



Informal comments to IAEG Members on suggested SDG indicators

28 August 2015

This document offers informal comments to the Inter-Agency Expert Group on SDG Indicators (IAEG-SDGs) from Saferworld on the August 11 [global indicators proposal](#). The comments focus on Goal 16 on peaceful and inclusive societies.

Key messages

1. The full range of indicators proposed for Goal 16 in the August 11th consultation document present a strong basis for the IAEG to prioritise those for global use. That detailed information has been collated for such a range of indicators demonstrates that the issues targeted in Goal 16 are already being measured and that significant consensus on best practice exists.
2. Nonetheless, the 18 “suggested indicators” (highlighted blue) in this latest proposal require more work. Based on an assessment of their relevance to the target, established best-practice, known data sources, and feasibility for universal use, we have suggested keeping 12 and removing 6 of the suggested indicators. We have put forward 6 replacement indicators along with 5 additions. *See the table below for a summary of these recommendations and Annex One for the detailed assessment.*
3. The nature of the issues addressed in Goal 16 means that special attention should be paid to the risk of creating perverse incentives. Furthermore, we recommend that where possible the IAEG draws on different types of indicators in order to present a rounded and balanced picture of progress. For example, administrative data can be helpful for monitoring capacities. These are often not, however, the same as outcomes for people – which is the focus of the 2030 Agenda. Outcomes for people are best captured using experiential or perception surveys. In specific cases, the IAEG should consider drawing on expert opinion from globally-recognised third parties.
4. Now that the 2030 Agenda has been agreed, it is important that, to the greatest extent possible, all of the issues captured in each of Goal 16’s targets are measured with individual indicators. For example, target 16.4 addresses 4 issues: IFFs, arms, recovered assets and transnational organised crime. The IAEG has the responsibility to identify indicators for each one of these issues; it would otherwise be making a political decision on which issues to prioritise. Furthermore, the nature of Goal 16 means that combinations of indicators may be required to provide an accurate picture of progress on individual issues.
5. The recommendations may result in a large number of indicators being proposed by the IAEG, but it should be remembered that it will be the responsibility of member states to support the development of necessary capacity to properly monitor what they have agreed to. Furthermore, while monitoring of will need to start from 2016, the reality is that producing data for every global indicator in every context will be a development outcome in itself; the IAEG should be establishing an aspirational vision to guide data providers collectively towards this eventual outcome.
6. Official national statistical systems will not have sufficient capacity to deliver comprehensive data coverage on their own. As has been recognised in the 2030 Agenda and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, national statistical organisations (NSOs) will need to work with a number of non-official data providers, including multilateral organisations, civil society and research organisations, the private sector, and citizens themselves. Impartial organisations independent of the state should be tasked with collecting data on especially sensitive issues within Goal 16 (e.g. targets 16.5, 16.7, 16.10). All data providers, however, will need to demonstrate independence, impartiality and transparency if the data they produce is to be meaningfully used by policy-makers and trusted by the wider public.

Saferworld priority indicators	
Targets under Goal 16	Suggested indicators
16.1 Significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere	Number of victims of intentional homicide by age, sex, mechanism and where possible type of perpetrator, per 100,000 population
	Conflict-related deaths per 100,000 people
	Percentage of people who report that they feel safe walking alone at night in the city or area where they live
16.2 End abuse, exploitation, trafficking and all forms of violence and torture against children	Percentage of children aged 1-14 years who experienced any physical punishment by caregivers in the past month
	Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age and form of exploitation
16.3 Promote the rule of law at the national and international levels, and ensure equal access to justice for all	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
	Percentage of people who voice confidence in the judicial system
16.4 By 2030 significantly reduce illicit financial and arms flows, strengthen recovery and return of stolen assets, and combat all forms of organised crime	Total value of inward and outward illicit financial flows (in current US\$)
	Percentage of people who believe that illicit arms are widespread in their community
	Drug-related crime per 100,000 population
	Recovered stolen assets as a percentage of illicit financial flows
16.5 Substantially reduce corruption and bribery in all its forms	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.
	Percentage of people who believe that corruption is widespread throughout the government in their country
16.6 Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels	Proportion of population satisfied with the quality of public services, disaggregated by service
	Open Budget Index Score
16.7 Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels	Proportions of positions held by different age, sex, disability and population groups in public institutions (national and local legislatures, public service, and judiciary) compared to national distributions.
	Percentage of population who believe they can influence policy-making in their country

16.8 Broaden and strengthen the participation of developing countries in the institutions of global governance	Percentage of members or voting rights of developing countries in international decision-making bodies
16.9 By 2030 provide legal identity for all including birth registration	Percentage of children under 5 whose births have been registered with civil authority
16.10 Ensure public access to information and protect fundamental freedoms, in accordance with national legislation and international agreements	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
	Percentage of people who feel that they can express political views without fear
16.a Strengthen relevant national institutions, including through international cooperation, for building capacities at all levels, in particular in developing countries, for preventing violence and combating terrorism and crime	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)
	Percentage of people who report that they feel safe walking alone at night in the city or area where they live
16.b Promote and enforce non-discriminatory laws and policies for sustainable development	Percentage of population reporting having felt discriminated against or harassed within the last 12 months because of their identity

Saferworld's work on indicators As well as being actively engaged in the development of the 2030 Agenda, Saferworld has worked on indicators related to issues of peace, justice and governance for several years. It is a steering member of the UN Virtual Network on Goal 16 indicators, a member of the Praia Group on Governance Statistics and an active member of indicator working groups within the Beyond 2015 and Transparency, Accountability and Participation (TAP) civil society networks.

Key publications and commentaries

- [Measuring peace from 2015: An indicator framework at work](#) - Briefing, March 2015
- [Who should measure the sustainable development goals?](#) - Blog, May 2015.
- [Want to measure peace, governance and rule of law? Africa may have the answer](#) - Comment piece, September 2014.
- [Towards regional and national statistical capacities for measuring peace, rule of law and governance](#) – Briefing, June 2014
- [Defining and measuring the external stress factors that lead to conflict in the context of the post-2015 agenda](#) - Briefing, April 2014.
- [Issue Paper 4: A vision of goals, targets and indicators](#) - Briefing, February 2013.

ANNEX ONE: Saferworld's specific comments on the IAEG August 11 Global Indicators Proposal are provided in detail below, together with suggestions where indicators should be kept, added, removed or moved:

16.1 Significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere			
IAEG indicator	Comment on IAEG	Replacement / addition	Why is this an improvement?
KEEP: Number of victims of intentional homicide by age, sex, mechanism and where possible type of perpetrator, per 100,000 population	This is a strong indicator. Efforts will be required to widen coverage and overcome reliance on estimates.	N/A	N/A
KEEP: Conflict-related deaths per 100,000 people (disaggregated by age, sex and cause)	<p>This is a strong indicator. The age and gender disaggregation could be removed as they should be applicable to <i>all</i> indicators.</p> <p>Few NSOs currently collect data on direct conflict deaths, meaning that third parties such as the Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCPD) will be required for initial global baselines and/or could be authorised by the United Nations Statistical Commission (UNSC) to be the primary source for this data, using a consistent methodology across countries. In the long-term, NSOs could collect this data.</p> <p>Beyond direct conflict-deaths, data on other deaths caused by conflict - e.g. deaths caused by disease or famine associated with violent displacement—will need to be gathered. Survey data on other types of deaths measured in other targets (e.g. 1.5, 3.1, 3.2) should be drawn on in conflict-zones to gather wider estimates. Estimated differences in average death rates before and after conflict could also be drawn on.</p>		

		<p>ADD: Percentage of people who report that they feel safe walking alone at night in the city or area where they live</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The indicator could also be put in target 16a (see below)</p> <p>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.</p>
--	--	---	---

16.2 End abuse, exploitation, trafficking and all forms of violence and torture against children

IAEG indicator	Comment on IAEG	Replacement / addition	Why is this an improvement?
<p>KEEP: Percentage of children aged 1-14 years who experienced any physical punishment by caregivers in the past month</p>	<p>This is a strong indicator that has widespread support.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>KEEP: Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age and form of exploitation</p>	<p>This is a strong indicator that could be used in 5.2, 10.7. Due to the illicit nature of human trafficking, accurate data may be challenging to gather.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>

16.3 Promote the rule of law at the national and international levels, and ensure equal access to justice for all			
IAEG indicator	Comment on IAEG	Replacement / addition	Why is this an improvement?
MOVE: 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)	This indicator is already used below in 16a and is a better proxy measure of security service capacity and public confidence in authorities. Its direct relevance to justice and the rule of law is limited.	REPLACE WITH: 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 is potentially a very informative objective indicator that directly captures the target's intended outcome, which is people's access to an effective dispute resolution mechanism – the heart of justice. Importantly, its focus goes beyond the formal justice sector. This indicator has been tested in several contexts and can be easily added to household surveys or national polling. Survey questions may need to define different types of dispute resolution mechanisms to respondents.
REMOVE: Unsentenced detainees as percentage of overall prison population	While this indicator has some merit when used along with public confidence indicators, it risks incentivising speedy but unjust trials. The link between the speed of sentencing and the quality of the rule of law or people's access to justice should not be assumed.	REPLACE WITH : Percentage of people who voice confidence in the judicial system	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.
16.4 By 2030 significantly reduce illicit financial and arms flows, strengthen recovery and return of stolen assets, and combat all forms of organised crime			
IAEG indicator	Comment on IAEG	Replacement / addition	Why is this an improvement?
KEEP: Total value of inward and outward illicit financial flows (in current US\$)	This is a strong indicator. While the methodology can still be refined, Global Financial Integrity has shown how it can be used.	N/A	N/A
REMOVE: Percentage of seized and collected firearms that are recorded and traced, in accordance with	This is a relatively strong indicator, but it would only measure one specific aspect of wider phenomenon of illicit arms flows and be loosely linked to the outcome intended by the target.	REPLACE WITH: Percentage of people who believe that illicit arms are widespread in their community	This indicator is based on survey questions developed as part of the UN International Small Arms Control Standards (ISACS). It would be a proxy for the extent to which people are affected by the illicit arms trade – thus being more outcome

international standards and legal instruments			focused that the suggested indicator. The survey question could be easily added to household surveys or national polls.
	The issue of organised crime in the target is not currently captured in the above indicators.	ADD: Drug-related crime per 100,000 population	The production, sale and transfer of illicit drugs makes up a considerable proportion of activities related to organised crime; this objective indicator would show a key dimension of the violence associated with it. UNODC collects data on a range of drug-related crimes through its surveys of member states and their administrative data. Victimization surveys may prove useful alternative sources of data for this indicator.
	The issue of stolen assets in the target is not currently captured in the other indicators.	ADD: Recovered stolen assets as a percentage of illicit financial flows	As a percentage of illicit financial outflows in a given year – excluding trade mispricing – the indicator would demonstrate successes in proportion to the challenge. Some countries currently maintain their own asset recovery databases. As part of the Stolen Asset Recovery Initiative (STAR), the World Bank and UNODC currently host the Asset Recovery Watch (ARW), which compiles, systematizes and publishes information about completed and active asset recovery efforts around the world.
16.5 Substantially reduce corruption and bribery in all its forms			
IAEG indicator	Comment on IAEG	Replacement / addition	Why is this an improvement?
KEEP: 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.	This is a strong indicator; it has already been used relatively comprehensively around the world.	N/A	N/A

		<p>ADD: Percentage of people who believe that corruption is widespread throughout the government in their country</p>	<p>Although hard to do, it is vital to make some attempt to monitor corruption at high levels, as this is the kind of corruption that robs public funds vital for development. This perception indicator captures people's views of corruption within their own countries. It only focuses on government corruption – potentially overlooking the private sector. Rumours of corruption, the level of media coverage or secrecy on the issue, and other perception-shaping factors in a country would impact on this indicator. Nonetheless, it could serve as a useful complement to the other more objective indicator – and perceptions of corruption have been shown to correlate with experiences of corruption.</p> <p>Data for this indicator are currently gathered through Gallup's World Poll and Transparency International's Corruption Perceptions Index, demonstrating the high feasibility of this indicator. It could be added to household, victimisation or national polling surveys.</p> <p>This indicator could be collected by a third party independent of the state.</p>
--	--	--	---

16.6 Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels

IAEG indicator	Comment on IAEG	Replacement / addition	Why is this an improvement?
<p>REMOVE: Primary government expenditures as a percentage of original approved budget</p>	<p>This indicator is very specific and only provides a partial picture of government effectiveness – it is therefore insufficiently relevant to the target.</p>	<p>REPLACE WITH: Proportion of population satisfied with the quality of public services, disaggregated by service</p>	<p>This indicator directly measures people's experiences of institutions. It is therefore the strongest available measurement of the effectiveness dimensions of the agreed target, and is therefore more relevant than the indicator proposed. It has been used by NSOs in several contexts over a long period of time.</p>
<p>REMOVE: Percentage of recommendations to strengthen national anti-corruption frameworks (institutional and legislative) implemented,</p>	<p>This indicator focuses on processes rather than actual outcomes for people and focuses on one specific dimensions of one aspect of the target. It could, however, potentially be moved to target 16.5 or 16b.</p>	<p>REPLACE WITH: Open Budget Index Score</p>	<p>Focusing on an important aspect of governance, this capacity indicator would help measure transparency and access to information in a country. The International Budget Partnership (IBP) currently scores countries using its Open Budget Survey Tracker. Information is gathered through a</p>

as identified through the UNCAC Implementation Review Mechanism			<p>standard questionnaire completed by researchers who assess practice as indicated in official documents and conduct interviews. The last survey included 100 countries.</p> <p>As well as requiring improvements in coverage and timeliness, this indicator could be challenged on the basis of subjectivity. Nonetheless, it demonstrates the feasibility, in principle, of measuring transparency of and access to information about government budgets. It should be noted that expert assessments from third parties similar to this have been proposed as indicators in other goals.</p> <p>The indicator could also be used for 16.10 and 16.b</p>
16.7 Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels			
IAEG indicator	Comment on IAEG	Replacement / addition	Why is this an improvement?
KEEP: Proportions of positions (by different age, sex, disability and population) groups in public institutions (national and local legislatures, public service, and judiciary) compared to national distributions.	This is a strong indicator measuring a part of the target. The wording could be slightly improved to make it clearer.	IMPROVED WORDING: Proportions of positions held by different age, sex, disability and population groups in public institutions (national and local legislatures, public service, and judiciary) compared to national distributions.	This wording is clearer.
REMOVE: Proportion of countries that address young people's multisectoral needs with their national development plans and poverty reduction strategies	This indicator only measures representativeness and responsiveness to one social group (youth). It is too specific.	REPLACE WITH: 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. It is also worded in a way that would be more universal than indicators on elections. 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. This indicator could be collected by a third party independent of the state.
16.8 Broaden and strengthen the participation of developing countries in the institutions of global governance			
IAEG indicator	Comment on IAEG	Replacement / addition	Why is this an improvement?
KEEP: Percentage of members or voting rights of developing countries in international organizations	This is a fairly strong indicator. It could be improved by adjusting the wording to “international decision-making bodies” The IAEG or UNDESA would need to agree on which international bodies it applied to, as well as defining developing countries. This indicator can also be used for target 10.6	IMPROVED WORDING: Percentage of members or voting rights of developing countries in international decision-making bodies	This would capture voting rights within multiple bodies in international organisations – such as the UN Security Council within the wider UN or the board of governors in the World Bank.
16.9 By 2030 provide legal identity for all including birth registration			
IAEG indicator	Comment on IAEG	Replacement / addition	Why is this an improvement?
KEEP: Percentage of children under 5 whose births have been registered with civil authority	This indicator is broadly accepted. Nonetheless, the age could be lowered to 1 in order to bring it into line with established practice.	N/A	N/A
16.10 Ensure public access to information and protect fundamental freedoms, in accordance with national legislation and international agreements			
IAEG indicator	Comment on IAEG	Replacement / addition	Why is this an improvement?
KEEP: Number of verified cases of killing, kidnapping, enforced disappearance, arbitrary detention and torture of journalists, associated	This indicator has broad support. It will be important that a multilateral body or independent third parties – rather than official government bodies – are responsible for gathering data for this	N/A	N/A

media personnel, trade unionists and human rights advocates in the previous 12 months	indicator.		
		ADD: Percentage of people who feel that they can express political views without fear	<p>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).</p> <p>Nonetheless, 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.</p> <p>It would be crucial that those conducting surveys are – and are perceived to be - independent of the state.</p>
16.a Strengthen relevant national institutions, including through international cooperation, for building capacities at all levels, in particular in developing countries, for preventing violence and combating terrorism and crime			
IAEG indicator	Comment on IAEG	Replacement / addition	Why is this an improvement?
KEEP: 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)	This is a strong proxy for capacities of security services and other authorities to deal with crime and present conflict.	N/A	N/A

		<p>ADD: Percentage of people who report that they feel safe walking alone at night in the city or area where they live</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The indicator could also be put in target 16.1 (see above)</p> <p>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.</p>
16.b Promote and enforce non-discriminatory laws and policies for sustainable development			
IAEG indicator	Comment on IAEG	Replacement / addition	Why is this an improvement?
<p>KEEP: Percentage of population reporting having personally felt discriminated against or harassed within the last 12 months on the basis of a ground of discrimination prohibited under international human rights law.</p>	<p>This is a strong indicator which measures people's direct experiences of discrimination. The wording could, however, be clearer.</p>	<p>IMPROVED WORDING: Percentage of population reporting having felt discriminated against or harassed within the last 12 months because of their identity.</p>	<p>The wording is clearer. Discrimination or harassment on the basis of is sufficiently addressed in universal human rights law.</p>

About Saferworld

Saferworld is an independent international organisation working to prevent violent conflict and build safer lives. We work with local people affected by conflict to improve their safety and sense of security, and conduct wider research and analysis. We use this evidence and learning to improve local, national and international policies and practices that can help build lasting peace. Our priority is people – we believe that everyone should be able to lead peaceful, fulfilling lives, free from insecurity and violent conflict. We are a not-for-profit organisation with programmes in nearly 20 countries and territories across Africa, Asia and Europe.

Saferworld – 28 Charles Square, London N1 6HT, UK
Registered Charity no 1043843
Company limited by guarantee no 3015948
Tel: +44 (0)20 7324 4646 | Fax: +44 (0)20 7324 4647
Email: general@saferworld.org.uk
Web: www.saferworld.org.uk