing governance frameworks. These reflect an assessment of the effectiveness of governance tools, as community engagement, knowledge and planning regulatory systems and financial tools on the safeguarding of heritage. Progress towards Target 11.4 would then be measured in terms of increases in the number (measured by means of population covered, square miles covered or another suitable metric) of urban areas supported by an effective development governance framework, that is to say, ones that meant the baseline definition of being inclusive of the safeguarding of heritage. The ICOMOS proposal focuses on spatial and process variables, versus economic/financial ones. ICOMOS believes this is justified in view of the multi-dimensional manner in which heritage safeguarding supports Goal 11. This approach also creates more synergy with the other Targets of Goal 11 and the New Urban Agenda expected to be adopted as part of the UN Habitat III process. Financial expenditure is a reducing tool of heterogeneity/complexity/multidimensionality, because it transforms all aspects into one dimension. While ICOMOS prefers an approach that is more multi-dimensional, ICOMOS does agree that financial mechanisms are extremely important. The ICOMOS proposal recognizes this by including as a baseline requirement the incorporation of incentives for heritage safeguarding within broader development governance tools. Thus, key to our proposal is the reference to development and financing governance frameworks. What follows is an explanation of the ICOMOS proposal with reference to each of the four key tests outlined above. (1) Methodology The ICOMOS proposal is based on research collected by UN Habitat and others and on national and sub-national assessment tools already in use and being developed by the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank. For example, the approach draws on the concept of country environmental analysis (CEA) found in the Asian Development Bank's 2003 Environmental Assessment Guidelines. (Available online at http://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/institutional-document/32635/files/environmental-assessment-guidelines.pdf). The CEA assesses, at a policy level, a country's Regulatory and Institutional Framework that includes a review of its environmental standards, regulations, enforcement, mechanism and instruments. It makes this assessment against identified environmental issues that are most important to a country's development strategy. The ICOMOS proposal utilizes this approach to assess existing governance frameworks against the issue of the safeguarding of natural and cultural heritage. One finds similarities in the World Bank's draft Environmental and Social Procedure, which requires the Bank, as part of its due diligence, to evaluate countries' Environmental and Social Frameworks, that is those aspects of the country’s policy, legal and institutional framework, including its national, sub-national, or sectoral implementing institutions and applicable laws, regulations, rules and procedures, and implementation capacity, which are relevant to the environmental and social risks and impacts of development. (Available online at http://consultations.worldbank.org/Data/hub/files/consultation-template/review-and-update-world-bank-safeguard-policies/en/materials/clean\_draft\_es\_procedure\_final\_draft\_for\_consultation\_july\_1\_2015.pdf). This review requires an assessment of the Country's overall legal framework in service of determining the extent to which that framework addresses the risks and impacts of development and enables the project to achieve objectives materially consistent with World Bank's Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESSs), including the World Bank policy on the safeguarding of cultural heritage. The starting point for application of the proposed Indicator would be a determination by national authorities of the urban development and finance framework (national, regional, sub-regional) relevant to its urban areas. Five elements could be used as part of a baseline for establishing whether heritage safeguarding had been included in the relevant framework: • Inclusion of natural and cultural heritage safeguarding elements in development standards, regulations, enforcement, mechanism and instruments. • Existence of financing tools for heritage safeguarding as part of broader schemes of development finance. • Existence of heritage capacity and capability within development and development finance agencies. • Existence of mechanisms for cross-sectoral coordination of heritage policies and actions with other development and finance functions. • Opportuinty for public consultation in heritage-related decision-making. The following references support these elements: REPORT YEAR REFERENCE TO HERITAGE RECOMMENDED ACTIONS RELATED SUSTAINABLE DIMENSIONS UN HABITAT REPORTS 2002 Good governance should “preserve the urban environment and the cultural and historical heritage of cities”… • Identify and protect the commons • Conservation offices • Conservation policies SOCIAL: “related to democracy, human rights and civic participation in decision-making processes” 2004-2005 “with the growth of Cultural Heritage Tourism, more cities in developing countries were investing in the conservation of old historic buildings and thus tapping into their ‘cultural capital’” • Culturally driven models of redevelopment ECONOMIC: “Cultural heritage sites are playing notable roles in the symbolic economy”… 2006-2007 “Law on Spatial Planning that followed is based on the overarching principle of protecting the public over individual interest“ • Integration of heritage conservation on urban planning SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC: “… a more rational use of land, greater equity in the provision of basic infrastructure and services, the protection of the environment and the preservation of cultural heritage.” 2008-2009 “cultural heritage, sense of place and memory and the complex set of social and symbolic relationships that give cities meaning” • Adopt policies to protect intangible assets, and create social spaces that contribute to “humanizing” cities SOCIAL: “these intangible assets represent the “soul of the city” and are as important for harmonious urban development as tangible assets” 2010-2011 “A number of cities today are using culture as a transformational tool to integrate ethnic minorities, preserve regional values, safeguard linguistic and religious diversity, resolve conflicts, protect the heritage in the built environment, and in the process promote economic development.: • An inclusive city promotes of creative artistic expression and heritage activities SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC: “Beyond the sole cultural sphere, these policies together can go a long way towards bridging the urban divide in its other social, political and economic dimensions.” 2012-2013 “Shared urban prosperity puts people first, values the tangible and intangible aspects of development” • To ensures civic participation by all in the social, political and cultural spheres SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL: ”inclusive economic growth, protects human rights, ensures enabling equitable development, cares for the natural environment, reduces disaster risks and vulnerabilities for the poor and builds resilience to adverse forces of nature” Local UN HABITAT REPORTS STATE OF ASIAN CITIES 2011 “Asian cities are also waking up to another dimension of globalization, i.e., tourism, with an attractive mix of historical heritage and dramatic modern buildings and skylines. • Conservation policies • Integration of conservation in planning strategies. SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL: “urban biospheres offer the potential for Asian cities to devise policies and development practices that recognize and manage environmental and cultural heritage and values in a more sustainable way.” STATE OF EUROPEAN CITIES, 2013 “Protected territories (natural and cultural heritage) are an element of master and detailed plans…. Spatial planning is also seeking to bring development in settlements…with crucial ecological value and to achieve the protection of territories endowed with historic and cultural heritage” • Better cooperation with European and global institutions for criteria setting, evaluation and management of the natural, cultural and landscape heritage. • Inclusion of cultural and natural heritage protection in a territory” ECONOMIC: “Some non-capital cities have a specialized economic or functional role, such as…smaller cities with rich a cultural heritage or natural resources…Cities with a significant urban region, on the other hand, were often able to recover from economic decline over quite short periods if they had architectural heritage… STATEOF LAC CITIES 2012 Latin American and Caribbean cities implementing conservation-led programs focus on the preservation and regeneration of public space as a tool to improve the quality of urban life. • development initiatives aimed at the recovery and renewal of historic centers SOCIAL: improvement of quality of life through the recovery and renovation of historic public spaces. STATE OF ARAB CITIES 2012 Arab Cities are also taking efforts to preserve their urban heritage through the renovation of old forts, palaces, suqs and mosques. • Development programs including the conservation of cultural (tangible) heritage ECONOMIC: Mostly mentioned through tourism revenues STATE OF AFRICAN CITIES 2013 “African Governments have deployed programs to restore and preserve the historic centers as a valued cultural heritage and an architectural and urban legacy that can be attractive to domestic and tourism…” • Launching plans to rehabilitate and promote urban heritage SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC: Challenges due to fragmented ownership patterns and the reluctance to participate in improvement initiatives that do not generate revenue. Nevertheless, significant improvements to public spaces,… URBAN MANAGEMENT / PERFORMANCE UIMC 2001 cultural heritage as part of a cities management departments • Establishment of heritage conservation and management offices SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC: “contribution related to high tourism potential and its social and economic implications. ECI, 2000 “An important component of a sustainable society is the general well-being of its citizens…” • Empower local communities • Foster citizen participation in local planning and decision-making processes SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL: “…This means being able to live in conditions that include safe and affordable housing, the availability of basic services (such as school, health, culture, etc.)... a good quality environment (both natural and built)...” URBAN COMPETITIVENESS PWC, 2011 “Preservation is taking off worldwide: Twelve percent of the world’s surface now is preserved, and a vast amount of new area awaits heritage certification, according to a study done by AMO” • “Measuring and comparing urban preservation efforts would make city comparisons unwieldy, inaccurate or impossible due to differences among cultures and economic conditions.” ECONOMIC: “ironically, heritage status attracts waves of tourists who, in turn, jeopardize the integrity of what was just preserved.” Table 2 BEST PRACTICES BASED ON THE CONSERVATION OF CULTURAL HERITAGE REPORT YEAR BEST PRACTICE INNITIATIVE RELATED SUSTAINABLE DIMENSIONS UN-HABITAT REPORTS 2002 1. Crosstown 116, re-design of the 116th Street corridor from Hudson to the East River Partnerships addressing inner-city issues through educational programs at high school level working with architects. SOCIAL: “Restore the former architectural feel of the area”. Participatory community, inclusive processes to protect the commons. 2004-2005 2. Ciutat Vella Project: Revitalization Of The Historic Centre Of Barcelona, Spain the city council, in partnership with citizens and the private sector, formulated an integrated plan to rehabilitate housing, improve public infrastructure, promote local economic development and implement social welfare programs. SOCIAL, ECONOMIC: Urban redevelopment and social policies have improved the quality of life in the district, including educational levels, household income, economic activity and security. this has, in turn, reduced the economic and social gaps that existed within Ciutat Vella 3. Atelier 231: Street Art In Sotteville, France located in a former French railways building, rehabilitated to accommodate artists, a cultural policy in favor of promoting street arts, it was essential to establish an appropriate system of rehabilitation SOCIAL: “This has helped to build and strengthen the social fabric of the city.” 4. Zanzibar, Tanzania: preserving the historic Stone Town “The Stone Town Conservation Plan was approved in 1994, lays out a general planning framework, and establishes the broad conservation and development policies for the Stone Town.” SOCIAL: “Life quality with measures to develop and improve parcels of land and other larger spaces in the central area, including methods to improve parking and circulation of vehicular traffic in and around the Stone Town.” 5. Kathmandu, Nepal: restoring a centuries-old water supply system “One of the projects undertaken by KMC, in collaboration with UNESCO, is the restoration of the centuries-old water supply system of sculptural ‘stone spouts’ and wells.” SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL: the restoration of the water spouts not only helps to preserve a unique living heritage, but also contributes to the improvement of the water supply and drainage system in a city that suffers from chronic water shortages. 6. Santiago de Chile’s strategic plan “Revitalizing the central core system, including the downtown district and the surrounding deteriorated areas, entailing the preservation of the city’s cultural heritage and specialized commerce, as well as restoring surrounding areas and improving access to them.” SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC 7. Havana’s 1998–2001 strategic plan Relevant projects given priority: Raise habitat quality and improve preservation of the built heritage. Strategic areas: Historic inner city of ‘World Heritage’ status in Old Havana., Malecon Rehabilitation Project SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC 8. Enhancing Partnership In Planning: The Case Of Mega-Project Management In TheNetherlands “The Rotterdam Central Station project had been part of a strategy that was to turn Rotterdam into a ‘world city’. But in 2002, the newly formed city council could not be convinced of this logic. The exuberant ‘champagne glass’ design had to be scrapped. The old railway station was declared a heritage building, and a ‘home-grown’ architect would be enlisted for the project” SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC: In this dramatic instance, globalization did not eliminate the local; it strengthened it. The new council majority represented the interests of small businesspeople and petty bourgeois in the city who were feeling disoriented, their livelihood threatened by the forces of globalization. It was this majority that the formerly hegemonic social democrats, in their eagerness to put Rotterdam on the global map, had failed to perceive. 2006-2007 9. Improving urban planning and monitoring in the city of Aleppo The new planning scheme, which aims to upgrade the historic core of the city and preserving its architectural heritage, conceived of this task within a broader structure of urban management, including land use regulation, housing, technical infrastructure, traffic, and others. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC: The municipality has also been able to involve several stakeholders and generate innovative partnership with local and international actors that allowed it to compensate for lack of know-how as well as the scarcity of its resources. 2008-2009 10. The strategic urban plan of Guangzhou provided the overall framework for implementation and resulted in substantial improvements in management, urban greening, sanitation, pollution control, and conservation of natural resources and cultural heritage. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC: In 1997, the municipality of Guangzhou in southern China initiated a five-year Actio0n Program for improving the living environment to maintain and enhance Guangzhou’s attractiveness both as a place to live and do business. 2010-2011 11. Bogotá’s “Declaration of Cultural Rights” this came as part of a broader-ranging effort to promote cultural diversity and more equitable appropriation of the city’s cultural riches and heritage. SOCIAL: in a bid to enhance equal opportunities for cultural expression by all segments of the population; STATE OF EUROPEAN CITIES, 2013 12. The county territory master plan, Lithuania, “Protected territories (natural and cultural heritage) are an element of master and detailed plans. The county administration and the Ministry of Environment supervise lower-level preparation of planning documents.” SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, ENVIRONMENTAL. 13. National Urban Policies, Belarus “Spatial planning is also seeking to bring development in settlements and on territories with crucial ecological value and to achieve the protection of territories endowed with historic and cultural heritage, as well as those with natural and recreational potential.” SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, ENVIRONMENTAL: focuses on sustainable development of its urban and rural settlements, transport system, engineering and technical infrastructure, social amenities, recreation and health care systems, and on preservation and efficient use of its historic STATEOF LAC CITIES 2012 14. Regenerating the Historic Centre of Havana “declared a priority area for conservation-led programs because of its dilapidated state. Regeneration saw improvements to social and cultural facilities and services for tourism.” SOCIAL, ECONOMIC: “The project, which recovered the center’s historical heritage without losing its residential character, favored the development of new economic activities and inspired similar initiatives in other cities in Cuba” 15. Regenerating the Historic Centre of Quito “a housing project for the historic centre, the relocation of street vendors to malls, and vehicle traffic regulation (1994-2004). With local and international financing, and private sector support, the project focused on the regeneration of vacant buildings to create social housing and private housing free of public subsidies.” SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC: “to achieve mixed occupation by different social groups. The architectural heritage was restored while basic infrastructure like water and sanitation have been improved, and so too the lives of inhabitants. The initiative, replicated in Cuenca, Ecuador, faces the challenge of maintaining socio-economic diversity and the financial viability of the zone” STATE OF ARAB CITIES 2012 16. Syria’s Municipal Administration Modernisation (Mam) Programme “From 2005 to 2010 MAM has undertaken activities which include reviewing and revising legislation, increasing the capacity of central and local governments and working jointly with municipalities to prepare sustainable urban development plans, … it addressed the issues involved in the preservation of cultural heritage in the Damascus historic centre and the archaeological site of Palmyra” SOCIAL, ECONOMIC: “developing approaches to the regularization of informal settlements, streamlining procedures for the delivery of urban services and improving financial management.” 17. Oman launched its National Spatial Strategy in 2010 “30-year development plan designed to promote geographically balanced and sustainable growth in line with its 2020 vision.” SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, ENVIRONMENTAL: It focuses on developing both urban and rural areas through land planning, economic development, infrastructure, social services, heritage conservation and environmental protection. 18. Bahrain’s national planning framework “access to global markets, preserve its environmental resources, develop an integrated transport network, build new communities, accentuate the waterfront, protect its heritage, ‘green’ the country and build a sustainable future” ECONOMIC: “tourism contributes 10 per cent to GDP and the government is investing in hotels and tourist facilities in Durrat Al Bahrain and Al Areen. It has proposed Muharraq for UNESCO’s world heritage list.” 19. Jeddah, historic department, Saudi Arabia “The Saudi government has recently invested a significant amount of money to restore and preserve the historic buildings and sections of Jeddah, develop a tourism corridor linking to Al Balad and obtain world heritage status, among other initiatives.” SOCIAL, ECONOMIC: “The government is also investing in initiatives to train local workers in the tourism sector and collaborating with educational institutions to offer vocational training” STATE OF AFRICAN CITIES 2013 20. Medinas 2020 Initiative “…a programme for the rehabilitation and conservation of Northern Africa’s historic urban centres.” SOCIAL, ECONOMIC URBAN MANAGEMENT / PERFORMANCE UIMC 2001 21. 16 Asian cities profiled trough different governance qualities and management challenges, in which Heritage is included Heritage is often included within the cultural and/ or governance sector, related activities include: • Adaptive reuse • Restoration • Inventory of cultural heritage assets • Community participation on heritage activities SOCIAL, ECONOMIC: “…Tourism attraction, Development (facilitating basic need for local communities)” The foregoing tables adapted from Guzman Molina, P.C. (Paloma), WORLD HERITAGE CITIES AND SUSTAINABLE URBAN DEVELOPMENT, Bridging global and local levels in monitoring the sustainable urban development of World Heritage cities (2015). Additional References [Online]: Asian Development Bank (ADB) (2001). “Urban Indicators for Managing Cities (UIMC)”. Available at: http://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/publication/30020/urban-indicators-managing-cities.pdf PricewaterhouseCoopers (PWC), (2011). “Cities of Opportunities Report”. Available at: https://www.pwc.com/mx/es/publicaciones/archivo/2014-05-cities-of-opportunity.pdf. The World Bank (WB) & Environmental Resource Management, (2008). Global Cities Indicators Facility (GCIF). Available at: http://www.cityindicators.org/Deliverables/Final%20Indicators%20Report%203\_21\_08\_4-23-2008-924597.pdf. 2. Correlation with the Broader Aims of SDG Goal 11 Target 11.4 calls for “making cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable by strengthening efforts to protect and safeguard the world’s cultural and natural heritage.” The development of an Indicator for Target 11.4 must start from an understanding of the ways in which the safeguarding of heritage link to urban inclusiveness, safety, resilience and sustainability. This in turn requires an understanding of the term “cultural heritage.” The term should not be exclusively associated with “extraordinary” sites such as Historic Monuments or World Heritage sites – even though such sites retain their exceptional iconic status – but rather should be understood as including cultural landscapes, historic cities, and sites of memory. Moreover, contemporary practice extends the concept of heritage beyond “tangible heritage,” to the intangible dimensions of heritage as well. This means the capital of knowledge derived from the development and experience of human practices, and from the spatial, social and cultural constructions linked to it. Cultural heritage, as thusly understood, comprehends not only a collection of monuments but humanity’s historical, cultural and social memory, preserved through authenticity, integrity and ‘sense of place,’ thus forming a crucial aspect of the development process. In both its tangible and intangible forms, heritage fosters socio-economic regeneration and is a crucible of creativity, a driver of 21st century economies. It is also a key element of resilience, from bio-cultural knowledge and its role in climate change adaptation, to the sustainable model for urbanization offered by traditional, dense development patterns. Perhaps most critically (in the face of climate change, potential future resource scarcity, rapid urbanization and other trends), cultural heritage with its value for identity strengthens social cohesion and social well-being and enhances the livability of cities. In short, heritage is both an enabler and a driver of sustainable development and it was for these values that it was included in Goal 11. One of the most comprehensive efforts to address the role of cultural heritage in urban development is the ICOMOS Symposium entitled “Heritage, a driver of development” held in Paris in 2011. This meeting was held in anticipation of the UN Conference on Sustainable Development (the Rio+20 Conference) and attended by nearly 1,200 heritage experts from over 100 countries. The meeting resulted in a doctrinal text in heritage known as the “Declaration of Paris on Heritage as a Driver of Development” (the “Paris Declaration”). The International Congress "Culture: Key to Sustainable Development" convened by UNESCO in Hangzhou (China) in 2013 was a foundational event in these discussions. The Habitat III Issue Paper on “Urban Culture and Heritage provides another valuable contribution to these questions and to other issues around culture, heritage, and urban sustainability. This work has yielded an enormous diversity of practical approaches and solutions designed to leverage heritage in service of urban resilience, safety, inclusiveness and sustainability. From these, the following conclusions can be drawn: • Heritage has the power to strengthen communities where citizens associate the historic environment with a shared identity, attachment to place and everyday life, including people who are minorities, disadvantaged or socially excluded. • Traditional settlements, with their lasting cultural identity and socio-economic traditions, raise the awareness and pride of citizens in local history and culture no matter where they originate or how they may be adapted. • The mix of public and private spaces found in traditional settlements engenders social cohesiveness and interaction by providing common spaces for diverse groups to interact. • Historic cities are by nature functionally and socially mixed, supporting a wide range of complementary activities, and embody multiple cultural values. Historic cities were vibrant, convivial, inspiring and have proved to be supremely adaptable to incremental and harmonious change. • People are at the heart of heritage conservation policies and projects. Good governance and transparency are key to a sense of ownership of heritage, which allows heritage to strengthen the social fabric and enhances social well-being. • Public spaces like historic parks or plazas are often key to historic parts of towns, or adjacent to historic monuments. • Historic towns, districts, and the historic parts of the cities are valuable for their uniqueness and sense of place. They help to attract tourism, employment and local investment, fostering the sustainable development of the city. They also engender curiosity and in so doing, build an understanding and acceptance of others’ values, history and traditions. In designing the Indicator for Target 11.4, it is also important to consider the key ways in which heritage can make cities and human settlements more inclusive. Some examples include: • Occupations related to cultural heritage, cultural practices, and creativity provide a valuable source of income, dignity, and livelihood. • Culture based livelihoods have the potential for small and micro enterprises empowering local communities and contributing to poverty alleviation. • Enables people to draw on and build on local and knowledge for their livelihoods and problem solving rather than privileging external education and knowledge alone. They offer a diversity of solutions to a wide range of problems. Heritage, both tangible and intangible, thus contributes to the goal of making cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable in a myriad of ways, including by strengthening sense of belonging and of identity of local communities; by promoting social cohesion, inclusion and equity; and as a model of sustainable, traditional settlement patterns. These processes are heterogeneous, complex and multi-dimensional. The challenge for the Indicator for Target 11.4 is to design a metric that expresses a meaningful correlation between these urban goals and heritage safeguarding. ICOMOS believes that measuring increases in the number of cities and settlements that are taking steps to incorporate heritage safeguarding into broader development and development finance governance frameworks offers an effective model for doing so. 3. Recognition of the inter-linkages of natural and cultural heritage The recognition of the inter-linkages of natural and cultural heritage provided by Target 11.4 are critical to harnessing the power of heritage, culture and nature-based solutions for sustainability. The Indicator selected should be agile enough to measure not only increases in the safeguarding of natural or cultural heritage but also in the effectiveness of governance tools at increasing the integration of natural and cultural heritage safeguarding. In the co-joining of cultural and natural heritage, Target 11.4 of course finds a ready antecedent in the World Heritage Convention, among international laws, that natural and cultural heritage. This co-joining is consonant with emerging best practice in the heritage field. A growing body of experience has demonstrated that in many landscapes, natural and cultural heritage are inextricably bound together and that the conservation of these resources would benefit from more integration. Protected natural landscapes and cultural landscapes, for example, share much common ground: both are focused on landscapes where human relationships with the natural environment over time define their essential character. In the World Heritage context, there has been much work done to stimulate the development of new methods and strategies to better integrate nature and culture. 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| ICPD |  |  |  | SUPPORT Indicator 11.7.2: Proportion of women subjected to physical or sexual harassment, by perpetrator and place of occurrence, and by age/5-year bands, in the last 12 months  • The element of ‘safe public spaces’ should be reflected at the indicator level, and seriously considered to avoid reducing the scope of this target and help fill critical measurement gaps under other related targets. This is especially relevant in relation to women and girls who experience sexual harassment and assault worldwide on a daily basis as they go about their routines, as well as safety for children in schools.  • Multi-purpose/Multiple Targets: Disaggregation ‘by place of occurrence’ – such as parks, transportation, educational institutions, places of work, among others – would help satisfy not only this indicator on ‘public spaces’ in this target, but also elements of Target 4.a. on education (“gender sensitive…safe, non-violent…learning environments”), Target 5.2 on violence against women and girls (‘all forms of violence …in the public spheres’, complementing the indicators in green), Target 8.8 on work places (“safe and secure working environments”), Target 11.2 on transportation (“safe transport systems…with special attention to…women”), and Targets 16.1 on violence (´all forms of violence”) and 16.2 on violence against children.  • Data for this indicator for several countries is available and can be collected from specialized violence against women surveys or survey modules (e.g. MICS, DHS), and would be monitored at global level by UN Women. The metadata submission is available on the IAEG site.  Alternative indicator: Proportion of people who report feeling safe walking alone around the area where they live, by sex, age sub-groups, location, among other characteristics. Metadata is available on the IAEG website. This indicator is relevant and welcome for this target, as proposed by stakeholders, but may not respond as fully to multiple targets. |  |  |  |
| ILEP |  |  | ILEP recommends disaggregation of indicators 11.5.1 by the list of characteristics mentioned in 17.18 (income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other relevant characteristics) and related chapeau of the 2030 Agenda. For indicator 11.5.1 we recommend aligning with the Sendai Framework for DRR and explicitly mentioning persons with disabilities. (The Sendai indicator process is parallel) |  |  |  |  |
| International Agency for the Prevention of Blindness (IAPB) |  |  | IAPB asks for any indicator to measure target 11.5. to stay in line with the Sendai Framework for DRR and to be disaggregated by the list of characteristics mentioned in 17.18 (income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other relevant characteristics) |  |  | IAPB asks for any indicator to measure target 11.b. to stay in line with the Sendai Framework for DRR and to be disaggregated by the list of characteristics mentioned in 17.18 (income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other relevant characteristics) |  |
| International Music Council | International Music Council: Percentage of national and local urban development plans developed with direct participation of civil society and which have integrated a specific ‘cultural impact' assessment Comment: In the past, too many development projects have failed because the cultural dimension was not taken into account. Development – premised on values, worldviews, ideological beliefs, vision etc – is itself an act of culture that impacts, benevolently or adversely, on the culture of its intended beneficiaries | International Music Council: Share of cities implementing integrated urban policies that protect and safeguard cultural and natural heritage Comment: we underscore the need for INTEGRATED urban policies Share of national (or municipal) budget devoted to the preservation of cultural and natural resources Comment: if there is not much room for change of the proposed indicator, we would at least favour the more generic notion of "resources" to highlight the dynamic character of heritage Index of development of a multidimensional framework for heritage sustainability |  |  |  |  |  |
| International Women's Health Coalition |  |  |  | IWHC supports this target. |  |  |  |
| LIGHT FOR THE WORLD |  |  | LIGHT FOR THE WORLD recommends disaggregation of indicator 11.5.1 by the list of characteristics mentioned in target 17.18 (income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other relevant characteristics) and related chapeau of the 2030 Agenda. We recommend aligning indicator 11.5.1 with the Sendai Framework for DRR and explicitly mentioning persons with disabilities. |  |  | LIGHT FOR THE WORLD recommends aligning indicator 11.b.1 with the Sendai Framework for DRR and explicitly mentioning persons with disabilities. |  |
| Loomba Foundation |  |  |  | The Loomba Foundation supports the inclusion of this additional indicator, but would like to see any disaggregation of those reporting harassment recognising widows as a key group subjected to harassment. |  |  |  |
| Mistra Urban Futures | Mistra Urban Futures comments: The current wording of Target 11.3 improves on its predecessor. Three comments on indicator 11.3.1: 1. Evidence from the Mistra Urban Futures' project to test the draft targets and indicators (the July 2015 FTR of which was submitted to UNDESA stats division), showed a clear preference in participating cities to avoid 'yes/no' tickbox indicators. This is a national reporting indicator rather than one helping cities. 2. Achieving progress towards this target requires a city-region rather than just city-based approach. Hence in this indicator, replace 'cities' with 'city regions'. 3. 'democratically' will be very hard to define clearly enough to form the basis of uniform international reporting. | Mistra Urban Futures comments: 1. as currently worded, this is not a city-based indicator. It does not specify where such heritage and heritage sites are located (which, within Goal 11, should be cities or city-regions); 2. 'national (or municipal)' is too vague and implies an either-or situation when presumably the intention is to capture relevant budgets from national, regional and local authorities devoted to urban heritage. 3. it doesn't specify where such heritage is located. Is this intended to be anywhere in the country (in which case it does not belong in Goal 11) or in cities/city-regions? This needs specifying. 4. 'national cultural natural heritage' is confusing in two respects: (a) does this imply that only heritage of national significance is to be included? If so, how is this to be defined - and by whom - relative to local, urban or regional significance? (b) 'cultural natural heritage' is a very unfamiliar term. What does it encompass? Does this exclude non-natural cultural heritage? 'cultural AND natural heritage' would make more sense - but, as indicated in the FTR from the Mistra Urban Futures' pilot project to test the draft indicators, participating cities argued strongly that cultural and natural heritage often fall under different jurisdictions within local authorities and between local and other authorities, making such a combination very difficult to handle. Separate questions on each were preferred. | Mistra Urban Futures comments: Adding 'per 100,000 people' to the current wording is an improvement since it provides a rate as basis for comparison across units of different population size. However, the target needs a unit of time to be useful (e.g. per annum). Moreover, neither the target nor indicator contains any spatial unit, which is essential. Presumably this should be city or city region. 'disasters' is vague and needs some definition to distinguish specific events from chronic problems of disastrous proportions to the poor and vulnerable, for instance. Again, please refer to the FTR of the Mistra Urban Futures' pilot project for detailed feedback from participating cities. | Mistra Urban Futures comments: 1. Neither the target nor indicator contains a spatial unit. 2. The indicator is also ambiguous relative to the target: is such harassment intended to be recorded only when it occurs in such public places? This needs specifying. 3. 'Women' implies adults only. Is the intention not to include females who are legally still minors? 4. Why is harassment of men and males not deemed pertinent? It would be far more useful to seek reporting on both genders (separately) in this indicator. | Mistra Urban Futures comments: This wording is identical to that of draft indicator 11.3.2 in the versions of early 2015. Please see detailed feedback on this in the FTR of the Mistra Urban Futures' pilot project testing the draft targets and indicators. | Mistra Urban Futures comments: This is a national reporting indicator of no relevance to individual cities' roles or performance. Please see detailed feedback on this in the FTR of the Mistra Urban Futures' pilot project testing the draft targets and indicators. | Mistra Urban Futures comments: Need clear specification what the baseline 'financial support' is of the percentage is to be reported. On other aspects, please see detailed feedback on this in the FTR of the Mistra Urban Futures' pilot project testing the draft targets and indicators. |
| Nagorik Uddyog |  |  | Disaggregated data on the deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters, especially for the people from poor and vulnerable communities. | Disaggregated data of women who have faced physical or sexual harassment by perpetrators and place of occurrence, by age, sex, caste, race, class and other forms. |  | Percentage 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, develop and implement in line with the forthcoming Hyogo Framework holistic disaster risk management at all levels. |  |
| Navsarjan Trust |  |  | Navsarjan Trust Disaggregated data on the deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters, especially for the people from poor and vulnerable communities. | Navsarjan Trust Disaggregated data of women who have faced physical or sexual harassment by perpetrators and place of occurrence, by age, sex, caste, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, class and other forms. |  | Navsarjan Trust Percentage 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, develop and implement in line with the forthcoming Hyogo Framework holistic disaster risk management at all levels. |  |
| P&D Factor |  |  |  | SUPPORT Indicator 11.7.2: Proportion of women subjected to physical or sexual harassment, by perpetrator and place of occurrence, and by age/5-year bands, in the last 12 months • The element of ‘safe public spaces’ should be reflected at the indicator level, and seriously considered to avoid reducing the scope of this target and help fill critical measurement gaps under other related targets. This is especially relevant in relation to women and girls who experience sexual harassment and assault worldwide on a daily basis as they go about their routines, as well as safety for children in schools. • Multi-purpose/Multiple Targets: Disaggregation ‘by place of occurrence’ – such as parks, transportation, educational institutions, places of work, among others – would help satisfy not only this indicator on ‘public spaces’ in this target, but also elements of Target 4.a. on education (“gender sensitive…safe, non-violent…learning environments”), Target 5.2 on violence against women and girls (‘all forms of violence …in the public spheres’, complementing the indicators in green), Target 8.8 on work places (“safe and secure working environments”), Target 11.2 on transportation (“safe transport systems…with special attention to…women”), and Targets 16.1 on violence (´all forms of violence”) and 16.2 on violence against children. • Data for this indicator for several countries is available and can be collected from specialized violence against women surveys or survey modules (e.g. MICS, DHS), and would be monitored at global level by UN Women. The metadata submission is available on the IAEG site. Alternative indicator: Proportion of people who report feeling safe walking alone around the area where they live, by sex, age sub-groups, location, among other characteristics. Metadata is available on the IAEG website. This indicator is relevant and welcome for this target, as proposed by stakeholders, but may not respond as fully to multiple targets. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ See page 657 in IAEG-SDGs, Compilation of Metadata Received on Indicators for Global Monitoring of the Sustainable Development Goals and Targets, as of October 23, 2015: http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/Metadata%20Compilation%20for%20SDG%20Indicators%2023%20October%202015%20Update.pdf Ibid. See pages 714-715. |  |  |  |
| Plan International |  |  | Plan International Comments: RECOMMENDED INDICATOR: 11.5.1 Number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters per 100,000 people. Further disaggregation: by sex and age RATIONALE: Inequalities in social relations, economic assets and political power exacerbate human vulnerabilities, as a result, the impact of disasters worsens the unequal conditions faced by women, children, indigenous peoples and the elders, among others DISAGGREGATIONS: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) DATA SOURCE: National Disaster Loss Databases, 85 (will be more than 115 by 2016) RESPONSIBLE ENTITY: UNISDR TIER: II | \*\* RECOMMENDED INDICATORS 7.3 AND 7.4 INCLUDED BELOW Plan International comments: RECOMMENDED INDICATOR: 11.7.2 Proportion of women and girls subjected to physical or sexual harassment by perpetrator and place of occurrence (last 12 months) Further disaggregation: age RATIONALE: Girls and women are subject to and fear physical and sexual harassment in public spaces every day. This restricts freedom of movement, impacts their ability to participate in public life, and negatively impacts their health and well-being. DISAGGREGATIONS: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ RECOMMENDED INDICATOR: 11.7.3 Percentage of women and girls who say they ever feel safe when in public spaces, noting under what circumstances they do and do not feel safe RATIONALE: In public spaces and settlements across many parts of the world, girls and women report feeling unsafe. In some cities, one in five girls chooses not to venture outside the home alone for fear of violence. DISAGGREGATIONS: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) DATA SOURCE: This has been piloted by Plan International in their research on safer cities in 3 countries. The baseline report is being developed. RESPONSIBLE ENTITY: Suggestion would be to further develop this in conjunction with UN Women and UN Habitat. TIER: III \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ RECOMMENDED INDICATOR: 11.7.4 Percentage of women and girls who say they have access to safe public spaces RATIONALE: Across 3 countries, 27% of girls said that they never feel safe in public spaces throughout their community. DISAGGREGATIONS: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) DATA SOURCE: This has been piloted by Plan International in their research on safer cities in 3 countries. The baseline report is being developed. RESPONSIBLE ENTITY: Suggestion would be to further develop this in conjunction with UN Women and UN Habitat. TIER: III |  |  |  |
| Practical Action | Practical Action endorses this indicator. |  | Practical Action comments that the Sendai framework will be collecting information beyond just the number of people affected. It also measures economic losses. And additional indicator should therefore be included here on reducing direct disaster economic losses in relation to GDP, as this will harmonise with the Sendai framework and cause no additional obligation on states. |  | Practical Action would like to ensure that these plans are 'based on effective stakeholder engagement that includes participation from poor and vulnerable communities' as well as the aspiration to integrate population projections and resource needs. |  |  |
| Rastriya Dalit Network (RDN) Nepal |  |  |  |  |  |  | Indicator 16.5.1: 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 |
| Saferworld |  |  |  | We would propose use of the indicator "percentage of people who feel safe walking home at night in the area they live". This methodologically sound indicator is widely used and tested on a global level, notably by Gallup but also my several NSOs (e.g. through the SHaSHA process in Africa). Feelings of safety are perceived states and so should be gathered through survey data. We would propose for this indicator sits in Goal 16 (either in target 16.1 or target 16.a) but is also used for target 11.7 by disaggregating by urban-rural, something that Gallup and others already do with this indicator. Furthermore, when disaggregated by gender it becomes useful for Goal 5 on gender. |  |  |  |
| Sightsavers |  |  | 11.5.1 Sightsavers comment: We recommend disaggregation of indicators 1.4.1, 1.5.1, and 11.5.1 by the list of characteristics mentioned in 17.18 (income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other relevant characteristics) and related chapeau of the 2030 Agenda. Additionally, for indicators 1.5.1, 11.5.1, 11.b.1, and 13.1.1 Sightsavers also recommends aligning with the Sendai Framework for DRR and explicitly mentioning persons with disabilities (the Sendai indicator process is parallel). |  |  | 11.b.1: Sightsavers comments: For indicators 1.5.1, 11.5.1, 11.b.1, and 13.1.1 Sightsavers also recommends aligning with the Sendai Framework for DRR and explicitly mentioning persons with disabilities (the Sendai indicator process is parallel). |  |
| SIWI (Stockholm International Water Institute) |  |  | SIWIORGANISATION SIWI COMMENTS: We support the proposal by UN-Water: For target 11.5, UN-Water notes that the proposed indicator actually includes several aspects that cannot be coherently aggregated into one numerical value, and we thus highly recommend the replacement of the proposed indicator with new indicators that allow reporting incorporating disaggregation by type of disaster and different types of losses (e.g., number of deaths and missing people; functional losses of critical infrastructure such as water supply and treatment plants, emergency shelters, power plants, and health-related facilities; and population with access to early warnings of disasters). Countries would benefit from this approach as it allows increased understanding of the dimensions of the losses from disasters and the ability of the country to have advanced warnings of disasters. Any indicator should disaggregate by type of disaster. We acknowledge that this indictor needs to be harmonized with the on-going indicator development of the Sendai process. |  |  |  |  |
| Stockholm Environment Institute | Stockholm Environment Institute staff recommend the use of the above indicator to monitor the participatory aspects of this goal | Indicator 11.4.1: Share of national (or municipal) budget which is dedicated to preservation, protection and conservation of national cultural natural heritage, including World Heritage sites Stockholm Environment Institute staff agree with the need for monitoring within this area, but believe the proposed indicators does not account for propensity of cultural and natural heritage sites to be managed under the aegis of civil society organisations (i.e. charities and local community members) so may underestimate the level of protection these receive; a more holistic indicator would capture all domestic expenditures intended for the maintenance of cultural and natural heritage sites. |  |  |  |  | Stockholm Environment Institute staff recommend the use of this proposed indicator. |
| Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN) |  |  |  | SDSN comments: This indicator measures a very important issue, well articulated in target 5.2, but we have concerns about it being featured under Goal 11, as it is not unique to urban areas or relevant to the specific target which is about inclusive, accessible public spaces. We suggest it be replaced with the Indicator 16.1.4 "Proportion of people that feel safe walking alone at night around the area they live." As a back up, we would at least recommend adding "harassment in public spaces" to the original indicator. | SDSN comments: We would like to second the proposal of UN Habitat and other urban groups to adapt this indicator so that is assesses the presence of a National Urban Policy (as well as the presence of national and regional development plans) as national government engagement will be crucial for a coherent set of regional development plans. We commend efforts to identify criteria for such plans, but would encourage the IAEG-SDG to keep the methodology simple and to avoid the measure having multiple composite parts. |  |  |
| Sustainable World Initiative | This indicator does not address whether the urban planning and management are sustainable. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The Danish Family Planning Association |  |  |  | Alternativ suggestion: Proportion of people who report feeling safe walking alone around the area where they live, by sex, age sub-groups, location, among other characteristics. Metadata is available on the IAEG website. This indicator is relevant and welcome for this target, as proposed by stakeholders, but may not respond as fully to multiple targets. |  |  |  |
| UN Major Group for Children and Youth | Simple classification of 'participation structures', 'regularly' or 'democratically' can be misleading. All of these need to be contextualized. Participation structures should specify budgeting (what extent and percentage of the municipal budget is subject to the mechanisms of the participatory approach) The parameter should be applied to municipal and city planning and managing. Measuring the scope and the actual extent of influence | complement UNSSO's proposal "Number and percentage of labour force that holds a heritage occupation or is employed in the heritage sector." Yet still require specification what the standard quality is to maintain the natural and cultural heritage | Disaggregation by age., gender and decent.. the disaster causality are heavily disproportionately allocated to age groups. |  | - Supplement by including the indocators on inequality among cities and between urban and rural areas. - Masure the rural authority, too. The indicator should be lined that "participation of all authorities from urban, peri-urban and rural area to design | Agree with countries to alline this with the Sendai Framewrok in indicators. Support Philippine and others to stipulate that "include vulnerable and marginalized groups in design, implementation and monitoring" with an addtion of words in the end "review of policy" | MOD: Support the idea of Mexico's proposal "Percentage of financial support that is allocated to the construction and retrofitting of sustainable, resilient and resource-efficient buildings and areas suitable for human development." / nees to include "technical assistance" and "utilizing local and sustainably produuced materials in respect of internationally and nationally recognised human rights", so that we will not promote the multi-national company to take over nor child labour, violation labour rights products etc. |
| Vanderbilt International Anesthesia | % of population with water within 10 mins of each community-women raped getting water needs to be decreased |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VENRO Working Group Disability and Development |  |  | VENRO Working Group Disability and Development, Germany, recommends aligning this indicator with the Sendai Framework for DRR. Furthermore the indicator shall be disaggregated by the list of characteristics mentioned in 17.18 (income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other relevant characteristics) and related chapeau of the 2030 Agenda. |  |  |  |  |
| Women Deliver |  |  |  | •Women Deliver Support UN Women's Recommendation: 11.7: “Proportion of women and children subjected to physical or sexual harassment, in the last 12 months, by perpetrator and place of occurrence”. Please refer to Women Delivers indicators position paper for the justification on this proposal: http://www2.unwomen.org/~/media/headquarters/attachments/sections/library/publications/2015/indicatorpaper-en-final.pdf?v=1&d=20150921T140212 • The element of ‘safe public spaces’ should be reflected at the indicator level, and seriously considered to avoid reducing the scope of this target and help fill critical measurement gaps under other related targets. This is especially relevant in relation to women and girls who experience sexual harassment and assault worldwide on a daily basis as they go about their routines, as well as safety for children in schools. • Multi-purpose/Multiple Targets: Disaggregation ‘by place of occurrence’ – such as parks, transportation, educational institutions, places of work, among others – would help satisfy not only this indicator on ‘public spaces’ in this target, but also elements of Target 4.a. on education (“gender sensitive…safe, non-violent…learning environments”), Target 5.2 on violence against women and girls (‘all forms of violence …in the public spheres’, complementing the indicators in green), Target 8.8 on work places (“safe and secure working environments”), Target 11.2 on transportation (“safe transport systems…with special attention to…women”), and Targets 16.1 on violence (´all forms of violence”) and 16.2 on violence against children. • Data for this indicator for several countries is available and can be collected from specialized violence against women surveys or survey modules (e.g. MICS, DHS), and would be monitored at global level by UN Women. The metadata submission is available on the IAEG site. |  |  |  |
| Women for Women's Human Rights - New Ways | WWHR - New Ways suggests: 11.3.2 Support, with the following edits: Percentage of cities with direct participation structure of civil society in urban planning and management, which operates regularly and democratically that are widely announced by the government with provisions of separate but integrated participation from women and girls |  | WWHR - New Ways suggests: 11.5.1 1) Number of people affected by hazardous events by age, sex, and socioeconomic status (including deaths, missing people, injured, relocated, or evacuated due to disasters); and 2) Number of initiatives that engage the most marginalized and vulnerable groups, including women, girls and others, in disaster-preparedness, adaptation and resilience initiatives at local, national and regional levels. | WWHR - New Ways supports gray indicator with addition of “woman ADD[and girls]”, as well as the following additional indicator: 11.7.3. Percentage of women and girls that are part of the planning process and percentage of women and girls who say they have access to safe spaces, age, civil status, disability, education level, ethnicity, geographic location, income, migrant status, IDPs, refugees. |  |  |  |
| Women's Environment and Development Organization | WEDO: Support, with the following edits: Percentage of cities with direct participation structure of civil society in urban planning and management, which operates regularly and democratically, that is widely announced by the government and includes provisions for separate but integrated participation by women and girls |  | WEDO: Revise 11.5.1, and also include a second part. 11.5.1 (1) Number of people affected by hazardous events by age, sex, and socioeconomic status (including deaths, missing people, injured, relocated, or evacuated due to disasters); and (2) Number of initiatives that engage the most marginalized and vulnerable groups, including women, girls and others, in disaster-preparedness, adaptation and resilience initiatives at local, national and regional levels. Remove 'per 100,000' because it does not reflect realities of small country populations in SIDS/LDCS or reflect the relative impact of disasters on small population sizes. | WEDO: We support grey indicator 11.7.2. We also suggest the following additional indicator: Percentage of women and girls that are part of the planning process and percentage of women and girls who say they have access to safe spaces, by age, civil status, disability, education level, ethnicity, geographic location, income, migrant status, IDPs, refugees. | WEDO: Support the grey indicator with the addition of making a gender analysis. 11.a.1 Cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants that implement urban and regional development plans integrating population projections and resource needs based on gender gap analysis. Comments: In "smart city" planning, and where city design and planning is led almost entirely by men, the gendered nature of urban poverty, safety issues and exclusion in expanding cities is amplified. Gender gap analysis will ensure better utilisation of resources. Gender analysis with regards to using spaces, assets and resources would result in more economically viable spaces that are available for use by all, rather than sprawling cities that lead to exclusion of women and vulnerable groups. | WEDO: Support grey indicator 11.b.1, with the following edits, to reflect that this is one of the few indicators that could support early action on climate change and should incorporate language to that effect: Percent of cities that are implementing climate action, risk reduction and resilience strategies aligned with accepted international frameworks (such as Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction) that include vulnerable and marginalized groups in their design, implementation and monitoring |  |
| Women's Major Group/ International Women's Health Coalition | Women's Major Group supports this indicator with the following edits: Percentage of cities with direct participation structure of civil society in urban planning and management, which operates regularly and democratically that are widely announced by the government with provisions of separate but integrated participation from women and girls | Women's Major Group proposes the below indicator. 11.4.1 The proportion of population that is involved in preservation activities of cultural and natural heritage, in buildings, customs and positive traditions and cultural practices. | Women's Major Group proposes the below indicator. 11.5.1 1) Number of people affected by hazardous events by age, sex, and socioeconomic status (including deaths, missing people, injured, relocated, or evacuated due to disasters); and 2) Number of initiatives that engage the most marginalized and vulnerable groups, including women, girls and others, in disaster-preparedness, adaptation and resilience initiatives at local, national and regional levels. | The Women's Major Group supports the grey indicator, as well as the following additional indicator: Percentage of women and girls that are part of the planning process and percentage of women and girls who say they have access to safe spaces, age, civil status, disability, education level, ethnicity, geographic location, income, migrant status, IDPs, refugees. | Women's Major Group indicator proposal below. 11.a.1 Cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants that implement urban and regional development plans integrating population projections and resource needs based on gender gap analysis. Cities are comprised of 50 percent women, but they are designed and planned almost entirely by men leading to gendered nature of urban poverty, safety issues and exclusion in expanding cities. This is particularly true of "smart city " planning. Gender gap analysis will ensure better utilisation of resources. For example instead of creating sprawling pretty cities (like Canberra) that lead to exclusion of women and vulnerable groups, gender analysis with regards to using spaces, assets and resources would result in more economically viable spaces that are available for use by all. | The Women's Major Group supports with the following edits: Percent of cities that are implementing climate responsive risk reduction and resilience strategies aligned with accepted international frameworks (such as the successor to the Sendai Framework for Action on Disaster Risk Reduction) that include vulnerable and marginalized groups in their design, implementation and monitoring This is one of the few indicators that could support early action on climate change. |  |
| WWF | WWF: Proxies for direct participation could include participatory budgetary structure, referenda, and open-house consultations. | WWF: An additional indicator could include percentage of urban area and percentage of historical/cultural and natural sites accorded protected status. |  |  |  | WWF: It would be important to broaden the focus of this indicator to include mitigation issues by including mitigation reporting frameworks such as the Compact of Mayors and Covenant of Mayors. |  |
| ACC (American Chemistry Council) and CEFIC (European Chemical Industry Council) | ACC and CEFIC - SUPPLEMENTAL INDICATOR: Number of industry-wide and sector-specific voluntary programs advancing global standards that systematically enable more sustainable use of resources through environmentally sound technologies, industrial processes, products and consumption practices. COMMENT: Many global industries have recognized common challenges in enhancing sustainability and established voluntary programs to systemically upgrade performance. These are often extended globally and can significantly upgrade standards in developing countries, accelerating progress toward more sustainable production and more sustainable products (consumption). Accounting for such initiatives where they are consistent with national aims would encourage both their development and global propagation. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Amiable Resource | Raised Efficiency principals, quality standards, waste reductions to ground zero ?? Mosaic Balance of many and various spaces and places for different demographics and functions?? | Reduce Legal libraries, minimize various accumulations and recycled dead wastes, expired deficiencies and disfunctional sites to merge or collaborate?? | Prevention and mitigation measures or programs to balance natural selections and risk management?? | Minimal to nil in public places and spaces. ?? Privacy policies, restricted or exclusive processes or establishments vulnerable? | 17 cities across canada working towards cooperative quality efficiency and resilient infrastructures... | Major international cities and capital metropolis require focused investments towards much longer terms durability and higher standard requirements of facilities, utilities and services... | Focused onto waste reduction, efficient durable clean transportation and complete recycling of materials... |
| Center for Governance, Evidence, Ethics, Policy, Practice |  | Center for Governance, Evidence, Ethics, Policy, Practice/USA: We believe the proposed Indicator is not serviceable in its current form. Investment levels by national governments for preservation, protection and conservation of cultural and natural heritage are certainly important, and generally measurable. But taken alone, they represent only inputs which may or may not align with resources required for successful and measurable protection, preservation and conservation. We propose an alternative Indicator below which outputs adds an independent assessment element to establish the needed resource level for investments, and adds a specific measure to address success in protecting heritage under threat.: \*\*\*\* Goal 11 Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable :: Target 11.4 - Strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world's cultural and natural heritage :::: Proposed Indicators - National (or municipal) budget dedicated to preservation, protection and conservation of national cultural and natural heritage - including World Heritage sites - as measured against independent assessments of budgetary resources required - Percentage of World Heritage sites successfully protected and preserved to 2030, specifically those which face threat or compromise conflict, terrorism, economic crisis and/or natural or man-made disaster. \*\*\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |
| International Federation of Freight Forwarders Association (FIATA) |  |  |  |  | Urban deliveries and transport to the peripheries, where only few people live, are challenges for transport of the future. Alternative fuels and the necessary fuel infrastructure are important feature to improve the environmental impact of heavy duty vehicles. We recommend giving positive incentives for changing behaviour and support the population's adequate supply. We recommend to look at improving passenger transport predominantly, because it has much more potential to change its environmental footprint compared to freight transport. The level of financing into logistics connectivity projects (trains, roads, and ferries) between urban and rural environments can be a good measure for the level of linkages between both areas |  |  |
| Maestral International |  |  |  | Consider "Proportion of women reporting harassment, disaggregated by physical, sexual and place of occurrence." |  |  |  |
| Philips | Philips: - Use of sustainable procurement methodology, such as total-cost over lifetime or other performance incentives over plain initial cost comparisons. |  |  |  |  |  | Philips: - Availability and penetration of pay-per-use models for public/societal infrastructure |
| Eindhoven University of Technology |  | Regarding the comments and the proposed indicator, the budget doesn’t say much (or provide basis for relevant comparison) on the strengthening efforts to protect cultural and natural heritage at a city level. Instead an indicator on the % of urban area under protection policies could be more relevant on the heritage management. This would at least imply or suggest that cities would need to: 1. Document or catalogue the protected assets and their values (and have a baseline to track changes) 2. Implement a specific management plan or/development plan 3. Include such areas and their values (cultural and/or natural) in wider urban plans To add to the suggestion made by Brazil, rather than number of protected goods, an indicator on % of areas could be interesting to correlate with a budget. This could help to set a basis for comparison whilst providing an idea of the type of heritage a city has to deal with, if it is understood as single monuments or as a whole urban areas such as historic centers etc. |  |  |  |  |  |
| IPTI | The IPTI suggests measuring not only the presence of participation structures, but also the quality of participation therein. Our qualitative research enables these distinctions. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| new York University |  |  |  | excellent indicator |  |  |  |
| Wayne State University School of Medicine |  |  |  | Add a category for children. |  |  |  |

| **Country/Organisation** | **Goal 12: Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Target 12.2:**By 2030, achieve the sustainable management and efficient use of natural resources. | **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. | **Target 12.8:**By 2030, ensure that people everywhere have the relevant information and awareness for sustainable development and lifestyles in harmony with nature. | **Target 12.a:**Support developing countries to strengthen their scientific and technological capacity to move towards more sustainable patterns of consumption and production. | **Target 12.b:**Develop and implement tools to monitor sustainable development impacts for sustainable tourism that creates jobs and promotes local culture and products. |
| *Indicator 12.2.1:*Material footprint (MF) and MF/capita | *Indicator 12.4.2:*Treatment of waste, generation of hazardous waste (tonnes), hazardous waste management by type of treatment | *Indicator 12.8.1:* Percentage of educational institutions with formal and informal education curricula on sustainable development and lifestyle topics | *Indicator 12.a.1:*Number of qualified green patent applications over total | *Indicator 12.b.1:*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) |
|  |  |  | *Discussion prompt: The IAEG-SDG Members ask for suggestions for an alternative indicator.* |  |
| **Total comments received** | 25 | 21 | 33 | 16 | 17 |
| Central Statistical Office of Poland |  | CSO of Poland comments: The indicator needs further clarification. CSO od Poland proposes following alternative indicators: - concerning treatment of waste - indicators on treatment of waste in tonnes and treatment of waste in % of waste generated; - concerning hazardous waste management - we suggest to precise types of treatment, for example incineration, landfilling etc. - additionally we propose indicator on treatment of hazardous waste in tonnes and in % of hazardous waste generated. |  |  |  |
| Government of Japan | Japan considers that the suggested indicator requires further efforts to collect necessary information, taking into account that there is no common methodology for MF and many developing countries may not have enough information to calculate MF. Therefore, sufficient and ample time should be given for discussion, in considering the development of this indicator. | Japan: Amount of generated waste as well as treated waste are more directly related to the target, and easy to understand. These 4 items are appropriate for each country to measure their own situations. 1. Total amount of generation of waste (tonnes) 2. Total amount of waste treated in an environmentally sound way (tonnes) 3. Total amount of generation of hazardous waste (tonnes) 4. Total amount of hazardous waste treated in an environmentally sound way (tonnes) (Because we can't understand the meaning of current three indicators, we don't know how to measure.) |  | Japan: If the support developing countries to strengthen their scientific and technological capacity is the goal, we suggest the indicator like ODA which shows how those developing countries are supported. Even if strengthening their scientific and technological capacity is the goal,　the number of patent application is not proportional to the scientific and technological capacity. Thus the number of patent application is not appropriate as the indicator and the number of qualified green patent is also unclear. As the indicator which shows the scientific and technological capacity, we wonder if the number of researcher is an appropriate indicator. |  |
| Hungarian Central Statistical Office | HU: The indicator of Domestic Material Consumption (DMC) would be a relevant alternatives. |  |  | HU: We suggest to change this indicator. The recommended indicator:The EMS and labelling. |  |
| Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Censos |  | The methodology to calculate this indicator should be determined. |  | There is no relation between Target 12.a and the proposed indicator, we suggest the elimination of this indicator. |  |
| ISTAT | Istat-Italy: we support the SEEA and disagree with the use of material footprint. This indicator is connected with 8.4.1 | Istat-Italy: we support the inclusion of this additional indicator | Istat-Italy: we suggest to retain the original indicator proposal, which better reflects the integration of sustainable development in formal education curricula | Istat-Italy: we suggest more methodological work Comments by Ministry of Environment: "To assess new technological capacity in developing countries for example through technical cooperation projects " | Istat-Italy: we support the Tourism Satellite Accounts and the SEEA. Thi indicator is connected to 8.9.1 |
| National Statistical Institute, Spain |  |  | Percentage of educational institutions with formal and informal education curricula. Nothing to add, but better if non formal curricula are linked with official education curricula in each country. |  |  |
| Singapore Department of Statistics |  | The current formulation of the additional indicator lacks clarity as to what it wishes to measure e.g. what does "treatment of waste" / "hazardous waste management by type of treatment" measures? |  |  |  |
| Statistics Denmark | The indicator is not sufficient. Further work is need on the indicator to cover the state of the natural ressources. It is suggested to maintain indicator and amend it with additional indicator. |  | Not acceptable. As the target relates to the access to information an alternative indicator could be: “number of countries that have implemented the Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters (Aarhus Convention)”. |  |  |
| Statistics Finland | Finland comments that these indicators do not necessarily give a complete picture of the impact of material use in a country. It doesn’t make difference between export and import, so export-led countries have also in their footprint materials consumed elsewhere. This indicator doesn’t make difference between environmental impacts either. Fairly “sensitive” indicator. |  | Finland comments that proposed indicator doesn't seem to measure the content of education. The indicator "Number of countries reporting inclusion of sustainable development and lifestyles topics in formal education curricula" is better than the new proposal. |  |  |
| Statistics Lithuania |  | Move to green | Move to green |  | Metodological framework needed |
| Statistics Portugal |  | We support the inclusion of this indicator. | Percentage of educational institutions with formal and informal education curricula –  Clarification is required in order to comparably identify curricula referring to education in sustainable development and lifestyles in harmony with nature. |  | This indicator is very difficult to be computed in a foreseeable time horizon. |
| Swiss Federal Statistical Office | Switzerland comments: It's an important indicator, because due to globalization, an important part of Swiss (and many other developed countries') resource use is generated abroad. Therefore the widely used domestic material consumption DMC provides an incomplete picture. Switzerland has produced a pilot indicator of the material footprint (raw material consumption RMC) in line with Eurostat requirements. |  |  | Switzerland comments: The indicators for targets 12.a.1 und 17.6.1 refer to patents (“Number of qualified green patent applications” and “Access to patent information (WIPO Patent Database) and use of the international IP system”). We think that it is crucial that these indicators are closely consulted with the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), which is an observer in the discussions on the indicators, to ensure that these indicators can be applied in practice and are actually measurable. Moreover, we wonder whether the indicator “Number of qualified green patent applications” is clear enough (what is a “qualified” green patent application?) and whether the focus on patent applications is adequate (by far not all patents applied for will in the end be granted) or whether the focus should rather be on the granted patents. |  |
| TurkStat |  | Turkstat comments: The suggested indicators are thought to be very complex and unclear. Moreover, it is expected one indicator under the title of indicator 12.4.2, but it is seen that there are more than one indicator under the title of indicator 12.4.2, so it is somehow confusing. Therefore, it is recommended to specify the indicator which follows the goal as "The generated amount of hazardous waste in tonnes" or "The recovered amount of hazardous waste in tonnes". |  |  | Turkstat comments: This indicator should be much more clear and less difficult to measure. |
| United States | US: Measurement of MF against units of economic output would be more appropriate to gauge resource efficiency. (We note those in extreme poverty may have the smallest MF.)  12.2.1. "Material footprint measured against GDP" Since COPS 21 has just concluded, we may have more comments to convey. | US: We recommend including a concept of risk to proposed revisions to this indicator. This risk could focus on those aspects/circumstances of exposure to waste likely to cause the most public or environmental harm. Since COPS 21 has just concluded, we may have more comments to convey. | US: No comments at this time. Since COPS 21 has just concluded, we may have more comments to convey. | US: The number of qualified “green” (definition?) patent applications over total is but one indicator or measure of a country’s progress in meeting Target 12.a. There are other factors that may have greater impact on a country’s ability to meet this target namely: regulatory coherence/policies, infrastructure, educated professionals/workers, etc. We would like to see these included among indicators for this target. Since COPS 21 has just concluded, we may have more comments to convey. | US: No comments at this time. Since COPS 21 has just concluded, we may have more comments to convey. |
| Eurostat | This indicator is an important resource efficiency and green economy indicator in the EU. More development work (only parts of the material footprint to be used!) needed at a later stage to achieve full coverage of the target. | This is a new indicator - most data on generation of hazardous waste available in ESS. The indicator could be possibly made GREEN. | The proposed indicator seems not suitable for the target which is very specific (information/awareness for sustainable development and lifestyles in harmony with nature). In addition, data to calculate the indicator is currently not collected by Eurostat (we do not have information on the number of institutions and we cover only formal education). | In the absense of any other indicators for this target, this indicator could possibly be considered GREEN and used in a transition period until other indicators are developed. A possible alternative would be the number of qualified green patent applications with co-inventors located in lower- as well as higher-income countries, over total. Please note that Eurostat does not collect this type of data (see other sources e.g. OECD) | The indicator does not address the development and implementation of monitoring tools. Further methodological work is needed at a later stage to achieve better coverage of the target. Development work should be done using the SEEA framework. |
| International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) | IUCN suggests consideration of the “Red List Index (impacts of utilisation)” as an indicator towards SDG Target 12.2. This is also a proposed indicator towards SDG Target 15.7, for which IUCN submitted metadata on 30 Jul 2015, provided on pages 376–384 of the “Compilation of Metadata Received on Indicators for Global Monitoring of the Sustainable Development Goals and Targets” (http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/Metadata%20Compilation%20for%20SDG%20Indicators%2023%20October%202015%20Update.pdf). It is based on an existing indicator used for tracking progress towards Aichi Target 4 of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020, and mobilised through the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (http://www.bipindicators.net/redlistindexforbirdsmammalsandamphibians). It shows trends in the aggregate extinction risk of species driven solely by the negative impacts of unsustainable utilisation or successful efforts to improve sustainability of use, and excluding trends driven by other factors. IUCN stands ready to provide any further support in documentation or interpretation as useful. |  |  |  |  |
| OECD | We suggest "Non-energy material productivity, GDP per unit of Domestic Material Consumption". This could be complemented by a footprint indicator: "Material consumption (consumption-based) /net national income" |  |  |  |  |
| UN World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO) |  |  |  |  | UNWTO comment: UNEP will submit a joint OECD/UNEP/UNWTO comment and suggestion. |
| UNEP | UNEP Comments: UNEP would like to propose similar indicators for 8.4 and 12.2. The two indicators for 12.2 are: a) DMC (domestic material consumption) and DMC per capita.; and b) MF (material footprint) and MF per capita Domestic Material Consumption (DMC) is a standard material flow accounting (MFA) indicator and reports the apparent consumption of materials in a national economy. It is calculated as direct imports (IM) of material plus domestic extraction (DE) of materials minus direct exports (EX) of materials measured in metric tonnes. DMC measures the amount of materials that are used in economic processes. It does not include materials that are mobilized the process of domestic extraction but do not enter the economic process. The DMC indicator is a proxy for overall environmental pressure of national economy and has a clear link with environmental impacts of various kinds. There are studies that have applied impact factors to DMC data and they show that the DMC is also a very good proxy for environmental impact. DMC is based on official economic statistics and it requires some modelling to adapt the source data to the methodological requirements of the MFA. The accounting standard and accounting methods are set out in the EUROSTAT guidebooks for MFA accounts in the latest edition of 2013. MFA accounting is also part of the central framework of the System of integrated Environmental-Economic Accounts (SEEA). Material footprint (MF) is the attribution of global material extraction to domestic final demand of a country. It is calculated as raw material equivalent of imports (RMEIM) plus domestic extraction (DE) minus raw material equivalents of exports (RMEEX). For the attribution of the primary material needs of final demand a global, multi-regional input-output (MRIO) framework is employed. The attribution method based on I-O analytical tools is described in detail in Wiedmann et al. 2015. It is based on the EORA MRIO framework developed by the University of Sydney, Australia (Lenzen et al. 2013) which is an internationally well-established and the most detailed and reliable MRIO framework available to date. DMC reports the amount of materials that are used that are used in a national economy. DMC is a territorial (production side) indicator. DMC also presents the amount of material that needs to be handled within an economy, which is either added to material stocks of buildings and transport infrastructure or used to fuel the economy as material throughput. DMC describes the physical dimension of economic processes and interactions. It can also be interpreted as long-term waste equivalent. Per-capita DMC describes the average level of material use in an economy – an environmental pressure indicator - and is also referred to as metabolic profile. Material footprint of consumption reports the amount of primary materials required to serve final demand of a country and can be interpreted as an indicator for the material standard of living/level of capitalization of an economy. Per-capita MF describes the average material use for final demand. DMC and MF need to be looked at in combination as they cover the two aspects of the economy, production and consumption. The DMC reports the actual amount of material in an economy, MF the virtual amount required across the whole supply chain to service final demand. A country can, for instance have a very high DMC because it has a large primary production sector for export or a very low DMC because it has outsourced most of the material intensive industrial processes to other countries. The material footprint corrects for both phenomena. Data is available from different national or international datasets in the domain of agriculture, forestry, fisheries, mining and energy statistics. International statistical sources for DMC and MF include the IEA, USGS, FAO and COMTRADE databases. The DMC indicator can be disaggregated into imports, domestic extraction and exports by a large number of material follow categories. At the highest level of aggregation biomass, fossil fuels, metal ores and non-metallic minerals are distinguished. DMC is usually reported for 11 material categories, DE for 44 material categories. The MF indicator can be disaggregated to four main material categories, a varying number of economic sectors whose expenditure require materials and to three domestic final demand sectors (household consumption, government consumption and capital investment) and foreign final demand (i.e. exports). UNEP publishes a material flow dataset which includes the DMC indicator for 180 countries, the seven UNEP world regions and the world, for the time period 1970 – 2010 www.uneplive.unep.org on each country page in the section ‘UNEP resources’ under the category ‘natural resources’. | UNEP Comments: UNEP would propose the following indicators produced through SAICM: a)Number of countries (and major companies – to be determined) that have developed sound chemicals management corporate policies and practices throughout the value chain, covering extended producer responsibility, communication about chemical hazards and risks both for chemicals and chemicals in products as well as the promotion of green design and BAT/BEP and b) Number of countries with institutional, legal, and regulatory frameworks for the sound management of chemicals and waste, including enforcement of national legislation and prevention of illegal traffic. The Parties to the Basel Convention submit national reports on indicator 12.4.2; currently there are 183 parties. The national reporting template can be viewed at: http://www.basel.int/Procedures/NationalReporting/tabid/1332/Default.aspx Annual national reports include quantitative information on the amount of the generation of hazardous and other wastes (also by Y categories (e.g. Y9 - Waste oils/water, hydrocarbons/water mixtures, emulsions), export and import of hazardous wastes and other wastes, including indication if they are destined for recycling or disposal and accidents occurred during the transboundary movement and disposal of hazardous wastes and other wastes. Also the national reports require narrative information on reduction and/or elimination of the generation of hazardous wastes and other wastes and reduction of the amount of hazardous wastes and other wastes subject to the transboundary movement, effect on human health and the environment, disposal and recovery facilities. | UNEP Comments: UNEP suggests that the indicators suggested in 4.7 could be relevant for this target. | UNEP Comments: UNEP suggests the following indicators: a) Number of clean technology patent applications; b) R&D spending on environmentally sound technologies; c )International co-authorship in the field of SCP The number of clean technology patent applications can be determined using Climate Tagger a word search in patent applications for climate ontologies. For international patent applications this approach could be applied to the WIPO database. Data are limited, especially for developing countries on R&D spending on environmentally sound technologies, however, this indicator has a strong relationship with the target and should be developed. | UNEP Comments: UNEP, OECD, UNWTO and UNEP propose the following priority indicator: Number of sustainable tourism strategies or policies, and implemented action plans, with agreed monitoring, and evaluation tools. This indicator can rely on policy surveys and tools such as the Tourism Satellite Account, the System of Environmental-Economic Accounting, and other tools to monitor the development at destination level and will be possible for a large group of countries to implement. UNWTO will provide additional information on the metadata. |
| UNESCO Institute for Statistics |  |  | Comments from UNESCO-UIS Targets 4.7 and 12.8 are linked and could be addressed by the same global indicator. Target 13.3 deals with similar issues and may be addressed by the same indicator. For Target 4.7 there was general concern about the original indicator and lack of consensus on others proposed during the consultation processes so far. While an outcome-based indicator may be preferred, UNESCO-UIS recommends a new provision- and process-based indicator instead which could also be used for Target 12.8 and possibly Target 13.3. It is more comprehensive than the original indicator proposed by the IAEG-SDGs for Target 4.7. The new indicator is included in the proposed thematic set of education indicators developed by the Technical Advisory Group for the Post-2015 Education Indicators (TAG) and is the TAG’s recommended global reporting indicator for Target 4.7. The indicator is: Extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education for sustainable development (including climate change education) are mainstreamed in (a) national education policies (b) curricula (c) teacher education and (d) student assessment It is a qualitative indicator. Unlike the other indicators proposed so far for Target 4.7 the new indicator captures a broader range of concepts in this complex target. A mechanism needs to be developed to collect the information needed for this indicator. At the global level, UNESCO has the mandate for both global citizenship education and education for sustainable development and therefore would be the body responsible for collecting this information. Metadata for this indicator are available and have been submitted today to UNSD. If the IAEG Members have questions about this proposal please contact UIS Director, Silvia Montoya (uis.director@unesco.org) and Alison Kennedy (a.kennedy@unesco.org). |  |  |
| UNESCO-IHE |  |  | UNESCO-IHE: Most of the population will not be reached via educational institutions, so by measuring only their efforts, this would not reflect overall progress towards reaching as many members of society as possible. An alternative/extended indicator would also capture Open Data initiatives (to indicate the availability of relevant information), no. of initiatives to crowdsource environmental data (and their numbers of active users), as well as other awareness raising initiatives in traditional and new (social) media. |  |  |
| World Bank |  | These are three indicators; suggest separating and using only one. |  |  |  |
| Bread for the World |  |  |  |  | Bread for the World: In addition to the SEEA also social costs need to be taken into account. The environmental accounting should also reflect the environmental costs of international tourism mobility. |
| Brookings |  |  | Jasodhara Bhattacharya, Brookings, USA Disaggregate the formal and informal education curricula. It would be useful to track where in the ecology of education the sustainable development and lifestyle topics are being introduced - formal, informal or both. Ideally, the entire ecology of education should support this rather than receiving conflicting messages from various sources. It might also be useful to disaggregate this information to track whether other structural supports can bolster such curricula where it is taught in the informal sector e.g. building partnerships with community organizations, providing students extra-curricular and co-curricular opportunities to participate in civil society such as eco-clubs. Also disaggregate sustainable development from lifestyles in harmony with nature. They are not the same concept, necessarily, and should not be conflated if possible. Lifestyles in harmony with nature are an ecocentric perspective and sustainable development is anthropocentric with a scope that encompasses economic growth. |  |  |
| Brookings |  |  | Jasodhara Bhattacharya, Brookings, USA Disaggregate the formal and informal education curricula. It would be useful to track where in the ecology of education the sustainable development and lifestyle topics are being introduced - formal, informal or both. Ideally, the entire ecology of education should support this rather than receiving conflicting messages from various sources. It might also be useful to disaggregate this information to track whether other structural supports can bolster such curricula where it is taught in the informal sector e.g. building partnerships with community organizations, providing students extra-curricular and co-curricular opportunities to participate in civil society such as eco-clubs. Also disaggregate sustainable development from lifestyles in harmony with nature. They are not the same concept, necessarily, and should not be conflated if possible. Lifestyles in harmony with nature are an ecocentric perspective and sustainable development is anthropocentric with a scope that encompasses economic growth. |  |  |
| Brookings |  |  | Jasodhara Bhattacharya, Brookings, USA Disaggregate the formal and informal education curricula. It would be useful to track where in the ecology of education the sustainable development and lifestyle topics are being introduced - formal, informal or both. Ideally, the entire ecology of education should support this rather than receiving conflicting messages from various sources. It might also be useful to disaggregate this information to track whether other structural supports can bolster such curricula where it is taught in the informal sector e.g. building partnerships with community organizations, providing students extra-curricular and co-curricular opportunities to participate in civil society such as eco-clubs. Also disaggregate sustainable development from lifestyles in harmony with nature. They are not the same concept, necessarily, and should not be conflated if possible. Lifestyles in harmony with nature are an ecocentric perspective and sustainable development is anthropocentric with a scope that encompasses economic growth. |  |  |
| Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International |  |  | Comments from Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International, Netherlands  Include availability of public and scientific information to percentage of population on environment and sustainable development, in addition to public educational institutions. | Comments from Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International, Netherlands  Percentage and absolute numbers of persons working in sustainable consumption and production jobs. | Comments from Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International, Netherlands   Using UN GSTC sustainable tourism destinations, rtevenues (absolute, per capita and as percentage of GDP) for destinations recognized under GSTC approved and recognized sustainable tourism destinations accreditation processes. |
| Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial research Organisation (CSIRO) | Sustainable resource management is usually measured by what we call the metabolic profile of a country which is defined as per-capita material use. Looked at form a production/territorial perspective this is measured as DMC (Domestic Material Consumption) per capita. From a consumption point of view material footprint (MF) per capita is the relevant measure. A recent report by the OECD demonstrates the reliability of footprint accounts which are now done with global, multi-regional input-output models and a primary material extraction satellite to attribute material extraction, wherever it occurs, to final demand of a country. The material footprint is very important because it shows the true demand for material of a country once trade is taken into account and avoids burden shifting. It is especially important for developing countries which often extract material for consumption abroad. In doing o they accept an environmental pressure and impact for consumers abroad which needs to be measured and addressed. The approach to material footprint accounting is now well established with numerous publications i the scholarly literature, the indicator has been adopted by the UNEP International Resource Panel, data for all countries of the world is available at UNEP Live and OECD and UNEP are collaborating to further improve the data situation which should lead to major data updates and improvements over the next two years. The now available data, nevertheless, is robust and reliable and ready to use. |  |  |  |  |
| Culture Committee, United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG) |  |  |  |  | The Committee on Culture of United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG) wishes to recall that target 12.b aims to “Develop and implement tools to monitor sustainable development impacts for sustainable tourism that creates jobs and promotes local culture and products”. In this context, sustainable tourism clearly goes beyond tourism’s impact on the environment and should also consider its social and cultural relevance. We are concerned that the current draft fails to acknowledge this and focuses too narrowly on the environment. In addition, the target also focuses on the existence and effectiveness of monitoring tools. In this respect, and bearing in mind the suggestions made by the UN SSOs as well as the indicators accepted elsewhere in Goal 12, we suggest an indicator as follows: “Number of countries with monitoring tools on the sustainable development impacts of tourism, including in terms of jobs and the promotion of local culture and products.” |
| Culture et Développement |  |  |  |  | France, Culture et Développement (ngo) Percentage of national and local sustainable tourism development strategies that integrate a cultural chapter AND 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) source: http://www.agenda21culture.net/images/a21c/culturegoal/Indicators\_ENG.pdf |
| Diyalo Pariwar |  | Locally clever solutions need to be explore and local innovation need to be praised and promoted for the sustainable management of hazardous waste at local level in each developing countries. |  |  |  |
| Education International |  |  | Education International proposes using the two indicators that we proposed under target 4.7, i.e. one process indicator that looks at the mechanisms in place to ensure implementation, and one outcome indicator that looks at the extent to which these subjects are covered in formal and non-formal education. 4.7.1 Extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education for sustainable development iii) gender equality and iv) human rights education are mainstreamed in (a) national education policies and plans (b) curricula (c) teacher education and (d) student assessment. 4.7.2 Percentage of teaching hours dedicated to education for sustainable development, global citizenship education, and human rights education (as per UNGA resolution 59/113) in formal and non-formal education. |  |  |
| Fair Trade Advocacy Office |  |  | We support this target and the indicator 12.8.1 to measure it. In order to be coherent with the text of the goal 12, we suggest to take into account not only the curricula on sustainable development and lifestyles, but also those on sustainable consumption by measuring the ‘percentage of educational institutions with formal and informal education curricula on sustainable development, sustainable consumption and lifestyle topics'. Changing the behaviours of citizens and consumers through education can facilitate sustainable development because it pushes the demand of products with a high standard of sustainability and it helps identify new sustainable patterns of consumption and production, respecting the carrying capacities of natural ecosystems. |  |  |
| Fairtrade Foundation |  |  | Fairtrade supports educational institutions which implement education practices concerning sustainable development and lifestyles in harmony with nature and believes that this indicator will encourage counties to implement this into the national programme. For an improvement to this, it may be useful to also include sustainable consumption within this indicator in order to also encourage this to also be implemented into educational practices. |  |  |
| Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei | FEEM: see also previous comment on target 8.4, Direct Material Consumption can be an alternative option (but we agree that a measurement per capita is interesting and maybe more informative than per € of production, evne though using less products/material can be a signal of increased poverty) | FEEM thinks that evaluating this indicator cna be a problem, need to provide a benchmark or define management priorities |  |  | FEEM would add also energy and water use (resource pressure to add to pollution) |
| Global Campaign for Education |  |  | GCE UK suggests using the two indicators proposed for 4.7 as indicators for this. To recap, these were 4.7.1 : Extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education for sustainable development iii) human rights education and iv) comprehensive sexuality education are mainstreamed in (a) national education policies and plans (b) curricula (c) teacher education and (d) student assessment (Structure indicator) 4.7.2: Percentage of teaching hours dedicated to education for sustainable development, global citizenship education, human rights education (as per UNGA resolution 59/113) and comprehensive sexuality education in formal and non-formal education (process indicator) Rationale: The indicators proposed earlier can serve as multipurpose indicators. In so doing it would measure not only the existence of curricula, but also address other enabling structural considerations. At the same time, it would be important to assess the extent to which these domains are transacted in educational settings. Rationale: The indicators proposed earlier can serve as multipurpose indicators. |  |  |
| Global Campaign For Education |  |  | Suggested indicators: Use the two indicators proposed by us for 4.7 as indicators for this. To recap, these were 4.7.1 : Extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education for sustainable development and iii) human rights education are mainstreamed in (a) national education policies and plans (b) curricula (c) teacher education and (d) student assessment (Structure indicator) 4.7.2 % of teaching hours dedicated to education for sustainable development, global citizenship education, human rights education (as per UNGA resolution 59/113) in formal and non-formal education (process indicator) Rationale: The indicators proposed earlier can serve as multipurpose indicators. In so doing it would measure not only the existence of curricula, but also address other enabling structural considerations. At the same time, it would be important to assess the extent to which these domains are transacted in educational settings. |  |  |
| Global Campaign for Education UK |  |  | GCE UK suggests using the two indicators proposed for 4.7 as indicators for this. To recap, these were 4.7.1 : Extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education for sustainable development iii) human rights education and iv) comprehensive sexuality education are mainstreamed in (a) national education policies and plans (b) curricula (c) teacher education and (d) student assessment (Structure indicator) 4.7.2: Percentage of teaching hours dedicated to education for sustainable development, global citizenship education, human rights education (as per UNGA resolution 59/113) and comprehensive sexuality education in formal and non-formal education (process indicator) Rationale: The indicators proposed earlier can serve as multipurpose indicators. In so doing it would measure not only the existence of curricula, but also address other enabling structural considerations. At the same time, it would be important to assess the extent to which these domains are transacted in educational settings. Rationale: The indicators proposed earlier can serve as multipurpose indicators. |  |  |
| ICMM and IPIECA | John Drexhage ICMM/IPIECA Material footprint or MF/capita is an insufficient indicator of how natural resources are being used/exteacted. The best approach for extraction would be a robust transparency regime defined on a case by case (or project by project) basis, comparing a credible (3rd party reviewable) Business As Usual scenario to additional subsequent efforts to improve energy and water use and lessen environmental impact (e.g. limiting tailings from waste water). |  | John Drexhage ICMM/IPIECA Extent to which governments develop information and awareness raising materials regarding Sustainable Development Goals. |  |  |
| Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES) | Comment by the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES) The proposed indicators – Material Footprint (MF) and MF per capita – are the only proposed SDGs indicators that reflect the environmental pressure associated with countries' final consumption of goods and services. This makes them key SCP indicators. The indicator proposed for Target 8.2 – Resource Productivity – accounts for the natural resources used in the production of goods in a country but does not consider the fact that many products produced in one country are exported and consumed elsewhere. The production perspective (how much resources are used in a country for production, regardless of import and export) and the consumption perspective (how much resources are used to produce the goods consumed in a country, taking international trade into consideration) are both important; they are complementary and therefore they both need to be reflected in the SDGs monitoring framework. The methods used for calculating the MF indicator are scientifically sound, fairly well-established and robust enough for monitoring trends towards sustainable consumption and production. A key scientific reference is the following: Wiedmann, T., Schandl, H., Lenzen, M., Moran, D., Suh, S., West, J., Kanemoto, K. (2015). The Material Footprint of Nations. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America (PNAS), 112(20), 6271-6276. |  |  |  |  |
| International Music Council |  |  |  |  | International Music Council Percentage of national and local sustainable tourism development strategies that integrate a cultural chapter Comment: sustainable tourism has to take into account the cultural context in which it is developed |
| International Trade Union Confederation |  |  | 12.8.1 Extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education for sustainable development iii) gender equality and iv) human rights education are mainstreamed in (angel) national education policies and plans (beer) curricula (coffee) teacher education and (d) student assessment. 12.8.2 Percentage of teaching hours dedicated to education for sustainable development, global citizenship education, and human rights education (as per UNGA resolution 59/113) in formal and non-formal education. |  |  |
| ISEAL Alliance |  |  | The ISEAL Alliance welcomes the proposed indicator under this target but notes that this is an indirect proxy at best. National adaption processes for these indicators will be crucial as to decide what ‘relevant information’ is. In countries where sustainability messaging is commonplace (i.e. high income countries) a crucial aspect of this target will be information on credible sustainability claims in the marketplace. In this area, we also note that various ISEAL members and other organisations are already collecting data on consumer awareness about sustainability standards. UEBT’s Biodiversity Barometer, Eurostat’s Eurobarometer which surveys awareness of Fairtrade across the EU, and FSC’s surveys across multiple countries are all notable examples which could be expanded upon and integrated into national level implementation and reporting. | The ISEAL Alliance notes that the current suggested indicator is not accurately reflecting ongoing scientific and technological exchanges to foster more sustainable patterns of consumption and production. We support the WWF's earlier comments in proposing a revision / or an additional indicator, which would cover the “percentage of credibly certified sustainable production of overall production”. Together with other indicators, this could serves as a proxy indicator for strengthening the scientific and technological capacity towards sustainable production. Productive entities in developing countries which comply with (credible) sustainability standards are in effect adopting innovative approaches which improve their sustainability performance. Measuring these concrete practices provides a more accurate view than a ‘patents’ indicator which would be strongly in favour of high-income countries. |  |
| Latin American Campaign for the Right to Education |  |  | Latin American Campaign for the Right to Education proposes: 4.7.1 : Extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education for sustainable development and iii) human rights education are mainstreamed in (a) national education policies and plans (b) curricula (c) teacher education and (d) student assessment (Structure) 4.7.2 % of teaching hours dedicated to education for sustainable development, global citizenship education, human rights education (as per UNGA resolution 59/113) in formal and non-formal education (process indicator) |  |  |
| Malala Fund |  |  | Organisation: Malala Fund Suggested Indicators: 12.8.1 Number of countries reporting the inclusion of sustainable development and lifestyles topics, including human rights, peace education and global citizenship, in formal education curricula. 12.8.2 Percentage of children/young people at the end of each level of education achieving at least a minimum proficiency level in human rights, peace education and global citizenship. Disaggregations: sex and location, and at each level of education from primary through to upper secondary, (and others where data are available). Rationale: States have a duty to ensure “that education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and the sense of its dignity, and shall strengthen the respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. They further agree that education shall enable all persons to participate effectively in a free society, promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations and all racial, ethnic or religious groups, and further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.” |  |  |
| Peruvian Campaign for the Right to Education |  |  | PERU Peruvian Campaing for the Right to Education Indicators proposed: Extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education for sustainable development and iii) human rights education are mainstreamed in (a) national education policies and plans (b) curricula (c) teacher education and (d) student assessment Percentage of teaching hours dedicated to education for sustainable development in formal and non-formal education (process indicator) |  |  |
| Rastriya Dalit Network (RDN) Nepal | Indicator 13.1.1: Number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters per 100,000 people |  |  |  |  |
| SIWI (Stockholm International Water Institute) | Organisation SIWI Comments: Water footprint, as a component of material footprint, is very general indicator that doesn’t capture aspects of water as a local resource well. However, as water is such a fundamental productive natural resource it must be included in any formulation of indicator 12.2.1. | Organisation SIWI Comments: As most of pollutants tend to end up in water it could be wise to expand the monitoring of indicator 6.3.1. “Percentage of receiving water bodies with ambient water quality not presenting risk to the environment or human health” as a way to track the aspects of 12.4 not covered by the proposed indicator. |  |  |  |
| Stockholm Environment Institute | Stockholm Environment Institute staff believe Domestic Material Consumption (DMC) is - on it’s own - inadequate because it is not a full consumption-based indicator. We therefore support the use of a Material Footprint (MF)-type indicator as a measure of sustainable consumption. However, MF is currently ill-defined and needs further development to be fully fit for purpose.. For example, the use of OECD Input-output tables would not cover all countries, rendering the use of a linked MF indicator that uses this data inadequate for global application. There are also implications on indicator results associated with the selection of alternative IO databases and modelling methods which must be identified and understood. Effort must also be channelled towards data collection and the development of national accounts to improve IO data. Further clarification around the commodity coverage of the MF indicators is required as - for example - data on some commodity types (e.g. fish) is patchy compared e.g. to agri-commodities. Additionally, a Material Footprint indicator alone does not indicate whether natural resources are being managed efficiently or sustainably. Extensions exist, or are in development, that could help provide this information, however. Overall though, the MF is an important indicator to develop further and SEI has broad expertise in this area which could be lent to this development. |  | Stockholm Environment Institute staff recommend the use of an indicator around the level of education society receives on sustainable development. We recommend a more detailed measurement of teaching on sustainable development in each country disaggregated by age-group/level of schooling and topics (diet, waste, climate change, energy use) covered in each country’s curriculum. In terms of provision of information on sustainable lifestyles, we recommend ‘No. of public service broadcasts (as a % of total per annum) around sustainable consumption and education’ and ‘No. of different languages (and local languages) used on government websites/public information exchange on SD’ to measure accessibility to civil society and minority ethnicity groups. |  |  |
| Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN) |  |  |  | SDSN comments: We are concerned that it will be difficult to define a "green" patent. |  |
| Sustainable World Initiative | We suggest the Ecological Footprint (EF) because it can be analyzed in the context of a sustainable threshold. The sustainable threshold for the Material Footprint is more undetermined. |  |  |  |  |
| UN Major Group for Children and Youth | Material footprint should be spread across the supply chain and not boxed into specefic jurisdiction based on the nature of the activity. Ratio of ecological footprint and available bio capacity discounted against the regeneration rate. | Indicator does not specify how and what is being measured in "treatment of waste" and "hazardous waste management". Additionally there is no qualifier on the quality of this management and treat. | Needs to be further enhanced and focus on the number and percent of people reached with this kind of education. In addition, the indicator should have an element that reflects standardization of content in line with the formal initiative of "education for sustainable development" | - Support the idea of UNSSO's propoal "Amount of spending on R&D in developing countries for SCP/environmentally sound technologies.". - Supplement of support perspective by adding "amont of financial support allocated to ... in a total monetary support | Compare and measure the extent bio diversity loss and regeneration in the tourism areas |
| Women's Major Group/ International Women's Health Coalition |  | Women's Major Group proposes the below indicator. Indicator 12.4.2: Reports filed in compliance with legally-binding Multilateral Environmental Agreements (to illustrate implementation of such MEAS e.g. through improved practices, substitution of safer alternatives) SIDS are often approached with suggestions to incinerate municipal waste. This is old, harmful technology which impacts adversely on health of populations living near the incinerator, and contribute to global air pollution. The MEAs were established to protect against toxic substances in the air,water and soil, and part of their implementation relies on countries reporting on concrete steps taken. | Women's Major Group indicator proposal below. Indicator 12.8.1 Percentage of institutions offering environmentally sound information on sustainable development and lifestyle topics, including formal and nonformal education settings at all levels. We should not narrow the source of information to educational institutions; NGOs, research institutions, conference presentations and media all provide data which assist decision-makers. It is important that they are based on environmentally sound guidelines. While academic institutions may be involved in both informal and formal curricula, there is a large number of non academic, non-educational organizations that promote informal curricula associated with sustainable development | Women's Major Group indicator proposal below. Indicator 12.a.1: Number of qualified environmentally sound patent applications over total | Women's Major Group indicator proposal below. Indicator 12.b.1: Residual beneficial flows generated as a result of tourism direct GDP (derived from an extended version of the System of Environmental Economic Accounting [SEEA] for tourism]) Very often GDP increases from tourism are related to land-grabbing or seizure of land from indigenous peoples. |
| WWF | WWF: WWF strongly supports the suggested indicator 12.2.2 Material footprint (MF) and MF/capita. This should cover for non-food production such as wood, cotton, mining etc. This indicator can also inform targets 8.4 and 12.5. | WWF: The proposed indicator could be amended to include "% of waste going to landfill sites" to measure reduction of release into the environment. Alternatively, or in addition, “Annual average levels of selected contaminants in air, water and soil from industrial sources, energy generation, agriculture, transport and waste water and waste treatment plants” could be used to measure degree of treatment. This could be combined with data on emissions releases against target reductions pledged in the Paris Accord and subsequent agreements that would come under goal 8. |  | WWF: Alternative indicators could include: “Percentage of credibly certified sustainable production (as defined by ISEAL http://www.isealalliance.org/our-members) of overall production” as proxy for ‘sustainable production” or " Investment in SCP innovations as a ratio of FDI." |  |
| ACC (American Chemistry Council) and CEFIC (European Chemical Industry Council) | ACC and CEFIC - SUPPLEMENTAL INDICATOR: Number of industry-wide and sector-specific voluntary programs advancing global standards that systematically enable more sustainable management and more efficient use of natural resources. COMMENT: Many global industries have recognized common challenges in enhancing sustainability and established voluntary programs to systemically upgrade performance. These are often extended globally and can significantly upgrade standards in developing countries, accelerating progress toward more sustainable management and more efficient use of natural resources. Accounting for such initiatives where they are consistent with national aims would encourage both their development and global propagation. | ACC and CEFIC - ALTERNATIVE: This Target is being addressed by the the nations under the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM), through 20 relevant indicators. COMMENT: The goal essentially restates the chemicals goal established by the Johannesburg Mandate in 2002, with the addition of the reference to "all wastes" made when the goal was re-adopted at Rio 2012. While goal 12.4.1 is therefor reasonable, it should be noted that the responsibility for delivering against this goal has been vested by the nations in the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM). SAICM has developed an array of 20 indicators by which it is assessing progress toward the 2020 goal, including an indicator relating specifically to hazardous waste. Mandating a separate reporting framework in response to goal 12.4.2 is therefore inappropriate. |  | ACC and CEFIC - COMMENT: The proposed indicator is satisfactory, but must be accompanied by a clear definition of "green patent." |  |
| Amiable Resource | Population management, community responsibilities, transparent moderation of exploitation with sustained requirements... | Naturalized and minimized.. Focused on reductions and complete recycling... | Open access with equal opportunity to basic life and communication standards. Available balanced selection adapted to demographic trends and social-environment requirements.... | Transferable and exportable products and services of copiously exceeded expertise and supplies.. | Intercultural immersion and explorations to exchange knowledge and experiences... Purpetuating happiness and cooperation encouragements and maturity... |
| LTO Nederland | This is also about consumption right? Here is where the consumers come in. Very important indicator! So it should measure % of consumer spending on sustainable products Or e.g. % of consumers paying ...% above the minimum price for sustainable products |  |  |  |  |
| Maestral International |  |  | Appears redundant with prior indicator on secondary schools having environmental science and geoscience curricula. "Informal curricula" will be impossible to measure, as will lifestyle topics. Level of educational institution not specified. Why not a simple "Percentage of educational institutions with curricula on sustainable development, disaggregated by secondary and higher education institutions."? |  |  |
| Philips | Philips: - SDGs could roughly follow approach taken in European Commission's Circular Economy package. - % of government tenders that contains targets for sustainable consumption (public authorities leading by example). | Philips: - Availability of incentives and legislation for industry to monitor and optimize (hazardous) waste management. (Create an industrial ecosystem that stimulates desired behavior). |  |  |  |
| Red de Educación de Personas Jóvenes y Adultas |  |  | Extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education for sustainable development and iii) human rights education are mainstreamed in (a) national education policies and plans (b) curricula (c) teacher education and (d) student assessment (Structure) % of teaching hours dedicated to education for sustainable development, global citizenship education, human rights education (as per UNGA resolution 59/113) in formal and non-formal education (process indicator) |  |  |

| **Country/Organisation** | **Goal 13: Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Target 13.1:** Strengthen resilience and adaptive capacity to climate-related hazards and natural disasters in all countries. | **Target 13.2:**Integrate climate change measures into national policies, strategies and planning. | **Target 13.3:**Improve education, awareness-raising and human and institutional capacity on climate change mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning. | **Target 13.b:**Promote mechanisms for raising capacity for effective climate change-related planning and management in least developed countries and small island developing States, including focusing on women, youth and local and marginalized communities. |
| *Indicator 13.1.1:* Number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters per 100,000 people | *Indicator 13.2.1:*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 | *Indicator 13.3.1:*Number of countries that have integrated mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning into primary, secondary and tertiary curricula | *Indicator 13.b.1:*Number of LDCs and SIDS 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 |
| *Discussion prompt: There is a parallel process to review this indicator.* | *Discussion prompt:*Awaiting the conclusion of the COP21 talks in Paris for the final formulation of this indicator. | *Discussion prompt: Awaiting the conclusion of the COP21 talks in Paris for the final formulation of this indicator.* | *Discussion prompt: Awaiting the conclusion of the COP21 talks in Paris for the final formulation of this indicator.* |
| **Total comments received** | 56 | 31 | 32 | 35 |
| Central Statistical Office of Poland | CSO of Poland comments: CSO of Poland collects data on number of deaths according to International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems (ICD-10) - Revision 10. It does not allow to determine, wheather the death was a result of disaster. |  |  |  |
| Government of Japan | Japan supports the comment made by ISDR and several countries in indicated in "Summary of comments (corrected version - 19 October 2015)" that both “Number of death/ missing and affected people” and “direct economic loss” are to be prioritized. Since there are some targets regarding Disaster Risk Reduction in different goals, it is preferable that both “Number of death/ missing and affected people” and “direct economic loss” are positioned as common indicators to measure progress of targets 1.5, 11.5 and 13.1. To minimize the reporting burden on countries, indicators for DRR targets in SDGs have to be identical with those in Sendai Framework. Therefore, we propose to set the indicators for targets 1.5, 11.5 and 13.1 as “Number of death, missing and affected people due to hazardous events per 100,000” and “Direct economic loss due to hazardous events in relation to global gross domestic products”. | Japan: "environmentally-friendly" is not appropriate for climate change indicator because it is an idea that expresses everything for environmentally-friendly. Therefore, “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 low carbon society.” is more appropriate indicator. (Use “transition to low carbon society” instead of “transition to environment friendly substances and technologies”) |  | Japan: In this context, we can use the word, “support”, and it is not necessary to use the word, “specialized support” as the support indicates the mechanism to raise capacity of the aspects already mentioned. If we decide to keep the word, “specialized support,” it is strongly recommended to define the “specialized support”. Otherwise, countries and organizations that need to report their results may find it difficult to categorize what activities are under the “specialized support”. |
| Hungarian Central Statistical Office | HU: In the indicator in its form is not clearly defined what disaster exactly means. It overlaps with indicators 1.5 and 11.5. | HU: The UNFCC can produce the indicator. | HU: The UNESCO, UNICEF and Global Education First Initiative can be suitable entity for global monitoring. Hungary is included to those countries that have integrated the above-mentioned processes to the education. It’s a “yes/no” question. The number of the related countries are the same everywhere, the main question is, that a country is a related country or not. |  |
| Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Censos | Ecuador proposes the following indicator: Percentage of territories that have evacuation or contingency plans in response to extreme environmental events |  |  |  |
| ISTAT | Istat-Italy: the SENDAI process will provide the final formulation for this indicator with economic losses also considered In general for GOAL 13 : It is worth waiting for the conclusion of the COP21 | Istat-Italy: we suggest indicators: i) GHG emissions (per CO2 equivalent) ii) GHG emissions per capita, per commodity, per GDP, and by sectors. Insert these indicators is fundamental before every other . Data for these indicators are collected by the UNFCCC . |  |  |
| National Statistical Committee, Belarus | We offer the following indicator: Share of state expenditures on  the prevention and elimination of emergency situations. |  |  |  |
| National Statistical Institute, Spain | Add disaggregated data on gender, age and ethnicity. |  |  |  |
| Statistics Denmark | Indicator should be changed. However not as a priority. The merging of “death” and “evacuation” number seams inappropriate and will give a wrong impression on the disaster impact, e.g. 1.500. per. 100.000 could cover 1.500 deaths in Bangladesh and 1.500 temporarily evacuated in Denmark. Suggesting an indicator having more focus on the impact on livelihoods (this will be critical for all, including the most vulnerable groups and hence have a strong poverty focus). |  | The proposed indicator has mainly focus on the “education”/ awareness. The long term result of sum of education, awareness and institutional capacity will be “climate aware” societies – having climate adaptation plans in place. | Denmark notices indicator 13.b.1. is similar to earlier proposal with addition of SIDS (follows logically from target definition). This does not alter Denmark’s assessment; i.e. the indicator appear very broad and does neither reflect the level or quality of capacity raising nor the importance of the targeted institutions, e.g. it would appear most relevant to engage authorities and entities with responsibility for setting and implementing a country’s energy and climate policies rather than non-governmental actors. |
| Statistics Finland | Finland comments that the indicator “Number of adaptation plans, which contain risk reduction measures as well as legislation and policies for mainstreaming climate change” would be more target-oriented and also applicable. |  |  |  |
| Statistics Lithuania | Already metioned in target 1.5.1 |  |  |  |
| Swiss Federal Statistical Office |  | Switzerland comments: Will this indicator be part of a next consultation? | Switzerland comments: Will this indicator be part of a next consultation? | Switzerland comments: Will this indicator be part of a next consultation? |
| TurkStat | Turkstat comments: besides this indicator "1. Firstly new indicators containing vulnerability factors that contribute to the occurrence of disasters should be established. For example; number of houses established at a flood risk area (at stream bed) 2. Secondly, the indicators related with the economic loss and affected infrastrcuture and services should be established. For example; a) Direct economic loss due to industrial facilities/ commercial facilities/ houses damaged or destroyed by hazardous events b) Direct agricultural loss due to hazardous events c) Number of health facilities/educational facilities/transportation infrastructures destroyed or damaged by hazardous events". Turkstat comments that the Indicator 13.1.1 is currently not clearly formulated regarding Target 13.1. In order to avoid ambiguity over the meaning and scope of "disasters", Turkstat suggests to replace "disasters" with "climate-related hazards and natural disasters" as stated in Target 13.1. This change will not only clarify the meaning but also prevent potential misleading calculations of the indicator as the term "disaster" is not easily defined and classified. | Turkstat comments: "This indicator can be used for the target, but there may be some additional indicators to measure affects of policies for climate change." |  |  |
| United States | US: No comments at this time. Since COPS 21 has just concluded, we may have more comments to convey. | US: We support the current indicator. Acknowledging the UNFCCC comment that the information is not currently collected, we don’t see this as a barrier to the selection of this indicator. Since COPS 21 has just concluded, we may have more comments to convey. | US: Needs to include SIDS to reflect the final target. We propose Number of countries that have integrated mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction, SIDS, and early warning into primary, secondary and tertiary curricula. Since COPS 21 has just concluded, we may have more comments to convey. | US: We think a space was intended for 13.a.1 as well, as per Bangkok. Our comment is:Mobilized amount of USD per year towards the USD 100 billion commitment.  US: Regarding 13.b.1, SIDS need to be reflected. We suggest Number of LDCs and SIDS 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.  Since COPS 21 has just concluded, we may have more comments to convey. |
| Department Foreign Affairs and Trade, Australia | Australia is concerned that results against this indicator will be determined more by the susceptibility of countries to natural disasters, rather than whether resilience has been strengthened. Australia questions the inclusion of “relocated or evacuated” - a higher number of people in these categories may in fact indicate an effective response to an imminent disaster, but be recorded as an impact. Inclusion of these categories should not conflate numbers of people relocated or evacuated with deaths or injuries. Request consideration of whether the indicator should refer to “natural disasters” rather than “disasters” given the specification in the target. | Submission of Intended Nationally Determined Contributions to the UNFCCC is an indicator for countries' intentions to mitigate climate change. Further specification of 'environmentally friendly substances and technologies' is required, or should be omitted from the indicator. |  | Australia suggests “assistance” would include a broader range of measures than “support”. |
| Eurostat | Methodological development work in line with the Sendai framework required. |  |  |  |
| ICAO |  | We suggest the following revision to recognize ICAO States' Action Plans as part of indicator 13.2.1: Indicator 13.2.1: 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, ICAO States' Action Plans to reduce aviation CO2 emissions). Further information on ICAO States' Action Plans is available at: http://www.icao.int/environmental-protection/Pages/ClimateChange\_ActionPlan.aspx |  |  |
| IMF, Fiscal Affairs Department |  | On behalf of the IMF (Fiscal Affairs Department): In addition to the suggested indicator, an indicator such as “rates of taxation applied to fossil fuel consumption” could be useful to measure the progress toward the target. The IMF will submit a technical note on this indicator separately. |  |  |
| International Disability Alliance | For indicators 1.5.1, 11.5.1 and 13.1.1 we recommend aligning with the Sendai Framework for DRR and explicitly mention persons with disabilities. |  |  | IDA recommends that persons with disabilities is added. It would read as: Number of LDCs and SIDS that are receiving specialized support for mechanisms for raising capacities for effective climate change related planning and management, including focusing on women, youth, persons with disabilities, local and marginalized communities |
| International Disability and Development Consortium | For indicator 13.1.1 IDDC recommends aligning with the Sendai Framework for DRR and explicitly mentioning persons with disabilities. |  |  | For indicator 13.b.1 IDDC recommends that persons with disabilities is added. It would read as: Number of LDCs and SIDS that are receiving specialized support for mechanisms for raising capacities for effective climate change related planning and management, including focusing on women, youth, persons with disabilities, local and marginalized communities. |
| International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) | IUCN suggests consideration of the “Red List Index (impacts of climate change)” as an indicator towards SDG Target 13.1. This is a thematic disaggregation of the Red List Index. The Red List Index is a “green” multi-purpose indicator towards SDG Target 15.5, for which IUCN submitted metadata on 30 Jul 2015, provided on pages 366–374 of the “Compilation of Metadata Received on Indicators for Global Monitoring of the Sustainable Development Goals and Targets” (http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/Metadata%20Compilation%20for%20SDG%20Indicators%2023%20October%202015%20Update.pdf). It is based on an existing indicator used for tracking progress towards Aichi Target 12 of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020, and mobilised through the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (http://www.bipindicators.net/rli/2010). It shows trends in the aggregate extinction risk of species driven solely by the negative impacts of climate change or by successful efforts to help species adapt, and excluding trends driven by other factors. IUCN stands ready to provide any further support in documentation or interpretation as useful. |  |  |  |
| OCHA | OCHA reiterates its earlier recommendation to add the number of people displaced by disasters in the indicator 13.1.1. The inclusion of ‘displaced’ in the indicator would enable more comprehensive and technically sound reflection of human impacts caused by disasters (and other shocks) than ‘evacuated’ and ‘relocated’ (NB. the three element are mutually compatible as the latter two reflect specific aspects of displacement and are inclusive thereof; hence could include “displaced, including evacuated and relocated”). Moreover, people who become displaced by disasters and other shocks are in high danger of remaining in said situation and being left behind by the 2030 Agenda long after the event that displaced them due to heightened vulnerability caused by loss of homes, employment, livelihoods, education, etc. Displacement data and statistics are collected and compiled with established, robust methodologies by actors such as UNHCR, Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre and governments. |  |  |  |
| OECD |  | We suggest “embodied CO2”. This is joint ongoing work between UNDP and the OECD to allocate CO2 emissions to countries based but on the country of consumption rather than on the country of production of goods. |  |  |
| UNCDF |  |  |  | UNCDF: The current indicator proposal is weak and needs to be strengthened. Given the COP21 agreement, UNCDF would like to spend a few more days to reformulate this indicator to strengthen it. For now, we would like to propose the following revision to the current proposal: Number of LDCs and SIDS that are implementing mechanisms (including financing mechanisms and budget allocations) for effective climate change related planning, management, and investment, including focusing on women, youth, local governments and marginalized communities |
| UNDP | UNDP Whilst the indicator above is important to highlight the impact of strengthened measures to reduce loss of life from disasters, it should be noted that strengthened adaptive capacity from climate related hazards is not limited to preventing deaths and relocation. This can also include community resilience, improved resilience to impacts such as disruption of school or health impacts. Suggest that this indicator is strengthened to reflect this. Likewise, it may be worth considering implementation indicators- for example number of countries in which disaster and climate risk management explicitly addressed in national, sub-national and sectorial planning frameworks, policies and budgetary systems | UNDP Whilst further work is needed to develop this indicator, UNDP feels that it will be important to ensure that an indicator is developed for 13.2 that includes INDCs. As a core part of the Paris agreement the INDCs will be a driver of national and subnational climate change action beyond 2015. They also have a huge potential to advance sustainable development and specifically the action under Goal 12 by spurring the integration of climate change action in policies at planning. Any indicator in this regard should measure progress toward achieving and implementing INDCs, with the number of countries who have submitted acting as a baseline. | UNDP suggests that the above indicator is amended to include a measures for the strengthening of institutional capacity. This should not only refer to education curricula but the qualitative outputs including better systems for early warning, mitigation, adaptation and so forth. It will be important to understand how this indicator will link to the new provision and mechanism on capacity building in the Paris Agreement | UNDP No specific comments on amending this indicator at present, however a recognition that for each individual group, there will be different data and so there may need to be a disaggregation of the indicator to appropriately track progress on each group and to identify gaps in progress for implementation. It is also recommended that synergies are identified between this indicator and the Paris agreement given that there are specific provisions included for SIDS and LDCs and vulnerable groups. |
| UNEP | UNEP Comments: In response to the IAEG prompt and following the adoption of the Paris Agreement, UNEP would propose two possible indicators: a)Proportion of population vulnerable to climate related hazards, that has access to resources and services which mitigate the impacts of one or more hazards. Preliminary data at the national level exist through the Preview platform (http://preview.grid.unep.ch. The development of such an indicator would address the target’s objectives by assessing the facilities, institutions and resources in place that would strengthen the resilience and adaptive capacity of a country to climate-related hazards and natural disasters; it would be upstream of the same mortality indicator cited for Targets 1.5 and 11.5.1. Following the adoption of the Paris Agreement, UNEP proposes that a second indicator be based on the data contained within the nationally determined contributions: b) Proportion of development assistance and climate finance programs which incorporate climate –proofing, climate resilient, disaster risk and preparedness measures. | UNEP Comments: Following the adoption of the Paris Agreement, UNEP proposes that the indicator be based on the data contained within the nationally determined contributions, relating to the national mid-century, long-term, low greenhouse gas emission development strategies. | UNEP Comments: Discussion during the Paris COP21, led to a suggestion to have two indicators: one on education one on institutions. | UNEP Comments: Following adoption of the Paris Agreement, UNEP proposes that through the Paris Committee on Capacity Building, an indicator be established to measure the capacity-development in LDCs and SIDS, women, youth, local and marginalized communities: Percentage of population in LDCs and SIDS, women, youth, local and marginalized communities, supported by mechanisms to build capacities relating to climate change planning and management. |
| UNESCO Institute for Statistics |  |  | Comments from UNESCO-UIS Targets 4.7 and 12.8 are linked and could be addressed by the same global indicator. Target 13.3 deals with similar issues and may be addressed by the same indicator. For Target 4.7 there was general concern about the original indicator and lack of consensus on others proposed during the consultation processes so far. While an outcome-based indicator may be preferred, UNESCO-UIS recommends a new provision- and process-based indicator instead which could also be used for Target 12.8 and possibly Target 13.3. It is more comprehensive than the original indicator proposed by the IAEG-SDGs for Target 4.7. The new indicator is included in the proposed thematic set of education indicators developed by the Technical Advisory Group for the Post-2015 Education Indicators (TAG) and is the TAG’s recommended global reporting indicator for Target 4.7. The indicator is: Extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education for sustainable development (including climate change education) are mainstreamed in (a) national education policies (b) curricula (c) teacher education and (d) student assessment It is a qualitative indicator. Unlike the other indicators proposed so far for Target 4.7 the new indicator captures a broader range of concepts in this complex target. A mechanism needs to be developed to collect the information needed for this indicator. At the global level, UNESCO has the mandate for both global citizenship education and education for sustainable development and therefore would be the body responsible for collecting this information. Metadata for this indicator are available and have been submitted today to UNSD. If the IAEG Members have questions about this proposal please contact UIS Director, Silvia Montoya (uis.director@unesco.org) and Alison Kennedy (a.kennedy@unesco.org). |  |
| UNESCO-IHE |  |  | UNESCO-IHE: The proposed indicator does not capture the manifold aspects of the proposed target. Specifically, human (i.e. individual) and institutional capacity (i.e. organizational capacity and enabling environment) is typically and most effectively strengthened through experience built up in the professional setting (outside formal education and training) and via organizational change (new routines and procedures). The indicator should therefore try to measure relevant climate change-related efforts (mitigation, adaption, impact reduction and early warning) at organizational levels (of public and private sector organisations, as well as NGOs). | UNESCO-IHE: The proposed indicator will measure inputs rather than the outcomes and effectiveness of capacity development efforts related to climate change. Admittedly this is due to the formulation of the target which should have been more outcome focused. |
| UNFPA | UNFPA has no specific proposal at this point but recommends an indicator that reflects particularly the position of the most vulnerable, especially women, children, young people and the elderly. |  |  |  |
| UNISDR | We advocate the following two indicators for targets 1.5, 11.5 and 13.1 as “twin” multi-purpose indicators. 1.Number of deaths, missing and affected people due to hazardous events per 100,000. 2. Direct economic loss due to hazardous events in relation to global gross domestic product. Since the beginning of the consultation, we have proposed “economic loss” indicator in addition to human loss indicator. Several countries expressed the support for the economic loss indicator. We believe this indicator should be added in the list of SDG indicators as it satisfies the criteria expressed by DESA that indicator supported at least one country can be added to grey indicator. Colombia, Korea, France, Japan, Canada clearly expressed adding “economic loss indicator” in the Aug-Sep consultation. In response to several comments on the proposed disaster loss indicators for 13.1, UNISDR would like to clarify that the data should be reported from national disaster loss database to UNISDR by hazard according to the existing standard. The current hazard classification we are utilizing is IRDR classification, which categorizes the hazards into climatological, meteorological, hydrological, geological etc. It is possible to exclude loss caused by hazards not related with climate change (e.g. geological event) and make “proxy” for climate-change related loss while it is very difficult to clearly identify and isolate the loss caused by climate change. (e.g. identifying whether certain flood events are caused by climate change or not is technically extremely difficult). The data source is the same as the one we proposed for indicator 1.5 and 11.5. Therefore, it will not cause additional burden on countries. UNISDR basically has proposed the same indicators for both the SDGs and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030. The details of suggested indicators are currently under review by the Member States in Sendai indicator discussion process. The Second session of the Open-ended Intergovernmental Expert Working Group to discuss Sendai indicators is scheduled to take place 10-11 February 2016. We would like to discuss bilaterally with UNDESA how to coordinate the SDG and Sendai process. | We have advocated integration of element of national DRR strategy as "Number of countries that adopt and implement national DRR strategies in line with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030" National DRR strategy should be a critical element of the 13.2 indicator, in addition to NAPA and other climate change related strategies. When this element is included in the final 13.2 indicator, we can report the global progress. UNISDR basically has proposed the same indicators for both the SDGs and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030. The details of suggested indicators are currently under review by the Member States in Sendai indicator discussion process. The Second session of the Open-ended Intergovernmental Expert Working Group to discuss Sendai indicators is scheduled to take place 10-11 February 2016. We would like to discuss bilaterally with UNDESA how to coordinate the SDG and Sendai process. |  |  |
| United Nations Mine Action Service | This indicator should consider deaths/ injuries due to landmines and other explosive remnants of war, even in conflict is not considered within disasters since natural disasters (e.g. floods, earthquakes) often displace landmines so that they move to areas that were thought to be mine-free. |  |  |  |
| World Meteorological Organization | The indicator is not informative as natural hazards and a priori their impacts are not equally linked to climate change. Furthermore the differ categories of people mentioned are concerned by many different causes. Also the same indicator is factored in other SDGs. Finally as far as natural disasters are concerned this should be better done within the sendai implementation monitoring. | It should be clarified if the focus is on the number of countries with one INTEGRATED policy Eg. Integrated sendai declaration, 2030 agenda, and Paris agreement and later Habitat III. In the context of the Paris agreement there are things to follow such as the INDC implementation. | There should be different indicators for measuring education, awareness and human capacities versus institutional capacities especially migration, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning which should be measured through law enforcement and budgetary priority choices. |  |
| Asia Pacific Forum on Women, Law and Development (APWLD) | Asia Pacific Forum on Women, Law and Development (APWLD) comments: APWLD proposes the following indicator as an alternative to the grey indicator: •Percentage of people who have effectively participated in the development of local adaptation and disaster risk reduction and resilience policies and practices (disaggregated by gender and other categories). There is ample evidence that supports the critical role that local communities play in developing and implementing effective resilience and adaptive capacity. | APWLD comments: Given the very recent conclusion of the COP, we suggest a longer-term consultation on the Goal 13 indicators. As a member of the Women and Gender Constituency in the UNFCCC, we would prefer to submit our comments as part of a consensus position reached by the Constituency. | APWLD comments: Given the very recent conclusion of the COP, we suggest a longer-term consultation on the Goal 13 indicators. As a member of the Women and Gender Constituency in the UNFCCC, we would prefer to submit our comments as part of a consensus position reached by the Constituency. | APWLD comments: Given the very recent conclusion of the COP, we suggest a longer-term consultation on the Goal 13 indicators. As a member of the Women and Gender Constituency in the UNFCCC, we would prefer to submit our comments as part of a consensus position reached by the Constituency. |
| RIGHTS | Percentage of people affected by climate related hazards and natural disasters, disaggregation based on age, sex, caste, race, language, location and other forms. |  |  |  |
| AbleChildAfrica |  |  |  | We recommend that persons with disabilities is added. It would read as: Number of LDCs and SIDS that are receiving specialized support for mechanisms for raising capacities for effective climate change related planning and management, including focusing on women, youth, persons with disabilities, local and marginalized communities. |
| ADD International |  |  |  | Number of LDCs and SIDS that are receiving specialized support for mechanisms for raising capacities for effective climate change related planning and management, including focusing on women, youth, PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES, local and marginalized communities |
| Adolescent Girl and SDG Indicators Working Group\*: signatories included the UN Foundation, Plan International, Advocates for Youth, Girl Effect, Girls Thinking Global, International Center for Research on Women | Adolescent Girl and SDG Indicators Working Group\*: 13.1.1 Number of initiatives that engage the most vulnerable, including women, boys, and girls, in disaster-preparedness and resilience-training Disaggregations: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) -DATA SOURCE: IUCN (Environment and Gender Index (EGI)) -GLOBAL MONITORING ENTITY: UNEP, UNESCO, UNISDR -RATIONALE: Inequalities in social relations, economic assets and political power exacerbate human vulnerabilities, as a result, the impact of disasters worsens the unequal conditions faced by women, children, indigenous peoples and the elders, among others. | Adolescent Girl and SDG Indicators Working Group\*: 13.2.1 Number of countries that have formally communicated the establishment of integrated low- carbon, climate-resilient, gender-responsive 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). -DATA SOURCE: Country data, IUCN (Environment and Gender Index (EGI)) -GLOBAL MONITORING ENTITY: UNEP -RATIONALE: While more countries are developing climate-responsive policies and action plans, many fail to acknowledge the connection between climate change and gender. This indicator combines recommended indicator on number of countries having conducted climate policy reviews with a focus on gender to ensure policies address both issues. | Adolescent Girl and SDG Indicators Working Group\*: 13.3.1 Number of countries that have integrated mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning into primary, secondary and tertiary curricula, that equally targets girls and boys -DATA SOURCE: IUCN (Environment and Gender Index (EGI)) -GLOBAL MONITORING ENTITY: UNICEF -RATIONALE: Climate change in the form of floods, droughts, and natural disasters have various effects on adolescent girls’ lives. They can increase the prevalence of water-borne diseases, reliance on girls for household chores, rates of child marriage, and negatively affect infrastructure hinder girls’ access to school or work. This indicator focuses on importance of engaging across all levels of education in promoting climate friendly policies and practices, acknowledging that efforts to do so should be undertaken in a fashion that does not exclude girls. | Adolescent Girl and SDG Indicators Working Group:\* 13.b.1 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 and girls, youth, local and marginalized communities and the national and local DRR coordination mechanism has a gender equity policy that supports women’s and girls’ full and equal participation in DRR planning and leadership opportunities -DATA SOURCE: Country data -GLOBAL MONITORING ENTITY: OECD -RATIONALE: Women make up 43% of the world’s agricultural work force, nearly 50% of workers involved in small-scale fisheries and are most often responsible for growing, harvesting and preparing food for their families — therefore preparedness for climate change related planning and management is crucial for women and girls |
| African Agency for Integrated Development (AAID) | Iam from Uganda called Mr. Kisembo Asuman, Executive Director of African Agency for Integrated Development (AAID) under a special Consultative Status with ECOSOC since 2012. Before considering the Number of death, missing people, injured, relocated or evacute due to disaster per 100,000 people let us consider first other Indicators like "Percentage of Communities practicing deforestration, Percentage of Increased industries which increase air Polution , Lack of policies connected to climate change |  |  | Iam from Uganda called Mr. Kisembo Asuman, Executive Director of African Agency for Integrated Development (AAID) under a special Consultative Status with ECOSOC since 2012. The best Indicator to me can be the Percentage of support to facilitate the Mechanism for raising Capacities for effective climate change related planning and management, including focusing on women, youth, local and Marginalized Communities in LDCs and SIDS. |
| Asia Dalit Rights Forum | Percentage of people affected by climate related hazards and natural disasters, disaggregation based on age, sex, caste, race, language, location and other forms. |  |  |  |
| Austrian Leprosy Relief Association | Align with the Sendai Framework for DRR and explicitly mentioning persons with disabilities |  |  | Add persons with disabilities! |
| Brookings |  |  | Jasodhara Bhattacharya, Brookings, USA Rephrase to integrated the topics of mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning; also, given that climate change will be a specific topic that falls under the categories of GCED and ESD when it comes to the educational space, it would again be great if we could measure what matters: if we want students to engage in actions towards promoting long-term wellbeing for themselves and their communities, we want to track the percentage of students at each level who have participated in planning, implementing and reflection on actions towards mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning. Student participation is such activities also ties into other 21st century 'soft skills' such as problem-solving, innovation and collaboration. | Jasodhara Bhattacharya, Brookings, USA Please include the disabled and vulnerable groups such as children and the elderly. |
| Brookings |  |  | Jasodhara Bhattacharya, Brookings, USA Rephrase to integrated the topics of mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning; also, given that climate change will be a specific topic that falls under the categories of GCED and ESD when it comes to the educational space, it would again be great if we could measure what matters: if we want students to engage in actions towards promoting long-term wellbeing for themselves and their communities, we want to track the percentage of students at each level who have participated in planning, implementing and reflection on actions towards mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning. Student participation is such activities also ties into other 21st century 'soft skills' such as problem-solving, innovation and collaboration. | Jasodhara Bhattacharya, Brookings Please include the disabled; also, please include vulnerable groups such as children and the elderly. |
| Brookings |  |  | Jasodhara Bhattacharya, Brookings, USA Rephrase to integrated the topics of mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning; Given that climate change will be a specific topic that falls under the categories of GCED and ESD when it comes to the educational space, it would again be great if we could measure what matters: if we want students to engage in actions towards promoting long-term wellbeing for themselves and their communities, we want to track the percentage of students at each level who have participated in planning, implementing and reflection on actions towards mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning. Student participation in such activities also ties into other 21st century 'soft skills' such as problem-solving, innovation and collaboration. | Jasodhara Bhattacharya, Brookings, USA Please include the disabled; also please include vulnerable groups such as children and the elderly. |
| CBM UK |  |  |  | Please add people with disabilities to this list of groups. |
| Christian Aid | Christian Aid recommends: % of all countries that report having progressed from a perceived low to an intermediate or from an intermediate to a high level of adaptive capacity to climate-related hazards and natural disasters in relation to a 1.5 world. | We welcome this indicator and agree with the need to reflect on current formulation in light of Paris agreement. We would like to see an emphasis in final indicator on implementation, and not just establishment or communication. |  |  |
| Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International | Comments from Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International, Netherlands   Using UN GSTC sustainable tourism destinations, rtevenues (absolute, per capita and as percentage of GDP) for destinations recognized under GSTC approved and recognized sustainable tourism destinations accreditation processes. |  | Comments from Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International, Netherlands  An indicator could be the availability within nations and at subnational units of public and private early warning systems and the percentage of the population that they can or do reach in the event.  Another indicator, after shocks or disasters, would be for economic impacts and losses at national level including : loss of home, educational access, livelihoods and business; and the ability of the poor and vulnerability to rebuild homes, re-enter education, and continue or re-start livelihood and businesses. |  |
| Culture et Développement |  |  | France, Culture et Développement, Ngo Number of countries that have integrated mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction, CULTURAL DIMENSIONS\* and early warning into primary, secondary and tertiary curricula \* both as cultural aspects and resources, as well as awarness-raising activities through the arts see also the results of the event Artcop21 http://www.juliesbicycle.com/latest/news/8442-cop21-letter-released |  |
| Dutch Coalition on Disability and Development (DCDD) | DCDD recommends aligning with the Sendai Framework for DRR |  |  | DCDD recommends that persons with disabilities is added. It would read as: Number of LDCs and SIDS that are receiving specialized support for mechanisms for raising capacities for effective climate change related planning and management, including focusing on women, youth, persons with disabilities, local and marginalized communities. |
| Education International |  |  | Education International proposes broadening the proposed indicator to look at climate change education in both formal and non-formal education. This builds on concerns from member states about limiting climate change education to formal education only. We support the focus on curricula as a strong process indicator. 13.3.1: Extent to which i) climate change education has been incorporated into primary, secondary and tertiary curricula [mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning] and ii) programmes for climate change awareness are in place |  |
| Finnish NGDO platform to the EU | a) The existence, proper funding and implementation of National Adaptation Plans based on the latest scientific knowledge in a participatory way. b) Disaster mortality rates significantly reduced by 2030 (compared to an average of the period 2000-2010). c) Direct of economic losses as % of GDP significantly reduced by 2030 (compared to an average of the period 2000-2010). d) Share of population suffering from flooding and/or droughts. | a) Number of countries that have developed and implemented Zero Carbon Action Plans (ZCAPS) and Low Carbon Development Plans (LCDPs). b) Number of cities that have developed and implemented Zero Carbon Action Plans (ZCAPS) and Low Carbon Development Plans (LCDPs). c) Countries en route to phasing out carbon emissions in 2050 by 2030. d) Carbon intensity per unit of GDP reduced significantly in all countries. e) Net GHG emissions in areas under forest management (GtCO2 e/ha). f) Availability and implementation of a transparent and detailed deep national decarbonization strategy, consistent with the 2°C -or below -global carbon budget, and with GHG emission targets for 2020, 2030 and 2050. g) CO2 intensity of new power generation capacity installed (gCO2per kWh), and of new cars (gCO2/pkm) and trucks (gCO2/tkm). | a) Number of children or youth who have learned climate change mitigation and adaptation measures at school. b) Percentage of population with increased knowledge on climate change. | a) Percentage of LDC’s receiving specific support for raising capacities for effective climate change related planning and management. |
| Global Campaign for Education |  |  | GCE UK Suggested Indicator: Extent to which i) climate change education has been incorporated into primary, secondary and tertiary curricula [mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning] and ii) programmes for awareness of climate change have been put in place. Rationale: The suggested indicator addresses the feedback received during the previous round of consultation on this indicator- viz. the need to assess other forms of awareness-raising on climate change beyond inclusion in formal curricula. |  |
| Global Campaign For Education |  |  | Proposed Indicator: Extent to which i) climate change education has been incorporated into primary, secondary and tertiary curricula [mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning] and ii) programmes for awareness of climate change have been put in place Rationale: The proposed indicator addresses the feedback received during the previous round of consultation on this indicator- viz. the need to asssess other forms of awareness raising on climate change beyond inclusion in formal curricula. |  |
| Global Campaign for Education UK |  |  | Extent to which i) climate change education has been incorporated into primary, secondary and tertiary curricula [mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning] and ii) programmes for awareness of climate change have been put in place. Rationale: The suggested indicator addresses the feedback received during the previous round of consultation on this indicator- viz. the need to assess other forms of awareness-raising on climate change beyond inclusion in formal curricula. |  |
| HelpAge International on behalf of the Stakeholder Group on Ageing | The Stakeholder Group on Ageing comments: We support UNEP’s earlier proposed indicator which includes disaggregation and measures adaptive capacity rather then just disaster loss which is the focus of the current indicator and is therefore not an adequate measure of this target. UNEP proposal: [Decrease in the ratio of vulnerable vs resilient (in terms of death and impact) subpopulation (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) ] |  |  |  |
| ICMM and IPIECA | John Drexhage ICMM/IPIECA Disasters cover much broader issues than climate (e.g., earthquakes). Perhaps ..."due to weather related events" | John Drexhage ICMM/IPIECA It is one thing to say that a record number of countries developed Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs), as is the case under the Paris Agreement. It is quite another to determine the extent to which such plans are integrated into nat'l policies, strategies and planning. Suggestion: value added indicator might be extent to which further development/design of INDCs take account of relevant SDGs. | John Drexhage ICMM/IPIECA Should take account of information services beyond formal education curricula, as many small hold farmers who are most immediately impacted by extreme weather events typically do not carry extended formal education backgrounds. |  |
| ILEP | For indicator 13.1.1 we recommend aligning with the Sendai Framework for DRR and explicitly mentioning persons with disabilities. (The Sendai indicator process is parallel) |  |  | For indicator 13.b.1 ILEP recommends that persons with disabilities is added. It would read as: Number of LDCs and SIDS that are receiving specialized support for mechanisms for raising capacities for effective climate change related planning and management, including focusing on women, youth, persons with disabilities, local and marginalized communities. |
| Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES) | Comment by the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES) a. Definition of climate-related hazards is required. Target 13 1 suggests that C-r-hazards must be differentiated from natural disasters, though comparability and coverage may be lacking. b. INDC or NDC could be information source. Until NDC guidelines or policies are agreed upon, suggest to leave this indicator open. | Comment by the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES) Though the value of the proposed indicators seems to be limited, and comparability is dubious, there is no alternative indicators. The indicators can rely on national communications or INDC/NDCs. | Comment by the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES) Though the value of the proposed indicators seems to be limited, and comparability is dubious, there is no alternative indicators. The indicators can rely on national communications or INDC/NDCs. | Comment by the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES) Since integration of climate actions with sustainable development, addition of relevance to sustainable development is recommended. |
| International Agency for the Prevention of Blindness (IAPB) | IAPB asks for any indicator to measure target 13.1. to stay in line with the Sendai Framework for DRR and to be disaggregated by the list of characteristics mentioned in 17.18 (income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other relevant characteristics) |  |  | IAPB recommends to add "persons with disabilities" to "women, youth, local and marginalized communities". |
| International Music Council | International Music Council: Percentage of national and local climate change strategies that consider the role of cultural aspects in the promotion of environmental sustainability |  |  |  |
| Latin American Campaign for the Right to Education |  |  | Latin American Campaign for the Right to Education proposes: Extent to which i) climate change education has been incorporated into primary, secondary and tertiary curricula [mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning] and ii) programmes for awareness of climate change have been put in place |  |
| LIGHT FOR THE WORLD | LIGHT FOR THE WORLD recommends aligning indicator 13.1.1 with the Sendai Framework for DRR and explicitly mentioning persons with disabilities. |  |  | LIGHT FOR THE WORLD recommends for indicator 13.b.1 that persons with disabilities are explicitly mentioned. It would read as: Number of LDCs and SIDS that are receiving specialized support for mechanisms for raising capacities for effective climate change related planning and management, including focusing on women, youth, persons with disabilities, local and marginalized communities. |
| Nagorik Uddyog | Percentage of people affected by climate related hazards and natural disasters, disaggregation based on age, sex, caste, race, language, location and other forms. |  |  |  |
| Navsarjan Trust | Navsarjan Trust Percentage of people affected by climate related hazards and natural disasters, disaggregation based on age, sex, caste, race, language, location and other forms. |  |  |  |
| Peruvian Campaign for the Right to Education |  |  | PERU Peruvian Campaign for the Right to Education Indicator proposed: Extent to which i) climate change education has been incorporated into primary, secondary and tertiary curricula [mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning] and ii) programes for awareness of climate change have been put in place. |  |
| Plan International | Plan International comments: RECOMMENDED INDICATOR: 13.1.1 Number of initiatives that engage the most vulnerable, including women, boys, and girls, in disaster-preparedness and resilience-training RATIONALE: Inequalities in social relations, economic assets and political power exacerbate human vulnerabilities, as a result, the impact of disasters worsens the unequal conditions faced by women, children, indigenous peoples and the elders, among others DISAGGREGATIONS: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) DATA SOURCE: IUCN (Environment and Gender Index (EGI)) RESPONSIBLE ENTITY: UNEP, UNESCO, UNISDR TIER: III | Plan International comments: RECOMMENDED INDICATOR: 13.2.1 Number of countries that have formally communicated the establishment of integrated low- carbon, climate-resilient, gender-responsive 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). RATIONALE: While more countries are developing climate-responsive policies and action plans, many fail to acknowledge the connection between climate change and gender. This indicator combines recommended indicator on number of countries having conducted climate policy reviews with a focus on gender to ensure policies address both issues. DISAGGREGATIONS: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) DATA SOURCE: Country data, IUCN (Environment and Gender Index (EGI)) RESPONSIBLE ENTITY: UNEP TIER: II/III | Plan International comments: RECOMMENDED INDICATOR: 13.3.1 Number of countries that have integrated mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning into primary, secondary and tertiary curricula, that equally targets girls and boys RATIONALE: Climate change in the form of floods, droughts, and natural disasters have various effects on adolescent girls’ lives. They can increase the prevalence of water-borne diseases, reliance on girls for household chores, rates of child marriage, and negatively affect infrastructure hinder girls’ access to school or work. This indicator focuses on importance of engaging across all levels of education in promoting climate friendly policies and practices, acknowledging that efforts to do so should be undertaken in a fashion that does not exclude girls. DISAGGREGATIONS: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) DATA SOURCE: IUCN (Environment and Gender Index (EGI)) RESPONSIBLE ENTITY: UNICEF TIER: III | Plan International comments: RECOMMENDED INDICATOR: 13.b.1 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 and girls, youth, local and marginalized communities and the national and local DRR coordination mechanism has a gender equity policy that supports women’s and girls’ full and equal participation in DRR planning and leadership opportunities RATIONALE: Women make up 43% of the world’s agricultural work force, nearly 50% of workers involved in small-scale fisheries and are most often responsible for growing, harvesting and preparing food for their families — therefore preparedness for climate change related planning and management is crucial for women and girls DISAGGREGATIONS: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) DATA SOURCE: Country data RESPONSIBLE ENTITY: OECD TIER: III |
| Practical Action | Practical action suggests that this indicator should focus on adaptive capacity and natural hazards only. The current indicator replicates what is covered in 1.5 and 11.5 for urban areas. | Practical Action suggests the following: Adoption of national legislation that requires integrated low-carbon, climate-resilient, disaster risk reduction development strategies (e.g. a national adaptation plan, national policies and measures to promote transition to environmentally-friendly technologies). |  |  |
| Rastriya Dalit Network (RDN) Nepal | Indicator 11.b.1: Percent of cities 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 |  |  |  |
| Sightsavers | 13.1.1 Sightsavers comments: For indicators 1.5.1, 11.5.1, 11.b.1, and 13.1.1 Sightsavers also recommends aligning with the Sendai Framework for DRR and explicitly mentioning persons with disabilities (the Sendai indicator process is parallel). |  | 13.3.1 Sightsavers comments: Extent to which i) climate change education has been incorporated into primary, secondary and tertiary curricula [mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning] and ii) programmes for awareness of climate change have been put in place. | 13.b.1 Sightsavers comments: We recommend that persons with disabilities is added. It would read as: Number of LDCs and SIDS that are receiving specialized support for mechanisms for raising capacities for effective climate change related planning and management, including focusing on women, youth, persons with disabilities, local and marginalized communities. |
| SIWI (Stockholm International Water Institute) | ORGANISATION SIWI COMMENTS: For this indicator to serve as a guide to possible preventive measures, “disasters” should be disaggregated by type. Also link to 1.5.1 and 11.5.1. The vast majority of climate-related extreme events and other shocks and disasters is closely linked to water why water management is key to reduce physical risks |  |  |  |
| Stockholm Environment Institute |  | Stockholm Environment Institute staff believe indicators linked to target 13.2 must assess both climate change mitigation and adaptation efforts. With respect to mitigation, national strategies for reduction of Short-Lived Climate Pollutants also have a role to play, especially in mitigating near-term CC. Quantification of benefits of taking action - e.g. on human health, crop yields, and ecosystem structure and function – are all required to capture national efforts to reduce carbon emissions. There is potential opportunity for consolidating indicators and improving linkages between goal measurement, with food security (goal 2), health/well-being (goal 3) and terrestrial ecosystem health (goal 15). |  |  |
| Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN) |  | SDSN comments: SDSN strongly supports the inclusion of an indicator to track national climate change policies, strategies and planning. Following the agreement at COP21, countries have committed to prepare long-term low-emission development strategies through to mid-century that are mindful of 2 and 1.5°C, based on SDSN's Deep Decarbonization Pathways Project (DDPP) that charts practical national and global pathways to reducing greenhouse gas emissions. This approach was also endorsed by Presidents Obama and Xi in summer 2015. Therefore we urge the IAEG-SDGs to align with these accords and include the indicator: "Availability and implementation of a transparent and detailed long-term low-emission development strategy through to mid-century that are mindful of 2 and 1.5°C." |  |  |
| UN Major Group for Children and Youth | Resiliance is not limited to only these listed parameters. The indicator should also elaborate on ecosystem loss and livelihood loss. Take into account time lags for normalisation of the respective variables | Enhance by incorporating ex ante and ex post analysis of Green House emmissions and adaptation initiatives |  |  |
| VENRO Working Group Disability and Development |  |  |  | VENRO Working Group Disability and Development, Germany, recommends that persons with disabilities is added. |
| Women Deliver | Women Deliver recommends that this indicator must be disagreegated by gender, age and geography to measure any differences in risk based on gender, age and georgraphy. |  |  | Women Deliver feels the need for a focus on gender hear to be very important. |
| Women for Women's Human Rights - New Ways | WWHR - New Ways suggests: Indicator 13.1.1 Number of people affected by hazardous events by age, sex, and socioeconomic status (including deaths, missing people, injured, relocated, or evacuated due to disasters); | WWHR - New Ways suggests: 13.2.1 Number of countries that have formally reviewed their national policies, strategies and planning in order to mainstream and indicate climate change measures that respect human rights and gender equality. |  | WWHR - New Ways suggests to replace with 13.b.1 Amount USD per year that is going towards specialized support to LDCs for mechanisms for raising capacities for effective climate change related planning and management, including focusing on women, youth, local and marginalized communities. |
| Women's Environment and Development Organization | WEDO: Slight modification to remove per 100,000 since that number does not reflect the small population in SIDS and elsewhere and to ensure disaggregation: 13.1.1 Number of people affected by hazardous events by age, sex, and socioeconomic status (including deaths, missing people, injured, relocated, or evacuated due to disasters) Suggest an additional indicator: Percentage of people who have effectively participated in the development of adaptation and disaster risk reduction and resilience policies and practices (disaggregated by gender and other categories), at local, national and regional levels. There is ample evidence that supports the critical role that local communities play in developing and implementing effective resilience and adaptive capacity. This could also be an alternative for 11.b Given the very recent conclusion of the COP, we suggest a longer-term consultation on the Goal 13 indicators to allow further reflection. | WEDO: Suggest further: Number of countries that have formally reviewed their national policies, strategies and planning in order to mainstream and indicate climate change measures that respect human rights and gender equality. Given the very recent conclusion of the COP, we suggest a longer-term consultation on the Goal 13 indicators. | WEDO: Slight modification to grey indicator to incorporate informal/non-formal education settings: Number of countries that have integrated mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning throughout all levels of education, including in nonformal settings | WEDO: Replace 13.b.1 with; Amount USD per year that is going towards specialized support to LDCs for mechanisms for raising capacities for effective climate change related planning and management, including focusing on women, youth, local and marginalized communities. |
| Women's Major Group/ International Women's Health Coalition | Given the very recent conclusion of the COP, the Women's Major Group suggests a longer-term consultation on the Goal 13 indicators. Our initial indicator proposals for 13.1.1 and 13.1.2 are below. Indicator 13.1.1 Number of people affected by hazardous events by age, sex, and socioeconomic status (including deaths, missing people, injured, relocated, or evacuated due to disasters); 13.1.2 Percentage of people who have effectively participated in the development of (local) adaptation and disaster risk reduction and resilience policies and practices (disaggregated by gender and other categories), at local, national and regional levels. There is ample evidence that supports the critical role that local communities play in developing and implementing effective resilience and adaptive capacity. This could also be an alternative for 11.b SIDS and LDCs have been questioning use of 'per 100,000' as in does not fit the population realities of small countries or reflects the relative impact of disasters on small population sizes. | Given the very recent conclusion of the COP, the Women's Major Group suggests a longer-term consultation on the Goal 13 indicators. Our initial indicator proposal is below. 13.2.1 Number of countries that have formally reviewed their national policies, strategies and planning in order to mainstream and indicate climate change measures that respect human rights and gender equality. | Given the very recent conclusion of the COP, the Women's Major Group suggests a longer-term consultation on the Goal 13 indicators. Our initial indicator proposal is below. Indicator 13.3.1: Number of countries that have integrated mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning throughout all levels of education, including in nonformal settings | Given the very recent conclusion of the COP, the Women's Major Group suggests a longer-term consultation on the Goal 13 indicators. Our initial indicator proposal is below. Replace with 13.b.1 Amount USD per year that is going towards specialized support to LDCs for mechanisms for raising capacities for effective climate change related planning and management, including focusing on women, youth, local and marginalized communities. |
| WWF | WWF: As similar indicators are already included under other goals, it would bring more value to include here an indicator on strengthening resilience, as per the proposal by UNEP. | WWF: Number of countries that have formally communicated the integrated low-carbon, climate resilient, disaster risk reduction development strategies to relevant UN agencies by 2020 | WWF: Number of countries that have integrated climate change mitigation and it's reduction measures, climate change adaptation, impact reduction and early warning into primary, secondary and tertiary curricula by 2020 |  |
| Amiable Resource | Action indexes... What conscious bio-physical behaviours are changing and transforming ?? Adaptation processes, implementation services and products of long term durability and resilient efficiencies... | Altruistic commitments and advancing leadership into tangible results with informed consumption and behaviour choices... | Loyal service to agreements... Fostered mobilization of improved lifestyles, humbled exploitations and restricted waste... | Immédiately Integrating knowledge exchanges, policy recommendations and academic innovations into primary schools, community groups and family routines... |
| LTO Nederland |  | % annual raise of sustainable stable organic matter in soils. Can easily be measured by taling soil samples. This cuts on three sides: carbon, biodiversity and production |  |  |
| new York University | USA, NYU: This indicator must be disaggregated by sex, age, etc |  |  |  |
| Red de Educación de Personas Jóvenes y Adultas |  |  | Extent to which i) climate change education has been incorporated into primary, secondary and tertiary curricula [mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning] and ii) programmes for awareness of climate change have been put in place |  |

| **Country/Organisation** | **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. | **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. | **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. | **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. | **Target 14.b:**Provide access for small-scale artisanal fishers to marine resources and markets. | **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. |
| *Indicator 14.1.1:*Nitrogen use efficiency composite indicator | *Indicator 14.2.1:*% 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 sharing and decent work | *Indicator 14.6.1:*Dollar value of negative fishery subsidies against 2015 baseline | *Indicator 14.7.1:*Fisheries as a % of GDP | *Indicator 14.b.1:*Consider "Proportion of national fishery production by country that are catches by small-medium fishery businesses" or FAO proposal of "Progress by countries in adopting and implementing legal/regulatory/policy/institutional framework which recognizes and protects access rights for small-scale fisheries" | *Indicator 14.c.1:*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 (moved to grey by IAEG-SDG Members during the green indicator consultation) |
| *Discussion prompt: The IAEG-SDG Members ask for suggestions for an alternative indicator that also includes marine debris.* |  | *Discussion prompt: The IAEG-SDG Members ask for suggestions for an alternative indicator, especially one to measure the prohibition of certain forms of fisheries subsidies.* |  | *Discussion prompt: At the 2nd IAEG-SDGs meeting, Members decided to consider the above two proposals* |  |
| **Total comments received** | 26 | 15 | 11 | 17 | 15 | 9 |
| Central Statistical Office of Poland | CSO of Poland comments: Further clarification is needed. CSO of Poland proposes an alternative indicator: total load of nitrates flowing into surface waters. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Government of Japan |  | Japan does not support this indicator and proposes further discussions because (1) ICM/MSP is only a measure to manage and protect marine and coastal ecosystems and does not represent the outcome of the implementation of the target by itself, (2) there are other similar methods such as marine protected areas and (3) the definition of ICM/MSP is not clear. | Japan does not support this indicator and proposes further discussions because (1) it makes no sense to calculate the amount of subsidies in the indicator because the discussion of define of fisheries subsidies have not been finalized in WTO negotiation and (2) the meaning of "negative" is not clear. |  | Japan supports "Progress by countries in adopting and implementing legal/regulatory/policy/institutional framework which recognizes and protects access rights for small scale fisheries." | Japan is supportive to the proposal of slight modification by UNSSO, "Progress by countries in implementing either legall or programmatically the provisions set out in relevant legally binding and voluntary instruments for sustainable use and conservation of ocean including instruments related to fisheries, shipping, labour, conservation at global and regional levels" because we think it indicates the progress of the implementation of the international law more precisely than the indicator referring to the number of countries. However, UNSSO should indicate how to measure the progress and ensure another chance for the stakeholders to review. In addition, it is needed to define that how instruments for shipping and labour can contribute to Goal 14. Otherwise the word, shipping and labour should be deleted from UNSSO's proposal. |
| Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Censos | We suggest the following indicator: Liquid discharge treatment plant care | The methodology of this indicator should be defined. | The methodology of this indicator should be defined. | The methodology of this indicator should be defined. In addition, the indicator does not denote whether fishing is done in a sustainable manner or if it is directly contribution to small fisher’s income . | We agree with the first indicator. |  |
| ISTAT | Istat-Italy: we suggest more methodological work. Comments made by Ministry of Environment "The proposal of Nitrogen use efficiency composite indicator is not thorough. It could be replaced by metric tonnes per year of plastic materials entering the ocean from all sources"; Comments made by ISPRA "The previous proposal should be integrated with "Input load of Nitrogen, Phosphorus and Organic matter in tonnes per year entering the ocean from all sources and "Input load of POPs, Heavy Metals and Oil in tonnes per year entering the ocean from all sources. These information can be found in the MSFD report. As the "hazardous substances"is concerned UN recognize the following categories: POPs, Radioactive substances, Heavy Metals Oil, Nutrient e Litter (Annex V - Assessment of Assessments Report). |  |  |  |  |  |
| Statistics Denmark | Inaccurate measure of nutrient pollution. “Nitrogen use efficiency” does not adequately reflect the intent of the target. Proposal for alternative indicator: Proportion of marine and coastal areas affected by pollution Additional indicator: - measurement of marine debris - measurement of underwater noice | Not sufficient.Very vague indicator. Proposae additional indicator: 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). | Should be in line with WTO rules. |  | Indicator should be further assessed. Tthe indicator does not say anything about access to marine resources and markets. |  |
| Statistics Finland |  |  |  | Finland comments that proposed indicator doesn't seem to measure the sustainable use of marine resources. Further methodological work on developing an alternative indicator is needed. |  |  |
| Statistics Korea |  |  |  |  | We support: "Proportion of national fishery production by country that are catches by small-medium fishery businesses |  |
| Statistics Portugal |  |  |  | What is the clear and objective relation between indicator and sustainable fisheries? An increase in the indicator may mean or not an increase in unsustainable fisheries. |  |  |
| TurkStat |  |  | Turkstat comments: Estimation of illegal fisheries would be an alternative indicator. | Turkstat comments: Fisheries contribution to GDP would be better since it is related with both fisheries share and growth rate in GDP. |  |  |
| United States | US: No comments at this time. Since COPS 21 has just concluded, we may have more comments to convey. | US: No comments at this time. Since COPS 21 has just concluded, we may have more comments to convey. | US: No comments at this time. Since COPS 21 has just concluded, we may have more comments to convey. | US: No comments at this time. Since COPS 21 has just concluded, we may have more comments to convey. | US: No comments at this time. Since COPS 21 has just concluded, we may have more comments to convey. | US: No comments at this time. Since COPS 21 has just concluded, we may have more comments to convey. |
| Eurostat | The main issue related to the target should not be use efficiency but loss of nutrients at a level that leads to undesirable impacts. Much work on this is made under UNECE, national nitrogen budgets are being prepared (e.g. http://www.initrogen.org/europe and http://www.clrtap-tfrn.org/epnb). Furthermore, phosphorus is becoming a key nutrient, so the indicator should also include phosphorus (See http://phosphorusplatform.eu). | Proposed indicator excludes management outside of "development" areas i.e. does not include protected areas, so does not fully map onto the target. Development of alternative indicator needed to achieve full coverage of the target. |  |  |  | “Regional seas protocols” should say “conventions”. And while the target refers to UNCLOS, the indicator picks up exclusively on other international instruments, so should be changed. |
| FAO |  |  | In FAO’s view, this indicator is problematic for monitoring target 14.6 and should be amended. Subsidies are not only a highly sensitive issue among member states, but “negative fishery subsidies” has no internationally agreed definition. An indicator based on negative fishery subsidies is therefore unlikely to be measurable. A more feasible alternative would be “Progress and coverage of multilateral, plurilateral or regional trade instruments that prohibit certain forms of fisheries subsidies which contribute to overcapacity and overfishing or that eliminate subsidies that contribute to illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing.” FAO has elaborated a new methodological factsheet to substantiate this proposal, taking into account countries’ request for “an alternative indicator, especially one to measure the prohibition of certain forms of fisheries subsidies”, and will transmit this to the Secretariat. Moreover, FAO also proposes that an indicator directly measuring the "Progress by countries in the implementation of international instruments on IUU fishing” may be highly relevant to this target. We recall that 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 these concerns, FAO proposed an IUU indicator for this target, formulated as "Progress by countries in the implementation of international instruments on IUU fishing”, and the relevant metadata have been submitted to the Secretariat. |  | As stated in Bangkok, FAO acknowledges that this indicator is problematic and suggests replacing it with its alternative proposal: “Progress by countries (level/degree of] in the application of 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 and is substantially more operationally feasible than the previous proposal relating to catch documentation. The new proposal draws on information from the biennial FAO survey questionnaire on the implementation of the Code of Conduct on Responsible Fisheries (CCRF), which will include new questions in relation to small-scale fisheries and the implementation of the Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication (SSF Guidelines). The first results will become available for FAO’s Committee on Fisheries (COFI) in 2016, allowing for the definition of a baseline and starting period for this indicator. Data could therefore be produced at country level every two years through the electronic questionnaire, based on the same objective scoring system used for the CCRF indicators family (14.6, 14.b, 14.c). FAO would also like to reiterate the statement made during the Bangkok meeting relating to the alternative proposal “Proportion of national fishery production by country that are catches by small-medium fishery businesses”. In FAO’s view, such an indicator would be very weakly indicative of any progress towards target 14.b as formulated, which calls for providing access for small-scale fishers to resources and markets. | FAO welcomes the re-categorization of this indicator to grey, which provides the needed space for further discussion on the appropriate metric for this critical target. Building on its input during the three-day consultation of green indicators, FAO has continued to coordinate with the main organizations in this area (IMO, ILO, UNEP, IOC-UNESCO, and DOALOS (also acting as UN-Oceans Secretariat)) in order to determine a better indicator. Mindful of the complexity of this objective, FAO organized a teleconference with these organizations on December 14th in order to discuss the various proposals and explore the way forward. FAO suggested the following guiding principles for more thorough discussions between now and February, and other organizations are invited to provide comments: To progress discussions with a view to reaching an agreement between the relevant organizations on the text for indicator 14.c, the following principles for the indicator are proposed: 1) Holistic The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development provides that the global indicator framework will be simple yet robust and address all SDGs and targets, including for means of implementation, and preserve the political balance, integration and ambition contained therein (para. 75). To that end, indicator 14.c needs to be robust and holistic in scope to adequately capture the intent of target 14.c. 2) Measurable The indicator is to be acceptable on methodological grounds and includes at least some degree of graduation. 3) Implementation of international law, as reflected in the 1982 UN Convention on the Law of the Sea Countries should be able to report on their implementation of international law, as reflected in the 1982 UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS). As provisions of UNCLOS are implemented through sectors, reporting of implementation of norms or emerging concepts formulated in instruments, whether legally-binding or not, is advisable and should build on monitoring of implementation being carried out by the sector related organizations and fora. 4) Explicit sectoral reference The 2030 Agenda calls for the active support of the UN system, including in the reporting of progress with global indicators (para. 83). In order to garner such support and cooperation from relevant UN organizations, explicit reference of key sectors is essential. Such representation promotes ownership and support of the monitoring and evaluation process for the indicator and the coherent and integrated support to implementation of the new Agenda by the UN system and other multilateral organizations. 5) Conservation and sustainable use of oceans and their resources While it is noted that the phrase “conservation and sustainable use” or “sustainable use” is not defined in UNCLOS, they are interpreted broadly to include the protection and preservation of the marine environment, resource extraction activities, and other uses of the oceans such as shipping and shipping-related matters. With these guiding principles in mind, FAO has proposed the following indicator as the appropriate metric for 14.c: “Progress by countries in implementing either legally or programmatically the provisions set out in relevant legally binding and voluntary instruments for sustainable use and conservation of the ocean, including instruments related to fisheries, shipping, labour, health of the marine environment, and conservation at global and regional levels”. This is a relevant, inclusive and measurable indicator, and FAO has already provided a detailed methodological note on how it could measure the fisheries component. The specific indicator proposed for fisheries by FAO is: “Progress by countries in [level/degree of] implementation of provisions of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (CCRF) and associated guidelines and plans, as reported in the biannual CCRF questionnaire surveys”. |
| Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of UNESCO | IOC/UNESCO: The current proposed indicator is not appropriate since fertilisers (for e.g. Nitrogen) are estimated to account for 24 to 30% of the global N input to marine ecosystems, which means that focusing only Nitrogen use would not capture the rest of the nutrients that ends up in the marine waters. It would more appropriate to focus on changes in the receiving system (i.e. the marine and coastal ecosystems. Through the UN consolidated inputs that was submitted to the second meeting of the IAEG-SDG in October, IOC and other UN agencies agreed on the following indicator: Index of Coastal Eutrophication (ICEP) and Floating Plastic debris Density The ICEP component sub-indicator is based on the fact that increased nutrients (nitrogen (N), phosphorus (P), and silica (Si)—from land-based sources entering coastal waters can result in high-biomass algal blooms, depletion of oxygen, increased turbidity, changes in community composition, and other effects (eutrophication). In addition, changes in the ratio of N:P:Si can promote the development of algae that are toxic and otherwise harmful to humans and ecosystems. The amount and ratio of N, P and Si from land-based sources can be directly measured at the mouth of rivers to calculate nutrient loads and ratios (ICEP). Application of the Nutient Export from Watersheds (NEWS) model can be used to calculate loads and ratios where measurements are not available as well as provide information on nutrient sources from human activities (e.g., agricutlure, fossil fuel combustion, sewage) which can be used for management decision on how to reduce nutrient pollution. Floating plastic is now ubiquitous in the global ocean, but highly variable in concentration. Larger items of plastic debris have been shown to have a significant detrimental impacts on many species of marine organisms, mainly due to entanglement and ingestion. We cannot measure all debris entering the ocean but the use of models will assist in coming up with quantitative assessments. Relative quantities of floating plastics can be estimated using a combination of hydrodynamic and particle-tracking models (HYCOM/NCODA and Pol3DD) It is important to note that both sub-indicators have been developed in the context of the Transboundary Water Assessment Programme implemented by IOC and UNEP. Finally, though not included here, tracking what Member States are actually doing in qualitative terms to achieve this target may also need to be measured. Possible indicators would be: the existence of regulatory regimes and some evidence of implementation; actions taken to comply with actions taken at the national and regional level to minimise and manage waste from land-based activities. | Through the UN consolidated inputs that was submitted to the second meeting of the IAEG-SDG in October, IOC and other UN agencies agreed on the following indicator: % of national Exclusive Economic Zones managed using ecosystem-based approaches Whilst this indicator further methodological work, the indicator would be measured through the global database of MPA including multi-use areas, other inventories of managed areas (eg LMMAs, ICCAs, etc) and other tools to measure progress on areas managed using the principles of an ecosystem approach such as the UNEP-Live portal on area-based planning and management (in development); the ecosystem approach to fisheries tracking tool, and the global assessment on Marine Spatial Planning conducted by IOC. |  |  |  |  |
| Ramsar Convention Secretariat |  | The Ramsar Secretariat suggests an alternative indicator: “percentage of change in the extent of marine and coastal wetlands”. The ability of wetlands to support the sustainable management of coastal and marine ecosystems can be measured through trends in their extent. This indicator would complement the indicator for target 14.5 which measures the “Coverage of protected areas in relation to marine areas”, although the Ramsar Secretariat would strongly recommend that coastal protected areas should also be included in the indicator for Target 14.5: "Coverage of protected areas in related to marine and coastal areas". As the suggested indicator for 6.6 focuses only on freshwater ecosystems, thus excluding coastal and marine wetlands, this alternative indicator for target 14.2 would also allow reporting on the trends in the extent of coastal and marine wetlands taking in consideration that the State of the World’s Wetlands Report indicates that coastal and marine wetlands are declining more than inland wetlands. The data would be obtained through the WET index (Wetlands Extend Trends Index) and would be disaggregated by wetland type as defined by the Ramsar Convention, which include coastal wetlands and marine wetlands up to 6m in depth at low tide. The metadata for this indicator is available based on the metadata initially produced for the indicator for Target 6.6. |  |  |  |  |
| UN ESCAP |  |  | WTO is negotiating this issue. There is also a notification requirement on subsidies, but that needs to be stregthened. Consultation with WTO and use of notifications would be an important source for monitoring this target. |  |  |  |
| UN World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO) |  |  |  | UNWTO comment: The dimension of "sustainable use of marine resources" seems central to the target. The current indicator is focused on fisheries only. The "tourism" dimension in this target could be considered by making cross-references to the indicators proposed under target 8.9. |  |  |
| UNDP | UNDP PROPOSAL \* Global (and preferably broken down by region) volume of debris released into the marine environment (metric tonnes per year) from land and ocean-based activities against baseline year (2015). | UNDP PROPOSAL \* % and km2 of Exclusive Economic Zone area (by country/continent/major region) with formulated or implemented ICM/MSP/LME plans | UNDP PROPOSAL \* Net reduction (US$) in negative fisheries subsidies achieved via their phasing out/prohibition, against 2015 baseline | UNDP PROPOSAL \* Sustainable fisheries, tourism and aquaculture as a % of SIDS and LDCs GDP, against 2015 baseline. | UNDP PROPOSAL \* Number of countries that have adopted and are implementing legal/policy/institutional framework which recognizes and protects access rights for small scale fisheries, leading to measurable increase in share of catch by small/medium scale fishers (against 2015 baseline). | UNDP PROPOSAL \* Number of countries implementing, either legally or programatically, the provisions set out in relevant regional seas, regional fisheries, Large Marine Ecosystem and IMO/shipping conventions and protocols; and ratification and implementation of the ILO Maritime and Fisheries Conventions COMMENT Gross indicator = Sum(# countries x agreements each country is implementing), against 2015 baseline |
| UNEP | UNEP Comments: The UN agencies propose two priority indicators to capture the dual focus of the target: a) Index of Coastal Eutrophication (ICEP); and b) Floating Plastic Debris (Particles/Km2). UNEP is available to assist operationalizing these proposed indicators through the Global Nutrient Partnership and Marine Litter Partnership working with IOC, GESAMP, others etc. The earlier proposed indicator on Nitrogen Use Efficiency is to some extend embedded with the broader Index of Coastal Eutrophication (ICEP). Moreover, 18 Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans are currently working to develop a core set of common indicators to be used across regional seas for routing monitoring and reporting on the status of the marine environment. Several proposed indicators are relevant to 14.1, for example: (a) Chlorophyll a concentration as an indicator of phytoplankton biomass; (b) Locatıons and frequency of algal blooms reported (c) Trends for selected priority chemicals ıncludıng POPs and heavy metals; (d) Quantification and classıfıcatıon of beach litter items, as well as indicators related to management of marine pollution and debris. This coordinated effort across Regional Seas, which builds on several already existing indicators and monitoring efforts can support delivery and monitoring of 14.1. Further details are at: http://www.unep.org/ecosystemmanagement/water/regionalseas40/Meetings/RegionalSeasIndicatorsWorkingGroup/tabid/1060470/Default.aspx | UNEP Comments: One priority indicator is proposed representing a consolidated, more practical indicator, which is supported by UNEP, IOC, FAO, IMO, DOALOS: a) Percentage of national EEZ managed using ecosystem-based approaches. While requiring some further development for practical implementation, the indicator is similar to UNEP indicators to monitor progress on marine and coastal EBM under its biannual programme of work. UNEP, IOC and FAO are available to support countries in operationalizing the indicator. Linkages can be explored with IUCN’s ‘Green List’ and the ‘Ocean Health Index’ to finalise the details supported by UNEP, IOC, FAO. Moreover, 18 Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans are currently working to develop a core set of common indicators to be used across regional seas for routing monitoring and reporting on the status of the marine environment. Several proposed indicators are relevant to 14.2, for example: (a) National ICZM guidelines and enabling legislation adopted; (b) Number of existing national and local coastal and marine plans incorporating climate change adaptation; (c) % national adaptation plans in place; (d) Fisheries measures in place (by-catch limits, area-based closures, recovery plans, capacity reduction measures); (e) Trends in critical habitat extent and condition; (f) Population pressure/urbanization: Length of coastal modification and km2 of coastal reclamation. This coordinated effort across Regional Seas, which builds on several already existing indicators and monitoring efforts can support delivery and monitoring of 14.2. Further details are at: http://www.unep.org/ecosystemmanagement/water/regionalseas40/Meetings/RegionalSeasIndicatorsWorkingGroup/tabid/1060470/Default.aspx |  | UNEP Comments: A new priority indicator is proposed by UN agencies, representing a more inclusive measure: a) Revenues and ecosystem services derived from sustainable fisheries, aquaculture, tourism and other coastal and marine resources uses. UNEP can also support the development of a practical indicator that accounts for ecosystem services in Small Island Development States relevant for 14.7, building on existing guidance on valuation and accounting of ecosystem services in SIDS: http://apps.unep.org/publications/index.php?option=com\_pub&task=download&file=011406\_en |  | UNEP Comments: Based on ongoing discussions among UN agencies, the following draft indicator is proposed for further operationalision: “Progress by countries in implementing either legally or programmatically the provisions set out in relevant legally binding and voluntary instruments for sustainable use and conservation of the ocean including, instruments related to fisheries, shipping, labour, health of marine environment, conservation at global and regional levels”. This formulation includes soft legal frameworks, like Implementation of the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (GPA) and some Regional Seas Action Plans, representing important platforms for the environmental pillar of SDG14c. Both Regional Seas and GPA have commitments and to varying degree systems for environmental monitoring and reporting that can support this indicator. Moreover, 18 Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans are currently working to develop a core set of common indicators to be used across regional seas for routing monitoring and reporting on the status of the marine environment. Several proposed indicators are relevant to 14.c, for example: (a) National ICZM guidelines and enabling legislation adopted; (b) National Action Plans to reduce input from Land-based Sources of pollution to the marine environment: % National action plans ratified / operational; (c) % of waste water facilities complying with adequate standards; (d) Incentive to reduce marine litter at sources, including: i) % port waste reception facilities available, ii) Incentives to reduce land based sources, iii) Amount of recycled waste on land (%). This coordinated effort across Regional Seas, which builds on several already existing indicators and monitoring efforts can support delivery and monitoring of 14.c. Further details are at: http://www.unep.org/ecosystemmanagement/water/regionalseas40/Meetings/RegionalSeasIndicatorsWorkingGroup/tabid/1060470/Default.aspx |
| World Bank |  | Too complex, suggest simplification e.g. % of coastal and marine development (to be defined) with formulated or implemented ICM/MSP plans. |  |  | FAO proposal is best linked to the target, with some fine tuning. |  |
| Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact |  |  |  |  | The practice of traditional occupations such as small-scale artisanal fisheries and, for example, family farming, pastoralism and shifting cultivation, is a fundamental right under international law. An indicator on traditional occupations, based on international instruments such as ILO Convention No. 111 on discrimination in employment and occupations, has already been adopted by states parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity. This indicator can also be used to monitor target 14 b, and will also contribute information relevant for targets 2.3 and 2.4. The indicator is: “Status and trends in traditional occupations”. See more at: https://www.cbd.int/doc/.../tk/.../wg8j-08-09-en.doc |  |
| Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International | Comments from Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International, Netherlands  Indicators for marine plastics, with assessment of percentage and types of plastics within aquatic ecosystems and species, and prevalence of micro plastic beads | Comments from Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International, Netherlands  Indicator based on percentage of national marine area that subject to a marine conservation or protection designation. | Comments from Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International, Netherlands   Removal and elimination of commercial fisheries subsidies, as an annual percentage reduction from a baseline year | Comments from Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International, Netherlands   Sustainable fisheries as a percentage of GDP  Sustainable aquaculture as percentage of GDP.  Sustainable tourism as percentage of GDP | Comments from Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International, Netherlands  Suggest both be included as complementary measures. | Comments from Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International, Netherlands  Support the above indicator. |
| Danish Institute for Human Rights |  |  |  |  | The practice of traditional occupations such as small-scale artisanal fisheries and, for example, family farming, pastoralism and shifting cultivation, is a fundamental right under international law. An indicator on traditional occupations, based on international instruments such as ILO Convention No. 111 on discrimination in employment and occupations, has already been adopted by states parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity. This indicator can also be used to monitor target 14 b, and will also contribute information relevant for targets 2.3 and 2.4. The indicator is: “Status and trends in traditional occupations”. See more at: https://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/tk/wg8j-08/official/wg8j-08-09-en.doc |  |
| EU Nitrogen Expert Panel / Wageningen University | The EU Nitrogen Expert Panel (about 20 experts from science, policy, industry and farmers’ practice in the European Union) supports the proposed ‘nitrogen use efficiency' indicator (indicator 14.1.1), although we argue that this indicator is equally important for sustainable agriculture (targets 2.3 and 2.4). In addition, the EU Nitrogen Expert Panel proposes the Nitrogen Use Efficiency (NUE) indicator that has recently been described and agreed by the Panel. As shown in the summary report (see link to report below), our NUE indicator is easy-to-use and applicable to all agricultural systems and food systems, and at different scales. The NUE indicator is based on sound scientific principles, i.e., the mass balance principle, using nitrogen input and nitrogen output in harvested yield for its calculation: NUE = nitrogen output divided by nitrogen input. NUE values have to be interpreted in relation to productivity level (nitrogen output in harvested yield) and to nitrogen surplus (i.e., the difference between total nitrogen input and nitrogen output in harvested yield). Thereby, the NUE indicator provides information about both (i) resource use effciency (NUE), (ii) the economy of food production (nitrogen in harvested yield), and (iii) the pressure on the environment (nitrogen surplus). The NUE indicator allows decision makers to examine differences between farms, between specific systems, between countries, and between years. Effects of technical progress and of policy measures can be identified. As such, the NUE indicator can serve as a valuable indicator for monitoring sustainable development in relation to food production and environmental challenges. By considering limits associate with both excess and insufficient N use, the NUE framework contributes towards improving N use efficiency in the food chain. For proper comparisons, a clear and approved protocol is needed for uniform data and information collection, processing and reporting. The EU Nitrogen Expert Panel has prepared an easy-to-use graphical approach for interpreting the the NUE indicator. Our approach is rather similar to (but easier to understand than) the approach of the Global Partnership on Nutriënt Management (GPNM). Link to the “EU Nitrogen Expert Panel” web site and to the summary report: www.eunep.com |  |  |  |  |  |
| Finnish NGDO platform to the EU | a) Ocean Health Index. b) Area of coral reef ecosystems and percentage live cover. c) Percentage of land-based pollution levels reduced, including litter and oils, municipal wastewater, nutrients and sediments, radioactive waste, heavy metals and persistent organic pollutants. | a) Share of coastal and marine areas that are protected | a) Elimination of fisheries subsidies that contribute to overcapacity and overfishing. | a) Number of countries that have developed or implemented sustainable management plans for fisheries, aquaculture and tourism. |  |  |
| Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei | FEEM: more extensively, amount of pesticides/fertilizers used in agricutlure |  |  | FEEM: how can we evaluate this indicator (the higher the worse)? Should be rather: share of total marine activities value added attributed to sustainable management of marine resources (e.g. ecotourism)? |  |  |
| SIWI (Stockholm International Water Institute) | Organisation SIWI Comments: As most of pollutants tend to end up in water it could be wise to expand the monitoring of indicator 6.3.1. “Percentage of receiving water bodies with ambient water quality not presenting risk to the environment or human health” to cover more of target 14.1 than the proposed indicator. Nitrogen use efficiency only covers some of the pollution from diffuse sources. With strong explicit links to a broader 6.3.1, (in e.g. a 14.1.1b) a focus on marine debris in 14.1.1 could be acceptable. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN) | SDSN comments: SDSN supports the EU Nitrogen Expert Panel (about 20 experts from science, policy, industry and farmers’ practice in the European Union) proposed ‘nitrogen use efficiency' indicator. Indeed, this indicator is also multi-purpose as it is an important measure for sustainable agriculture (targets 2.3 and 2.4). The EU Nitrogen Expert Panel’s Nitrogen Use Efficiency (NUE) indicator is easy-to-use and applicable to all agricultural systems and food systems, and at different scales. It is based on sound scientific principles, and it provides information about both (i) resource use efficiency (NUE), (ii) the economy of food production (nitrogen in harvested yield), and (iii) the pressure on the environment (nitrogen surplus). The NUE indicator allows decision makers to examine differences between farms, between specific systems, between countries, and over years. Effects of technical progress and of policy measures can be identified. As such, the NUE indicator can serve as a valuable indicator for monitoring sustainable development in relation to food production and environmental challenges. By considering the limits associated with both excess and insufficient N use, the NUE framework contributes towards improving N use efficiency in the food chain. For proper comparisons, a clear and approved protocol is needed for uniform data and information collection, processing and reporting. The NUE indicator also tracks Targets 2.4. and 14.1. For more information, see the EU Nitrogen Expert Panel web site and summary report: www.eunep.com | SDSN comments: Protected areas overlay with biodiversity: This indicator could be used for several targets and it gives good information on area protected, biodiversity relevance of the areas protected and, ultimately, in time, how well protected areas are being managed. |  | SDSN comments: This indicator doesn't illustrate at all the sustainable use of resources. An increase in the indicator could be a reflection of a more massive and unsustainable approach to fisheries. Furthermore, it focuses only on one sector (fisheries), ignoring tourism and aquaculture. Instead, we recommend using the "Percentage of fish tonnage landed within Maximum Sustainable Yield (MSY)" as a multipurpose indicator. MSY is the largest average yield (catch) that can theoretically be taken from a species’ stock over an indefinite period under constant environmental conditions. It is usually measured in tons.This indicator provides information on the degree of exploitation of fishery resources and the progress towards sustainable management of fisheries. The UN Conference on the Law of the Sea, the UN Fish Stocks Agreement, the Plan of Implementation of the 2001 World Summit on Sustainable Development, and the CBD, among others, all refer to MSY-based reference points and targets. In the final declaration from Rio+20, states committed to take urgent measures to “maintain or restore all stocks at least to levels that can produce the maximum sustainable yield (MSY).” | SDSN comments: FAO's proposal is too policy oriented. That indicator would not necessarily illustrate actual results on access trends over time. |  |
| Sustainable World Initiative |  |  |  | This indicator does not address whether the fisheries are sustainable. | The first option is more specific and relevant to Target 14.b. |  |
| UN Major Group for Children and Youth | Align with Planetary boundaries framework. |  |  | Need to quality 'sustainable' here. "% of GDP derived from sustainably certified fisheries" |  |  |
| Women's Major Group/ International Women's Health Coalition | The Women's Major Group proposes the below indicator. 14.1.2 Using 2015 as a baseline, record the volume of marine debris which collects in ocean gyres and progressively to measure the effectiveness of steps to prevent and/or reduce marine pollution, in particular marine plastics using environmentally sound practices. |  |  |  |  |  |
| WWF | WWF: WWF suggests replacing the proposed indicator with the suite of HELCOM (Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission) indicators in order to capture a more comprehensive set of pollution indicators. Data are collected by regional seas organisations and national coastal management organisations. Vessel based garbage into sea could be measured via proxy: MARPOL Annex V ratified and implemented by all flag states. The Red List Index and Living Planet Index of species threatened by pollution would also be of use and bring interlinkages with other targets. | WWF: WWF proposes to replace the proposed indicator with "Percentage of change in the extent of marine and coastal wetlands”.... as proposed by Ramsar. The ability of wetlands to support the sustainable management of coastal and marine ecosystems can be measured through trends in their extent. As the suggested indicator for 6.6 focuses only on freshwater ecosystems, this indicator under target 14.2 would also allow reporting on the trends in the extent of coastal and marine wetlands. The data would be obtained through the WET index (Wetlands Extend Trends Index) and would be disaggregated by wetland type as defined by the Ramsar Convention. In addition, WWF strongly suggests to AMEND 14.5 to include coastal areas: "Coverage of protected areas in related to marine and coastal areas" to ensure full coverage. |  | WWF: To capture the sustainability and productivity dimensions of this target, 14.7 should be informed jointly by the suggested indicator for 14.4 “Proportion of fish stocks within biologically sustainable level” and the suggested indicator “Fisheries as a percentage of GDP”. In addition, in order to better represent the economic benefits for SIDS and LDCs WWF suggests an additional indicator on “Volume of aquaculture production certified against credible independent certification schemes” with data collected from the certification bodies. | WWF supports the FAO proposal. | WWF suggests amending the suggested indicator to add other relevant agreements: ‘Number of countries implementing the provisions set out in all relevant agreements and instruments (including UN Fish Stocks Agreement, IMO MARPOL and annexes, Cape Town Agreement, STWC-F, FAO Port State Measures Agreement, ILO Labour in Fishing Agreement, the UNGA annual oceans and fisheries resolutions). |
| ACC (American Chemistry Council) and CEFIC (European Chemical Industry Council) | ACC and CEFIC - SUPPLEMENTAL INDICATOR: The number of countries developing and implementing innovative solid waste management programs as means to reduce land-based sources of marine debris, consistent with the recommendations of the report:"Stemming the Tide: Land-based strategies for a plastic-free ocean", by the Trash Free Seas Alliance of the Ocean Conservancy. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Amiable Resource | Education and awareness to playgrounds, social and sport clubs like muséums and exécutive boardrooms. .. | Too much... Inventives and community expérimentations with aqua and perma culture practices, establishments and productions. Educational awareness, supply relief as demand subsidiés and capacity building while wild stocks recover and rest... | Dissolve trade tarifs, import and export inventives... Raise standards, stewardship and sensé of invested or responsible ownership with wild and natural systèmes... | Populations are Clearly deminishing and under stressed eventual threat without commited changes... Both too much and not enough... | Good | Good, reduced competition while increased research, cooperation and conservative protections... |
| CF Industries | CF Industries is a global leader in nitrogen fertilizer manufacturing and distribution through our ownership and operation of world-scale nitrogen complexes, located in the U.S., Canada and the United Kingdom. We are members of the International Fertilizer Industry Association (IFA), and we support the association’s comments on Indicator 14.1.1 which are incorporated below. The current proposed “nitrogen use efficiency composite indicator” is an improvement compared to the initially proposed indicator for Target 14.1 (fertilizer use in kg/ha). However it is a proxy that does not provide a comprehensive picture of marine pollution. First, nitrogen use efficiency does not provide any useful information on plastic debris pollution. Second, as far as nutrient pollution is concerned, it focuses on nitrogen only, while other nutrients are also involved in eutrophication processes, especially phosphorus and silicon. In addition, it is unclear whether the proposed nitrogen use efficiency (NUE) indicator would apply to crop production only, to agricultural production (including livestock and fish farming), to the food chain (from field to fork), or to the economy as a whole (including energy combustion, industrial wastes, etc.). If the NUE indicator applies to crop production only, it is irrelevant from a marine environment point of view because fertilizers do not account for the majority of nitrogen-related marine pollution and the proposed indicator ignores nitrogen pollution from livestock manure, sewage, atmospheric deposition and other sources. The NUE indicator would be more relevant if applied to agricultural production, to the food chain, or to the whole economy. From an ocean health point of view, relevance of the NUE indicator increases with its scope. However, complexity of its monitoring also increases with its scope. This raises issues as to the capacity of countries, especially developing countries, to monitor this indicator. However, should NUE in cropping systems be retained as indicator, it should be monitored following the methodology agreed by the Global Partnership on Nutrient Management (GPNM): http://www.nutrientchallenge.org/document/position-paper-nitrogen-use-efficiency-and-nutrient-performance-indicators It should be noted that this indicator has been designed for monitoring Target 2.4, not Target 14.1. Because NUE does not provide information on other limiting nutrients in marine systems, such as phosphorus and silicon, and it does not provide information on all sources of nitrogen unless a very complicated economy-wide indicator is monitored, we recommend using the Indicator of Coastal Eutrophication Potential (ICEP) for Target 14.1. This indicator is relevant because it is based on nitrogen, phosphorus and silicon inputs in estuaries, and it measures nutrient pollution from all sources – fertilizer, manure, sewage, atmospheric deposition, etc. Ideally, ICEP should be supplemented by an indicator reflecting the plastic debris input to oceans. |  |  |  |  |  |
| International Fertilizer Industry Association | The current proposed “nitrogen use efficiency composite indicator” is an improvement compared to the initially proposed indicator for Target 14.1 (fertilizer use in kg/ha). However it is a proxy that does not provide a comprehensive picture of marine pollution. First, nitrogen use efficiency does not provide any useful information on plastic debris pollution. Second, as far as nutrient pollution is concerned, it focuses on nitrogen only, while other nutrients are also involved in eutrophication processes, especially phosphorus and silicon. In addition, it is unclear whether the proposed nitrogen use efficiency (NUE) indicator would apply to crop production only, to agricultural production (including livestock and fish farming), to the food chain (from field to fork), or to the economy as a whole (including energy combustion, industrial wastes, etc.). If the NUE indicator applies to crop production only, it is irrelevant from a marine environment point of view because fertilizers do not account for the majority of nitrogen-related marine pollution and the proposed indicator ignores nitrogen pollution from livestock manure, sewage, atmospheric deposition and other sources. The NUE indicator would be more relevant if applied to agricultural production, to the food chain, or to the whole economy. From an ocean health point of view, relevance of the NUE indicator increases with its scope. However, complexity of its monitoring also increases with its scope. This raises issues as to the capacity of countries, especially developing countries, to monitor this indicator. However, should NUE in cropping systems be retained as indicator, it should be monitored following the methodology agreed by the Global Partnership on Nutrient Management (GPNM): http://www.nutrientchallenge.org/document/position-paper-nitrogen-use-efficiency-and-nutrient-performance-indicators It should be noted that this indicator has been designed for monitoring Target 2.4, not Target 14.1. Because NUE does not provide information on other limiting nutrients in marine systems, such as phosphorus and silicon, and it does not provide information on all sources of nitrogen unless a very complicated economy-wide indicator is monitored, we recommend using the Indicator of Coastal Eutrophication Potential (ICEP) for Target 14.1. This indicator is relevant because it is based on nitrogen, phosphorus and silicon inputs in estuaries, and it measures nutrient pollution from all sources – fertilizer, manure, sewage, atmospheric deposition, etc. Ideally, ICEP should be supplemented by an indicator reflecting the plastic debris input to oceans. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kingenta Ecological Engineering Group Co. Ltd. | Comments by the International Fertilizer Industry Association (IFA) on Proposed SDG Indicators for Targets 2.3 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 Following the Bangkok meeting of the Inter-Agency and Expert Group (IAEG) on SDG Indicators, three potential indicators have been proposed for Target 2.4: 2.4.1 the percentage of agricultural area under sustainable agricultural practices (the original proposed indicator) 2.4.2 the percentage of agricultural households using irrigation systems compared to all agricultural households 2.4.3 the percentage of agricultural households using eco-friendly fertilizers compared to all agricultural households using fertilizers. The original indicator - the percentage of agricultural area under sustainable agricultural practices -closely matches the target. The issue is that there is no clear definition of "sustainable agricultural practices” yet. The term “sustainable agricultural practices” should include all forms of sustainable agriculture, including sustainably intensive agriculture. Any suggestion that sustainably intensive agriculture is undesirable would have negative impacts on food security, nutrition and biodiversity, particularly in regions with highly degraded soils and low agricultural productivity such as Africa. FAO is working on a definition and will complete this by the end of the year. We recommend that this indicator be provisionally approved by the IAEG pending the development of a measurable definition. The proposed indicator 2.4.2 percentage of agricultural households using irrigation systems may be appropriate in some regions but is meaningless in regions were adequate regular rainfall means irrigation is not required or where increasing irrigated areas by pumping groundwater is not sustainable due to physical water scarcity. Therefore, it is not a suitable global indicator. The proposed indicator 2.4.3 percentage of agricultural households using eco-friendly fertilizers compared to all agricultural households using fertilizers is a very vague indicator because the term “eco-friendly fertilizers” is a not an established term and is not defined. If “eco-friendly fertilizers” is defined as “fertilizers adapted to the site- and crop-specific conditions, whether of mineral, organic or organo-mineral origin” then there may be some validity in the Indicator, although it would only cover one aspect of agricultural sustainability and would be open to misinterpretation. If the term is taken to refer to organic sources of nutrients only, it would be a misleading indicator because it would focus on one form of agriculture only (organic farming) and would ignore most forms of sustainable agriculture, which should ideally integrate both organic and mineral nutrient sources. This would have negative consequences on food security, both in developed and developing nations. In most regions the availability of organic nutrients is insufficient to maintain or increase yields and maintain soil health. It is estimated that, globally, organic nutrients are sufficient to maintain around half of current agricultural production. It would also conflict with Target 2.3 as it is impossible to increase sustainably the productivity of small scale food producers without access to all forms of crop nutrients, organic and mineral. The proposed indicator would give a contra indication as countries applying sustainable integrated nutrient practices would appear to be performing badly against the indicator when in fact they would be meeting targets 2.4 and 2.3. We strongly recommend using the “percentage of agricultural area under sustainable agricultural practices” as the indicator for Target 2.4, with a broad definition of “sustainable agricultural practices” to be adopted by FAO.   Comments by the International Fertilizer Industry Association (IFA) on Proposed SDG Indicators for Target 14.1 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 The current proposed “nitrogen use efficiency composite indicator” is an improvement compared to the initially proposed indicator for Target 14.1 (fertilizer use in kg/ha). However it is a proxy that does not provide a comprehensive picture of marine pollution. First, nitrogen use efficiency does not provide any useful information on plastic debris pollution. Second, as far as nutrient pollution is concerned, it focuses on nitrogen only, while other nutrients are also involved in eutrophication processes, especially phosphorus and silicon. In addition, it is unclear whether the proposed nitrogen use efficiency (NUE) indicator would apply to crop production only, to agricultural production (including livestock and fish farming), to the food chain (from field to fork), or to the economy as a whole (including energy combustion, industrial wastes, etc.). If the NUE indicator applies to crop production only, it is irrelevant from a marine environment point of view because fertilizers do not account for the majority of nitrogen-related marine pollution and the proposed indicator ignores nitrogen pollution from livestock manure, sewage, atmospheric deposition and other sources. The NUE indicator would be more relevant if applied to agricultural production, to the food chain, or to the whole economy. From an ocean health point of view, relevance of the NUE indicator increases with its scope. However, complexity of its monitoring also increases with its scope. This raises issues as to the capacity of countries, especially developing countries, to monitor this indicator. However, should NUE in cropping systems be retained as indicator, it should be monitored following the methodology agreed by the Global Partnership on Nutrient Management (GPNM): http://www.nutrientchallenge.org/document/position-paper-nitrogen-use-efficiency-and-nutrient-performance-indicators It should be noted that this indicator has been designed for monitoring Target 2.4, not Target 14.1. Because NUE does not provide information on other limiting nutrients in marine systems, such as phosphorus and silicon, and it does not provide information on all sources of nitrogen unless a very complicated economy-wide indicator is monitored, we recommend using the Indicator of Coastal Eutrophication Potential (ICEP) for Target 14.1. This indicator is relevant because it is based on nitrogen, phosphorus and silicon inputs in estuaries, and it measures nutrient pollution from all sources – fertilizer, manure, sewage, atmospheric deposition, etc. Ideally, ICEP should be supplemented by an indicator reflecting the plastic debris input to oceans. December 2015 For further information on the fertilizer industry, the importance of integrated nutrient management to food security, soil health and protecting biodiversity see www.fertilizer.org/aboutfertilizers |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOROS AGRI | Turkey - Toros Agri comments; The current proposed “nitrogen use efficiency composite indicator” is an improvement compared to the initially proposed indicator for Target 14.1 (fertilizer use in kg/ha). However it is a proxy that does not provide a comprehensive picture of marine pollution. First, nitrogen use efficiency does not provide any useful information on plastic debris pollution. Second, as far as nutrient pollution is concerned, it focuses on nitrogen only, while other nutrients are also involved in eutrophication processes, especially phosphorus and silicon. In addition, it is unclear whether the proposed nitrogen use efficiency (NUE) indicator would apply to crop production only, to agricultural production (including livestock and fish farming), to the food chain (from field to fork), or to the economy as a whole (including energy combustion, industrial wastes, etc.). If the NUE indicator applies to crop production only, it is irrelevant from a marine environment point of view because fertilizers do not account for the majority of nitrogen-related marine pollution and the proposed indicator ignores nitrogen pollution from livestock manure, sewage, atmospheric deposition and other sources. The NUE indicator would be more relevant if applied to agricultural production, to the food chain, or to the whole economy. From an ocean health point of view, relevance of the NUE indicator increases with its scope. However, complexity of its monitoring also increases with its scope. This raises issues as to the capacity of countries, especially developing countries, to monitor this indicator. However, should NUE in cropping systems be retained as indicator, it should be monitored following the methodology agreed by the Global Partnership on Nutrient Management (GPNM): http://www.nutrientchallenge.org/document/position-paper-nitrogen-use-efficiency-and-nutrient-performance-indicators It should be noted that this indicator has been designed for monitoring Target 2.4, not Target 14.1. Because NUE does not provide information on other limiting nutrients in marine systems, such as phosphorus and silicon, and it does not provide information on all sources of nitrogen unless a very complicated economy-wide indicator is monitored, we recommend using the Indicator of Coastal Eutrophication Potential (ICEP) for Target 14.1. This indicator is relevant because it is based on nitrogen, phosphorus and silicon inputs in estuaries, and it measures nutrient pollution from all sources – fertilizer, manure, sewage, atmospheric deposition, etc. Ideally, ICEP should be supplemented by an indicator reflecting the plastic debris input to oceans. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yara International | Comment from Yara international (Norwegian corporation): The current proposed “nitrogen use efficiency composite indicator” is an improvement compared to the initially proposed indicator for Target 14.1 (fertilizer use in kg/ha). However it is a proxy that does not provide a comprehensive picture of marine pollution. First, nitrogen use efficiency does not provide any useful information on plastic debris pollution. Second, as far as nutrient pollution is concerned, it focuses on nitrogen only, while other nutrients are also involved in eutrophication processes, especially phosphorus and silicon. In addition, it is unclear whether the proposed nitrogen use efficiency (NUE) indicator would apply to crop production only, to agricultural production (including livestock and fish farming), to the food chain (from field to fork), or to the economy as a whole (including energy combustion, industrial wastes, etc.). If the NUE indicator applies to crop production only, it is irrelevant from a marine environment point of view because fertilizers do not account for the majority of nitrogen-related marine pollution and the proposed indicator ignores nitrogen pollution from livestock manure, sewage, atmospheric deposition and other sources. The NUE indicator would be more relevant if applied to agricultural production, to the food chain, or to the whole economy. From an ocean health point of view, relevance of the NUE indicator increases with its scope. However, complexity of its monitoring also increases with its scope. This raises issues as to the capacity of countries, especially developing countries, to monitor this indicator. However, should NUE in cropping systems be retained as indicator, it should be monitored following the methodology agreed by the Global Partnership on Nutrient Management (GPNM): http://www.nutrientchallenge.org/document/position-paper-nitrogen-use-efficiency-and-nutrient-performance-indicators It should be noted that this indicator has been designed for monitoring Target 2.4, not Target 14.1. Because NUE does not provide information on other limiting nutrients in marine systems, such as phosphorus and silicon, and it does not provide information on all sources of nitrogen unless a very complicated economy-wide indicator is monitored, we recommend using the Indicator of Coastal Eutrophication Potential (ICEP) for Target 14.1. This indicator is relevant because it is based on nitrogen, phosphorus and silicon inputs in estuaries, and it measures nutrient pollution from all sources – fertilizer, manure, sewage, atmospheric deposition, etc. Ideally, ICEP should be supplemented by an indicator reflecting the plastic debris input to oceans. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Monash Sustainability Institute | David Griggs - Monash Sustainability Institute. This indicator should be expanded to also include phosphorous. Nutrient use efficiency should improve by 20% by 2020; no more than 35 million tonnes of nitrogen per year should be extracted from the atmosphere; phosphorus flow to the oceans should not exceed 10 million tonnes a year; and phosphorus runoff to lakes and rivers should halve by 2030. |  |  | David Griggs - Monash Sustainability Institute. This indicator does not address the target, namely sustainable fisheries, not just fisheries. Change indicator to something like "the magnitude and percentage of fishery activity that meets sustainability standards for practice and size of catch". |  |  |

| **Country/Organisation** | **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. | **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. | **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 | **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 | **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 | **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. | **Target 15.9:**By 2020, integrate ecosystem and biodiversity values into national and local planning, development processes, poverty reduction strategies and accounts. | **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. | **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. |
| *Indicator 15.1.1:*Forest area as a percentage of total land area | *Indicator 15.2.1:*Forest cover under sustainable forest management | *Indicator 15.3.1:* Percentage of land that is degraded over total land area (moved to grey by IAEG-SDG Members during the green indicator consultation) | *Indicator 15.7.1:*Red List Index for species in trade (moved to grey by IAEG-SDG Members during the green indicator consultation) | *Indicator 15.7.2:*Proportion of detected trade in wildlife and wildlife products that is illegal (same as indicator 15.c.1) | *Indicator 15.8.1:*Adoption of national legislation relevant to the prevention or control of invasive alien species | *Indicator 15.9.1:*Number of national development plans and processes integrating biodiversity and ecosystem services values | *Indicator 15.b.1:*Forestry official development assistance and forestry FDI | *Indicator 15.c.1:*Proportion of detected trade in wildlife and wildlife products that is illegal (same as indicator 15.7.2) |
| *Discussion prompt: The IAEG-SDG Members ask for suggestions for an alternative indicator, in particular considering coverage of protected areas of important sites for terrestrial and fresh water biodiversity.* |  |  | *Discussion prompt: The IAEG-SDG Members ask for suggestions for an alternative indicator.* |  | *Discussion prompt: The IAEG-SDG Members ask for suggestions for an alternative indicator to cover both legislation and resources.* |  |  | *Discussion prompt: The IAEG-SDG Members ask for suggestions for an alternative indicator, especially one that covers the component of increasing the capacity of local communities.* |
| **Total comments received** | 27 | 25 | 15 | 13 | 10 | 11 | 7 | 10 | 5 |
| Central Statistical Office of Poland |  | CSO of Poland comments: There should be provided more detailed description of the indicator. CSO has data on areas of forests with forest management plan. | CSO of Poland comments: The indicator can be considered as a proper one for target monitoring. | CSO of Poland comments: The indicator is appropriate in sense of monitoring established goal. | CSO of Poland comments: The indicator is appropriate in sense of monitoring established goal. |  |  |  | CSO of Poland comments: The indicator is appropriate in sense of monitoring established goal. |
| Government of Japan |  | Japan considers more discussion is required in order to build international consensus on what data should be reported because the definition of "forest cover under sustainable forest management" has yet to be agreed upon. We also think "Forest certification" cosidered in the IAEG-SDG is inadequate as an indicator of "Forest cover under sustainable forest management" since it is a third-party operated system and has substantial regional differences in terms of its achievement. In particular, wood-exporting developed countries have significant shares while developing countries have made little progress. Some countries conduct sustainable forest management based on their own forest planning system in line with their forest legislation rather than obtaining forest certification. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Censos |  |  |  |  |  | We propose the following indicator: the number of public policies adopted that prevent the entry of invasive species on specific ecosystems. |  |  |  |
| ISTAT | Istat-Italy: we support French proposal |  | Istat-Italy: we suggest more methodological work. Look at the UNCCC definition | ISTAT-Italy : we suggest more methodological work |  |  | Istat-Italy: the indicator covers just part of the target |  |  |
| National Statistical Committee, Belarus | Additionally specify the indicators for the protected areas. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Statistics Denmark | Indicator should be changed as a priority Denmark recommends supplementing the indicator currently proposed for Target 15.1 with “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” | Indicator should be changed. This indicator would be an ideal one, if agreed sub criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management (SFM) were in place for assessments in absolutes of the degree of SFM reached nationally. However, there is no such agreement, and no reporting on the degree of SFM reached nationally. The FAO reporting on a number of sub criteria and indicators related to forest management provides an overview of TRENDS TOWARDS SFM but does not include a framework for assessing the degree of SFM it in absolutes. It is therefore questionable if existing data collections will allow data to be provided for this indicator. A more robust indicator would therefore be to only count those forest areas that have been concretely assessed and considered sustainably managed, e.g. indicated by an SFM certification or other concrete “bluestamp” that SFM is reached. Conclusion: In the lack of an agreed common framework for assessing SFM in absolutes an indicator on certified forest area – as suggested by UNEP - seems more operational and better. Forest cover under sustainable forest management: certification. (FAO: Certified forest area). Red list should be used as well Trends in pressures from unsustainability agriculture, forestry, fisheries and aquaculture. Trends in abundance and distribution of selected species including invasive species. Areas under sustainable management: forest area under sustainable management (certification/degradation); area of agricultural ecosystems under sustainable management |  | In general indicators used within the work of the Convention on Biodiversity ( CBD ) should be applied in regard to this target and supplemented where appropriate Use the MIKE and ETIS programmes to monitor illegal ivory trade and poaching of elephants and rhinos |  | Acceptable In general indicators used within the work of the Convention on Biodiversity ( CBD ) should be applied in regard to this target and supplemented where appropriate | Indicator should be changed. Not precise. In general indicators used within the work of the Convention on Biodiversity ( CBD ) should be applied in regard to this target and supplemented where appropriate | In general indicators used within the work of the Convention on Biodiversity ( CBD ) should be applied in regard to this target and supplemented where appropriate. | Acceptable In general indicators used within the work of the Convention on Biodiversity ( CBD ) should be applied in regard to this target and supplemented where appropriate Proposal: Number of national prosecutions of illegal trade in wildlife |
| Statistics Finland | Finland comments that further work is needed based on the proposal by France (coverage of protected areas of important sites for terrestrial and fresh water biodiversity). How are protected areas defined here? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Statistics Lithuania | Move to green |  |  |  |  |  |  | Could be available |  |
| United States | US: Further work needed based on the proposal by France (coverage of protected areas of important sites for terrestrial and fresh water biodiversity). Since COPS 21 has just concluded, we may have more comments to convey. | US: No comments at this time. Since COPS 21 has just concluded, we may have more comments to convey. | US: No comments at this time. Since COPS 21 has just concluded, we may have more comments to convey. | US: No comments at this time. Since COPS 21 has just concluded, we may have more comments to convey. | US: No comments at this time. Since COPS 21 has just concluded, we may have more comments to convey. | US: No comments at this time. Since COPS 21 has just concluded, we may have more comments to convey. | US: No comments at this time. Since COPS 21 has just concluded, we may have more comments to convey. | US: Include official development assistance and public expenditure, including OECD ODA data, OECD OOF data, and SSC totals; as well as FDI inflows based on IMF reporting on forestry. Since COPS 21 has just concluded, we may have more comments to convey. | US: No comments at this time. Since COPS 21 has just concluded, we may have more comments to convey. |
| Ministry of Agricuture, Hungary | FAO GFRA collects data on "Forest area designated primarily for protection of soil and water" worldwide. | FAO GFRA collects data on "Forest area under sustainable forest management" worldwide. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CITES Secretariat |  |  |  | The CITES Secretariat considers that Indicator 15.7.1 should be removed from Target 15.7 and should only be used to monitor Target 15.5. The IUCN Red List Index doesn’t specifically monitor Target 15.7 because it is designed to estimate declines in species from all causes not just poaching. Species declines can be attributed to many causes, including habitat loss and degradation, competition from alien invasive species, climate change and pollution. It is therefore inappropriate to measure efforts to end poaching or address illicit trafficking in wildlife using this overly broad indicator. Changes may occur in the Red List Index irrespective of global trends in illegal wildlife trade. | The CITES Secretariat supports the use of Indicator 15.7.2 and considers it appropriate for measuring progress towards Target 15.7. It is proposed that the name of the indicator is amended to 'Proportion of traded wildlife that was poached or illicitly trafficked' to simplify language and more clearly align it to Target 15.7. The indicator requires two elements in its construction: seizures of illicitly-traded wildlife and legal trade on wildlife. Data on both of these components are regularly maintained by national authorities. As part of the obligations of the 181 States Parties to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), countries report annually on legal trade and biennially on illegal trade (with a proposed change to annual monitoring of illegal trade currently under discussion), so there already exists a global repository of data for monitoring. For example national data are currently available for some 160,000 wildlife seizures made in the last decade from 117 countries. In addition, the CITES Trade Database includes over 15 million national records of legal trade in specimens of CITES-listed species, with records dating back to the mid-1970s. Comparing seizures of wildlife specimens (as an indication of trafficking) and legal trade intends to measure the last part of the target “address both demand and supply of illegal wildlife products”. |  |  |  |  |
| Convention on Biological Diversity |  | Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity. Supported the proposal submitted by FAO Forestry Department for an “index of sustainable forest management” with four sub-indicators that can be used as a basic indicator of progress towards sustainable forest management by a country. The four sub-indicators are 1. Annual average percent change in forest area over most recent available 5 year period 2. Annual average percent change in stock of carbon in above ground biomass over most recent available 5 year period 3. Share of forest area whose primary designated function is biodiversity conservation, most recent period 4. Share of forest area under a forest management plan, of which forest area certified under an independent forest management certification scheme, most recent period For the 3rd sub-indicator the significance is as follows: Forest areas managed for the conservation of biodiversity are a proxy for trends in forest biodiversity and a clear indication of political will to incorporate biodiversity into forest management. The Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 calls for each country to conserve at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water areas, so this may be taken as a goal for this element. Work is underway in developing a number of indicators of forest biodiversity, which might represent a more direct measure of forest biodiversity and could be considered for inclusion in the SFM index once fully operational. Sources and data collection should include a reference to additional indicators related to forest biodiversity, and the potential of, for example, new sensors (i.e. Copernicus) to enable review and the possible incorporation of indicators based on published methodologies and credible and publicly accessible data sources to refine and enhance coverage of the SFM index over time. On risks and limitations, it is important to note that there are operational issues with the FRA data that allow flexibility in how the forest classes or types are reported among countries. Hence the data are not comparable among countries, nor is the issue of scale (intactness) addressed by FRA. It is not possible in the FRA data to define an error term for the dataset reported globally, because countries report an exact value. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Eurostat |  | Further work needed to specify "Sustainable forest management" and the measurement of "forest cover under SFM" relative to total forest area. |  |  |  |  |  | Domestic resources should be included in the measurement. Therefore, more development work needed at a later stage to achieve better coverage of the target . |  |
| FAO | FAO recognizes that the proposed indicator on forest area, despite being an established MDG indicator, is insufficient to measure the breadth of this target. This is why, in the context of the consultations between IAEG members and international organizations in August/September, FAO had coordinated with other UN Statistical System Organizations and had also proposed a second indicator formulated as “protected area overlays with biodiversity”, which is a BIP indicator under the CBD Convention. This is very similar to the proposal suggested by France during the 2nd IAEG-SDG meeting. As such, FAO would welcome the introduction of an additional indicator on protected area coverage, and would encourage IAEG members to determine the exact formulation in consultation with UNEP, UNEP-WCMC and the CBD Secretariat. For the other elements of target 15.1, FAO suggests that wetlands may be addressed under target 6.6, whereas mountains are adequately addressed under 15.4. For drylands, FAO has data on the canopy cover of drylands, which provides a good proxy for their state of conservation and sustainable use. FAO is eager to explore the development of a related indicator if the IAEG so suggests. FAO can offer a tool for countries to establish their baselines, and probably continue monitoring the conservation, restoration and sustainable use of drylands. | FAO suggests to keep this indicator, reformulated as “Progress towards sustainable forest management”. In response to concerns about the clarity of the indicator, FAO has revised the proposal by reducing the sub-components to four and simplifying them. The new/revised proposal, will be transmitted directly to the Secretariat, The rationale is that for each of these components, countries can set national targets, monitor and report on progress. The final value of the indicator would be a simple arithmetic average of the values for the four sub-indicators. The use of national targets allows each country to define sustainable forest management for its own specific circumstances, within a coherent international framework. In response to concerns about definitions, FAO would like to highlight that the source of international agreement on the concept of ‘sustainable forest management’ is UN General Assembly Resolution GA A/RES/62/98 on the Non-legally binding instrument on all types of forests where it states: “Recognizing that sustainable forest management, as a dynamic and evolving concept, is intended to maintain and enhance the economic, social and environmental value of all types of forests, for the benefit of present and future generations;”. As such, this is not a term or concept introduced by the indicator but captured by the target and also the Goal itself, which implicitly refer back to the aforementioned UNGA resolution. An important consideration is that this change has been made to address and integrate the suggestions and discussions made by the IAEG, i.e. on “net permanent forest loss” and forest certification. Both are now addressed and incorporated in the new/revised proposal. The indicator thus includes forest certification in one of four components of the indicator (forest area under forest management plans), where areas certified highlight the area of land where such plans and their implementation is assessed and monitored by an independent forest management certification scheme. It should be recalled that certification is a poor stand-alone SFM indicator at global level as >95% of certified forest is in high income countries, primarily in the temperate and boreal zones, and because certification refers mainly to private schemes that are market/market access driven and are often not particularly influenced by government policy. Conversely, the indicator of SFM that FAO proposes includes forest certification as a component of a broader and more balanced indicator. Another component on trends in forest area also covers the net effect of the other parts of Target 15.2: “halt deforestation” and “substantially increase afforestation and reforestation”, thus incorporating the intended concept of “net permanent forest loss”, at present classified “green” under 15.2.2. FAO would however like to stress that strictly speaking, the proposed indicator 15.2.2: net permanent forest loss is not presently collected and not possible to collect as described. There is no way to adequately indicate permanent forest loss or gain, as any piece of land can return to forest, in one way or another, and that has been amply demonstrated. While the intended concept is now fully addressed in the revised proposal 15.2.1, in case IAEG members would still like to preserve a separate indicator, FAO suggests that 15.2.2 be amended as “annual average percent change in forest area”. This would equally allow tracking forest area loss, as well as forest area gain (which would show up negatively if “Net permanent forest loss” is used as indicator and minus (-) 20,000 ha means a gain of 20,000 ha). Countries usually monitor forest area change and most countries already report the relevant data internationally, including through FAO’s Forest Resources Assessment. | FAO suggests that the indicator “percentage of land that is degraded over total land area” is a suitable metric for this target and should be retained. It is the best indicator we have for measuring the decline, stability and improvement of land status or condition over time. “Land productivity” disaggregated by “land use type” provides the percentage or area of degraded land over total land area at national and sub-national levels. Monitoring and reporting on this indicator can be done by countries using national data. In the case where national data is not available, earth observation data can be provided to countries for their validation and use. The UNCCD, FAO, CBD and other international partners are organizing an expert meeting to be held on 25-26 February 2016 to issue technical guidance on the methodology and recommendations on datasets for this indicator. The methodology will be applicable for national data as well as earth observation data in order to ensure harmonization and comparability in reporting on this target. This technical guidance will be made available to the IAEG-SDGs before its 3rd meeting. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| International Tropical Timber Organization | A sub-indicator dealing with area of primary (undisturbed) forest as a percentage of total forest area could help to address the concern with biodiversity. | FAO has made a submission proposing 4 sub-indicators to compose an index for this indicator. ITTO supports this proposal in principal while noting that further work should occur to develop an index that is equitable to all countries (the use of net forest change as part of this index may unfairly penalize high-forest cover countries that undertake legitimate forest land-use conversion plans for agriculture). With regard to the proposed sub-indicator on area under forest management plans/certification, it is important that areas under national certification schemes can also be counted. ITTO is prepared to work with the UN, FAO and other stakeholders to continue developing a meaningful and equitable way to report on forest areas under sustainable forest management. |  |  | Does this mean the proportion of all trade that is detected to be illegal? As for international illegal trade of all products, the proportion that is detected is probably only a fraction of what is really happening... |  |  | This indicator only deals with international funding, the amount of national funding is equally if not more important in most countries. |  |
| International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) | IUCN supports adoption of “coverage of protected areas of important sites for terrestrial and fresh water biodiversity” as an indicator towards SDG Target 15.1. This responds to all elements of the target, spanning all terrestrial and freshwater ecosystems, and encompassing both conservation and sustainable use. It is based on an existing indicator used for tracking progress towards Aichi Target 11 of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020, and mobilised through the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (http://www.bipindicators.net/paoverlays). IUCN submitted metadata underpinning the indicator on 30 Jul 2015; in addition, this multi-purpose indicator is proposed in a formulation disaggregated for mountains as a “green” indicator towards SDG Target 15.4, for which metadata are provided on pages 356–363 of the “Compilation of Metadata Received on Indicators for Global Monitoring of the Sustainable Development Goals and Targets” (http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/Metadata%20Compilation%20for%20SDG%20Indicators%2023%20October%202015%20Update.pdf). IUCN stands ready to provide any further support in documentation or interpretation as useful. IUCN also supports adoption of “forest area as a percentage of total land area” as an indicator towards SDG Target 15.1. It is based on an existing indicator used for tracking progress towards Target 5 of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020, and mobilised through the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (http://www.bipindicators.net/forestextent). | IUCN supports adoption of “forest cover under sustainable forest management” as an indicator towards SDG Target 15.2. It is based on an existing indicator used for tracking progress towards Target 7 of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020, and mobilised through the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (http://www.bipindicators.net/forestcertification). |  | IUCN supports adoption of the “Red List Index (impacts of utilisation)” as an indicator towards SDG Target 15.7. It is based on an existing indicator used for tracking progress towards Aichi Target 4 of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020, and mobilised through the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (http://www.bipindicators.net/redlistindexforbirdsmammalsandamphibians). IUCN submitted metadata underpinning the indicator on 30 Jul 2015, and these are documented on pages 376–384 of the “Compilation of Metadata Received on Indicators for Global Monitoring of the Sustainable Development Goals and Targets” (http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/Metadata%20Compilation%20for%20SDG%20Indicators%2023%20October%202015%20Update.pdf). IUCN stands ready to provide any further support in documentation or interpretation as useful. In the IAEG-SDGs open consultation on “green” indicators (4–7 November 2015), some comments expressed concern that this indicator “doesn’t specifically monitor the target because it is designed to estimate declines in species from all causes, not just poaching. Species declines can be attributed to many causes, including habitat loss and degradation, legal over-exploitation, competition from alien invasive species, climate change and pollution.” This is incorrect: as explained in the metadata, the indicator is a disaggregation of the Red List Index, measuring the aggregate change in extinction risk driven solely by unsustainable utilisation or from successful efforts to reduce or manage utilisation sustainably, and excluding changes driven by other factors. |  | IUCN supports adoption of national legislation relevant to the prevention or control of invasive alien species as an indicator towards SDG Target 15.8. It is based on an existing indicator used for tracking progress towards Aichi Target 9 of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020, and mobilised through the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (www.bipindicators.net/iaslegislationadoption). IUCN also suggests consideration of the “Red List Index (impacts of invasive species)” as an indicator towards SDG Target 15.8. This is based on an existing indicator used for tracking progress towards Aichi Target 9 of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020, and mobilised through the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (http://www.bipindicators.net/birdrlitrendsdrivenbyias). This is a thematic disaggregation of the Red List Index measuring the aggregate change in extinction risk driven solely by the impacts of invasive alien species or from successful efforts to eradicate or control invasive alien species, and excluding changes driven by other factors. The Red List Index is a “green” multi-purpose indicator towards SDG Target 15.5, for which IUCN submitted metadata on 30 Jul 2015, provided on pages 366–374 of the “Compilation of Metadata Received on Indicators for Global Monitoring of the Sustainable Development Goals and Targets” (http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/Metadata%20Compilation%20for%20SDG%20Indicators%2023%20October%202015%20Update.pdf). It is based on an existing indicator used for tracking progress towards Aichi Target 12 of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020, and mobilised through the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (http://www.bipindicators.net/rli/2010). IUCN stands ready to provide any further support in documentation or interpretation as useful. |  |  |  |
| OECD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | We suggest dropping forestry FDI, as reliable comprehensive data are not available. Also, to better address the sustainability aspects of the target, we also suggest restricting the coverage of ODA to forestry so as only to count those activities specifically marked as fostering biodiversity, climate change or general environmental objectives. For the definitions of these policy markers, see http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/documentupload/DCD-DAC%282013%2915-ADD2-FINAL-ENG.pdf, pp. 40-41, 43-45. |  |
| Ramsar Convention Secretariat | The Ramsar Secretariat suggests amending the indicator suggested by France “Coverage by protected areas of important sites for terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity” to include Wetlands of International Importance as designated under the Ramsar Convention: “Percentage coverage of protected areas of important sites for terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, including Wetlands of International Importance”. This amendment would support the existing and growing network of Ramsar Sites listed under the criteria for identifying Wetlands of International Importance. The inclusion of a site in the List embodies the government’s commitment to take the steps necessary to ensure that its ecological character is maintained. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UNCCD |  |  | The indicator “percentage of land that is degraded over total land area” is a suitable metric for monitoring and reporting on restoration, combatting desertification and achieving land degradation neutrality (the primary aims of target 15.3). It is the best indicator we have for measuring the decline, stability and improvement of land status or condition and assess the balance between negative and positive trajectories over time, i.e., as is implied by land degradation neutrality. “Land productivity” disaggregated by “land use type” provides the percentage or area of degraded land over total land area at national and sub-national levels. Monitoring and reporting on this indicator can be done by countries using national data. In the case where national data is not available, earth observation data can be provided to countries for their validation and use. The indicator has already adopted by the UNCCD COP to monitor progress made toward the improvement of the conditions of the ecosystems affected by land degradation, desertification and drought. The UNCCD, FAO, CBD and other international partners are organizing an expert meeting to be held on 25-26 February 2016 to issue definitive technical guidance on the methodology and recommendations on datasets for this indicator. The methodology will be applicable for national data as well as earth observation data in order to ensure harmonization and comparability in reporting on this target. This technical guidance will be made available to the IAEG-SDGs before its 3rd meeting. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UNDP | UNDP PROPOSAL \* Protected area overlays with protected areas (BIP indicator that considers designated protected areas against key biodiversity areas) | UNDP PROPOSAL \* Forest cover under sustainable forest management as a proportion of total current and historic forest cover COMMENT "historic forest cover" would need to be defined in order to set a feasible target for restoration and afforestation | UNDP COMMENTS Globally this is a difficult indicator owing to data limitations. The BIP has a forest fragmentation index but it is limited to a number of sites globally, as opposed to comprehensive coverage. The UNCCD “Trends in land degradation” indicator could also be reconsidered here | UNDP COMMENTS CITES had a series of process indicators for their Strategic Vision, including on compliance (objective 1.7 in https://cites.org/eng/disc/E-SV-indicators.pdf). They may be able to contribute a suitable metric. |  | UNDP PROPOSAL \* Proportion of countries adopting relevant national legislation and adequately resourcing the prevention or control of invasive alien species RATIONALE The original formulation here has also been proposed by the CBD AHTEG on indicators for its Strategic Plan. The resourcing part is shoehorned in here and may not be feasible since CBD reporting does not specifically ask for such information. | UNDP PROPOSAL An alternative approach could be: 'the proportion of national SDG implementation plans (in whichever form they will be produced) that integrate biodiversity and ecosystem services values', or more simply 'acknowledge biodiversity and ecosystem services' | UNDP COMMENT The OECD Rio Markers can be disaggregated by type: http://www.oecd.org/dac/environment-development/BIODIVERSITY-RELATED%20FINANCE%20FEBRUARY%202015.pdf | UNDP COMMENT CITES had a series of process indicators for their last Strategic Plan, including on compliance (objective 1.7 in https://cites.org/eng/disc/E-SV-indicators.pdf). They may be able to contribute a suitable metric |
| UNEP | UNEP Comments: UNEP would like to suggest the following indicator: Percentage coverage of protected areas of important sites for terrestrial and fresh water biodiversity. This responds to all elements of the target, spanning all terrestrial and freshwater ecosystems, and encompassing both conservation and sustainable use. It is based on an existing indicator used for tracking progress towards Aichi Target 11 of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020, and mobilised through the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (http://www.bipindicators.net/paoverlays). The BIP indicator Partner, IUCN submitted metadata underpinning the indicator on 30 Jul 2015; in addition, this multi-purpose indicator is proposed in a formulation disaggregated for mountains as a “green” indicator towards SDG. | UNEP Comments: UNEP would like to support the indicator proposed by FAO “Forest cover under sustainable forest management”. This indicator is based on an existing indicator used for tracking progress towards Target 7 of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020, and mobilised through the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (http://www.bipindicators.net/forestcertification). “Sustainable forest management” is a central concept for Goal 15 and target 15.1 as well as for target 15.2. It has been formally defined, by the UN General Assembly, as follows: [a] dynamic and evolving concept [that] aims to maintain and enhance the economic, social and environmental values of all types of forests, for the benefit of present and future generations”. (Resolution A/RES/62/98) An “index of sustainable forest management” with four sub-indicators can be used as a basic indicator of progress towards sustainable forest management by a country. The four sub-indicators are 1. Annual average percent change in forest area over most recent available 5 year period 2. Annual average percent change in stock of carbon in above ground biomass over most recent available 5 year period 3. Share of forest area whose primary designated function is biodiversity conservation, most recent period 4. Share of forest area under a forest management plan, of which forest area certified under an independent forest management certification scheme, most recent period For each of these components, countries can set national targets, monitor and report on progress. The four sub-indicators will be combined into a single composite index, but targets would be set at the level of sub-indicators. Once targets have been set by national authorities, in terms of the four sub-indicators, and progress measured over an agreed period, countries would assess progress (on track to exceed target, on track to achieve target, progress but at an insufficient rate, no significant overall progress, moving away from target). The final value of the index would be a simple arithmetic average of the values for the four sub-indicators. The use of national targets allows each country to define sustainable forest management for its own specific circumstances, within a coherent international framework. Targets on the sub-indicators can also be set at regional or global levels. | UNEP Comments: We encourage the IAEG-SDG to consider a comprehensive land indicator either under Goal 15 or Goal 1 as 1.4.2 to track “secure rights to land”, as these are integral to sustainable land management and sustainable use of natural resources and combatting desertification and restoration of degraded land and soil. One possible land indicator could be as follows: Percentage of women, men, indigenous peoples, and local communities (IPLCs) with secure rights to land, property and natural resources, measured by a) percentage with legally documented or recognized evidence of tenure, and b) percentage who perceive their rights are recognized and protected. This indicator has been supported by UK and others, and concerns expressed by Italy, South Africa and Switzerland during the consultations. It has been supported by the Global Land Indicator Initiative (led by the World Bank, and UN-Habitat, and facilitated by GLTN), the Global Donor Platform on Rural Development, the IP Major Group, the Women’s Major Group, IUCN, UN-Habitat, UNEP, SDSN, and a broad coalition of civil society. | UNEP Comments: UNEP proposes the possible alternative indicator: Rates of poaching/illegal harvest of high value protected species of flora and fauna. Whilst it is not possible to provide an indicator that captures the full supply chain (poaching, trafficking and demand) for illegal wildlife products, an indicator focusing on the poaching/harvest supply side would nonetheless be sensitive to changes along the supply chain (such as enforcement), and demand-side efforts to address the illegal trade. Data are available for an increasing number of high value protected species. For example, elephants, rhino, vicuna, great apes, and a range of timber species that are subject to illegal trade. Such data are available nationally in range states for the species concerned, from wildlife departments, forestry departments, and through international reporting mechanisms such as the MIKES (Monitoring the Illegal Killing of Elephants and other Endangered Species) programme - https://www.cites.org/eng/prog/mike/index.php, which has recently been expanded from a focus on elephants to a wider range of taxa. Available data across taxa can be aggregated to global scale from Range States of the taxa concerned. In addition, new datasets anticipated or being developed by the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Flora and Fauna (CITES) (see https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/sc/66/E-SC66-30-02.pdf) and UN Office of Drugs and Crime (UNODC) will allow additional analysis in the future of seizures data for a range of protected species of flora and fauna. Such available data would support a more robust indicator (15.7.2) on the proportion of detected trade in wildlife and wildlife products that is illegal. The methodology for such an indicator would need to take into account measures of effort in addition to actual seizures. | UNEP Comments: UNEP would like to propose an additional alternative indicator that could be considered would be: Number of countries that recognize trafficking of protected species of flora and fauna as a serious crime. Such an indicator would be based on national legislation that reflects wildlife and forest crimes as serious crimes in line with the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (UNTOC) - https://www.unodc.org/unodc/treaties/CTOC/ | UNEP Comments: Unfortunately, UNEP does not have a similar indicator which includes resources and thus UNEP would like to support the maintenance of the current indicator which is based on existing indicator used for tracking progress towards Aichi Target 9 of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020. This indicator provides very useful information on political will. Additionally, the Red List Index (indicator 15.5.1) is useful for monitoring this target. |  |  |  |
| UNODC |  |  |  | UNODC advice is to remove this indicator from this target and keep it only to monitor target 15.5. The IUCN Red Index doesn’t specifically monitor the target because it is designed to estimate declines in species from all causes, not just poaching. Species declines can be attributed to many causes, including habitat loss and degradation, legal over-exploitation, competition from alien invasive species, climate change and pollution. It is therefore inappropriate to measure efforts to end poaching or address illegal wildlife markets using this overly broad indicator. Changes may occur in the Red List Index irrespective of trends in global poaching and illegal wildlife trade. | UNODC advise is to change the indicator description as following: Proportion of traded wildlife that was poached or illicitly trafficked. This indicator requires two elements in its construction: seizures of wildlife and legal trade on wildlife. Data on both of these components are regularly maintained by national authorities. As part of the obligations of the 181 States Parties to the CITES convention, countries report annually on legal trade and biannually on illegal trade, so there already exists a global repository of data for monitoring (currently for example national data are available for some 160,000 wildlife seizures made in the last decade, from 117 countries). Comparing seizures of wildlife and wildlife products (as an indication of trafficking) and legal trade aims at measuring the last part of the target’s wording “address both demand and supply of illegal wildlife products”. |  |  |  |  |
| UNODC |  |  |  | UNODC advice is to remove this indicator from this target and keep it only to monitor target 15.5. The IUCN Red Index doesn’t specifically monitor the target because it is designed to estimate declines in species from all causes, not just poaching. Species declines can be attributed to many causes, including habitat loss and degradation, legal over-exploitation, competition from alien invasive species, climate change and pollution. It is therefore inappropriate to measure efforts to end poaching or address illegal wildlife markets using this overly broad indicator. Changes may occur in the Red List Index irrespective of trends in global poaching and illegal wildlife trade. | UNODC advise is to change the indicator description as following: "Proportion of traded wildlife that was poached or illicitly trafficked". This indicator requires two elements in its construction: seizures of wildlife and legal trade on wildlife. Data on both of these components are regularly maintained by national authorities. As part of the obligations of the 181 States Parties to the CITES convention, countries report annually on legal trade and biannually on illegal trade, so there already exists a global repository of data for monitoring (currently for example national data are available for some 160,000 wildlife seizures made in the last decade, from 117 countries). Comparing seizures of wildlife and wildlife products (as an indication of trafficking) and legal trade aims at measuring the last part of the target 's wording: “address both demand and supply of illegal wildlife products”. |  |  |  |  |
| World Water Council | World Water Council: the World Water Council agrees that the indicator is not adequate and doesn't include freshwater ecosystems |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Center for Global Development | Suggested additional indicator: rate of forest loss as a percentage of total land area, as measured by independent satellite monitoring (e.g. Hansen et al 2013). Where possible, countries should disaggregate natural forests from plantations. While this is currently only possible within a handful of countries, this capacity will grow as technology improves rapidly. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International | Comments from Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International, Netherlands  Protected or conservation designation or status as percentage of total land and aquatic area. |  | Comments from Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International, Netherlands  Percentage of land area that subject to periodic, seasonal or ongoing water scarcity, drought,or flooding. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diyalo Pariwar |  | Community mobilization and community ownership need to be revisited for the further effective management of forest areas and lands of concerned. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Finnish NGDO platform to the EU | a) Annual change in forest area and land under cultivation. b) Percentage of ecosystems and services protected. | a) Percentage of primary forest protected. b) Area of forest under sustainable forest management as a percentage of forest area. c) Improved land ownership and governance of forests. | a) Pace of land degradation. |  |  | a) Abundance of invasive alien species. |  | a) Improved land ownership and governance of forests. |  |
| Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei |  | FEEM: Also annual deforestation loss (complements forest area at target 15.1 and the additional 15.2.2 net permanent loss) |  |  | FEEM: if the undetected is also unknown, how can we measure the proportion? |  |  |  |  |
| Forest Stewardship Council A.C. |  | FSC input into IAEG consultation on “grey indicators” 12/14/15 FSC refers to the conclusion of the co-chair at the IAEG meeting in Bangkok, that forest certification should be considered as part of a possible sustainable forest management indicator. That conclusion was in line with interventions from the German IAEG member, the Danish IAEG observer, UNEP and the joint Stakeholder contribution. FSC fully supports this. It would improve the quality of the indicator, making it more useful as a signal to governments, business and civil society to how this target could be achieved. And it is feasible. The indicator could be rephrased as follows: “Forest area under sustainable forest management, including certified forest area” The information can be easily compiled, by FAO, UNEP or country by country, on the basis of the public databases of the international certification schemes. Double counting with more general information about sustainable forest management performance can be easily prevented by using the term “including certified forest area”. Forest certification has proven its value in the last 20 years to mobilize not only forest managers but also the forest industry as well as final users/consumers for a common effort. Its third party verification practices and transparency gives market players the confidence in the scheme and its impacts. Forest certification can be applied as a tool irrespective of government leadership and effectiveness. In this way it can play a vanguard role in mobilizing civil society and giving access to markets of importing countries where sustainability requirements have become more mainstream. Forest certification is also a concrete and reliable tool to promote by governments, financial institutions and civil society organizations. Forest certification has a great potential to assist governments and civil society to achieve the Target 15.2 by 2020 and maintain so beyond that date. In order to ensure that only reliable, inclusive and effective schemes are being considered for this indicator, governments are advised to organise their own recognition processes of schemes that are, or have the intention to be, active in the country concerned, with full engagement of civil society and the business sector. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Global Forest Coalition (GFC) | GFC proposes, "Forest area as a percentage of total land area (disaggregate by types -- national, community, protected and private)" Rationale "For achieving successful conservation and sustainable development outcomes it is essential to establish a clear differentiation between a natural forest and a monoculture tree plantation. Monoculture tree plantations should be excluded from ‘forest area percentages’ and the FAO definition of forests should be updated accordingly as it does not capture ""conservation, restoration and sustainable use"" as set out in the target. Coverage of protected areas is a flawed indicator. It does not indicate conservation outcomes, as both the management effectiveness and addition of protected areas are questionable. More importantly other area-based measures like Indigenous Peoples' and Community Conserved Territories and Areas (ICCAs) have proven to be far more effective and socially sustainable than State-governed protected areas. There should be recognition and inclusion of “Effectively and equitably conserved territories and areas,” which would be a more appropriate indicator." | "Criteria for SFM should be specified, in line with country obligations under human rights treaties and CBD: - SFM must enhance the country’s efforts to fulfill its obligations under CBD.- SFM must be rights-based, meaning the rights of indigenous peoples and forest communities to land, culture and participation, are respected. The “SFMI” criteria of “stakeholder platform […] and involvement […]” should be supplemented by reference to the rights of indigenous peoples and forest communities. - SFM reporting must include reporting on communities access to forest resources, specifies by sex, age, gender and indigenous peoples and local and minority group. " |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ICMM and IPIECA | John Drexhage ICMM/IPIECA As target implies, simply reflect the frameworks and reporting results out of relevant international agreements, including the Conventions on Biodiversity and Desertification |  | John Drexhage ICMM/IPIECA Use relevant indicators developed out of multilateral agreements, such as Convention on Desertification |  |  |  | John Drexhage ICMM/IPIECA Reflect national communication reviews out of CBD and Desertification processes |  |  |
| ISEAL Alliance |  | The ISEAL Alliance fully supports the inclusion of forest certification as part of an indicator of sustainable forest management, in line with similar proposals and comments by the German IAEG member, the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC), and various other stakeholders. ISEAL reiterates the suggestion made by FSC that the indicator could be rephrased as follows: “Forest area under sustainable forest management, including certified forest area.” We underline that certification provides the crucial element of independent verification and as such provides a reliable tool for sustainable forest management for both governments and private actors. ISEAL reiterates that when certification is used as an indicator it is important that this be further qualified - policy makers should only recognize and use credible and effective standards and certification schemes. ISEAL has developed a range of public resources and tools which provide stakeholders with the necessary guidance to identify and benchmark credible standards and certification systems. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pro Natura - Friends of the Earth Switzerland | "15.1.1 Forest area as a percentage of total land area (should be disaggregated  into “primary, secondary forests, plantations” and types -- national, community, protected and private)" FAOs definition is way too broad and insufficient, as “Forests’ alone doesn’t tell us anything about forest biodiversity and sustainable use. Without this precision, expansion of plantations could legitimize deterioration of terrestrial ecosystems. | Sustainable Forest Management Index Criteria for SFM should be specified, in line with country obligations under human rights treaties and CBD: - SFM must enhance the country’s efforts to fulfill its obligations under CBD.- SFM must be rights-based, meaning the rights of indigenous peoples and forest communities to land, culture and participation, are respected. The “SFMI” criteria of “stakeholder platform […] and involvement […]” should be supplemented by reference to the rights of indigenous peoples and forest communities. - SFM reporting must include reporting on communities access to forest resources, specifies by sex, age, gender and indigenous peoples and local and minority group. " | Trends in land degradation Consider further elements that include analysis of the root causes of trends in land degradation such as land grabs for industrial bioenergy production, industrial agriculture, and the livestock industry. These elements should be analyzed in their relation to land tenure including gender and ecosystems disaggregated data and collective rights. |  |  | Trends in the numbers of invasive alien species introduction and establishment events |  | Trends in the mobilization of financial resources Information provided through the financial reporting framework of the CBD, adopted by decision XII/3 (https://chm.cbd.int/search/financial-reporting) |  |
| Pro Natura - Friends of the Earth Switzerland | 15.1.1 Forest area as a percentage of total land area (disaggregate by types -- national, community, protected and private). Rationale: "For achieving successful conservation and sustainable development outcomes it is essential to establish a clear differentiation between a natural forest and a monoculture tree plantation. Monoculture tree plantations should be excluded from ‘forest area percentages’ and the FAO definition of forests should be updated accordingly as it does not capture ""conservation, restoration and sustainable use"" as set out in the target. Coverage of protected areas is a flawed indicator. It does not indicate conservation outcomes, as both the management effectiveness and addition of protected areas are questionable. More importantly other area-based measures like Indigenous Peoples' and Community Conserved Territories and Areas (ICCAs) have proven to be far more effective and socially sustainable than State-governed protected areas. There should be recognition and inclusion of “Effectively and equitably conserved territories and areas,” which would be a more appropriate indicator." | Comment: "For achieving successful conservation and sustainable development outcomes it is essential to establish a clear differentiation between a natural forest and a monoculture tree plantation. Monoculture tree plantations should be excluded from ‘forest area percentages’ and the FAO definition of forests should be updated accordingly as it does not capture ""conservation, restoration and sustainable use"" as set out in the target. Coverage of protected areas is a flawed indicator. It does not indicate conservation outcomes, as both the management effectiveness and addition of protected areas are questionable. More importantly other area-based measures like Indigenous Peoples' and Community Conserved Territories and Areas (ICCAs) have proven to be far more effective and socially sustainable than State-governed protected areas. There should be recognition and inclusion of “Effectively and equitably conserved territories and areas,” which would be a more appropriate indicator." | Comment: "For achieving successful conservation and sustainable development outcomes it is essential to establish a clear differentiation between a natural forest and a monoculture tree plantation. Monoculture tree plantations should be excluded from ‘forest area percentages’ and the FAO definition of forests should be updated accordingly as it does not capture ""conservation, restoration and sustainable use"" as set out in the target. Coverage of protected areas is a flawed indicator. It does not indicate conservation outcomes, as both the management effectiveness and addition of protected areas are questionable. More importantly other area-based measures like Indigenous Peoples' and Community Conserved Territories and Areas (ICCAs) have proven to be far more effective and socially sustainable than State-governed protected areas. There should be recognition and inclusion of “Effectively and equitably conserved territories and areas,” which would be a more appropriate indicator." |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rastriya Dalit Network (RDN) Nepal |  |  |  |  |  | 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 gross domestic product caused by disasters, including water-related disasters, with a focus on protecting the poor and people in vulnerable situations. |  |  |  |
| Stockholm Environment Institute | Stockholm Environment Institute staff support the recommendation to include an indicator on the proportion of forest coverage under protected area management. | To bring consideration of forests in line with the equivalent indicator for agricultural land (2.4.1), Stockholm Environment Institute staff support the inclusion of an indicator to measure forest cover under sustainable forest management and suggest - in the absence of other information - the use of data from common certification schemes such as FSC, Rainforest Alliance or FairTrade as a proxy for SFM within this indicator. We believe this would complement the use of a no net loss indicator, which given the nascent state of scientific evidence supporting offsetting activities, is an insufficient indicator on its own. Stockholm Environment Institute staff believe that it is also potentially important to link information on the sustainability of production systems, such as forests, to consumption-based indicators such as the Material Footprint (see Indicator 12.2.1) due to the supply-chain driven nature of production. SEI has a track-record of linking material production to consumption via supply chain modelling, and has expertise that could be applied to this end. |  |  |  |  | Stockholm Environment Institute staff believe the proposed indicator for this target assumes national level planning implies local level implementation. We recommend further disaggregation of this indicator by sub-national region and localities (cities, towns and local authorities). Also, poverty reduction strategies are not mentioned in the indicators specifically - but should be since these are contained within the ambition of the target. An additional indicator could measure the ‘Number of km2 dedicated to parks and urban allotments in urban centres’ and would improve the coverage of monitoring at sub-national levels. Furthermore, information related to the embeddedness of the ‘mitigation hierarchy’ across national and sub-national planning could help indicate the level of protection of priority species within planning processes |  |  |
| Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN) | SDSN comments: In line with other comments, "Protected areas overlay with biodiversity" would be a strong indicator for this target. As explained, this indicator is multipurpose and applicable to several targets and it gives good information on area protected, biodiversity relevance of the areas protected and, ultimately, in time, how well protected areas are being managed. | SDSN comments: There is no harmonized perspective on what constitutes sustainable management so work will need to be done in that direction. |  | SDSN comments: SDSN strongly supports the use of the IUCN Red List. It is the most respected system to track the status of animal and plant species. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sustainable World Initiative | This target has numerous elements that cannot reasonably be reduced to a single indicator. However, one suggested alternative is the following: Percentage of municipalities that define a sustainable threshold for resource use and regulate resource extraction in accordance with that threshold. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Women's Major Group/ International Women's Health Coalition | Women's Major Group supports with addition of "disaggregated by type (national, community, protected and private) Additional indicator: Percentage of effectively and equitably preserved territories and areas as a percentage of total land area For achieving successful conservation and sustainable development outcomes it is essential to establish a clear differentiation between a natural forest and a monoculture tree plantation. Monoculture tree plantations should be excluded from ‘forest area percentages’ and the FAO definition of forests should be updated accordingly as it does not capture "conservation, restoration and sustainable use" as set out in the target. Coverage of protected areas is a flawed indicator. It does not indicate conservation outcomes, as both the management effectiveness and addition of protected areas are questionable. More importantly other area-based measures like Indigenous Peoples' and Community Conserved Territories and Areas (ICCAs) have proven to be far more effective and socially sustainable than State-governed protected areas. | Comments from Women's Major Group below. Criteria for sustainable forest management (SFM) should be specified, in line with country obligations under human rights treaties and CBD: - SFM must enhance the country’s efforts to fulfill its obligations under CBD.- SFM must be rights-based, meaning the rights of indigenous peoples and forest communities to land, culture and participation, are respected. The “SFMI” criteria of “stakeholder platform […] and involvement […]” should be supplemented by reference to the rights of indigenous peoples and forest communities. - SFM reporting must include reporting on communities access to forest resources, specifies by sex, age, gender and indigenous peoples and local and minority group. | Women's Major Group indicator proposal below. Percentage of productive land owned or accessed by smallscale food producers, in particular women, indigenous peoples, family farmers, pastoralists and fishers. Consider further elements that include analysis of the root causes of trends in land degradation such as land grabs for industrial bioenergy production, industrial agriculture, and the livestock industry. These elements should be analyzed in their relation to land tenure including gender and ecosystems disaggregated data and collective rights. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WWF | WWF supports amending the indicator suggested by France “Coverage by protected areas of important sites for terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity” to include Wetlands of International Importance as designated under the Ramsar Convention: “% coverage of protected areas of important sites for terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, including Wetlands of International Importance”. It could also be supplemented with additional BIP indicators to provide a larger picture of the extent of conservation or restoration (e.g. The Living Planet Index, Red List Index, PA cover and PA management effectiveness) | WWF supports the indicator “Forest cover under sustainable forest management” and propose that it this is measured from two complementary sources: (a) forest area under independent forest certification, and (b) the FAO SFM index based on country reporting. Forest certification is neutral to government policies and effectiveness. In this way it can play a vanguard role countries where sustainability is not yet well integrated into public policies and regulations. Certification also translates directly into delineated areas of forest and already applies to a significant portion of the world’s production forests (according to the FAO FRA in 2014 the world had 1,187 million ha of production forest, of which 430 million ha were certified). |  | WWF supports the inclusion of 15.7.1 Red List Index for species in trade, especially if used with the Living Planet Index for species in trade. Both are established BIP indicators. We also support 15.7.2 as an established indicator managed by CITES that more directly measures the Target. It could be the primary indicator if supported by the RLI and Living PIanet Index; it’s linked to targets 16.4 and 16.5. Clarity is needed on use of the term “protected”. For 15.7.2, data concern species protected within a defined framework (CITES) but overlook non-CITES-listed species regulated under forestry/fisheries management regimes and trafficked illegally. Combined with data collection challenges, it would underestimate illegal wildlife trade. The RLI and LPI include a broad range of species and provide a basis to assess species status but do not always distinguish between legal and illegal trade: their utility for trafficked species is limited unless linked to trade systems through 15.7.2. | WWF: As above: WWF supports the proposed indicator for 15.2 "proportion of detected trade in wildlife and wildlife products that is illegal", when linked with the data sources noted above, ie., the Red List Index and Living Planet Index. This combination has worked well, for example in the recent Living Blue Planet report (http://www.worldwildlife.org/publications/living-blue-planet-report-2015), which tracked the trends in exploited fish species. | The suggested indicator is weak in that it considers only one “measure to prevent” invasives (legislation). It would be much stronger if the impact of those measures was monitored, which could be done with a combination of appropriate BIP indicators with interlinkages to multiple targets: The Living Planet Index for species threatened by invasives (also 6.6, 14.1, 14.2, 14.4, 14.5, 15.1, 15.2, 15.4, 15.5, 15.7) and the Red List Index for species threatened by invasives (14.1, 14.2, 14.4, 15.2, 15.4, 15.5, 15.7). These would allow both “measures” taken and “impact” to be tracked. |  |  |  |
| Amiable Resource | Not enough, reserve and protect greater proportion as oxygen production, tranpiration protection and air quality assurance... 25-35% natural areas should be new minimum species habitat and ecologic diversity reservation and representation goals ... | More 25-35% natural ecologic and biological diversity conservation... | Too much..? | Raised awareness, relationship with, experience values, offense penalties and asserted respected protectionisms... | Competitive to region and reason.. | Inspire affection, foster healthy relations and higher respected education... Legistalive guidance and principals... | Too many similairities, merging and collaborating stregths, objectives and operational expenses... Additional specialized organizations evolving to serve different needs and perspectives.... | Shared strengths, services and supplies towards collaborative progress into effective gaoled results, adaptive to place, peoples and needs... | Participatory incentives with community, organization and public exchanges and interactions to learn and impliment resolutions with developing capacity.. |
| new York University |  |  | USA, NYU: proportion of women-managed farms that have degraded land and soil vulnerable to drought or flooding. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

| **Country/Organisation** | **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. | **Target 16.1:** Significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere. | **Target 16.2:** End abuse, exploitations, trafficking and all forms of violence against and torture of children | **Target 16.3:** Promote the rule of law at the national and international levels and ensure equal access to justice for all | **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 | **Target 16.5:**Substantially reduce corruption and bribery in all their forms. | **Target 16.7:** Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels | **Target 16.10:** Ensure public access to information and protect fundamental freedoms, in accordance with national legislation and international agreements. | **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. |
| *Indicator 16.1.2:*Conflict-related deaths per 100,000 people (disaggregated by age, sex and cause) | *Indicator 16.1.4:* Proportion of people that feel safe walking alone around the area they live (IAEG-SDG Members agreed to add this indicator and classify it as grey during the green indicator consultation) | *Indicator 16.2.3:* Percentage of young women and men aged 18-24 years who experienced sexual violence by age 18 | *Indicator 16.3.1:* 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) | *Indicator 16.4.1:*Total value of inward and outward illicit financial flows (in current US$) | *Indicator 16.5.1:*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 | *Indicator 16.7.2:*Proportion of countries that address young people's multisectoral needs with their national development plans and poverty reduction strategies | *Indicator 16.10.1:*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 | *Indicator 16.a.1:*Percentage of victims who report physical and/or sexual crime to law enforcement agencies during the past 12 months (Disaggregated by age, sex, region and population group) |
|  |  |  | *Discussion prompt: At the 2nd IAEG-SDGs meeting, Members decided to choose between the current proposal or the alternative indicator "Proportion of those who have experienced a dispute in the past 12 months who have accessed a formal, informal, alternative or traditional dispute resolution mechanism."* |  | *Discussion prompt: The IAEG-SDG Members ask for suggestions for an alternative indicator that includes private sector corruption.* | *Discussion prompt: At the 2nd IAEG-SDGs meeting, Members decided to consider the three alternative proposals: 1) Turnout as a share of voting-age population in national elections; 2) Percentage of population who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive, by age, sex, disability and population group; 3) Proportion of public service positions held by women and members of target groups.* |  | *Discussion prompt: The IAEG-SDG Members ask for suggestions for an alternative indicator.* |
| **Total comments received** | 53 | 27 | 71 | 60 | 28 | 46 | 54 | 55 | 49 |
| Australian Bureau of Statistics |  | This is not a good measure for the of target indicator. Feelings of safety are not necessarily reflective of actual rates of violence, and are subject to influenced by media, experience of social disorder, and personal perceptions etc. If retained as an indicator, it is recommended that the question specify whether focus of feeling safe is during the day or night to ensure consistent interpretation of this question by respondents. |  |  | Direct data on this indictaor would difficult to obtain. However, modelling of data could be possible. | Conceptually relevant indicator. Not highly relevant to Australia - data not likely to be available. |  |  |  |
| Central Statistical Office of Poland |  |  | CSO of Poland comments: It should be considered to include to this target some indicators measuring other types of violence, e.i. mental violence and neglect (for the same age bracket). In the case of monitoring this indicators it should be also specified how to collect this information. |  | CSO of Poland comments: This indicator is highly important, however the term "illicit financial flows" needs further clarification. There are different regulatory approaches in different countries to qualify financial flows as illicit. Therefore, it should be considered to divide the illicit financial flows into subcategories. Poland also proposes to take into consideration an alternative indicator: The Financial Secrecy Index. It ranks jurisdictions according to their secrecy and the scale of their activities. A politically neutral ranking, it is a tool for understanding global financial secrecy, tax havens or secrecy jurisdictions, and illicit financial flows. The FSI combines two measurements, one qualitative and one quantitative. The qualitative measure looks at a jurisdiction’s laws and regulations, international treaties, and so on, to assess how secretive it is.The assessment is given in the form of a secrecy score: the higher the score, the more secretive the jurisdiction. The second, quantitative, measurement attaches a weighting to take account of the jurisdiction’s size and overall importance to the global financial markets. In combining the two scores, we mathematically emphasise the secrecy score (by cubing it) and de-emphasise the weighting (by applying the cube root), in order to give secrecy its due importance, and to make sure that the index is properly responsive to changes in either score. | CSO of Poland comments: It might be worthwhile to consider an additional disaggregation by methods of transferring the bribes. Poland also proposes to take into consideration an alternative indicator based on the transparency international index (corruption perceptions index), which is elaborated in 176 countries and is widely recognised as not biased (www.transparency.org). |  | CSO of Poland comments: Poland proposes to take into consideration an alternative indicator: the E-Participation Index (United Nations e-government survey which puts emphasise on the participation of societies in decision making via electronic means [http://unpan3.un.org/egovkb/en-us/About/Overview/E-Participation]). Moreover, we support the suggestions of the US representative in IAEG-SDGs to address 16.10: (a) number of times in which UN Special Rapporteurs report violations of fundamental freedoms, including freedoms of association, expression, and assembly, (b) Percentage of recommendations to strengthen fundamental freedoms – including freedom of association, assembly and expression – that were implemented, as identified through the UN Human Rights Council Universal Periodic Review, (c) Perception of the public and of civil society organizations on whether they can pursue issues of interest, including human rights governance, in the public arena without fear of government retribution. (Surveys/polls; Disaggregated by age, sex, gender), (d) Adoption and implementation of access to information laws and regulations and the number and percentage of requests for information fulfilled in the past 12 months (though it is difficult to measure), (e) Existence of enabling laws, policies and practices with regard to the freedoms of expression, association and assembly. |  |
| Government of Japan |  |  |  |  | Japan proposes the modifications to the indicator as follows; "Total value of inward and outward illicit financial flows captured" or "Total value of inward and outward illicit financial flows arrested" | Japan proposes the alternative indicator as follows; "Number of arrested criminals on bribe and corruption in the last 12 months" |  |  |  |
| Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Censos | For countries that are not in ongoing armed conflicts, we recommend the following indicator: the number of violent deaths per 100.000 people. | This indicator does not measures an objective topic for this reason we recommend to eliminate. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ISTAT | Istat-Italy: we support the indicator Goal 16 general comments: there is no reference to environmental damages and crimes (Convention of Arlus) in goal 16 |  | Istat-Italy: we highlight that not only youngs 18-24 yrs are the most at risk of sexual violence, better consider 18-29 or 18-34 yrs old, as demonstrated in European surveys |  | ISTAT-Italy: It should be connected to 16.4.2 indicator that Istat proposed to change in "percentage of small arms and light weapons marked and recorded at the time of import in accordance with international standards" . For illicit financial flows it seems more realistic to estimate the economic value of illicit economy, i.e. related to criminal activities. |  |  | Istat-Italy: we propose an additional indicator: "Number of countries that have approved laws to ensure public access to information" |  |
| National Statistical Institute, Spain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | We propose the following indicator: Number of national policy reforms adopted that incorporate accountability and transparency principles (e.g. accountability and transparency laws, transparency councils, transparency portals). |  |
| Singapore Department of Statistics |  |  | We would like to seek further clarifications on what constitutes “sexual violence” in the context of the SDG as what constitutes “sexual violence” may be interpreted differently across countries’ due to differences in legislation. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Statistics Denmark |  |  |  |  |  |  | It is unclear if it possible to obtain specific data regarding persons with disabilities. | In relation to Gender Equality we wish to propose that this indicators should be disaggregated by sex. |  |
| Statistics Finland | Finland suggests "Number of people displaced due to conflict, war, persecution or human rights violations". The indicator is already available and international legal and statistical standards exist to support its compilation. Global data on refugees are collected by UNHCR twice yearly for 190 countries. Data on internally displaced persons are available for about 60 countries. |  |  | Finland comments: Open Society's proposal "The % of the population who live within reasonable reach [measured in km or time of travel] of affordable and effective basic legal service providers and of a justice institution whose resolutions are fair, timely, and enforced" is supported. |  |  | Finland comments: the proposal that we could support is the perception-based indicator suggested by the Transparency, Accountability and Participation Network (TAP): "Percentage of population who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive". This also would need to be disaggregated by sex, age, disability, region, etc. | Finland suggests: "Number of verified cases of killing, enforced disappearance, arbitrary detention, assault and torture of journalists, trade unionists or human rights defenders in the previous 12 months". "Human rights defenders" is an established term. | Finland suggests "Level of compliance of existing national human rights institutions with the Paris Principles adopted by the UN General Assembly." The High Level Task Force for ICPD has also commented the indicator proposal on 10 December. Finland suggests that those comments would be taken into consideration by the IAEG-SDG. |
| Statistics Lithuania | Move to green |  | Move to green | Data available |  |  |  | Could be available | Could be available |
| Swiss Federal Statistical Office | Switzerland comments: We believe in the need to keep this indicator in order to ensure the nexus between peace and development and to reflect the debates on the Agenda 2030. Conflict is an impediment to development and its should be measured as such. | Switzerland comments: We believe that the perception of security (safety) aspect is important and should be measured in the Goal 16, alternatively the indicator could look like: 16.4 Perception of security conditions (by region, gender, social groups) (Source Perception Survey) |  |  |  |  | Switzerland comments: We suggest to change the Indicator with: Perception of inclusion in the political processes (national and local) |  |  |
| TurkStat |  | Turkstat comments: The available indicator is an ideal indicator for safety. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| United States | US: We support but would like clarification of "type of perpetrator." A disaggregated data set on perpetrators must include the state or state actors. Note that it is important to include this in addition to the intentional homocide indicator (16.1.1) because these two things are measured separately. Not including this indicator would mean that our notion of "peaceful societies" does not include a focus on countries mired in or affected by conflict. (Unless there is a change to the measurement of intentional homocide to include conflict-related deaths.) Note, however, that there is a difference between "conflict-related deaths" and "conflict deaths" with the former more inclusive of things like increased death from preventable illness in conflict zones due to lack of health providers. This is likely to be measured elsewhere (in health data) and there is a significant debate as to how to measure whether a death is conflict-related or not. Support cleaner language of conflict-death. | US: We support this additional indicator as a supplement to the other measures proposed. The current additional indicator measures peace within society in a way that death/homocide doesn't. For example in a context where people are not going outside, there may be fewer deaths, but that doen't mean it's a peaceful society. However: we do not want to risk the first two in order to keep this one. | US: We think this indicator could be deleted as redundant. Note that indicators 5.2.1, 5.2.2 and 11.7.2 all reference similar although only with regard to girls/women. Also, if proposed indicator 16.1.3 remains, that would be inclusive of this as well. Do not strongly support given those other indicators. | US: We cannot support the proposed measures, but offer several alternatives presented as 16.3.3-16.3.7. The current proposed indicators for target 16.3 [16.3.1 and 16.3.2] do not adequately capture the scope and nature of rule of law. They only deal with violence and criminal law and do not at all address the crux of rule of law: the political independence of the police, prosecuting authority, the judiciary, civil justice access and capacity issues.  16.3.3 World Justice Project's Rule of Law Index, which assesses conditions in 102 countries (http://worldjusticeproject.org/rule-of-law-index) 16.3.4 Proportion of those who have experienced a dispute in the past 12 months who have accessed a formal, informal, alternative or traditional dispute resolution mechanism.  16.3.5 Proportion of those who have accessed such a mechanism for resolution of a dispute in the past 12 months who feel the process was just. 16.3.6 Percentage of people who voice confidence in the judicial system.  16.3.7 Proportion of those who are charged with a crime and qualify for criminal legal aid who are provided with counsel | US: We cannot support the proposed measure since, as several countries note, there is no universal definition of illicit financial flows. However, we can offer an alternative as noted (16.4.3).  16.4.3. Total value of inward and outward illicit financial flows related to trade misinvoicing at the country level (in current US$).  This is our proposed alternative to 16.4.1. Unlike "illicit financial flows," there is an agreed definition and understanding of the term "trade misinvoicing." The IMF has used it for decades and has excellent data to measure this through the IMF's Direction of Trade Statistics (DOTS) data set. Our analysis of DOTS data shows that, on a global basis, more than 75% ($730 billion in 2012) of measurable illicit flows are due to trade misinvoicing. So, while the indicator we've suggested won't measure every aspect of illicit flows, it will measure the largest component. Moreover, measuring trade misinvoicing has a direct connection to a country's ability to increase domestic resource mobilization given that, for every dollar of trade-related illicit flows—regardless if it is an inflow or an outflow—taxes and duties are not being paid to the government. Curtail trade-related illicit flows and you increase DRM. | US: We suggest the revisions as noted. In terms of data sources, Transparency International's Global Corruption Barometer surveys people in 107 countries about their perceptions of corruption and their experiences with public officials. Specifically, it asks people if they have come into contact with public officials of various types (police, judiciary, registry & permit services, tax, public utilities, public medical & health services, and land services) and if so, have they paid a bribe to a public official of this particular type. A review of UNODP and TI GCB data sources would be useful. 16.5.1 Percentage 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. 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. | US: We cannot support the proposed indicator, but offer several alternatives as shown (16.7.3 to 16.7.6). The current proposed indicator is a weak conceptual fit with the target. This indicator focuses on a very narrow portion of the population and does not well-measure responsiveness, participation and representation. A broadly focused perception measure would be a better fit, readily understandable, and obtainable through existing polling survey methodology.  16.7.3 Number of times in which the public and civil society organizations are invited to comment on policy and legal initiatives, compared to the number of policy and legal initiatives in the last twelve months. 16.7.4 Proportions of the public and civil society organizations that believe that the government provides them adequate time, opportunity, and information to comment on policy and legal initiatives.  16.7.5 Proportions of the public and civil society organizations that believe that the government genuinely considers their comments on policy or legal initiatives. 16.7.6 Environmental Democracy Index has developed indicators on public participation, such as "To what extent do the laws concerning: environmental impact assessments, pollution control standards and permits, forest concessions, extractive industries, biodiversity protection, and environmental policy-making require the State or state agencies to provide for a public review process for decisions relating to the environment if previously unconsidered environmental impacts become apparent?" | US: We support this indicator with revisions shown. The proposed indicator as currently formulated only focuses on a very limited number of human rights violations—and is not limited to human rights for that matter. For example, only killings committed by state actors ‎usually violate human rights, which are government obligations.  16.10.1 Number of verified cases of extrajudicial killing, kidnapping, enforced disappearance, arbitrary detention, arbitrary blocking or shutting down of activities, and torture of journalists, associated media personnel, trade unionists, staff of civil society organizations, and human rights or governance advocates in the previous 12 months AND (1) Number of times in which UN Special Rapporteurs report violations of fundamental freedoms, including freedoms of association, expression, and assembly, (2) Percentage of recommendations to strengthen fundamental freedoms—including freedoms of association, assembly, and expression—that were implemented, as identified through the UN Human Rights Council Universal Periodic Review, (3) Perception of the public and of civil society organizations on whether they can pursue issues of interest, including human rights and governance, in the public arena without fear of government retribution. | US: We cannot support this indicator as currently proposed. We believe it is a weak conceptual fit with the target. The action of reporting a crime would (also) signify public trust in national institutions, and therefore lower reports would not necessarily mean proper functioning of national institutions. |
| Department Foreign Affairs and Trade, Australia |  |  | Note tendency for underreporting in this space, and the importance of enabling victims to respond anonymously. Note that a change in this indicator could be due to a change in the actual experience of respondents or a change in the response rates. | Note tendency for underreporting in this space, and the importance of enabling victims to respond anonymously. Note that a change in this indicator could be due to a change in the actual experience of respondents or a change in the response rates. | May need further specification of what illicit flows are to be measured. Question ability to gather robust data. | Note indicator focuses only on a subset of corruption (bribery presumably at bureaucratic/point of service delivery level). An alternate indicator that includes both individual and private sector experiences of corruption would be difficult given the different contexts in which individuals versus private firms encounter corruption. If looking specifically at the private sector, however, the IAEG could consider the strengths/weaknesses of current assessment tools like Transparency International Bribe Payers Index or the World Bank's Enterprise Surveys. |  | Indicator provides limited information around public access to information and thus the full scope of the target is not addressed. | Similar to indicator 16.3.1. Limited relevance to the target - this indicator does not provide information on whether institutional capacity to prevent violence and combat terrorism and crime has been strengthened. Query whether the Peacebuilding and Statebuilding Goals (PSG) indicators have been considered for the SDG indicators, given their relevance to the SDGs. The PSG on security would be most relevant for this target. |
| Slovak Republic |  |  |  |  |  | [Input from the Slovak Republic](http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/Slovak-Republic-PM.pdf) | [Input from the Slovak Republic](http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/Slovak-Republic-PM.pdf) | [Input from the Slovak Republic](http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/Slovak-Republic-PM.pdf) |  |
| Commonwealth Secretariat |  |  |  | Commonwealth Secretariat comments on Indicator 16.3.1: The rule of law can be characterised through three key elements – legal frameworks, institutional capacity, and legal empowerment. Each of these intersects with the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development. It is extremely challenging for just two global indicators to capture these elements and dimensions. In the same way as, for example, complex Target 3.3 (which refers to multiple diseases) requires four indicators (all now coded "Green"), so Target 16.3, which measures a complex socio-legal concept, justifies three indicators. Accordingly, in respect of Target 16.3, the Commonwealth Secretariat proposes: 1) The inclusion of current proposed Indicator 16.3.1 (crime reporting rate), which the Secretariat supports; 2) The addition of an indicator "Proportion of those who have experienced a dispute in the past 12 months who have accessed a formal, informal, alternative or traditional dispute resolution mechanism and who feel it was just”; and [3) The current "Green" indicator 16.3.2 (unsentenced detainees as a percentage of overall prison population).] Indicators 1) and 3) refer to the criminal justice system only. Indicator 2) is additionally required in order to provide information on the fairness and substantive justice of dispute resolution mechanisms as a whole. Rule of law experts from small developing Commonwealth countries have consistently highlighted that, in addition to criminal aspects, the rule of law and access to justice concerns areas such as investment, commerical, corporate, land and family law. It is important that these aspects are captured by an indicator for Target 16.3 that is broader than the criminal justice system alone. In respect of proposed indicator 2) above, the Commonwealth Secretariat notes that: - The reference to ‘who feel it was just’ is important in order to assess the operation of the system. An indicator that measures only whether a dispute resolution mechanism is accessed is largely dependent upon the nature and circumstances of the dispute, as opposed to the effectiveness and fairness of the justice system itself; - It is acknowledged that there can be a bias as to whether respondents perceive a mechanism as 'just' depending upon if the case is won or lost by the respondent. A number of steps can be taken in this respect however, including: (a) the indicator should be disaggregated by dispute outcome; and (b) where possible, the indicator should be supplemented by information from additional respondents including (at least in the case of formal justice systems), legal counsel or independent court monitors; - Methodologies are increasingly developed for measurement of the indicator through population-based and business surveys, as well as court (or other dispute resolution mechanism) user surveys. Specific guidance on survey questions and methodology could be included in indicator metadata; and - The indicator should be further disaggregated by type of dispute and resolution mechanism. |  |  |  |  |  |
| DPKO | DPKO would recommend one composite indicator under target 16.1 i.e. "Violent deaths per 100,000 people (including intentional homicides per 100,000 + direct conflict deaths per 100,000)". Should this not be possible, and indicator 16.1.1 limited to intentional homicide, we would recommend that this proposed indicator be limited to "direct conflict deaths per 100,000". |  |  | DPKO supports the propose alternative indicator. In addition, it is recommended that the following indicator be considered under target 16.3: "Unsentenced detainees as percentage of overall prison population". This is a widely available indicator for evaluating access to justice. Although this indicator is limited to the criminal justice system, in circumstances where there is a high percentage of unsentenced detainees it is highly unlikely that there is, overall, adequate access to justice. Therefore, this is an indicator that is relevant for evaluating the performance of the entire justice system. |  |  | DPKO would support the inclusion of an indicator on the "Percentage of population who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive". |  | DPKO would support the inclusion of this indicator. In addition, we would recommend that the following indicator be considered under target 16.a: "Unsentenced detainees as percentage of overall prison population". This is a widely available indicator for evaluating access to justice and the performance of justice institutions. Although this indicator is limited to a significant extent to the performance of criminal justice institutions, in circumstances where there is a high percentage of unsentenced detainees it is highly unlikely that national institutions are adequately able to prevent violence and combat terrorism and crime. Therefore, this is an indicator that is relevant for evaluating the strength of national institutions in this regard. |
| Eurostat | As a first step, a clear definition for conflict related deaths is needed. More development work needed at a later stage to achieve full coverage of the target. | The proposed indicator, which is based on individuals' perceptions of safety may not adequately reflect the level of violence in a society. The prevalence of violence experienced by victims (obtained via a representative victimisation survey) would be more suitable to complement the other indicators for this target. | The proposed indicator requires estimates based on a representative population-based sample survey to collect the information, as details of all incidents of sexual violence would not be available from police records. In the area of sexual violence, such information from victims is challenging to collect and countries that collect the data may not use common definitions regarding what constitutes sexual violence or common age breaks. In order to provide representative data for young men and women for the specific age group 18-24, a relatively large sample size may be required for this age group to be adequately represented in a survey. A recent, comparable survey exists on European level: In 2014 the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights reported on its survey on violence against women. In this survey the results were reported for women aged 18-74 (not 18-24) and the respondents were asked about experience of sexual violence before the age of 15 (not 18). | The indicator is very narrow in terms of the target, which means that more development work is needed to achieve full coverage of the target. A high rate of crime reporting does not necessarily indicate the law is accessible or properly applied, as the competent authorities may decide not to take any action, and good legal advice may not always be affordable. The indicator is also focusing on criminal offences, whereas the target is more general and includes civil/commercial litigation. However, the proposed indicator could be used as a first step and later be replaced or complemented by other indicators. The legal costs in the justice system may be a significant barrier to providing access to justice for all. A better indicator may therefore be one that reflects the threshold at which legal aid is provided for individuals with limited financial resources (e.g. % of national median income below which legal aid is granted). Other options to consider are the indicator suggested by WB/UNDP and others on access to justice, providing a wider picture of the justice system, and the indicator proposed by OHCHR on pre-trial detention. | Illicit flows are difficult to estimate. Methodology needs to be established. | Several forms of corruption exist while the indicator only covers one. The proposed indicator focuses on petty corruption and ignores the other dimensions. More development work needed at a later stage to achieve full coverage of the target. However, the proposed indicator could be used as a first step and later be replaced or complemented by other indicators. A potential avenue for improvement is the OHCHR proposal: "Proportion of persons/businesses that did, were asked to or were expected to pay a bribe or provide a product or service to a public official". |  | More development work needed to achieve full coverage of the target. The professional status of victims could be added as another victim disaggregation variable in the International Classification of Crime for Statistical purposes to encourage authorities to record the information, with journalists, associated media personnel, trade unionists and human rights advocates separately identified. |  |
| g7+ Secretariat | g7+ Secretariat: Alternative indicators from "Fragility Spectrum" which is the menu of indicators proposed by g7+ countries which conducted Fragility assessments. The indicator is "Violent deaths per 100,000 population". The term "violent" addresses all form of deaths related to conflict. | g7+ Secretariat: This indicator should remain as it is. Security is of main importance to the g7+ countries | g7+ Secretariat: Supports this indicator. Slightly alternative indicator is also available in "fragility spectrum", i.e. Number of cases of sexual violence. / # of rape cases reported | g7+ Secretariat: Alternative indicator is suggested (available in the g7+ fragility spectrum): "Proportion of cases resolved from total cases reported on annually". This is a good measure of access to justice rather than just reporting. Victims do report on the incidents, but the extent of the cases resolves is a good measure of access to justice | g7+ Secretariat: A good indicator, but can we measure it in countries like FCS | g7+ Secretariat: The existing indicator should be desegregated by services (security, Justice and opening a business). | g7+ Secretariat: We suggest "1)Turnout as a share of voting age population in national elections". It is better than the 2) as the later already covered in 16.7.1 | g7+ Secretariat: We would prefer to replace this with “Proportion of population who feel safe to express their voice” | g7+ Secretariat: Alternative indicator from (g7+ fragility Spectrum) "% of Population Confident in Security Personnel delivering national security" or "% change in public perception of confidence in security sector" |
| IMF |  |  |  |  | IMF:Regarding the proposed indicator, the total value of inward and outward illicit financial flows (in current US$), as measured by Global Financial Integrity (http://www.gfintegrity.org/issues/data-by-country/), we note that there is no official definition of illicit financial flows (see, for example, the IMF’s Balance of Payments and International Investment Position Manual, Sixth Edition (BPM6)), and thus no well-defined and widely accepted measurement of the magnitude of such flows. While we agree on their importance of this phenomenon, we believe that prior work is needed on agreeing on a definition and on its measurement. |  |  |  |  |
| International Disability Alliance |  |  |  |  |  | IDA recommends disaggregating by disability. It would read as: 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, disability, 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. |  |  | IDA-IDDC recommends disaggregating by disability It would read as: Percentage of victims who report physical and/or sexual crime to law enforcement agencies during past 12 months Disaggregated by age, sex, disability, region and population group |
| International Disability and Development Consortium | For indicator 16.1.2 IDDC recommends disaggregating by disability It would read as: Conflict-related deaths per 100,000 people (disaggregated by age, sex, disability and cause) |  |  |  |  | For indicator 16.5.1 IDDC recommends disaggregating by disability It would read as: 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, disability, region and population group |  |  | For indicator 16.a.1 IDDC recommends disaggregating by disability It would read as: Percentage of victims who report physical and/or sexual crime to law enforcement agencies during past 12 months (Disaggregated by age, sex, disability, region and population group) |
| OCHA | OCHA supports the indicator in light of its direct relevance to the target, humanitarian action as well as the overall achievement of sustainable development. The indicator could be further bolstered with an \_additional\_ element that would measure the number of people forcibly displaced by conflict and complement the measuring of deaths. The scale of forced displacement can function as a measure of the frequency and intensity of conflicts both at country and regional levels and globally, including in contexts and cases where it’s more difficult to measure conflict deaths than internal or cross-border displacement. People who become displaced by conflcit are in high danger of remaining in protracted displacement and being left behind by the 2030 Agenda long after the event that displaced them due to heightened vulnerability caused by loss of homes, employment, livelihoods, education, etc. Displacement data and statistics are collected and compiled with established, robust methodologies by actors such as UNHCR, Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre and governments. Efforts are also currently underway under the auspices of the UN Statistical Commission to strengthen refugee data/statistics and the capacity of national statistical offices and international organizations to collect, compare, share and use said data. (Nb. Displacement elements proposed also for indicators 1.5.1, 11.5.1 and 13.1.1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OECD |  |  |  |  | We suggest using countries' compliance ratings with core components of FATF recommendations and the Global Forum on Transparency; see http://www.oecd.org/tax/transparency/GFratings.pdf. |  |  |  |  |
| SRSG-VAC |  |  | Marta Santos Pais, SRSG-VAC I am greatly encouraged by the recognition of the IAEG members that all forms of violence need to be monitored in the SDGs. This is illustrated by the additional "green" indicator foreseen under target 16.1 on "the percentage of the population subjected to physical, psychological or sexual violence within the last 12 months." In the same spirit, alongside the “green” indicator already foreseen under target 16.2 focussing on the percentage of children who experienced any "physical punishment and/or psychological aggression," it is crucial to ensure that all three major forms of violence that affect girls and boys in childhood are being measured. In this regard, a strong consensus among all stakeholders working to end violence against children has emerged for the inclusion of indicator 16.2.3 that measures the percentage of young women and men aged 18-24 who experience sexual violence in childhood. I strongly urge that 16.2.3 is included as a green indicator in the final list of SDG indicators. The addition of indicator 16.2.3 will ensure that taken together these indicators meet the ambition of and help monitor progress towards target 16.2 of an end to all forms of violence against all children. Target 16.2 is achievable and measurable. There are existing tools and mechanisms for data collection to measure all forms of violence against children (sexual, physical and psychological) that have already been implemented, even in resource poor settings. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UN Women | UN Women supports PBSO, EXO/RoLU and UNDP and suggests the following indicators: Indicator 16.1.3: Conflict-related deaths per 100,000 people, by age, sex and cause | UN Women support the indicator but suggest that is is disaggregated by sex and age Indicator 16.1.4: Proportion of people that feel safe walking alone around the area they live, by sex and age | UN Women supports this indicator | Proposed Indicator 16.3.1: 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 who feel the process was just, by sex and type of justice institution/mechanism UN Women supports this indicator but would like to point out that women and men have unequal access to justice and the type of justice institution (e.g. formal or informal) that people access has an important bearing on outcomes. Therefore we would like to suggest adding disaggregation by sex and type of justice institution/mechanism to the formulation of the indicator. |  | Indicator 16.5.1: Percentage of persons who had to pay or were asked for a bribe for a service, during the last 12 months, by age, sex, and sector (public or private) |  |  |  |
| UNCDF |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | UNCDF would like to support the proposal by UNDP/UN system to add an additional indicator “Percentage of government revenues, procurement and natural resource concessions that are publicly available and easily accessible in open data format” |  |
| UNDP | UNDP supports submission by Jana Schuhmann on behalf of inter-agency group on Goal 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UNDP | Comment in behalf of PBSO, EOSG/ROLU, UNDP, DPKO, UNWOMEN: We support this indicator, as it is very relevant to the target. In order to register global progress in achieving peace it is crucial to have some basic measure of frequency and intensity of armed conflict. The fundamental unit of measuring armed conflict is the number of deaths arising over a period of time. Even when it’s difficult to measure conflict deaths with one single indicator, it’s the best proxy available. While conceptually challenging, measuring deaths from armed conflicts is methodologically feasible. There are standardized approached to measuring direct death at the global and national levels, including incidents of killings of soldiers and civilians, based of sources such as hospitals, morgues, news reports, military records and human rights assessments. Even though the statistical system has still to agree on a standardized system of measurement, several approaches to measure conflict death already exist. We recommend to include this indicator in the framework (tier 3) and to work on a common methodology. Estimates of conflict-related deaths are produced at international level: conflict death databases include the IISS Armed Conflict Database, the Armed Conflict Location and Event Database, the Correlates of War Project, the UCDP Battle-Related Deaths Dataset, and WHO estimates of deaths by cause. Data from these sources, though they may vary on estimates, exist for all major (>1000 battle deaths) and minor (>25 battle deaths per year) conflicts since 1945 (see UCDP). The Global Burden of Armed Violence (Geneva Declaration) compares and collects conflict-related deaths from multiple sources. Additionally, at the local and regional level, observatories and other civil society initiatives provide data on conflict incidence and deaths. In order to simplify the measurement it may be a solution to replace “conflict-related” with “conflict” to count direct conflict death only. | Comment in behalf of PBSO, EOSG/ROLU, UNDP, DPKO, UNWOMEN: We support this indicator. The proposed indicator reflects very well the purpose of the target and should be considered as additional indicator. We would also like to emphasize the relevance of this indicator for Goal 11.7.1.: the indicator would serve the purpose of measuring safe public spaces in a broader scope and should also be disaggregated by sex, as perceptions of security might differ broadly between men and women. A methodology is available. Data is collected through national and international crime victimization surveys, which are being implemented by an increasing number of countries. The International Crime Victimization Survey (ICVS), for example, has been conducted in approximately 80 countries worldwide. Data is also collected periodically through World Value Surveys and Gallup International Polls. In addition, the Governance, Peace and Security Module (GPS) of 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. Meta data has been provided earlier in the process. | Comment in behalf of PBSO, EOSG/ROLU, UNDP, DPKO, UNWOMEN, UNICEF, Office of the SRDG on Violence against Children: We support the proposed indicator. An additional indicator on sexual violence disaggregated by sex, along with “green” indicator 16.2.1 on physical and psychological violence against children, would ensure that all forms of violence against children are being measured and thus reflect the ambition of the target. The indicator can also be useful to and linked with SDG 5, Target 5.2 which measures sexual violence by type, but currently exclusively for women and girls aged 15-49. Comparable data on specific forms of sexual violence are available for a number of low- and middle-income countries through Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS). Questions on experiences of sexual violence are currently posed to girls and women of reproductive age and to boys and men aged 15 and older (depending on the survey, men up to the age of 49, 54, 59, 60 or 64 are included). While the same questionnaire is used in DHS to collect information on the experiences of sexual violence among both sexes, data for males are available for a significantly smaller number of countries. While it is fairly well recognized that, in most parts of the world, girls are at increased risk of sexual violence, boys are victimized as well – but their experiences of abuse remain largely undocumented. | Comment in behalf of PBSO, EOSG/ROLU, UNDP, UNWOMEN: We do not support this indicator. This indicator, combined with indicator 16.3.2. on pretrial detention (currently included as green) would introduce a narrow focus on criminal justice only, instead of the broader aim of the target on the rule of law and access to justice. A narrow focus on criminal justice and on victims of violence would not meet the balance and ambition of the SDGs and targets. We therefore support an alternative indicator, see below. Furthermore, this indicator is duplicitous as a version has already been proposed as indicator for 16.a. Instead we support the alternative indicator "Proportion of those who have experienced a dispute in the past 12 months who have accessed a formal, informal, alternative or traditional dispute resolution mechanism." It responds adequately to the intended scope of target 16.3. It aims to measure the whole range of situations, criminal, civil and commercial, which require access to justice and benefit from the rule of law. We suggest to change the indicator slightly into: 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 who feel the process was just. The first part of the indicator [proposed by the US as alternative b)] focusses on the access to the justice system. The second part [proposed by the US as alternative c)], assesses the quality of the process, providing an important measure on the functioning of the justice system and thereby an important proxy on the respect for the rule of law. The focus on all forms of “dispute” is helpful in meeting the ambition of the 2030 Agenda, and will need to be translated appropriately into national contexts to allow for data collection. “Dispute” is further defined as part of the survey process to ensure consistent data. Data should be disaggregated by sex as experiences of access to justice can be dramatically different for men and women in some countries, due to the existence of formal or informal barriers. Data can be collected through household surveys. Surveys in 107 countries already respond to this or closely related questions, proving that methodologies are in place. Meta-data has been provided earlier in the process. | Comment in behalf of PBSO, EOSG/ROLU, UNDP, DPKO, UNWOMEN: We support this indicator, as it is very relevant to the target. Even though the statistical system has still to agree on a standardized system of measurement, several approaches to measure IFF already exist. We recommend to include this indicator in the framework (tier 3) and work on a common methodology. Global Financial Integrity (GFI) undertakes macroeconomic analyses of IFFs and detailed analyses of trade misinvoicing by commodity groups. GFI consistently use the following: IMF: 1. Balance of payments data, contributing to the analysis of net errors and omissions. 2. Direction of Trade Statistics (DOTS), enabling analyses of discrepancies in trade between pairs of reporting countries. For other economic and trade analyses, GFI draws from a selection of sources including the following: • World Bank: Providing data on debt, contributing to the analysis of broad capital flight. • UN COMTRADE: Providing data on bilateral trade in commodity groups. • US Dept. of Commerce: Providing data on trade transactions by Harmonized System coding categories. • European Statistics: Providing data on trade transactions by Harmonized System coding categories. GFI believes that the estimates arising from these data sources and analytical methodologies are very conservative. Meta-data has been provided earlier in the process. | Comment in behalf of PBSO, EOSG/ROLU, UNDP, DPKO, UNWOMEN: We support the proposed indicator with the addition to include an “and” between “public official” AND “who paid” to clarify the reference group for this proposed indicator. This indicator provides solid information on the experience of bribery, typically occurring in the interaction between people/businesses and the public sector in the context of basic service delivery/transactions. This indicator can be measured through Household corruption surveys and victimisation surveys with a module on bribery. Asking the respondents if they “have been asked” to pay a bribe ensures that no one has to expose him/herself to prosecution. Various programmes and initiatives have produced data on the experience of corruption by the population. Programmes of surveys on the experience of corruption have been supported by international organizations, including by UNODC, the World Bank and UNDP. At national level, surveys on the experience of corruption are conducted by an increasing number of countries, sometimes as part of the regular production by official statistics. Data on bribery can also be collected as part of general victimization surveys. Meta data has been provided earlier in the process. We suggest to add a second indicator and propose to include: 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. into the framework. Furthermore we raise our concerns against any indicator that includes the number of prosecutions/convictions on bribery. These indicators are not actionable and may even create perverse incentives. In countries with high corruption levels cases are usually not prosecuted. It is also not clear what the increase/ decrease of number would tell us: does the level of corruption rise/sink or do public institutions work more efficiently? Finally it can also create incentives for misuse, e.g. by incriminating someone for political purposes. Meta- data has been provided earlier in the process. | Comment in behalf of PBSO, EOSG/ROLU, UNDP, UNWOMEN: We would like note, that this indicator was not accepted by most of the IAEG-SDG members in the Bangkok meeting, 3 alternative indicator proposals were put forward as grey indicators: “Turnout as a share of voting-age population in national and local elections.” “Proportion of public service positions held by women and members of target groups.” “Percentage of population who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive.” 1. We do not support this indicator. The reference to "proportion of countries" does not make sense in this context and is also not a national indicator. The suggested indicator collects data only from strategies but doesn’t measure their implementation, thus the inclusiveness of real decision-making is not actually measured. The focus on youth is also very narrow. 2. We support the indicator suggested by the African IAEG-SDG members: "Turnout as a share of voting-age population in national elections" responds better to the needs of the target, especially if the data is to be disaggregated by age groups and gender. Measuring turnout is systematic and comparable, but cannot measure election quality. 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 and should be disaggregated by sex. In addition, international organisations such as the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA) maintain 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. 3. In general we support the proposed indicator “Proportion of public service positions held by women and members of target groups.” But since a similar indicator had been proposed and agreed on for 5.5.2., we suggest to include one of the other 2 proposals for 16.7. into the framework. 1. We support the proposed indicator “Percentage of population who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive.” This perception survey-based indicator is complementary to 16.7.1. on “proportions of positions…”.This indicator is a way of measuring the perception of people of their government, focusing on inclusiveness and responsiveness to the population. It is both easy to understand and communicate. It will require scaling up of household surveys that collect perception based data. Citizens' participation mechanisms at all levels of government are, for example, parliamentary fora for citizens' input, the use of referenda, participatory budget preparation at local levels, etc., and speak to the participatory nature of decision-making. Disaggregation by sex, age groups and social groups might reveal significant sub-national disparities. | Comment in behalf of PBSO, EOSG/ROLU, UNDP, DPKO, OHCHR, ILO, UNWOMEN: We support this indicator. The full methodology of this indicator will be developed jointly by OHCHR, UNESCO, and ILO, in close collaboration with the Inter-agency Expert Group on SDG indicators. It will build upon existing methodologies, ensuring harmonization of data sources. The primary data sources will be national, including administrative records maintained by national human rights institutions, non-governmental organizations, trade unions and other relevant entities. Data will be cross-checked and verified based on triangulation methods, bringing together and reviewing data from multiple sources, ensuring removal of duplicate or non-verified cases, and compiled in line with the agreed international definitions outlined above. Information on the number of violations committed against human rights defenders is compiled annually by OHCHR from national sources submitted to its human rights mechanisms and through its field offices. Information on the number of journalists killed is 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’ and in the UNESCO study titled World Trends in Freedom of Expression and Media Development. Information on trade unionists killed, disappeared and detained is compiled by: 1) ILO through submissions made to their regular system of supervision of International Labour Standards and through complaints submitted to the ILO Committee on Freedom of Association; 2) International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC) through reports submitted by national and regional trade union organizations to the ITUC which are compiled on an annual basis in the ITUC Annual Survey on the violation of trade union rights; and 3) International Federation of Journalists (IFJ) through submissions made by national independent trade unions of journalists to the IFJ. In order to address challenges with disaggregation and to make this indicator more operational, we suggest to consider to focus on specific cases of violations as proxy for the whole concept. Comment in behalf of PBSO, EOSG/ROLU, UNDP, UNWOMEN: We would also like to introduce again: "Percentage of government revenues, procurement and natural resource concessions that are publicly available and easily accessible in open data format" as additional indicator, which focusses on the access to information aspect of the target. This indicator addresses, inter alia, matters relating to the reliability of procurement and natural resource concessions, and any other matters affecting the management and use of public resources.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. Data for 149 countries (collected on 398+ occasions) available at www.pefa.org. Meta- data has been provided earlier in the process. | Comment in behalf of PBSO, EOSG/ROLU, UNDP, UNWOMEN: We propose as alternative indicators: We support an indicator on National Human Rights Institutions (NHRI) and suggest “Existence of independent NHRI in compliance with Paris Principles”, which also captures a qualitative element of the institution, and placing it as an additional indicator to 16.b. The specific mandates of NHRIs vary, but their overall role is to promote and advance the protection of civil political, economic, social and cultural rights, including addressing discrimination in all its forms. The indicator is not only focusing on the existence of the institute, but also on the quality. An Independent NHRI is an institution with ‘A level’ accreditation status as benchmarked against the United Nations Paris Principles, which were adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in 1993.1 The process of accreditation is conducted through peer review by the Sub-Committee on Accreditation (SCA) of the ICC. There are three possible types of accreditation: A: Compliance with Paris Principles B: Observer Status – Not fully in compliance with the Paris Principles or insufficient information provided to make a determination C: Non-compliant with the Paris Principles The Paris Principles require NHRIs to: a) Protect human rights, including by receiving, investigating and resolving complaints, mediating conflicts and monitoring activities; and b) Promote human rights, through education, outreach, the media, publications, training and capacity building, as well as advising and assisting the Government. The Paris Principles set out six main criteria that NHRIs require to meet: Mandate and competence: a broad mandate, based on universal human rights norms and standards; Autonomy from Government; Independence guaranteed by statute or Constitution; Pluralism; Adequate resources; and Adequate powers of investigation. The indicator is useful in measuring not only 16.a., but also 16.b., 1.4., Goal 5, 10.3., 16.6., 16.7., and 16.10., as well as all targets that address various forms of crime. Data is already available, gathered by the OHCHR. Meta data has been provided earlier in the process. We also support: “Percentage of requests for international cooperation (mutual legal assistance and extraditions) that were met during the reporting year.” 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. Meta –data has been provided earlier in the process. |
| UN-ESCAP |  |  |  | Should not be just accessed, but who have had a satisfactory outcome |  |  |  |  |  |
| UNESCO Institute for Statistics |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Comments from UNESCO-UIS UNESCO, in concert with OHCHR, ILO, the World Bank and over 200 international, regional and national media development actors represented by the Global Forum for Media Development (GFMD), maintains its support, both from a methodological standpoint and for its relevance to the measurement of the “fundamental freedoms” enshrined in Target 16.10, to the priority 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’, as per the input provided by statistical departments of UN organizations before the Bangkok meeting. While this indicator does not cover every aspect of this particular target, it does identify one of the most salient and measurable dimensions that impact on the whole. Further, it is an indicator that draws upon existing UN agreements and mechanisms for data collection. The components on journalists and media personnel are already monitored regularly by UNESCO. UNESCO, along with its partners above, also strongly supports the inclusion of a second or additional indicator, which addresses the equally key aspect of “public access to information,” which is clearly signposted by Target 16.10. The additional indicator is: Adoption and implementation of constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees for public access to information. This dual-indicator approach is, to varying degrees, supported by FAO, UNEP, seven African IAEG members, the USA, Canada, and others. Target 16.10 was deliberately drafted and approved by the Open Working Group with two mutually reinforcing but distinct components: one for ‘ensuring public access to information’ and the second for ‘protecting fundamental freedoms’. For this indicator, the operative words are ‘adoption’ and ‘implementation’. As such, it establishes: (a) whether a country (or at the global level, the number of countries) has constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees for public access to information; (b) the extent to which such national guarantees reflect ‘international agreements’ (e.g. the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, etc.); and (c) the implementation mechanisms in place for such guarantees, including the following aspects: (i) Government efforts to publicly promote the right to information; (ii) citizens’ awareness of their legal right to information and their ability to utilise it effectively; and (iii) the capacity of public bodies to provide information upon request by the public. This indicator will collate data from multiple sources, including National Human Rights Institutions, national and international non-governmental organisations, academic institutions and national media regulatory authorities, among others. Such information will be gathered, processed and checked by UNESCO and the World Bank. Some aspects of the indicator are already being collected. For example, data on the number of countries with freedom of information laws are currently available for at least 195 countries. As suggested by the Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN) and UNESCO in earlier presentations to the UN Technical Support Team (UN TST), this is a relevant and measurable indicator, which also responds to the growing number of UN Member States that have already adopted legal guarantees and many others that are currently considering relevant legislation or regulation in the field. UNESCO, within its mandate for the right to freedom of expression, which includes the corollary of the right to freedom of information, already monitors progress and issues in this area through its existing submissions to the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) and regularly issued research reports on World Trends on Freedom of Expression and Media Development, including its Media Development Indicators assessments. The inclusion of this additional indicator would impose no additional research or reporting responsibilities on national statistical offices. Besides UNESCO, the World Bank, the International Parliamentary Union and the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights are among the agencies within the intergovernmental system which currently monitor legal guarantees on access to information. Metadata for this additional indicator are available and have been submitted today to UNSD. Metadata for the first indicator have already been shared with the IAEG. If the IAEG Members have questions about this proposal, please contact UIS Director, Silvia Montoya (uis.director@unesco.org), Alison Kennedy (a.kennedy@unesco.org) and Martin Schaaper (m.schaaper@unesco.org). |  |
| UNESCO-IHE |  | UNESCO-IHE: The proposed indicator seems like a perfect example for a suitable bottom-up data collection effort. Via crowdsourcing initiatives, based on citizens' own perceptions, thus implementing the proposed data revolution in measuring progress towards the implementation of the SDGs (which seems to be missing from almost all other indicators thus far proposed). |  |  |  |  | UNESCO-IHE: The proposed indicator is biased towards the Youth and excludes many other relevant groups of society. Among the discussion prompts, no. 2) seems most appropriate although this should include a measure of their own desired vs. achieved level of participation. |  | UNESCO-IHE: The proposed indicator only reports on the capacity gap and not on the efforts towards closing this gap (which is what this target is about). A useful indicator would measure the extent to which relevant projects in this domain (law enforcement) have achieved their objectives/ their desired outcomes (i.e. no. of trained police and judicial staff, strengthened laws and improvements in their enforcement, etc.). |
| UNFPA |  |  | UNFPA supports the proposal by UNDP to disaggregate by type of violence at this point. | UNFPA supports the proposed alternate indicator including the added final clause suggested by the US Government: Proportion of those who have experienced a dispute in the past twelve months and who have accessed a fair formal, informal, alternative or traditional dispute mechanism who feel the process was just. |  |  | UNFPA supports the alternative proposal by the African Group (ShaSA proposal): Percentage of population who believe decision-making at all levels is inclusive and responsive, disaggregated by age, sex and other characteristics. |  |  |
| UNICEF | UNICEF supports the proposed indicator |  | UNICEF strongly supports the inclusion of an indicator on ‘Percentage of young women and men aged 18-24 who experienced sexual violence by age 18’ under target 16.2. The indicator is in line with the target and covers a critical form of violence against children that has been high on political agendas. The inclusion of such indicator is essential to provide a comprehensive picture of violence against children. There are existing tools and mechanisms for data collection. Household surveys such as DHS have been collecting data on this indicator since the late 1990s. Fully comparable data are already available for some 50 low- and middle-income countries. Statistics on sexual violence are also collected regularly in a number of high-income countries. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UNICEF |  |  | UNICEF: In order to promote a coherent approach to data collection for 16.2 that reflects the scope of the target, it is strongly requested that this indicator is included as the second indicator for 16.2. It reflects a key aspect of the change in violence that boys and girls face, in its multiple forms we want to observe in order to achieve target 16.2. It is universally relevant and sexual violence has recently been high on political agendas. It addresses the critical need for systematic data collection on sexual violence against girls and boys – a widespread though often inconsistently measured and reported issue. There are existing tools and mechanisms for data collection that countries have implemented to monitor the situation with regards to this indicator. Household surveys such as DHS have been collecting data on this indicator in low- and middle-income countries since the late 1990s. Fully comparable data is available for some 50 low- and middle-income countries. The indicator on human trafficking (Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age and form of exploitation) currently proposed under 16.2 and coded green is not child specific; it would be better placed under SDG 10.7 where it is also listed and has a stronger and more appropriate match. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unicef UK |  |  | In order to promote a coherent approach to data collection for 16.2 that reflects the scope of the target, it is strongly requested that this indicator is included as the second indicator for 16.2. It reflects a key aspect of the change in violence that boys and girls face, in its multiple forms we want to observe in order to achieve target 16.2. It is universally relevant and sexual violence has recently been high on political agendas. It addresses the critical need for systematic data collection on sexual violence against girls and boys – a widespread though often inconsistently measured and reported issue. There are existing tools and mechanisms for data collection that countries have implemented to monitor the situation with regards to this indicator. Household surveys such as DHS have been collecting data on this indicator in low- and middle-income countries since the late 1990s. Fully comparable data is available for some 50 low- and middle-income countries. The indicator on human trafficking (Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age and form of exploitation) currently proposed under 16.2 and coded green is not child specific; it would be better placed under SDG 10.7 where it is also listed and has a stronger and more appropriate match. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| United Nations |  |  | The Office of the Secretary-General's Envoy on Youth reiterates its support for the inclusion of the proposed indicator 16.2.3. "Percentage of young women and men aged 18-24 who experience sexual violence by age 18", alongside the “green” indicator already foreseen under target 16.2 focussing on the percentage of children who experienced any "physical punishment and/or psychological aggression". Inclusion by the Members of the IAEG-SDGs of this additional indicator is critical for ensuring that all major forms of violence that affect children and young people are being measured. |  |  |  | The Office of the Secretary-General's Envoy on Youth believes out of the three indicators under consideration that the second one seems the most relevant. The first proposed indicator on "share of turnout as share of voting-age population in national elections" would prove problematic in measuring the target in countries that know compulsary voting. The third proposed indicator on "Proportion of public service positions held by women and members of target groups" seems to close to the already agreed indicator 16.7.1 "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." The second perception based indicator on "Percentage of population who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive, by age, sex, disability and population group" would instead respond to elements of the target that are not yet measured by 16.7.1 indicator. |  |  |
| United Nations Mine Action Service | The number of deaths due to landmines and other explosive remnants of war should be one of the ‘causes’ that are disaggregated under the 16.1 target. The United Nations Mine Action Monitoring and Evaluation Mechanism could provide a source for this data. NB. Even if this indicator is combined with the suggested indicator for 16.1 that covers all forms of violent deaths, victims of landmines and other explosive remnants of war could still be included in the disaggregation. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) | OHCHR supports this indicator, while recognising the data collection challenges. OHCHR also urges the inclusion of the indicator ‘Number of people displaced due to conflict, war, persecution or human rights violations.’ This indicator is already available and international legal and statistical standards exist to support its compilation. Global data on refugees are collected by UNHCR twice yearly for 190 countries. Data on internally displaced persons are available for about 60 countries. |  |  |  |  |  | OHCHR suggests the following alternative indicator: ‘Turnout as a share of voting-age population (disaggregated according to target 17.18) in and frequency of national elections or referenda’ | OHCHR fully supports the proposal of the IAEG-SDG to add this indicator and recommends the use of the term ‘human rights defenders’ (in line with UN Declaration on Human Rights Defenders A/RES/53/144) instead of ‘human rights advocates’. This indicator has also been widely supported by civil society organisations, the UN Task Team on SDG16 as well as by chief statisticians of UN organisations, as priority indicator to measure this target. It is an ‘outcome’ indicator fully relevant to measure the target that aims to “ensure protection of fundamental freedoms”, by counting specifically those who are most at risk of being victims of violence and prevented from fully exercising their fundamental freedoms, which in international human rights law includes freedoms of opinion, expression, association, and peaceful assembly. Beyond its conceptual and normative relevance to the target and full consistency with international human rights law, it is from a methodological point of view similar to crime statistics which records data on events, victims and perpetrators, and not overall perceptions of general population who may not be subjected to such violence. To ensure the reliability and trust in recorded data, OHCHR, UNESCO and ILO, in collaboration with the IAEG-SDGs, will review information coming from multiple sources at country level (e.g. statistical offices, administrative records, civil society organisations, human rights institutions). As most data are already compiled and made publically available by the three organisations, the main task will be to bring information together and strengthen collaborations among data collectors/providers. A second/additional indicator to measure ‘access to information’ from a more legal or procedural perspective would also be desirable to measure more comprehensively the target. | OHCHR suggests an alternative indicator, also suggested by the UN task team and chief statisticians of UN organisations, ‘Level of compliance of existing national human rights institutions with the Paris Principles adopted by the UN General Assembly.’ This indicator is indeed relevant for the measurement of target 16a. As reflected in the resolution adopted by the GA A/RES/48/134, national human rights institutions have been recognised as relevant in preventing violence in accordance with internationally agreed human rights standards, and their strengthening is effectuated through international cooperation. This indicator is already publically available and fully consistent with international human rights standards and mechanisms. It is not a yes/no indicator and can change over time according to a transparent, periodic and internationally agreed peer review procedure. |
| UNODC | The indicator is relevant to monitor the target but it lacks a standard methodology. UNODC advice is to retain the indicator and initiate a process within the IAEG to discuss definitions and agree on a standard methodology so that the indicator becomes operational in the near future. | The standard formulation of this indicator is: “Proportion of people who feel safe walking alone in their neighbourhood after dark”. While this is an established indicator in the field of victimization surveys, caution should be used in monitoring violence trends with this indicator. While the perception of safety can be a value by itself, is not the same as safety and can diverge significantly from actual rates/trends of violence experienced by individuals. Domestic violence is notoriously the most prevalent form of violence against women which the indicator for example can not properly measure. The indicator is relevant for monitoring target 11.7. | UNODC advice is to retain this indicator because it measures the most severe form of violence against children as covered by the target. It has an underlying tested methodology and it has been used in global reporting. | UNODC advice is to retain the current indicator because it is a direct indicator of accessibility to and trust into justice and law enforcement institutions and, as such, it contributes to measure the rule of law and access to justice. Its advantage is that it is widely understood, easily measurable, comparable across different contexts, based on an established survey methodology, feasible and has a relatively broad availability in national official statistics. The disadvantage is that it focuses only on one aspect of the justice system, which is the first contact with a criminal justice institution. The other suggested indicators is broader, vaguer and difficult to compare across countries as the concept of “dispute” and dispute resolution mechanism translates very differently in different social, economic and justice systems. By unconditionally putting together all forms of dispute resolution mechanisms the indicator legitimizes unfair and un-transparent resolution mechanisms which may go against the target’s intention to ensure equal access to justice for all. | The indicator is highly relevant in monitoring the target although it lacks a standard definition and an agreed methodology. UNODC advice is to retain it while an expert consultation is initiated for defining a statistical definition of illicit financial flows and a standard methodology so that the indicator can gradually be implemented at national and global level. | In order to include private sector corruption the indicator can be reformulated as following: “Percentage of persons who had at least one contact with a public official or person who directs or works [in any capacity] for a private sector entity, who paid a bribe or were asked for a bribe by such persons, during the last 12 months by type of officials (public/private)´”. To note that the terminology on a person who "directs or works, directly or indirectly, in any capacity, for a private sector entity" is explicitly mentioned in the UN Convention against Corruption when defining private sector corruption. If the IAEG intended to consider corruption paid by the private sector, the following indicator may be considered: Percentage of persons and private business which had at least one contact with a public official and paid a bribe or were asked for a bribe, during the last 12 months. |  |  | UNODC suggestion for an alternative indicator is “Number of outgoing requests for mutual legal assistance (MLA) that were granted, disaggregated by type of MLA” Another indicator which covers international cooperation is “Number of outgoing requests for extradition that were granted, disaggregated by type of crime”. These suggestions are based on a test implemented by UNODC in 2013 for a global data collection on international cooperation in criminal matters. Outgoing requests for legal assistance or for extraditions are normally made and transmitted by a central authority responsible for international cooperation in criminal matters. This central authority normally keeps detailed records on all incoming and outgoing requests and their follow up. "Mutual Legal Assistance” includes: assistance afforded by one state to another state in investigations, prosecutions and judicial proceedings in relation to criminal matters, including with respect to the freezing, seizing and confiscation of proceeds and instrumentalities of crime and terrorist property, irrespective of the legal basis for such assistance. “Extradition” means the decision to transfer, from one State to another, a person who is wanted in the requesting State for prosecution for an extraditable offence or for the imposition or enforcement of a sentence in respect of such an offence. |
| World Bank |  |  |  | From the World Bank - Respecting the Target: The green indicator for 16.3 on detention rates is about criminal justice. If the IAEG includes a second indicator on "crime reporting rate" it would not fulfill the 2030 outcome document requirement that the indicators “preserve the political balance, integration and ambition” of the 2030 agenda. 16.3 is about rule of law and access to justice which is more ambitious than just criminal justice. Justice systems and the rule of law contribute to sustainable development through resolving land and natural resource disputes, keeping governments accountable, and giving businesses the confidence to enter into and enforce contracts. All of these (amongst many others) lie outside of the criminal justice system. We therefore propose the following indicator (proposed and supported by some member states in Bangkok): “Proportion of those who have experienced a dispute in the past 12 months who have accessed a formal, informal, alternative or traditional dispute resolution mechanism and who feel it was just.” This indicator is a sound measure for trust and confidence in the rule of law and access to justice systems (making it also useful for 16.6. 16.7 and 16b). It captures experience in both civil and criminal law, and with state and non-state dispute resolution mechanisms. It focuses not only on institutions, but on individuals’ experience of the justice system and on just outcomes. Experience has shown respondents are able to separate outcome from the justness of the process itself. Measurable: National Statistics Offices (and others) – in all regions - have already been collecting data for such an indicator over many years. A selection of these “legal needs” surveys are contained here: http://map.gastonpierri.com/ This indicator has been backed by a wide group of experts, including the UN Virtual Network on Goal 16, the World Bank, and the Asian Development Bank. This indicator has been tested in several contexts and can be easily added to household surveys or national polling. Avoiding Duplication: We would recommend moving the “crime reporting rate” indicator to target 16a, where a very similar version already sits. Keeping the crime reporting rate indicator at 16.3 would result in duplicate indicators. |  | This indicator could encounter measurement issues since it has 3 elements of the issue mixed up. Suggest to rephrase and use the easiest to count or estimate measure which would be “Percentage of persons and businesses who were asked for a bribe by public officials, of those who have had at least one contact with a public official, during the last 12 months”. Asking people if they paid a bribe is not likely to yield candid responses. |  | The World Bank is supporting the idea of two indicators for measurement of this Goal. Indicator one would be the indicator suggested above. In the statement we put out in the summer, we had previously proposed wording as follows: "Level of implementation of legislative guarantees and mechanisms for public access to information, including but not limited to information pertinent to each and all of the Sustainable Development Goals and protection of fundamental freedoms." We also support wording proposed by the OHCHR as follows: "Monitoring the adoption and implementation of constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees and mechanisms for public access to information (for which the corresponding metadata is attached)." This measure recognizes that not only is it important for countries to establish legislative guarantees, for example by passing right to information laws, but that they need to take steps to effectively implement those laws in order to realize the full potential of the laws as pathways to sustainable development. This indicator will thus collate data from multiple sources, including National Human Rights Institutions, national and international non-governmental organisations, academic institutions, and national media regulatory authorities, among others. Such information will be gathered, processed and checked by international organisations - UNESCO and World Bank. UNESCO collects some aspects of this data using the Media Development Indicators, in addition to the biennial World Trends in Freedom of Expression and Media Development report. Data are available for at least 195 countries. |  |
| World Bank |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | The World Bank has taken the position that 16.10 requires an additional indicator on legislative guarantees of public access to information. We had previously released a statement that proposed wording as follows: "Level of implementation of legislative guarantees and mechanisms for public access to information, including but not limited to information pertinent to each and all of the Sustainable Development Goals and protection of fundamental freedoms." We would also support wording proposed by the OHCHR as follows: "Monitoring the adoption and implementation of constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees and mechanisms for public access to information (for which the corresponding metadata is attached)." |  |
| World Vision |  |  | World Vision supports this indicator. Reasons for supporting this indicator In order to promote a coherent approach to data collection for 16.2 that reflects the scope of the target, it is strongly requested that this indicator is included as the second indicator for 16.2. It reflects a key aspect of the change in violence that boys and girls face, in its multiple forms we want to observe in order to achieve target 16.2. It is universally relevant and sexual violence has recently been high on political agendas. It addresses the critical need for systematic data collection on sexual violence against girls and boys – a widespread though often inconsistently measured and reported issue. There are existing tools and mechanisms for data collection that countries have implemented to monitor the situation with regards to this indicator. Household surveys such as DHS have been collecting data on this indicator in low- and middle-income countries since the late 1990s. Fully comparable data is available for some 50 low- and middle-income countries. World Vision wishes to also register our views on a green indicator under this Target related to human trafficking (Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age and form of exploitation). It is not child specific; it is already placed under SDG 10.7 where it fits better and has a stronger and more appropriate match. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact |  |  |  | The proposed indicators under target 16.3 do not capture the outcome of the justice process, but only the mere reporting and processing. The following indicator, proposed by the UNDP and the World Bank, captures the equality aspect of justice for all, including the importance of customary and traditional dispute mechanisms: “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, in accordance with international human rights standards |  |  | The proposed indicator focuses on a narrow section of the population; it will only be relevant for countries with national poverty reduction strategies and; it is difficult to measure. As participation in public affairs is a fundamental human right and a key principle of governance, it should be measured by two complementary additional indicators, measuring perceptions and structural spaces for participation, respectively. The proposed indicators are: “Percentage of population who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive” and “Number of countries with institutionalised spaces for multi-stakeholder dialogues on national and local decision-making and existence of independent monitoring and feed-back mechanisms” (indicator proposed by the European Commission). |  |  |
| Asia Pacific Forum on Women, Law and Development (APWLD) | Asia Pacific Forum on Women, Law and Development (APWLD) comments: APWLD proposes the following indicators as an alternative to the grey indicator: Ø Proportion of military personnel relative to civilian population (geographically localised) Ø Availability of small arms and armaments in the community Ø Percentage of military budget as a percentage of national budgets Ø Proportion of budget spent on military purposes compared to social development sectors such as health and education. Ø Existence of a tax on the arms trade The reduction of all forms of violence should be measured by reference to the level of military expenditure by governments and the availability of arms within the community. Excessive militarisation not only affects women’s peace and security in militarised settings, it also diverts financial resources into military spending that could be used to promote social and economic development. This would be consistent with governments' obligations under Critical Area E of the Beijing Platform for Action. |  |  | APWLD comments: APWLD proposes the following indicators as an alternative to the grey indicator: ➢ Percentage of people who live within reasonable reach of affordable and effective basic legal service providers and of a justice institution whose resolutions are fair, timely and enforced ➢ Percentage of people who express confidence in justice systems and dispute resolution (formal and informal), disaggregated ➢ Existence of a right to information law that establishes 1) citizens’ access to information, including laws, budgets and expenditures; 2) defines a time limit for responding to RTI requests; and 3) establishes a mechanism for appeal in the event of denial ➢ Proportion of requests for information lodged and answered fully in a reasonable amount of time (X days) ➢ Existence of legal aid services that are affordable, fair and timely, including for family law and complaints of gender-based violence It is important that the indicators measure the perceived fairness of justice processes and legal service providers |  |  | APWLD comments: APWLD supports the second of the three alternative proposals considered by Member States. Alternatively, it proposes the following indicators as an alternative to the grey indicator: “Percentage of people who report effectively participating decision making at all levels.” |  |  |
| Council of Baltic Sea States Secretariat |  |  | Need to keep: “Percentage of young women and men aged 18-24 years who experienced sexual violence by age 18”. This indicator is universally relevant and sexual violence has recently been high on political agendas.It addresses the critical need for systematic data collection on sexual violence against girls and boys. The indicator on human trafficking (Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age and form of exploitation) currently proposed under 16.2 and coded green is not child specific; it would be better placed under SDG 10.7 where it is also listed and has a stronger and more appropriate match. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RIGHTS | Disaggregated Data of victims of violence and conflict including conflict related deaths, according to age sex, caste, location and other forms and cause. |  | Percentage and disaggregation of the women and men who experienced sexual exploitation and violence below age 18. | 1. CEDAW, CRC, CERD, ICCPR and ICESCR all countries sign and ratify these conventions along with the optional protocols. 2. UN convention on the elimination of discrimination based on work and descent based on the principles and guidance ensuring equal access to justice to communities which are affected by inter-generational discrimination based on work and descent, caste and analogous forms of hierarchy. Encompassing access to public and private recourses, institutions, and markets. 3. Presence of effective national campaign that visiblaises forms of violence based age, sex, disability, race, caste, ethnicity, social origin, religion and economic and other status. |  | Percentage 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. Disaggregate by age, sex, region, caste, race and other population groups |  |  |  |
| AbleChildAfrica | We recommend disaggregating by disability. It would read as: Conflict-related deaths per 100,000 people (disaggregated by age, sex, disability and cause) |  |  |  |  | We recommend disaggregating by disability It would read as: 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, disability, region and population group |  |  | We recommend disaggregating by disability. It would read as: Percentage of victims who report physical and/or sexual crime to law enforcement agencies during past 12 months (Disaggregated by age, sex, disability, region and population group) |
| ACLED (Armed Conflict Location and Event Dataset Project) | ACLED: Define "conflict-related" so that the indicator takes into account deaths from political violence and not just civil wars, which are on the decline. Also include indicator for actor names and types (government supported militia, rebel group, unidentified armed group etc.). |  |  | ACLED: Prefer alternative indicator with amendment: "Proportion of those who have experienced a dispute in the past 12 months who have attempted to access a formal, informal, alternative or traditional dispute resolution mechanism." |  |  | ACLED: Prefer altnernative proposal 2) Percentage of population who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive, by age, sex, disability and population group |  |  |
| ACLED: Armed Conflict Location and Event Data Project | ACLED: Any indicator must consider the variety of ways in which political and social violence manifests in countries- to have a one size fits all indicator such as conflict deaths is one of many ways to interpret the threat to life in countries. There is no clear indication from the existing materials what constitutes a conflict in this modern era- will violence by the state count (outside of a proclaimed war?) Will violence by un-named or politically affiliated gangs count? Will vigilante/community violence count when not within a broader political conflict? In many regions, this risks are the basis for high vulnerability and low resilience. This information is not caught in many of the global coverage on national level data noted in the review. There needs to be a broader interpretation of conflict, with a more realistic focus on what information can be expected (i.e. there is a lot of information on the 'who, what, where, when' of conflict events, but not reliable information on age, sex or cause (indeed, many 'causes' are externally assigned and present a biased interpretation) Further, fatality information is one of the most unreliable indictors from monitoring, and often exaggerates or under-counts victims. Countries and civil society should be able to ￼report on the types of threats that they experience them, have that information systematically calibrated and collected and usable to local, national and international organizations. To accomplish that, a greater emphasis on in-country capacity building and differential conflict risks is necessary. | ACLED: The main issue here is whether they believe that a security organization exists? Is present? and represents them? Across several key areas, the question would be whether that is a state institution or not. Given the other goals, that should be a main concern. | ACLED: Again, these and other goals are best collected in country, and by civil society/government partnerships. Once a systematic framework for data delivery is established, these information can be collected over time and territory with minimal bias. What is crucial here is whether services are available to those who have had such experiences? | ACLED: This is a problematic question which can be simplified by asking whether (like the \walking at night' one) the public believes their police and security services to be 1) present; 2) fair; 3) competent and 4) not politicized. This question would require knowing how many people have been victimized and then how many reported it. This is unlikely to be possible without a local reporting base that does not appear to be considered. |  | ACLED: Income surveys of urban, rural, gendered and different ages could assess the amount of money (per time period) that is spent on bribes or getting official work accomplished and private sector engagment |  | ACLED: In cases where the state regime or those affiliated are engaged in this activity, it will not be verified or reported. The SDG indicators are designed to provide a basis from which to grow social resilience and rule of law. Asking questions that deliberately do not include a large contender in the violence and security arena will not help in their achievement. Realistically, local sourcing can prompt this information when states are unwilling to furnish it. | ACLED: this can be a useful metric once there is some way that justice can be accessed for victims. Until such point as laws will cover what may be publically accepted rates of violence, it is not likely to be actively reported (hence under-counted) ￼ |
| ADD International | Conflict-related deaths per 100,000 people (disaggregated by age, sex,DISABILITY and cause) |  |  |  |  | Disaggregate by age, sex, DISABILITY, region and population group |  |  | Percentage of victims who report physical and/or sexual crime to law enforcement agencies during the past 12 months (Disaggregated by age, sex, DISABILITY, region and population group) |
| Adolescent Girl and SDG Indicators Working Group\*: signatories included the UN Foundation, Plan International, Advocates for Youth, Girl Effect, Girls Thinking Global, International Center for Research on Women | Adolescent Girl and SDG Indicators Working Group\*: 16.1.2 Conflict-related deaths, injuries, assaults, exploitation, forced inscription, trafficking, torture and degrading/inhumane treatment per 100,000 people by cause and type of perpetrator Disaggregations: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) -RATIONALE: Adolescent girls are at a comparative disadvantage before, during and after crises. The risks in these contexts, including rape, abuse, early marriage and abduction, are greater for adolescent girls compared to other population groups. 16.1.3 Violent crime rate (intentional homicide, assault and sexual violence, including attempts) per 100,000 population, as compared against reporting and conviction rates Disaggregations: relationship to perpetrator, sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) -DATA SOURCE: National crime statistics, including reporting and conviction rates -GLOBAL MONITORING ENTITY: Data currently collected by UNODC, but other agencies could participate. -RATIONALE: It is important to compare crime rates to reporting and conviction rates in order to measure ‘access to justice’ under Goal 16. Reporting rate can help reflect whether victims feel comfortable reporting crimes, and confident that they will actually receive help if they report crimes. Conviction rates show whether the justice system is actually working and whether reported cases get resolved. Many cases of gender-based violence may be dismissed, and victims are often pressured or threatened to drop cases. The type of conviction is also important to ensure crimes are charged appropriately (rather than being charged as lesser crimes carrying lesser penalties), to identify whether cases are resolved in favor of the victim, and to ensure that perpetrators are given appropriate sentences that reflect the gravity of the crime. |  | Adolescent Girl and SDG Indicators Working Group\*: 16.2.3 Percentage of young women and men aged 18-24 years who experienced sexual violence by age 18 Disaggregations: relationship to perpetrator, sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) -RATIONALE: Sexual violence against children is a global human rights violation with short-term and long-term health and social consequences. An estimated 150 million girls under age 18 have experienced rape or other forms of sexual violence. Up to 50 percent of sexual assaults worldwide are committed against girls under 16 and up to one in five girls under the age of 15 experience sexual abuse. , | Adolescent Girl and SDG Indicators Working Group\*: 16.3.1 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) against conviction rates Disaggregations: relationship to perpetrator, type of crime, sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) -RATIONALE: Adolescent girls are disproportionately vulnerable to human rights abuses and generally lack a support system through which they can protest abuses and access justice. 16.3.2 Proportion of those who have experienced a dispute in the past 12 months and who have accessed a fair, formal, or alternative dispute mechanism Disaggregations: relationship to perpetrator, type of mechanism, sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) -RATIONALE: Girls face common obstacles to seeking justice and navigating complex legal systems, including lack of knowledge of rights and how to access them; fear of stigma, of not being believed and being blamed; re-victimization through the justice system; and lack of girl-friendly services. |  |  | Adolescent Girl and SDG Indicators Working Group\*: 16.7.2 Proportion of countries that address young people’s multisectoral needs with their national development plans and poverty reduction strategies including mechanisms for young people to actively participate in the policy making process. -RATIONALE: Unequal power relations at the family, community, and institutional level mean that girls and women often lack voice and influence in decision-making. 16.7.3 Percentage of population who believe decision-making at all levels is inclusive and responsive Disaggregations: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) -DATA SOURCE: Surveys -GLOBAL MONITORING ENTITY: UN Women, OHCHR, UNFPA -RATIONALE: Inclusive and gender-responsive decision-making helps ensure that women and girls’ needs are prioritized, met, and defended. This can lead to improvements in their health, promote education and economic empowerment, and enable girls to hold governments accountable when their needs or interests are ignored. | Adolescent Girl and SDG Indicators Working Group\*: 16.10.1 Number of verified cases of killing, kidnapping, enforced disappearance, arbitrary detention and torture of journalists, associated media personnel, trade unionists, women’s rights defenders and human rights advocates in the previous 12 months Disaggregations: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) -RATIONALE: Access to information is vital to recognizing injustice or discrimination and accessing services to right those injustices and combat inequality. It is critical to include women’s rights defenders in this indicator, as they are not only subject to the same risks as any human rights defenders, but are also targeted for gender-specific threats and gender-based violence. 16.10.2 Number of initiatives on awareness-raising of rights, with specific focus on youth, girls, women, and other marginalized populations -DATA SOURCE: Country data -GLOBAL MONITORING ENTITY: UN WOMEN, OHCHR -RATIONALE: In order to claim their rights, girls need knowledge of their rights through rights education and support networks, including challenging gender stereotypes and attitudes through creative use of media, positive role models, voices of girl leaders, and awareness raising in communities. | Adolescent Girl and SDG Indicators Working Group\*: 16.a.1 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 Further disaggregations: civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) -RATIONALE: Ensuring that girls have the skills, knowledge, and support needed to recognize abuse or discrimination and access justice systems is critical to promoting their well-being and contribution to international and community development. 16.a.2 Number of public initiatives on trainings for inclusive reporting, including gender-based violence sensitivity-training for local and national law enforcement, judicial institutions, and other governments agencies -DATA SOURCE: Country data, United Nations Survey of Crime Trends and the Operations of Criminal Justice Systems mandated by the UN General Assembly (UN-CTS) -GLOBAL MONITORING ENTITY: UN Women, OHCHR, UNODC -RATIONALE: Gender-sensitivity training includes specialized training on women’s rights and trainings on the applicable laws in particular, relating to violence against women and girls, for all points of contact for girls in the legal system (police, prosecutors, medical examiners, judges). |
| Alliance for Peacebuilding | This indicator should also include conflict-related violence, including SGBV. | I think this indicator is difficult to connect to the target (16.1) - feeling safe doesn't necessarily reduce all forms of violence and death. I suggest the following - "Proportion of people who have gone to mediation centers and/or conflict resolution mechanisms (both formal and informal) when conflict has arisen (both individual and communal) and before it turns violent". |  | I think this indicator needs to go beyond just reporting and should include responding to the incident or crime. I suggest the following - "Percentage of incidents reported by victims of violence to competent authorities or other officially recognized conflict resolution mechanisms that have been properly addressed/followed-up accordingly". Data can come from the case documents in conflict resolution mechanisms, police stations, etc. |  |  | I think this indicator needs to include all marginalized groups that are typically not involved in decision-making processes, including women, people with disabilities, religious and ethnic minorities, etc. Furthermore, I suggest it includes something around how these groups were involved in the decision-making processes in relation to getting their needs in national development plans and poverty reduction strategies. My recommendation is - "Proportion of countries that have implemented inclusive processes to ensure that marginalized groups' multisectoral needs are included in their national development plans and poverty reduction strategies". |  | As stated previously, I strongly believe that this needs to go beyond reporting and includes that these reports are actually addressed/followed up. My recommendation is - "Percentage of incidents reported by victims of a physical and/or sexual crime to law enforcement agencies that have been properly addressed/followed-up accordingly". |
| Alliance for Peacebuilding | Goal 16 is the most important of all of the goals as violence not only causes the ultimate in human misery, but it also makes achievement of the other goals more difficult, if not impossible. This indicator (16.1.2) is, of course, is the primary indicator of violence an any reduction is a positive for humanity. The target should be elimination of all conflict related deaths by 2030, but a reduction to less than half the current level will be a remarkable achievement. I highly recommend consulting the Institute for Economics and Peace and the Global Peace Index as well as the Positive Peace Index for in-depth data and analysis of the entire concept of peace. |  |  |  |  | Corruption, while difficult to measure, is a primary factor driving violence, and reducing it must be a priority. Transparency International has paved the way in measuring corruption, but additional meassures should be developed and incorporated into the process. |  |  |  |
| American Society for Reproductive Medicine |  |  | American Society for Reproductive Medicine. For indicator 16.2.2, should include cross border reproductive care with consideration of the trafficking of reproductive health products or for reproduction , i.e, sperm, surrogacy, embryos. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ARTICLE 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ARTICLE 19 ARTICLE 19 was actively engaged in the negotiations of 16.10 and believes that as currently stands, the existing proposed indicator being considered by the IAEG is too narrow and does not accurately reflect the text or intent of the Open Working Group or the UNGA. To meet the requirements of the OWG, there needs to adopt two separate indicators: an indicator on access to information as well as one on protecting fundamental freedoms. Access to information was broadly discussed throughout the debates of the Open Working Group in all six public drafts over the five month period of negotiations. In each version of the draft document, while slightly changing, the text consistently referred to access to information as a key strand, as well as protecting human rights. Thus, it is clear from the negotiations on the SDGs and previous development resolutions, that there was a recognizable intent by member states to ensure that both access to information and the protection of human rights need to be monitored though an individual indicator. ARTICLE 19 recommends that the working group adopt two indicators on 16.10. For access to information, we recommend the inclusion of a standalone indicator which focuses on public access to information held by public bodies and which evaluates the substantive legal provisions in the counties, its implementation and ultimately actual public access, in a graduated manner. This is similar to ones proposed by UNESCO and the World Bank: 16.10.1 Adoption and level of implementation of legal guarantees and mechanisms for public access to information, including but not limited to information pertinent to each and all of the Sustainable Development Goals. We do not believe that in ensuring a right of access to information that the monitoring of constitutional rights is especially effective. From our work around the world, we have found that in only a few of the 100 + countries is a constitutional provisions used by the public to be able to demand information from public bodies. In comparison, over 100 countries have adopted laws on access to information which sets out detailed rights, procedures and obligations which are more effective. We also do not support limited to right to only certain sectorial or technical areas such as budgets or open data as these are only related but not directly relevant to access to information. We support the existing proposal for the proposed indicator on fundamental rights and note that there are already existing mechanisms from national bodies in most countries and international bodies to collect this information: 16.10.2 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. For 16.10.1 indicator, a simply binary measurement is not sufficient and recommend that instead a graduated method be used over the 15 year period of the goals. In the first stage, to be done in 2016, a simple process could be employed to assess the existence of a regime on access to information. As described below, much of this information is already collected and published yearly by UNESCO. The second stage would consider the substantive adequacy of the existing laws as based on international standards. The standards, set out below, are already available in international and regional laws which apply to nearly all countries. The OAS suggests evaluating the “Jurisdictional, territorial, and thematic scope and competence.” The third state would focus on the impact of the framework, identifying the level of implementation of the access to information legislation. We note that the World Bank and UNESCO, have both been piloting projects on measurement in this area. We suggest that these could focus on areas relating to the implementation of the other Sustainable Development Goals to promote compliance in those. We note that there are already several sources for the access to information indicator relating to adoption including UNESCO, UNODC as part of the upcoming review of implementation of the UNCAC and the Open Government Partnership. International standards for assessment of the quality of the laws is already set out by the UN Special Rapporteur for Freedom of Opinion and Expression and at the regional level by the OAS, AU and Council of Europe. On implementation, the World Bank and UNESCO have already been assessing possible means of measurement. |  |
| Articulacion Feminista Marcosur | Colombia. This shouldnt bevreduce to deaths. It should incorporate sexual violence against women in conflict settings. |  |  | Colombia. Gender perspective is particularly sensitive in the approach to access to justice. |  |  | Colombia. There wont be a real change in participation if it doesnt include wome. The indicator should mention: efforts towards parity. |  |  |
| Asia Dalit Rights Forum | Disaggregated Data of victims of violence and conflict including conflict related deaths, according to age sex, caste, location and other forms and cause. |  | Percentage and disaggregation of the women and men who experienced sexual exploitation and violence below age 18. | 1. CEDAW, CRC, CERD, ICCPR and ICESCR all countries sign and ratify these conventions along with the optional protocols. 2. UN convention on the elimination of discrimination based on work and descent based on the principles and guidance ensuring equal access to justice to communities which are affected by inter-generational discrimination based on work and descent, caste and analogous forms of hierarchy. Encompassing access to public and private recourses, institutions, and markets. 3. Presence of effective national campaign that visiblaises forms of violence based age, sex, disability, race, caste, ethnicity, social origin, religion and economic and other status. |  | Percentage 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. Disaggregate by age, sex, region, caste, race and other population groups |  |  |  |
| Austrian Leprosy Relief Association | Also, disaggregate by disability |  |  |  |  | Also, disaggregate by disability |  |  | Also, disaggregate by disability |
| Avocats Sans Frontières |  |  |  | Avocats Sans Frontières prefers the second option, with the following changes (as noted in CAPS): "Proportion of those who have experienced a dispute in the past 12 months who have accessed a FAIR formal, informal, alternative or traditional dispute resolution mechanism, IN COMPLIANCE WITH INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS." We have included "fair" to ensure that this indicator captures the perception of people who seek justice. Mentioning international standards ensures coherence with other duty-bearer obligations, and is a useful means of verification. Also important for means of verification, ASF thinks it is important to include something on formal mechanisms for civil society participation in data collection, monitoring and reporting. Of course, this indicator should be disaggregated by sex, age, population group, region, and other characteristics relevant in national contexts. |  |  |  |  |  |
| BØRNEfonden |  |  | In order to promote a coherent approach to data collection for 16.2 that reflects the scope of the target, it is strongly requested that this indicator is included as the second indicator for 16.2. It reflects a key aspect of the change we want to observe in violence that boys and girls face, in its multiple forms, in order to achieve target 16.2. It is universally relevant and sexual violence has recently been high on political agendas. It addresses the critical need for systematic data collection on sexual violence against girls and boys – a widespread though often inconsistently measured and reported issue. There are existing tools and mechanisms for data collection that countries have implemented to monitor the situation with regards to this indicator. Household surveys such as DHS have been collecting data on this indicator in low- and middle-income countries since the late 1990s. Fully comparable data is available for some 50 low- and middle-income countries. The indicator on human trafficking (Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age and form of exploitation) currently proposed under 16.2 and coded green is not child specific; it would be better placed under SDG 10.7 where it is also listed and has a stronger and more appropriate match. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CBM UK |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | People with disabilities are disproportionately victims of violence, therefore this indicator should also be disaggregated by disability. |
| Center for Economic and Social Rights |  |  |  | This indicator 16.3.1 measures public confidence in authorities more than access to justice (although the two are linked). This is therefore an indirect measure of access to justice, but not a very satisfactory one. Therefore, CESR favours the alternative proposal, which more directly captures the targets outcome (it has been tested in several contexts and can easily be added to household surveys or national polling). Alternative 1 (as proposed by Saferworld): Proportion of those who have experienced a dispute in the past 12 months who have accessed a formal, informal, alternative or traditional dispute resolution mechanism and who feel it was just. (This must be disaggregated by income as well as the other specified grounds.) Alternative 2: Compliance with recommendations from the Universal Periodic Review and UN human rights Treaty Bodies An indicator on compliance with recommendations from the international human rights monitoring mechanisms is key for illustrating the absorption of rule of law from international to national levels, and policy coherence between sustainable development and human rights. This indicator is relevant for targets across the SDG framework, and could be measured using information collected by the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), as well as civil society organizations that collect relevant data, such as UPR-Info. | We strongly welcome the measurement of tax-related illicit financial flows which severely undermine the capacity of governments to mobilize sufficient domestic revenues for sustainable development. Global Financial Integrity provides compelling estimates, but eventually comprehensive consensus methodologies tracking IFFs (and other significant tax abuses such as abusive transfer pricing practices) in and out of all countries will need to be developed, administered by the appropriate international institution. We urge the IAEG to set up a working group to agree on metadata and methodologies for this indicator, involving civil society organizations with expertise on this topic. At least two complementary indicators—one outcome-oriented and one performance-oriented-- will be necessary to properly measure this corrosive phenomenon. Tracking the volume of tax-related flows in and of themselves is crucial, but addressing this problem will require specific policy efforts by specific governments to reduce them, which is what Agenda 2030 and the Addis Ababa Agenda is set up to promote. Proposal 1 (slight modification of existing grey indicator): Total value of inward and outward tax-related illicit financial flows – including trade misinvoicing and abusive transfer pricing (Data source: GFI and IMF, respectively) The largest portion of illicit financial flows stems from trade mis-invoicing, a form of corporate tax evasion based on fraud. This should therefore be a central focus of the monitoring efforts. In addition, developing countries are estimated to lose between $212 and 500 billion per year in direct revenue from various cross-border tax avoidance techniques, in particular abusive transfer pricing which are not currently included under the Global Financial Integrity measures. Thus, measuring these two problems would be the most efficient way to improve domestic resource mobilization and poor governance related to illicit financial flows. Proposal 2 (additional): Level of financial secrecy (Data source: Financial Secrecy Index) In parallel to this outcome indicator, it is absolutely critical to track the actual conduct and performance of countries in either enabling or tacking illicit financial flows. A country’s level of financial secrecy is a very strong determinant of whether it is enabling large-scale corruption, tax abuses, stealing of public assets and money laundering. Illicit financial flows exist largely because of lack of proper financial transparency, thus Agenda 2030 should be measuring and tracking the financial secrecy of governments as the most appropriate proxy to assess compliance with their SDG commitments on target 16.4. The Financial Secrecy Index combines measures of financial scale with 15 key indicators of secrecy, in a range of areas relevant across the horizon of IFFs. Given its independence and robustness in tracking individual country performance, it is already being utilized by several leading international organizations, including UNCTAD, the Basel Institute of Governance (re: money laundering), the OECD, Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE) and the African Union/Economic Commission for Africa High Level Panel on Illicit Flows out of Africa, chaired by H.E. Thabo Mbeki. | We welcome the inclusion of an indicator on bribe-paying (which should be disaggregated along lines of sex, age, region and income, at least ). We would urge that special attention is paid to ensure that the whole community (especially those most marginalized) are counted in these surveys, rather than just a select group of business people or academic experts. We also advocate for additional, more comprehensive indicator(s) to track the permissive environment which facilitates corruption (including that of the private sector). A country’s level of financial secrecy is a very useful way to do so, and therefore we would suggest that this indicator be used here as well as under target 16.4 (see above). Additional indicator: Level of financial secrecy (Data source: Financial Secrecy Index) | The indicators suggested will only provide a very partial picture of how far countries are meeting this target. Public participation in budgeting and other aspects of fiscal policy is an essential component of any public finance management system and decision-making process. Given the different levels of federalism and decentralization in different countries and mixed experiences of fiscal decentralization, for target 16.7 we suggest context-independent indicators measuring the quality and transparency of decision-making (including on fiscal matters) at the national and local levels. These key fiscal governance process indicators are essential to ensuring participatory, equitable and legitimate outcomes that serve the most marginalized. Alternative 1: Provision of sufficient political and financial support to ensure effective participation of women and other disadvantaged sectors of the population in decision-making at all phases of policy-making (including the fiscal policy cycle), at all levels from local to global Alternative 2: Share of tax and budget laws and policies subject to periodic, participatory gender equality and human rights analyses, and public expenditure tracking (Data source: Open Budget Survey and others) | We strongly support the inclusion of this indicator 16.10.1, but it only gets at the most egregious violations of the human rights in question (and not at other more common ways that some governments infringe on civil and political rights and constrain the space for civil society to shape, monitor and challenge sustainable development policies, for example by making it difficult for NGOs to register or by restricting freedom of assembly). As proposed by the Global Forum for Media Development, Article 19, and UNESCO, we strongly urge an additional indicator on the right to information, including legal guarantees. Additional 1 (priority): The adoption and implementation of legal guarantees and mechanisms ensuring public access to information As a matter of public record, the existence of passage of legislation would not be difficult to measure, and various bodies exist (including National Human Rights Institutions) which could monitor the implementation of such legislation. See also the Global Right to Information Rating, which also measures the overall strength of the legal framework on right to information in a given country. Given the prominence of public budgeting as an essential tool for sustainable development, we urge explicit inclusion of the right to budget, resource and other information critical for civil society to hold their governments to account to their SDG commitments. Additional 2: Share of government tax laws (including tax exemptions), budget policies, public procurement, social service delivery information and corporate lobbying activities made publicly available in a common, open, machine-readable, detailed, timely and accessible standard |  |
| Center for Reproductive Rights |  |  |  | The Center for Reproductive Rights comments that indicators for this target should include: • Percentage of individuals (disaggregated by sex, age, disability, migration status, race, etc) who have experienced a human rights violation who have accessed judicial or administrative remedies that ensure adequate and prompt reparation, which includes restitution, compensation, rehabilitation, satisfaction, and guarantees of non-repetition; • Percentage of individuals (disaggregated by sex, age, disability, migration status, race, etc) who are able to access to information concerning access to justice and reparation mechanisms; • Has the state ratified all international human rights treaties and participated regularly in the reporting and review process before human rights mechanisms. |  |  | The Center for Reproductive Rights comments that indicators for this target should include: Percentage of people, disaggregated by age, sex, disability and population group, who report effectively participating in decision making at the local, national, and international levels in the formulation, adoption, implementation, and monitoring of standards and policies affecting them. |  |  |
| ChildFund Alliance |  |  | ChildFund Alliance comments: In order to promote a coherent approach to data collection for 16.2 that reflects the scope of the target, it is strongly requested that this indicator is included as the second indicator for 16.2. - It reflects a key aspect of the change we want to observe in violence that boys and girls face, in its multiple forms, in order to achieve target 16.2. - It is universally relevant and sexual violence has recently been high on political agendas. - It addresses the critical need for systematic data collection on sexual violence against girls and boys – a widespread though often inconsistently measured and reported issue. - There are existing tools and mechanisms for data collection that countries have implemented to monitor the situation with regards to this indicator. - Household surveys such as DHS have been collecting data on this indicator in low- and middle-income countries since the late 1990s. Fully comparable data is available for some 50 low- and middle-income countries. The indicator on human trafficking (Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age and form of exploitation) currently proposed under 16.2 and coded green is not child specific; it would be better placed under SDG 10.7 where it is also listed and has a stronger and more appropriate match. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ChildFund Japan |  |  | ChildFund Japan comments: In order to promote a coherent approach to data collection for 16.2 that reflects the scope of the target, it is strongly requested that this indicator is included as the second indicator for 16.2. It reflects a key aspect of the change we want to observe in violence that boys and girls face, in its multiple forms, in order to achieve target 16.2. It is universally relevant and sexual violence has recently been high on political agendas. It addresses the critical need for systematic data collection on sexual violence against girls and boys – a widespread though often inconsistently measured and reported issue. There are existing tools and mechanisms for data collection that countries have implemented to monitor the situation with regards to this indicator. Household surveys such as DHS have been collecting data on this indicator in low- and middle-income countries since the late 1990s. Fully comparable data is available for some 50 low- and middle-income countries. The indicator on human trafficking (Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age and form of exploitation) currently proposed under 16.2 and coded green is not child specific; it would be better placed under SDG 10.7 where it is also listed and has a stronger and more appropriate match. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ChildFund Korea |  |  | ChildFund Korea comments: In order to promote a coherent approach to data collection for 16.2 that reflects the scope of the target, it is strongly requested that this indicator is included as the second indicator for 16.2. It reflects a key aspect of the change we want to observe in violence that boys and girls face, in its multiple forms, in order to achieve target 16.2. It is universally relevant and sexual violence has recently been high on political agendas. It addresses the critical need for systematic data collection on sexual violence against girls and boys – a widespread though often inconsistently measured and reported issue. There are existing tools and mechanisms for data collection that countries have implemented to monitor the situation with regards to this indicator. Household surveys such as DHS have been collecting data on this indicator in low- and middle-income countries since the late 1990s. Fully comparable data is available for some 50 low- and middle-income countries. The indicator on human trafficking (Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age and form of exploitation) currently proposed under 16.2 and coded green is not child specific; it would be better placed under SDG 10.7 where it is also listed and has a stronger and more appropriate match. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ChildFund New Zealand |  |  | ChildFund New Zealand comments: In order to promote a coherent approach to data collection for 16.2 that reflects the scope of the target, it is strongly requested that this indicator is included as the second indicator for 16.2. It reflects a key aspect of the change we want to observe in violence that boys and girls face, in its multiple forms, in order to achieve target 16.2. It is universally relevant and sexual violence has recently been high on political agendas. It addresses the critical need for systematic data collection on sexual violence against girls and boys – a widespread though often inconsistently measured and reported issue. There are existing tools and mechanisms for data collection that countries have implemented to monitor the situation with regards to this indicator. Household surveys such as DHS have been collecting data on this indicator in low- and middle-income countries since the late 1990s. Fully comparable data is available for some 50 low- and middle-income countries. The indicator on human trafficking (Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age and form of exploitation) currently proposed under 16.2 and coded green is not child specific; it would be better placed under SDG 10.7 where it is also listed and has a stronger and more appropriate match. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CHOICE for Youth and Sexuality |  |  | CHOICE for Youth and Sexuality: We support Indicator 16.2.3but would like to see additions to the indicator: Percentage of young women and men aged 18-24 years who experienced sexual violence by age 15 and by age 18, and by perpetrator • This indicator should be supported as the only one in the current SDGs framework addressing sexual violence against children and adolescents under 15, given its widespread occurrence worldwide with devastating and long-term consequences—with girls being the majority of victims/survivors. It is recommended by the UN Chief Statisticians and available in the UNICEF database, with metadata submission available on the IAEG website. • Note that indicator 5.5.2 will only measure sexual violence against girls since age 15, excluding those under 15 – even though girls under 16 are estimated to be roughly half of all sexual assaults globally. • Disaggregation by age sub-groups, or at a minimum, ‘by age 15’, is therefore strongly recommended – including since effective policies and interventions require tailored approaches to particular age groups and other characteristics: Data is available by age, as well as marital status, place of residence and income quintiles. |  |  |  | CHOICE for Youth and Sexuality: SUBSTITUTE current Indicator 16.7.2. with: Percentage of population who believe decision-making at all levels is inclusive and responsive, by age, sex and other characteristics, a survey-based indicator proposed by various stakeholders. • Disaggregation by the maximum factors allowable will be especially relevant – including to capture young people’s responses and sense of adequate representation and inclusiveness. • Consider an additional indicator to capture meaningful participation in decision-making, such as those proposed on “enabling environment for civil society” or on “institutionalized spaces for multi-stakeholder dialogues for decision-making”. |  |  |
| Christian Aid |  |  |  |  | Christian Aid would urge the establishment of a working group, with civil society participation, to identify suitable measures. We would strongly recommend two indicators - one measuring flows and the other measuring risk. | Christian Aid would urge retention of this indicator but would like to see it supplemented with an indicator which takes account of global systemic issues, including the facilitation of corruption, in line with the principle of universality. This could include use of the Financial Secrecy Index or an indicator linked to UNCAC, as previously considered by the IAEG. For example: Percentage of recommendations to strengthen national anti-corruption frameworks (institutional and legislative) implemented, as identified through the UNCAC Implementation Review Mechanism. | Christian Aid would like to see the principle of budget openness reflected in the indicator/s to measure 16.7. For example, alignment with the Open Budget Survey. |  |  |
| CIVICUS |  |  |  |  |  |  | CIVICUS comments that '2) Percentage of population who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive, by age, sex, disability and population group' is the best of the three alternatives proposed, however we also advocate for this indicator to track the actual existence of civil and political space to influence decision-making in the first place. A tangible way to do this could be to include something on participatory budgeting and/or public policy planning. This could instead be included in an amended green 16.7.1. but if not covered there then this must be addressed here. | CIVICUS comments that this indicator is acceptable only with the other indicators proposed in tandem by UNESCO/OHCHR/ILO. But if we are able to choose only of of these, then the one on access to information would be a superior choice to the current grey one: “Number of countries that have adopted and implemented constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees for public access to information.” To simplify, you could take out constitutional as they generally do not provide actual mechanisms for RTI except in handful of countries. There are also other assessments that cover the extent of protection of the fundamental freedoms of expression, association and peaceful assembly at the country level which should be taken into account to measure country level performance on this target. This includes the Freedom in the World survey which rates countries on civil liberties and political freedoms and the Reporters Without Borders Press Freedom Index. CIVICUS is currently in the process of developing a Civic Space Monitor which will provide a global rating of countries along five parameters (from open to closed) on the extent of protection of fundamental freedoms of expression, association and peaceful assembly. |  |
| Civilian Peace Service Canada |  |  | Canada; Civilian Peace Service Canada. Suggested rewording: "Percentage of young women and men aged 18 to 24, disaggregated by age groups, experiencing physical violence by age 18". Note: addressing sexual violence alone will not address "all forms of violence" referred to in the target. |  |  | Canada; Civilian Peace Service Canada: Suggested alternative: "Percentage of persons who had at least one request in the last 12 months for a bribe (an unofficial, unwarranted sum of money, goods or services) from a public official or private sector representative. Disaggregate by age, sex, region and population group." |  |  | Canada; Civilian Peace Service Canada: Proposed alternative: "Percentage of individuals in a select community who express respect for and confidence in local and national institutions in relation to their capacity to prevent violence and combat terrorism and crime." |
| Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Comments from Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International, Netherlands  Another indicator is implementation of public access to information in accordance with national legislation and international agreements, with public access to environmental information under the Aarhus Convention serving as a model. |  |
| CONCORD Sweden |  | CONCORD Sweden supportst the proposal to add this indicator to measure people’s experiences/perceptions of violence and insecurity. This indicator could be measured by gathering data via surveys. It is important that the information gathered is disaggregated based on the groups identified in Agenda 2030, para. 74. | CONCORD Sweden support the proposed indicator 16.2.3 since it is the only one in the current SDGs framework addressing sexual violence against children and adolescents under 18, given its widespread occurrence worldwide with devastating and long-term consequences—with girls being the majority of victims/survivors It is recommended by the UN Chief Statisticians and available in the UNICEF database, with metadata submission available on the IAEG website. However, we note that the proposed indicator 16.2.3 will only measure sexual violence against girls since age 15, excluding those under 15 – even though girls under 16 are estimated to be roughly half of all sexual assaults globally. Therefore, we strongly recommend to include: disaggregation by age sub-groups, or at a minimum, ‘by age 15’, - including since effective policies and interventions require tailored approaches to particular age groups and other characteristics: Data is available by age, as well as marital status, place of residence and income quintiles. CONCORD Sweden suggestst the following modified indicator: “Percentage of young women and men aged 18-24 years who experienced sexual violence by age 15 and by age 18, and by perpetrator.” | CONCORD Sweden supports both these indicators and believe that the indicator "Proportion of those who have experienced a dispute in the past 12 months who have accessed a formal, informal, alternative or traditional dispute resolution mechanisms” is important to measure the equality aspects of access to fair legal processes. Disaggregated data will be particularly important here. |  |  |  | CONCORD Sweden supports this indicator. However, target 10 is very broad, addressing both public access to information as well as the protection of fundamental freedoms. The proposed indicator rightly measures gross violations, but do not cover multiple aspects of the target, including the access to information. Therefore, we suggest that an additional indicator on measuring public access to information is added. Additionally, there are many existing assessments which measure political rights, including freedom of speech the right to organize and freedom of assembly at the country level. These should be include when data is collected. Examples of existing assessments are: Reporters Without Borders Press Freedom Index, measuring freedom of the press, The Freedom in the World Survey, which ranks countries based on civil and political freedoms. |  |
| Culture Committee, United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | The Committee on Culture of United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG) wishes to recall that target 16.10 refers both to public access to information and to the protection of fundamental freedoms, but observes that the draft indicator fails to acknowledge these two components and focuses on the latter only. As proposed by IFLA and other organisations, and in line with suggestions made by UNESCO and other UN agencies, we propose replacing the draft indicator or using a second indicator as follows: “Existence and implementation of constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees for public access to information”. |  |
| Culture et Développement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | France, Culture et Développement Index of print, broadcast, and internet-based media freedom\* (or Percentage of individuals using internet)\* and 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 \*source : Unesco, http://en.unesco.org/creativity/sites/creativity/files/digital-library/CDIS%20Methodology%20Manual\_0.pdf See also : http://www.agenda21culture.net/images/a21c/culturegoal/Indicators\_ENG.pdf (page 6) |  |
| Danish Institute for Human Rights | DIHR supports the alternative indicator proposed by OHCHR: “Number of people displaced due to conflict, war, persecution or human rights violations.” |  |  | The proposed indicators under target 16.3 do not capture the outcome of the justice process, but only the mere reporting and processing. The following indicator, proposed by the UNDP and the World Bank, captures the equality aspect of justice for all, including the importance of customary and traditional dispute mechanisms: “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, in accordance with international human rights standards”. |  |  | The proposed indicator focuses on a narrow section of the population; it will only be relevant for countries with national poverty reduction strategies and; it is difficult to measure. As participation in public affairs is a fundamental human right and a key principle of governance, it should be measured by an indicator that measures institutionalised structures for broad and inclusive participation. A feasible indicator is: “Number of countries with institutionalised spaces for multi-stakeholder dialogues on national and local decision-making and existence of independent monitoring and feed-back mechanisms” (indicator proposed by the European Commission). | The target is very broad as it addresses the range of fundamental freedoms enshrined in international human rights law, as well as the right to access to information. The proposed indicator measures the most extreme violations of fundamental freedoms and should be maintained with a slightly revised formulation: “Number of verified cases of killing, enforced disappearance, arbitrary detention, assault and torture of journalists, trade unionists or human rights defenders.” However, the indicator does not capture the broader aspects of the protection of fundamental freedoms or public access to information. As these are fundamental rights and freedoms with a bearing on the adequate implementation of the entire Agenda, two additional indicators should be considered: “Number of countries that have adopted and implemented constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees for public access to information” (proposed by UNESCO and UNSSO). “Number of countries that have received and implemented recommendations regarding fundamental freedoms of treaty monitoring bodies, ILO supervisory bodies, the Universal Periodic Review and UN Special Rapporteurs”. This indicator proposes a direct link to existing monitoring mechanisms regarding fundamental freedoms, and is thus highly feasible as data is already available and constantly updated. The meta-data should specify the timeframe for the review of the recommendations as well as the parameters for assessing status of implementation. | The suggested indictor is not directly linked to the target and it has a too narrow scope. National Human Rights Institutions (NHRIs) promote accountability, prevent violence and promote and enforce non-discriminatory laws. NHRIs also have a unique bridging role between the state, rights-holders, civil society and business. Thereby, they promote transparent, participatory and inclusive national processes for implementation and monitoring, in accordance with international human rights standards. Hence, NHRIs contribute directly to the realisation of target 16.a., but also to targets 5.c, 10.3, 16.10, 16.b and 17.18 and have a catalytic impact on the realisation of the entire Agenda. The following indicator is thus both feasible and highly relevant: “Level of compliance of existing National Human Rights Institutions with the Paris Principles adopted by the UN General Assembly” (indicator proposed by France, OHCHR, UNDP, UNSSO, UNPFA and others). Data for this indicator is publicly available and is subject to change over time according to a periodic, transparent and internationally agreed peer review procedure. |
| Defence for Children International (DCI) |  |  | Defence for Children International supports this indicator as it is important to collect relevant disaggregated data on children victims of violence to prove the scale of this phenomenon. There are already countries where such statistics are in place and can be duplicated to have comparative data on a global level. | Defence for Children International thinks that it would be good to also make reference to access to justice in the informal, alternative or traditional dispute resolution mechanisms as in many countries formal justice systems are not effective or accessible. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diyalo Pariwar |  | Concept of Safe cities and sale areas can be replicate as per the best practices around the world. The focus need to be targeted in developing and less safety countries by different means of poor safe measurements. | Children should be given special consideration as they are current users and future producers. Street children and domestic children as well as the children involved in worst forms of child labours need to be rehabilitated and equipped with life-skills and vocational opportunity to develop them as dignified and self-sustained citizen of future. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dutch Coalition on Disability and Development (DCDD) | DCDD recommends disaggregating by disability |  |  |  |  | DCDD recommends disaggregating by disability |  |  | DCDD recommends disaggregating by disability |
| Education International |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Education International would like to see an indicator on fundamental freedoms, and would support the indicator proposed by the US: (a) Number of times in which UN Special Rapporteurs report violations of fundamental freedoms, including freedoms of association, expression, and assembly; (b) Percentage of recommendations to strengthen fundamental freedoms—including freedoms of association, assembly, and expression—that were implemented, as identified through the UN Human Rights Council Universal Periodic Review; (c) Perception of the public and of civil society organizations on whether they can pursue issues of interest, including human rights and governance, in the public arena without fear of government retribution (Surveys/polls; Disaggregated by age, sex, gender); (d) Adoption and implementation of access to information laws and regulations and the number and percentage of requests for information fulfilled in the past 12 months; (e) Existence of enabling laws, policies, and practices with regard to the freedoms of expression, association, and assembly Another possibility would be the Canadian proposal: (a) Presence of legislative framework that protects fundamental freedoms and recourse mechanism when they are violated; (b) length of time to participate in recourse mechanism, (c) percentage of public access to government information request that are accepted or denied. |  |
| EDUCO / Development and Education for Children |  |  | EDUCO comments: In order to promote a coherent approach to data collection for 16.2 that reflects the scope of the target, it is strongly requested that this indicator is included as the second indicator for 16.2. It reflects a key aspect of the change we want to observe in violence that boys and girls face, in its multiple forms, in order to achieve target 16.2. It is universally relevant and sexual violence has recently been high on political agendas. It addresses the critical need for systematic data collection on sexual violence against girls and boys – a widespread though often inconsistently measured and reported issue. There are existing tools and mechanisms for data collection that countries have implemented to monitor the situation with regards to this indicator. Household surveys such as DHS have been collecting data on this indicator in low- and middle-income countries since the late 1990s. Fully comparable data is available for some 50 low- and middle-income countries. The indicator on human trafficking (Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age and form of exploitation) currently proposed under 16.2 and coded green is not child specific; it would be better placed under SDG 10.7 where it is also listed and has a stronger and more appropriate match. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Family Care International |  |  | SUPPORT Indicator 16.2.2/’Additional’: Percentage of young women and men aged 18-24 years who experienced sexual violence by age 15 and by age 18, and by perpetrator • This indicator should be supported as the only one in the current SDGs framework addressing sexual violence against children and adolescents under 15, given its widespread occurrence worldwide with devastating and long-term consequences—with girls being the majority of victims/survivors. It is recommended by the UN Chief Statisticians and available in the UNICEF database, with metadata submission available on the IAEG website. • Note that indicator 5.5.2 will only measure sexual violence against girls since age 15, excluding those under 15 – even though girls under 16 are estimated to be roughly half of all sexual assaults globally. • Disaggregation by age sub-groups, or at a minimum, ‘by age 15’, is therefore strongly recommended – including since effective policies and interventions require tailored approaches to particular age groups and other characteristics: Data is available by age, as well as marital status, place of residence and income quintiles. SUPPORT Indicator 16.a.1: Percentage of victims who report physical and/or sexual crime to law enforcement agencies during the past 12 months, by age, sex, location, population group and type of crime. • Note there is no indicator in all of Goal 16 reflective of people’s confidence in, or reliance and access to, national institutions charged with delivering protection and justice, best exemplified by the issue of violence. • Data analysis of specific groups of victims would be relevant to inform policy-making and to identify potential underreporting—for example, by type of violence and perpetrator such as in cases of gender-based and domestic violence, or hate crimes (e.g. based on race, ethnicity, migrant status, religion, sexual orientation and gender identity). The metadata submission is available on the IAEG website. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Finnish NGDO platform to the EU | a) A country reduces by X % the number of violent deaths and injuries caused by societal violence per 100,000 by year Y. b) A country reduces by X % the number of violent deaths and injuries caused by war or violent conflict per 100,000 by year Y. c) A country reduces by X % the number of cases of rape and other forms of sexual violence annually per 100,000 by year Y. d) A country increases the share of criminal charges in cases of rape and other forms of sexual violence, and child abuse by X % by year Y. e) A country has developed official reporting mechanisms / systems for reporting and processing cases of violence. f) Existence of national laws and policies to actively prevent violence against any person. g) Percentage of people who report feeling safe walking alone at night. | a) A country reduces by X % the number of violent deaths and injuries caused by societal violence per 100,000 by year Y. b) A country reduces by X % the number of violent deaths and injuries caused by war or violent conflict per 100,000 by year Y. c) A country reduces by X % the number of cases of rape and other forms of sexual violence annually per 100,000 by year Y. d) A country increases the share of criminal charges in cases of rape and other forms of sexual violence, and child abuse by X % by year Y. e) A country has developed official reporting mechanisms / systems for reporting and processing cases of violence. f) Existence of national laws and policies to actively prevent violence against any person. g) Percentage of people who report feeling safe walking alone at night. | a) A country reduces by X % the number of infant homicide per 100,000 by year Y. b) A country reduces by X % the number of cases of physical violence against children by 100,000 by year Y. c) A country reduces by X % the number of cases of sexual violence against children by 100,000 by year Y. d) A country has developed official reporting mechanisms / systems for reporting and processing cases of child abuse. e) A country reduces by X % the number of children out of school because of conflict, insecurity, or disaster. f) A country reduces by X % the number of children recruited and women and girls captured by armed forces per 100,000 by year Y. g) A country reduces by X % the number of women aged 20–24 who were married before 15 or 18 per 100,000 by year Y. h) A country reduces by X% the prevalence of FMG. i) A country has developed official reporting mechanisms / systems for reporting and processing cases of trafficking. |  | a) Assets and liabilities of Bank for International Settlements (BIS) reporting banks in international tax havens (as per OECD definition), by country. b) Publication of all payments made to governments under resource contracts. c) A country reduces by X % the number of illicit and legal small arms and light weapons by year Y. d) A country has and effectively uses national mechanisms to control illicit small arms and light weapons and to hinder illegal trade with weapons, humans and drugs. e) Number of countries that have ratified and implemented the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT). f) Level of perceived criminality in society. |  | a) National politics and governance take place in a pluralist multiparty setting. b) Voter turnout increased (with data disaggregated by gender, region, ethnicity, etc.). c) Percentage of people participating in political parties and civil society organizations increased (with data disaggregated by gender, region, ethnicity, etc.). d) Percentage of youth, women and marginalized groups in decision-making bodies at all levels. e) National and local governance structures enabling participation of all are in place and enforced. f) Existence of laws and strategies to actively ban and prevent discrimination against any person or group. g) Existence of national strategies for civil society participation. h) Public surveys show that people, especially the most marginalized ones, can engage effectively in civic activities, including policymaking, budgeting and other public processes. | a) Existence of Freedom of Information (FOI) Act and its efficient implementation. b) Proportion of people with a legal entitlement to information held by public bodies provided within 30 days without arbitrary barriers. c) Proportion of people who apply to access of information, and whose requests are accepted, disaggregated by gender and other most relevant grounds of discrimination, including ethnicity and disability. d) Increase in CIRI indicator of freedoms of speech and press. e) Increase in CIRI indicator of freedom of political choice. f) Increase in CIRI indicator of freedom of religion. g) Public surveys show that people believe that they can exercise their freedom of expression and are heard. |  |
| Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei |  |  |  |  |  | FEEM suggests: Corruption Perception Index by Transparency Internaitonal | FEEM: Share of people that does not feel involved in decision-making, number of non-voters because discouraged as they do not believe in positive actions from governments at different levels |  |  |
| France Volontaires |  |  |  |  |  |  | Volunteer groups consider that this target should include an indicator to measure the existence of supportive policies for civil society engagement. An enabling environment for civil society is measurable and has been monitored through several sources of data, including the Enabling Environment Index, Enabling Environment National Assessment, CSO Sustainability Index, Freedom in the World Survey and the NGO Law Monitor. |  |  |
| Gender and Mine Action Programme |  |  |  | GMAP think this indicator should be measured by sex and age groups |  |  | GMAP believes that the "Percentage of population who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive, by age, sex, disability and population group" is a good indicator to capture perception, but it should be integrated by a more objective indicator, such as "Proportion of representatives in decision-making public institutions (could be specified) reflects the demographics of the country's population (sex, age, ethnic group, etc.)" | GMAP thinks the indicator should specify "by gender" | GMAP thinks there should also be an indicator highlighting the active role of agents to prevent violence and combat terrorism and crime, this could be: Percentage of national budget and donor funding going to CSO and state agencies/programmes working to prevent violence and combat terrorism and crime |
| German Institute for Human Rights | We support this indicator but only complementary, not at the expense of indicator 16.1.1 which should be retained in its entirety, in particular including “and where possible type of perpetrator”. | We support this indicator but only complementary, not at the expense of indicator 16.1.1 which should be retained in its entirety, in particular including “and where possible type of perpetrator”. | We support the indicator but only complementary, not at the expense of indicator 16.2.2 (trafficking). | We support this indicator as it is a sound measure for trust and confidence in rule of law and access to justice systems. An alternative formulation could be “Proportion of crimes (assault and sexual violence, including attempts) reported to law enforcement agencies” (see OHCHR metadata sheet for 16.3). Data already partially available, e.g. International Crime Victimization Survey (ICVS) |  |  |  | We strongly support this indicator since data on human rights violations committed against journalist, trade unionists and human rights defenders is necessary in order to know if fundamental freedoms are protected. This indicator collates data from multiple sources, including administrative data (from the police, court, and health institutions), national and regional Human Rights Commissions, Courts and Special Procedures of the Human Rights Council as well as National Human Rights Institutions, national non-governmental organisations, associations of journalists, trades unions/ITUC, ILO, UNESCO, OHCHR and international non-governmental organisations including, for example Reporters without Borders, Article 19, and the Human Rights Observatory. | We support this indicator. In addition the following indicator could be used: “Existence of independent National Human Rights Institution in compliance with the Paris Principles” (see OHCHR metadata sheets). Data for this indicator is readily accessible from the Accreditation Committee of the International Coordinating Committee of National Human Rights Institutions (ICC). |
| Global Forum for Media Development (GFMD) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | IAEG UN Statistics Division submission – Dec 13 2015 The Global Forum for Media Development (GFMD) strongly urges adoption of an SDG16.10 indicator dedicated specifically to monitoring progress on its pledge to “ensure public access to information.” Such an indicator has been proposed by UNESCO and endorsed in submissions to the UN Inter-Agency and Experts Group on the SDGs (IAEG) by other UN agencies, the World Bank, and several IAEG member states, as well as by scores of civil society groups. SDG16.10 was deliberately drafted and approved by the Open Working Group with two mutually reinforcing but distinct components – one for “ensuring public access to information,” and the second for “protecting fundamental freedoms.” To be faithful to the target’s clear text and intent, indicators are required for both. The compilations of “suggested” indicators submitted previously to the IAEG included a joint proposal from three UN agencies (OHCHR, ILO, UNESCO) for monitoring the “protection of fundamental freedoms” as well as for four other targets in the SDGs. GFMD and other civil society organizations strongly back the inclusion of an indicator tracking progress in these human rights, as promised by SDG16.10. But this proposed indicator - now among those coded 'gray' - does not measure and was never intended to measure public access to information. Both the letter and spirit of SDG16.10 require inclusion of an indicator specifically monitoring public access to information. The indicator proposed by UNESCO, is directly relevant to the target; technically feasible, as it based on public records and already existing multilateral monitoring in this area; and poses no additional data-gathering or reporting burdens on national statistical offices: Existence and implementation of constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees for public access to information. This highly relevant and methodologically feasible SDG16.10 indicator has been • Submitted to the IAEG by UNESCO with comprehensive ‘metadata’ citations of UN sources and precedents • Endorsed either textually or conceptually by other UN System agencies, including UNEP, FAO, and the World Bank, as well as by the UN Chief Statisticians of the UNSSO and by the expert advisors on the SDGs in the UN Sustainable Development Solutions Network • Supported in submissions to the IAEG from many other leading international civil society organizations specialized in public access to information, including the International Federation of Library Associations; Article 19; GFMD; and other member groups of the TAP Network and the UN NGO Human Rights Caucus • Recommended further by at least four IAEG members in comments to IAEG, even though this indicator was not among those ‘suggested’ for evaluation The 180 national, regional, and international member groups of the Global Forum for Media Development respectfully ask the IAEG members to ensure the inclusion of this specific and necessary indicator, without which there will be no SDGs mechanism for monitoring progress toward better public access to information. At the Sustainable Development Summit in September 2015, all UN member states endorsed this principle, as an integral part of the 2030 Agenda. Every UN member state will have distinct national needs, priorities and systems for achieving this target over the next 15 years, yet all countries at all stages of development can do better at ensuring public access to information than they are doing now. A commitment to keeping the promise articulated in this target is essential to the achievement of all 17 SDGs, which cannot succeed without free and open public access to all information relevant to each and every one of these new global goals. |  |
| Global Forum for Media Development (GFMD) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | IAEG UN Statistics Division submission – Dec 13 2015 The Global Forum for Media Development (GFMD) strongly urges adoption of an SDG16.10 indicator dedicated specifically to monitoring progress on its pledge to “ensure public access to information.” Such an indicator has been proposed by UNESCO and endorsed in submissions to the UN Inter-Agency and Experts Group on the SDGs (IAEG) by other UN agencies, the World Bank, and several IAEG member states, as well as by scores of civil society groups. SDG16.10 was deliberately drafted and approved by the Open Working Group with two mutually reinforcing but distinct components – one for “ensuring public access to information,” and the second for “protecting fundamental freedoms.” To be faithful to the target’s clear text and intent, indicators are required for both. The compilations of “suggested” indicators submitted previously to the IAEG included a joint proposal from three UN agencies (OHCHR, ILO, UNESCO) for monitoring the “protection of fundamental freedoms” as well as for four other targets in the SDGs. GFMD and other civil society organizations strongly back the inclusion of an indicator tracking progress in these human rights, as promised by SDG16.10. But this proposed indicator - now among those coded 'gray' - does not measure and was never intended to measure public access to information. Both the letter and spirit of SDG16.10 require inclusion of an indicator specifically monitoring public access to information. The indicator proposed by UNESCO, is directly relevant to the target; technically feasible, as it based on public records and already existing multilateral monitoring in this area; and poses no additional data-gathering or reporting burdens on national statistical offices: Existence and implementation of constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees for public access to information. This highly relevant and methodologically feasible SDG16.10 indicator has been • Submitted to the IAEG by UNESCO with comprehensive ‘metadata’ citations of UN sources and precedents • Endorsed either textually or conceptually by other UN System agencies, including UNEP, FAO, and the World Bank, as well as by the UN Chief Statisticians of the UNSSO and by the expert advisors on the SDGs in the UN Sustainable Development Solutions Network • Supported in submissions to the IAEG from many other leading international civil society organizations specialized in public access to information, including the International Federation of Library Associations; Article 19; GFMD; and other member groups of the TAP Network and the UN NGO Human Rights Caucus • Recommended further by at least four IAEG members in comments to IAEG, even though this indicator was not among those ‘suggested’ for evaluation The 180 national, regional, and international member groups of the Global Forum for Media Development respectfully ask the IAEG members to ensure the inclusion of this specific and necessary indicator, without which there will be no SDGs mechanism for monitoring progress toward better public access to information. At the Sustainable Development Summit in September 2015, all UN member states endorsed this principle, as an integral part of the 2030 Agenda. Every UN member state will have distinct national needs, priorities and systems for achieving this target over the next 15 years, yet all countries at all stages of development can do better at ensuring public access to information than they are doing now. A commitment to keeping the promise articulated in this target is essential to the achievement of all 17 SDGs, which cannot succeed without free and open public access to all information relevant to each and every one of these new global goals. |  |
| Global Forum for Media Development (GFMD) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | The Global Forum for Media Development (GFMD) strongly urges adoption of an indicator dedicated specifically to monitoring progress on the SDG16.10 pledge to “ensure public access to information,” as proposed by UNESCO and endorsed in submissions to the UN Inter-Agency and Experts Group on the SDGs (IAEG) by other UN agencies, the World Bank, and several IAEG member states, as well as by scores of civil society groups. This proposed SDG16.10 indicator should be presented for comment from IAEG members and observers well in advance of the IAEG’s final meeting in March 2016. The omission of this widely supported and essential indicator from previous compilations of recommended or ‘suggested’ SDGs indicators was an unfortunate oversight. SDG16.10 was deliberately drafted and approved by the Open Working Group with two mutually reinforcing but distinct components – one for “ensuring public access to information,” and the second for “protecting fundamental freedoms.” To be faithful to the target’s clear text and intent, indicators are required for both. The compilations of “suggested” indicators submitted previously to the IAEG included a joint proposal from three UN agencies (OHCHR, ILO, UNESCO) for monitoring the “protection of fundamental freedoms” as well as for four other targets in the SDGs. GFMD and other civil society organizations strongly back the inclusion of an indicator tracking progress in these human rights, as promised by SDG16.10. But this proposed indicator - now among those coded 'gray' - does not measure and was never intended to measure public access to information. Both the letter and spirit of the text of SDG16.10 require inclusion of an indicator specifically monitoring public access to information. The following indicator, proposed by UNESCO, is directly relevant to the target; technically feasible, as it based on public records and already existing multilateral monitoring in this area; and poses no additional data-gathering or reporting burdens on national statistical offices: Existence and implementation of constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees for public access to information. This highly relevant and methodologically feasible SDG16.10 indicator has been: • Submitted to the IAEG by UNESCO with comprehensive ‘metadata’ citations of UN sources and precedents • Endorsed either textually or conceptually by other UN System agencies, including UNEP, FAO, and the World Bank, as well as by the UN Chief Statisticians of the UNSSO and by the expert advisors on the SDGs in the UN Sustainable Development Solutions Network • Supported in submissions to the IAEG from many other leading international civil society organizations specialized in public access to information, including the International Federation of Library Associations; Article 19; GFMD; and other member groups of the TAP Network and the UN NGO Human Rights Caucus • Recommended further by at least four IAEG members in comments to IAEG, even though this indicator was not among those ‘suggested’ for evaluation The 180 national, regional, and international member groups of the Global Forum for Media Development respectfully ask the IAEG members to ensure the inclusion of this specific and necessary indicator, without which there will be no accepted SDGs mechanism for monitoring progress toward better public access to information. At the Sustainable Development Summit in September 2015, all UN member states endorsed this principle, as an integral part of the 2030 Agenda. Every UN member state will have distinct national needs, priorities and systems for achieving this target over the next 15 years, yet all countries at all stages of development can do better at ensuring public access to information than they are doing now. A commitment to keeping the promise articulated in this target is essential to the achievement of all 17 SDGs, which cannot succeed without free and open public access to all information relevant to each and every one of these new global goals. |  |
| Health in Post-2015 NGO Coalition |  |  | The Health in Post-2015 NGO Coalition SUPPORTS Indicator 16.2.2, however suggests additional language to read: Percentage of young women and men aged 18-24 years who experienced sexual violence by age 15 and by age 18, and by perpetrator • This indicator should be supported as the only one in the current SDGs framework addressing sexual violence against children and adolescents under 15, given its widespread occurrence worldwide with devastating and long-term consequences—with girls being the majority of victims/survivors. It is recommended by the UN Chief Statisticians and available in the UNICEF database, with metadata submission available on the IAEG website. • Note that indicator 5.5.2 will only measure sexual violence against girls since age 15, excluding those under 15 – even though girls under 16 are estimated to be roughly half of all sexual assaults globally. • Disaggregation by age sub-groups, or at a minimum, ‘by age 15’, is therefore strongly recommended – including since effective policies and interventions require tailored approaches to particular age groups and other characteristics: Data is available by age, as well as marital status, place of residence and income quintiles. |  |  |  |  |  | The Health in Post-2015 NGO Coalition SUPPORTS Indicator 16.a.1 • Note there is no indicator in all of Goal 16 reflective of people’s confidence in, or reliance and access to, national institutions charged with delivering protection and justice, best exemplified by the issue of violence. • Data analysis of specific groups of victims would be relevant to inform policy-making and to identify potential underreporting—for example, by type of violence and perpetrator such as in cases of gender-based and domestic violence, or hate crimes (e.g. based on race, ethnicity, migrant status, religion, sexual orientation and gender identity). The metadata submission is available on the IAEG website. RECOMMEND an additional higher-level indicator for which data is available as follows: “Existence of an independent National Human Rights Institution in compliance with the Paris Principles”. • The proposal to include ‘and level of compliance of’ with the Paris Principles should also be taken note of. Adopted by the General Assembly in 1993, the Paris Principles set a group of standards to ensure that National Human Rights Institutions are truly independent and have the minimum level of capacity to undertake their mandate effectively. • Data is available from a certification process compiled by OHCHR, with status updated every six months. This indicator is especially meaningful as it provides an essential pillar and anchor for targets across this goal, among other goals. |
| HelpAge International on behalf of the Stakeholder Group on Ageing |  |  |  |  |  |  | We support comments made by Germany and Switzerland that the suggested indicator does not meet the target by focusing exclusively on the needs of young people, and recommends that all groups should be reflected when measuring the target. |  |  |
| High-Level Task Force for the ICPD |  |  | HLTF for ICPD on 16.2.3: SUPPORT Indicator 16.2.3: Percentage of young women and men aged 18-24 years who experienced sexual violence by age 15 and by age 18, and by perpetrator • This indicator should be supported as the only one in the current SDGs framework addressing sexual violence against children and adolescents under 15, given its widespread occurrence worldwide with devastating and long-term consequences—with girls being the majority of victims/survivors. It is recommended by the UN Chief Statisticians and available in the UNICEF database, with metadata submission available on the IAEG website. • Note that indicator 5.5.2 will only measure sexual violence against girls since age 15, excluding those under 15 – even though girls under 16 are estimated to be roughly half of all sexual assaults globally. • Disaggregation by age sub-groups, or at a minimum, ‘by age 15’, is therefore strongly recommended – including since effective policies and interventions require tailored approaches to particular age groups and other characteristics: Data is available by age, as well as marital status, place of residence and income quintiles. | HLTF for ICPD on 16.3.1: SUBSTITUTE current Indicator 16.3.1 (crime reporting rate/reporting of violence) with the proposal of various stakeholders: Proportion of those who have experienced a dispute in the past 12 months who have accessed a formal, informal, alternative or traditional dispute resolution mechanism and who feel it was just, by sex, age and other characteristics. • This proposal would ensure a broader measure more in line with the target’s scope. • The current grey indicator on ‘victims of violence who reported the crime’ is also welcome, while understanding stakeholder concerns on its limitations for the scope of the target; and noting it is similar to grey indicator 16.a.1 (‘victims who report physical/sexual crime’), where it could be considered alongside other options. • Regardless of the indicator decided upon, disaggregation by various factors (as applicable to the indicator to be selected) would be especially relevant in order to provide a meaningful measure of whether low-income, rural, women, young people, among other groups who face discrimination and exclusion, have equal access to justice. • The following high-level indicator for this goal should be considered, under this or another target: Existence of an independent National Human Rights Institution in compliance with the Paris Principles. The proposal to include ‘and level of compliance of’ should also be taken note of. Adopted by the General Assembly in 1993, the Paris Principles set standards to ensure that National Human Rights Institutions are independent and have the minimum level of capacity to undertake their mandate effectively (linked to Target 16.a). Data is available from a certification process compiled by OHCHR, with status updated every six months. This indicator is especially meaningful as it provides an essential pillar and anchor for targets across this goal, among other goals. |  |  | HLTF for ICPD on 16.7.2: SUBSTITUTE current Indicator 16.7.2. (young people's multi-sectoral needs addressed in national plans) with: Percentage of population who believe decision-making at all levels is inclusive and responsive, by age, sex and other characteristics, a survey-based indicator proposed by various stakeholders. • Disaggregation by the maximum factors allowable will be especially relevant – including to capture young people’s responses and sense of adequate representation and inclusiveness. • Consider an additional indicator to capture participation in decision-making, such as those proposed on “enabling environment for civil society” or on “institutionalized spaces for multi-stakeholder dialogues for decision-making”. |  | HLTF for ICPD on 16.a.1: SUPPORT Indicator 16.a.1: Percentage of victims who report physical and/or sexual crime to law enforcement agencies during the past 12 months, by age, sex, location, population group and type of crime. • Note there is no indicator in all of Goal 16 reflective of people’s confidence in, or reliance and access to, national institutions charged with delivering protection and justice, best exemplified by the issue of violence. • Data analysis of specific groups of victims would be relevant to inform policy-making and to identify potential underreporting—for example, by type of violence and perpetrator such as in cases of gender-based and domestic violence, or hate crimes (e.g. based on race, ethnicity, migrant status, religion, sexual orientation and gender identity). The metadata submission is available on the IAEG website. |
| Hivos |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Hivos suggests to include indicator on access to information as well: “Number of countries that have adopted and implemented constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees for public access to information.” |  |
| Human Dignity Foundation |  |  | In order to promote a coherent approach to data collection for 16.2 that reflects the scope of the target, it is strongly requested that this indicator is included as the second indicator for 16.2. It reflects a key aspect of the change in violence that boys and girls face, in its multiple forms we want to observe in order to achieve target 16.2. It is universally relevant and sexual violence has recently been high on political agendas. It addresses the critical need for systematic data collection on sexual violence against girls and boys – a widespread though often inconsistently measured and reported issue. There are existing tools and mechanisms for data collection that countries have implemented to monitor the situation with regards to this indicator. Household surveys such as DHS have been collecting data on this indicator in low- and middle-income countries since the late 1990s. Fully comparable data is available for some 50 low- and middle-income countries. The indicator on human trafficking (Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age and form of exploitation) currently proposed under 16.2 and coded green is not child specific; it would be better placed under SDG 10.7 where it is also listed and has a stronger and more appropriate match. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ICMM and IPIECA |  |  |  |  | John Drexhage ICMM/IPIECA Need to be clear about what falls under 'illicit financial flows" - we assume the intent is referring to drug/extortion/terrorism activities. Should be clear about this. |  |  |  |  |
| ICPD |  |  | SUPPORT Indicator 16.2.2/’Additional’: Percentage of young women and men aged 18-24 years who experienced sexual violence by age 15 and by age 18, and by perpetrator • This indicator should be supported as the only one in the current SDGs framework addressing sexual violence against children and adolescents under 15, given its widespread occurrence worldwide with devastating and long-term consequences—with girls being the majority of victims/survivors. It is recommended by the UN Chief Statisticians and available in the UNICEF database, with metadata submission available on the IAEG website.  • Note that indicator 5.5.2 will only measure sexual violence against girls since age 15, excluding those under 15 – even though girls under 16 are estimated to be roughly half of all sexual assaults globally. • Disaggregation by age sub-groups, or at a minimum, ‘by age 15’, is therefore strongly recommended – including since effective policies and interventions require tailored approaches to particular age groups and other characteristics: Data is available by age, as well as marital status, place of residence and income quintiles. | SUBSTITUTE current Indicator 16.3.1 (crime reporting rate/reporting of violence) with the proposal of various stakeholders: Proportion of those who have experienced a dispute in the past 12 months who have accessed a formal, informal, alternative or traditional dispute resolution mechanism and who feel it was just, by sex, age and other characteristics.  • This proposal would ensure a broader measure more in line with the target’s scope.  • The current grey indicator on ‘victims of violence who reported the crime’ is also welcome, while understanding stakeholder concerns on its limitations for the scope of the target; and noting it is similar to grey indicator 16.a.1 (‘victims who report physical/sexual crime’), where it could be considered alongside other options.  • Regardless of the indicator decided upon, disaggregation by various factors (as applicable to the indicator to be selected) would be especially relevant in order to provide a meaningful measure of whether low-income, rural, women, young people, among other groups who face discrimination and exclusion, have equal access to justice. • The following high-level indicator for this goal should be considered, under this or another target: Existence of an independent National Human Rights Institution in compliance with the Paris Principles. The proposal to include ‘and level of compliance of’ should also be taken note of. Adopted by the General Assembly in 1993, the Paris Principles set standards to ensure that National Human Rights Institutions are independent and have the minimum level of capacity to undertake their mandate effectively (linked to Target 16.a). Data is available from a certification process compiled by OHCHR, with status updated every six months. This indicator is especially meaningful as it provides an essential pillar and anchor for targets across this goal, among other goals. |  |  | SUBSTITUTE current Indicator 16.7.2. (young people's multi-sectoral needs addressed in national plans) with: Percentage of population who believe decision-making at all levels is inclusive and responsive, by age, sex and other characteristics, a survey-based indicator proposed by various stakeholders.  • Disaggregation by the maximum factors allowable will be especially relevant – including to capture young people’s responses and sense of adequate representation and inclusiveness.  • Consider an additional indicator to capture participation in decision-making, such as those proposed on “enabling environment for civil society” or on “institutionalized spaces for multi-stakeholder dialogues for decision-making”. |  | SUPPORT Indicator 16.a.1: Percentage of victims who report physical and/or sexual crime to law enforcement agencies during the past 12 months, by age, sex, location, population group and type of crime.  • Note there is no indicator in all of Goal 16 reflective of people’s confidence in, or reliance and access to, national institutions charged with delivering protection and justice, best exemplified by the issue of violence. • Data analysis of specific groups of victims would be relevant to inform policy-making and to identify potential underreporting—for example, by type of violence and perpetrator such as in cases of gender-based and domestic violence, or hate crimes (e.g. based on race, ethnicity, migrant status, religion, sexual orientation and gender identity). The metadata submission is available on the IAEG website. |
| ILEP | For indicator 16.1.2 ILEP recommends disaggregating by disability It would read as: Conflict-related deaths per 100,000 people (disaggregated by age, sex, disability and cause) |  |  |  |  | For indicator 16.5.1 ILEP recommends disaggregating by disability It would read as: 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, disability, region and population group |  |  | For indicator 16.a.1 ILEP recommends disaggregating by disability It would read as: Percentage of victims who report physical and/or sexual crime to law enforcement agencies during past 12 months (Disaggregated by age, sex, disability, region and population group) |
| Institute for Economicsand Peace (IEP) | IEP support this indicator, as it is very relevant to the target. We recommend including this indicator in the framework and working toward a common methodology. Conflict-related deaths are a key indicator of the severity of violence and established methodologies and datasets are available. Developing a common methodology will require a clear definition of “conflict-related.” We do not recommend narrowing the scope of the indicator to “battle-related deaths,” as this limits the measurement and would fail to account for the growing number of civilian causalities that result from modern forms of armed conflict. Rather, the concept of “conflict-related fatalities” affords the opportunity to build from standard measurements of battle-related deaths toward a more comprehensive and globally appropriate indicator. As such, an ideal dataset would incorporate multiple forms of violent conflict. For example, the UCDP Battle-related Deaths Dataset captures fatalities from major armed conflicts (>1,000 battle deaths in a year), but does not capture conflict-related fatalities associated with minor armed conflict, one-sided abuses, drug wars or conflicts between solely non-state actors. It is important to also incorporate data from other sources, such as UCDP’s complimentary Non-State Violence and One-Sided Violence datasets. Alternative or additional datasets include: • Global Terrorism Database • IISS Armed Conflict Database • Armed Conflict Location and Event Database • Social Conflict Analysis Database We would argue the Global Peace Index could be used as an overarching or secondary indicator for the target as it has ten years of data, captures the multidimensional aspects of violence and fear of violence and will continue into the future. | IEP support this indicator. Citizen-reported perceptions of safety are an important aspect of peacefulness. It is very important to disaggregate this indicator by sex (and by gender) because there is a significant disparity in perceived and actual safety in public space between men and women. Policy makers need this disaggregated information in order to advance progress toward the target. Gallop World Poll has available data on this question as do various barometers. | IEP believe this indicator needs to be improved in order to accurately capture sexual violence against children. Indicator 16.2.1 measures violence against children, but does not capture sexual violence. As such, the framework lacks a measurement of sexual violence against persons aged 0 to 17 years. A more comprehensive indicator would capture the percentage of persons aged 0 to 39 years (the full range of youth by global definitions) who experienced sexual violence before age 18, disaggregated by sex and by age in five-year cohorts. As with all indicators for Goal 16, disaggregation is very important because acts of violence are not evenly distributed across the population. Different types of violence affect different groups to varying extents, making disaggregated data crucial to effective policy making. | IEP support this indicator. Conceptually, crime reporting represents trust in formal institutions and an expectation of their efficacy. The majority of cases of intimate partner violence and sexual violence, against men and women, go unreported, in both developed and developing countries. However, differences in reporting rates can be addressed by policy. For example, England and Wales have demonstrated progress in recent years in instituting policy reforms that have demonstrably improved the reporting rate of sexual assault. A direct focus on a country’s crime reporting rates can encourage the development of effective and inclusive institutions that are accessible to and protect all members of society. In order to collect consistent and comparable data for this indicator across all countries, victimization surveys will need to be introduced in countries not currently administering them. Existing surveys may also need to be improved or amended for comparability. The lack of existing data presents a challenge for measurement, but also an opportunity to improve data collection and research on victimization across the globe. As of now, accurate analysis of victimization at the global level – especially sexual and intimate partner violence – is rendered impossible by gaps in the data. Global data collection on victimization and crime reporting will not only serve this specific indicator and target, but also broader progress toward peacefulness and the spirit of Goal 16. | IEP support this indicator with the important caveat that data derived from seizures will likely prove counterproductive to the target. Data derived from law enforcement seizures privileges countries with weak rule of law and high levels of corruption. | We support the proposed indicator with the commentary and suggestions provided by UNDP. | IEP support this indicator. The global Youth Development Index offers a holistic measure of youth development across the domains of employment and opportunity, education, health and wellbeing, civic participation and political participation. Either the overall country YDI score or country scores for youth participation – at the indicator or the domain level – could serve as measurements for at least the 177 countries currently included in the index. | IEP support this indicator. Including it in the framework will encourage the collection of globally comparable data, which is currently lacking. | IEP propose as alternative indicators: The Global Peace Index, which offers a comprehensive measure of a country’s effectiveness in reducing crime and violence. (Currently 162 countries.) The Positive Peace Index or one of its component parts, which offers a comprehensive measure of a country’s national institutions and capacity to prevent and combat crime and violence. (Currently 162 countries.) The World Internal Security and Police Index, which offers a comprehensive measure of the legitimacy, capacity, process, and outcomes of internal security agencies. (Currently 127 countries.) |
| Institute for Media Policy Research |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | In addition to the above Indicator, it is essential to include an indicator that measures the aspect of 'public access to information'. As such, an additional indicator (Indicator 16.10.2) proposed is: "Monitoring the adoption and implementation of constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees and mechanisms for public access to information". This is reinforced by UNESCO and other agencies, along with several countries. This indicator will help Member States to assess the extent to which their regulatory environment allows for the practice of journalism to thrive, protecting the safety of journalists and other human rights defenders in the process and guarding against impunity. More importantly, it allows Member States to address the dual intent of Target 16.10 focused on 'fundamental freedoms' (in terms of the safety of media and other human rights workers) and 'public access to information'(in terms of the environment in which media and other human rights workers operate). |  |
| International Agency for the Prevention of Blindness (IAPB) | IAPB asks for disaggregation by the list of characteristics mentioned in 17.18 (income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other relevant characteristics) |  | IAPB asks for disaggregation by the list of characteristics mentioned in 17.18 (income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other relevant characteristics) | IAPB recommends for either alternative to disaggregate by the list of characteristics mentioned in 17.18 (income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other relevant characteristics) |  |  |  |  | IAPB asks for disaggregation by the list of characteristics mentioned in 17.18 (income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other relevant characteristics) |
| International Budget Partnership |  |  |  |  |  |  | The International Budget Partnership welcomes the indicator that reflects the 'Extent to which the executive and/or the legislature receive inputs through written submissions or public meetings from citizens during the budget cycle, and provides feedback on the use of such inputs.' [Refinement of indicator ‘Extent to which legislature conducts public hearings during budget cycle’ proposed by EOSG/RoLU, PBSO, UNDP, UNODC (in consultation with others)] We also support the IMF indicator proposal: 'percentage of government units (constituencies) providing citizens with a formal voice in budget deliberations' As noted by the IMF, the suggested indicator is feasible with data on citizens’ informed participation in decisions regarding the government units’ budget. 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 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 and will continue to do so. | If budget transparency is not captured in the 16.6 indicator (as noted by Colombia, Italy, UK, UNDP, IMF and others), the International Budget Partnership proposes: 'Extent to which budget information, including expected and actual on-budget and off-budget revenue and expenditure, procurement, and natural resource concessions, is publicly available and easily accessible in open data format.' This addresses the comments and support of the African IAEG-SDG members and the IMF. Governments should publish eight budget documents in a timely manner, according to international good practices. These include the Pre-Budget Statement, Executive’s Budget Proposal, Enacted Budget, Citizens Budget, In-Year Reports, Mid-Year Review, Year-End Report, and Audit Report. Each should be broken down by expenditure allocated and spent towards each of the SDGs. |  |
| International Council of AIDS Service Organizations |  |  | To truly measure violence and abuse of children, this should not be limited to sexual violence but include all violence. This could be "who experienced sexual or other violence" and disaggregate by types of violence - sexual, physical, other. There are good existing indices of violence. | Promoting rule of law is feasible and can be measured with clear indicators including measures of reporting rates, judiciary processes including legislation and court proceedings. This is critical for people affected by HIV because they have experienced high levels of discrimination and can use the rule of law to enforce their rights. |  |  |  | We recommend the deletion of "verified cases" because of the numbers of such instances that cannot be verified or in which verification is extremely difficult. We prefer the previous "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))." |  |
| International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | The International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions comments that: The indicator currently proposed does not help to measure public access to information. IFLA and many other civil society organisations do not support this proposal. SDG target 16.10 was deliberately drafted and approved with two mutually reinforcing but separate components – one for “ensuring public access to information,” and the second for “protecting fundamental freedoms.” We propose replacing the existing indicator, or using a second indicator proposed by UNESCO which has support from other UN agencies including FAO; the World Bank Group, several IAEG member states, as well as civil society groups: [Existence and implementation of constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees for public access to information.] |  |
| International Movement ATD Fourth World |  |  |  | ATD Fourth World- We prefer the alternative indicator and we will add "proportion of those who are satisfied with the result of the resolution. As agreed in Agenda 2030 and in the spirit of “leaving no one behind” and focusing “on the poorest, most vulnerable and those furthest behind”, this indicator should be “disaggregated by income, sex, age, race, ethnicity, migration status, disability and geographic location and other characteristics relevant in national contexts” Para 74 g |  | ATD Fourth World- People living in extreme poverty can be disproportionately affected by corruption, bribery and illegal forms of “taxes” and fees from wealthier and more powerful local elites due to discrimination and limited income and power. The indicators shouldn’t reinterpret the dimensions for disaggregation that were agreed in Agenda 2030. In the spirit of leaving no one behind and focusing on the poorest, most vulnerable and those furthest behind, this indicator should be “disaggregated by income, sex, age, race, ethnicity, migration status, disability and geographic location and other characteristics relevant in national contexts” Para 74 g |  |  |  |
| International Trade Union Confederation |  |  |  |  | Ratification and compliance with UN Conventions against Corruption and against Transnational Organized Crime and OECD Standard for Automatic Exchange of Financial Account Information in Tax Matters and implementation of recommendations of the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) and the Stolen Asset Recovery Initiative (StAR) |  |  | Three proposals listed in order of preference: First priority (endorse US proposal): (a) Number of times in which UN Special Rapporteurs report violations of fundamental freedoms, including freedoms of association, expression, and assembly, (b) Percentage of recommendations to strengthen fundamental freedoms – including freedom of association, assembly and expression – that were implemented, as identified through the UN Human Rights Council Universal Periodic Review, (c) Perception of the public and of civil society organizations on whether they can pursue issues of interest, including human rights governance, in the public arena without fear of government retribution. (Surveys/polls; Disaggregated by age, sex, gender), (d) Adoption and implementation of access to information laws and regulations and the number and percentage of requests for information fulfilled in the past 12 months. (though it is difficult to measure), (e) Existence of enabling laws, policies and practices with regard to the freedoms of expression, association and assembly.” Second priority (endorse Canada proposal): (a) Presence of legislative framework that protects fundamental freedoms and recourse mechanism when they are violated; (b) length of time to participate in recourse mechanism, (c) percentage of public access to government information request that are accepted or denied.” Third priority (revision of original proposal): Number of reported cases of killing, kidnapping, enforced disappearance, arbitrary detention, arbitrary blocking or shutting down of activities, and torture of journalists, associated media personnel, trade unionists, staff of civil society organizations, and human rights or governance advocates in the previous 12 months. |  |
| Ipas |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | also disaggregate data by TYPE OF CRIME Also consider higher level indicator : "Existence of an independent National Human Rights Institution in compliance with the Paris Principles" |
| LIGHT FOR THE WORLD | For indicator 16.1.2 LIGHT FOR THE WORLD recommends disaggregating by disability. It would read as: Conflict-related deaths per 100,000 people (disaggregated by age, sex, disability and cause) |  |  |  |  | LIGHT FOR THE WORLD recommends for indicator 16.5.1 disaggregating by disability. It would read as: 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, disability, region and population group |  |  | LIGHT FOR THE WORLD recommends disaggregating by disability, this would read as: It would read as: Percentage of victims who report physical and/or sexual crime to law enforcement agencies during past 12 months (Disaggregated by age, sex, disability, region and population group) |
| Loomba Foundation |  | The Loomba Foundation supports the inclusion of this additional indicator. In some societies, widows are subjected to harassment due to their status. We would like to see a broad approach to disaggregation across all indicators - linked to human rights frameworks as well as the fundamental principles of official statistics - reflecting all relevant groups for all indicators, including widows as a group / marital status as a factor. We would like to see disaggregation by marital status for this indicator. |  | The Loomba Foundation would like to see victims of violence reporting their victimization disaggregated by all relevant criteria, including marital status, as widows are often a target of victimisation. We would also like to see an additional indicator measuring steps taken (e.g. laws passed) to end harassment and harmful social practices aimed at widows under this target or, preferably, target 5.3 on harmful practices. |  |  |  |  | The Loomba Foundation supports the original indicator, but would like to see victims disaggregated by marital status as well as other relevant criteria. |
| MADE Civil Society Network |  |  | Migration and Development civil society network (MADE) Target 16.2 refers to ending abuse, exploitation, trafficking and all forms of violence against and torture of children. The proposed global indicator under consideration is formulated as follows: “Percentage of young women and men aged 18-24 years who experienced sexual violence by age 18”. We propose to explicitly refer to migrants, and amended as follows: “Percentage of young women and men, including migrants, regardless of migration status, aged 18-24 years who experienced sexual violence by age 18”. We also believe that the above mentioned proposed indicator on human trafficking (under target 10.7) could help to measure the decrease in child trafficking, again with the concern that the data for this proposed indicator are not available for all countries, only for those countries included in the annual Trafficking In Persons (TIP) report. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nagorik Uddyog | Disaggregated Data of victims of violence and conflict including conflict related deaths, according to age sex, caste, location and other forms and cause. |  | Percentage and disaggregation of the women and men who experienced sexual exploitation and violence below age 18. | 1. CEDAW, CRC, CERD, ICCPR and ICESCR all countries sign and ratify these conventions along with the optional protocols. 2. UN convention on the elimination of discrimination based on work and descent based on the principles and guidance ensuring equal access to justice to communities which are affected by inter-generational discrimination based on work and descent, caste and analogous forms of hierarchy. Encompassing access to public and private recourses, institutions, and markets. 3. Presence of effective national campaign that visiblaises forms of violence based age, sex, disability, race, caste, ethnicity, social origin, religion and economic and other status |  | Percentage 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. Disaggregate by age, sex, region, caste, race and other population groups |  |  |  |
| Namati |  |  |  | Namati: The green indicator for 16.3 on detention rates (NB. an indicator that is dangerous to use on its own) focuses on criminal justice. Including a second indicator on "crime reporting rate" limits the measurement of justice to criminal justice; it does not measure the broader conception of justice agreed to in Goal 16 or “preserve the political balance, integration and ambition” of the 2030 agenda. The framework should include an indicator that more fully respond to the target. We would recommend the survey-based indicator, with a slight revision "Proportion of those who have experienced a dispute in the past 12 months who have accessed a formal, informal, alternative or traditional dispute resolution mechanism and who feel it was just" is used. This indicator is a sound measure for trust and confidence in the rule of law and access to justice systems (making it also useful for 16.6. 16.7 and 16b). It captures experience in both civil and criminal law, and with state and non-state dispute resolution mechanisms. It seeks to drive an approach to the rule of law and access to justice which focuses not only on institutions, but on individuals’ experience of the justice system and on just outcomes. The indicator measures experience and perception of the justice system. It also measures the process in terms of accessibility and quality of services, rather than the outcome. Whether a mechanism is "just" 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. When used alongside other measures of justice, perception indicators can provide a validation of whether people believe that the justice system is fair and effective. This indicator has been backed by a wide group of experts, including NSOs and the UN Virtual Network on Goal 16. This indicator has Data can be collected through household surveys. Surveys in 151 countries already respond to this or closely related questions, proofing that methodologies are in place. We would recommend moving the “crime reporting rate” indicator to target 16a, where a very similar version already sits, given that it is an excellent proxy for people's faith in security institutions, and therefore their capacity. |  | Namati: Support the suggested indicator. There is a strong body of data captured over time and across more than 100 countries (this is often captured by third-party data producers under rigorous statistical methods). The indicator also is useful for measuring changes in corruption by using the proxy of reported experiences of bribery and has strong correlations with development outcomes related to the other SDGs. Still clarifications would be needed for who is being defined as ‘person’ (to include children) and ‘public official’. | Namati: We recommend alternative (2) "Percentage of population who believe decision-making is responsive and inclusive". This indicator, which was originally proposed by the UN Statistical Commission in February, would reflect the important elements of ‘inclusive’, ‘responsive’ and ‘participatory’ in the target that would otherwise not be measured. It would be universally relevant and in line with a growing consensus that public participation is an essential component of governance processes. The indicator should track adults’ and children’s involvement in public decision-making at all levels, including local and national levels. It would be feasible to track this indicator through perception-based surveys. |  | Namati: Move 16.3.1: "Crime Reporting Rate" Indicator to here given that it is an excellent proxy for people's faith in security institutions, and therefore their capacity. |
| Navsarjan Trust | Navsarjan Trust Disaggregated Data of victims of violence and conflict including conflict related deaths, according to age sex, caste ethnicity, sexual orientationlocation and other forms and cause. |  | Navsarjan Trust Percentage and disaggregation of the women and men including LGBTQI, who experienced sexual exploitation and violence below age 18. | Navsarjan Trust 1. CEDAW, CRC, CERD, ICCPR and ICESCR all countries sign and ratify these conventions along with the optional protocols. 2. UN convention on the elimination of discrimination based on work and descent based on the principles and guidance ensuring equal access to justice to communities which are affected by inter-generational discrimination based on work and descent, caste and analogous forms of hierarchy. Encompassing access to public and private recourses, institutions, and markets. 3. Presence of effective national campaign that visiblaises forms of violence based age, sex, disability, race, caste,sexual minority ethnicity, social origin, religion and economic and other status. |  | Navsarjan Trust Percentage 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. Disaggregated by age, sex, region, caste, race, sexual minorities and other population groups |  |  |  |
| Oak Foundation |  |  | We strongly support the inclusion of an on sexual violence because of the need to catalyze action to prevent It. We know that preventing sexual violence during childhood not only full fills the aim of 16.2 target, but is also advances other targets, such as gender equity, education and and child health. It is critical that boys are not left if we are to break the cycle of violence. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Oka Foundation |  |  | Reasons for supporting this indicator: In order to promote a coherent approach to data collection for 16.2 that reflects the scope of the target, it is strongly requested that this indicator is included as the second indicator for 16.2. It reflects a key aspect of the change in violence that boys and girls face, in its multiple forms we want to observe in order to achieve target 16.2. It is universally relevant and sexual violence has recently been high on political agendas. It addresses the critical need for systematic data collection on sexual violence against girls and boys – a widespread though often inconsistently measured and reported issue. There are existing tools and mechanisms for data collection that countries have implemented to monitor the situation with regards to this indicator. Household surveys such as DHS have been collecting data on this indicator in low- and middle-income countries since the late 1990s. Fully comparable data is available for some 50 low- and middle-income countries. The indicator on human trafficking (Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age and form of exploitation) currently proposed under 16.2 and coded green is not child specific; it would be better placed under SDG 10.7 where it is also listed and has a stronger and more appropriate match. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P&D Factor |  |  | SUPPORT Indicator 16.2.2/’Additional’: Percentage of young women and men aged 18-24 years who experienced sexual violence by age 15 and by age 18, and by perpetrator • This indicator should be supported as the only one in the current SDGs framework addressing sexual violence against children and adolescents under 15, given its widespread occurrence worldwide with devastating and long-term consequences—with girls being the majority of victims/survivors. It is recommended by the UN Chief Statisticians and available in the UNICEF database, with metadata submission available on the IAEG website. • Note that indicator 5.5.2 will only measure sexual violence against girls since age 15, excluding those under 15 – even though girls under 16 are estimated to be roughly half of all sexual assaults globally. • Disaggregation by age sub-groups, or at a minimum, ‘by age 15’, is therefore strongly recommended – including since effective policies and interventions require tailored approaches to particular age groups and other characteristics: Data is available by age, as well as marital status, place of residence and income quintiles. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Ibid. See pages 719-720; also pages 63-65 in UNICEF (2014) A statistical analysis of violence against children: http://files.unicef.org/publications/files/Hidden\_in\_plain\_sight\_statistical\_analysis\_EN\_3\_Sept\_2014.pdf | SUBSTITUTE current Indicator 16.3.1 (crime reporting rate/reporting of violence) with the proposal of various stakeholders: Proportion of those who have experienced a dispute in the past 12 months who have accessed a formal, informal, alternative or traditional dispute resolution mechanism and who feel it was just, by sex, age and other characteristics. • This proposal would ensure a broader measure more in line with the target’s scope. • The current grey indicator on ‘victims of violence who reported the crime’ is also welcome, while understanding stakeholder concerns on its limitations for the scope of the target; and noting it is similar to grey indicator 16.a.1 (‘victims who report physical/sexual crime’), where it could be considered alongside other options. • Regardless of the indicator decided upon, disaggregation by various factors (as applicable to the indicator to be selected) would be especially relevant in order to provide a meaningful measure of whether low-income, rural, women, young people, among other groups who face discrimination and exclusion, have equal access to justice. |  |  | SUBSTITUTE current Indicator 16.7.2. (young people's multi-sectoral needs addressed in national plans) with: Percentage of population who believe decision-making at all levels is inclusive and responsive, by age, sex and other characteristics, a survey-based indicator proposed by various stakeholders. • Disaggregation by the maximum factors allowable will be especially relevant – including to capture young people’s responses and sense of adequate representation and inclusiveness. • Consider an additional indicator to capture participation in decision-making, such as those proposed on “enabling environment for civil society” or on “institutionalized spaces for multi-stakeholder dialogues for decision-making”. |  | SUPPORT Indicator 16.a.1: Percentage of victims who report physical and/or sexual crime to law enforcement agencies during the past 12 months, by age, sex, location, population group and type of crime. • Note there is no indicator in all of Goal 16 reflective of people’s confidence in, or reliance and access to, national institutions charged with delivering protection and justice, best exemplified by the issue of violence. • Data analysis of specific groups of victims would be relevant to inform policy-making and to identify potential underreporting—for example, by type of violence and perpetrator such as in cases of gender-based and domestic violence, or hate crimes (e.g. based on race, ethnicity, migrant status, religion, sexual orientation and gender identity). The metadata submission is available on the IAEG website. RECOMMEND an additional higher-level indicator for which data is available as follows: “Existence of an independent National Human Rights Institution in compliance with the Paris Principles”. • The proposal to include ‘and level of compliance of’ with the Paris Principles should also be taken note of. Adopted by the General Assembly in 1993, the Paris Principles set a group of standards to ensure that National Human Rights Institutions are truly independent and have the minimum level of capacity to undertake their mandate effectively. • Data is available from a certification process compiled by OHCHR, with status updated every six months. This indicator is especially meaningful as it provides an essential pillar and anchor for targets across this goal, among other goals. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Ibid, see page 450. For up to date information on National Human Rights Institutions, including the list of certified countries, see here: http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Countries/NHRI/Pages/NHRIMain.aspx. For additional metadata. For additional metadata, see OHCHR’s submission to the IEAG: http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/2015/06/16/detailed-inputs/ |
| Peace Education Project MOMO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PROPOSED NATIONAL INDICATORS must not be treated as complementary, but be included as proper indicators for Goal 16, especially the following indicators; 16.2. Compliance with recommendations from the Universal Periodic Review and UN Treaties, 16.8. Representation of women among mediators, negotiators and technical experts in formal peace negotiations, and 16.9. Number of journalists and associated media personnel that are physically attacked, unlawfully detained or killed as a result of pursuing their legitimate activities SUGGEST to keep in mind that education for peace is the most important safeguard for peaceful and inclusive society that is capable of sustainable development, as repeatedly agreed in UNESCO. SUGGEST to include policy and implementation of education for peace as defined by UNESCO as a process indicator. SUGGEST to strengthen the proposed indicator 16.9 by including the number of verified cases of killing, enforced disappearance, arbitrary detention, assault and torture of trade unionists or human rights defenders SUGGEST to include existence of independent National Human Rights Institution in compliance with the Paris Principles and National Action Plan to implement UN Security Council Resolution 1325 as structural indicators (state commitments). |
| Peacebuilding Advisory Service | Tobi Dress-Germain, Peacebuilding Advisory Service, US (Boston) Might also add conflict-related injuries requiring medical care or hospitalization per 100,000 people, which may provide a more complete picture of the seriousness of the circumstances. Might also add conflict-related sexual assaults reported per 100,000, since it is now known that sexual assault is sometimes used as an instrument of subjugation and humiliation. The problem with the latter is that so many of these assaults are not reported. However, through reportage of numbers, we could begin to have an estimate. | Tobi Dress-Germain, Peacebuilding Advisory Service, US (Boston) Might consider adding: ..... walking alone around the area "where they live or work". And "....If they do not feel safe in either of these environments, do they have options for assistance?" | Tobi Dress-Germain, Peacebuilding Advisory Service, US (Boston) One quick edit: In 16.2 the word 'exploitation' should be singular, with no 's' at the end. | Tobi Dress-Germain, Peacebuilding Advisory Service, US (Boston) Tobi Dress-Germain, Peacebuilding Advisory Service, US (Boston) Both of these options have very different meanings, and both would provide useful information, so perhaps both can be included. However, 16.3.1 should be slightly reworked because "......who reported their victimization to competent authorities or other ...... conflict resolution mechanisms" does not seem to make sense as it is worded. Also, should there be a target or indicator exploring the critical issue of (1) whether dispute resolution mechanisms exist in their area, (2) if not, how they can be created, (3) what type of public education is there about available dispute resolution mechanisms, and (4), do they trust the dispute resolution mechanisms that currently exist? | Tobi Dress-Germain, Peacebuilding Advisory Service, US (Boston) Should this read "illicit financial flows and arms flows?" Perhaps add ".......and total value of illicit arms flows", together with information about the nature of the arms flows, including where they are coming from. | Tobi Dress-Germain, Peacebuilding Advisory Service, US (Boston) Strongly agree that the indicator should include private sector corruption; perhaps there should be two separate indicators. The phrase, ".....who had at least one contact with a public official....." poses serious concerns because there are many instances when people know, meet, or are friendly with public officials but which do not in any way imply that there is corruption involved in the relationship, and this may have the effect of tainting perfectly innocent friendships or relationships. Perhaps the language should read: ".... who paid a bribe to a public official or were asked for a bribe by any public official, during the last 12 months". | Tobi Dress-Germain, Peacebuilding Advisory Service, US (Boston) All of these could be indicators, but No. 1 is problematic and could engender unreliable information. For example, if a dictator who has been in power for many years becomes, once again, a candidate for office, the electorate might boycott the vote because they believe that the conclusion is foregone and that their vote will not, in fact, count. No. 2 and no. 3 provide much more reliable information, and also very important and very different information, so it would be excellent if both of these could be included. | Tobi Dress-Germain, Peacebuilding Advisory Service, US (Boston) Should the following be added: "..... trade unionists, human rights advocates, and other members of civil society who are advocates for social justice issues....."? | Tobi Dress-Germain, Peacebuilding Advisory Service, US (Boston) Should Target 16.a read: ".....to prevent armed violence and conflict and to combat terrorism and crime"? This does require a stronger, broader indicator, not only for those reporting crime, but perhaps also for those reporting threats, suppression, and other more ambiguous types of repression, as well as crime. It may also require an indicator related to the types of institutions and capacity that exist to monitor violence, crimes and terrorism, but generally, these types of issues are handled by different types and levels of institutions. Crimes by individuals in civil society may be handled at a different level than crimes, threats or suppression by a nation-state. Before completing this survey, I would also like to make a few more general observations. I hope that there will be a preamble to the SDGs that indicate the strong and powerful linkages and interconnections between and among all of the SDGs. For example, poverty cannot be alleviated during periods of armed conflict, development cannot move forward during armed conflict, and public health processes and education are often curtailed during armed conflict . So in regions where there is substantial armed conflict, many of the SDGs are automatically postponed until the conflict is resolved. For countries that find themselves in perpetual cycles of violence, this can mean that most of the SDGs cannot even begin to be implemented until the root of the conflict is finally explored and the conflict is largely resolved. And at that point the development process has often been reversed and becomes more of a re-development process. It is important that these concepts be articulated within a preamble or within the structure of the SDGs, or perhaps particularly within the language of Goal 16. When armed violence and conflict are reduced in more and more countries and regions, the other 16 goals will be much easier to implement and measure. This is why Goal 16 is such a pivotal addition to the list of goals. In addition, since Goal 16 includes access to justice, this will mean that this goal interacts closely with Goal 4 relating to education, since, in order to have access to justice, more members of civil society will have to be trained as lawyers and legal specialists so that people who are denied justice will be able to be educated about their rights and obligations and will know where to go to access legal assistance. It is also closely aligned with the target in Goal 4 relating to building a culture of peace. Moreover, Goal 16 is closely related to Goal 10 on reducing inequality since we now have a greater understanding that perceptions of inequality are one of the principal drivers of violent conflict. Goal 16 also relates closely to Goal 9 with regard to resilient infrastructure and inclusivity, to Goal 11, to Goal 8, and to all goals relating to climate and environmental factors. Hence, many of the goals are interactive and closely linked, and Goal 16 may, in a way, end up being the connective tissue between and among many of the goals. Capacity building, institution building and public education will likely be the keys to optimal success of all of the goals. |
| Plan International | \*\* RECOMMENDED INDICATOR 16.1.3 INCLUDED BELOW Plan International comments: RECOMMENDED INDICATOR: 16.1.2 Conflict-related deaths, injuries, assaults, exploitation, forced inscription, trafficking, torture and degrading/inhumane treatment per 100,000 people by cause and type of perpetrator RATIONALE: Adolescent girls are at a comparative disadvantage before, during and after crises. The risks in these contexts, including rape, abuse, early marriage and abduction, are greater for adolescent girls compared to other population groups. DISAGGREGATIONS: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) DATA SOURCE: 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. RESPONSIBLE ENTITY: 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 ----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------- Plan International comments: RECOMMENDED INDICATOR:16.1.3 Violent crime rate (intentional homicide, assault and sexual violence, including attempts) per 100,000 population, as compared against reporting and conviction rates. Further disaggregation: relationship to perpetrator RATIONALE: It is important to compare crime rates to reporting and conviction rates in order to measure ‘access to justice’ under Goal 16. Reporting rate can help reflect whether victims feel comfortable reporting crimes, and confident that they will actually receive help if they report crimes. Conviction rates show whether the justice system is actually working and whether reported cases get resolved. Many cases of gender-based violence may be dismissed, and victims are often pressured or threatened to drop cases. The type of conviction is also important to ensure crimes are charged appropriately (rather than being charged as lesser crimes carrying lesser penalties), to identify whether cases are resolved in favor of the victim, and to ensure that perpetrators are given appropriate sentences that reflect the gravity of the crime. DISAGGREGATIONS: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household), relationship to perpetrator DATA SOURCE: National crime statistics, including reporting and conviction rates RESPONSIBLE ENTITY: Data currently collected by UNODC, but other agencies could participate. TIER: II |  | \*\*COMMENTS FOR 16.2.2 Plan International comments: RECOMMENDED INDICATOR: 16.2.2 Percentage of young women and men aged 18-24 years who experienced sexual violence by age 18 Further disaggregation: relationship to perpetrator RATIONALE: Sexual violence against children is a global human rights violation with short-term and long-term health and social consequences. An estimated 150 million girls under age 18 have experienced rape or other forms of sexual violence. Up to 50 percent of sexual assaults worldwide are committed against girls under 16 and up to one in five girls under the age of 15 experience sexual abuse. DISAGGREGATIONS: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household), relationship to perpetrator | \*\*COMMENTS FOR RECOMMENDED INDICATOR 16.3.2 INCLUDED BELOW Plan International comments: RECOMMENDED INDICATOR: 16.3.1 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) against conviction rates. Further disaggregations: relationship to perpetrator, type of crime RATIONALE: Adolescent girls are disproportionately vulnerable to human rights abuses and generally lack a support system through which they can protest abuses and access justice. DISAGGREGATIONS: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household), relationship to perpetrator, type of crime DATA SOURCE: Victimisation surveys RESPONSIBLE ENTITY: 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 -------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------- Plan International comments: RECOMMENDED INDICATOR: 16.3.2 Proportion of those who have experienced a dispute in the past 12 months and who have accessed a fair, formal, or alternative dispute mechanism. Further disaggregations: relationship to perpetrator, type of mechanism RATIONALE: Girls face common obstacles to seeking justice and navigating complex legal systems, including lack of knowledge of rights and how to access them; fear of stigma, of not being believed and being blamed; re-victimization through the justice system; and lack of girl-friendly services. DISAGGREGATIONS: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household), relationship to perpetrator, type of mechanism DATA SOURCE: Household surveys; data is available for 107 countries RESPONSIBLE ENTITY: World Bank (prospective) TIER: II | Plan International comments: RECOMMENDED INDICATOR: RATIONALE: DISAGGREGATIONS: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) DATA SOURCE: RESPONSIBLE ENTITY: TIER: |  | \*\* COMMENTS FOR RECOMMENDED INDICATOR 16.7.3 INCLUDED BELOW Plan International comments: RECOMMENDED INDICATOR: 16.7.2 Proportion of countries that address young people’s multisectoral needs with their national development plans and poverty reduction strategies including mechanisms for young people to actively participate in the policy making process. RATIONALE: Unequal power relations at the family, community, and institutional level mean that girls and women often lack voice and influence in decision-making. DISAGGREGATIONS: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) DATA SOURCE: UNFPA COAR database RESPONSIBLE ENTITY: UNFPA TIER: III ------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------- Plan International comments: RECOMMENDED INDICATOR: 16.7.3 Percentage of population who believe decision-making at all levels is inclusive and responsive RATIONALE: Inclusive and gender-responsive decision-making helps ensure that women and girls’ needs are prioritized, met, and defended. This can lead to improvements in their health, promote education and economic empowerment, and enable girls to hold governments accountable when their needs or interests are ignored. DISAGGREGATIONS: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) DATA SOURCE: Surveys RESPONSIBLE ENTITY: UN Women, OHCHR, UNFPA TIER: III | \*RECOMMENDED INDICATOR 16.10.2 INCLUDED BELOW Plan International comments: RECOMMENDED INDICATOR: 16.10.1 Number of verified cases of killing, kidnapping, enforced disappearance, arbitrary detention and torture of journalists, associated media personnel, trade unionists, women’s rights defenders and human rights advocates in the previous 12 months RATIONALE: Access to information is vital to recognizing injustice or discrimination and accessing services to right those injustices and combat inequality.It is critical to include women’s rights defenders in this indicator, as they are not only subject to the same risks as any human rights defenders, but are also targeted for gender-specific threats and gender-based violence. DISAGGREGATIONS: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) DATA SOURCE: This indicator collates data from multiple sources, including National Human Rights Institutions, national non-governmental organisations, associations of journalists, trades unions, ILO, and international nongovernmental organisations. RESPONSIBLE ENTITY: 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 ------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------- Plan International comments: RECOMMENDED INDICATOR: 16.10.2 Number of initiatives on awareness-raising of rights, with specific focus on youth, girls, women, and other marginalized populations RATIONALE: In order to claim their rights, girls need knowledge of their rights through rights education and support networks, including challenging gender stereotypes and attitudes through creative use of media, positive role models, voices of girl leaders, and awareness raising in communities. DISAGGREGATIONS: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) DATA SOURCE: Country data RESPONSIBLE ENTITY: UN Women, OHCHR TIER: III | \*RECOMMENDED INDICATOR 16.a.2 INCLUDED BELOW Plan International comments: RECOMMENDED INDICATOR: 16.a.1 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 RATIONALE: Ensuring that girls have the skills, knowledge, and support needed to recognize abuse or discrimination and access justice systems is critical to promoting their well-being and contribution to international and community development. DISAGGREGATIONS: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household), region and population group ------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------- Plan International comments: RECOMMENDED INDICATOR: 16.a.2 Number of public initiatives on trainings for inclusive reporting, including gender-based violence sensitivity-training for local and national law enforcement, judicial institutions, and other governments agencies RATIONALE: Gender-sensitivity training includes specialized training on women’s rights and trainings on the applicable laws in particular, relating to violence against women and girls, for all points of contact for girls in the legal system (police, prosecutors, medical examiners, judges). DISAGGREGATIONS: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) DATA SOURCE: Country data, United Nations Survey of Crime Trends and the Operations of Criminal Justice Systems mandated by the UN General Assembly (UN-CTS) RESPONSIBLE ENTITY: UN Women, OHCHR, UNODC TIER: II/III |
| Post-2015 Volunteering Working Group |  |  |  |  |  |  | Volunteer groups consider that this target should include an indicator to measure the existence of supportive policies for civil society engagement. An enabling environment for civil society is measurable and has been monitored through several sources of data, including the Enabling Environment Index, Enabling Environment National Assessment, CSO Sustainability Index, Freedom in the World Survey and the NGO Law Monitor. |  |  |
| Public Services International |  |  |  |  |  | Public Services International Proposal: Modify Indicator 16.5.1: Percentage of persons who paid a bribe to a public official or a private entity, or were asked for a bribe by either a public official or a private entity during the last 12 months. Disaggregate by public or private frequency (mode or absolute number of occurrences), age, sex, region and population group. | Public Services International Supports alternative proposal 1), with the proviso that where and when abstention is not legal it must be recorded. |  |  |
| Rastriya Dalit Network (RDN) Nepal |  |  |  | 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. |  |  |  |  |  |
| RFSU |  |  | RFSU, Sweden comments: We are concerned that indicator 5.5.2 only measures sexual violence against girls since age 15, excluding those under 15 – even though girls under 16 are estimated to be roughly half of all sexual assaults globally. The target 16.2 should be complemented with an additional indicator: "Percentage of young women and men aged 18-24 years who experienced sexual violence by age 15 and by age 18, and by perpetrator" This indicator would then address sexual violence against children and adolescents under 15, given its widespread occurrence worldwide with devastating and long-term consequences—with girls being the majority of victims/survivors. It is recommended by the UN Chief Statisticians and available in the UNICEF database, with metadata submission available on the IAEG website. Disaggregation by age sub-groups, or at a minimum, ‘by age 15’, is therefore strongly recommended – including since effective policies and interventions require tailored approaches to particular age groups and other characteristics: Data is available by age, as well as marital status, place of residence and income quintiles. | RFSU, Sweden comments on; current Indicator 16.3.1 (crime reporting rate/reporting of violence) with the proposal of various stakeholders: "Proportion of those who have experienced a dispute in the past 12 months who have accessed a formal, informal, alternative or traditional dispute resolution mechanism and who feel it was just, by sex, age and other characteristics". This proposal would ensure a broader measure more in line with the target’s scope. We suppport the indicator; "Victims of violence who reported the crime", while understanding stakeholder concerns on its limitations for the scope of the target; and noting it is similar to grey indicator 16.a.1 (‘victims who report physical/sexual crime’), where it could be considered alongside other options. • Regardless of the indicator decided upon, disaggregation by various factors (as applicable to the indicator to be selected) would be especially relevant in order to provide a meaningful measure of whether low-income, rural, women, young people, among other groups who face discrimination and exclusion, have equal access to justice. |  |  | RFSU, Sweden support to substitute current Indicator 16.7.2. (young people's multi-sectoral needs addressed in national plans) with: "Percentage of population who believe decision-making at all levels is inclusive and responsive, by age, sex and other characteristics", a survey-based indicator proposed by various stakeholders. Disaggregation by the maximum factors allowable will be especially relevant – including to capture young people’s responses and sense of adequate representation and inclusiveness. Consider an additional indicator to capture participation in decision-making, such as those proposed on “enabling environment for civil society” or on “institutionalized spaces for multi-stakeholder dialogues for decision-making”. |  | RFSU, Sweden supports Indicator 16.a.1: Percentage of victims who report physical and/or sexual crime to law enforcement agencies during the past 12 months, by age, sex, location, population group and type of crime. Notes there is no indicator in all of Goal 16 reflective of people’s confidence in, or reliance and access to, national institutions charged with delivering protection and justice, best exemplified by the issue of violence. Data analysis of specific groups of victims would be relevant to inform policy-making and to identify potential underreporting—for example, by type of violence and perpetrator such as in cases of gender-based and domestic violence, or hate crimes (e.g. based on race, ethnicity, migrant status, religion, sexual orientation and gender identity). The metadata submission is available on the IAEG website. RECOMMEND an additional higher-level indicator for which data is available as follows: “Existence of an independent National Human Rights Institution in compliance with the Paris Principles”. The proposal to include ‘and level of compliance of’ with the Paris Principles should also be taken note of. Adopted by the General Assembly in 1993, the Paris Principles set a group of standards to ensure that National Human Rights Institutions are truly independent and have the minimum level of capacity to undertake their mandate effectively. Data is available from a certification process compiled by OHCHR, with status updated every six months. This indicator is especially meaningful as it provides an essential pillar and anchor for targets across this goal, among other goals |
| Saferworld | The IAEG has a clear mandate to measure conflict-related deaths. Peace is one of five priorities for the 2030 Agenda; target 16.1 is on all forms of violence. Conflict deaths are no harder to measure than many other issues the IAEG has chosen to count. Indicators on direct conflict deaths are already used by UN missions (e.g. in Afghanistan) and by various research institutes (e.g. UCDP, IISS, ACLED). Data on indirect conflict deaths is also available. Please see more information on meta data and methodologies here: http://www.saferworld.org.uk/resources/view-resource/1010-counting-conflict-deaths-options-for-sdg-161 We would strongly recommend that this indicator is retained. Nonetheless, as with many other indicators that are green or grey, some more work is required on its methodology. we would recommend that Praia City Group on Governance, Peace and Security Statistics is given a one-year mandate to identify agreed methodology around gathering data for direct conflict deaths. This would be followed by a longer period of research on indirect conflict deaths, which is admittedly more methodologically challenging (though still possible, with existing data available). | We urge the IAEG to retain this indicator. This perception indicator is a direct measure of people’s sense of security and freedom from fear, underpinning the target and the aspiration of the wider goal. Safety and security are perceived states, so it is appropriate that a perception indicator is used. Its strength also comes from the fact that, when disaggregated by urban/rural, age, gender, the indicator can be used for targets 5.2, 10.2, 10.3, 11.1, 11.2, 11.7, 16.2. The indicator could also be put in target 16a (see below) The indicator is widely used and tested. Global data for this indicator could be drawn from Gallup’s annual World Poll, which covers 95% of the world’s population. Nonetheless, the indicator is already being used by several NSOs, including those in Africa that are part of the SHaSA process. The indicator could be packaged into household, victimisation or national polling surveys. |  | The "crime reporting rate" - 16.3.1 - is a useful indicator. Nonetheless, it is restricted to the criminal justice system and so does not measure the broader conception of justice that member states agreed to in Goal 16 and this target. As such, we would recommend moving 16.3.1 to target 16a, where a very similar version already sits, given that it is an excellent proxy for people's faith in security institutions, and therefore their capacity. Alongside the green indicator for 16.3 on detention rates (NB. an indicator that is dangerous to use on its own), we would therefore recommend that "promotion of those who have experienced a dispute..." is used. This indicator has been backed by a wide group of experts, including NSOs, through the UN Virtual Network on Goal 16. In addition, the "Percentage of people who voice confidence in the judicial system" is also a useful indicator. This perception indicator gathers people’s views on the judicial system – and is potentially a proxy of their confidence in the rule of law more widely (making it also useful for 16.6. 16.7 and 16b). When used alongside other measures of justice, perception indicators can provide a validation of whether people believe that the justice system is fair and effective. Data on this indicator already exists in the Gallup World Poll, which could be used for global baselines, and it could be easily added to household surveys or national polls. | This is a strong indicator which directly captures a key component of the target. While the methodology can still be refined, Global Financial Integrity has shown how it can be used and have collected data over several years. The accuracy of this data is still debated (as is the case with many different issues that IAEG has selected indicators for). As such, we would recommend that the IAEG retains the indicator but that an expert group is created in order to refine methodologies, with a mandate of one year to return to the IAEG with a recommendation for consideration. | Indicator 16.5.1 is widely used, by both NSOs and research organisations. It has been repeatedly tried and tested across numerous contexts and at global level. UNODC has recommended its use and advised NSOs on the methodology underpinning it. As many IAEG members sought to argue in Bangkok, this indicator should be green. It would be very challenging to create an indicator which includes private sector corruption. While the wording of indicator 16.5.1 could be changed, it would still essentially be two indicators. So we would advise against this. There are, however, options for additional indicators to measure corruption, specifically in the private sector. A perception or experiential survey question could be formed on this issue, e.g. "percentage of people who believe corruption is a pervasive issue in the private sector" or "percentage of people who have paid a bribe, or been asked for a bribe, by a representative of the private sector." | Indicator 16.7.2 is not relevant to the target and it is a poor indicator either way. We strongly recommend dropping the indicator, as was discussed by the IAEG in Bangkok. "Turn-out as a share of voting-age population ..." (alternative 1) is a reasonable indicator but only relevant to democracies and countries where voting is not obligatory. "Proportion of public service positions... " (alternative 3) is already largely dealt with in the green indicator for this target, i.e. representativeness is already being measured. The specific issue of women's representation is also already largely addressed in Goal 5 (target 5.4). "Percentage of population who believe decision-making ..."(alternative 2) is the strongest alternative indicator but remains somewhat undefined. We would suggest, instead, that the IAEG use more precise language: "Percentage of population who believe they can influence policy-making in their country" This perception indicator would reflect people’s views on the essence of the target and is potentially the optimal way to measure feelings of responsiveness and inclusiveness as it relates to decision-making. While there are currently no known global data sources for this indicator, it would be feasible to add it into existing national polls or household surveys. The indicator might require that survey questions outline or define the different types of policy-making processes to which the question applies. | We believe that indicator 16.10.1 is a strong indicator and should be retained. It will be important that a multilateral body or independent third parties – rather than official government bodies – are responsible for gathering data for this indicator. It is clear that specialised UN agencies believe they already have the data and capacity to monitoring this indicator. We would propose the addition of a survey-based indicator in order to round 16.10.1 off (for issues of governance, human rights, justice, etc, best practice suggests using baskets of complimentary indicators). We would propose the IAEG add the "Percentage of people who feel that they can express political views without fear." Freedom of expression is a fundamental freedom. The Gallup World Poll collected data on this indicator across many countries in the past, demonstrating its feasibility. Alternatively, in order to focus more on behaviours, a variant of this indicator would measure the "percentage of people who feel free to join any political organisation they want" (Afro-barometer currently collects data on this indicator). Political restrictions could obstruct efforts to gather data for either indicator in some contexts: if people already fear expressing political views, some may be less likely to respond honestly to polling or other forms of survey. As such, it would be crucial that those conducting surveys are – and are perceived to be - independent of the state. | We believe indicator 16.a.1 should be slightly modified to reflect the crime reporting rate indicator suggested for indicator 16.3 (i.e. replace with 16.3.1). We think that this would be a fairly robust proxy for confidence in security services, itself a proxy for capacity. This indicator is already used. We would also suggest that people's feelings of safety (16.1.4, above) could be placed under this target, although as explained above it would have relevance to many targets across the SDGs. It can be used straight away. However, more work will need to be done on this target. We would suggest that the Praia Group is given the task of exploring alternatives. The g7+ group of 20 conflict-affected and self-defined fragile states have identified three indicators on security forces capacity which may merit consideration by the IAEG or the Praia Group. These are: Measure 7) Presence of police and state security across the territory Measure 8) Frequency of payment of salaries within police force Measure 9) Quality of human resources within police force While the g7+ have made only limited progress in gathering data for these indicators, it could be worthwhile exploring them in more detail. |
| Save the Children |  |  | Save the Children RETAIN INDICATOR We consider this to be an indicator that reflects a key aspect of the change required in order to achieve target 16.2. The indicator is universally relevant and addresses the critical need for systematic data collection on sexual violence against girls and boys – a widespread, though often inconsistently measured and reported, issue. Already, there are existing tools and mechanisms for data collection that countries have implemented to monitor the situation with regards to this indicator. For example, household surveys such as DHS have been collecting data on this indicator in low- and middle-income countries since the late 1990s and fully comparable data is available for approximately 50 low- and middle-income countries. |  |  | Save the Children RETAIN INDICATOR Save the Children supports the current indicator as the best option to measure changes in corruption by using the proxy of reported experiences of bribery. It is universally relevant and speaks to an individual’s experience of corruption and bribery in everyday life, including while accessing essential public services. This indicator can be measured through population-based surveys that are increasingly being used to measure the experience of corruption. UNODC collects prevalence data on bribery through the annual data collection UN-CTS. A number of non-state actors also collect data on corruption and bribery. Transparency International, for example, measures corruption through its Corruption Perceptions Index and its Global Corruption Barometer (www.transparency.org/research/). The reference to ‘persons’ in the suggested indicator must include children. Children come in contact with public service providers on a daily basis and encounter corruption and bribery. To ensure that the population-based surveys used to measure this indictor capture the experiences of all, it is important that the experiences of children, as far as possible and taking their evolving capacities into account, are collected directly from them. There are methodologies and tools developed at national, regional and international levels to capture children’s perceptions on the realization of their rights. For example, the Centre for Children’s Rights at Queen’s University in Belfast, in collaboration with Save the Children, Plan International and a wide range of other organizations, has developed a methodology and tools to capture children’s views on transparent, participatory and accountable public spending to realize children’s rights (www.childrightsconnect.org/govtspendingsurvey/). | Save the Children RETAIN INDICATOR 16.7.2 and ADD alternative proposal 2: percentage of population who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive - this should be disaggregated by all of the groups set out in target 17.18. The indicator 16.7.2 above, together with the suggested indicator rated ‘green’ for this target on the proportion of positions in public institutions compared to national distribution, have a strong focus on measuring to what extent decision-making is representative. However, the suggested two indicators will not measure the extent to which decision-making is responsive, participatory and inclusive. We therefore suggest the addition of alternative proposal 2, disaggregated by all of the groups set out in target 17.18. This indicator, which was originally proposed by the UN Statistical Commission in February, would reflect the important elements of ‘inclusive’, ‘responsive’ and ‘participatory’ in the target that would otherwise not be measured. It would be universally relevant and in line with a growing consensus that public participation is an essential component of governance processes. The indicator should track adults’ and children’s involvement in public decision-making at all levels, including local and national levels. It would be feasible to track this indicator through perception-based surveys. Children, who constitute more than 30% of the world's population, have a right to be involved in public decision-making. Their participation in public decision-making can also assist governments to design more accurate and relevant interventions for children and allocate resources more effectively. In view of this, the indicator should track to what extent children believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive. There are methodologies and tools developed to capture children’s perceptions on the realization of their rights. | Save the Children REVISE + ADD INDICATOR [ADD] Existence and implementation of constitutional and statutory guarantees for public access to information [ADD] Extent to which the rights to freedom of expression, association and peaceful assembly are guaranteed in law and practice The suggested indicator captures important elements related to protection of fundamental freedoms. However, it does not measure the realization of internationally agreed standards on the right to expression, association and peaceful assembly in less extreme situations and it will not track progress on access to information. For example, civil society, journalists, associated media personnel and human rights advocates could face serious challenges in relation to fundamental freedoms, including harassment, difficulties in registering civil society organizations and securing funding for human rights activities without being killed, kidnapped, detained or tortured. The two suggested indicators would cover the key aspects of the change we want to see to achieve target 16.10, focusing on both the legal guarantees and to what extent these legal guarantees have been translated into practice. These indicators are universally relevant. The legal guarantees of these rights could, for example, be tracked by information emanating from UN Human Rights Mechanisms while how these fundamental freedoms are guaranteed in practice could be measured through perception-based surveys. Population-based surveys need to be designed in such a way that they capture the views of all people. Children, who constitute more than 30% of the world’s population, are, for example, often not included in these kinds of surveys. Without capturing the perceptions of all people, including children, the picture will not be complete. There are methodologies and tools developed to capture children’s perceptions on the realization of their rights (for further information see target 16.5 above). |  |
| Sightsavers | 16.1.2 Sightsavers comments: We recommend disaggregating by disability. It would read as: Conflict-related deaths per 100,000 people (disaggregated by age, sex, disability and cause). |  |  |  |  | 16.5.1 Sightsavers comments: We recommend disaggregating by disability. It would read as: 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, disability, region and population group. |  |  | 16.a.1 Sightsavers comments: We recommend disaggregating by disability. It would read as: Percentage of victims who report physical and/or sexual crime to law enforcement agencies during past 12 months (Disaggregated by age, sex, disability, region and population group) |
| Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN) | SDSN comments: SDSN strongly supports this indicator, as it is very relevant to the target. In order to register global progress in achieving peace it is crucial to have some basic measure of frequency and intensity of armed conflict. Measuring death from armed conflicts is methodological feasible. There are standardized approached to measuring direct death at the global and national levels. Estimates of conflict-related deaths are produced at international level: conflict death databases include the IISS Armed Conflict Database, the Armed Conflict Location and Event Database, the Correlates of War Project, the UCDP Battle-Related Deaths Dataset, and WHO estimates of deaths by cause. Data from these sources, though they may vary on estimates, exist for all major (>1000 battle deaths) and minor (>25 battle deaths per year) conflicts since 1945 (see UCDP). The Global Burden of Armed Violence (Geneva Declaration) compares and collects conflict-related deaths from multiple sources. Even though the statistical system has still to agree on a standardized system of measurement, several approaches to measure conflict death already exist. We recommend to include this indicator in the framework (tier 3) and to work on a common methodology. | SDSN comments: SDSN supports this indicator. It reflects the purpose of the target and also helps measure 11.7.1. on safe public spaces. A methodology is available and data is currently already collected through national and international surveys. This includes the Gallup World Survey and the International Crime Victimization Survey (ICVS), which has been conducted in approximately 80 countries worldwide. |  |  | SDSN comments: We support this indicator. Several approaches to measure illicit financial flows already exist. Another valuable indicator for this target is "Disclosure of Natural Resource Rights Holdings." This indicator measures whether resource-based rights and registry of rights holders between governments and business, including contracts and licenses relating to extractive resource exploration and production, as well as agriculture and forestry operations, are published in a timely manner. Disclosure of rights and rights holders is an essential precondition to ensuring that all parties benefit from large-scale resource investments. Secrecy can be a convenient way to hide corruption, power imbalances, incompetence, and mismanagement Disclosure is also a necessary precursor for the coordinated and effective management of the sector by government agencies. It also allows citizens to monitor rights in areas such as environmental compliance and the fulfillment of social commitments. Contract and rights transparency also provides incentives: government officials can be deterred from seeking their own interests over the population’s and, over time, governments can also increase their bargaining power by gauging contracts from around the world. | SDSN comments: This indicator provides solid information on the experience of bribery, typically occurring in the interaction between people/businesses and the public sector in the context of basic service delivery/transactions. This indicator can be measured through Household corruption surveys and victimization surveys with a module on bribery. However this indicator only describes low-level corruption. To address high-level corruption, we suggest the "Disclosure of Natural Resource Rights Holdings" indicator described under Target 16.4 or using the Transparency International metric "Perception of public sector corruption." The Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) ranks countries based on how corrupt their public sector (administrative and political) is perceived to be. It is a composite perception-based index drawing on corruption-related data collected by a variety of reputable institutions. The CPI reflects the views of observers from around the world, including experts living and working in the countries and territories evaluated. Transparency International publishes annual reports covering 177 countries with some 20 years of historic data. | SDSN comments: we agree that the proposed indicator does not make sense. In an effort to reduce the overall number of indicators and encourage multi-purpose indicators, SDSN proposes using the indicator from Goal 5: "Proportion of seats held by women in national parliaments and local governments." This indicator helps track inclusive and representative decision-making. | SDSN comments: SDSN supports this indicator and notes that data is available from multiple sources, including UNESCO, Human Rights Institutions and NGOs, associations of journalists, etc. In addition, it is vital to measure policies on access to information. We recommend "Existence and implementation of a national law and/or constitutional guarantee on the right to information." This indicator helps assess whether a country has a legal or policy framework that protects and promotes access to information. Public access to information helps ensure institutional accountability and transparency. It is important to measure both the existence of such a framework and its implementation, as good laws may exist but they may not be enforced. This can be simply due to a lack of capacity, more systematic institutional resistance, or a culture of secrecy or corruption. Furthermore, exceptions or contradictory laws, such as government secrecy regulations, can erode these guarantees. | SDSN comments: In order to reduce the number of overall indicators, we would recommend using the multipurpose indicator already included under Goal 5. |
| Task Team on CSO Development Effectiveness and Enabling Environment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Task Team on CSO Development Effectiveness and Enabling Environment comments: The original target proposed is too narrow as it does not adequately reflect the access to information and fundamental freedoms target. The current indicator masks the spectrum of ways in which for example civil society organisations (CSOs) are currently experiencing threats to their operations and existence. The Task Team would fully support the creation of an additional indicator for the “fundamental freedoms” component. This could be as per the previous consultation's suggestion of the US: “(a) Number of times in which UN Special Rapporteurs report violations of fundamental freedoms, including freedoms of association, expression, and assembly, (b) Percentage of recommendations to strengthen fundamental freedoms – including freedom of association, assembly and expression – that were implemented, as identified through the UN Human Rights Council Universal Periodic Review, (c) Perception of the public and of civil society organizations on whether they can pursue issues of interest, including human rights and governance, in the public arena without fear of government retribution. (Surveys/polls; Disaggregated by age, sex, gender), (d) Adoption and implementation of access to information laws and regulations and the number and percentage of requests for information fulfilled in the past 12 months (though it is difficult to measure), (e) Existence of enabling laws, policies and practices with regard to the freedoms of expression, association and assembly.” Alternatively, this indicator could be as per Canada's previous suggestion: “(a) Presence of legislative framework that protects fundamental freedoms and recourse mechanism when they are violated; (b) length of time to participate in recourse mechanism, (c) percentage of public access to government information request that are accepted or denied.” At minimum, the Task Team would like to see a modification of the original indicator such as the suggestion of the US: “Number of reported cases of killing, kidnapping, enforced disappearance, arbitrary detention, arbitrary blocking or shutting down of activities, and torture of journalists, associated media personnel, trade unionists, staff of civil society organizations, and human rights or governance advocates in the previous 12 months.” Recognizing that it is not in the grey indicator category, the The Task Team reiterates the position in its Oct. 23 letter to the IAEG recommending that an indicator reflecting CSO engagement and the enabling environment for such engagement is needed under target 17.17. This position reflects that of other stakeholders that the current indicator for target 17.17 is too narrow as it does not capture the dimension related to the effectiveness of partnerships with CSOs. Such an indicator would respond to the concerns previously raised by the African member states in the IAEG that the indicator needs to reflect partnerships with civil society. It is also in the spirit of the proposal previously made by the UK to include a CSO enabling environment indicator under target 17.17. Therefore the Task Team could support the development of a complementary alternative indicator, specifically: “Number of criteria met by the country in the “Civil Society Organisations Enabling Environment Assessment”. |  |
| Tax Justice Network |  |  |  |  | Target (16.4) calls for the SDGs to significantly reduce illicit financial flows (IFFs). Too few researchers agree on an appropriate methodology and data sources by which to estimate IFFs. Without this important consensus there is a danger of insufficient progress towards the target. There are important implications for the SDG indicator which are summarised here; there also follows (see below) a recommendation for the 16.4 indicator: Implications: • A fully resourced, time-limited process is needed to bring together existing expertise in order to establish priorities for additional data, and a higher degree of consensus on methodology, so that by 2017 at the latest consistent IFF estimates (in current US$) will be available; • Estimates of IFF are just that - estimates. As such they lack both certainty and the detailed analysis necessary to support national policy decisions. A measurement of the financial secrecy to which countries are exposed in their bilateral economic and financial relationships would provide a substantially more rigorous indicator. One such indicator which would provide the necessary granularity to IFF analysis is the Financial Secrecy Index (FSI) published by Tax Justice Network. Since 2009 the FSI has ranked jurisdictions according to their secrecy and the scale of their offshore financial activities. As a politically neutral ranking, it is a tool for understanding global financial secrecy, tax havens or secrecy jurisdictions, and illicit financial flows or capital flight. Crucially, for SDG monitoring processes the FSI tool is tested and well placed to be immediately available for assessment, evaluation and operation. As the SDG indicators are required now, attempts to design or improve data and methodologies, by necessity, should be resourced in a strictly time-limited process. Financial secrecy is an essential feature of, and central to, free flowing of illicit finance. Financial Secrecy is a concept which is at the heart of illicit financial flows. An estimated $21 to $32 trillion of private financial wealth is located, untaxed or lightly taxed, in secrecy jurisdictions around the world. Secrecy jurisdictions use secrecy to attract illicit and illegitimate or abusive financial flows. Illicit cross-border financial flows have been estimated at $1-1.6 trillion per year: dwarfing the US$135 billion or so in global foreign aid. Since the 1970s African countries alone have lost over $1 trillion in capital flight, while combined external debts are less than $200 billion. So Africa is a major net creditor to the world - but its assets are in the hands of a wealthy élites, protected by offshore secrecy; while the debts are shouldered by broad African populations. The FSI is uniquely powerful as a measure of financial secrecy. It takes 204 criteria of which 46 are employed in the FSI database to construct 15 different secrecy indicators (KFSIs).The choice of indicators is necessarily subjective – but an objective list does not exist, and never will. The Financial Secrecy Index produces the next best thing: a list that is plausible, comprehensive, transparent and as short as possible. FSI indicators are designed to provide clear pointers for policy change to help jurisdictions become more transparent. The Financial Secrecy index has received enormous global recognition and gained international credibility for its ability to support understanding of the risks and vulnerabilities created for jurisdictions by illicit finance. By example, the 2015 report of the Economic Commission for Africa’s High Level Panel on Illicit Flows out of Africa, chaired by H.E. Thabo Mbeki, including the first major publication of a pioneering analysis of illicit financial flow (IFF) risk, which by combining FSI secrecy scores with bilateral data on trade, investment and banking stocks and flows, establishes the relative IFF vulnerability in each area. www.uneca.org/sites/default/files/PublicationFiles/iff\_main\_report\_26feb\_en.pdf Recommendation: There is limited time until the SDG indicators must be finalised. Consideration should be given to the establishment of a 16.4 indicator which recognises and adopts the Financial Secrecy Index as a tested and effective method of monitoring year on year reduction of illicit financial flows and through the measurement of jurisdictional secrecy. (Tax Justice Network) |  |  |  |  |
| Tax Justice Network |  |  |  |  | Alex Cobham (Tax Justice Network/King's College London) comments: At present, there is great consensus on a target to reduce illicit financial flows, but a lack of consensus on an appropriate methodology and data sources by which to estimate them (and hence to ensure progress). There are important implications for the SDG indicator, set out below. To summarise: \* a fully resourced, time-limited process is needed to bring together existing expertise in order to establish priorities for additional data, and a higher degree of consensus on methodology, so that by 2017 at the latest consistent IFF estimates (in current US$) will be available; and \* recognising that even the best such estimates will inevitably have a substantial degree of uncertainty, and are likely also to lack the granularity necessary to support national policy decisions, additional indicators should be adopted immediately which proxy for the risk of IFF and provide that granularity - specifically, by measuring the financial secrecy that countries are exposed to in their bilateral economic and financial relationships. Illicit flows are, by definition, hidden. As such, most approaches rely on estimation on the basis of anomalies in existing data (including on trade, capital accounts, international assets and liabilities, and of the location of real activity and taxable profits of multinational corporations). Almost inevitably then, any estimate is likely to reflect data weaknesses as well as anomalies that result from illicit flows - so that one necessary response is to address the extent and quality of available economic and financial data, especially on bilateral stocks and flows. In addition, there is no consensus on appropriate methodologies - despite leading work by many civil society organisations, and growing attention from academic researchers. In part, this reflects the failure of international organisations to engage in research here - a failure which should be rectified with some urgency, as part of the second necessary response which is to mobilise a sustained research effort with the aim of reaching greater consensus on high quality methodologies to estimate illicit financial flows. Since the SDG indicators are needed almost immediately, the efforts to improve data and methodologies should be resourced in a strictly time-limited process, ideally under the auspices of a leading international organisation but recognising that the expertise resides with civil society (primarily among members of the Financial Transparency Coalition) and in academia, so that the process must be fully inclusive. The results of this process are unlikely to be available before 2017. In addition, it must be recognised that the eventual estimates of illicit financial flows (IFF) will not be free of uncertainty. Moreover, individual IFF types (e.g. tax evasion or money-laundering) do not map onto individual channels (e.g. trade mispricing or non-declaration of offshore assets), so that overall IFF estimates - however good - will not immediately support granular policy responses. The SDG indicators should therefore include, starting immediately, a set of measures of risk. Since IFF are defined by being hidden, measures of financial secrecy therefore provide the appropriate proxies. The stronger a countries' trade or investment relationship with secrecy jurisdictions ('tax havens'), the greater the risk of hidden, illicit components. For example, there is more risk in trading commodities with Switzerland than with Germany; and less risk in accepting direct investment from France than from Luxembourg. The Tax Justice Network publishes the major ranking of secrecy jurisdictions, the Financial Secrecy Index (FSI, http://www.financialsecrecyindex.com ) every two years. This combines measures of financial scale with 15 key indicators of secrecy, in a range of areas relevant across the horizon of IFFs. The African Union/Economic Commission for Africa High Level Panel on Illicit Flows out of Africa, chaired by H.E. Thabo Mbeki, published pioneering work using the FSI to establish indicators of vulnerability for each African country, separately for trade, investment and banking relationships. http://uncounted.org/2015/02/02/mbeki-panel-showcases-new-risk-based-illicit-flows-approach/ In addition, each country and jurisdiction should be asked to publish the following information annually, in order to track consistently the contribution of each to financial secrecy affecting others: i. the proportion and absolute volume of domestically-established legal persons and arrangements (companies, trusts and foundations) for which beneficial ownership information is not publicly available; ii. the proportion and absolute volume of cross-border trade and investment relationships with other jurisdictions for which there is no bilateral, automatic exchange of tax information; and iii. the proportion and absolute volume of domestically-headquartered multinational companies that do not report publicly on a country-by-country basis. These indicators map to three proposed IFF targets which are estimated to have very high benefit-cost ratios: see http://www.copenhagenconsensus.com/publication/post-2015-consensus-iff-assessment-cobham. By prioritising the suggestions made here, the SDG process can make a great contribution to both the analysis and the curtailment of IFFs. |  |  |  |  |
| Terre des Hommes Netherlands | Netherlands: Change 'conflict' into 'physical, sexual en psychological violence' to include other forms of harm. |  | Netherlands: This is a very important indicator |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The African Child Policy Forum |  |  | In order to promote a coherent approach to data collection for 16.2 that reflects the scope of the target, it is strongly requested that this indicator is included as the second indicator for 16.2. It reflects a key aspect of the change in violence that boys and girls face, in its multiple forms we want to observe in order to achieve target 16.2. It is universally relevant and sexual violence has recently been high on political agendas. It addresses the critical need for systematic data collection on sexual violence against girls and boys – a widespread though often inconsistently measured and reported issue. There are existing tools and mechanisms for data collection that countries have implemented to monitor the situation with regards to this indicator. Household surveys such as DHS have been collecting data on this indicator in low- and middle-income countries since the late 1990s. Fully comparable data is available for some 50 low- and middle-income countries. The indicator on human trafficking (Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age and form of exploitation) currently proposed under 16.2 and coded green is not child specific; it would be better placed under SDG 10.7 where it is also listed and has a stronger and more appropriate match. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The African Child Policy Forum (ACPF) |  |  | In order to promote a coherent approach to data collection for 16.2 that reflects the scope of the target, it is strongly requested that this indicator is included as the second indicator for 16.2. It reflects a key aspect of the change in violence that boys and girls face, in its multiple forms we want to observe in order to achieve target 16.2. It is universally relevant and sexual violence has recently been high on political agendas. It addresses the critical need for systematic data collection on sexual violence against girls and boys – a widespread though often inconsistently measured and reported issue. There are existing tools and mechanisms for data collection that countries have implemented to monitor the situation with regards to this indicator. Household surveys such as DHS have been collecting data on this indicator in low- and middle-income countries since the late 1990s. Fully comparable data is available for some 50 low- and middle-income countries. The indicator on human trafficking (Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age and form of exploitation) currently proposed under 16.2 and coded green is not child specific; it would be better placed under SDG 10.7 where it is also listed and has a stronger and more appropriate match. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The Danish Family Planning Association |  |  | Percentage of young women and men aged 18-24 years who experienced sexual violence by age 15 and by age 18, and by perpetrator • This indicator should be supported as the only one in the current SDGs framework addressing sexual violence against children and adolescents under 15, given its widespread occurrence worldwide with devastating and long-term consequences—with girls being the majority of victims/survivors. It is recommended by the UN Chief Statisticians and available in the UNICEF database, with metadata submission available on the IAEG website. • Note that indicator 5.5.2 will only measure sexual violence against girls since age 15, excluding those under 15 – even though girls under 16 are estimated to be roughly half of all sexual assaults globally. • Disaggregation by age sub-groups, or at a minimum, ‘by age 15’, is therefore strongly recommended – including since effective policies and interventions require tailored approaches to particular age groups and other characteristics: Data is available by age, as well as marital status, place of residence and income quintiles. |  |  |  |  |  | We recommend an additional higher-level indicator for which data is available as follows: “Existence of an independent National Human Rights Institution in compliance with the Paris Principles”. |
| The Hunger Project |  |  |  |  | Would be even more useful to measure the proportion of inward and outward illicit financial flows to the total revenue of a country, region, etc. |  |  |  |  |
| The International Legal Foundation |  |  |  | As an international non-governmental organization with recognized expertise in strengthening access to justice in post-conflict and transitional countries by building effective legal aid institutions, the International Legal Foundation (ILF) welcomes the opportunity to provide feedback to the IAEG-SDG Members on the proposed SDG indicators coded grey, specifically target 16.3. 1. Comments on the Current and Alternative Draft Indicator 16.3.1 The ILF believes that the current draft indicator 16.3.1 should be replaced with the alternative draft indicator 16.3.1, "Proportion of those who have experienced a dispute in the past 12 months who have accessed a formal, informal, alternative or traditional dispute resolution mechanism and who feel the process was just." The current draft indicator 16.3.1, "Percentage of victims of violence in the previous 12 months who reported their victimization to competent authorities or other officially recognized conflict resolution mechanisms," is (1) redundant of proposed indicator 16.a.1, (2) is limited to criminal justice, and fails to address important civil access to justice issues that are critical to target 16.3 and the other SDGs both generally and specifically, and (3) is too narrowly focused, given the broad definition of “access to justice,” and the fact that there will only be 2-3 indicators per target. 2. NEW Proposed Indicator 16.3.3 or Proposed Amendment to Draft Indicator 16.3.1 Recognizing the importance of access to legal assistance in ensuring access to justice, as well as many other SDG targets, the ILF proposes inclusion of the following global indicator, in addition to the proposed alternative indicator 16.3.1: 16.3.3: "Proportion of those who have been accused of a criminal offense, are a victim or witness in a criminal case, or who are a party to a civil or administrative case, who accessed legal assistance." This indicator is intended to be broad enough to encompass criminal, civil, and administrative matters, as well as a range of legal assistance, including access to both lawyers and non-lawyers (for example paralegals and clinical students), and self-help and community education. It is also intended to be broad enough to provide States room to design, measure, and report on legal assistance systems that work best in their particular contexts. Further, the ability to access legal assistance impacts the ability to access every other right implicated in the SDGs and beyond, and so an access to legal assistance indicator would be cross-cutting with other goals and targets, and make the entire indicator framework more efficient and revelatory. Alternatively, the new proposed indicator could be combined with draft alternate indicator 16.3.1: "The proportion of those who have experienced a dispute in the past 12 months who have accessed a formal, informal, alternative, or traditional dispute resolution mechanism, who had access to legal assistance, and who feel the mechanism was just." (Disaggregated by age, sex, gender, income, type of dispute (criminal, civil, administrative), type of legal assistance (attorney, non-attorney legal professional), source of legal assistance (self-funded, State-funded, NGO-funded), type of resolution mechanism (formal, informal, alternative, traditional)). The ability to access counsel or other legal assistance is the most significant measure of inequality between the poor and those with means. Those individuals or entities who can afford to hire counsel will do so, recognizing that any layperson is ill-equipped to efficiently and effectively navigate justice systems or dispute resolution mechanisms. On a yet more significant scale, there is systemic, institutional inequality in every criminal justice system that has the State’s interests represented by a well-resourced, well-trained prosecutor, but leaves poor and vulnerable defendants with no access to meaningful, quality legal assistance. Every day millions of poor and marginalized persons face arbitrary and extended pretrial detention, torture, coerced confessions, and wrongful convictions. In addition, in many countries, poor people face civil legal problems without access to legal assistance and, as a result, may be left homeless, jobless, destitute, without food, and in need of medical care. Critical to the aims of the SDGs, without access to legal assistance in these disputes, the poor and vulnerable sink ever deeper into poverty. Finally, access to legal assistance is easily measurable, either through administrative data from local and international institutions, field data, document review, expert surveys, or public perception surveys. Many States already measure access to justice and access to legal assistance. For example, the government of Nepal—one of the poorest countries in the world—measures and reports statistics on its court systems and access to legal aid services in its annual Supreme Court reports. The United Nations has previously addressed access to justice through its Rule of Law Indicators, United Nations, Rule of Law Indicators, 2011, which include: (49) availability of free legal assistance for indigent defendants, & (71) legal assistance for children in conflict with the law. Further, civil society organizations working in the rule of law and access to justice development fields have measured access to justice in context-specific ways. The most extensive of these is the World Justice Project’s Rule of Law Index, which includes indicators on access to legal assistance for both civil cases (Factor 7.1) & criminal cases (Factor 8.7). The recently launched UNDP and UNODC Global Study on Legal Aid will also be a catalyst and resource for countries to look critically at their legal aid systems, existing data, and gaps. The ILF appreciates the opportunity to offer these short comments to the IAEG-SDG. We very much hope there will be a continuing dialogue on this important subject. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Together for Girls |  |  | Together for Girls Secretariat in the U.S. comments that we are in agreement with the Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Violence against Children that alongside the “green” indicator already foreseen under target 16.2 (related to the percentage of children who experienced any "physical punishment and/or psychological aggression") it is crucial to ensure that all three major forms of violence that affect girls and boys in childhood are being measured. In order to ensure this and to promote a coherent approach to data collection for 16.2 that reflects the scope of the target, we strongly request that this indicator on sexual violence be included for 16.2 as a "green" indicator. The addition of indicator 16.2.3 will ensure that along with the indicator on physical and psychological violence, the indicators for 16.2 will help us comprehensively measure and monitor progress towards ending all forms of violence against all children. 16.2.3 is universally relevant and sexual violence is increasingly recognized in political and public forums as a major problem requiring attention and work. It addresses the critical need for systematic data collection on sexual violence against girls and boys – a widespread though often inconsistently measured and reported issue. There are existing tools and mechanisms for data collection that countries have implemented to monitor the situation with regards to this indicator. Data collected by Together for Girls through the Violence Against Children Survey (VACS) demonstrate both the feasibility and necessity of collecting data on this indicator. The VACS provides robust quantitative data at the national level that is providing a platform for action. Eight countries have launched data and are currently working on or implementing nationally-led prevention and response efforts, and by the end of 2017 data will be available for as many as 18 countries. Household surveys such as DHS have been collecting data on sexual violence among girls and women aged 15-49 in low- and middle-income countries since the late 1990s. Internationally, an increasing level of data allows us to compare rates across countries. This indicator will allow us to have fully comparable data in this important area. Data from the VACS reveals high rates of sexual violence against both boys and girls. Studies also demonstrate how deeply experiences of sexual violence are linked with other issues under the SDGs; sexual violence is linked to a constellation of poor mental and physical health outcomes and HIV risk behaviors related to these experiences of violence, as well as association with future experiences of or perpetration of violence. In order to measure progress towards achievement of 16.2, along with other related targets, we urge that this indicator be included as "green". |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transparency International |  |  |  | on rule of law and access to justice: the green indicator (on pre-trial detention rate) and the grey indicator (on crime reporting rate) refer both only to criminal justice. Therefore, crucial elements of the rule of law and access to justice are not measured by both indicators. We therefore suggest to replace the grey indicator by the following: “Proportion of those who have experienced a dispute in the past 12 months who have accessed a formal, informal, alternative or traditional dispute resolution mechanism and who feel it was just“ (to be measured through household survey. Data is already available for 107 countries (Ref. “UNDP et al.: “Goal 16: The indicators we want”; Virtual Network Sourcebook on Measuring Peace, Justice and Effective Institutions”) |  | Transparency International: The indicator that is the best option for what is currently presented by the IAEG and other members to date. There is a strong body of data captured over time and across more than 100 countries (this is often captured by third-party data producers under rigorous statistical methods). The indicator also is useful for measuring changes in corruption by using the proxy of reported experiences of bribery and has strong correlations with development outcomes related to the other SDGs . For this reason, TI recommends: Percentage of persons who had at least one contact with a public official, who paid a bribe to a public official in the last twelve months. Still clarifications would be needed for who is being defined as ‘person’ (to include children) and ‘public official’. In addition, TI would recommend a secondary indicator to compliment the first indicator if additional data sets were to be collected: % of national-level parliamentarians (and perhaps top level members of the executive) whose assets, income and interest declarations are publicly accessible online at sufficient level of detail, in timely manner and in machine-readable data formats Here is the rational: • It is a foundational marker of a strong culture of public accountability, in which citizens are entitled and able to inspect whether their representatives and senior public executives are compromised in their independence when exercising the powers they are intrusted with • It sets a sufficiently high ambition and represents a step change in government-citizen relationships. It also captures the dynamic of private sector corruption. • It speaks to the much broader band of corruption issue referenced by SDG 16.5 than just bribery and acts as a viable red flag for the underlying systemic deficiencies and compromised decision-processes that underpin policy capture, conflicted policy-design and illicit enrichment; • It can serve as set of super-indicators since it not only covers SDG 16.5 (corruption) but also helps trace essential pre-requisites for the accountability and transparency dimension of SDG 16.6 and the responsiveness and inclusiveness of decision-making of target 16.7. • Is is NOT unproductively divided along North/South lines with both industrialised countries and DCs among the good and bad performers • It offers tangible, meaningful targets and progress tracking and holds the promise of widespread support and public traction – TI Mexico’s ongoing Tres-de-Tres initiative that asks candidates for political office to disclose assets, income and interests, for example has been very well received by civil society, office-holders and the broader public. • It is eminently and flexibly actionable, since it can for example be mandated through national legislation • The best empirical cross-country evidence available suggests that public disclosure of assets and income is closely associated with better governance and less corruption. • It helps not only in tracking SDG targets, but also generates a foundational data layer with essential building block for lots of important anti-corruption diagnostics from following-the-money to scanning for collusive public procurement, from life-style monitoring exercises to important research on rent-seeking, revolving door premiums etc.[3] • The required data is extremely cheap and relatively easy to collect and verify compared to other suggested SDG indicators, due to its focus on online public disclosure and existing initiatives such as the World Bank’s Financial Disclosure Law Library • It is eminently expandable and scalable and can from its core focus on national legislators be expanded to senior office-holders in the executive and judiciary, to sub-national institutions at state and local level. UNCAC monitoring is useful but it would be difficult to show implementation of the commitments across the broader body of commitments under the convention given the rotational nature of UNCAC monitoring. For a complimentary business indicator on corruption: Target 16.5 – Indicator 16.5.2 („Businesses“, as requested in the Consultation): 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. Number of business that paid a bribe to, or were asked to pay a bribe by, (potential) business partners during the last 12 months as a percentage of all surveyed businesses. Disaggregate by sector, company size, company origin and country of doing business. Transparency International has monitored such indicators before through its Bribe Payer's Index: http://www.transparency.org/bpi2011 Survey method: 3,016 business executives were surveyed across 30 countries around the world. A minimum of 100 people were surveyed in each country with the exception of China where 82 interviews were achieved during the fieldwork period. The surveyed countries replicated the survey sample of 26 countries from the 2008 Bribe Payers Survey and added an additional four countries with high levels of trade and investment inflows. |  |  |  |
| Transparency, Accountability, Participation (TAP) Network | The TAP Network believes that this is a strong indicator and captures the impact of conflict, which is key to the whole goal 16 and indeed Agenda 2030 more generally. There are increasingly standardized approaches to measuring direct deaths: Direct deaths are also described as “battle-related deaths” and involve combatants and civilians violently killed in “normal” warfare. They are counted on the basis of registered incidents from hospitals, morgues, news reports, and human rights groups. While more difficult to measure, significantly more civilians die indirectly during and after wars - for example due to disease linked to displacement- and are routinely unaccounted for. Excess deaths linked to conflict are frequently estimated based on probabilistic sampling and scientifically rigorous household surveys, surveillance and multiple systems estimation in war-affected area. The use of data from other indicators in other goals with thus be crucial. We would urge for IAEG to organize a working group or ask the Praia City Group to focus on this, with deadlines for when methodology is agreed upon. | The TAP Network strongly supports this indicator put forward by the African Group. This perception indicator is a direct measure of people’s sense of security and freedom from fear, underpinning the target and the aspiration of the wider goal. Its strength also comes from the fact that when disaggregated it will be useful for a range of targets. The indicator could also be put in target 16a. The indicator is already being used by several NSOs, including those in Africa that are part of the SHaSA process. The indicator could be easily packaged into household, victimisation or national polling surveys. Global data for this indicator could be drawn from Gallup’s annual World Poll, which covers 95% of the world’s population. When disaggregated by urban/rural, age, sex, the indicator can be used for targets 5.2, 10.2, 10.3, 11.1, 11.2, 11.7, 16.2. | The TAP Network supports this indicator, and it is strongly requested that this indicator is included as the second indicator for 16.2. It reflects a key aspect of the change in violence that boys and girls face, in its multiple forms we want to observe in order to achieve target 16.2. It is universally relevant and sexual violence has recently been high on political agendas. It addresses the critical need for systematic data collection on sexual violence against girls and boys – a widespread though often inconsistently measured and reported issue. There are existing tools and mechanisms for data collection that countries have implemented to monitor the situation with regards to this indicator. Household surveys such as DHS have been collecting data on this indicator in low- and middle-income countries since the late 1990s. Fully comparable data is available for some 50 low- and middle-income countries. | The TAP Network would support the alternative indicator proposed by the IAEG-SDGs, provided that a reference to people’s perceptions of these mechanisms are referenced, using the established survey-based indicator "Proportion of those who have experienced a dispute in the past 12 months who have accessed a formal, informal, alternative or traditional dispute resolution mechanism and who feel it was just.” This alternative indicator is a sound measure for trust and confidence in the rule of law and access to justice systems (making it also useful for 16.6. 16.7 and 16b). It captures experience in both civil and criminal law, and with state and non-state dispute resolution mechanisms. It seeks to drive an approach to the rule of law and access to justice which focuses not only on institutions, but on individuals’ experience of the justice system and on just outcomes. The indicator measures experience and perception of the justice system. It also measures the process in terms of accessibility and quality of services, rather than the outcome. Whether a mechanism is "just" 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. When used alongside other measures of justice, perception indicators can provide a validation of whether people believe that the justice system is fair and effective. This indicator has been backed by a wide group of experts, including NSOs and the UN Virtual Network on Goal 16. This indicator has been tested in several contexts and can be easily added to household surveys or national polling. The current (crime reporting rate) indicator’s focus on “victims of violence” is restricted to the criminal justice system and so does not measure the broader conception of justice that member states agreed to in Goal 16 and this target. Additionally, the current language prioritizes criminal over civil disputes. The current language would not account for reporting of business and investment disputes to “competent authorities or other officially recognized conflict resolution mechanism.” We would recommend moving the current proposal (on crime reporting rate) for 16.3.1 to target 16a, where a very similar version already sits, given that it is an excellent proxy for people's faith in security institutions, and therefore their capacity. | The TAP Network feels that this is a strong indicator which directly captures a key component of the target. While the methodology can still be refined, Global Financial Integrity has shown how it can be used and have collected data over several years. As such, we would recommend that the IAEG retains the indicator but that the UN Statistical Commission convene an expert group in order to refine methodologies, with a mandate of one year to return to the IAEG with a recommendation for consideration. This expert group should include IAEG-SDGs NSOs, the UN System, IMF, World Bank and a wide range of experts from CSOs and should provide a transparent process for defining these methodologies. | The TAP Network strongly supports this indicator, with a slight amendment to read “percentage of persons who had at least one contact with a public official, who paid a bribe to a public official in the last twelve months.” This indicator, and the methodologies to collect data on these issues are very well established and data captured over time spans across more than 100 countries (this is often captured by third-party data producers such as Transparency International, under rigorous statistical methods). The indicator also is useful for measuring changes in corruption by using the proxy of reported experiences of bribery and has strong correlations with development outcomes related to the other SDGs. UNCAC monitoring is useful but it would be difficult to show implementation of the commitments across the broader body of commitments under the convention given the rotational nature of UNCAC monitoring. It is a foundational marker of a strong culture of public accountability, in which citizens are entitled and able to inspect whether their representatives and senior public executives are compromised in their independence when exercising the powers they are entrusted with. The required data is extremely cheap and relatively easy to collect and verify compared to other suggested SDG indicators, due to its focus on online public disclosure and existing initiatives such as the World Bank’s Financial Disclosure Law Library. It is also eminently expandable and scalable and can from its core focus on national legislators be expanded to senior office-holders in the executive and judiciary, to sub-national institutions at state and local level. The indicators shouldn’t reinterpret the dimensions for disaggregation that were agreed in Agenda 2030. In the spirit of leaving no one behind and focusing on the poorest, most vulnerable and those furthest behind, this indicator should be “disaggregated by income, sex, age, race, ethnicity, migration status, disability and geographic location and other characteristics relevant in national contexts” in para 74g | The TAP Network strongly supports the Option #2 as a replacement for the current indicator. The current indicator proposed by the IAEG-SDGs is insufficient and is not directly relevant to the target, nor does it address the scope of the issues contained within 16.7 on the whole. This Option #2 indicator would reflect the important elements of ‘inclusive’, ‘responsive’ and ‘participatory’ in the target that would otherwise not be measured, and would be universally relevant. This indicator is relevant for the target’s focus, is easy to communicate, and is feasible to gather through existing and well-established methodologies. It more accurately reflects the balance and ambition sought through the SDG outcome document, and is in line with a growing consensus that public participation is an essential component of governance processes at all levels. Option #1 is a reasonable indicator, but it would not be universally applicable, as it would only be relevant to democracies and countries where voting is not obligatory. Option #3 is also largely addressed with the current “green” indicator for this target, and the specific issue of women’s representation is addressed in Goal 5, particularly in 5.4. | The TAP Network supports this proposed indicator, however, it is essential for this indicator to be paired with the inseparable complementary indicator proposed by UNESCO/OHCHR/ILO and others, “Number of countries that have adopted and implemented constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees for public access to information” to reflect the full ambition of the target. This complementary indicator proposal was not reflected upon by the IAEG-SDGs with the current proposal, and must be seen as inseparable from the current proposal to the IAEG-SDGs. While the two inseparable and complementary indicators proposed above by UNESCO/OHCHR/ILO are strongly preferred, additional secondary indicators that can be considered for this target include: - Existence and implementation of constitutional and statutory guarantees for public access to information. - Extent to which the rights to freedom of expression, association and peaceful assembly are guaranteed in law and practice | The TAP Network believes that indicator 16.a.1 should be slightly modified to reflect the crime reporting rate indicator suggested for indicator 16.3 (i.e. replace with 16.3.1 “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)”). We think that this would be a fairly robust proxy for confidence in security services, itself a proxy for capacity. We would also suggest that people's feelings of safety (16.1.4, above) could be placed under this target, although it would have relevance to many targets across the SDGs. The g7+ group of 20 conflict-affected and self-defined fragile states have identified three indicators on security forces capacity which may merit consideration by the IAEG. These are: Measure 7) Presence of police and state security across the territory Measure 8) Frequency of payment of salaries within police force Measure 9) Quality of human resources within police force While the g7+ have made only limited progress in gathering data for these indicators, it could be worthwhile exploring them in more detail. |
| UN Major Group for Children and Youth | Support Brazil, in need of further clarification of "conflict" | Perception based indicators are a good supplement to verify official statistics. But cannot be looked at in isolation. | This focused on only on formally reported cases. The indicator needs to take into account extend of 'unreported cases" Additionally, the classification of an an incident as "sexual violence" needs a progressive international definition, as a lot of countries have very unfriendly laws towards to victims. | Percentage implies a baseline number for comparision. If the data available is reported cases, than the percentage is reported cases out of total cases of victimization (an extrapolated approximation). | Operationalization of "inward" and "outward" illicit financial flow as well as identification of existing agency tracking this information | Good area for expansion to citizen generated data | Obviously have to support, but the concept needs to be operationalized. | Percentage of population with access to Internet as proxy for information access | Where is the percentage coming from? Need denominator data (number of total victims), which is unknown. |
| UNA-USA |  |  |  | Exclusive focus on ”victims of violence” in indicator 16.3.1 is too constrictive to properly satisfy this target, particularly the commitment to “promote the rule of law . . . and ensure equal access to justice for all.” Specifically, the current language prioritizes criminal over civil disputes. For example, the current language would not account for reporting of business and investment disputes to “competent authorities or other officially recognized conflict resolution mechanism.” Recommend adoption of the broader phrasing of the alternative indicator: "Proportion of those who have experienced a dispute in the past 12 months . . . " The reputable World Bank Group’s “Doing Business” and “Investing Across Borders” initiatives offer existing datasets to support effective measurement and tracking of the proposed broader language focused on “disputes.” |  |  |  |  |  |
| United Nations Association of Tanzania |  |  | United Nations Association of Tanzania, Tanzania UNFPA at this point supports the proposal by UNDP to disaggregate by type of violence. | United Nations Association of Tanzania, Tanzania UNA Tanzania supports the proposed alternate indicator including the added final clause suggested by the US Government: Proportion of those who have experienced a dispute in the past twelve months and who have accessed a fair formal, informal, alternative or traditional dispute mechanism who feel the process was just. |  |  | United Nations Association of Tanzania, Tanzania UNA Tanzania supports the alternative proposal by the African Group (ShaSA proposal): Percentage of population who believe decision-making at all levels is inclusive and responsive, disaggregated by age, sex and other characteristics. |  |  |
| VENRO Working Group Disability and Development | VENRO Working Group Disability and Development, Germany, recommends disaggregation by disability. It would read as: Conflict-related deaths per 100,000 peope (disaggregated by age, sex, disability and cause). |  |  |  |  | VENRO Working Group Disability and Development, Germany, recommends disaggregation by disability. |  |  | VENRO Working Group Disability and Development, Germany, recommends disaggregation by disability. |
| Women Deliver |  |  | Women Deliver also supports the High Level Task Force on ICPD to reduce the age from 18 to 15 so data set becomes 15-24 by age 15. SUPPORT Indicator 16.2.2/’Additional’: Percentage of young women and men aged 18-24 years who experienced sexual violence by age 15 and by age 18, and by perpetrator • This indicator should be supported as the only one in the current SDGs framework addressing sexual violence against children and adolescents under 15, given its widespread occurrence worldwide with devastating and long-term consequences—with girls being the majority of victims/survivors. It is recommended by the UN Chief Statisticians and available in the UNICEF database, with metadata submission available on the IAEG website. • Note that indicator 5.5.2 will only measure sexual violence against girls since age 15, excluding those under 15 – even though girls under 16 are estimated to be roughly half of all sexual assaults globally. • Disaggregation by age sub-groups, or at a minimum, ‘by age 15’, is therefore strongly recommended – including since effective policies and interventions require tailored approaches to particular age groups and other characteristics: Data is available by age, as well as marital status, place of residence and income quintiles. | Women Deliver supports UNFPA and UNDP on the proposal to disagreegate by type of violence as well as gender and age. We also support UNFPA and the US Gov't alternative indicator including the added final clause suggested by the US Government: Proportion of those who have experienced a dispute in the past twelve months and who have accessed a fair formal, informal, alternative or traditional dispute mechanism who feel the process was just. |  |  | Women Deliver supports UNFPA and the alternative proposal by the African Group (ShaSA proposal): Percentage of population who believe decision-making at all levels is inclusive and responsive, disaggregated by age, sex and other characteristics. • Disaggregation by the maximum factors allowable will be especially relevant – including to capture young people’s responses and sense of adequate representation and inclusiveness. • Consider an additional indicator to capture participation in decision-making, such as those proposed on “enabling environment for civil society” or on “institutionalized spaces for multi-stakeholder dialogues for decision-making”. | Women Deliver recommends disaggrergating this data by age, sex and other characterists. | Women Deliver SUPPORTS Indicator 16.a.1: Percentage of victims who report physical and/or sexual crime to law enforcement agencies during the past 12 months, by age, sex, location, population group and type of crime. • Note there is no indicator in all of Goal 16 reflective of people’s confidence in, or reliance and access to, national institutions charged with delivering protection and justice, best exemplified by the issue of violence. • Data analysis of specific groups of victims would be relevant to inform policy-making and to identify potential underreporting—for example, by type of violence and perpetrator such as in cases of gender-based and domestic violence, or hate crimes (e.g. based on race, ethnicity, migrant status, religion, sexual orientation and gender identity). The metadata submission is available on the IAEG website. RECOMMEND an additional higher-level indicator for which data is available as follows: “Existence of an independent National Human Rights Institution in compliance with the Paris Principles”. • The proposal to include ‘and level of compliance of’ with the Paris Principles should also be taken note of. Adopted by the General Assembly in 1993, the Paris Principles set a group of standards to ensure that National Human Rights Institutions are truly independent and have the minimum level of capacity to undertake their mandate effectively. |
| Women for Women's Human Rights - New Ways | WWHR - New Ways suggests 16.1.1 Number of countries which have 1) set up monitoring mechanism against all forms of violence; and 2) enacted and strengthened the enforcement of laws addressing and punishing all forms of violence, including gender-based violence |  | WWHR suggests: 16.2.1. Percentage of children who experience sexual violence by age 18 Otherwise the current grey indicator would cause delay for the data to be collected for the new cases of sexual violence experienced by children | WWHR - New Ways suggests the following: 16.3.1 Percentage of people who live within reasonable reach of affordable, ADD [accessible] and effective basic legal service providers and of a justice institution whose resolutions are fair, timely and enforced These institutions are not always "accessible" (due to location, language, attitute etc.) especially to women. 16.3.2. Existence of a right to information law that establishes 1) citizens’ access to information, including laws, budgets and expenditures; 2) defines a time limit for responding to RTI requests; and 3) establishes a mechanism for appeal in the event of denial 16.3.3. Existence of legal aid services that are affordable, fair and timely, including for family law and complaints of gender-based violence |  | WWHR - New Ways suggests: 16.5.1 Number of countries which have open budget sufficient for the public to access national budget information: 1. countries have transparent and detailed national budget (Open Budget index); 2. Transparency in political party donations; 3. reduction in the number of bribes accepted by national officials; 4. reduction in the number of people who offered bribes to national officials; 5. reduction in the perception of people that their government is corrupt |  | WWHR - New Ways suggests: 16.10.1 Number of DELETE[verified] cases of killing, kidnapping, enforced disappearance, arbitrary detention and torture of journalists, associated media personnel, trade unionists, ADD[women's human rights defenders], and human rights advocates in the previous 12 months We suggest the deletion of "verified" as most of these cases are not "officially" verified by the authorities anyways |  |
| Women's Major Group/ International Women's Health Coalition | Women's Major group supports with addition of the following indicators: Military expenditure as a percentage of total government expenditure; Proportion of military personnel relative to civilian population (geographically localised); Availability of small arms and armaments in the community; Percentage of military budget as a percentage of national budgets; Proportion of budget spent on military purposes compared to social development sectors such as health and education.; Existence of a tax on the arms trade. The reduction of all forms of violence should be measured by reference to the level of military expenditure by governments and the availability of arms within the community. Excessive militarisation not only affects women’s peace and security in militarised settings, it also diverts financial resources into military spending that could be used to promote social and economic development. This would be consistent with governments' obligations under Critical Area E of the Beijing Platform for Action. | Women's Major Group supports with the inclusion of disaggregation by gender. | Women's Major Group proposes the below indicator. Percentage of children who experience sexual violence by age 18 This indicator would mean statistical knowledge would be delayed until the survivor was 18+. Should try to include information from those under 18. | Women's Major Group indicator proposal below. Percentage of people who live within reasonable reach of affordable, ADD [accessible] and effective basic legal service providers and of a justice institution whose resolutions are fair, timely and enforced. The Women's Major Group also proposes the below indicators as alternatives. ➢ Percentage of people who live within reasonable reach of affordable and effective basic legal service providers and of a justice institution whose resolutions are fair, timely and enforced ➢ Percentage of people who express confidence in justice systems and dispute resolution (formal and informal), disaggregated ➢ Existence of a right to information law that establishes 1) citizens’ access to information, including laws, budgets and expenditures; 2) defines a time limit for responding to RTI requests; and 3) establishes a mechanism for appeal in the event of denial ➢ Proportion of requests for information lodged and answered fully in a reasonable amount of time (X days) ➢ Existence of legal aid services that are affordable, fair and timely, including for family law and complaints of gender-based violence It is important that the indicators measure the perceived fairness of justice processes and legal service providers. |  |  | Women's Major Group proposes the below indicator. Percentage of people, including young people, who report effectively participating decision making at all levels. | Women's Major Group proposes the below indicator. Indicator 16.10.1: Number of 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 We recommend the deletion of "verified cases" because of the numbers of such instances that cannot be verified. |  |
| Working Group on Youth-Inclusive Governance Indicators |  |  |  |  |  |  | Working Group on Youth-Inclusive Governance Indicators: We do not support this indicator ('Proportion of countries...'). The reference to "proportion of countries" does not make sense in this context and is also not a national indicator. The suggested indicator collects data only from strategies but doesn’t measure their implementation, thus the inclusiveness of real decision-making is not actually measured. While the Working Group supports in principle the inclusion of each of the alternative proposals considered at the 2nd IAEG-SDGs meeting, we believe #3 is the best of the options from a youth-inclusive perspective: “Percentage of population who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive.” This perception survey-based indicator is complementary to the ‘green’ indicator we have already supported: 16.7.1. “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”. This indicator is a way of measuring the perception of people of their government, focusing on 'inclusiveness' and 'responsiveness' to the population. It is both easy to understand and communicate. It will require scaling up of household surveys that collect perception based data. Measurement should be disaggregated by age and sex at a minimum to track the experiences of girls/young women and boys/young men. The indicator should measure adults’ and children’s views of public decision-making at all levels, especially given children’s right to have their views given due weight in decision-making. |  |  |
| World Vision Brazil |  |  | In order to promote a coherent approach to data collection for 16.2 that reflects the scope of the target, it is strongly requested that this indicator is included as the second indicator for 16.2. It reflects a key aspect of the change in violence that boys and girls face, in its multiple forms we want to observe in order to achieve target 16.2. It is universally relevant and sexual violence has recently been high on political agendas. It addresses the critical need for systematic data collection on sexual violence against girls and boys – a widespread though often inconsistently measured and reported issue. There are existing tools and mechanisms for data collection that countries have implemented to monitor the situation with regards to this indicator. Household surveys such as DHS have been collecting data on this indicator in low- and middle-income countries since the late 1990s. Fully comparable data is available for some 50 low- and middle-income countries. The indicator on human trafficking (Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age and form of exploitation) currently proposed under 16.2 and coded green is not child specific; it would be better placed under SDG 10.7 where it is also listed and has a stronger and more appropriate match. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Amiable Resource | Lead openly with examples and equality... | Encouraged hospitality and compassion with social skills , common needs and wants... | ?? social Interactions and humane experiences frequently.. Dissolve, minimize and discourage atonomy and technological relations... | ?? Increased with population, tech exploitation, velocity and fashion of communication dispersal... People loss patients , persistance and human compassion with tools and toy products... | ??? Philanthropy, disassociate numbers and measures from basic needs and humane social ethics required... | Behaviour change, leadership and social inclusion with opportune choices... | Equality, and open access.. | Obstructions and intervention of paradox diffrences... Lead or follow... Bottle neck population restraints... | ??? Too many, most private and yet to surface or expose confessions...? |
| Maestral International |  |  | This is an essential SDG indicator. Sexual violence has a serious impact on human capital development, affecting participation rates in school and quality of school performance, not to mention health status and HIV risk. A very large number of children are affected, so this is not a marginal issue. There are tools available to measure this. In addition to human capital, this is a key provision of the Convention on the Rights of the Child and other global and regional conventions. |  |  |  | National policy frameworks (such as national development plans or poverty reduction strategies) explicitly address the needs of people, especially the poor and those at risk, at all stages of the life cycle. |  |  |
| The Law & Development Partnership |  |  |  | Suggestion: Adopt the alternative indicator with a key addition: Proportion of those who have experienced a dispute in the past 12 months who have accessed a formal, informal, alternative or traditional dispute resolution mechanism and who feel it was just Alternative proposed indicator is broader than crime and includes all disputes (e.g. land, matrimonial); also includes traditional justice mechanisms. It also captures the outcome 'and who feel it was just' |  |  |  |  |  |
| DPHRU, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg |  |  |  | Dr Mark Orkin, former national statistician of South Africa (1995-2000) comments: I have done a brief empirical exploration which suggests that such a survey-based indicator of 16.3 (Justice) would be a powerful predictor of (an overall proxy for) Goal 16. But it exercises this strong total effect via the indicators of 16.7 (Representativeness) and 16.10 (Freedoms), i.e. it is heavily mediated by them. So it needs to be decided in conjunction with them. The adjusted R-squared fit of the path model for the above three survey-based indicators in combination is appreciably better than that for the corresponding “green” admin-based indicators. The comparative table, path model and fit statistics have been displayed in a supporting Technical Note sent to IAEG-SDG members. The earlier, bivariate version of this empirical exploration ‒ focussing on dispute resolution and previously uploaded in response to the UNSD’s earlier December invitation ‒ had not yet tackled the mediation above, but its conclusion was similar. |  |  | Dr Mark Orkin, former national statistician of South Africa (1995-2000) comments: The proposed “grey” survey-based indicator for 16.7 (Representativeness) is “Percentage of population who believe decision making is inclusive and responsive”. I have done a brief empirical exploration, using a gender operationalisation, which suggests that this would be as powerful a predictor of (an overall proxy for) Goal 16 as the proposed “green” admin-based indicator. Moreover, it combines strongly with survey-based indicators for 16.3 (Justice) and 16.10 (Freedoms) into a coherent path model, whose adjusted R-squared fit is appreciably better than that for the corresponding “green” admin-based indicators. The comparative table, path model and fit statistics have been displayed in a supporting Technical Note sent to IAEG-SDG members. The earlier, bivariate version of this empirical exploration ‒ previously uploaded in response to the UNSD’s earlier December invitation ‒ reached a similar conclusion. | Dr Mark Orkin, former national statistician of South Africa (1995-2000) comments: A survey-based indicator for 16.10 (Fundamental freedoms), “Percentage of population who believe they can express political opinion without fear”, had been widely canvassed in the Virtual Network but was not brought forward to Bangkok. I have done a brief empirical exploration which suggests that, as a predictor of (an overall proxy for) Goal 16, this survey-based indicator would be as powerful as, or more powerful than, the proposed “green” admin-based indicator. It also fares much better on the additional criteria of accessibility to people, one-world application, and aspiration. Moreover, it combines strongly with survey-based indicators for 16.3 (Justice) and 16.7 (Freedoms) into a coherent path model, whose adjusted R-squared fit is appreciably better than that for the corresponding “green” admin-based indicators. The comparative table, path model and fit statistics have been displayed in a supporting Technical Note sent to IAEG-SDG members. The earlier, bivariate version of this empirical exploration ‒ prepared in response to the UNSD’s earlier December invitation for comment ‒ reached a similar conclusion. |  |
| IPTI |  |  |  |  |  |  | The IPTI would like to support the second alternative indicator, the IPTI suggests measuring the level of influence the population had on decision making, i.e. assessing first, a statistically representative sample of population and find out what type of influence they had on decision making; second, assessing the same question with regards to specific groups identified as civil society and other lobby groups representing interests pertinent in a given context for decision making in various levels; third, assessing thereafter, to what extent the proposals of the first and second sample group made it into the results of decision making (i.e. assessing outcome documents and their implementation). |  |  |
| new York University |  | USA, NYU: valuable perception-based indicator that must of course be sex-disaggregated | USA, NYU: excellent indicator Also could have specific indicator at a global level on the numbers of children recruited as soldiers | USA,NYU: the indicator on crime reporting rate is more valuable. The alternative indicator on dispute resolution is too susceptible to the massive variations in national judicial and other mechanisms. |  | USA,NYU: Women experience corruption differently from men. they might not be asked for a financial bribe but rather for sex. this form of sexual coercion is an important feature of corruption and discourages women and girls from demanding their rights vis a vis public authorities. The indicator therefore must be phrased" Percentage of persons who had at least one contact with a public official, who paid a bribe or were asked for a bribe or for payments in kind such as sexual services or labor on behalf of the public official' | USA, NYU: Women's levels of political engagement are a useful and universally relevant indicator of the inclusiveness of a political system. Therefore the elements worth including in the indicator are: Turnout of women, youth, and other marginalized social categories (eg racial or ethnic groups) as a share of the voting-age population in national elections (in non-mandatory vote contexts) proportion of public service positions held by women and members of target groups, disaggregated by senior management and frontline service delivery functions. | USA, NYU: this must be disaggregated by sex Alternatives: Existence of a national freedom of information act that permits citizens to access, within one year of the public action in question, documentary information on the basis for public decisions. | USA,NYU: capacities to prevent violence and combat terrorism and crime require high-capacity egalitarian institutions that treat all crimes of violence with equal concern but with methods of investigation that are appropriate to the crime in question. A proxy indicator for this type of capacity and sensitivity is police capacity to intervene in cases of domestic violence and judicial capacity fairly to prosecute such cases. Another proxy indicator of this capacity and sensitivity would be the percentage of victims of crimes of sexual violence who report the crime, and the percentage of these cases that are investigated, and the percentage of these cases resulting in a prosecution process. |
| Small Arms Survey | Small Arms Survey comments: The indicator is of the highest relevance for the target. It should be better specified as referring to “Direct conflict deaths”, as opposed to “Indirect conflict deaths” (defined as persons who lost their life because of the worsening of social, economic and health conditions in the conflict affected areas – Global Burden of Armed Violence 2008, p 33). Direct conflict deaths are violent deaths caused by armed conflicts, political violence, and terrorism (Global Burden of Armed Violence 2015, p. 54). It is estimated that they represent approximately 14% of the total violent deaths annually. The prevalent method for calculation is incident reporting, excluding victimization and epidemiological surveys and multiple systems estimation (Global Burden of Armed Violence 2011, Methodological Annexe, available http://www.genevadeclaration.org/fileadmin/docs/GBAV2/GBAV2011\_Methodological\_Annexe.pdf). Examples of current data collections of conflict-related deaths include: i) government –based systems, such as Colombia where data on conflict casualties is collected by the national statistical office (DANE); ii) UN Peacekeeping forces, such as UNMAS in Afghanistan; iii) civil society organisations, such as Iraq Body Count and Syria Tracker. The organization Every Casualty Counts, together with a network of relevant stakeholders including the UN, has developed minimum quality standards on incident reporting (Minor. 2012). Minor Elizabeth. 2012. An Overview of the Field. In Minor Elizabeth, John Sloboda and Hamit Dardagan "Good Practice in Conflict Casualty Recording: Testimony, Detailed Analysis and Recommendations From a Study of 40 Casualty Recorders” http://www.everycasualty.org/downloads/ec/ecpp1-overview.pdf |  | Small Arms Survey comments: The proposed indicator may be too vague to capture relevant trends across time and cultures if not accompanied by a qualifier (eg during daytime, at night, on a festive day, etc). Different socio-demographic and cultural contexts may imply different habits and ability of respondents to walk alone. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

| **Country/Organisation** | **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. | **Target 17.3:** Mobilize additional financial resources for developing countries from multiple sources. | **Target 17.5:**Adopt and implement investment promotion regimes for least developed countries. | **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. | **Target 17.13:** Enhance global macroeconomic stability, including through policy coordination and policy coherence | **Target 17.15:**Respect each country's policy space and leadership to establish and implement policies for poverty eradication and sustainable development. | **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 | **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 | **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 |
| *Indicator 17.1.2:* Proportion of domestic budget funded by domestic taxes (IAEG-SDG Members agreed to add this indicator to grey during the green indicator consultation) | *Indicator 17.3.1:* "Foreign Direct Investments as % of total FDI + ODA" with modification ( IAEG-SDG Members agreed to move this indicator to grey during the green indicator consultation) | *Indicator 17.5.1:*Number of national and investment policy reforms adopted that incorporate sustainable development objectives or safeguards by country | *Indicator 17.9.1:*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 aims at sustainable development in three dimensions (including elements such as reducing inequality within a country and governance) | *Indicator 17.13.1:*GDP | *Indicator 17.15.1:*Number of constraints that are embodied in ODA or loan agreements, IIAs, RTAs, etc | *Indicator 17.16.1:*Indicator 7 from Global Partnership Monitoring Exercise: Mutual accountability among development co-operation actors is strengthened through inclusive reviews | *Indicator 17.18.2:*Number of countries that have national statistical legislation that complies with the Fundamental Principles of Official statistics (IAEG-SDG Members agreed to add this indicator to grey during the green indicator consultation) | *Indicator 17.19.2:*Inclusive Wealth Index |
|  |  | *Discussion prompt: The IAEG-SDG Members ask for suggestions for an alternative indicator.* |  |  |  | *Discussion prompt: The IAEG-SDG Members ask for suggestions for an alternative indicator.* |  | *Discussion prompt: The IAEG-SDG Members ask for suggestions for an alternative indicator.* |
| **Total comments received** | 19 | 13 | 13 | 12 | 23 | 13 | 19 | 12 | 26 |
| Government of Japan |  |  |  | Japan: It's unclear that which records in ODA statistics of OECD/DAC would match "financial and technical assistance committed to developing countries' designing and implementing a holistic policy mix that aims at sustainable development in three dimensions". It is necessary to identify which CRS purpose codes should be used for the indicator. It should be taken into account that the ODA statistics of OECD/DAC can't differenciate among NorthSouth, SouthSouth and Triangular. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Censos |  |  |  |  | We believe it is necessary to incorporate a group of relevant macroeconomic indicators that reflect macroeconomic stability, considering volatility. We agree with the proposal of the United Nations Statistical Division to include a dashboard of indicators. |  | We propose to measure the number of participations of countries in regional or global association members that have come together for development cooperation. |  | We suggest to eliminate because the indicator is not relation with the target. |
| ISTAT |  |  |  |  | Istat-Italy: GDP is not a measure of macroeconomic stability. If GDP is retained it would be better to have "GDP growth rate", as level of GDP is not comparable among countries. If the focus is on income levels it would be better to have GDP per-capita in PPP. In general, more methodological work is required. | Istat-Italy: we suggest "Number of national plans against poverty" and its monitoring through economic indicators, or poverty indicators | Istat-Italt: we suggest more methodological work. Comment made by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs: " It should be defined a mechanism of multi-stakeholders reviews managed by ECOSOC in line with the model of Universal Periodic Review" |  | ISTAT-Italy: as first choice we agree on "life satisfaction" indicator and we desagree on IWI or GPI, as they do not fit the aim of developping "progress measures or wellbeing of people measures" as stated by the art.38 of the report "The Future We Want" of Rio+20. In general it would be better more methodological work on this point. We are ready to share our experience on this topic. |
| National Statistical Institute, Spain |  |  | “Number of national & policy reforms adopted that aim to promote investment x country, based on UNCTAD recommendations based on IPFSD (Investment Policy Framework for Sustainable Development) model”. |  | The indicator doesn´t relate directly with the target. We could consider an indicator on “Number of countries implementing/adopting financial transaction taxes on their financial systems”. E.g.: Use Agricultural Market Information System hosted by FAO. |  | “Number of initiatives carried by the global partnership or multi-stakeholder partnerships aiming to support the achievement of the SDG”. It can be used as well the dollar value of the interventions. Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation and Busan Principles and aid effectiveness principles, and its monitor and accountability system. |  |  |
| Statistics Denmark |  |  |  |  | This indicator does not measure variability and does not as such capture the intended goal. | This indicator again does not seem sufficient in comparison to the goal that it is meant to report on. It gives rise to the question about the meaning of “constrains”? The word ‘conditions’ would be more accurate and a well-known terminology in the development sector. However, this data may not be derived from OECD DAC reporting. The department of Quality Assurance in the MFA was very much in doubt of whether it was possible to generate this information from the DAC reporting. At the same time, it seems that an indicator capturing whether or not donors are aligning their development cooperation to the developing countries’ own national plans would be more accurate vis-à-vis the sub-goal Another question is whether or not the UNSTATCOM has considered the reporting ongoing within the GPEDC monitoring |  |  | acceptable Find that Inclusive Wealth is a suitable second indicator. |
| Statistics Finland |  |  |  |  | Finland comments that proposed indicator doesn't seem to measure global macroeconomic stability, including through policy coordination and policy coherence. Further methodological work on developing an alternative indicator is needed. |  |  |  |  |
| Statistics Lithuania |  |  |  |  | Move to green |  |  |  |  |
| TurkStat |  |  |  |  | Turkstat comments: Not only GDP indicator but also indicators of industrial production index and consumer price index changes and also their time series may feed this case. |  |  |  | Turkstat comments: "Human Developmet Index" can be used for this target as alternative indicator |
| United States | US: No comments at this time. | US: No comments at this time. | US: No comments at this time. | US: Two aspects of the target would need to be captured by two indicators. See proposed supplemental indicator, 17.9.2 17.9.1 The dollar value for capacity building to support national plans from international support from North-South, South-South and triangular cooperation. 17.9.2 [A second indicator must be sought to assess the quality of national plans to implement the SDGs.] | US: We support the recommendations of other countries that have proposed a "suite" of indicators for macroenconomic stability. See our proposed revison to the indicator that would reflect this. Note that simple GDP growth is not necessarily a measure of "stability" if that growth is based on unsupportable, speculative investments or similar. As economies develop, they may also experience relatively slower growth. A measure that assesses frequencey, duration and severity of regional or global downturns may be a better proxy for "stability". 17.13.1 Current account deficit/GDP, inflation, external debt to reserves, real GDP growth, annual growth in domestic credit in excess of growth in nominal GDP, change in the real effective exchange rate over the last 2 years (and for commodity exporters and developing countries, augment with) change in terms of trade. | US: Noting that the indicator should address whether countries have the policy space necessary to articulate and implement policies needed for poverty reduction and sustainable development, we propose the alternate indicator shown.  17.15.1 Number of countries with a score of 3.2 or above in the World Bank Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA) | The U.S. supports the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation and its monitoring of the mutual accountability indicator in cooperation with the UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs. Technically however, the mutual accountability survey does not measure the strength of the global partnership. It measures the percentage of countries that undertake inclusive mutual assessments of progress inimplementing agreed commitments (at the national level). This speaks only to quantity, not to quality and does not measure multi-stakeholder partnerships. We do not know of an existing measure that would assess the strength of the global partnership, but recommend further development. | US: No comments at this time. | US: No comments at this time. |
| Department Foreign Affairs and Trade, Australia | Domestic resource mobilisation is critical but tax revenue is only one aspect of this target. Australia notes the validity of indicator 16.4.1 (illicit financial flows) to this target. Australia notes the importance of sex disaggregation across means of implementation targets(particularly 8.10.2 and 9.3.2) in order to improve information on women's access to financial services, noting that indicators 5.5.2 and 5.a.1 do not fully reflect gender finance elements of these gender targets. | This indicator is inadequate for the breadth of the target. Indicators of international private financial flows in addition to foreign direct investment, such as portfolio equity (the buying and selling of stocks and shares) and private sector borrowing, would be highly relevant to this target. There is a lack of data around resources being provided by philanthropic organisations and providers of South South Cooperation currently, and improving measurement of these flows will be critical over the life of the SDGs. The ongoing TOSSD discussion reflects that additional resources beyond ODA need to be captured. | Australia notes that indicators on support for aid for trade are relevant in this regard. | Australia suggests that an indicator on the number of countries with access to a project preparation facility (or similar) could be a useful addition. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Eurostat |  | The proposal is generally feasible from a statistical point of view. It needs to be clarified, however, whether the focus of the indicator is on those receiving or on those offering the assistance/investments. This has repercussions on the data availability. Conceptually, the ratio FDI/(FDI+ODA) may not fully fit the target as offering governments' influence on outward (private) FDI could be seen as rather limited. As part of comprehensive indicator on all flows, this indicator should also include south-south flows. |  | Limited relevance for the target. More development work needed at a later stage to achieve full coverage of the target. It is particularly important to clarify the definition of the indicator proposal. We support the principle of the disaggregation of data under this target which is important for showing the scale of flows from different sources, including south-south. | Indicator can be put to GREEN as a short-term solution but with the caveat that more work is needed to develop alternative/additional indicator(s) to better cover the target, since the relevance of the proposed indicator for macroeconomic stability is limited. On European level, the macroeconomic imbalances procedure uses a range of indicators, as opposed to a single measure, to determine macroeconomic stability, see http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/cache/Imbalance\_Scoreboard/MIPs\_EN.html. The quantitative assessment should also be complemented by a more qualitative measure looking at the enabling policy enviroment and specific actions to address PCD. |  | We need to ensure the indicator reflects the multi-stakeholder nature of the partnership- the term 'development co-operation actors' should be interpreted widely to also include e.g. the private sector, CSOs and south-south co-operation. Support the proposed indicator from the GPEDC monitoring framework. Alternatively, the entire country driven monitoring exercise of the GPEDC could be included here as a subset of 10 indicators which measure development effectiveness on the ground, as driven by multi-stakeholder partnerships. |  | As a short term solution, we would recommend to use a life satisfaction indicator. Data on life satisfaction is available in the ESS from the EU-SILC survey. The Genuine Progress Indicator (GPI), which is perhaps the most widely recognised alternative GDP measure taking into account poverty issues as well as environmental and climate impacts, could also be considered. Methodology has been developed by researchers in US and Canada among others and data compiled for a time period for example by Statistics Finland. It would be more comprehensive to include a cultural component in indicators related to satisfaction and wellbeing |
| IMF, Fiscal Affairs Department |  |  | On behalf of the IMF (Fiscal Affairs Department): The suggested indicator can be easily manipulated. It is difficult to determine in a systematic basis what constitutes a discrete policy reform. For example, do different provisions in a regulation designed to promote sustainable development each count as a reform, or the one regulation as a whole. If the latter, countries may simply break up their regulations to the detriment of wide understanding of policies. The suggested indicator does not take effectiveness into account. Reforms may be approved, but may not be well-designed or well-implemented. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| International Monetary Fund |  |  |  |  | Comments from Martin Cihak, Advisor, International Monetary Fund, Monetary and Capital Markets Department: The level of GDP in itself would not seem to be a good proxy for enhancements in global macroeconomic stability. One may need to look for example into measures that have been used to capture variability in GDP over time (such as standard deviation of GDP growth, divided by average GDP growth over a period of time). |  |  |  |  |
| International Monetary Fund |  |  |  |  | Comments from Martin Cihak, International Monetary Fund, Monetary and Capital Markets Department: The level of GDP in itself would not seem to be a good proxy for enhancements in global macroeconomic stability. One may need to look for example into measures that have been used to capture variability in GDP over time (such as standard deviation of GDP growth, divided by average GDP growth over a period of time). |  |  |  |  |
| International Monetary Fund |  |  |  |  | International Monetary Fund. The IMF has two multilateral policy issues reports which directly address the related issues of macroeconomic stability, policy coordination, and policy coherence: 1. The External Sector Report, which assesses the sustainability of the external balance of member countries, and analyzes the sustainability of the current account balance, the assessment of the real effective exchange rate relative to its equilibrium level (using various methods to assess such equilibrium), and the adequacy of international reserves. 2. The Spillover Report, which examines the external effects of domestic policies in five systemic economies: China, the euro area, Japan, the United Kingdom, and the United States. In addition to these two multilateral policy issues reports, the staff reports for the Article IV consultations often contain the results of the IMF (or joint IMF-World Bank) debt sustainability analysis of public and external debts of member countries. The advantage of using the results of such reports over the proposed series (GDP) is that they contain both the macroeconomic variables which are one of the inputs needed to assess macroeconomic stability, policy coordination and policy coherence, as well as the analytical frameworks needed to interpret the variables. Even if the results of these reports are not used for assessing global macroeconomic stability, including through policy coordination and policy coherence, they should prove useful for guiding the selection of indicators to be used and the frameworks with which to interpret and analyze such indicators. If there is no agreement on the indicators and framework, we would support deleting this target given the complexity of its measurement. |  |  |  |  |
| OECD | This indicator fails to capture the element of "international support to developing countries" in the target, which is not captured by 17.1.1 either. In our view a better indicator would be ODA in support of tax capacity building. We can provide details of the data on request. |  |  |  |  | We suggest “Extent of use of country-owned results frameworks and planning tools by providers of development cooperation”. This indicator will be available from a joint UNDP/OECD monitoring exercise. Metadata can be supplied on request. | We suggest “Number of countries reporting progress in multi-stakeholder development effectiveness monitoring frameworks that support the achievement of sustainable development goals.” This indicator will be available from a joint UNDP/OECD monitoring exercise. Metadata can be supplied on request. |  |  |
| UN ESCAP | Measure thorugh Aid for Trade support as well as ODA so far as international support is concerned. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UNCDF | Proposed Indicator: Percentage of payments that are made digitally, by payment value and number of payments (can break down by taxes and by type, fees, and other revenues) This indicator represents total payments made digitally whether to or from government, business, or persons by value relative to total value of payments (cash and digital) and by number of payments made relative to total number payments (cash and digital) Rationale: When payments are made digitally, costs are reduced and leakages minimized, resulting in greater resources available for government investment in priority areas. Additionally, the shift to digital payments contributes to formalization which enhances the tax base and domestic resource mobilization. Data Source: The Better Than Cash Alliance has developed and tested a digital payments diagnostic tool that uses good-practice, cost-effective approaches for measuring the baseline volumes, values and payment types for each payer-payee combination in the payment grid. https://www.betterthancash.org/tools-research/toolkits/ecosystem-diagnostics |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UNCTAD |  | UNCTAD: We do not understand the construction of this indicator. Better to aggregate FDI+ODA+SSC and compare this to total domestic budget. | UNCTAD: Alternatives - (1) Adoption/Implementation of sustainable development orientated targets by new or existing investment promotion agencies (2) Number of policy changes in investment regimes incorporating sustainable development objectives | UNCTAD: Wording could be simplified to read 'The dollar value of financial and technical assistance (including through North-South, South-South, and triangular cooperation) committed to developing countries' design and implementation of policies aimed at sustainable development'. Alternative proposal: 'Number (share) of national plans to implement SDGs approved by governments by end of 2016 compared to by 2020'. | UNCTAD: GDP is NOT a measure of macro-economic stability. To begin with, there is no agreement in economic literature or across international organisations as to what macro-economic stability means. Nor is a there any single indicator that could capture such a complex idea. Therefore UNCTAD continues to argue that the original proposal by TST 17, which proposed a macro-economic dashboard, is the only sensible approach. There can be some debate as to what indicators would be included in the dashboard, but one could imagine, debt, deficit, price, unemployment all being some of the minimum elements required.NCTAD | UNCTAD: Recommends replacing proposed indicator with a new indicator 'Number of disputes brought against countries through dispute settlement processes (by companies or countries) in areas such as trade, investment, technology' | UNCTAD: As yet we haven't seen a better indicator. Consequently we still support this indicator. But we can support some other proposals, such as: (1) Number of countries reporting on the full set of SDGs (2) Indicator 2 from the Global Monitoring Exercise: Civil society operates within an environment which maximises its engagement in and contribution to development' (3) Number of countries that report progress against the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC) Monitoring Framework indicators | UNCTAD We support this proposal. Without national statistical legislation that upholds the UNFPOS then there is little chance of any good quality, reliable and independent data being compiled, let alone disaggregated. The UN should stress the infrastructural nature of the UNFPOS - they are a key building block. | UNCTAD UNCTAD supports this indicator. The first part of this target calls for some sort of 'beyond GDP' type indicator. There is clearly no consensus on which of the many such indicators available is best. The IWI has a mixture of economic, social and environment and thus strikes a compromise across the 3 key pillars. It seems a reasonable compromise to us. We would strongly argue against trying to develop yet another composite measure of progress. We already have too many. If not the IWI, we should at least use an existing indicator. No what indicator is selected it will be criticized. Need to be pragmatic. |
| UNDP |  |  |  |  |  |  | UNDP PROPOSAL (jointly with OECD on behalf of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation) \* Number of countries reporting progress in multi-stakeholder development effectiveness monitoring frameworks that support the achievement of sustainable development goals RATIONALE AND INTERPRETATION It is broadly recognized that achieving the SDGs will require the concerted efforts of national and subnational governments, bilateral and multilateral organisations, civil society, the private sector, representatives from parliaments, as well as other non-state actors. Both the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development recognize this consensus by highlighting the role of inclusive multi-stakeholder platforms that focus on development effectiveness. These platforms provide useful instruments to track the effective delivery of the means of implementation for the ambitious Post-2015 agenda at the national, regional and global level. Existing (and future) multi-stakeholder development effectiveness frameworks provide a meaningful indication of the extent of progress achieved in implementing specific development effectiveness commitments that countries and other stakeholders may have voluntarily agreed to pursue. The multi-stakeholder character of the DEMFs contributes to ensure mutual accountability and transparency of all implementation efforts. |  |  |
| UNEP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | UNEP Comments: UNEP would like to maintain the Inclusive Wealth Index. It includes a published methodology which is available online and as an annex in the Inclusive Wealth Report. Information and metadata is available from http://inclusivewealthindex.org/. The Inclusive Wealth Index has measures the wealth of 140 nations over more than 20 years (1990-2010). The IWI is based on official statistics. |
| UN-ESCAP |  | This should also speak to local/municipal government access to finance and/or the ability to increase sources of their fiscal base |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UNESCO-IHE |  |  |  |  | UNESCO-IHE: The proposed indicator does not measure the extent of policy coordination and policy coherence. |  |  |  |  |
| UNFPA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | UNFPA supports the existing indicator on legislation and suggests that it be complemented with an additional indicator that has emerged from the consultation with National Statistical Offices: ‘Number of countries with a National Statistical Plan that is fully funded and under implementation’, disaggregated by sources of funding. | UNFPA supports the following proposal: Proportion of countries that a) have conducted at least one Population and Housing Census in the last ten years, and b) have achieved 100 per cent birth registration and 80 per cent death registration. This is also consistent with the World Bank's CRVS Scaling-Up Plan targets for 2030. |
| Asia Pacific Forum on Women, Law and Development (APWLD) | Asia Pacific Forum on Women, Law and Development (APWLD) comments: APWLD proposes the following indicators as an alternative to the grey indicator: • Proportion of GDP lost through tax avoidance and tax evasion practices • Existence of a global corporate tax floor • Existence of a universal intergovernmental tax body. International support to developing countries in this context should be measured through the existence of a global corporate tax floor and fair and inclusive cooperation on international tax rules and their enforcement through, for example, the existence of an universal intergovernmental tax body. The latter proposal was strongly supported by developing countries at Third International Conference on Financing for Development. | APWLD comments: APWLD proposes the following indicators as an alternative to the grey indicator: • Proportion of financial resources that are public, grant-based, additional and unconditional as a share of financial resources for developing countries APWLD opposes the emphasis on FDI as a source of finance for sustainable development in developing countries. FDI in developing countries more broadly is increasingly short-term and speculative, and the biggest source of greenfield investment is in the primary sector (according to UNCTAD's 2015 World Investment Report). Within that sector, most investment is in extractive industry, which is incompatible with sustainable development and frequently undermines the enjoyment of human rights in local communities. Instead, the indicator should measure the proportion of resources that are granted in line with the obligations of developed countries to provide grant-based, additional and unconditional aid. | APWLD comments: APWLD proposes the following indicator as an alternative to the grey indicator: • Proportion of investment policy reforms promoted by multilateral development banks that are consistent with sustainable development objectives or safeguards by country. The World Bank’s promotion of ‘business-friendly’ reforms through its Doing Business Index and Enabling the Business of Agriculture (EBA) initiative, which have considerable influence on policy-makers in developing countries, has been documented to create significant risks to human rights, labour rights, and environmental protection. For example, the EBA initiative has functioned to heavily promote the interests of foreign agribusiness while overlooking the interests and rights of smallholder farmers, who are critical for rural food security and sustainable development. |  |  | APWLD comments APWLD proposes the following indicator as an alternative to the grey indicator: Ø Number of disputes brought against countries through dispute settlement processes (by companies, other countries, other) in areas such as trade, investment, technology etc that challenge policies or practices promoting poverty eradication, sustainable development or human rights. Ø Existence of a gender wage gap, quality of work conditions and social benefits in the sectors affected by trade (export-oriented and import-competing sectors) This target is critical for evaluating the impact of international trade investment and finance frameworks on a country's ability to undertake regulations to promote sustainable development and human rights. Investor-state dispute settlement clauses in trade and bilateral investment treaties, for example, are regularly used to undermine the ability of countries to regulate the interests of human rights, gender equality and sustainable development, including challenging government regulation to increase the minimum wage; protect environmental resources; and ensure accessibility of public services. |  |  |  |
| Adolescent Girl and SDG Indicators Working Group\*: signatories included the UN Foundation, Plan International, Advocates for Youth, Girl Effect, Girls Thinking Global, International Center for Research on Women |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Adolescent Girl and SDG Indicators Working Group\*: 17.19.1 Number of countries whose national budgets include resourcing for gender data collection and analysis -DATA SOURCE: Country data -GLOBAL MONITORING ENTITY: UN Women, World Bank -RATIONALE: In 2013, only 13 percent of 126 countries review for gender statistics programs had a regular dedicated budget for the production of these data. In order to strengthen the mandate of national statistical offices to produce gender data and other critical disaggregations, it is essential to protect their funding and autonomous role, including from growing competition from private data providers. |
| Articulacion Feminista Marcosur |  |  |  |  |  | Colombia. But ensuring human rights protection. | Colombia. Including the participation of CSO. |  |  |
| Bread for the World |  | Bread for the World: total Foreign Direct Investments (excluding PPPs and ODA blended investments) | Bread for the World supports old indicator: Number of national and investment policy reforms adopted that incorporate sustainable development objectives or safeguards by country |  | Bread for the World: GDP is not a sufficient indicator to measure global stability. Number of countries that have implemented a supervisory framework for controlling large exposures regarding repo and securities lending markets. Number of countries that have ratified and implemented the Financial Stability Boards (FSB) regulatory framework for haircuts for non-centrally cleared securities financing transactions (SFTs) to non-bank-to -non-bank transactions. |  |  |  | Bread for the World: measure growth of wealthy in relation to number of poor population |
| Center for Economic and Social Rights |  | FDI is not a reliable indicator of financing for sustainable development. |  |  | Gross Domestic Product is a wholly inadequate indicator for measuring this target, and indeed is not a relevant indicator of any aspect of the target. A robust way to measure policy coherence (which is a crucial element of this target) would be the existence of sustainable development impact assessments across all relevant policies. Impact assessments are critical to knowing and proving the extent to which one's own country's policies and practices (e.g. corporate accountability, environment, trade, investment, aid, tax, migration, intellectual property, debt, monetary, and financial regulation) have negative spillover effects on other countries. The Addis Ababa Action Agenda also calls upon countries to “assess the impact of their policies on sustainable development” (para. 103). Examples from the Netherlands and Ireland show that the methodologies are available to measure the negative spillover effects of corporate tax policies, and similar assessments are available for trade and investment. We urge this to become a standardized practice across major economies—in line with their obligations under the UN Charter and applicable international (and EU) law. This is potentially relevant to targets 17.1, 17.2 and 17.3. Alternative indicator: Existence of sustainable development impact assessments of policies, particularly on developing countries. Robust methodologies abound in this area. The IMF's "Spillovers in International Corporate Taxation" is one, the European Commission’s sustainability impact assessments of trade negotiations and agreements are another. The Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs has also developed an impact assessment, "Analysing effects of Dutch corporate tax policy on developing countries." The UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food also developed a methodology for assessing the impact of trade and investment agreements and policies. |  |  |  |  |
| Christian Aid | Christian Aid would like to see improvements to this indicator as current formulation could penalise developing countries and/or be seen as supportive of an austerity agenda (i.e. by penalising borrowing for investment even if there is a strong long-term economic case). Instead we would rather see: - Tax/GDP ratio; and progressivity of tax policy (Kakwani Index) | Christian Aid would like to see improvements to this indicator as the current formulation would not give you any information about sustainable development impact. In order for this to be meaningful, we would need to know: country of origin of FDI (inwards and outwards), country of destination of FDI (inwards and outwards), sector of FDI going into (inwards and outwards), and what proportion of FDI is originating and has the destination of going into Special Purpose Vehicles (SPVs) that lack economic substance. | Christian Aid supports the currently proposed indicator. |  |  | Christian Aid supports the indicator as currently proposed. |  |  |  |
| Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International |  |  | Comments from Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International, Netherlands   Adoption of recognized and reputable regulatory and monitoring framework for global and national sustainable investment at regional, national and sub-national levels |  |  |  | Comments from Coastal and Marine Union (EUCC), EUCC International, Netherlands   Adoption of recognized and reputable regulatory and monitoring framework for sustainability for institutions, industry and markets at regional, national and sub-national levels |  |  |
| Culture et Développement |  |  |  | France, Culture et Développement 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 aims at sustainable development in ALL ITS dimensions (including elements such as reducing inequality within a country and governance) Since long scholars and many local authorities are promoting culture as 4th pillar of sustainable development. As the UN narrative is still focus on the 3 dimensions, in order to increase inclusive and contextualised approches the wording on the three dimensions could be revised as proposed Source : http://www.culturaldevelopment.net.au/community/Downloads/HawkesJon%282001%29TheFourthPillarOfSustainability.pdf http://www.agenda21culture.net/index.php/docman/-1/393-zzculture4pillarsden/file |  |  |  |  | France, Culture et Développement Inclusive Wealth index and Human Sustainable development Index |
| Fair Trade Advocacy Office |  |  |  |  | We question whether the GDP is a useful measure of the macroeconomic stability for members of countries’ populations. The indicator of the target 17.13 should not be focused around the economic stability of the country but of members of the community. |  |  |  |  |
| Fairtrade Foundation |  |  |  |  | Fairtrade questions whether GDP is a useful measure of the macroeconomic stability of a countries’ populations. This indicator should not be focused around the economic stability of a country but of the individual members of the community and so focus on ensuing equality and that no one is left behind. |  |  |  |  |
| Finnish NGDO platform to the EU | a) Whether a country requires public countryby- country reporting for large multinational companies. To capture tax avoidance, countryby- country reporting must be public, cover all jurisdictions, and include; • The name of each country in which the company operates and the names of its subsidiaries in each country • Internal and external sales purchases and finance costs, labor costs, employee numbers, pre-tax profits and assets, and • Tax payments to the government in each country. b) Whether a country has signed up to a multilateral agreement on automatic information exchange. c) Full and effective participation by developing countries in design and implementation of multilateral automatic information exchanges between tax authorities. d) A country publishes public registers of beneficial owners of companies and funds. e) A country has a minimum 20 percent tax- GDP ratio. |  |  |  |  |  | a) Increase in the number of multi-stakeholder partnerships. b) Number of participants active in both developed and developing countries. | a) 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. b) Number of countries that have formal institutional arrangements for the coordination of the compilation of official statistics (at international, national and regional level). | a) Number of countries that have developed and / or implemented a new wider indicator for measuring well-being alongside with the GDP. |
| Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei |  |  |  |  | FEEM: GDP, inflation rate, exchange rate fluctuations from the average (over X years) |  |  |  | FEEM: Genuine Progress Indicator |
| France Volontaires |  |  |  |  |  |  | Volunteer groups salute the current version of the target, as it embraces the former view on multi-stakeholder partnerships which is not limited to private-public partnerships. Regarding indicator 17.16.1, we salute the fact that the IAEG has taken into account ways of measuring partnerships other than the monetary dimension. In particular, using the Global Partnership Monitoring exercise will contribute to a more integrated use of monitoring tools among different initiatives concerning development. However, we consider that the proposed indicator does not capture the essence of the target, as it is focused on mutual assessments on accountability on implementation, leaving aside the quality of official engagement with civil society. We suggest that this indicator be complemented in order to measure an enabling environment for civil society and civil society’s ability to engage in multi-stakeholder partnerships, using sources of data such as the Enabling Environment Index, Enabling Environment National Assessment, CSO Sustainability Index, Freedom in the World Survey, or NGO Law Monitor. |  |  |
| Health Poverty Action |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Suggest this is amended to: Number of countries that have national statistical legislation that complies with the Fundamental Principles of Official statistics and the Professional Ethics of the International Statistical Institute (ISI). It is necessary to address the full range of human rights concerns in data disaggregation which include including self-identification, data privacy, the involvement of vulnerable and marginalised groups in data collection and analysis and protecting the independence of official statistics. Reference to both Fundamental Principles of Official statistics and the Professional Ethics of the International Statistical Institute provides a broader set of principles. In order to fulfil this target, and meet the principle of Leave No One Behind, it is vital that data across the whole indicators set is disaggregated by income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other characteristics relevant in national contexts data as set out in this target and paragraph74g of Agenda 2030. We strongly urge specific reference to this to be made across the whole indicator set. |  |
| ICMM and IPIECA | John Drexhage ICMM/IPIECA How about extent to which actual revenue collection differs from projection based on adult populations of countries. |  | John Drexhage ICMM/IPIECA Simply track investments in LDCs at this point - adding SD component is not consistent with stated target. | John Drexhage ICMM/IPIECA Simply track national implementation of Transforming our World through SDGs | John Drexhage ICMM/IPIECA Economic growth and relevant equity indicators between and within countries |  |  |  | John Drexhage ICMM/IPIECA Further work is required, but a sufficiently defined "inclusive wealth index" which manages to incorporate concepts of social coherence and environmental protection would be useful. |
| International Agency for the Prevention of Blindness (IAPB) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | IAPB asks to add to the indicator proposal "(...) and an action plan towards full data disaggregation of sustainable development indicators." | IAPB suggests to include well-being in the indicator for target 17.19 |
| International Council of AIDS Service Organizations | Clear indicators on domestic financing of health are quite relevant - we recommend that the indicator include domestic spending on health and other sectors as relevant to the SDGs. | Prefer previous version of this indicator: Amount of additional, predictable and untied finance available in national budgets for sustainable development financing. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peacebuilding Advisory Service | This indicator seems excessively broad and doesn't specify the proportion of the budget and of collected taxes that may be used towards achieving the SDGs. Moreover, the target isn't clear enough that resource mobilization and international support, financial and otherwise, should be linked with the SDGs. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Plan International |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \*COMMENT APPLIES TO 17.19.1 Plan International comments: RECOMMENDED INDICATOR: 17.19.1 Number of countries whose national budgets include resourcing for gender data collection and analysis RATIONALE: In 2013, only 13 percent of 126 countries review for gender statistics programs had a regular dedicated budget for the production of these data. In order to strengthen the mandate of national statistical offices to produce gender data and other critical disaggregations, it is essential to protect their funding and autonomous role, including from growing competition from private data providers. DISAGGREGATIONS: sex, age, civil status, disability, education level, wealth quintile, ethnicity, geographic location, employment status, migrant status, IDPs, refugees, type of household (including head of household) DATA SOURCE: Country data RESPONSIBLE ENTITY: UN Women, World Bank TIER: II |
| Post-2015 Volunteering Working Group |  |  |  |  |  |  | Volunteer groups salute the current version of the target, as it embraces the former view on multi-stakeholder partnerships which is not limited to private-public partnerships. Regarding indicator 17.16.1, we salute the fact that the IAEG has taken into account ways of measuring partnerships other than the monetary dimension. In particular, using the Global Partnership Monitoring exercise will contribute to a more integrated use of monitoring tools among different initiatives concerning development. However, we consider that the proposed indicator does not capture the essence of the target, as it is focused on mutual assessments on accountability on implementation, leaving aside the quality of official engagement with civil society. We suggest that this indicator be complemented in order to measure an enabling environment for civil society and civil society’s ability to engage in multi-stakeholder partnerships, using sources of data such as the Enabling Environment Index, Enabling Environment National Assessment, CSO Sustainability Index, Freedom in the World Survey, or NGO Law Monitor. |  |  |
| Rastriya Dalit Network (RDN) Nepal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Percentage 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. Disaggregate by age, sex, region, caste, race and other population groups |
| Saferworld | This is a strong indicator that should be retained. It is simple to understand and relevant to the target. |  |  |  |  | Difficult to measure. |  | This is an important indicator and should be retained. |  |
| Social Justice in Global Development | Proposed more precise specification: Rolling five-year average primary budget balance of central government (five-year average to smooth out cyclical fluctuations as want annual budget deficit to vary; primary budget excludes the interest cost of servicing the public debt, which is beyond control of fiscal authorities; primary budget balance includes mining royalties and fees as well as tax collection per se; data on central government finances most completely available internationally and attributable to functioning of the national government, although general government is theoretically more desirable concept). | Horrible indicator with absolutely no indicative value. Kill this one if you wish the exercise to retain any credibility. Alternative (please consider all of them):: Net flow of multilateral financial institution resources to LDCs (or LICs if BWIs won't change their categorization); net flow to middle-income countries; monitor (as a footnote?) number of countries graduating out of eligibility to concessional or any multilateral financial institution lending. Net external financing flow (distinct from commitments) of infrastructure projects in LDCs and developing countries as a whole (presumably as calculated by new infrastructure forum to be created under Addis Ababa Action Agenda). Net inward FDI (as per UNCTAD data base) as % recipient GDP (PPP dollars), annual average for LDCs and other special groups of countries plus developing countries as a whole and medians to at least partly address concentration of FDI inflows on small number of countries. Net inflow of portfolio and bank lending as % GDP (PPP dollars), annual averages and medians for country groupings as above for FDI. Data as per balance-of-payments statistics; note we are proposing no distinction between funds borrowed by governments or private sector and no distinction between short-term and medium-term flows since they can all be volatile regardless of classification. | Number of LDCs with official investment promotion agencies. | Alternative: Capacity-building assistance received by developing countries to implement national SDG plans as % GDP (PPP basis), average for all developing countries and for LDCs and other special groups. Note: target requires monitoring of support by receiving developing countries, for which UNDP could provide assistance. Should include relevant overseas scholarships as well as technical assistance and financial and in-kind support. As specified, this target cannot rely on data of donors, as some will not be reporting. Compiling such data centrally could assist receiving governments in specifying priority needs to fill, which may not accord with donor-assumed priorities. | There is a variety of indicators that are regularly measured for reports on the world economic situation by IMF, UN/DESA, BIS and others. They include gross world product (global equivalent of GDP), world trade volume and price indicators, global unemployment estimates, average inflation rates, average exchange rate volatility indicators. These are measures of outcomes as regards goal of stabllity.. There is no way to realistically measure the degree of policy coordination, except perhaps by checking that the G20 communiqués include statements of coordination, which they always do. | Actually, there can be good constraints as well as bad ones. For example, World Bank and other IFI social and environmental safeguards are important constraints that should be strengthened, as well as their accountability mechanisms, such as the World Bank's Inspection Panel. It does not seem possible to design an indicator for this target. Each receiving government signs the contract to get the assistance and would not admit that it did so under duress. Suggest no indicator here. | Alternative: Percentage of recognized partnerships that disclose the partners, contributions and matching funds for all relevant partnerships, including at the country level (as per GA resolution C.2/70/L.24, as adopted 10 December). "Recognized partnerships" meant in this context the partnerships announced at the major conferences in 2015 plus partnerships announced in earlier international meetings that are still in effect. |  | This target calls for thinking about new or revised indicators. This could be measured by identified efforts to think up such measures. One such measure could be number of articles in peer-reviewed journals around the world on the subject. The second half of the target is unrelated and calls for support of statistical capacity building for which the indicator could be the sum of bilateral and multilateral and non-governmental technical assistance in statistical areas, which could in principle be compiled. |
| Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN) | SDSN comments: tax as a proportion of GDP or national budget is a critical measure of domestic resource mobilization (DRM). DRM will be critical to achieve the SDGs, so we recommend including this indicator. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | SDSN comments: It is important to include a direct measure of subjective wellbeing for target 17,19, as an alternate to GDP. Measures of evaluative wellbeing capture a reflective assessment of an individual’s overall satisfaction with life. One of the most widely used measures of evaluative wellbeing is the Cantril Self-Anchoring Striving Scale, which is included in Gallup’s World Poll of more than 150 countries, representing more than 98% of the world’s population. It asks respondents to imagine a ladder with steps numbered 0 (bottom) to 10 (top), with 10 representing the best possible life for you ￼ and 0 the worst. Respondents then respond with which step they feel they are currently on, and where they will be in 5 years. The Cantril Scale measures how individuals evaluate their own lives, and is complemented by the positive affect measure of “Positive Mood,” which measures the ups and downs of daily emotions. Positive affect specifically measures a range of recent positive emotions. Although short-term emotional reports carry much less information about life circumstances than do life evaluations, they are very useful at revealing the nature and possible causes of changes in moods on an hour-by-hour or day-by- day basis. |
| Sustainable World Initiative |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | The Sustainable World Initiative supports the existing indicator on legislation and suggests that it be complemented with an additional indicator that has emerged from the consultation with National Statistical Offices: ‘Number of countries with a National Statistical Plan that is fully funded and under implementation’, with the sources of funding disaggregated. |  |
| Sustainable World Initiative |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Another alternative is the Happy Planet Index. |
| Task Team on CSO Development Effectiveness and Enabling Environment |  |  |  |  |  |  | Task Team on CSO Development Effectiveness and Enabling Environment comment: The Task Team supports the OECD-UNDP’s most recent (December 15) indicator proposal “Number of countries reporting progress in multi-stakeholder development effectiveness monitoring frameworks that support the achievement of sustainable development goals” given its emphasis on multi-stakeholder engagement and mutual accountability across stakeholders in reviewing progress. |  |  |
| Tax Justice Network | Alex Cobham (Tax Justice Network/King's College London) comments: This is a very important indicator, for a number of reasons. First, the more commonly highlighted tax/GDP ratio is important but has flaws and so should not be used alone. The main issue is that policymakers do not control the denominator, and hence the ratio can show changes that contradict the degree of progress actually made in respect of tax. In addition, measurement of GDP is subject to well-known weaknesses. Second, the research literature shows that the ratio of tax to expenditures may have a particularly strong role in driving the positive relationship between taxation and effective political representation: that is, the higher the share of domestically mobilised, non-resource taxation in total government expenditure, the stronger over time is likely to be the quality of governance and institutions. Raising tax in the right way will not only increase potential expenditures, but ultimately the quality and accountability of the expenditures made. For some further discussion, see http://uncounted.org/2015/02/27/tax-target-post-2015/. |  |  | Alex Cobham (Tax Justice Network/King's College, London) comments: This is a highly skewed measure of assistance, likely to be unhelpful in practice. Recent examples, including technical assistance on tax in particular, show how (some) donor countries have effectively imposed assistance which is neither requested nor valued by recipient countries. At the same time, the Financial Secrecy Index published by Tax Justice Network, and the Commitment to Development Index published by Center for Global Development, show just how much more donor countries could be doing in terms of genuine cooperation - removing the barriers in many areas, including tax transparency, that otherwise shut out many lower-income countries. Measures of policy cooperation would be much more valuable, and meaningful, than measures of donor cost in providing technical assistance of uncertain value. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transparency International |  |  |  |  |  |  | Indicator should be based on measurement of civil society space as currently done by CIVICUS. |  |  |
| United Nations Association of Tanzania |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | United Nations Association of Tanzania UNA Tanzania supports the existing indicator on legislation and suggests that it be complemented with an additional indicator that has emerged from the consultation with National Statistical Offices: ‘Number of countries with a National Statistical Plan that is fully funded and under implementation’, and the sources of funding are disaggregated. | United Nations Association of Tanzania UNA Tanzania supports the following proposal: Proportion of countries that a) have conducted at least one Population and Housing Census in the last ten years, and b) have achieved 100 per cent birth registration and 80 per cent death registration. |
| Wemos | Wemos/Netherlands: additionally, proportion of tax income lost due to tax avoidance & evasion. Also: number of countries that resist international cooperation to tackle tax avoidance and evasion. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Women Deliver |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Women Deliver supports UNFPA position on the existing indicator on legislation and suggests that it be complemented with an additional indicator that has emerged from the consultation with National Statistical Offices: ‘Number of countries with a National Statistical Plan that is fully funded and under implementation’, and the sources of funding are disaggregated. | Women Deliver supports UNFPA following proposal: Proportion of countries that a) have conducted at least one Population and Housing Census in the last ten years, and b) have achieved 100 per cent birth registration and 80 per cent death registration. |
| Women's Major Group/ International Women's Health Coalition | The WMG proposes the following indicators as an alternative to the grey indicator: • Proportion of GDP lost through tax avoidance and tax evasion practices • Existence of a global corporate tax floor • Existence of a universal intergovernmental tax body. International support to developing countries in this context should be measured through the existence of a global corporate tax floor and fair and inclusive cooperation on international tax rules and their enforcement through, for example, the existence of a universal intergovernmental tax body. The latter proposal was strongly supported by developing countries at Third International Conference on Financing for Development | The WMG proposes the following indicator as an alternative to the grey indicator: Proportion of financial resources that are public, grant-based, additional and unconditional as a share of financial resources for developing countries The WMG opposes the emphasis on FDI as a source of finance for sustainable development in developing countries. FDI in developing countries more broadly is increasingly short-term and speculative, and the biggest source of greenfield investment is in the primary sector (according to UNCTAD's 2015 World Investment Report). Within that sector, most investment is in extractive industry, which is incompatible with sustainable development and frequently undermines the enjoyment of human rights in local communities. Instead, the indicator should measure the proportion of resources that are granted in line with the obligations of developed countries to provide grant-based, additional and unconditional aid. | The Women's Major Group proposes the following indicator as an alternative to the grey indicator: Proportion of investment policy reforms promoted by multilateral development bakns that are consistent with sustainable development objectives or safeguards by country The World Bank’s promotion of ‘business-friendly’ reforms through its Doing Business Index and Enabling the Business of Agriculture (EBA) initiative, which have considerable influence on policy-makers in developing countries, has been documented to create significant risks to human rights, labour rights, and environmental protection. For example, the EBA initiative has functioned to heavily promote the interests of foreign agribusiness while overlooking the interests and rights of smallholder farmers, who are critical for rural food security and sustainable development. |  | The Women's Major Group indicator proposal below. Proportion of investment policy reforms promoted by multilateral development banks that are consistent with sustainable development objectives or safeguards by country. | The WMG proposes the following indicators as an alternative to the grey indicator: Number of disputes brought against countries through dispute settlement processes (by companies, other countries, other) in areas such as trade, investment, technology etc that challenge policies or practices promoting poverty eradication, sustainable development or human rights. Existence of a gender wage gap, quality of work conditions and social benefits in the sectors affected by trade (export-oriented and import-competing sectors). This target is critical for evaluating the impact of international trade investment and finance frameworks on a country's ability to undertake regulations to promote sustainable development and human rights. Investor-state dispute settlement clauses in trade and bilateral investment treaties, for example, are regularly used to undermine the ability of countries to regulate the interests of human rights, gender equality and sustainable development, including challenging government regulation to increase the minimum wage; protect environmental resources; and ensure accessibility of public services. |  | Number of disputes brought against countries through dispute settlement processes (by companies, other countries, other) in areas such as trade, investment, technology etc that challenge policies or practices promoting poverty eradication, sustainable development or human rights. |  |
| ACC (American Chemistry Council) and CEFIC (European Chemical Industry Council) |  |  |  | ACC and CEFIC - SUPLEMENTAL INDICATOR: Number of industry-wide and sector-specific voluntary programs advancing global standards and investment that enable scientific and technology enhancement within industry, that are consistent with national plans. COMMENT: Many global industries have recognized common challenges in enhancing sustainability and established voluntary programs to systemically upgrade performance. These are often extended globally and can significantly upgrade standards in developing countries, accelerating scientific and technological capacity, significantly supplementing other forms of financial and technical assistance. Accounting for such initiatives where they are consistent with national aims would encourage both their development and global propagation. |  |  | ACC AND CEFIC - ALTERNATIVE: number of global partnerships among development cooperation actors that have inclusive publicly available reviews. |  |  |
| Amiable Resource | Reduce taxes , dissolve ciolections, system change to front end membership commission on rear.... | Create capacity, action and energy, forget and reject economic structures... Focus on tangible achievement... Failed economics model indexes and sustain non attainable fantasy excluding all extranalities and extra attitudes ... | Results based, achieved statistic figures... | Balance... Cooperations... | Frequent monitors and adaptations... With auctalizing ... | ??? | Continue seeking... | ??? | Results... Tang able behaviour changes, achieved goals... |
| International Federation of Freight Forwarders Association (FIATA) |  |  |  |  |  | The logistics performance index serves as a good measure for states to assess their trading capbilities and therefore their openess to cooperate with other states on integrated policy. |  |  |  |
| LTO Nederland | A reduction of the % of informal economy (ie not paying taxes, not being registered etc) |  |  |  |  |  | Number / % of private sector organisations, including farmers' organisations, being active in / leading SDG initiatives as part of all SDG initiatives per country Number / % of private - public SDG initiatives |  |  |
| new York University |  |  |  | USA, NYU: percentage of technical assistance specifically targetting women's empowerment |  |  |  |  |  |
| World Trade Institute, University of Bern |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | The sustainable development law group of the World Trade Institute and the Centre for Development and Environment suggests to include a comprehensive indicator on policy coherence on sustainable development, particulary targetting economic policies and related trade offs (being the core of the sustainable development agenda) |
| Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | The extent to which the High-level Group for Partnership, Coordination and Capacity-Building for post-2015 monitoring has contributed to statistical capacity-building in developing countries in the area of sustainable development. Benchmark for assessing significant contribution to be developed in consultation with the High-level Group. An additional indicator could monitor statistical capacity more broadly of all countries in monitoring SDG achievements, e.g.: "percentage of countries that have the statistical capacity to regularly report on 80% or more of the SDG indicators". |