

Priority Indicators and Metadata for Goal 16

from the

Transparency, Accountability & Participation (TAP) Network



Transparency, Accountability
& Participation in Post-2015

www.tapnetwork2015.org

The following priority indicators and recommendations and corresponding Metadata for Goal 16 Indicators are the result of months of work and feedback from TAP Network organizations, including the inputs of dozens of experts from CSOs working closely on each of these issues. This includes some of the world's foremost civil society data providers and users from, and experts on sustainable development metrics and measurement.

Endorsements by organizations for each of these indicators and recommendations are meant to represent organizations that support these inputs and organizations with expertise on each particular issue, and are not meant to imply relative importance or prioritization of certain inputs over others.

Table of Contents

16.1 <i>Significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere.....</i>	2
16.2 <i>End abuse, exploitation, trafficking and all forms of violence and torture against children.....</i>	5
16.3 <i>Promote the rule of law at the national and international levels, and ensure equal access to justice for all</i>	8
16.4 <i>By 2030 significantly reduce illicit financial and arms flows, strengthen recovery and return of stolen assets, and combat all forms of organized crime</i>	10
16.5 <i>Substantially reduce corruption and bribery in all its forms</i>	14
16.6 <i>Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels</i>	19
16.7 <i>Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels</i>	24
16.9 <i>By 2030 provide legal identity for all including birth registration.....</i>	26
16.10 <i>Ensure public access to information and protect fundamental freedoms, in accordance with national legislation and international agreements.....</i>	28
16.a <i>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</i>	33



Endorsed by: 21st Community Empowerment for Youth and Women Initiative, Brain Builders International, CAFSO-WRAG for Development, Civil Society Partnership for Development Effectiveness (CPDE) – Nigeria, ENDA Tiers Monde, Global Network for Community Development, Namati, Nonviolence International, Saferworld, Sisters of Charity Federation, Stakeholder Forum, Transparency International, Universal Rights Network, Women Educators Association of Nigeria (WEAN), World Federation of United Nations Associations (WFUNA), Women for Peace and Gender Equality Initiative, Zero Corruption Coalition

16.1 significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere

Proposed Indicator #1	“Number of victims of intentional homicide by age, sex, mechanism and where possible type of perpetrator, per 100,000 population”
Rationale and interpretation:	This is a strong indicator that directly measures a key aspect of violence. Efforts will be required to widen coverage and overcome reliance on estimates through building capacities in those countries with weak data. Definitions may need to be tightened.
Examples of available data sources and methods of collection:	National data: Administrative data (criminal justice system and public health/civil registration), household and victimization surveys Global data: UNODC currently collects and publishes data from criminal justice systems. UNODC and WHO (collecting data from public health systems) are working together to harmonize data and procedures to produce joint UNDOC-WHO homicide estimates at country, regional and global level.
References:	See UNODC: https://www.unodc.org/gsh/en/data.html
Disaggregation:	Age, sex, urban-rural, mechanism and – where possible – similar disaggregation on perpetrator
Interlinkages with other goals and targets:	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.

<u>Proposed Indicator #2</u>	“Conflict-related deaths per 100,000 people”
Rationale and interpretation:	<p>With peace identified as one of five cross-cutting priorities for the international community, the IAEG has a clear mandate to measure conflict-related deaths. 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Measuring both direct and indirect conflict deaths is feasible. Nonetheless, more work will be required to build a consensus and build capacities in order for the world to arrive at baseline and monitor progress until 2030. Doing this would mark a significant achievement. Few NSOs currently collect data on direct conflict deaths, meaning that third parties such as the Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCPD) may 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 working with UN statistical bodies could collect and collate this data.</p>
Examples of available data sources and methods of collection:	<p>National data: Variety of methodologies including expert reporting (data has not yet been mainstreamed into national accounting systems)</p> <p>Global data: Direct conflict deaths currently gathered by Uppsala Conflict Data Program battle deaths dataset, IISS Armed Conflict Database, PRIO Battle-Deaths Data and the WHO.</p>
References:	<p>See UCPD: http://www.pcr.uu.se/research/UCDP/</p> <p>See Global Burden of Armed Violence: http://www.genevadeclaration.org/measurability/global-burden-of-armed-violence/global-burden-of-armed-violence-2015.html</p> <p>See IISS: https://acd.iiss.org/</p>
Disaggregation:	Age, sex, urban-rural, social identity (e.g. ethnicity, religion)

Interlinkages with other goals and targets:	When disaggregated by urban/rural, age, gender, the indicator can be used for targets 5.2, 16.2.
--	--

<u>Proposed Indicator #3</u>	“Percentage of people who report that they feel safe walking alone at night in the city or area where they live”
Rationale and interpretation:	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.
Examples of available data sources and methods of collection:	National: 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: Global data for this indicator could be drawn from Gallup’s annual World Poll, which covers 95% of the world’s population.
References:	See Gallup: http://www.gallup.com/services/170945/world-poll.aspx
Disaggregation:	Urban/rural, age, sex, social identity
Interlinkages with other goals and targets:	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.



Endorsed by: 21st Community Empowerment for Youth and Women Initiative, Brain Builders International, CAFSO-WRAG for Development, Civil Society Partnership for Development Effectiveness (CPDE) – Nigeria, ENDA Tiers Monde, Global Network for Community Development, International Presentation Association, Nonviolence International, Plan International, Saferworld, Save the Children, Sisters of Charity Federation, Society of Catholic Medical Missionaries, Stakeholder Forum, Transparency International, Universal Rights Network, Women Educators Association of Nigeria (WEAN), World Federation of United Nations Associations (WFUNA), Women for Peace and Gender Equality Initiative, Youth Initiative for Advocacy of Human Rights and Democracy, Zero Corruption Coalition

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

<u>Proposed Indicator #1</u>	“Percentage of young women and men aged 18-24 years who experienced sexual violence by age 18”
Rationale and interpretation:	<p>While it is recognized that this indicator captures only one of the gravest forms of violence against children rather than being inclusive of all forms, it can be considered a proxy indicator that reflects a key aspect of the change we want to observe in order to achieve the target of elimination of VAC. This indicator is also universally relevant, and has recently been high on political agendas.</p> <p>The right of children to protection from all forms of violence is enshrined in the Convention on the Rights of the Child and its Optional Protocols.</p>
Examples of available data sources and methods of collection:	Household surveys such as DHS have been collecting data on this indicator in low- and middle-income countries since the late 1990s.

	<p>There are existing globally comparable tools and mechanisms for data collection that countries have implemented to monitor the situation with regards to this indicator.</p> <p>UNICEF for household surveys (fully comparable data is available for some 50 low- and middle-income countries)</p> <p>On child related indicators, at international level, data on violent crime are collected by UNICEF and UNODC; at national level, data are produced by criminal justice sources (the police/judiciary), and social and child protection services.</p>
References:	<p>“Sexual violence” as defined in General Comment No. 13 on the Convention of the Rights of the Child, accessible here: http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/crc/docs/CRC.C.GC.13_en.pdf</p> <p>Goal 16 Virtual Network Sourcebook</p> <p>UNICEF technical consultation with Child-focused INGOs</p> <p>A Global Partnership to End Violence Against Children, David Steven http://16-2endviolenceagainstchildren.org/uploads/Consultation_Unabridged_Report_310715.pdf</p>
Disaggregation:	Urban/rural, age/s at time of sexual violence, sex, social identity
Interlinkages with other goals and targets:	16.1 When disaggregated by age, gender, the indicator can be used for targets 5.2, 16.1.

<i>Proposed Indicator #2</i>	“Percentage of children aged 1-14 years who experienced any physical punishment by caregivers in the past month”
Rationale and interpretation:	<p>While it is acknowledged that the target refers to the elimination of all forms of VAC and the proposed indicators refers to only one specific form, it is the most widespread, and socially accepted, type of violence against children and will provide a good indication of children’s overall exposure to violence.</p> <p>This indicator is also universally relevant.</p>
Examples of available data sources and methods of collection:	<p>Existing data collection mechanisms are already in place for many countries to monitor this indicator.</p> <p>There is an existing, standardized and validated measurement tool (the CTS) that is widely accepted and has been implemented in a large number of countries.</p>

	<p>Household surveys such as DHS and MICS that have been collecting data on this indicator in low- and middle-income countries since around 2005.</p> <p>Nationally representative and comparable data are available for some 60 low- and middle-income countries.</p>
References:	<p>The protection of children from all forms of violence is a fundamental right guaranteed by the Convention on the Rights of the Child and its Optional Protocols.</p> <p>Use of the term “caregivers” broadens the scope since children can be exposed to violence from a variety of actors charged with their care, and leaves space for the potential future development of methodologies and data collection tools for gathering information about the use of physical punishment in settings other than the home.</p> <p>The term “caregivers” and “physical punishment” as defined in General Comment No. 13 on the Convention of the Rights of the Child, accessible here: http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/crc/docs/CRC.C.GC.13_en.pdf</p> <p>Children’s protection from physical punishment and other cruel and degrading forms of punishment is also guided by General Comment No. 8 on the CRC, accessible here: http://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRC%2fC%2fGC%2f8&Lang=en</p>
Disaggregation:	Age, sex, social identity , relationship of caregiver to child
Interlinkages with other goals and targets:	16.1.2. The indicator also monitors other targets: 5.2 (women), 10.3 (hate crimes).



Endorsed by: 21st Community Empowerment for Youth and Women Initiative, Brain Builders International, CAFSO-WRAG for Development, Civil Society Partnership for Development Effectiveness (CPDE) – Nigeria, ENDA Tiers Monde, Global Network for Community Development, International Presentation Association, Namati, Nonviolence International, Open Society Justice Initiative, Plan International, Saferworld, Sisters of Charity Federation, Stakeholder Forum, Society of Catholic Medical Missionaries, Transparency International, Universal Rights Network, Women Educators Association of Nigeria (WEAN), World Federation of United Nations Associations (WFUNA), Women for Peace and Gender Equality Initiative, Youth Initiative for Advocacy of Human Rights and Democracy, Zero Corruption Coalition

16.3 promote the rule of law at the national and international levels, and ensure equal access to justice for all

<u>Proposed Indicator</u>	“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”
Rationale and interpretation:	<p>The United Nations Technical Support Team Sub-Group for Goal 16 and a Virtual Network on Indicators for Goal 16 (an online platform with more than 200 members from governments, NSOs, civil society, academia and other multilateral agencies) both also recommend this indicator. 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.</p> <p>This indicator is a sound measure for trust and confidence in the rule of law and access to justice systems. It captures experience in both civil and</p>

	<p>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.</p> <p>The indicator measures the experience of those who had a dispute in accessing the justice system and whether that experience was considered fair. It also measures the process in terms of accessibility and quality of services, rather than the outcome. Whether a mechanism is "fair" 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. The indicator covers the full spectrum of mechanisms for dispute resolution.</p> <p>Governments will need to collect disaggregated data on performance to ensure that they are not discriminating in delivery of public services, governance, justice and rule of law.</p>
<p>Examples of available data sources and methods of collection:</p>	<p>Origin of Data: Household surveys Scope: Data is available for 107 countries Source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government • Data from existing household surveys can be expanded and collected by the World Bank at the global level.
<p>References:</p>	<p>Extensive data is collected by the World Justice Project, available at: http://worldjusticeproject.org/sites/default/files/files/wjp_rule_of_law_index_2014_report.pdf</p>
<p>Disaggregation:</p>	<p>Beyond existing binding commitments will need to be disaggregated along other dimensions including social group, income levels, location, for policymakers to properly assess progress on peace, justice for all and effective institutions for all in society including the lowest quintile</p> <p>All countries have ratified at least one human rights treaty obliging themselves to guarantee rights and freedoms without discrimination based on grounds including race, ethnicity, color, sex, age, language, religion, disability, migratory status, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.</p>
<p>Interlinkages with other goals and targets:</p>	<p>16.6, 16b</p>



Endorsed by: 21st Community Empowerment for Youth and Women Initiative, Brain Builders International, CAFSO-WRAG for Development, Civil Society Partnership for Development Effectiveness (CPDE) – Nigeria, ENDA Tiers Monde, Global Network for Community Development, Liberian united to Expose Hidden Weapons Organization, Namati, Nonviolence International, Saferworld, Sisters of Charity Federation, Stakeholder Forum, Society of Catholic Medical Missionaries, Transparency International, Universal Rights Network, Women Educators Association of Nigeria (WEAN), World Federation of United Nations Associations (WFUNA), Women for Peace and Gender Equality Initiative, Youth Initiative for Advocacy of Human Rights and Democracy, Zero Corruption Coalition

16.4 by 2030 significantly reduce illicit financial and arms flows, strengthen recovery and return of stolen assets, and combat all forms of organized crime

<u>Proposed Indicator #1</u>	“Total annual value of inward and outward illicit financial flows at the country level (in current US\$) disaggregated by trade misinvoicing and other sources.”
Rationale and interpretation:	Indicator closely mirrors that suggested by IAEG. Additions include a requirement for an annual country level report and data disaggregated by sources.
Examples of available data sources and methods of collection:	<p>There are IMF studies and books that demonstrate the ability to use Direction of Trade Statistics to highlight the impact of illicit money leaving developing economies: The following is not a comprehensive list but is representative:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. External Debt and Capital Flight in Sub-Saharan Africa, S. Ibi Ajayi and Moshin S. Khan, Editors, IMF, 2000 link: http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/nft/2000/extdebt/index.htm 2. An Analysis of External Debt and Capital Flight in the Severely Indebted Low Income Countries in Sub-Saharan Africa, S. Ibi Ajayi, IMF Working Paper No. WP/97/68, June 1997

3. Capital Flight from Russia, Prakash Loungani and Paolo Mauro, IMF Policy Discussion Paper, PDP/00/06, June 2000 . This paper recognizes the role of trade misinvoicing in Russia but does not carry out the actual calculations. Uses a broader definition of the Hot Money method that includes the net errors and omissions to capture balance of payments leakages; link: <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/pdp/2000/pdp06.pdf>
4. Capital Flight: Scale and Nature L. Grigoryev and A. Kosarev, February 24, 2000 link <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/seminar/2000/invest/pdf/kosarev.pdf>
5. Philippines 2014 Article IV Consultation - Staff Report; Press Release; IMF Country Report No. 14/245; June 18, 2014 ; link: <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/scr/2014/cr14245.pdf>.
This is an official Board Document on a member following an Article IV Consultation. It refers to the GFI study on the Philippines on page 52, footnote 3.
6. Putting the Cart Before the Horse? Capital Account Liberalization and Exchange Rate Flexibility in China Eswar Prasad, Thomas Rumbaugh, and Qing Wang January 1, 2005 IMF Policy Discussion Paper No. 05/1
7. Money Laundering: Muddying the Macroeconomy - Finance & Development - March 1997 - Peter J. Quirk
8. Capital Controls: Country Experiences with Their Use and Liberalization IMF Occasional Paper 190, May 17, 2000 part 1 of 3
9. Robbing the Riches: Capital Flight, Institutions, and Instability; by Valerie Cerra, Meenakshi Rishi, and Sweta C. Saxena; IMF Working Paper 05/199; October 1, 2005.

Given these citations we believe the assessment of “robust-ness, reliability, validity” should be considered “high.” Further, the “Objective Verifiability” should also be listed as “high” given the source.

There was considerable disagreement in the FfD negotiations over the definition of ‘illicit financial flows.’ However, ‘trade misinvoicing’ (i.e. trade fraud) has been defined and used (as the above publications would suggest) for decades. Trade misinvoicing is the method that is used to move close to 80 percent of all illicit money offshore so it is relevant to the current target which calls for “substantially reduce illicit financial flows.” This change, we believe, will provide an indicator that is fit for purpose.

Additionally, the way the current indicator is written it is unclear if it is meant to infer that total volumes should be provided on a country level or just the aggregated global level. Also, it is unclear if it is meant that

	this exercise will be carried out only once or every year for the post-2015 period. We would suggest that the new indicator language on trade misinvoicing should spell out that these estimates of volumes should be on a country-level basis and that the estimations should occur every year up to 2030 so that progress toward reducing them can be determined.
References:	Global Financial Integrity uses the IMF Director of Trade Statistics dataset and a methodology based on one developed at the IMF to estimate the volume of trade misinvoicing on a country-level basis which can be found here: http://www.gfintegrity.org/report/2014-global-report-illicit-financial-flows-from-developing-countries-2003-2012/
Disaggregation:	Data should be disaggregated by trade misinvoicing, leakages from the balance of payments and other sources.
Interlinkages with other goals and targets:	17.1

<i>Proposed Indicator #2</i>	"Percentage of seized and collected firearms that are recorded and traced, in accordance with international standards and legal instruments."
Rationale and interpretation:	The TAP Network supports this indicator as currently proposed by the IAEG.
Examples of available data sources and methods of collection:	No change from indicator suggested by IAEG.
References:	No change from indicator suggested by IAEG
Disaggregation:	No change from indicator suggested by IAEG.
Interlinkages with other goals and targets:	No change from indicator suggested by IAEG.

<i>Proposed Indicator #3</i>	"Recovered stolen assets as a percentage of illicit financial flows."
Rationale and interpretation:	Stolen assets issue is not captured in other indicators. As a percentage of IFFs in a given year, excluding trade misinvoicing, indicator would demonstrate successes in proportion to the challenge.
Examples of available data sources and methods of collection:	National data: Some countries currently maintain their own asset recovery databases. Global data: 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.
References:	See Asset Recovery Watch: http://star.worldbank.org/corruption-cases/assetrecovery/?f[0]=bundle%3Aarw
Disaggregation:	N/A
Interlinkages with other goals and targets:	17.1

<i>Proposed Indicator #4</i>	"Percentage of businesses who believe organized crime imposes costs on business in their country."
Rationale and interpretation:	This indicator could be feasibly integrated into polling of the general public or into crime victimization surveys.
Examples of available data sources and methods of collection:	Data are currently collected through the World Economic Forum's Global Competitiveness Report (WEF-GCR). Data has been collected since 2005.
References:	See the Global Competitiveness Report: http://reports.weforum.org/global-competitiveness-report-2014-2015/
Disaggregation:	N/A
Interlinkages with other goals and targets:	17.1



Endorsed by: 21st Community Empowerment for Youth and Women Initiative, Brain Builders International, CAFSO-WRAG for Development, Civil Society Partnership for Development Effectiveness (CPDE) – Nigeria, ENDA Tiers Monde, Global Network for Community Development, International Movement ATD Fourth World, International Presentation Association, Namati, Nonviolence International, Saferworld, Save the Children, Sisters of Charity Federation, Stakeholder Forum, Society of Catholic Medical Missionaries, Transparency International, Universal Rights Network, Women Educators Association of Nigeria (WEAN), World Federation of United Nations Associations (WFUNA), Women for Peace and Gender Equality Initiative, Youth Initiative for Advocacy of Human Rights and Democracy, Zero Corruption Coalition

16.5 substantially reduce corruption and bribery in all its forms

<p><u>Proposed Indicator</u></p>	<p>The indicator that is the best option for measuring changes in corruption by using the proxy of reported experiences of bribery is: “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.”</p>
<p>Rationale and interpretation:</p>	<p>This is a strong indicator; it has already been used relatively comprehensively around the world. However, there are two issues that would have to be resolved related to how to define ‘persons’ and ‘public official’.</p> <p>‘Persons’ would have to include children, who constitute more than 30% of the world's population. As a group, children are highly dependent on public services for their survival and development, come in contact with public service providers on a daily basis and very often encounter corruption and bribery. To ensure that this indicator captures the perspectives of all it would be important that the perceptions of children are, as far as possible and taking their evolving capacities into consideration, collected directly from them. Without capturing their perceptions, the picture will not be complete. There are methodologies</p>

	<p>and tools developed at national, regional and international levels to capture children’s perceptions on public policy-making, governance and service delivery that could be adapted to capture the views of children in relation to this indicator.</p> <p>‘Public official’ also would have to be properly and commonly defined. There are two options for doing this: public official should be understood as an government employee as defined by the UN Convention against Corruption (UNCAC) in Article 2 (a): “public official” shall mean: (i) any person holding a legislative, executive, administrative or judicial office of a State Party, whether appointed or elected, whether permanent or temporary, whether paid or unpaid, irrespective of that person’s seniority; (ii) any other person who performs a public function, including for a public agency or public enterprise, or provides a public service, as defined in the domestic law of the State Party and as applied in the pertinent area of law of that State Party; (iii) any other person defined as a “public official” in the domestic law of a State Party. However, for the purpose of some specific measures contained in chapter II of this Convention, “public official” may mean any person who performs a public function or provides a public service as defined in the domestic law of the State Party and as applied in the pertinent area of law of that State Party.”</p> <p>Alternatively, public official could be limited to interactions with specific public services and the public servants administering them. Here a list of services could include: police, judiciary, registry land, medical, education, tax and utilities.</p>
<p>Examples of available data sources and methods of collection:</p>	<p>The suggestion would be to look beyond official data sources for data and use regional surveys such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Afrobarometer (see question 56: http://www.afrobarometer.org/sites/default/files/questionnaires/Round%206/saf_r6_questionnaire.pdf) · Eurobarometer (http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_397_en.pdf) · Latinobarometro: (see question 80 ST.D: http://www.latinobarometro.org/latContents.jsp) · The global corruption barometer produced by Transparency International (see question 7: http://www.transparency.org/gcb2013/in_detail). <p>For Transparency International 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</p>

	<p>representative where possible. In six countries, the sample was urban only.</p> <p>In terms of method collection, there are some useful resources for gathering the experiences and perceptions of children. The Centre for Children’s Rights at Queen’s University in Belfast, in collaboration with Save the Children, Plan International, UNICEF and a wide range of other national, regional and international organisations, has developed a methodology and tools to capture children’s views (with a main focus on children 10-18 years of age) on public spending to realize children’s rights within frameworks of transparency, participation and accountability. The perceptions of almost 2.700 children from 71 countries were collected using this methodology. A report and video summarizing the views of these children can be found on the following link: http://www.childrightsconnect.org/govtspendingsurvey/. The report also outlines the methodology and tools used to engage with children.</p>
<p>References:</p>	<p>For how to do a corruption survey, see:</p> <p>http://gateway.transparency.org/guides/intro/corruption_surveys and http://gateway.transparency.org/guides/approach/corruption_surveys.</p> <p>For global, see: http://www.transparency.org/gcb2013/in_detail.</p> <p>For national, see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bangladesh: http://www.ti-bangladesh.org/research/Executive%20Summary_23122010%20FINAL.pdf - Ghana: http://www.transparency.org/news/pressrelease/20111209_votp_report - Kenya: http://gateway.transparency.org/tools/detail/324 and http://www.tikenya.org/index.php/the-east-african-bribery-index. - Mexico: http://gateway.transparency.org/tools/detail/331 and http://www.tm.org.mx/indice-nacional-de-corrupcion-y-buen-gobierno-incbg/. - Peru: http://www.proetica.org.pe/encuestas-corrupcion/. - Vietnam: http://gateway.transparency.org/tools/detail/517.
<p>Disaggregation:</p>	<p>Data should be disaggregated by: gender, urban/rural, age group, administrative level (at least sub-national), ethnicity, disability and income group.</p>

	Ideally, it would also be disaggregated by sector and type of public service (see examples of surveys noted above).
Interlinkages with other goals and targets:	<p>Due to this indicator’s interlinkages with many governance targets, it can also be used to concurrently monitor certain dimensions of progress on the other targets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Poverty (Goal 1: End poverty in all its forms everywhere, targets 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5) - Hunger (Goal 2: End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture, target 2.3) - Health (Goal 3: Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages, targets 3.1, 3.2, 3.7, 3.8) - Education (Goal 4: Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all, targets 4.1, 4.2, 4.6) - Gender (Goal 5: Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls; targets 5.1, 5.2, 5.a) - Water & Sanitation (Goal 6: Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all; targets 6.1, 6.2, 6.5, 6.b) - Energy (Goal 7: Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all; target 7.1, 7.b) - Growth (Goal 8: Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all; targets 8.1, 8.7, 8.8) - Infrastructure (Goal 9: Build resilient infrastructure promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and foster innovation; targets 9.1, 9a) - Inequality (Goal 10: Reduce inequality within and among countries; targets 10.1, 10.3, 10.c) - Cities (Goal 11: Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable; target 11.1) - Sustainable production (Goal 12: Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns; targets 12.2, 12.6, 12.7) - Climate Change (Goal 13: Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts, target 13.1) - Oceans (Goal 14: Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development; targets 14.1, 14.4) - Forestry (Goal 15: Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat

	<p>desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss; targets 15.2, 15.5, 15.7, 15.c)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Peace, justice and governance (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; targets 16.1, 16.2, 16.3, 16.4, 16.7, 16.9, 16.10). - Finance (Goal 17: Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development; targets 17.1 <p>(In an attempt to test some of these links Transparency International found that in countries with higher bribery rates people are more likely to be detained in prisons without any charges, almost entirely negating the positive effects of good governance on protecting fundamental freedoms. This also holds true when testing the correlation between corruption and public services (primary education, clean water, proper sanitation, maternal and child health, and poverty):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - https://www.transparency.org/files/content/feature/2014_MDGs_Statistical_Annex.pdf - http://economicsandpeace.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/Peace-and-Corruption.pdf <p>http://blog.transparency.org/2015/09/24/measuring-corruption-to-end-poverty-2/</p> <p>for links between corruption and peace).</p> <p>(NOTE: While this shows corruption’s undermining effects, we could not establish clear links between corruption and the other related Goal 16 concepts owing to a lack of data availability).</p>
--	---



Endorsed by: 21st Community Empowerment for Youth and Women Initiative, Access Info Europe, AfroLeadership, CAFSO-WRAG for Development, Brain Builders International, Civil Society Partnership for Development Effectiveness (CPDE) – Nigeria, ENDA Tiers Monde, Global Network for Community Development, International Budget Partnership, International ATD Fourth World, International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA), International Presentation Association, Liberian united to Expose Hidden Weapons Organization, Namati, Nonviolence International, Open Society Justice Initiative, Plan International, Restless Development, Saferworld, Save the Children, Stakeholder Forum, Society of Catholic Medical Missionaries, Transparency International, Universal Rights Network, Women Educators Association of Nigeria (WEAN), World Federation of United Nations Associations (WFUNA), Women for Peace and Gender Equality Initiative, Youth Initiative for Advocacy of Human Rights and Democracy, Zero Corruption Coalition

16.6 develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels

<u>Proposed Indicator #1</u>	“Proportion of population satisfied with the quality of public services, disaggregated by service”
Rationale and interpretation:	<p>The recommended indicator has the potential to capture real change due to work of effective, accountable and transparent institutions. The indicator, which directly measures people’s experiences of institutions, is an example of a perception-based measure that address satisfaction with public services and therefore is reflective of overall effectiveness of public services and institutions.</p> <p>This data has been used by NSOs in several contexts over a long period of time, in collaboration with data producers from civil society.</p>

	<p>This recommendation has also been identified as a priority indicator by the Goal 16 Virtual Network and by the UN Technical Support Team on this issue, and represents an emerging consensus amongst key stakeholders.</p> <p>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 excluded from these kind of surveys. At the same time, children are highly dependent on public services. Without capturing the perceptions of all people, including children, the picture will not be complete.</p>
<p>Examples of available data sources and methods of collection:</p>	<p>Data is currently collected by perception surveys such as the World Value Survey, Gallup, Afrobarometer and the other Barometers, and various NSOs, is globally or regionally comparable. The general methodology is well established among NSOs in developed and developing countries.</p> <p>In Africa, the approach has already been applied and reported by several NSOs using the SHaSA questionnaire. Nine countries have already started to collect data using the Harmonised Module on Democratic Governance, with as many as 20 more expressing interest in conducting survey in the future. Questions on the Harmonised Module ask specifically about rates of access to, and trust in, the following services/institutions: public service (in general), courts of justice, police, public hospitals and clinics, public schools, tax/customs authorities, social security system, state media, Parliament, army, President, Prime Minister (where applicable), Mayor (where applicable).</p> <p>Regional Barometers (e.g. 19 countries in Africa in 2014 amongst 36 in total since the Afrobarometer process started, 10 Arab states in the Arabbarometer, 18 Latin American states in the Latinobarometer, 13 Asian states with three surveys and a further five with at least one survey each) ask about experience of accessing essential government services, including public schools, public clinics and hospitals, registration offices (birth certificate, driver’s licence, passport, voter’s card, permits, etc.), water, sanitation and electricity. Questions also ask about ease of access, including the need for bribes, gifts or favours.</p> <p>The World Values Survey asks respondents in 60 countries (for the 6th Wave, 2010-2014) about confidence in institutions including the armed forces, the police, the courts, government and parliament. There are also questions on the extent to which government should take responsibility to ensure that everybody is provided for. Private sector data collectors already conduct surveys in a range of countries – Gallup’s World Poll conducts representative surveys face to face in over 140 countries covering the emerging and developed world, including questions on confidence in the judicial system, in the local police, in the military and in government. Edelman’s Trust Barometer breaks down questions of trust amongst a range of institutions.</p>

	(Goal 16 Virtual Network Sourcebook)
References:	<p>SHaSA Questionnaire: http://ea.au.int/en/statistics</p> <p>Afrobarometer: http://www.afrobarometer.org/</p> <p>Latinobarometro: http://www.latinobarometro.org/lat.jsp</p> <p>Arabbarometer: http://www.arabbarometer.org/</p> <p>World Values Survey: http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/wvs.jsp</p> <p>Gallup World Poll: http://www.gallup.com/services/170945/world-poll.aspx</p> <p>Centre for Children’s Rights: http://www.childrightsconnect.org/govtspendingsurvey</p> <p>Goal 16 Virtual Network Sourcebook</p>
Disaggregation:	By sex, age, income, economic and social situation, ethnicity, minority, indigenous, race, migratory status, disability, and geographic location.
Interlinkages with other goals and targets:	<p>Linked to targets/indicators such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Target 1.3 on social protection systems ✓ 1.4 on access to basic services ✓ Target 2.2 on ending all forms of malnutrition ✓ Target 3.2 on ending preventable deaths of newborns and children under 5 years of age ✓ Target 3.8 on universal health coverage ✓ Target 4.1 on free, equitable and quality primary and secondary education ✓ Target 4.2 on quality early childhood development ✓ Target 7.1 on access to affordable, reliable energy services ✓ Target 10.2 on social inclusion ✓ Target 11.1 on adequate housing ✓ Target 16.3 on rule of law ✓ Target 16.9 on legal identity and birth registration

<i>Proposed Indicator #2:</i>	Open Budget Index Score
Rationale and interpretation:	Transparency and access to budget information enable governments and stakeholders alike to plan and track spending to results and impact, and help foster open and participatory governance at all levels.

	<p>The Open Budget Index assesses the amount, level of detail, and timeliness of budget information governments are making publically available. Each country is given a score between 0 and 100 that determines its ranking on the Open Budget Index.</p> <p>The Open Budget Index uses documented evidence and objective criteria to provide an independent, comparable assessment of how government manages public finances. The Survey is aligned with the international standards of the International Monetary Fund, the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, the Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability program (whose secretariat is hosted by the World Bank), the International Organisation of Supreme Audit Institutions (INTOSAI), as well as the High Level Principles on Fiscal Transparency issued by the Global Initiative for Fiscal Transparency (GIFT) and endorsed by United Nations General Assembly Resolution 67/218.</p>
<p>Examples of available data sources and methods of collection:</p>	<p>Many governments already publish timely, comprehensive, comparable, and useable fiscal reports throughout the year according to a set of graduated standards, derived from established international norms.</p> <p>The Open Budget Index uses documented evidence and objective criteria to provide an independent, comparable assessment of how government manages public finances. The Index is aligned with the international standards of the International Monetary Fund, the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, the Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability program (whose secretariat is hosted by the World Bank), the International Organisation of Supreme Audit Institutions (INTOSAI), as well as the High Level Principles on Fiscal Transparency issued by the Global Initiative for Fiscal Transparency (GIFT) and endorsed by United Nations General Assembly Resolution 67/218.</p> <p>The Index examines the timeliness and comprehensiveness of eight budget documents, from expenditure plans to execution and audit reports, which enable stakeholders to fully understand and monitor government use of public resources.</p> <p>The Survey is not an opinion poll or a measure of perceptions – it is based on a rigorous, objective methodology subject to independent review. The International Budget Partnership biennially produces the Open Budget Survey, including the Open Budget Index. The latest Survey, released September 2015, includes 102 countries. It should be noted that expert assessments from third parties have been proposed as indicators in other goals.</p>
<p>References:</p>	<p>The Open Budget Survey, including the Open Budget Index: http://internationalbudget.org/opening-budgets/open-budget-initiative/open-budget-survey</p> <p>Goal 16 Virtual Network Report</p>

Disaggregation:	The Open Budget Index assesses the transparency and comprehensiveness of national budget documents, including multi-year information on revenue and expenditure, showing the overall resources available and spending trends, program-level information and non-financial performance data. This information is critical for planning and tracking the SDGs.
Interlinkages with other goals and targets:	<p>Budgets are critical for all of the SDGs. This indicator is linked to targets/indicators such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ 1.3 (social protection) ✓ 1.4 on access to basic services ✓ 3.8 (health coverage) ✓ 4.1 (education) ✓ 7.1 on access to affordable, reliable energy services ✓ 10.2 on social inclusion ✓ 16.9 on legal identity and birth registration ✓ 17.1 (domestic resources) ✓ 17.9 (capacity building) ✓ 17.13 (macroeconomic stability)



Endorsed by: 21st Community Empowerment for Youth and Women Initiative, Access Info Europe, AfroLeadership, Brain Builders International, CAFSO-WRAG for Development, Civil Society Partnership for Development Effectiveness (CPDE) – Nigeria, ENDA Tiers Monde, Global Network for Community Development, International ATD Fourth World, International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA), International Presentation Association, Liberian united to Expose Hidden Weapons Organization, Namati, Nonviolence International, Open Society Justice Initiative, Saferworld, Save the Children, Stakeholder Forum, Sisters of Charity Federation, Society of Catholic Medical Missionaries, Transparency International, Universal Rights Network, Women Educators Association of Nigeria (WEAN), World Federation of United Nations Associations (WFUNA), Women for Peace and Gender Equality Initiative, Youth Initiative for Advocacy of Human Rights and Democracy, Zero Corruption Coalition

16.7 – Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels

<p><u>Proposed Indicator</u></p>	<p>“Percentage of population who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive”</p>
<p>Rationale and interpretation:</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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</p>

	<p>define the different types of policy-making processes to which the question applies.</p> <p>This recommendation has also been identified as a priority indicator by the Goal 16 Virtual Network and by the UN Technical Support Team on this issue, and represents an emerging consensus amongst key stakeholders.</p>
Examples of available data sources and methods of collection:	No known global data sources on this indicator, but NSOs and stakeholders could feasibly add to existing national polls or household surveys.
References:	Goal 16 Virtual Network Sourcebook
Disaggregation:	<p>Sex, Gender, Age, Ethnicity, race, Geographical location, Migratory Status, economic group, disability.</p> <p>To ensure the effective realization of the SDG goals and targets, all people, including women, children, persons living with disabilities and people living in poverty, must be able to meaningfully engage in decision-making based on access to timely and user-friendly public information. It is thus important that the suggested indicator measures to what extent these and other vulnerable groups consider decision-making being inclusive and responsive.</p>
Interlinkages with other goals and targets:	1.b, 5.5, 10.2, 10.3, 16.6, 16.10



Endorsed by: 21st Community Empowerment for Youth and Women Initiative, Brain Builders International, CAFSO-WRAG for Development, Civil Society Partnership for Development Effectiveness (CPDE) – Nigeria, ENDA Tiers Monde, International ATD Fourth World, Global Network for Community Development, International Presentation Association, Namati, Nonviolence International, Open Society Justice Initiative, Plan International, Saferworld, Save the Children, Stakeholder Forum, Sisters of Charity Federation, Society of Catholic Medical Missionaries, Transparency International, Universal Rights Network, Women Educators Association of Nigeria (WEAN), World Federation of United Nations Associations (WFUNA), Youth Initiative for Advocacy of Human Rights and Democracy, Women for Peace and Gender Equality Initiative, Youth Initiative for Advocacy of Human Rights and Democracy, Zero Corruption Coalition

16.9 by 2030 provide legal identity for all including birth registration

<u>Proposed Indicator</u>	“Percentage of children under 5 whose births have been registered with civil authority”
Rationale and interpretation:	<p>We would endorse this suggested indicator by the IAEG-SDGs. This indicator relies on established, widely used methodologies, which incentivize governments to expand access to legal identity.</p> <p>By disaggregating birth registration for children under five by single year age, member states will ensure a more responsive measurement to track 'immediate' 'late' and 'delayed' birth registration.</p> <p>Statisticians should ensure that the design of household survey modules is suitable to capture non-registered populations, which may require substantial alterations to sampling designs to capture previously unmeasured populations. Like other indicators, results for this indicator should be disaggregated to surface inequalities.</p>

Examples of available data sources and methods of collection:	<p>Legal identity documents and birth registration is tracked by many national governments. Fully comparable data are available in UNICEF databases for more than 110 low- and middle-income countries.</p> <p>UN Principles and Recommendations for a Vital Statistics System</p>
References:	<p>http://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/health/publication/global-civil-registration-vitalstatistics-scaling-up-investment</p>
Disaggregation:	<p>Disaggregated by income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other characteristics relevant in national contexts. Ensuring disaggregation will bring to light any discriminatory treatment or disproportionate challenges faced by vulnerable groups.</p> <p>The indicator should be disaggregated for children under five by single year age, especially to highlight birth registration among children under 1 year of age.</p> <p>To measure progress on birth registration in the lowest quintile, field surveys will be needed to cover those who were excluded by household surveys.</p>
Interlinkages with other goals and targets:	<p>When Disaggregated – 1.4, 4.1, 4.2, 16.6</p>



Endorsed by: 21st Community Empowerment for Youth and Women Initiative, Access Info Europe, AfroLeadership, Brain Builders International, CAFSO-WRAG for Development, Civil Society Partnership for Development Effectiveness (CPDE) – Nigeria, ENDA Tiers Monde, Global Network for Community Development, International ATD Fourth World, International Presentation Association, Namati, Nonviolence International, Saferworld, Save the Children, Stakeholder Forum, Sisters of Charity Federation, Society of Catholic Medical Missionaries, Transparency International, Universal Rights Network, Women Educators Association of Nigeria (WEAN), World Federation of United Nations Associations (WFUNA), Women for Peace and Gender Equality Initiative, Youth Initiative for Advocacy of Human Rights and Democracy, Zero Corruption Coalition

16.10 ensure public access to information and protect fundamental freedoms, in accordance with national legislation and international agreements

<p><u>Proposed Indicator</u> <u>#1:</u></p>	<p>“Number of countries that have adopted and implemented constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees for public access to information.”</p>
<p>Rationale and interpretation:</p>	<p>A specific indicator on legal provisions for ‘ensuring public access to information’ is essential for the achievement of 16.10, in keeping with the intent and literal text of this target. Safeguards for freedom of expression and media are also required to ensure public access to information.</p> <p>The definition here relates directly to “public access to information”, which is wider than, but is also very much based upon, the established fundamental freedoms of freedom of expression and freedom of association.</p> <p>(Conversely, these freedoms also both impact on the environment for public access to information).</p>

	<p>The focus of this indicator is thus on the status of adoption and implementation of constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees for public access to information.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>It 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.</p> <p>The rationale for assessing the implementation dimension is to assess the relevance of legal steps to practical information accessibility. It is not a composite indicator, but a logical linkage of laws and policies to practical impact that is relevant to SDG concerns.</p> <p>This indicator is recommended as an inseparable complement to the proposed indicator #2 below.</p>
<p>Examples of available data sources and methods of collection:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNESCO and World Bank reports ▪ Other UN bodies, such as UNDP ▪ National bodies such as commissioners responsible for right to information implementation ▪ Media regulators ▪ Academic and research institutions ▪ Media support NGOs (national and international)
<p>References:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNESCO Media Development Indicators: Framework for assessing media development. http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0016/001631/163102e.pdf ▪ World Trends in Freedom of Expression and Media Development: http://www.unesco.org/new/en/world-media-trends ▪ Universal Periodic Review: [UNESCO contributes data on freedom of expression, including constitutional guarantees thereof, in addition to tracking killings of journalists]. http://www.ohchr.org/en/hrbodies/upr/pages/BasicFacts.aspx <p>Prior submissions to DESA-SD by UNESCO, and also by GFMD, IFLA, Article 19 and other TAP Network NGOs.</p>
<p>Disaggregation:</p>	<p>The indicator can be disaggregated in terms of the extent to which the residence of citizens affects their ability to access information (e.g. how do rural, peri-rural, urban and peri-urban dwellers access information from public bodies). It can also be disaggregated in terms of whether gender influences ability to access information.</p>

Interlinkages with other goals and targets:	This indicator is essential to the monitoring and, ultimately, achievement of all 17 SDGs and 169 targets.
--	--

<u>Proposed Indicator #2:</u>	“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.”
Rationale and interpretation:	<p>This indicator collates data from multiple sources, including National Human Rights Institutions, national non-governmental organisations, associations of journalists, trades unions, ILO, and international non-governmental organisations. Information on the number of violations committed against human rights defenders will be compiled annually by OHCHR from these data sources and further data collected through individual complaints to human rights treaty bodies, and Special Procedures of the Human Rights Council, including the Special Rapporteurs on human rights defenders, on freedom of opinion and expression, torture, the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances, and the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention. Additional data from OHCHR field offices and UN Country Teams will also be included. These data will be verified, cross-checked to ensure no duplication, and compiled in line with the agreed international definitions outlined above. Information on the number of journalists killed are 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'.</p> <p>This indicator is recommended as an inseparable complement to the proposed indicator #1 above.</p>
Examples of available data sources and methods of collection:	Data reported now by UNESCO, OHCHR & ILO
References:	Prior submissions to DESA-SD by UNESCO, and also by GFMD, IFLA, Article 19 and other TAP Network NGOs.
Disaggregation:	UN data on attacks on journalists and CSO activist is disaggregated by gender and by other relevant factors (nationality, ethnicity, religion, political affiliation, etc.)

Interlinkages with other goals and targets:	This indicator is designed, as noted in the original proposal, to apply to four other SDGs targets: 5.2, 16.1, 16.3, 16.6
--	---

<u>Alternate Indicator:</u>	“Extent to which the rights to freedom of expression, association, and peaceful assembly are guaranteed in law and practice”
Rationale and interpretation:	<p>This indicator would provide a comprehensive picture of how fundamental freedoms are ensured by a focus on how people experience the realization of their rights to expression, association and peaceful assembly.</p> <p>Perception-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 excluded from these kind of surveys. At the same time, have the right to expression, association and peaceful. Without capturing the perceptions of all people, including children, the picture will not be complete.</p>
Examples of available data sources and methods of collection:	<p>The legal guarantee of these rights could be tracked by the OHCHR based on information emanating from UN Human Rights Mechanisms, including UN Treaty Bodies, UN Special Procedures, such as the Special Rapporteur on the Rights to Peaceful Assembly and Association and the Special Rapporteur on the Promotion and Protection of the Right to Freedom of Opinion and Expression, and the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) of the UN Human Rights Council.</p> <p>How these fundamental freedoms are guaranteed in practice could be tracked through perception-based surveys.</p> <p>There are methodologies and tools developed at national, regional and international levels to capture children’s perceptions on public policy-making, governance and service delivery that could be adapted to capture the views of children in relation to this indicator. For example, the Centre for Children’s Rights at Queen’s University in Belfast, in collaboration with Save the Children, Plan International, UNICEF and a wide range of other national, regional and international organizations, has developed a methodology and tools to capture children’s views on public spending to realize children’s rights within frameworks of transparency, participation and accountability. The perceptions of almost 2.700 children from 71 countries were collected using this methodology.</p>
References:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UPR - www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/UPR/Pages/UPRMain.aspx • Special Rapporteur on the Rights to Peaceful Assembly and Association - www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/AssemblyAssociation/Pages/SRFreedomAssemblyAssociationIndex.aspx

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special Rapporteur on the Promotion and Protection of the Right to Freedom of Opinion and Expression - www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/FreedomOpinion/Pages/OpinionIndex.aspx • Special Rapporteur on the Situation of Human Rights Defenders www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/SRHRDefenders/Pages/SRHRDefendersIndex.aspx • Human Rights Committee - www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/CCPR/Pages/CCPRIndex.aspx • Committee on the Rights of the Child - www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/CRC/Pages/CRCIndex.aspx • Centre for Children’s Rights: http://www.childrightsconnect.org/govtspendingsurvey
Disaggregation:	Age, sex, income, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability and geographic location



Endorsed by: 21st Community Empowerment for Youth and Women Initiative, AfroLeadership, CAFSO-WRAG for Development, Brain Builders International, Namati, Civil Society Partnership for Development Effectiveness (CPDE) – Nigeria, ENDA Tiers Monde, Global Network for Community Development, Nonviolence International, Saferworld, Stakeholder Forum, Sisters of Charity Federation, Society of Catholic Medical Missionaries, Transparency International, Universal Rights Network, Women Educators Association of Nigeria (WEAN), World Federation of United Nations Associations (WFUNA), Women for Peace and Gender Equality Initiative, Youth Initiative for Advocacy of Human Rights and Democracy, Zero Corruption Coalition

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

<p><u>Proposed Indicator #1</u></p>	<p>“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)”</p>
<p>Rationale and interpretation:</p>	<p>This is a strong proxy for capacities of security services and other authorities to deal with crime and prevent conflict. It is outcome focused rather than purely capacity focused, ensuring that the focus is on people. Definitional issues for “conflict resolution mechanism” may need to be addressed.</p>
<p>Examples of available data sources and methods of collection:</p>	<p>National data: Crime victimisation surveys combined with administrative records. Many countries should be able to combine this data. For example, 9 African countries have already implemented or are in the process of implementing a victimisation survey module as part of SHaSA Global data: At international level, methodological guidance on victimisation surveys is included in the UNODC-UNECE Manual on</p>

	Victimization Surveys (2010). UNODC gathers some of the administrative data.
References:	See UNODC manual: https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/data-and-analysis/Manual-on-victim-surveys.html
Disaggregation:	Urban/rural, age, sex, social identity
Interlinkages with other goals and targets:	16.1, 16.2, 5.3

<u>Proposed Indicator #2:</u>	“Percentage of people who report that they feel safe walking alone at night in the city or area where they live”
Rationale and interpretation:	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 16.1
Examples of available data sources and methods of collection:	National: 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: Global data for this indicator could be drawn from Gallup’s annual World Poll, which covers 95% of the world’s population.
References:	See Gallup: http://www.gallup.com/services/170945/world-poll.aspx
Disaggregation:	Urban/rural, age, sex, social identity
Interlinkages with other goals and targets:	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.