



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

UNDP/PRIO Expert Meeting on Measuring SDG 16: Targets 16.1 on Peace, 16.3 on Justice, 16.7 on Inclusion and 16.10 on Freedoms

28-29 January 2016, Voksenåsen Conference Centre, Oslo, Norway

Report of the Conveners – Executive Summary

On 28-29 January, UNDP's Oslo Governance Center (OGC) and the Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO) convened an expert meeting to consider in detail various indicators for Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 16 on peace, justice and accountable institutions. The meeting was attended by 78 representatives from National Statistical Offices (NSOs), governments, multilateral agencies, research and policy institutions, and civil society organizations.

The indicators for the SDGs have been discussed by the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on SDGs (IAEG-SDG). It has done an admirable job, and we especially applaud its efforts to solicit advice and input from a broad set of stakeholders.

However, the set of indicators so far agreed on by the IAEG-SDG for Goal 16 do not adequately cover the full ambition of the Goal. It is important that we rise to the occasion and select indicators for this Goal that are most suitable to represent the issues at stake. The very intention of Goal 16 — to foster peaceful and just societies and inclusive and accountable institutions — makes it especially important to include peoples' voice in monitoring progress towards the Goal. To this end, in the view of the Conveners and supported by many participants at the Expert Meeting, Goal 16 should where applicable include survey-based evidence as an essential complement to administratively based indicators, representing other types of needed information.

The expert meeting focused in particular on targets 16.1 on violence, 16.3 on justice, 16.7 on inclusiveness, and 16.10 on fundamental freedoms and access to information. In the discussions, both administrative and survey indicators were identified that were considered by some participants – on conceptual, methodological, practical or statistical grounds – to be preferable alternatives, or essential complements, to those presently prioritized. Although the meeting was not intended to reach a consensus position on recommendations, in the view of the Conveners, the options presented below garnered considerable support from participants:

1. *A conflict deaths indicator for Target 16.1:* A measure of the human cost of conflict-related violence is necessary to realize the full vision of SDG 16, and target 16.1 in particular, which focuses on all forms of violence. The international community has broad experience and proven methodology in collecting data on conflict deaths. Experience to date suggests *that the number of direct conflict-related deaths (Tier III)* is the best proxy available to measure the frequency and intensity of political violence

and could be included as 16.1.2. The research community has extensively tested such an indicator, and it has already been widely used in official reports of various United Nations agencies, the World Bank, the OECD, as well as a number of Member States.

2. *A safety indicator for Target 16.1:* An indicator of peoples' sense of security and freedom from fear complements the other indicators under consideration for this target (i.e. homicide rate and conflict deaths). Data has already been collected by many NSOs through the International Crime Victimization Survey (ICVS), and modules under the Strategy for the Harmonization of Statistics in Africa (SHaSA). The use of national samples keeps the variations of particular subgroups in proportion (e.g. the elderly), while allowing subnational breakdowns (e.g. provinces experiencing conflict). This indicator would also inform targets under Goals 5, 10, and 11.
3. *A dispute indicator for Target 16.3:* The presently proposed indicator for 16.3 (*Percentage of victims of violence in the previous 12 months who reported their victimization to competent authorities or other officially recognized conflict resolution mechanisms*) takes a narrow focus on criminal justice and on victims of violence. Many participants recommended the inclusion of an indicator with a much broader coverage, measuring the *proportion of those who have experienced a dispute in the past 12 months who have accessed a formal, informal, alternative or traditional dispute resolution mechanism and who feel it was just (Tier III)*. By focusing on 'dispute' rather than victimization, this alternative or additional indicator covers the whole range of cases — criminal, civil and commercial — on which ordinary people need to access justice and the rule of law.
4. *A decision-making indicator for 16.7:* The proposed indicator 16.7.2 (*Proportion of countries that address young peoples' multisectoral needs within their national development plans and poverty reduction strategies*) only measures representativeness and responsiveness of one social group (youth), an unduly narrow focus for such a broad target. We suggest the inclusion of an indicator measuring the: *percentage of population who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive (by age, sex, disability and population groups) (Tier II)*. This indicator speaks directly to the participatory nature of decision-making to which the target also refers.
5. *A voter turnout indicator for 16.7:* In addition, we suggest the inclusion of an indicator reporting: *electoral turnout as a share of voting-age population in national elections (Tier I)*. This indicator responds better to the intended aim of the target, especially if the data is to be disaggregated by age groups and gender. We note, however, that this indicator says nothing about the *quality* of elections, and the issue of compulsory voting must also be recognized.
6. *An indicator on fundamental freedoms for 16.10* The indicator currently under discussion by the IAEG-SDG for 16.10 has an asterisk: *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 (Tier II)*. This indicator would directly measure violations and

is methodologically feasible, although complex. Given that freedom of expression is a key measure for the SDG agenda of popular involvement in society, participants suggested an additional/alternate indicator measuring: *percentage of population who believe they can express political opinion without fear (by age, sex, civic involvement and population groups) (Tier II)*. This indicator has a proven record in the various regional Barometer surveys; and the SHaSA survey on Governance, Peace and Security conducted in twelve African countries has demonstrated the ability of NSOs to collect such data.

7. *An access to information indicator for 16.10*. The focus on access to information in 16.10 is a critical enabling condition for the implementation of all 17 SDGs. Participants considered the inclusion of an indicator measuring the: *adoption and implementation of constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees for public access to information (aspects of which are Tier I)*. UNESCO and the World Bank already collect information on the adoption and implementation of national legislation on the Right to Information, and this could be officially submitted by NSOs after validation at the country level.

UNDP/PRIO Expert Meeting on Measuring SDG 16: Targets 16.1 on Peace, 16.3 on Justice, 16.7 on Inclusion and 16.10 on Freedoms

28-29 January 2016, Voksenåsen Conference Centre, Oslo, Norway

Report of the Conveners

On 28-29 January, UNDP's Oslo Governance Center (OGC) and the Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO) convened an expert meeting on measurement of Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 16 to consider the relevance and feasibility of indicators still under review by the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on Sustainable Development Goal Indicators (IAEG-SDG), with a focus on targets 16.1, 16.3, 16.7 and 16.10. Although concerns about indicators for other targets (for example 16.5) were raised, this report discusses the four targets that were the focus of the meeting.

The meeting was attended by 78 representatives from National Statistical Offices (NSOs), national governments, multilateral agencies, research and policy institutions, and civil society organizations.¹ This report is a document issued by the convening organizations (OGC and PRIO), which, in their view, summarizes the overall discussion and key points. It does not claim to reflect a consensus among participants.

We understand that indicators marked with an asterisk in the report already submitted for the 47th session of the Statistical Commission to be held in March 2016 are still being examined by the IAEG-SDG, and that an updated version of the list of indicators is expected to be issued as an Addendum paper to the IAEG-SDG's report to the Statistical Commission, in mid-February. The following observations and suggestions, compiled by the Conveners of this Expert Meeting, are shared as an input to the IAEG-SDG deliberations, to any subsequent inter-governmental discussions and to inform future work at the national level on indicators for Goal 16. They represent, in the opinion of the Conveners, the views and experiences of a significant mass of expertise, including officials from several NSOs that are members of the IAEG-SDG.

1. Staying true to political aspirations for the 2030 Agenda, and to the ambition of Goal 16

In the view of many participants, the very intention of Goal 16 — to foster peaceful, just and inclusive societies and accountable institutions — makes it especially important to include peoples' voices in monitoring progress towards the Goal. To some extent this sets Goal 16 apart from other Goals, in so far as the stated intentions of the Goal requires the measurement process to be accountable to people. To this end, Goal 16 should include appropriate survey-based

¹ The full programme of discussions as well as presentations made available by participants are available here: http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/ourwork/global-policy-centres/oslo_governance_centre/our-work/

evidence manifesting peoples' *own assessments*, as a complement to administratively based indicators representing other types of needed information.

In this vein, several indicators for other targets of Goal 16 have wisely been chosen to capture peoples' *experiences* of governance, peace and security. But, some *perception*-based indicators will also be required to ensure that we record whether people *feel* that an improvement is occurring in their lives. If we fail to do this, we may be omitting a constitutive element of Goal 16; presenting a partial picture of the state of the world on peace, justice and accountable institutions. Moreover, empirical evidence was noted by the Expert Meeting suggesting that such indicators in specific circumstances perform as well or better than the present selections for targets 16.1, 16.3, 16.7 and 16.10.²

Some NSOs that participated in the Expert Meeting — from Asia, Africa, Latin America and Europe — are already conducting governance surveys and publishing both experiential and perception-based data. Advantages and disadvantages of survey-based instruments were also extensively discussed. It is on this basis that participants in the Expert Meeting identified additional and/or alternative perception-based indicators for selected targets, provided in Table 1.

2) Using tested innovations to push the boundaries of established statistical practice

The development of a global indicator framework for Goal 16 comes after a period of tremendous strides in the fields of governance, peace and security statistics. Following massive expansion of international measurement initiatives since 2000, the Stiglitz-Sen-Fitoussi Commission argued in 2009 that sufficient progress had been made in measuring “voice and governance” for questions that have “proved their value within small-scale and unofficial surveys [to] be included in larger-scale surveys undertaken by official statistical offices.”³ A growing number of national governments are implementing systems to monitor governance or its aspects, and officially publishing their results, with NSOs playing a central role in such initiatives.

This mounting engagement with governance statistics culminated in March 2015 in the creation by the UN Statistical Commission of the ‘Praia City Group on Governance Statistics’. The Praia Group has a mandate to develop international guidelines and standards for producing governance statistics - the Group has decided this will include “violence and perceptions of peaceful societies, quality of democracy, corruption, institutional capacity, child protection, justice, women’s participation and empowerment, illicit financial flows and human rights.”⁴

² Mark Orkin, “An empirical examination of key Goal 16 indicators”, submitted to the IAEG-SDG consultation, December 2015, mimeo.

³ Joseph F. Stiglitz, Amartya Sen and Jean-Paul Fitoussi, “Report by the Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress” (2009). www.stiglitz-sen-fitoussi.en.

⁴ See <http://unstats.un.org/unsd/statcom/47th-session/documents/2016-16-Praia-group-on-governance-statistics-E.pdf>

Goal 16 represents a global understanding that the time is ripe for harmonized data on peace, justice and accountable institutions; and we owe it to future generations to be both bold and thoughtful in choosing metrics that measure the stated intent of our ambitious goals and targets.⁵ It would be a setback to settle for indicators that may be better known but are less relevant simply because newer and more meaningful methodologies, that have already confirmed their feasibility, have not yet been formally adopted by the international statistical community.

Participants at the meeting discussed the challenges as well as the strengths of the indicators suggested in Table 1. No one was under any illusion that these are perfect data sources, and we need to aim for the art of the possible, rather than the pursuit of perfection. Nevertheless, these indicators have to a large extent already proven their utility, having been widely used in official reports of various United Nations agencies, the World Bank, the OECD, as well as a number of member states and their NSOs. The data are also widely used in the academic and think tank research communities where they are required to meet the standards of peer review. Consequently, the international community is not starting from scratch. All additional or alternative indicators presented in Table 1 have already proven their worth in practice. They therefore provide a solid basis for discussion on available data sources and methodology for an improved coverage of tier II indicators, and for establishing an adequate methodology for the indicators in tier III.⁶

Moreover, in the same way as methodologies for computing economic growth (GDP), national accounts or poverty were once novel, and still continue to undergo improvements, it is reasonable to expect that indicators measuring peace, justice and accountable institutions will follow a similar trajectory.

Some of the indicators suggested here will require further testing and refinement over time. However, this fact should not prevent us from including them in the global monitoring apparatus from the outset, to ensure that we make immediate investments towards improving their operationalization. Above all, we have a responsibility towards future generations to select indicators that, for Goal 16 in particular, are not only methodologically sound and policy-relevant, but also easily understandable by the 7 billion people who are the custodians of Goal 16.

⁵ For the data to be harmonized there needs to be common definitions and common or at least commensurate methodologies.

⁶ The IAEG use a tier system to classify indicators. For Tier I indicators, established methodology exists and data are already widely available. For Tier II indicators a methodology has been established but data are not easily available. Finally, for Tier III indicators an internationally agreed methodology has not yet been developed.

Table 1: Indicators discussed at the UNDP/PRIO Expert Meeting on Measuring SDG 16: Targets on Peace, Justice, Inclusion and Freedoms

In the table below, we list indicators discussed at the meeting for targets 16.1, 16.3, 16.7 and 16.10. In the second column, we list in **bold font the indicators already agreed on by the IAEG-SDG**, and in normal font the indicators that the IAEG-SDG has not yet agreed upon (the IAEG-SDG marks these with an asterisk). In the third column are additional or alternative indicators that are, or previously were, proposed but not yet discussed by the IAEG-SDG. We underline those indicators for which there is strong evidence and rationale for inclusion, as discussed at the Expert Meeting.

Goal 16: Selected targets	Indicators currently considered by the IAEG-SDG	Recommended additional or alternative indicators
16.1 SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCE ALL FORMS OF VIOLENCE AND RELATED DEATH RATES EVERYWHERE	<p>16.1.1 Number of victims of intentional homicide per 100,000 population, by age group and sex</p> <p><u>16.1.2* Conflict-related deaths per 100,000 population (disaggregated by age group, sex and cause)</u></p> <p>16.1.3 Percentage of the population subjected to physical, psychological or sexual violence in the previous 12 months</p> <p><u>16.1.4* Proportion of people that feel safe walking alone around the area they live</u></p>	
16.3 PROMOTE THE RULE OF LAW AT THE NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL LEVELS AND ENSURE EQUAL ACCESS TO JUSTICE FOR ALL	<p>16.3.1* Percentage of victims of violence in the previous 12 months who reported their victimization to competent authorities or other officially recognized conflict resolution mechanisms (also called crime reporting rate)</p> <p>16.3.2 Unsentenced detainees as a percentage of overall prison population</p>	<p><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.</u> (N.B. This indicator, which does not appear on the latest list, was 'grey' after being reviewed and discussed at the second meeting of the IAEG -SDGs, held in Bangkok from 26-28 October 2015)</p>



PRIO

Conflict
Trends



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

<p>16.7 ENSURE RESPONSIVE, INCLUSIVE, PARTICIPATORY AND REPRESENTATIVE DECISION-MAKING AT ALL LEVELS</p>	<p>16.7.1 Proportions of positions (by age group, sex, persons with disabilities and population groups) in public institutions (national and local legislatures, public service, and judiciary) compared to national distributions 16.7.2* Proportion of countries that address young peoples' multi-sectoral needs within their national development plans and poverty reduction strategies</p>	<p><u>Percentage of population who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive (by age, sex, disability and population groups) (N.B. This indicator, not showing on the latest list, was 'grey' after being reviewed and discussed at the second meeting of the IAEG -SDGs,)</u></p> <p><u>Electoral turnout as a share of voting age population in national elections</u></p>
<p>16.10 ENSURE PUBLIC ACCESS TO INFORMATION AND PROTECT FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS, IN ACCORDANCE WITH NATIONAL LEGISLATION AND INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS</p>	<p><u>16.10.1* Number of verified cases of killing, kidnapping, enforced disappearance, arbitrary detention and torture of journalists, associated media personnel, trade unionists and human rights advocates in the previous 12 months</u></p>	<p><u>Percentage of population who believe they can express political opinion without fear (by age, sex, civic involvement and population groups) (N.B. This indicator, not showing on the latest list, was 'grey' after being reviewed and discussed at the second meeting of the IAEG -SDGs, held in Bangkok from 26-28 October 2015)</u></p> <p><u>Adoption and implementation of constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees for public access to information</u></p>

The Conveners summary of the discussion of indicators favored by the IAEG-SDG, and justifications for proposing additional or alternative indicators

Target 16.1: Significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere

16.1.2* Conflict-related deaths per 100,000 population (disaggregated by age group, sex and cause) (Tier III)

Meeting the ambition of the target: The only way to reduce the human cost of war is to decrease the scope and intensity of armed conflict in the world. It would be hard to justify that a Goal aimed at promoting ‘peaceful societies’ ignores armed conflict completely. Without conflict death data we will have no way of determining whether the world — or individual states — are becoming more or less peaceful. Notwithstanding the concerns echoed below, many participants argued *that experience to date suggests that the number of direct conflict-related deaths is the best proxy available to measure the frequency and intensity of political violence.*

Methodologically feasible: To the best of our knowledge, NSOs are not comprehensively collecting data on direct conflict deaths. Currently, however, several UN agencies, and international third-party initiatives have developed systematic approaches to measuring deaths (of both combatants and civilians) from armed conflicts. These data have been tested extensively by the research community, and have already been widely used in official reports of various United Nations agencies, the World Bank, the OECD, as well as a number of member states.

Uppsala University’s Conflict Data Program (UCDP) Battle-Related Deaths Dataset provides annual updates of conflict deaths for all countries in the world. The dataset has a time series extending back to 1989. UCDP data are now increasingly geo-referenced. UCDP relies on the cross-referencing of news sources and a variety of other sources to count battle deaths. Such methods have so far not been used by NSOs but have been extensively scrutinized by the research community. For this reason, *the Conveners suggest that the Praia Group on Governance Statistics is asked to establish an expert working group that will review the data and methodological requirements necessary to allow NSOs and UN agencies to develop and use methods to collect data on conflict deaths.*

The expert meeting had a candid discussion of the limits of using battle-deaths data, notably that all fatality counts are subject to a degree of uncertainty, and the extent to which such data encompass target 16.1. Participants recognized, however, the need to be pragmatic and the importance of not letting the perfect be the enemy of the good. The Conveners also note that uncertainty about data estimates is characteristic of many of the SDG target indicators. *Nevertheless, as the 2030 Agenda progresses, the IAEG-SDG, with input from the Praia Group, should consider other indicators to more fully capture the breadth of target 16.1.* The next step in such a process could be violent *conflict events*. Data on conflict events include the Armed



*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*

Conflict Location and Event Data (ACLED). ACLED is a fully geo-referenced data on reported political violence events in over 60 developing countries in Africa and Asia. It has been published since 1997. The International Institute of Strategic Studies' Armed Conflict Database also records conflict statistics dating back to 1997.

A universally agreeable standardized methodology for monitoring progress towards target 16.1 could be developed in close consultation with the IAEG-SDG and the organizations that have pioneered the above-mentioned methodologies. This could be done within the framework of an expert group organized by the Praia Group. While initial global baselines, to track progress from 2015, could be drawn from existing international datasets, in the longer-term, to ensure national ownership and sovereignty of the data, NSOs should assume a leading role in the compilation and verification of this data.

Armed conflict invariably leads to both direct and indirect casualties. Presently, the research community has established methodologies for measuring direct deaths but no agreed method for measuring indirect deaths. In order to simplify the measurement in the initial phase, a focus on *direct* conflict deaths only, i.e. those that result directly from violent injuries, is warranted. But note that in some conflicts 'indirect' deaths—those arising from war-exacerbated disease or malnutrition — can be considerably larger than those caused by deaths from injuries. *In a subsequent phase, it would be worth gradually integrating a complementary indicator on indirect deaths, to do justice to the full human cost of conflict.*

16.1.4 Proportion of people that feel safe walking alone around the area they live (Tier II)*

Meeting the ambition of the target: This perception indicator is a direct measure of peoples' sense of security and freedom from fear, consistent with the intended aim of the target and the broader aspiration of Goal 16 as a whole. By providing an indication of the general sense of anxiety in a given location, this indicator would serve as an important complement to the two other administrative indicators under consideration for this target (i.e. homicide rate and conflict deaths).

Methodologically feasible: Data for this indicator has already been collected by several NSOs, notably through the International Crime Victimization Survey (ICVS), which has been conducted in approximately 80 countries worldwide. In Africa, twelve NSOs have collected data for this indicator through the Governance, Peace and Security (GPS) survey module of the Strategy for the Harmonization of Statistics in Africa (SHaSA). The use of national samples keeps in proportion the variations of particular subgroups (e.g. the elderly), while allowing monitoring of the sense of security in particular locales (e.g. provinces experiencing conflict). With smaller (but still representative) samples, Gallup's World Poll has gathered data on this indicator for over 95% of the world's population.

Multipurpose indicator relevant to other targets: This perception-based indicator would also be a useful complement for reporting on target 11.7 on access to safe public spaces, which currently only has an indicator drawing from experiential data (on women’s victimization) and objective data (share of open space for public use). Similarly, targets 5.2, 10.2, 10.3, 11.1, 11.2, 11.7, 16.2 and 16.a would benefit from this indicator.

Target 16.3: Promote the rule of law at the national and international levels and ensure equal access to justice for all

16.3.1 Percentage of victims of violence in the previous 12 months who reported their victimization to competent authorities or other officially recognized conflict resolution mechanisms (also called crime reporting rate) (Tier II)*

By itself, the proposed indicator fails to meet the ambition of the target: This indicator, when combined with (approved) indicator 16.3.2 on pre-trial detention, establishes a narrow focus on criminal justice and on victims of violence, thus failing to capture the broader aim of the target, which speaks to the ‘rule of law’ and ‘access to justice’ across a broad range of areas affecting peoples’ lives (including labor, land or electoral disputes, disputes related to administrative services such as the issuance of birth certificates, the provision of health and education services, etc.) In fact, this indicator is a better proxy measure of security service capacity and public confidence in authorities. Its relevance to the rule of law and access to justice is therefore limited.

Subject to misinterpretation: It will be difficult to tell whether increases in this indicator are due to an increase in the incidence of crime, or to peoples’ heightened confidence in institutions (prompting them to report incidents), or both — which in turn will make it difficult for policymakers to act on this indicator.

Based on the discussion at the expert meeting, the Conveners suggest the following indicator: *Proportion of those who have experienced a dispute in the past 12 months who have accessed a formal, informal, alternative or traditional dispute resolution mechanism and who feel it was just (Tier III).*

Meets the ambition of the target: By focusing on ‘dispute’ rather than victimization, this alternative indicator covers the whole range of cases — criminal, civil, and commercial — for which people require access to justice and the rule of law. It also covers all mechanisms people use for resolution, keeping in mind that many people in many countries may not use formal conflict resolution mechanisms.

High relevance to the intended aim of the target: The second part of this indicator (‘and who feel it was just’) assesses the perceived *quality* of the process, thus providing an important outcome measure of the *functioning* of the justice system, which is missing in the first indicator.

Easier for policymakers to ‘act on’: Measures of *quality* are essential to ensure that indicators do not ‘condone’ systems that are not compliant with human rights. The best basis for assessing ‘quality’ across countries is through user experience, which will give policymakers an indication of which type of mechanism is most appreciated by which users.

Proven feasibility: Similar survey questions have already been tested in household surveys in many countries — notably through the World Justice Project, the regional multi-country Barometer surveys, World Bank-supported surveys, as well as surveys conducted by NAMATI and the International Legal Foundation. This provides a proven methodological basis for this indicator.

Statistical effect: When investigated statistically using close proxy perception variables, drawn from the World Justice Project or Afrobarometer, this indicator correlates very well with the overall Goal 16 outcome, both directly and supplemented indirectly via the indicators recommended below for inclusion and freedoms.

Other participants proposed the provision of legal aid as the basis for an indicator, which may be a focus worth considering in subsequent discussions and at the country-level.

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

16.7.2 Proportion of countries that address young people’s multisectoral needs within their national development plans and poverty reduction strategies*

Fails to meet the ambition of the target: This indicator only measures representativeness and responsiveness of one social group (youth), an unduly narrow focus for such a broad target. Furthermore, it stops short of measuring the *implementation* of youth-sensitive development strategies, and as such fails to measure the inclusiveness of decision-making, which is the stated intent of the target.

Based on the discussion at the expert meeting, the Conveners suggest the following indicator: *Percentage of population who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive (by age, sex, disability and population groups) (Tier II).*

Meets the ambition of the target: While the existing 16.7.1 indicator on “proportions of positions ... in public institutions ... compared to national distributions” focuses exclusively on representation, *this indicator provides an important complement by focusing on the perceived quality of decision-making processes*, and the extent to which it serves the interest of the general public.

Proven methodological feasibility: Twelve NSOs have collected data for this indicator through the Governance, Peace and Security (GPS) survey module of the Strategy for the Harmonization

of Statistics in Africa (SHaSA); and similar questions are used in the various regional multi-country Barometer surveys.

Statistical effect: When investigated statistically using close proxy perception variables, drawn from the World Justice Project or Afrobarometer, this indicator correlates well with the overall Goal 16 outcome.

The following indicator was also discussed: *Electoral turnout as a share of voting-age population in national elections (Tier I).*

Meets the ambition of the target: Responds better to the intended aim of the target, especially if the data is to be disaggregated by age groups and gender.

Methodologically feasible: national authorities already routinely collect data on turnout relative to eligibility/voting-age, which makes this indicator highly comparable across countries. The International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA) maintains detailed tables on voter turnout at multiple administrative levels for all countries where elections take place.

Disadvantages: Measuring voter turnout does not say anything about the quality of elections. Furthermore, when comparing countries across this indicator it is crucial to differentiate between countries with and without compulsory voting laws.

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

Target 16.10 refers to two conceptually distinct yet mutually reinforcing commitments — namely ‘access to information’ and ‘fundamental freedoms’ — and as such requires indicators that capture both aspects to be consistent with the intent of the target.

16.10.1 Number of verified cases of killing, kidnapping, enforced disappearance, arbitrary detention and torture of journalists, associated media personnel, trade unionists and human rights advocates in the previous 12 months (Tier II)*

Strength of the indicator: It will directly measure violations against some of those who exercise their fundamental freedoms.

Methodologically feasible: Information on the number of violations committed against human rights defenders is compiled annually by OHCHR from national sources submitted to its human rights mechanisms and through its field offices. Information on the number of journalists killed is compiled annually by UNESCO from data collected from press reports, monitoring groups, direct reports, and information from UNESCO field offices and other UN bodies. Information on trade unionists killed, disappeared and detained is compiled by: 1) ILO through submissions made to their regular system of supervision of International Labour Standards and through

complaints submitted to the ILO Committee on Freedom of Association; 2) International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC) through reports submitted by national and regional trade union organizations on an annual basis for the ITUC Annual Survey on the violation of trade union rights; and 3) International Federation of Journalists (IFJ) through submissions made by national independent trade unions of journalists. Building on these existing methodologies, OHCHR, UNESCO and ILO, possibly coordinated by the Praia Group, could propose to the IAEG-SDG a methodology for this indicator that would ensure harmonization of data sources.

Leveraging national sources while ensuring triangulation with third-party data: While primary data sources for this indicator would be national, including cases compiled by national human rights institutions, non-governmental organizations, trade unions and other relevant entities, triangulation methods drawing from multiple sources, including international sources, could then be applied to cross-check and verify national data.

There was also support for the following indicator, but no agreement on whether it should be alternate or additional to the above: *Percentage of population who believe they can express political opinion without fear (by age, sex, civic involvement and population groups) (Tier II)*

Meets the ambition of the target: Freedom of expression is a fundamental freedom, and this indicator, by asking people about their lived experience of this principle in their daily life, would measure the ‘positive’ outcome of the target (i.e. freedom of expression), thus providing an important complement to the other indicator measuring the negative outcomes (i.e. cases of abuse).

Methodologically feasible: At the regional level, the SHaSA survey on Governance, Peace and Security conducted in twelve African countries has demonstrated the feasibility of this indicator when surveys are conducted by NSOs. Likewise, the regional multi-country Barometers include a similar item. The Praia Group could draw on this experience to develop a harmonized method for collecting this indicator.

Statistical effect: When investigated statistically using close proxy perception variables, drawn from the World Justice Project or Afrobarometer, this indicator correlates well with the overall Goal 16 outcome.

Participants also suggested the following indicator to capture the breadth of the target: *Adoption and implementation of constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees for public access to information (some aspects are Tier I)*

Meets the ambition of the target: This option provides an indicator on access to information, so is consistent with the *intent of the target*.

Universally relevant: As of 2015, more than 100 of 193 member states have adopted access to information laws or mechanisms – up from 13 in 1990 — and even while adoption of national

legislation is not yet universal, all member states have endorsed this principle. Practical implementation of this legislation, however, has been uneven.

Critically relevant to the entire SDG Agenda: The Conveners believe that Target 16.10 and its focus on access to information is a critical enabling condition for the implementation of all 17 SDGs: goals will not be achieved unless people are able to freely access information about these goals. Access to information is also catalytic for the achievement of Goal 16 as a whole, particularly in regards to target 16.7: meaningful participation in democratic processes requires informed participants with access to a broad range of information.

Methodologically feasible: Information on the adoption and implementation of national legislation on the Right to Information is already being collected by UNESCO and the World Bank, and could be officially submitted by NSOs after due consideration and validation of this data at country level.

Disadvantages: This indicator is mostly static. Furthermore, adoption of laws does not reflect implementation and peoples' lived experience. This warrants discussion about a possible alternative indicator on access to information. The expert meeting did not have time to delve deeper into that issue.