

Goal 16

Target number: 16.6

Indicator Number and Name: 16.6.2 Proportion of the population satisfied with their last experience of public services

Agency: UNDP

Has work for the development of this indicator begun?

Yes. A survey instrument has been developed on the basis of extensive consultations held over the past year and a half with governance measurement experts and national statistical offices (NSOs) in all regions, and 11 NSOs will soon go to field to pilot this survey instrument. The draft metadata for this indicator, along with accompanying survey implementation guidelines and data reporting form (Excel), will be revised and finalized by October 2018, on the basis of piloting results.

Who are the entities, including national and international experts, directly involved and consulted in developing the methodology/and or data collection tools?

a) National statistical offices

In collaboration with the Praia City Group on Governance Statistics, which has been tasked by the UNSC to develop international methodological guidelines for the production of governance statistics, including for Tier III SDG 16 indicators, the UNDP Oslo Governance Centre has hosted in Oslo two Expert Group Meetings over the past year and a half (respectively held on 9-10 May 2017 and 4-5 December 2017), which brought together 14 NSOs with a well-established practice of measuring satisfaction with public services, namely from **Cameroon, Cabo Verde, Colombia, Germany, Jamaica, Kenya, Mexico, Norway, Palestine, the Philippines, South Africa, Tunisia, Uganda, Viet Nam**. At these two Expert Group Meetings, NSOs were invited to share experiences and advise on a range of definitional, methodological and practical issues that needed to be considered in developing a harmonized methodology for this indicator.

In preparation for the first Expert Group Meeting, a global survey of current surveying practices by NSOs in relation to SDG indicator 16.6.2 was completed by **33¹ country respondents**. This survey provided a valuable preliminary overview of broad trends with respect to the main sectors/service categories assessed by NSOs, and the various types of questions used.

Further to the first Expert Group Meeting, a “Review of NSOs’ Practices and Methodological Considerations in Measuring Citizen Satisfaction with Public Services” documented relevant surveying practices by NSOs in selected countries, including **Cameroon, Germany, Georgia, Kenya, Latvia, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, South Africa, Tunisia and Viet Nam**.

¹Country respondents to the survey included 3 countries from the MENA region, 5 from Africa, 19 from Europe, 1 from North America, 3 from Latin America, and 2 from Asia-Pacific. The full list of respondents is as follows: Australia, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Cote d’Ivoire, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Israel, Jamaica, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, Palestine, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, South Africa, Sweden, Turkey and Uganda.

Further to the second Expert Group Meeting and to the consolidation of a draft survey instrument for 16.6.2, a call for expressions of interest for reviewing or piloting the proposed methodology was sent to the NSO membership of the Praia Group and other NSOs that are members of the IAEG-SDGs or have been involved in consultations around this indicator. As of mid-July 2017, 11 NSOs have expressed their intention to test the two candidate survey items in the coming months/weeks as part of a larger survey or separately on a small sample, including **Bolivia, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana, Kenya, Mexico, Palestine, Peru, Republic of Korea, Uganda**. Meanwhile, 7 NSOs, namely **Canada, Colombia, Egypt, New Zealand, Philippines, Sweden and Turkey** have committed to reviewing the proposed survey instrument and to providing feedback on its methodological soundness and feasibility in individual national contexts.

b) Global and regional survey producers

Several well-established global and regional producers of survey data on satisfaction with public services have contributed to the development of this methodology through Expert Group Meetings and bilateral consultations. At the regional level, expert contributions were obtained from the **Afrobarometer**, which has been producing pan-African series of national public attitude surveys on a wide range of governance issues, including satisfaction with public service provision, for nearly 20 years, as well as from experts in the **OECD's Statistics, Health and Education Directorates** working on long-established European survey programmes, such as the European Quality of Life Survey (carried out every four years since 2003) and the EU-Statistics on Income and Living Conditions (EU-SILC) survey (carried out annually since 2004). At the global level, researchers affiliated with the **World Values Survey Association** also contributed expert guidance and feedback on the methodology throughout the process.

c) International governance measurement experts

Several independent researchers with expertise in designing and conducting citizen surveys on governance contributed to the design of this methodology, including Dr. Ellen Lust, University of Gothenburg (Sweden), who coordinates the Local Governance Performance Index (a survey-based instrument to monitor local governance, currently run in dozens of countries), Dr. Macartan Humphreys, Columbia University, who is the Director of a Research Group on Institutions and Political Inequality at the WZB in Berlin, as well as experts from the French Institute of Research for Development (IRD), International IDEA, the University of the Witwatersrand (South Africa), the Open Society Foundation, the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), the Transparency, Accountability & Participation (TAP) Network and Transparency International.

What is the involvement of or how do you plan to involve National Statistical Systems in the development of the methodology?

See preceding question. So far, more than 40 NSOs have played a central role in developing and piloting this survey methodology, on the basis of prior surveying experience in this area, or through their membership of the Praia City Group on Governance Statistics, or the IAEG-SDGs.

Please briefly describe the process of developing the methodology for the indicator

The process for developing the methodology for this indicator has been guided by the Praia City Group on Governance Statistics, which has a dedicated Working Group on SDG indicator

16.6.2, and a mandate to support the development of methodologies for Tier III indicators under SDG 16. It drew extensively from NSOs' experiences in this area, and from the expertise of other cross-national survey research initiatives, as listed above.

Chronologically, the following steps were taken:

- 1) *Preliminary research paper to frame discussions at the first Expert Group Meeting (April 2017)*: A first stock-taking of selected NSO practices in surveying satisfaction with public services and a compilation of “Key Issues for Consideration by the Working Group” were prepared by the UNDP Oslo Governance Centre ahead of the first Expert Meeting. This first ‘Issue Paper’ provided a broad overview of the methodological aspects that would need to be addressed in developing a survey methodology for indicator 16.6.2.
- 2) *Global survey of NSO experiences with measuring satisfaction with public services (April 2017)*: Also in preparation for the first Expert Group Meeting, the UNDP Oslo Governance Centre designed an online survey which was completed by 33 NSOs around the world. This survey helped identify broad trends in current surveying practice by NSOs ahead of the Meeting, notably in regards to the type of questions posed (i.e. measuring experiences or perceptions), the range of sectors/services monitored, the frequency of data collection, and common disaggregation practices.
- 3) *First Expert Group Meeting (Oslo, 16-17 May 2017)*: This first Expert Group Meeting generated consensus around three key aspects of the methodology to be developed, namely (1) the need to narrow down a limited set of public services that are universally salient, for all countries and within countries (i.e. for rural and urban populations); (2) the need for the methodology to also capture those excluded from public service provision, who risk being left unheard if the methodology strictly focuses on “last experience” of services, as per the indicator language; and (3) the benefits of asking respondents to assess the quality of service delivery by invoking specific attributes of any given service (such as accessibility, affordability, courtesy of service providers, etc.), which minimizes recall bias and enhances the cross-cultural comparability of responses.
- 4) *Review of NSOs' practices and methodological considerations in measuring citizen satisfaction with public services (June – November 2017)*: Following on a recommendation made at the first Expert Group Meeting to further investigate existing NSO surveying practices in this area, the UNDP Oslo Governance Centre conducted an in-depth review of methodologies in place in 13 NSOs and relevant government agencies around the world, including Cameroon, Germany, Georgia, Kenya, Latvia, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, South Africa, Tunisia and Viet Nam. This review looked at a) the various sectors/categories of public services included in national household surveys; b) question formulation (e.g. experience-based vs. perception-based questions and the ordering of such questions); c) response modalities (various response scales); and d) survey implementation issues (respondent profiles, frequency of surveys, etc.). In addition, this Review compiled the latest research and ‘best practices’ on a number of methodological considerations of relevance to 16.6.2, outlining advantages and disadvantages of various approaches. Finally, participating NSOs and regional statistical agencies (such as the OECD’s Statistics Directorate) were invited to make recommendations towards a harmonized methodology for indicator 16.6.2, and a draft survey instrument was elaborated on the basis of these inputs, with a focus on four types of services, namely health, education, registration and justice services.

- 5) *Second Expert Group Meeting (Oslo, 4-5 December 2017)*: A second Expert Group Meeting was held to invite NSOs and governance measurement experts to review findings and recommendations made in the aforementioned Review, and to advise on methodological options for the proposed survey instrument. At that Meeting, experts and statisticians advised to focus on three ‘core’ categories of services, namely health, education and administrative services (i.e. a broader category of services than ‘registration services’ as initially proposed, which may be used only a few times in a lifetime). While acknowledging that justice services are critically important public services (and that existing indicators under target 16.3 on ‘access to justice for all’ fall short of measuring people’s experiences and/or satisfaction with the judicial system), it was noted that the infrequent use of *formal* justice services would result in high non-response rates, as few respondents would be able to rate the quality of justice services *based on experience*. Finally, participating NSOs and experts endorsed the recommended approach of combining questions about specific dimensions of service delivery (such as accessibility, responsiveness, tangibles and fairness/inclusivity) with a question on overall satisfaction, to optimize the policy relevance of the data collected. At the same time, they also warned against overburdening NSOs with a lengthy questionnaire and recommended a more narrow focus on a few service attributes with high international salience.
- 6) *Final round of consultations with selected NSOs and the OECD’s Statistics Directorate on revised survey instrument (January – June 2018)*: Further to the second Expert Group Meeting, the draft survey instrument was revised to incorporate suggestions made by national statisticians and experts, and further rounds of consultations and revisions were held with selected NSOs and with the Statistics Directorate of the OECD, given the latter’s well-established survey instruments measuring various aspects of public service provision (such as the EU-SILC and the European Quality of Life Survey), already in use by 28 European NSOs. In this phase, efforts were made to optimize alignment of questions in the proposed survey instrument for 16.6.2 with existing survey questions in these standardized regional questionnaires, with a view to minimizing disruption in time series in countries already using these regional questionnaires.
- 7) *Piloting by NSOs (July - October 2018)*: In July 2018, the NSO membership of the Praia Group and other NSOs that are members of the IAEG-SDGs or that have been involved in consultations around SDG indicator 16.6.2 were invited to contribute to the final validation of the methodological proposal for this indicator in three possible ways, namely a) through piloting on a large-scale (integrating the short set of survey questions proposed for indicator 16.6.2 into an upcoming nationally representative household survey); b) through piloting on a small-scale (testing the methodology on smaller samples of 500 or above if no large-scale survey was planned in the near future); c) through a review of the methodological proposal (if piloting was not possible). As of mid-July 2018, 11 NSOs have expressed their intention to pilot the survey instrument as part of a larger survey or separately on a small sample, and 7 NSOs have committed to providing feedback on the methodological soundness of the proposed survey instrument, as well as on its feasibility in individual national contexts.
- 8) *Final revisions based on piloting results and feedback received (September – October 2018)*: The survey instrument, accompanying survey implementation guidelines, data reporting form (Excel) and metadata will be revised based on survey results and insights generated by the pilot and review exercise.

Please indicate new international standards that will need to be proposed and approved by an intergovernmental process (such as UNSC) for this methodology.

The applicable standards are derived from well-established European surveys developed by Eurostat nearly 15 years ago, such as the EU-SILC and the European Quality of Life Survey, to measure various aspects of public service provision. As such, no additional approval procedures by the UNSC are foreseen.

When do you expect the methodological work on this indicator to be completed?

End of 2018

Are data and metadata already being collected from the National Statistical System for one or more components of this indicator?

Yes.

If yes, please describe:

An increasing number of NSOs already measure various aspects of citizen satisfaction with selected public services, *albeit* using a variety of methods, as captured by UNDP's global survey of NSO surveying practices in this area (referenced above) and the in-depth Review of surveying practices carried out on a sample of 13 NSOs located across all regions (referenced above). Survey questions currently in use by NSOs around the world focus on various aspects of service quality, which may include its affordability, its physical accessibility, the conditions of the physical facilities where the service was accessed, the timeliness of its provision, the comprehensiveness of the information provided and availability of information in minority languages, the professionalism and courtesy of service providers, responsiveness to queries or complaints, etc. More details can be obtained from the *Review of NSOs' practices and methodological considerations in measuring citizen satisfaction with public services* carried out by UNDP.

How do you plan to collect the data?

The survey instrument, along with survey implementation guidelines and the metadata for the indicator, will be sent to NSOs, and survey results will be compiled in a data reporting form (in Excel), also provided to NSOs by UNDP.

With what frequency is data expected to be collected?

Annually

Is there a process of data validation by countries in place or planned for this indicator?

Yes.

If yes, please briefly describe: The data for this indicator is to be provided directly by NSOs and as such NSOs will apply their own data validation procedures prior to submitting data at the international level for SDG reporting.

If the indicator involves multiple components from different data sources, please describe how each individual component of the indicator will be collected here.

Not applicable.

If you have any additional comments that you believe would be helpful to IAEG-SDG members in analysing the work plan and methodological development of the indicator, please provide them here:

Piloting of the survey instrument is scheduled to continue beyond early October 2018, at which date the methodological proposal for this indicator must be submitted to the IAEG-SDGs if it is to be considered at the fall meeting. As such, further refinements of the survey implementation guidelines, data reporting form and metadata for this indicator are likely to be made until the completion of all piloting exercises, in early 2019.

Detailed timeline:

- **Methodological work will be completed:** By October 2018
- **Methodology will be approved as an international standard:** By October 2018 (as explained above, the proposed methodology draws from standardized questionnaires developed by Eurostat and adopts the existing standards built-in these questionnaires)
- **Indicator will be submitted to the IAEG-SDG for possible reclassification:** Meeting of the IAEG-SDGs in fall 2018 (November 2018)
- **Data collection will begin:** January 2019 (for reporting to the HLPF 2019)

Expected data coverage of the indicator: Global (Question will be integrated in a ‘SDG 16 Survey Module’ currently being developed, for easy administration by NSO ‘in one go’ of all survey questions required to report on SDG 16.)

(as of July/August 2018)