Goal 16

Target number: 16.7

Indicator Number and Name: 16.7.1 Proportions of positions (by age group, sex, persons with disabilities and population groups) in public institutions (national and local legislatures, public service, and judiciary) compared to national distribution

Agency: UNDP

Has work for the development of this indicator begun?
Yes. Metadata for each sub-component of this indicator – namely for a) legislatures, b) the public service and c) the judiciary – have been developed on the basis of extensive consultations held since early 2017 with governance measurement experts and national statistical offices (NSOs) in all regions. These three metadata are now being pilot-tested by data-producing agencies in the public service, the judiciary and legislatures of more than 50 countries across all regions. Further to this piloting exercise, the three metadata for this indicator, along with accompanying data reporting form (Excel) and reporting guidelines, will be revised and finalized by October 2018.

In March 2018, UNDP requested (in an email to UNSD in March 2018) a refinement to the indicator along the following lines:
*Proportions of positions (by sex, age, persons with disabilities and population groups) in public institutions (national and local **(a)** legislatures, **(b)** public service, and **(c)** judiciary) compared to national distributions.*

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 and national data-producing agencies in the public service, the judiciary and the legislature*

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 hosted an Expert Group Meeting on 9-10 May 2017 which brought together seven NSOs from countries that have a well-established practice of tracking the socio-demographic composition of the workforce in the public service and the judiciary, namely NSOs from **Cabo Verde, Colombia, Jamaica, Kenya, Norway, South Africa, Uganda.** At this Expert Group Meeting, NSOs were invited to share experiences and advise on a range of definitional, methodological and practical issues that needed to be considered to develop a harmonized methodology for this indicator.

In preparation for the Meeting, a global survey of current data collection practices by NSOs and data-producing agencies in the public service, judiciary and parliament was completed by **33[1]**

---

[1] Country 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.

country respondents. This survey provided a preliminary overview of broad trends with respect to the various types of data collected on the workforce in these public institutions, and the mechanisms used to gather this data.

National experiences in producing data on the composition of the workforce in public institutions directly informed the development of methodologies for the three sub-components of this indicator:

With respect to the public service sub-component of 16.7.1, the methodological development process drew significantly from a global mapping on the availability and quality of data on women in public service in over **130 countries,** conducted by UNDP's Gender Equality in Public Administration (GEPA) initiative.

With respect to the judiciary sub-component of 16.7.1, the methodological development process drew mainly from a desk research of a wide range of national data collection practices across various judicial systems (incl. systems of both civil and common law traditions). The metadata for this sub-component was informed by a consideration of data collection practices in place in more than **40 countries**.

Finally, the methodology for the parliamentary sub-component of 16.7.1 drew largely from the data collection practices already in place in **193 parliaments** that report to the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) on the sex and age of parliamentarians, as well as other information on the structure/functioning of parliaments.

For each one of these sub-components, the draft metadata was piloted by relevant data producing agencies at country level, in consultation with NSOs, in at least **twenty countries** carefully selected to ensure representation across development levels, regions and diverse institutional traditions/configurations (e.g. unicameral vs. bicameral parliaments; judiciaries of civil vs. common law traditions; etc.).

b) *Global and regional producers of data on composition of workforce in public service, judiciary and legislature*

UNDP engaged with several regional and international organizations that have long-standing experience in producing and collecting administrative data on the composition of the workforce in public institutions, including the legislature, public service and judiciary. These organizations have been consulted throughout the process and their experience and advice have informed the design of the metadata and data reporting instruments for all three sub-components of 16.7.1.

For the public service sub-component, at global level, UNDP's Gender Equality in Public Administration Global Initiative (GEPA)[2] provided an invaluable knowledge base in the form of a global mapping of public service definitions, data sources, data collection mechanisms, disaggregation and reporting practices conducted over the past three years. UNWomen also provided guidance based on its experience developing a methodology for SDG indicator 5.5.1b on the proportion of seats held by women in local governments. Finally, the International Labor Organization (ILO) contributed insights specifically on the use of labor force surveys in the

---

[2] UNDP's GEPA is a global policy and programming initiative aimed at getting more women into public service leadership by (1) addressing the systemic lack of data and knowledge on women in decision-making in public administrations and; (2) developing an evidence-base that demonstrates the impact of women's public service leadership on governance outcomes.

collection and reporting of public sector data. Because the ILO regularly produces employment statistics disaggregated by occupation using the International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO-08), it has been important to ensure that the occupational categories introduced by the metadata for this sub-component were in line with international standards.

At regional level, the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)'s experience in collecting data on the composition of the central government workforce in 35 OECD countries was carefully examined, particularly with respect to the typology of positions developed by the OECD to enable harmonized reporting on the representation of women at various levels of decision-making[3]. The data collection instrument developed for this sub-component directly built on this approach. Also at the European level, the methodology developed by the European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE) for its *Database on Women and Men in Decision-Making*, which compiles sex-disaggregated statistics on individuals holding positions at the first and second highest levels of national public administration across Europe, was reviewed by the Expert Group as another effective approach to harmonize public servant statistics across very diverse configurations of public service in 35 countries of the European Union.

For the judiciary sub-component, at global level, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNDOC) was consulted to draw from its well-established experience in gathering sex-disaggregated data from UN Member States on the number of "professional judges or magistrates" in criminal courts, through the annual UNODC Survey on Crime Trends and the Operations of Criminal Justice Systems (CTS). The experience of the World Bank in compiling data on the percentage of female judges and chief justices in constitutional courts for the 153 economies where constitutional courts exist was also examined. At regional level, the regional data collection system established by the CEPEJ European Judicial Systems – Efficiency and Quality of Justice Report for 47 European countries showed how harmonized regional statistics on men and women working at all levels of courts could be produced, including first instance, second instance, and supreme courts, and in a wide range of capacities, from "court presidents" to "prosecutors" to "notaries", amongst others.

For the parliamentary sub-component, at global level, the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) contributed significantly to the development of the metadata, as it already collects data from the secretariats of 193 national parliaments on an ongoing basis for its PARLINE[4] database on national parliaments. UNWomen also provided critical input on the feasibility of collecting data on the composition of sub-national legislatures[5]. International IDEA, the Open Government Partnership and the Bundestag (International Cooperation Unit) also provided feedback on the metadata. At regional level, several regional parliamentary associations were consulted on the metadata, including the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, the SADC Parliamentary Forum,

---

[3] Using six occupational codes in the ISCO-08 and their corresponding definitions, national public administration bodies were able to translate relevant figures from their national registries into this harmonized typology, thus producing comparable statistics.

[4] PARLINE provides up-to-date sex- and age-disaggregated data on members of parliament in 193 countries (split between chambers in case of bicameral parliaments), sex-disaggregated data on speakers, and sex-disaggregated data on selected committee chairs in some parliaments.

[5] One option being considered for reporting on the composition of sub-national legislatures is to piggy-back on the data collection mechanism established by UNWomen to report on SDG indicator 5.5.1b (*Proportion of seats held by women in local governments*), which focuses on elected members of legislative bodies across all tiers of local government. Adding categories for age, population groups and disability status to the data reporting form elaborated by UNWomen for this indicator would allow for both indicators (5.5.1b and 16.7.1/local legislatures) to be monitored at once.

ParlAmericas, the Westminster Foundation for Democracy (WFD) and the
Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE).

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 60 NSOs have played a central role in developing and piloting the methodology for the three sub-components of indicator 16.7.1: several had an established data collection practice in this area, while others were members 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 methodologies for each sub-component of this indicator has been guided by the Praia City Group on Governance Statistics, which has a dedicated Working Group on SDG indicator 16.7.1, and a mandate to support the development of methodologies for Tier III indicators under SDG 16. It drew extensively from the experiences of NSOs and relevant data-producing agencies in the public service, judiciary and parliament of countries around the world, and from the expertise of regional and global organizations producing or collecting statistics in this area, as listed above.

Chronologically, the following steps were taken:

1) *Preliminary research paper to frame discussions at the Expert Group Meeting (April 2017):* A first stock-taking of global and regional data collection initiatives of relevance to SDG indicator 16.7.1 was prepared by the UNDP Oslo Governance Centre ahead of the Expert Meeting. This first set of 'Key Issues for Consideration by the Working Group' provided a broad overview of the methodological aspects that would need to be addressed in developing a methodology for each sub-component of 16.7.1, such as defining the scope of the 'public service' or the 'judiciary', identifying specific occupations holding 'decision-making power' in each institution, developing a harmonized typology for these occupations, etc.

2) *Global survey of experiences by NSOs/judiciaries/public services/legislatures in compiling data on workforce composition (April 2017):* Also in preparation for the 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 data collection practice by NSOs and/or by data-producing agencies in relevant public institutions, notably in regards to the type of data collected (e.g. which positions, at what levels, etc.), the extent to which it is disaggregated (by disability and population group status), its public availability, how frequently it is updated, etc.

3) *Expert Group Meeting (Oslo, 16-17 May 2017):* This Expert Group Meeting generated consensus around some key aspects of the methodology to be developed for each sub-component of 16.7.1, namely (1) <u>Public service</u>: The internationally agreed definition of 'general government sector' from the System of National Accounts can be used to harmonize the scope of the 'public service' even while national definitions can differ significantly; data derived from administrative records maintained by a Public Service Commission (or related public administration body) is more suitable to reporting on 16.7.1 than public employment statistics derived from a national labor force survey; a harmonized typology of occupations in the public service is needed to guide the recoding of national classification systems in accordance with the international standard classification ISCO-08; there is a need to further

investigate the range of data collected on population groups and disability status. (2) Legislature: This sub-component can focus on three types of positions identified as holding decision-making power: members of parliament, the Speaker of the House, and Chairs of permanent committees; the feasibility of collecting data on permanent committee leadership (not currently collected by IPU) must be tested, as well as on the population group and disability status of members. (3) Judiciary: Reporting on this sub-component must also include lower-level courts (first-instance or frontline courts such as labour courts, family courts, administrative courts, social welfare courts, etc.) since they are most often used by populations at the local level; decision-making positions other than judges should be considered; there is a need to test the feasibility of collecting harmonized data on non-judge positions, given significant variations in the classification of positions in the judiciary across countries; the feasibility of collecting data on the population group and disability status of judges and other non-judge positions in the judiciary also needs to be tested.

4) *Further consultations with global and regional producers of data on the composition of the workforce in the public service, judiciary and legislature (June 2017 – October 2018):* Further to the Expert Group Meeting, draft metadata for each sub-component of 16.7.1 were elaborated and shared with relevant regional and global organizations (listed above) for feedback and revisions. Consultations with these organizations, prior to, during and after the piloting exercises, were critical to generating broad-based consensus and buy-in by these various actors for the methodologies.

5) *Piloting of draft metadata by data-producing agencies in public service, judiciary and legislature across the world (February – October 2018):* Once a metadata for each sub-component was stabilized, a survey on existing data collection practices by the relevant institution was designed to test out the feasibility of the metadata across diverse national contexts. The survey on data collection practices in the public service was completed by 15 countries[6], and surveys on data collection practices in the legislature and the judiciary are ongoing.

6) *Final revisions based on piloting results and feedback received (September – October 2018):* The metadata, data reporting form (Excel) and accompanying reporting guidelines will be revised based on piloting results.

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 international standards such as the System of National Accounts, ISCO-08, IPU's nomenclature on parliamentary positions, UN DESA's Manual for the Development of a System of Criminal Justice Statistics, the European Commission's BEIS typology (namely Basic functions, Economy, Infrastructure and Socio-cultural functions) to categorize ministries by fields of actions, amongst others. 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

---

[6] Namely: Ghana, Mauritius, South Africa, Fiji, Indonesia, Malaysia, Egypt, Tunisia, El Salvador, Jamaica, Georgia, Kosovo, FYR Macedonia, Germany and New Zealand.

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:

While data collection on the workforce in the public service, judiciary and parliament is commonplace in most countries, methodologies used across countries are not harmonized. As evidenced by the global mapping conducted by UNDP's GEPA, most countries already produce public servant statistics through a human resources management information system managed by a Public Service Commission or the like, but classifications of positions vary across countries and data is not collected on the same set of socio-demographic characteristics. Similarly, data on judges and other positions in the judiciary is typically collected by a Judicial Services Commission (or a Ministry of Justice), but again datasets vary. While all parliaments already collect sex- and age-disaggregated data on members of parliament for global reporting to the IPU, information on the population group and disability status of members is not yet systematically collected.

How do you plan to collect the data?

The metadata, along with the data reporting form (in Excel) and accompanying reporting guidelines, will be sent to NSOs and/or relevant national institution. A significant number of data points for the parliamentary sub-component will be reported directly by the IPU, which already compiles data on members of parliament in its PALRINE database (soon to be revamped in an Open Data Portal).

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/or relevant public institutions, and as such NSOs and/or relevant public institutions 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.
As mentioned above, a significant number of data points for the parliamentary sub-component will be reported directly by the IPU, which already compiles sex- and age-disaggregated data on members of parliament in its PARLINE database (soon to be revamped in an Open Data Portal). IPU is currently considering whether other data points on committee chairs could also be collected by the Open Data Portal, which could eventually become the sole data source for the parliamentary sub-component of 16.7.1.

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:
N/A

Detailed timeline:
- **Methodological work will be completed:** By October 2018
- **Methodology will be approved as an international standard:** Already approved (as explained above, the proposed methodology draws from existing international standards in the various sectors of relevance to indicator 16.7.1)
- **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

(as of July/August 2018)