
First Meeting of the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on the Sustainable Development Goal Indicators

New York, 1-2 June 2015

Venue: UNHQ, Conference Room 3

Statements and related inputs submitted in writing

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Inputs from National Statistical Offices – IAEG-SDGs members..... | 2 |
| 1. Samoa Bureau of Statistics and Fiji Islands Bureau of Statistics – in preparation with support and advice from Secretariat of the Pacific Community – 9 June 2015 | 2 |
| Inputs from National Statistical Offices – IAEG-SDGs observers | 5 |
| 2. Statistics Denmark – 4 June 2015..... | 5 |
| 3. Federal Statistical Office of Germany - G2, Environmental Economic Accounts, Sustainable Development Indicators – 10 June 2015..... | 6 |
| Inputs IAEG observers, ordered by date of submission to the IAEG-SDGs Secretariat..... | 7 |
| 4. OHCHR on a human rights-based approach to data – 1 June 2015 | 7 |
| 5. ILO – 1 June 2015 | 10 |
| 6. ICAO – 1 June 2015..... | 12 |
| 7. International Monetary Fund – 2 June 2015 | 13 |
| 8. UNDP - 2 June 2015..... | 14 |
| 9. UN-Water on Goal 6 – 2 June 2015 | 16 |
| 10. Global Alliance on Health & Pollution – 2 June 2015 | 18 |
| 11. UNISDR – 2 June 2015 | 19 |
| 12. Joint Statement of OCHA and UNHCR – 2 June 2015 | 22 |
| 13. Office of the United Nations Secretary-General’s Envoy on Youth – 3 June 2015..... | 23 |
| 14. Co-Chairs of the Global Migration Group Technical Working Group on Data and Research (IOM, UN DESA), GMG Chair (World Bank), SRSG on International Migration – 4 June 2015 | 25 |
| 15. UN-Energy – 5 June 2015 | 27 |
| 16. UNFPA - 9 June 2015 | 30 |
| 17. Sustainable Energy for All initiative - NY office – 9 June 2015 | 32 |
| 18. UNODC – 12 June 2015 | 36 |
| 19. UNODC (second inputs) – 12 June 2015..... | 41 |
| 20. UNODC and WHO – 12 June 2015..... | 52 |
| 21. FAO – 19 June 2015..... | 56 |
| Additional inputs from National Statistical Offices – IAEG-SDGs observers..... | 59 |
| 22. Director-General for Policy Planning (Statistical Standards) of Japan – 1 June 2015..... | 59 |

Inputs from National Statistical Offices – IAEG-SDGs members:

1. Samoa Bureau of Statistics and Fiji Islands Bureau of Statistics – in preparation with support and advice from Secretariat of the Pacific Community – 9 June 2015

Indicator 6.1.1: Percentage of population using safely managed drinking water services
Madame Chair,

Access to safe and sustainable drinking water and sanitation is a critical development issue for Pacific SIDS, with profound implications for economic growth, public health, the environment and human rights. Meeting the proposed SDG targets for water and sanitation would require improved facilities to be made available to approximately 7 million additional people (water) and 10 million additional people (sanitation) across the region, with most of these facilities in rural PNG. This is a huge task, and is why we would regard these two priority targets (6.1.1 and 6.2.1) paramount, with the sanitation target ranked higher due to the region's relatively poor performance in this area.

Indicator 13.1.2: Number of casualties and amount of economic loss *and damages (we would like to add these last 2 words)*

This is very important for PSIDS, exposed to regular climate-related hazards like cyclones/hurricanes, as it indicates the true impact of climate induced disasters on small economies. This was illustrated only 2 months ago, with a Category 5 cyclone Pam destroying much of Vanuatu - housing, infrastructure, food gardens.

Preliminary estimates of total damage amounted to around 380 million US\$. While this is not in the same category as the more recent horrific earthquake in Nepal, it nevertheless amounts to just under 50% of Vanuatu's recent annual GDP.

Indicator 13.a.2: % of GCF funded projects finalized and sustained afterwards through national funding to produce climate neutral solutions

This is very critical for SIDS, as it indicates actual wealth transfer via projects completed and committed to by nations to increase resilience.

We also believe this indicator could be more powerful, if wording could be amended to specifically refer to SIDS, as advocated in 3rd Small Islands States outcome document, the SAMOA Pathway.

Indicator 14.3.1: Average marine acidity (pH) measured at agreed suite of representative sampling station *to established monitoring goals (= proposed modification)*

Madame Chair,

We respectfully like to request this small addition to the target, as we feel this reads more like an activity unless there is a specific numerical target.

This targets is also directly linked to coral coverage (same target, indicator 2), which is very important to the Pacific and could be useful in monitoring Goal 13 on climate change, so it could also contribute to our collective efforts to reduce the number of indicators.

Indicator 15.1.1: Coverage of protected areas broken down by ecosystem type, including total area of forests in protected areas (thousands of hectares, and *relative proportional size of different ecosystems*)

Madam chair,

We like to add this small text amendment, as the relative weight of different eco-systems might provide valuable information about relative change over time (in addition to absolute space).

As an added bonus, it would also render Indicator 15.1.2 obsolete.

Target 15.5: Take urgent and significant action to reduce the degradation of natural habitats, halt the loss of biodiversity, and, by 2020, protect and prevent the extinction of threatened species.

Madam Chair,

On behalf of PSIDS, we propose a new indicator 15.5.3 here:

"Number of threatened species that have "recovered" to non-threatened status".

We believe that with such positive reversals happening, it would be useful to be able to track and document such progress.

Indicator : 16.9.1: Percentage of children under 5 whose births have been registered with civil authority.

Madam Chair,

This indicator is not only long overdue in its own right for a variety of obvious reasons, but is also

mission-critical to monitor progress in the current decade of CRVS.

We propose to modify the age -reference to "under 1", which is also in line with national law in many/most countries, as well as with UN Principles and Recommendations for Vital statistics.

Indicator: 17.2.1: Net ODA, total and to LDCs and SIDS, as percentage of OECD/Development Assistance Committee {DAC} donors' gross national income {GNI}, and net ODA to GNI of recipient country.

Madam Chair,

We wish to propose amendments in line with language of SAMOA Pathway Document, with the net ODA to GNI of recipient country measures net ODA flows to countries, which remains critical for many SIDS' development efforts.

Indicator 7/11.18.1

Number of countries that have national statistical legislation (that [a] enshrine statistical independence; [b] mandate data collection; and [c] secure access to national administrative data)

Madam Chair,

We believe it is HIGH TIME for all National Statisticians, to see statistical development appear as a development objective in its own right. I hope, madam Chair, as a fellow national statistician, you share in our delight.

Having said this, we strongly believe that we require a better indicator, something that builds on the World Bank's SCI, but which would allow the measurement of 3 core components of national statistical capacity:

- a. Human capacity (trained, experienced staff to do their job);
- b. Financial capacity (with Governments providing more than just "shoe-string" budgets for their NSOs that extend beyond payment of salaries, and actually enables NSOs to do their jobs; and
- c. Political-institutional capacity, that embraces a culture of evidence informed policydevelopment, planning, monitoring of progress and accounting for results - which requires access to quality and timely statistics.

Our regional statistical body, SPC, is in consultation with colleagues at PARIS 21, to develop such an indicator.

Thank you Madam Chair.

Inputs from National Statistical Offices – IAEG-SDGs observers:

2. Statistics Denmark – 4 June 2015

Dear Madame Chair and UNSD

Thank you for the opportunity to present our comments on the prioritised list of indicators in light of the meeting held in the IAEG-SDG. We highly appreciate your efforts to promote discussion of the indicators in relation to the targets under the SDGs.

Denmark would like to highlight the importance of maintaining the indicators put forth by the SE4ALL initiative and the Global Tracking Framework (GTF) in relation to SDG 7, in the prioritised list of indicators. Unfortunately, the prioritised list of indicators presented by UNSD ahead of the IAEG-SDG meeting did not include all of the GTF indicators, which in turn provides for a less complete picture of how we will measure progress in this very important area. The GTF indicators ensure a holistic view of energy issues, pertaining not just to access, but also to gender and energy intensity, and were all rated AAA/BAA in terms of their feasibility, suitability and relevance. The GTF report has been undertaken in broad co-operation between 23 organisations and agencies with profound expertise on the subject and the proposed indicators thus enjoy the highest credibility. We would hence like to echo the statements made by the World Bank, India, WHO and others in relation to maintaining the GTF indicators under SDG 7 in the prioritised list of indicators.

Once again we wish to thank you for your efforts in pushing discussions forward.

3. Federal Statistical Office of Germany - G2, Environmental Economic Accounts, Sustainable Development Indicators – 10 June 2015

1. Emphasizing that the IAEG-SDG should follow the political key messages and the 17 goals and 169 targets suggested by the Open Working Group (OWG) on Sustainable Development Goals.
2. Agreeing that splitting the discussions into separate work-streams could facilitate to cope with the huge workload within the time given. However, having doubts that a split up into the suggested two work streams “indicator system” and “inter-linkage” is the best option at this moment. Instead we suggest discussing within separate work-streams the individual indicators goal by goal.
3. Suggesting identifying one to one indicator target relations (such as Target 1.1 and Indicator 1.1.1). These are low-hanging fruits that should be picked first and need no longer discussion on the indicator in general (its data availability at the most). These indicators should be set and not further discussed.
4. Advising that disaggregation (by sex, age, region etc.) does not necessarily be discussed in first stage. It should not lead to new indicators but additional information/time series. The “by something” disaggregated indicator normally does not point at the relevant target but something else (e.g. the more global political idea) set by the variable it is disaggregated by. Thus, discussion on disaggregation is to be made not now but at a later stage.
5. Recommending discussing within separate work-streams the individual, more complex indicators goal by goal. Using SWOT-analysis identifying pros and cons of the individual indicator options. Choosing the indicator with best results for the specific target and drop others. In case no suitable indicator can be identified there is no urgent need defining an indicator right away. In these cases the indicator could be finally set in a later stage.
6. Ensuring that for communication logic at least on “goal level” all common and well established indicators (tbd, e.g. GDP per capita or life expectancy) are included within the set.
7. Announcing that Germany will provide a detailed list suggesting indicators for selected targets including methodical remarks and additional comments. Germany will provide such list as soon as we have internally agreed on it.

Inputs IAEG observers, ordered by date of submission to the IAEG-SDGs Secretariat:

4. OHCHR on a human rights-based approach to data – 1 June 2015

Ensuring no one is left behind: A human rights-based approach to data

Why are averages not enough?

Official statistics have traditionally focussed on national averages, whether in the field of economics or to aid policymaking on the provision of healthcare, education or social services. However, averages by their very nature mask disparities and are inadequate as a sole measure of progress. If our aim is genuinely to leave no one behind, we must learn the lessons of the MDGs and ensure that the indicators chosen to measure progress towards the SDGs include a clear focus on the most marginalized and vulnerable members of society. This means that SDG data collection should capture not only national averages or aggregate statistics, but also the situation of the most disadvantaged or deprived, as well as the inequalities among social groups.

What groups do we need data for?

Current censuses and household surveys all too often exclude the most vulnerable or marginalised. This may be due to design limitations, for example when surveys conducted at a person's home exclude the homeless or when the person conducting the survey cannot communicate with a member of a linguistic minority. But it can also be due to fear and stigmatisation of identifying as a member of a particular minority, or mistrust as to the purposes for which personal data may be accessed or used. A true data revolution must therefore include innovative approaches to reaching the marginalised groups who are currently invisible in official statistics.

Relevant data should be disaggregated by all grounds of discrimination prohibited by international human rights law, as enshrined in the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights and subsequently elaborated upon by international human rights mechanisms. Such grounds include ethnicity, sex, age, income, geographic location, disability, religion, migratory or displacement status, civil status, sexual orientation and gender identity. While some disaggregation should be common to all countries and follow standard definitions, such as that on sex, age or disability, the precise categories to be included under grounds such as ethnicity, geographic location and religion will vary according to national circumstances. However, differences in the make-up of populations cannot be used as a justification not to measure the progress of the most marginalised towards the SDGs.

The categories by which data should be disaggregated should be determined in an inclusive, participatory process at the national and sub-national levels, with the direct involvement of minority groups themselves. The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD) has made clear that identification as a member of a particular ethnic group “shall, if

no justification exists to the contrary, be based upon self-identification by the individual concerned.” This principle should apply across the SDGs. Groups themselves should determine how they are identified on any list of options, and it should be possible for individuals to choose not to identify as a member of any group, or to enter their own choice of identity. In some cases, proxy indicators such as language spoken at home may be more appropriate than direct questions about group identity if these are likely to reinforce divisions, but such choices must be made with the full participation of groups themselves.

Is disaggregation always the best way to detect inequalities?

No, sometimes other types of data collection will be more appropriate. Inequalities may be detected, for example, through disaggregation of data, by calculating the share of public expenditure spent on public services for each group, or through targeted surveys.

Where the size of a group is very small compared to the size of the whole population, too few members of the group would be captured by a general survey to allow for general conclusions about the group to be drawn. This may be overcome by weighting the survey with the aim to increase representation of specific groups, or by conducting a separate survey for the targeted group, which can then be compared to the national survey.

Where a group is victim of on-going or historical, direct or indirect discrimination by authorities or even other members of society, members of the group may not be willing to identify as such. This risk may be reduced by ensuring clear and transparent safeguards on data storage to protect the privacy of data subjects. However, even this may not be enough, and collection of data through civil society organisations or service providers that enjoy the trust of the most marginalised groups may produce more reliable results. This will require new partnerships between National Statistics Offices (NSOs) and civil society organisations (CSOs), and capacity strengthening within both CSOs and NSOs.

What is the role of big data in ensuring no one is left behind?

In addition to more ‘traditional’ data sources such as socioeconomic statistics, administrative records, household surveys and expert opinion, new potential sources include social media, online or mobile-based crowdsourcing, automated content analysis of a large quantity of online media, satellite data, and even data on spikes in mobile telephone usage. Such data do not in general suffer from the time-lag of traditional data sources, where there is often a long gap between collection and publication, and so can provide vital information in crisis situations. However, their usefulness in on-going monitoring is unclear, and it is telling that none of the currently proposed indicators for the SDGs involve ‘big data.’

While big data can be useful, it is vital to ensure representation of all members of society in measuring progress towards the SDGs. Many new data sources rely on literacy and access to an internet connection or mobile telephone, and so may exclude the most marginalised groups. In collecting such data, it is generally impossible to determine or ensure coverage of the total population. Such sources should therefore be used with caution, and only in tandem

with other data sources that have adequate safeguards in place to ensure representation of all members of society.

What kind of data revolution do we need?

Member States have indicated on numerous occasions, including in the Open Working Group deliberations and final report, that no target should be considered achieved unless met for all population sub-groups so that no one is left behind. There is a need for a ‘data revolution’ for data disaggregation and targeted data collection to capture the situation of the most disadvantaged groups and the groups affected by discrimination, including multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination. This revolution must involve not only experts from the statistical community but also civil society organisations, national human rights institutions, service providers and, most importantly, marginalised populations themselves.

5. ILO – 1 June 2015

a) In the presentation by UNSD, there was no reference to the conclusion of the last Expert Group meeting ref. the consensus that the MDGs were considered appropriate measures of specific SDG targets, and therefore there was value in integrating them into the new framework. This was judged to be a continuity of the past long lasting effort (particularly in developing countries) and on the extensive methodological and data development already done both by the national and international levels. The ILO thinks it is important to incorporate this actively in this as an already proven "Statistical framework" to be actively used.

b) In the same presentation, it was mentioned that the SDG indicators should be linked to the target. It is true, but it should also be HELPFUL and RELEVANT to the target and able to capture the essence of the purpose of the target. This means that we could see that we are inheriting a set of targets which are by definition, too comprehensive and encompassing of various and several dimensions simultaneously. They are too complex and its metrics should therefore multidimensional. In those cases, there is NO POINT in having only one indicator, even if it is desired. The temptation of having composite indexes, as it was hinted by ISTAT, has proven to be very conflicting and difficult to agree and implement and many countries, thorough their own ministries and politicians have resisted and opposed the use of composite indexes.

c) Thirdly, regarding Mathias´ s answer to the floor on how the priority list of indicators was compiled by UNSD is not accurate and even is misleading. The agencies were asked to have a priority in each of the set of possible indicators within each target but this was not the case when in some targets, the priority indicator was not taken by UNSD and therefore it disappeared completely leaving meaningless situations. For instance, Unemployment rate by sex and age group was taken out of the Target 8.5 under the assumption that could be taken by the 8.6 but then when the later was not included, we have the meaningless situation that we will not have Unemployment rates anywhere, which nobody would not doubt to regard that this should be an indicator included in decent work and employment.

I think that this precisely a contradiction with what we all have agreed: to try to see this set of indicators as a set and not precisely linked with one target. This view should be kept and therefore it is not the way to see each target individually but as an interlinked process.

d) ILO shares Netherlands' worries about the speed at which the IAEG-SDG is working. We think that some of the presentations were not relevant to the topic we had to deal urgently and on the other hand the agencies were not allowed any time for interventions or participation. I would like to remind that the global reporting would be the agencies' responsibility afterwards. If this is what it is going to happen in the SDG again, then the agencies should be playing the role their own governing bodies (mainly official ministries from member states) have asked them to provide.

Additional inputs by ILO:

i) ILO agrees with FAO's worries on the confusion and the priority setting process which in some cases led to loosing the core of the rationale of the choice trying to get parsimony. For instance, indicators which were prioritized in one target but combined with others in other

targets and in this process these synergies were lost leaving a lame process which in some cases it does not make sense.

ii) As for target 1.1, indicator 1.1.1.. the ILO thinks that we should be adding "and employment status (working poor)" taking the suggestion of not having additional indicators for goal 8 and, besides, to have a continuity on the "working poor" within MDG 1.

iii) As for the target 1.3 and indicator 1.3.1, it is strongly suggested that the target is clear about covering social protection systems and measures FOR ALL. Therefore it would add distortions and political controversies if the wording is kept as UNSD suggested. Therefore, it should read:

" Percentage of the population covered by social protection floors/systems, disaggregated by....."

We should remember that the SDG is a universal process.

6. ICAO – 1 June 2015

ICAO supports the comment from Italy on the need to classify or categorize indicators into whether they are predictive, leading or outcome/reactive. The MDG indicators typically put attention to this, covering leading/predictive and outcome/reactive indicators for each target. ICAO considers that the SDG framework should pay attention to these distinctions as well and have a balanced set of indicators.

7. International Monetary Fund – 2 June 2015

In light of time constraints which precluded observers from making interventions at the meeting above, as requested, below please find the IMF intervention regarding the IMF staff's potential contribution to the deliberations on developing the indicator framework:

Fund staff is well positioned to offer technical expertise in regard to a limited number of the proposed targets with direct relevance to the work of the Fund. Potential examples include targets such as 10.5 on improving the regulation and monitoring of global financial markets and 17.1 on domestic revenue mobilization. Fund staff would reserve the right not to participate in the dialogue on targets that the Fund deems to be inappropriate. Advice on the appropriate specification of indicators would be based on technical grounds and not represent any endorsement of specific targets. The assistance noted above does not imply a commitment regarding assisting in compiling or monitoring the agreed indicator set for the post-2015 development agenda, nor to providing support for capacity building in compilation.

8. UNDP - 2 June 2015

The UN System has provided substantive support to the inter-governmental process on the SDGs and Post-2015, through the Open Working Group and current inter-governmental negotiations.

That support has been channelled through the Technical Support Team, in which agencies, funds and programmes have organized themselves in sub-clusters along thematic areas for each SDGs.

The TST sub-clusters have responded to requests from the inter-governmental process to support UNSD in developing the statistical notes for the proposed goals, and the preliminary list of indicators, including prioritization of those indicators.

However, many of those agencies do not recognize themselves in the lists produced by UNSD, which seem somewhat arbitrary and do not seem to take into account the consensus agreed by agencies.

We would therefore suggest, Madam Chair, that the Secretariat relies more on that TST mechanism, it has proven very effective in fostering collaboration and coherence within the UN system and bringing to bear the collective expertise of the UN system of the issues that have been vexing us over the past couple of days. This mechanism can also support the work of members the IAEG-SDGs, as it has supported the member states-led inter-governmental process so far, including the suggestion by the USA and the Netherlands, to structure the work of the IAEG-SDGs in smaller groups.

Our second suggestion is to leverage existing networks which already bring together broader sets of expertise not only from the UN system, but also from civil society, academia, and member states, such as in the areas of water and sanitation, Disaster Risk Reduction, and sustainable energy. UNDP is pleased to host a Virtual Network on Indicators for Goal 16. We look forward to sharing the Report from the Network later this month, as a contribution to the work of the IAEG-SDGs in measuring progress in delivering peaceful societies, access to justice, and effective, accountable and inclusive institutions. The Federal Republic of Germany and the Republic of Cabo Verde hosted a meeting at noon today in Conference Room 6 to introduce the work of the Virtual Network, where the multi-stakeholder nature of the network was very much in evidence. Madam Chair herself can attest to that and to the huge turnout.

Finally, UNDP has been pleased to support the creation and launch of the Group Praia on Governance Statistics and looks forward to contributing to the work of the Group as it proceeds in coming months and years. We agree with the remarks from the Head of the Statistics Division yesterday morning that work on the SDG Indicator Framework is a long-

term effort, and that we need to keep this time dimension in mind. Along with many other goals, Goal 16 is one area of the SDG framework which will continue to benefit from attention.

UNDP has also been pleased to contribute to the efforts of the UN System through the TST, and will provide further written comments as appropriate to the Secretariat along with our partners.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

9. UN-Water on Goal 6 – 2 June 2015

This comment relates to Goal 6, on behalf of the UN's inter-agency coordination mechanism on water and sanitation. Because there is no single UN agency on water, UN-Water was created in 2003 at the highest levels of the UN to coordinate and add coherence to the work of the 31 different UN entities whose work touch upon freshwater and sanitation issues.

Together with our colleagues from WHO and UNICEF at the Joint Monitoring Programme and dozens of others, UN-Water has been mandated and working for years to provide a consolidated technical advice on Goal 6 to the OWG, to the Technical Support Team, to Member States in the post-2015 negotiations. UN-Water was invited as an observer to the 1st IAEG-SDGs meeting to provide consolidated input on Goal 6, and we've submitted a consolidated set of proposed indicators and metadata for the entire Goal 6 in advance of this meeting. We are confident that our submission represents the best possible technical advice from the UN system on Goal 6, including on the current state and work on global monitoring that is already well underway for “new” targets 6.3-6.6.

Unfortunately our full set of technical suggestions did not reach the IAEG-SDGs membership within the short priority list that was provided for the meeting, and many were not included at all. Notably, for example, what was missing was our suggestion for a priority 1 indicator for water stress in target 6.4 or the indicators we suggested for 6a and 6b.

Ladies and gentlemen, we heard Member States say at Rio+20 that water and sanitation are at the core of sustainable development. This is clearly reflected in the current Goal 6, which links to all of the other goals. Its indicators are inherently multipurpose.

Achieving Goal 6 will go a long way towards achieving the entire sustainable development agenda - with significant gains for health, agriculture, energy and natural resources.

More than that, the entire Goal 6 is monitorable and achievable.

UN-Water is already working closely with our Members WHO and UNICEF in the Joint Monitoring Programme who are looking at monitoring targets 6.1, 6.2 and the wastewater component of 6.3. We are also well underway on a new global monitoring initiative together with our Members UNEP, UN-Habitat, WHO, FAO, UNESCO, UNICEF and WMO and in close collaboration with CBD, UNECE and Ramsar, to build upon and expand existing data collection mechanisms that have been in place for years (such as AquaStat and GemStat) to help Member States prepare to begin monitoring targets 6.3 to 6.6 in the very near future. In this work we are already engaged with the Statistical Division to discuss harmonization with the SEEA environmental accounting methods that relate to water statistics.

Ladies and gentlemen, Goal 6 is achievable, measurable, and linked to the entire Sustainable Development Agenda, with the opportunity to transform the lives of so many. We would be

very happy to share our technical advice with you in its original, consolidated form and offer whatever support the Members of this group need in their ongoing discussion on indicators for Goal 6. Thank you, and good luck.

10. Global Alliance on Health & Pollution – 2 June 2015

Dear Madam Chair and colleagues at UNSD,

As promised during my intervention today on behalf of the Global Alliance on Health and Pollution (GAHP), I am pleased to submit for consideration of the IAEG SDG the attached document which outlines our proposed indicator for target 3.9 on pollution and health. As I noted, this indicator has also been proposed by UNEP in the list of all proposed indicators on the IAEG SDG website.

To summarize my short intervention:

The currently proposed indicator 3.9.1 on outdoor air pollution for Target 3.9 is insufficient to measure the target, and does not reflect the magnitude of the issue: Pollution is the largest cause of death in the world, responsible for 8.9 million deaths in 2012, according to data from the WHO, IHME and GAHP. We urge the IAEG-SDGs to consider a more comprehensive indicator, such as is proposed by UNEP, which would measure death and disability from all types of pollution (indoor and outdoor air pollution, polluted water and sanitation, and contaminated sites). It would be measured against the 2012 baseline established by WHO/IHME using Global Burden of Disease methodology. An indicator such as this would be feasible, as well as SMART, and is already being collected for many countries around the world.

In addition, I also attach a document which shows the interlinkages of this issue to several other proposed SDGs. We would greatly appreciate if both of these documents were to be made available to the IADG SDG, as well as made publicly available on the IAEG SDG website.

On behalf of our 34 members, including more than 15 governments from low- and middle-income countries, thank you for the opportunity to contribute to this discussion. We look forward to continuing to engage in the process in the coming months. Please do not hesitate to contact us should you require further information or background data.

11. UNISDR – 2 June 2015

Disaster Risk Reduction in SDG

I. Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 (SFDRR)

- a. SFDRR is international agreement to promote disaster risk reduction (successor of Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015)
- b. SFDRR was adopted at March 2015 in Sendai, Japan
- c. Given the recognition of mutual relationship between development process and disaster risk¹, building linkage between SDG and SFDRR was strongly claimed by the Member States

II. Seven Global Targets in SFDRR

- a. Substantially reduce global disaster mortality by 2030, aiming to lower average per 100,000 global mortality between 2020-2030 compared to 2005-2015.
- b. Substantially reduce the number of affected people globally by 2030, aiming to lower the average global figure per 100,000 between 2020-2030 compared to 2005-2015.
- c. Reduce direct disaster economic loss in relation to global gross domestic product (GDP) by 2030.
- d. Substantially reduce disaster damage to critical infrastructure and disruption of basic services, among them health and educational facilities, including through developing their resilience by 2030.
- e. Substantially increase the number of countries with national and local disaster risk reduction strategies by 2020.
- f. Substantially enhance international cooperation to developing countries through adequate and sustainable support to complement their national actions for implementation of this framework by 2030.
- g. Substantially increase the availability of and access to multi-hazard early warning systems and disaster risk information and assessments to the people by 2030.

III. Proposed indicators to bridge SDG and SFDRR

- a. **Number of mortality, missing, injured, relocated or evacuated die to disaster per 100,000**
SDG: 11.5 (the number of deaths and the number of people affected and economic loss caused by disasters), **1.5** (the resilience of the poor and those in vulnerable situations, exposure and vulnerability to climate-related extreme events and disasters), **13.1** (resilience and adaptive capacity to climate-related hazards and natural disasters). Also related with 14.2 (resilient marine and coastal ecosystem) and 15.3 (desertification)
SFDRR: a (global disaster mortality) and b (the number of affected people globally)
- b. **Direct disaster economic loss in relation to global gross domestic product²**
SDG: 11.5 (the number of deaths and the number of people affected and economic loss caused by disasters), **1.5** (the resilience of the poor and those in vulnerable situations, exposure and vulnerability to climate-related extreme events and disasters), **13.1** (resilience and adaptive capacity to climate-related hazards and natural disasters). Also related with 14.2 (resilient marine and coastal ecosystem), 15.3 (desertification) and 2.4 (resilient agriculture)
SFDRR: c (direct economic loss)

¹ Disaster will hinder the sustainable development process and unsustainable development will increase disaster risk. Disaster strikes the vulnerable group and poverty is an underlying risk driver to increase the vulnerability to hazards. Climate change increases the intensity and frequency of disaster risk.

² If economic valuation methodology is not agreed, the number of housing units damaged and destroyed can be a measurable proxy. Agriculture loss due to disaster is also measurable as sub-component and strongly related with SDG target 2.4 (resilient infrastructure) and 15.3 (desertification).

- c. Number of health and educational facilities affected, lengths of road affected by disasters**
SDG: 9.1 (resilient infrastructure).
 Also related with 1.5 (the resilience of the poor and those in vulnerable situations), 11.5 (human and economic loss due to disaster), 4.a (safe education facilities), 13.1 (resilience to climate change), 14.2 (resilient marine and coastal ecosystem) and 15.3 (desertification).
SFDRR: d (disaster damage to critical infrastructure)
- d. Number of countries with national DRR strategies in line with SFDRR**
SDG: 13.2 (climate change into national policies), **13.1** (resilience and adaptive capacity to climate-related hazards and natural disasters). Also related with 9.1 (resilient infrastructure) and 11.5 (human and economic loss due to disaster).
SFDRR: e (national and local DRR strategies)
- e. Number of local governments with more than 100,000 inhabitants and capital cities that adopt and implement local DRR strategies in line with SFDRR, in relation to total number of local governments with more than 100,000 inhabitants and capital cities**
SDG: 11.b (integrated policies and plans in line with the SFDRR)
 Also related with 13.1 (resilience to climate change), 9.1 (resilient infrastructure), 11.5 (human and economic loss due to disaster), and 14.2 (resilient marine and coastal ecosystem)
SFDRR: e (national and local DRR strategies)
- f. Number of countries with critical infrastructure protection plan**
SDG: 9.1 (resilient infrastructure).
 Also related with 13.2 (climate change into national policies), 1.5 (the resilience of the poor and those in vulnerable situations), 11.5 (human and economic loss due to disaster), 4.a (safe education facilities), 13.1 (resilience to climate change), 14.2 (resilient marine and coastal ecosystem) and 15.3 (desertification).
SFDRR: d (disaster damage to critical infrastructure) and **e** (national and local DRR strategies)
- g. Number of countries that have probabilistic risk assessment profile and early warning system against major hazards that the country faces**
SDG: 13.3 (education, awareness-raising and capacity on climate change mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning)
 Also related with 15.3 (desertification), 2.4 (resilient agriculture), 11.5 (human and economic loss due to disaster) and 13.1 (resilience to climate change).
SFDRR: f (availability of early warning system and risk assessment)

IV. Methodology and Measurability: National Disaster Loss Database and SFDRR Monitor

- a. National disaster loss database (based on DesInventar methodology)**
- DesInventar methodology: (i) **Same definition** of loss and hazards. (ii) **No thresholds** for recording disaster loss. (iii) disaggregated/aggregated at **national and municipality level**
 - The database adopting DesInventar methodology covers **85 countries** as of June 2015

- The coverage is highly likely to be more than **115 countries** by the end of 2015
 - The database are generally owned and maintained by disaster management agency.
 - Standard guidelines are currently under development by UNISDR (aims to be agreed in SFDRR indicator setting process).
 - The further standardization by member states will be facilitated by SFDRR indicator setting intergovernmental process.
- b. SFDRR Monitor (successor of HFA Monitor, under development)
- Biennial voluntary reporting system under HFA Monitor
 - **Standardized indicator sets** to monitor DRR policy progress
 - **133 countries** submit evaluation report in 2013
 - The report is generally submitted by disaster management agency (country HFA focal point).
 - SFDRR Monitor is currently under development by UNISDR.
 - The some indicators will monitor global targets and be discussed by SFDRR indicator setting intergovernmental process.

V. Process for Setting Indicators to Monitor SFDRR Global Targets

2015 June: GA adoption of establishment of Open-ended Intergovernmental Working Group (OEWG)

Member States are invited to nominate experts for OEWG

Sep/Oct: First Session of OEWG → *bring inputs to IEAG discussion*

Dec: Informal meeting → *Discuss further alignment between SDG and SFDRR*

2016 Three informal meetings and 2 formal meetings: Continuous discussion of SFDRR global indicators

Dec: Final report of the OEWS submitted to GA

UNISDR: as secretariat, support the process by providing technical advice to the OEWG

- Technical advice shall be coordinated with UN agencies and other stakeholders through UNISDR technical expert meeting

12. Joint Statement of OCHA and UNHCR – 2 June 2015

I would like to follow up on interventions of IOM, the UN Office for Disaster Risk Reduction and OHCHR as all directly or indirectly touched upon refugees, internally displaced persons and displacement in general. As we know, people displaced because of war and armed conflict is a cross-cutting theme and currently not appropriately reflected in the list of priority indicators.

We support the idea of disaggregated data by specific population groups as was mentioned by some colleagues. This is in particular the case for disaggregation by migratory status as colleagues from IOM, DESA and the Global Migration Group, among others, have highlighted yesterday and which we support. Similarly, disaggregation by displacement status is relevant for a total of 9 different priority indicators (1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 4.1, 10.2, 10.3, 16.1 and 16.9), complemented by others listed in annex 2 of our joint submission on displacement indicators to the UNSD.

In addition, indicators for targets 1.5, 11.5 and 13.1 proposed by the UN Office for Disaster Risk Reduction are directly relevant for displaced populations. Target 1.5, for instance, makes reference to “economic, social and environmental shocks” which in our view is correlated to displacement. However, reference to the term “displaced” in the indicator has been omitted. Instead, the term “relocated” has been used. Having looked at the metadata provided by UNISDR, UNHCR and OCHA suggest to replace the term “relocated” with “displaced” in the indicator formulation to have an all-encompassing multi-purpose indicator which accounts for both natural disaster- and conflict-induced displacement, crises and shocks (in line with target 1.5). As such, we will be engaging with UNISDR in the coming weeks to look into this issue.

By background, data on forced displacement are available at the global level and would certainly complement the one of the National Disaster Loss Database.

13. Office of the United Nations Secretary-General's Envoy on Youth – 3 June 2015

Co-Chairs, colleagues, distinguished participants,

On behalf of the Office of the Secretary-General's Envoy on Youth, we wish to thank the United Nations Statistics Division, as the Secretariat of the Statistical Commission and the Inter-agency and Expert Group on Sustainable Development Goal Indicators for the preparations and support in the lead up to this meeting, including the development of the first proposed indicator list.

Over the course of the Post 2015 Development Agenda process to date we have heard repeatedly how youth are central to sustainable development. Member States, as well as other stakeholders over and over again have expressed their recognition for the fact that youth development contributes directly to ensuring key development outcomes and objectives from the community to the national and international level.

The Post-2015 Synthesis Report of the Secretary-General also included a strong focus on youth.

It is therefore that we need to ensure that youth needs and rights are not only assumed in the various goals and targets of the SDGs, but that they are concretely reflected in specific indicators. We must measure what we treasure, and vice-versa.

It is therefore that we wish to express our serious concerns that some key indicators to ensure youth development and well-being can be tracked in the next development agenda appear to be missing from the list of proposed priority indicators that this Inter-agency and Expert Group has in front of it for its deliberations.

We wish to particularly highlight the following five areas of key concern:

Firstly, we are gravely concerned by the fact that youth unemployment rate, an indicator that was rated triple A (AAA) in the survey that was undertaken as part of the global SDG indicators process, is not included in the priority list. Especially given the current global unemployment crisis faced by youth all over the world, standing at a staggering 74 million globally and while youth unemployment rates remain two- to three times as high as those of older working populations in many countries, we strongly believe youth unemployment rate should be given consideration as a priority indicator.

Secondly, while we welcome the inclusion of the indicator on “Percentage of children/young people at the end of each level of education achieving proficiency in reading and mathematics”, we regard this as an insufficient indicator for globally measuring the target (4.2) of ensuring all girls and boys complete free, equitable and quality primary and secondary education.

While this proposed priority indicator would contribute to tracking progress for those who are already in the education system, it would not allow us to monitor trends in access and completion rates, which are so critical to measuring youth development with so many young people remaining or prematurely dropping out of school.

Third, the indicators for target 4.7., with reference to “education”, and 12.8, with reference to “information and awareness”, “for sustainable development and sustainable lifestyles” are in our view too narrowly defined. Aside from education in environmental science and geo science (4.7), as well as SCP (sustainable consumption and production) education (12.8), the indicators for these targets should consider important issues such global citizenship, human rights, gender equality and comprehensive education on human sexuality.

Fourth, with regards to the indicators for the targets under Goal 3 on Health, we believe it is of grave concern that the Adolescent Birth Rate indicator, which was rated with a triple A score in the afore-mentioned survey, is absent from the current list of priority indicators. This indicator has moreover been time-tested during the currently finishing development era of the MDGs under MDG5, which happens to be one of the MDGs most of track still.

With some 16 million girls aged 15 to 19 and some 1 million girls under age 15 giving birth every year, most of them in low- and middle-income countries, and while complications during pregnancy and childbirth are the second leading cause of death for 15-19 year-old girls globally, we strongly believe that Adolescent Birth Rate should be considered and added as a priority indicator to measuring universal access to sexual and reproductive health care services, which we know many young people, especially adolescent girls and young women continue to face severe barriers to.

Our last comment, at this stage, relates to target 16.7. “Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels” and its proposed priority indicator “Proportions of positions (by sex, disability and population groups) in public institutions compared to national distributions. Here we strongly urge the Inter-Agency and Expert Group to also consider the inclusion of ‘age’ as a variable for making the proposed comparison. Young people are under-represented in formal and political institutions and processes, such as parliaments, political parties, electoral processes and public administrations and are often excluded in decision making processes. While over half the world’s population is under 30, globally the average age in parliament is 53. Fewer than 2 per cent of parliamentarians around the world are in their 20s; only 12 per cent are in their 30s. Yet we know that young people’s participation is an essential condition for peaceful and inclusive societies.

--

The Office of the Secretary-General’s Envoy on Youth wishes to once again express its sincere thanks for the efforts undertaken to date and stands ready to support the work of the Inter-Agency and Expert Group in order to ensure that the global indicators will be reflective of the need for the Sustainable Development Agenda to include young people at its centre.

14. Co-Chairs of the Global Migration Group Technical Working Group on Data and Research (IOM, UN DESA), GMG Chair (World Bank), SRSG on International Migration – 4 June 2015

The report of the Open Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals (OWG) has affirmed the importance of including migrants and migration in the Post-2015 Development Agenda. The ongoing crises in the Mediterranean, the Bay of Bengal and the Andaman Sea meanwhile, testify to the significance of the OWG's proposals for safe, orderly and regular migration.

The OWG's proposed SDGs include a number of important targets relating to different migration-related issues, such as human trafficking, remittances, labour migration, safe, orderly, regular and responsible migration, and data disaggregation, including by migratory status. In order to give effect to these targets, the Post-2015 Agenda will require a robust set of migration-related indicators to measure progress towards the goals and targets.

The Co-Chairs of the Global Migration Group (GMG) Technical Working Group on Data and Research, with the support from the Chair of the GMG (the World Bank) and the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for International Migration, made a joint submission with proposed indicators on 15 May.

The group welcomes that some migration related indicators have been included in the list of proposed priority indicators collated by the UN Statistical Division, but would like to submit the following five points for consideration:

- 1) The group considers target 10.7 the most important from a migration perspective. Bearing in mind that safe, orderly and regular migration as well as “well-managed migration policies” are multi-dimensional issues, spanning issues like migrant recruitment, circular migration, responses to climate change and crises; we maintain that the proposal for an International Migration Policy Index would be the best way to capture progress towards 10.7 and to make actionable gap analyses. The indicator currently proposed for that target does not fully capture the multi-dimensional nature of target 10.7. Further, we note that a number of other indices have been proposed as priority indicators for other complex targets, highlighting that such composite measures should be given due consideration in the framework.
- 2) The ambition of leaving no one behind is now well integrated as an overarching principle of the Post-2015 Agenda. In order to meet that ambition, the new agenda must measure migrants' development outcomes and well-being. This in turn requires more references to migratory status as an important factor of disaggregation in the priority indicator list. Disaggregated reporting on select SDGs/targets (in particular related to poverty, health, education, social protection, employment, legal identity) would also contribute to measuring target 10.7.
- 3) The proposed indicator for target 10.c on remittance costs (“remittance costs as a percentage of the amount remitted”) is currently listed as a Tier II indicator. Considering that an established methodology exists and is monitored by the World Bank (currently

conducting quarterly surveys in 226 migration corridors) in response to a target already agreed by the G20, this indicator should be graded as Tier I (methodology exist and data is available).

- 4) Although the proposed SDGs contain two separate targets (5.2 and 16.2) addressing the issue of human trafficking, we were surprised to see that the priority indicator list does not contain a single indicator focused on this issue. The group reiterates its proposal that this be addressed by including the following as a priority indicator: "Number of victims of human trafficking per 100,000 persons". This would serve as a multi-purpose indicator tracking progress towards Targets 5.2 and 16.2.
- 5) With the number of people experiencing forced migration due to conflict and violence exceeding 50 million for the first time since World War II, we further believe that displacement needs to be better reflected in the indicators. A proposed indicator to this effect would be "Percentage of refugees and IDPs who have found a durable solution". Such an indicator would cast light on issues posing severe impediments to development. Additionally, indicators for targets 1.5, 11.5 and 13.1 offer an important opportunity to include forced migration in the agenda. A multi-purpose indicator for these targets addressing the number of people affected by hazardous events could be included. However, the term "relocated" in the proposal outlined in the list of priority indicators should be replaced with "displaced".

IOM, UN DESA, the World Bank, and the SRSG on International Migration stand ready to contribute further to the important work of the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on Sustainable Development Goal Indicators.

15. UN-Energy – 5 June 2015

UN-Energy is a conglomerate of over 30 UN agencies and other international organizations involved in energy activities and supporting cooperation and capacity development in this field. UN-Energy promotes coherence and coordination among international organizations in order to accelerate achievement of major global energy goals and objectives.

UN-Energy is very concerned about the major shift in the indicators that are being put forward for SDG-7 on Energy relative to what was being considered in the earlier technical report of the Bureau of the UN Statistical Commission. The energy indicators from this earlier technical report had received high level ratings of mainly AAA from the statistical experts, and almost all of these indicators have now been modified or replaced with others. We believe that the four indicators mentioned in the earlier report provided a much more solid basis for monitoring SDG-7.

- Percentage of population with electricity access (AAA) for Target 7.1
- Percentage of population with access to non-solid fuels (BAA) for Target 7.1
- Share of renewable energy in total final energy consumption (AAA) for Target 7.2
- Compound annual growth rate of primary energy intensity to GDP in PPP terms (AAA) for Target 7.3

Universal Energy Access (Target 7.1)

The latest proposal retains the important indicator on “Percentage of population with electricity access” but has dropped the indicator on “Percentage of population with access to non-solid fuels”. The latter is important because cooking and heating represent a large share of household energy use across the developing world and are not typically undertaken using electricity. Instead, for cooking and heating, households typically rely on solid fuels (such as wood, charcoal, biomass) or non-solid fuels (mainly natural gas or LPG). It is well known that reliance on solid fuels for cooking and heating is associated with high levels of indoor air pollution estimated to cause almost 4 million deaths annually, mainly among women and children. This is more than TB, HIV and malaria combined. These adverse health impacts can be avoided by switching to non-solid fuels, or in some circumstances by adopting advanced combustion cook stoves and adopting strict protocols for their safe use.

Given the importance of clean and safe cooking as a human development issue, universal access to energy among the technical practitioner community is currently taken to mean access to both electricity and non-solid fuels. For this reason, clean cooking forms part of the universal access objective under the UN Secretary General’s Sustainable Energy for All initiative. Therefore, it is recommended to reinstate the previously proposed indicator defined in terms of “Percentage of population with access to non-solid fuels” or alternatively in terms of “Percentage of population with primary reliance on clean fuels and technologies.”

Renewable Energy (Target 7.2)

The proposed indicator “Share of energy from renewable sources in net domestic energy use” is unusual in taking “net domestic energy use” as the denominator for measuring the renewable energy share. “Net domestic energy use” is not a very widely used indicator for energy use and is not very precisely defined, compared to more standard and widely used measures such as “primary energy supply” or “total final energy consumption”. This terminology will definitely translate into lack of data, particularly in LDCs and other developing countries.

Energy Efficiency (Target 7.3)

The proposed indicator “Ratio of value added to net domestic energy use, by industry” is an energy intensity measure at the level of individual industries. There are two problems with this formulation.

First, while the industrial sector is an important consumer of energy, it is far from being the only consumer of energy. This indicator therefore does nothing to capture the energy efficiency of all other sectors of the economy including transport, energy production, residential sector, agriculture and services.

Second, the indicator proposes reporting separate energy intensity information for each industry. In this sense, it is not a single indicator but rather a family of indicators, a separate one for the steel industry, the cement industry, the manufacturing industry, etc. Furthermore, there are at present relatively few countries in the world that have energy intensity data available at the level of individual industries.

Finally, energy intensity measures are more commonly expressed as the inverse of what is proposed (that is energy usage per dollar of value added as opposed to value added per unit of energy). Furthermore, the same comments made above under renewable energy regarding the use of the indicator “net domestic energy use” would also apply here, in particular in relation to the lack of data in many developing countries.

Means of Implementation

The second indicator proposed for the means of implementation 7b is identical to the one proposed under energy efficiency and does not appear to have any direct relationship to the issues posed under means of implementation 7b.

Sustainable Energy for All Global Tracking Framework

UN-Energy would like to bring to the attention of the IAEG-SDGs Indicators a major global effort on energy indicators and statistics entitled “Sustainable Energy for All (SE4ALL) Global Tracking Framework” (GTF). This is the most comprehensive on-going framework for monitoring and accountability of progress on achieving global energy objectives. The effort is led by the World Bank, the International Energy Agency (IEA) and more than 20 other renowned international organizations and mechanisms, including the UN-Energy and many UN agencies. In addition to providing baselines and data on progress for almost all

countries, the SE4All GTF also provides indicators for the three objectives of the SE4All initiative. Because of the similarity of these objectives to the proposed targets under SDG-7 on energy, these proposed GFT indicators are also of direct relevance for the energy SDG. The previous set of energy indicators proposed for SDG-7 were prepared in full consultation with the SE4ALL GTF team and energy experts from supporting UN and international organizations.

Therefore, UN-Energy strongly recommends reinstating the high rated previously proposed energy indicators as the basis for future discussions.

For any questions or further discussion, please contact Mr. Ivan Vera, Secretary of UN-Energy at vera@un.org.

16. UNFPA - 9 June 2015

UNFPA has supported the Post 2015 Process including Indicator development throughout, both at the TST level where we co-chaired Goal 3 with WHO and Goal 5 with UN Women, and through our continued engagement with Member States at Country and Regional levels.

We stand ready to continue supporting MS and in particular the National Statistics Offices (NSOs) in their work.

We would like to express our deep appreciation for the work done by UNSD, and would like to share a few comments.

We would like to support the intervention in the IAEG by OHCHR on disaggregation especially on age and sex but also on quintiles across all relevant indicators, as a crucial equity measure and to ensure that no one is left behind, also recalling the measures of disaggregation reflected in target 17.18 which could be applied to all indicators.

We would also like to support another comment made by a number of Member States and UN Agencies regarding certain targets, which by their very articulation would require more than one indicator to be truly measured. For example Target 5.3, which addresses both child marriage, and FGM would require both an indicator on child marriage and another on FGM to be fully monitored. This was reflected in an earlier submission by the TST working on Goal group 5. In this light, we recommend reflecting our proposed indicator 5.3.2, at the very least (kindly see also above).

More generally, and this goes particularly for Goal 3, restricting to one indicator per target means the ambition level drops below that of the Millennium Development Goal indicators. Let us recall that MDG targets 5A and 5B were measured by two and four indicators respectively. Furthermore, the MDG indicators included indicator 6.3 (on comprehensive correct knowledge of HIV/AIDS) while in the current Proposed Indicators List the issue of SRH information and education (part of target 3.7) would not even be assigned an indicator.

Moreover, continuing on the issue of targets covering multiple areas, some MS in the meeting noted that target 4.7 would be particularly hard to measure with only one indicator. We would like to recall that in our submission we highlighted existing global accountability mechanisms, based on inter-governmental agreements, for education on human rights, gender equality and sustainable development.

Kindly find herewith in more detail, the main discrepancies between the input we sent to UNSD in our submission to the IAEG on 15 May, and how this input has been reflected in the Proposed Priority Indicator List as presented to the IAEG for discussion on 28 May:

Submitted by UNFPA:

3.1.2 Skilled birth attendance (WHO, UNICEF)

Not included in the Proposed Priority Indicator List.

We recommend that this indicator is added.

Submitted by UNFPA:

3.7.1 Adolescent birth rate (10-14; 15-19) (UNPD, UNFPA)

Not included in the Proposed Priority Indicator List.

We recommend that this indicator is added.

Submitted by UNFPA:

5.2.1 Proportion of ever-partnered women and girls (aged 15-49) subjected to physical and/or sexual violence by a current or former intimate partner, in the last 12 months (UNWomen, WHO, UNICEF, UNFPA)

Reflected in the Proposed Priority Indicator List:

UNICEF, UNWomen and UNSD

We request that this is corrected to include UNFPA and WHO.

Submitted by UNFPA:

5.2.2 Proportion of women and girls (aged 15-49) subjected to sexual violence by persons other than an intimate partner, in the last 12 months (UNWomen, WHO, UNICEF, UNFPA)

Not included in the Proposed Priority Indicator List.

We recommend that this indicator is added.

Submitted by UNFPA:

5.3.1 Percentage of women aged 20-24 who were married or in a union before age 18 (i.e. child marriage) (UNFPA and UNICEF)

Reflected in the Proposed Priority Indicator List:

UNICEF

We request that this is corrected to include UNFPA.

Submitted by UNFPA:

5.3.2 Percentage of girls and women aged 15-19 who have undergone FGM (UNFPA and UNICEF)

Not included in the Proposed Priority Indicator List.

We recommend that this indicator is added.

Submitted by UNFPA:

5.6.1 Percentage of women (aged 15-49) who make their own sexual and reproductive decisions (UNFPA)

Included in the Proposed Priority Indicator List, but without the note (the text mentions ++ but there does not seem to be a matching note/reference).

We request that this is corrected as per our original submission (text in column and supplementary technical materials attached to our submission at the time).

Submitted by UNFPA:

5.6.2 Proportion (%) of countries with laws and regulations that guarantee all women and adolescents access to sexual and reproductive health services, information and education. Legal/regulatory frameworks covered by this indicator include laws and regulations that explicitly guarantee (UNFPA):

1. Access to SRH services without third party authorization (from the spouse, guardian, parents or others);
2. Access to SRH services without restrictions in terms of age and marital status;
3. Access by adolescents to SRH information and education.

Not included in the Proposed Priority Indicator List.

We recommend that this indicator is added.

In addition, the Proposed Priority Indicator List, last column, includes the note: ‘is overlapping with 5.6’.

We request this note is deleted, to avoid any suggestion that 3.7 and 5.6 would be considered for coverage by one indicator. The latter would be a mistake as, with UNWomen, we have

made the technical case in the context of the TST why 3.7 and 5.6 are complementary targets and, as such, need their own, separate indicators.

Submitted by UNFPA:

16.7.2 Proportion of countries that address young people's multisectoral needs with their national development plans and poverty reduction strategies (UNPA)

Not included in the Proposed Priority Indicator List.

We recommend that this indicator is added.

Submitted by UNFPA:

16.9. Percentage of children under 1 whose births have been registered with civil authority (UNICEF, WHO, WB, UNSD and UNFPA)

Included in the Proposed Priority Indicator List, but without any reference to supporting agencies (blank column).

We recommend that this is corrected, to include UNICEF, WHO, WB, UNSD and UNFPA

Submitted by UNFPA:

17.18.1 Proportion of sustainable development indicators with full disaggregation produced at national level (UNFPA, UNDESA, UNDP)

Included in the Proposed Priority Indicator List.

17. Sustainable Energy for All initiative - NY office – 9 June 2015

SE4All strongly recommend to use the indicators proposed under the SE4All Global Tracking Framework (see box) as the basis for further discussions on indicators for Sustainable Development Goal 7 on energy. The four indicators have received top ratings (mostly AAA) in a survey by the Bureau of the United Nations Statistical Commission. These indicators represent a “best consensus” at present by more than 20 globally-recognised organizations that have developed the SE4All Global Tracking Framework through extensive expert-level and public consultations, as well as a series of consultations/briefings with Member States. It also presents a data platform drawing on national data records for more than 180 countries. We strongly urge that the proposed “priority indicators” for the first meeting of the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on Sustainable Development Goal Indicators be revised to fully reflect the recommended indicators based on the work under the SE4All Global Tracking Framework. Under target 7.1, on energy access, it is essential that both access to electricity and access to non-solid fuels have their own separate indicators, given their diverse links to poverty, growth, gender and health. Targets 7.2 and 7.3 on renewable energy and energy efficiency respectively represent game changers in addressing climate change and equitable growth, and as such will depend on solid indicators going forward.

OWG-SDG proposed target 7.1: By 2030 ensure universal access to affordable, reliable, and modern energy services. *Proposed indicator 1: Percentage of population with electricity access. Proposed indicator 2: Percentage of population with access to non-solid fuels.*

OWG-SDG proposed target 7.2: Increase substantially the share of renewable energy in the global energy mix by 2030. *Proposed indicator: Share of renewable energy in total final energy consumption*

OWG-SDG proposed target 7.3: Double the global rate of improvement in energy efficiency by 2030. *Proposed indicator: Compound annual growth rate of primary energy intensity to Gross Domestic Product in Purchasing Power Parity terms.*

Background:

The General Assembly’s Open Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals (OWG-SDG) has proposed as universal goal number 7 to “Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable, and modern energy for all”. The proposed goal is accompanied with proposed targets on *e.g.* energy access, energy efficiency and renewable energy. Due to the close similarity of these three targets with the three objectives of the Secretary-General’s Sustainable Energy for All (SE4All), possible indicators, data, baselines and a global tracking framework for the three first targets of SDG7 (7.1-7.3) do already exist.

The Sustainable Energy for All (SE4All) Global Tracking Framework (GTF) is a comprehensive framework produced by the World Bank, ESMAP, the International Energy Agency (IEA) and more than 20 other internationally recognized organizations, many of them members of UN-Energy. The SE4All Global Tracking Framework has also been presented to and endorsed by the Advisory Board of the Sustainable Energy for All, a group

of 45 high-level multi-stakeholders members from governments, international organisations, business and civil society. Involving also many Member States, a technical report by the Bureau of the United Nations Statistical Commission (UNSC) on the process of the development of an indicator framework for the goals and targets of the post-2015 development agenda gave further impetus to these indicators, most of which were top rated as triple-A (AAA) – meaning “A: Easily feasible (methodology exists and data is available)” / “A: We support this indicator” / “A: Very relevant”.

Organizations involved in the Sustainable Energy for All Global Tracking Framework:

The development of the 2nd Sustainable Energy for All (SE4All) Global Tracking Framework has been coordinated by the World Bank, the International Energy Agency (IEA) and the Energy Sector Management Assistance Program (ESMAP) in collaboration with the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), the International Partnership for Energy Efficiency Cooperation (IPEEC), Practical Action, the International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA), the Renewable Energy Policy Network for the 21st Century (REN21), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), UN-Energy, the United Nations Foundation, the World Energy Council (WEC), the World Health Organization (WHO), the Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves (GACC), the United Nations Industrial Organization (UNIDO), the Stockholm International Water Institute (SIWI), the United Nations Statistics Division, the United Nations Department of Social and Economic Affairs (DESA), the United Nations Statistics Division (UNSD), UN WOMEN, the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), the Global Water Partnership, the UNEP DTU Partnership, and the International Network on Gender and Sustainable Energy (ENERGIA).

18. UNODC – 12 June 2015

General Comments submitted by UNODC on the SDG indicator framework

1. **Trafficking in Persons: a political concern that Member States have included in two targets but that priority indicators risk to leave behind**

Trafficking in persons is a crime resulting in a serious violation of the victim's human rights, in particular of women and children. Two SDG targets reflect the political commitment of Member States to eliminate trafficking in persons (target 15.2: Eliminate all forms of violence against all women and girls in the public and private spheres, including trafficking and sexual and other types of exploitation; target 16.2: End abuse, exploitations, trafficking and all forms of violence against and torture of children). However, priority indicators for these two targets focus on other forms of violence against women and children pushing away the overall concern on trafficking in persons. At the same time, other vulnerable populations covered by other targets are closely connected to trafficking in persons, such as migrants (target 10.7) victims of forced labour, child labour and child soldiers (target 8.7) as well as victims of child and forced marriage (target 5.3). These human rights violations can all be forms of trafficking in persons.

UNODC has proposed the following indicator on Trafficking in Persons "**Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age and form of exploitation**" (see Annex for description). The part of the indicator on detected victims is widely available nationally and globally (globally available for over 130 countries) and belongs to tier I. Through a General Assembly resolution, Member States have already mandated UNODC to collect this indicator and produce a global report every two years. Estimating the number of non-detected victims is more challenging. UNODC is currently testing a methodology to be applied to regional and global estimates which are expected to become available within the next 3-5 years.

2. **Some targets are multi-dimensional and may need more than one indicator in order to reflect the commitment made by Member States in the SDG**

Keeping the number of indicators to a manageable number is undoubtedly a legitimate concern. However, it should be noted that some targets are by nature multi-dimensional and require more than one indicator to monitor them. Reducing the monitoring of a multi-dimensional target to one indicator would require political judgment on what aspect of the target is more relevant compared to others. While consolidated measures may not be available to measure all aspects of multi-dimensional targets it would be relevant to acknowledge that some targets may need more than one indicator to be properly monitored.

A clear example is target *16.3 Promote the rule of law at the national and international levels and ensure equal access to justice for all*. The rule of law is a multi-faceted concept ranging from equal protection of the law, efficient justice system, and safe community to ensuring that all persons,

institutions and entities, public and private, including the State itself, are held accountable to standards that are embodied in just, fair and equitable laws. Given this cross-cutting and multidimensional scope of the concept, no rule of law target can be measured with only one single indicator. In an ideal situation, such a target requires a multitude of indicators to track progress in many, if not all of the areas that comprise the rule of law. However, in a pragmatic approach two or three global indicators may be sufficient to describe the basic political commitments that such a multi-dimensional target encompasses. There is a widely available indicator on the length of pre trial detention for example that gives an indication of the efficiency of the justice system (see Annex for description of this indicator); other indicators may be constructed to be included in tier II or III.

In addition to the global monitoring, it is worth recognizing that the ambit of universal principles and norms, definitions and common conceptions on what constitutes safety, fairness and justice are deeply contextual. Each country, or even community, must share a basic understanding of what these concepts look like when they are realised. Accordingly for each rule of law area, a basket of indicators is needed to capture a range of issues, including people's perceptions, structures and institutions' capacity's. These baskets can be tailored at various levels, national, regional or local and can, then, form the engines that spur a real transformation based on evidence.

In addition to the rule of law target, other targets are also multidimensional and require a large set of indicators, including for example target 6.2 'end abuse, exploitation and trafficking and all forms of violence against children' or target 16.6 'develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions'.

3. It may be useful for the IAEG to compile a list of existing mandated regional and global statistical activities which already collect indicators related to the areas included in the Sustainable Development Goals and Targets.

Member States have repeatedly called for the need to rationalize regional or international data collection activities with the view to avoid duplications and limit the reporting burden of countries. Constructing a new indicator framework of the magnitude required by the SDG, in isolation from the statistical activities which agencies are already undertaken (following requests made by national statistical offices or inter-governmental bodies), risk to create duplication of efforts, repetitions and inconsistencies. While the ambitious SDG agenda may require in some areas novel methodology and new mechanisms for global monitoring, it may be useful for the IAEG to have at its disposal a list of regional and international agencies which have been explicitly mandated by member states to construct and collect indicators relevant to SDG areas, taking stock of existing regional and global data collection mechanisms which have gone, similarly to the IAEG, through formal processes to select thematic indicators. With this information the IAEG could also take stock of the agencies that have accumulated knowledge and experience in global statistical activities in relation to different SDG areas and that are in the position to offer their statistical support as needed.

Annex

| | |
|---|--|
| Indicator 16.2.2 | Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age and form of exploitation |
| Goal and target addressed | Goal 16 Target 16.2 |
| Definition and method of computation | <p>Trafficking in persons is defined as the recruitment, transportation, transfer, harbouring or receipt of persons, by means of the threat or use of force or other forms of coercion, of abduction, of fraud, of deception, of the abuse of power or of a position of vulnerability or of the giving or receiving of payments or benefits to achieve the consent of a person having control over another person, for the purpose of exploitation. Exploitation shall include, at a minimum, the exploitation of the prostitution of others or other forms of sexual exploitation, forced labour or services, slavery or practices similar to slavery, servitude or the removal of organs (The United Nations Protocol to Prevent Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, especially Women and Children, which is supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime).</p> <p>The number of victims is defined as the number of detected and estimated number of non-detected adult women and men and girls and boys (18-) who have been trafficked for different forms of trafficking in persons. The estimated ratio between the number of detected victims and the estimated number of non-detected victims can be used to estimate the total number of human trafficking victims at national, regional and global levels. In addition, the ratio can be used to measure the efficiency of countries to detect trafficking victims.</p> |
| Rationale and interpretation | Human trafficking for different forms of exploitation represents a major violation of victim's human rights, dignity and inclusion to the society. It has an impact on a person's health and opportunities, it creates economic inequalities and it is a threat to the personal security. The regular production of figures on this indicator will allow the monitoring of the impact of the anti-trafficking measures to the level of trafficking at national, regional and global levels. It also helps to assess the capacity of countries to detect and consequently support victims of trafficking. It will raise awareness on the most prevalent forms of trafficking in persons in different parts of the world. |
| Sources and data collection | Currently, the available and country specific number of detected victims is collected yearly from the Member States using a specific questionnaire. It is published in the UNODC biennial Global Report on Trafficking in Persons. Data are available for about 130 countries, since 2007. The data is disaggregated for age, sex and forms of exploitation. The estimated number of non-detected victims can be established by applying methodologies developed to measure the estimated number of different hidden populations (e.g. Respondent Driven Sampling and Network Scale-up Method). These methodologies have been tested with different forms of trafficking in persons (see comments below). |
| Disaggregation | Recommended disaggregation for this indicator is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sex of the victim • age of the victim • form of exploitation |
| Comments and limitations | In 2013 and 2014, UNODC has conducted two Expert Group Meetings with the academia on measuring different hidden populations. The work |

| | |
|--|---|
| | has resulted in a methodology to measure the hidden part of trafficking in persons in order to estimate the number of non-detected victims of trafficking. The methodology has been used in some studies and will be soon tested by UNODC. |
| Gender equality issues | Trafficking in persons has a negative impact particularly on women. Currently, 70 % of detected victims of trafficking in persons are female: adult women (49%) and girls (21%). The international community stressed this aspect already when they adopted the international instrument to address trafficking which is titled: The UN Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, especially Women and Children. |
| Data for global and regional monitoring | UNODC is the only international organization which is regularly collecting and disseminating data on the number of detected victims of human trafficking at the global level. Selected data on specific forms of trafficking in persons are collected and disseminated by ILO, UNICEF and UNHCR. Regional and geographically defined data is collected by IOM and some regional organizations such as EU. The Academia has developed a list of local studies assessing the hidden part of trafficking for specific geographical areas and forms of exploitation. |
| Supplementary information | <p>The General Assembly in resolution A/RES/64/293 mandated UNODC to report every two years on trafficking in persons flows and patterns, at the national, regional and international levels.</p> <p>As to the results of current data collection, we can see that between 2007 and 2013, there is a slight increase in the number of detected victims per 100,000 population. There should be a continuous monitoring of this trend and it should be combined with the number of non-detected victims to understand the changes in the severity of trafficking in persons.</p> |
| References | <p>UNODC Global Report on Trafficking in Persons 2009, 2012 and 2014, www.unodc.org/glotip.html</p> <p>UNODC, International Classification of Crime for Statistical Purposes, 2015</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| Indicator 16.3.2 | Unsentenced detainees as percentage of overall prison population. |
| Goal and target addressed | Goal 16 Target 16.3 |
| Definition and method of computation | <p>The total number of persons held in detention who have not yet been sentenced, as a percentage of the total number of persons held in detention, on a specified date.</p> <p>‘Sentenced’ refers to persons subject to criminal proceedings who have received a decision from a competent authority regarding their conviction or acquittal. For the purposes of the indicator, persons who have received a ‘non-final’ decision (such as where a conviction is subject to appeal) are considered to be ‘sentenced’.</p> |
| Rationale and interpretation | The indicator signifies overall respect for the principle that persons awaiting trial shall not be detained in custody. This, in turn, is premised on aspects of the right to be presumed innocent until proven guilty. From a development perspective, extensive use of pre-sentence detention when not necessary for reasons such as the prevention of absconding, the |

| | |
|--|--|
| | protection of victims or witnesses, or the prevention of the commission of further offences, can divert criminal justice system resources, and exert financial and unemployment burdens on the accused and his or her family. Measuring the relative extent to which pre-sentence detention is used can provide the evidence to assist countries in lowering such burdens and ensuring its proportionate use. |
| Sources and data collection | UNODC collects data on prisons through its annual data collection (UN-CTS). Data on unsentenced and total detainees from the UN-CTS are available for 114 countries. The country coverage can improve if other sources (research institutions and NGOs) are included (data for additional 70 countries are available, bringing the total to 184 countries). |
| Disaggregation | Recommended disaggregation for this indicator are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • age and sex • length of pre-trial (unsentenced) detention |
| Comments and limitations | The target relates to the multidimensional concepts of rule of law and access to justice and at least two indicators are required to cover the main elements of access to justice and efficiency of the justice system. The proposed indicator 16.3.2 covers the efficiency of the justice system. |
| Gender equality issues | These data can be disaggregated by sex and indicate whether different levels of unsentenced detention exist for men and women |
| Data for global and regional monitoring | At international level, data on the number of persons held in unsentenced detention are available from the long-standing United Nations Survey of Crime Trends and Operations of Criminal Justice Systems mandated by the UN General Assembly (UN-CTS). At regional level, data are available from a number of collection initiatives including Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics (SPACE) and OAS Observatory on Citizen Security Data Repository. |
| Supplementary information | The indicator is most commonly measured using data from administrative records. National decisions that need to be taken when collecting data for the indicator include the definition of ‘detention’, as well as the day of the year on which the data is collected. Data from all individual places of detention (which may be managed by different government authorities) must be aggregated and used for overall calculation of the indicator. |
| References | Definitions and other metadata are provided in the UN-Crime Trends Survey (UN-CTS) Guidance on collection of information on detained persons, as well as example data collection sheets, are provided in the United Nations Manual for the Development of a System of Criminal Justice Statistics, as well as (for children), in the UNODC/UNICEF Manual for the Measurement of Juvenile Justice Indicators. |

19. UNODC (second inputs) – 12 June 2015

Comments on the priority list produced for the IAEG-SDGs meeting of 1-2 June 2015

Target 15.7, 16.3, 16.4 and 16.6

Main suggestions

1. Replacing priority indicator identified for target 15.7 with an indicator on Proportion of detected trade in wildlife and wildlife products that is illegal (PIT) elaborated by UNODC together with the CITES Secretariat (CITES is the inter-governmental body which monitors illegal wildlife trade).
2. Replacing priority indicator identified for target 16.3 with an indicator on pre-trial detention and the addition of another priority indicator on unreported crime (which can also be linked to target 16.a).
3. To add the priority indicator on target 16.4 on percentage of seized and collected firearms that are recorded and traced, in accordance with international standards and legal instruments (placing this indicator in tier I and keeping the financial flows indicators in tier III).
4. Replacing priority indicator identified for target 16.6 with an indicator on percentage of recommendations to strengthen national anti-corruption frameworks (institutional and legislative) implemented, as identified through the UN Convention against Corruption Implementation Review Mechanism.

Rational

1. Target 15.7: Take urgent action to end poaching and trafficking of protected species of flora and fauna and address both demand and supply of illegal wildlife products

The originally proposed priority indicator (Red List Index for species in trade) does not measure the spirit of the target which is poaching and trafficking of protected species. It shows changes in the overall extinction risk of sets of species over time which can be due to many factors (legal trade, climate change etc.). The RLI measures the overall rate at which species move through IUCN Red List categories towards or away from extinction. Moreover, the proposed indicator is rated Tier One, but while data may be available, these are not relevant to measuring progress towards the target (end poaching). National assessments of extinction risks are very costly and take a long time, which is not suitable for measuring a dynamic phenomenon such as poaching, but more relevant for measuring long term objectives, for example related to loss of biodiversity (e.g. Target 15.5).

A relevant indicator for target 15.7 should measure:

- if poaching has been reduced
- if demand and supply of illegal wildlife products has changed

The indicator suggested by UNODC and the CITES Secretariat includes both these components: **“Proportion of detected trade in wildlife and wildlife products that is illegal (PIT)”** (see **Annex for metadata**). If poaching is defined as the illegal taking of wildlife for the purposes of international trade, an indicator of poaching is attempted illegal imports as a share of total imports. The indicator measures the law enforcement effort to combat illegal trafficking of protected species of flora and fauna, with seizures representing law enforcement action. Since trends in seizures are meaningless without some indication of trends in demand, import and export permits issued (required under CITES) are used as an indicator of legal market demand.

This indicator is Tier I since, the necessary data are available nationally in dedicated and in law enforcement institutions and internationally in UNODC and the CITES Secretariat:

- 1) The required details on the legal trade in protected wildlife and wildlife products are derived from import and export permits issued. The records of this legal trade collected by the CITES Secretariat. All CITES parties (n=180) are required to submit data annually on the export and import permits they issue.
- 2) Seizures of protected wildlife and wildlife products. The records of these seizures are being collected by the CITES Secretariat and the World Customs Organization. The records of this illegal trade are managed by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime under the International Consortium on Combatting Wildlife Crime partnership.
- 3) Declared values for imported wildlife products. These are collected by national governments and are maintained in the global wildlife database by UNODC.

CITES (the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora) is an international agreement between governments. CITES has 181 Parties. Its aim is to ensure that international trade in specimens of wild animals and plants does not threaten their survival. Because the trade in wild animals and plants crosses borders between countries, the effort to regulate it requires international cooperation to safeguard certain species from over-exploitation. Today, it accords varying degrees of protection to more than 35,000 species of animals and plants, whether they are traded as live specimens, fur coats or dried herbs. Within the framework of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the relevant Aichi Biodiversity Targets adopted by the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, and the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, CITES covers issues relating to the illegal wildlife trade.

The records of the legal trade in wildlife are submitted annually by States Parties to the CITES Secretariat and are maintained in the CITES Trade Database. In addition, CITES Parties have submitted individual seizure data in their biennial reports on implementation of the Convention. From 2016 onward, there may be an annual seizure report if Parties agree.

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

This target is multidimensional and it would require at least two indicators to be properly monitored, to reflect its two main dimensions (efficiency-effectiveness of the justice system and access to justice)

For the first dimension (efficiency-effectiveness of the justice system), there is an established indicator which could be reflected as priority indicator: **Unsentenced detainees as percentage of overall prison population (see Annex for metadata).**

The indicator signifies overall respect for the principle that persons awaiting trial shall not be detained in custody. It is widely used to assess the functioning of criminal justice system, in terms of efficiency and effectiveness of justice and security institutions and of accountability of public officials. Moreover, it is relevant to evaluate whether defendants are given fair access to justice.

This indicator belongs to Tier 1, as it is defined at international level (see United Nations 2003, *Manual for the Development of a System of Criminal Justice Statistics* and UNODC-UNICEF 2007, *Manual for the measurement of juvenile justice indicators*) and data on the number of persons held in unsentenced detention are widely available at national level. At international level, data are available from the long-standing United Nations Survey of Crime Trends and Operations of Criminal Justice Systems mandated by the UN General Assembly (UN-CTS). At regional level, data are available from a number of collection initiatives including Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics (SPACE) and OAS Observatory on Citizen Security Data Repository. Currently, data on unsentenced and total detainees from the UN-CTS are available for 114 countries. The country coverage can improve if other sources (regional organisations and research institutions) are included (data for additional 70 countries are available in these sources, bringing the total to 184 countries).

For the second dimension of target 16.3 (access to justice), the currently proposed indicator is ‘**Proportion of those who have experienced a dispute in the past 12 months and who have accessed a fair formal, informal, alternative or traditional dispute mechanism**’. This indicator belongs to tier 3: it has not been defined at international level and it requires further methodological work as there are several elements of the indicator in need of clarification (*e.g.: what is a dispute? What does it mean to access a mechanism? When a dispute resolution mechanism can be considered as fair? Which mechanisms should be included?*). It is not clear what the indicator measures as anyone who lost his/her dispute case is more likely to rate the process as unfair, something which may have nothing to do with the fairness of the justice system. While a number of sample surveys have been conducted on access to justice, nationally and internationally, and may have included questions which if put together can produce data on the indicator, this experience has not yet been consolidated in a standard indicator with proven analytical value and statistical validity/robustness.

An alternative option for the second dimension of target 16.3 is: **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), see Annex for metadata.**

Reporting to competent authorities is the first step for crime victims to seek justice: if competent authorities are not alerted they are not in a condition to conduct proper investigations and administer justice. However, lack of trust and confidence in the ability of the police or other authorities to provide effective redress, or objective and subjective difficulties in accessing them, can influence negatively the reporting behaviour of crime victims. As such, reporting rates provide a direct measure of the confidence of victims of crime in the ability of the police or other authorities to provide assistance and bring perpetrators to justice. Reporting rates provide also a measure of the ‘dark figure’ of crime, that is the proportion of crimes not reported to the police. Trends in reporting rates of violent

crime can be used to monitor public trust and confidence in competent authorities on the basis of actual behaviours and not perceptions.

This indicator ranks as Tier 1, as it represents one of the most important and policy-relevant indicators derived from victimisation surveys. At international level, methodological guidance on victimisation surveys is included in the UNODC-UNECE Manual on Victimization Surveys (2010), that provides technical guidance on the implementation of such surveys on the basis of good practices developed at country level. National data availability is good. According to a recent review conducted by UNODC-INEGI Centre of Excellence on crime statistics, 72 countries have implemented at least one national victimisation survey after 2009 (in 43 of these countries the victimisation survey has been conducted by the national statistical office or another public institution/ministry). In addition, 9 African countries have already implemented or are in the process of implementing a victimisation survey module as part of the Strategy for Harmonisation of Statistics for Africa (SHaSA).

This indicator is relevant also for target 16.a

3. Target 16.4: *By 2030, significantly reduce illicit financial and arms flows, strengthen the recovery and return of stolen assets and combat all forms of organized crime*

This target is a multi-dimensional target expressing a political will to act on a number of distinct areas. Most of these areas don't have one single established measure which is regularly used at national or international level. The current priority indicator "total value of inward and outward illicit financial flows (in current US\$)" could conceptually be a good indicator, but there are no standard definitions and procedures established in national accounts which can at the moment make this indicator operational (placing the indicator in tier III). The suggestion is to add an indicator which focuses on a different aspect of the target: the reduction of arms flows. The proposed indicator is **Percentage of seized and collected firearms that are recorded and traced, in accordance with international standards and legal instruments** (see Annex for metadata). This indicator is available (although at different quality rate) at national level from police and custom/boarder agencies. At international level UNODC has been mandated by the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime to collect indicators related to firearm trafficking including the one proposed here.

4. Target 16.6: *Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels*

The suggestion for this target is to consider as priority indicator an indicator related to the UN Convention against Corruption (UNCAC): **Percentage of recommendations to strengthen national anti-corruption frameworks (institutional and legislative) implemented, as identified through the UN Convention against Corruption Implementation Review Mechanism (see Annex for metadata)**. The use of indicator is supported by the following arguments:

- the UNCAC review mechanism already exists and is collecting data
- the mechanism and the individual country reviews are endorsed by all States parties (175)
- a baseline exists and will be fully completed by latest 2016 when all States parties will have undergone the first cycle of reviews, thereafter data on progress will be continuously collected on an annual basis and become available for all States parties every five years;
- since data collection is global and peer reviewed it is less vulnerable to tampering

- it focuses on a "positive" (anti corruption)
- it does treat all countries equal and does not create the risk of undue misrepresentation for any groups of countries

Annex

| | |
|--|--|
| Indicator 16.3.2 | Unsented detainees as percentage of overall prison population. |
| Goal and target addressed | Goal 16 Target 16.3 |
| Definition and method of computation | The total number of persons held in detention who have not yet been sentenced, as a percentage of the total number of persons held in detention, on a specified date. ‘Sentenced’ refers to persons subject to criminal proceedings who have received a decision from a competent authority regarding their conviction or acquittal. For the purposes of the indicator, persons who have received a ‘non-final’ decision (such as where a conviction is subject to appeal) are considered to be ‘sentenced’. |
| Rationale and interpretation | The indicator signifies overall respect for the principle that persons awaiting trial shall not be detained in custody. This, in turn, is premised on aspects of the right to be presumed innocent until proven guilty. From a development perspective, extensive use of pre-sentence detention when not necessary for reasons such as the prevention of absconding, the protection of victims or witnesses, or the prevention of the commission of further offences, can divert criminal justice system resources, and exert financial and unemployment burdens on the accused and his or her family. Measuring the relative extent to which pre-sentence detention is used can provide the evidence to assist countries in lowering such burdens and ensuring its proportionate use. |
| Sources and data collection | UNODC collects data on prisons through its annual data collection (UN-CTS). Data on unsentenced and total detainees from the UN-CTS are available for 114 countries. The country coverage can improve if other sources (research institutions and NGOs) are included (data for additional 70 countries are available, bringing the total to 184 countries). |
| Disaggregation | Recommended disaggregation for this indicator are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • age and sex • length of pre-trial (unsentenced) detention |
| Comments and limitations | The target relates to the multidimensional concepts of rule of law and access to justice and at least two indicators are required to cover the main elements of access to justice and efficiency of the justice system. The proposed indicator 16.3.2 covers the efficiency of the justice system. |
| Gender equality issues | These data can be disaggregated by sex and indicate whether different levels of unsentenced detention exist for men and women |
| Data for global and regional monitoring | At international level, data on the number of persons held in unsentenced detention are available from the long-standing United Nations Survey of Crime Trends and Operations of Criminal Justice Systems mandated by the UN General Assembly (UN-CTS). At regional level, data are available from a number of collection initiatives including Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics (SPACE) and OAS Observatory on Citizen Security Data Repository. |

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Supplementary information | The indicator is most commonly measured using data from administrative records. National decisions that need to be taken when collecting data for the indicator include the definition of ‘detention’, as well as the day of the year on which the data is collected. Data from all individual places of detention (which may be managed by different government authorities) must be aggregated and used for overall calculation of the indicator. |
| References | Definitions and other metadata are provided in the UN-Crime Trends Survey (UN-CTS) Guidance on collection of information on detained persons, as well as example data collection sheets, are provided in the United Nations Manual for the Development of a System of Criminal Justice Statistics, as well as (for children), in the UNODC/UNICEF Manual for the Measurement of Juvenile Justice Indicators. |

| | |
|---|--|
| Indicator 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). |
| Goal and target addressed | Goal 16 Target 16.3 |
| Definition and method of computation | Number of victims of violent crime (physical or sexual assault) in the previous 12 months who reported their last incident to competent authorities or other officially recognized conflict resolution mechanisms, as a percentage of all victims of crime in the previous 12 months. Competent authorities includes police, prosecutors or other authorities with competencies to investigate certain crimes (such as corruption or fraud), while ‘other officially recognised conflict resolution mechanisms’ may include a variety of institutions with a role in the informal justice or dispute resolution (e.g. tribal or religious leaders, village elders, community leaders), provided their role is officially recognised by state authorities. |
| Rationale and interpretation | Reporting to competent authorities is the first step for crime victims to seek justice: if competent authorities are not alerted they are not in a condition to conduct proper investigations and administer justice. However, lack of trust and confidence in the ability of the police or other authorities to provide effective redress, or objective and subjective difficulties in accessing them, can influence negatively the reporting behaviour of crime victims. As such, reporting rates provide a direct measure of the confidence of victims of crime in the ability of the police or other authorities to provide assistance and bring perpetrators to justice. Reporting rates provide also a measure of the ‘dark figure’ of crime, that is the proportion of crimes not reported to the police. Trends in reporting rates of violent crime can be used to monitor public trust and confidence in competent authorities on the basis of actual behaviours and not perceptions. |
| Sources and data collection | Victimisation surveys provide direct information on this indicator, as they collect information on the experience of violent crime and on whether the victim has reported it to competent authorities. According to a recent review conducted by UNODC-INEGI Centre of Excellence on crime statistics, 72 countries have implemented at least one national victimisation after 2009 (in 43 of these countries the victimisation survey |

| | |
|--|---|
| | has been conducted by the national statistical office or another public institution/ministry). In addition, 9 African countries have already implemented or are in the process of implementing a victimisation survey module as part of the Strategy for Harmonisation of Statistics for Africa (SHaSA). |
| Disaggregation | Recommended disaggregations for this indicator are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sex • type of crime • ethnicity • migration background • citizenship |
| Comments and limitations | The target relates to the multidimensional concepts of rule of law and access to justice and at least two indicators are required to cover the main elements of access to justice and efficiency of the justice system. The proposed indicator 16.3.1 covers the aspect of access to justice although it doesn't cover civil or administrative disputes. The indicator as formulated is a standard indicator widely published when a victimization survey is undertaken, but further work could be conducted to test the feasibility to expand the indicator to cover administrative disputes. |
| Gender equality issues | Independently of the level of violent victimization of women, it provides information on whether there are gender disparities on the attitude to freely and safely report their victimization experiences. For example, female victims of domestic violence are more reluctant to report to authorities their experience for different reasons, including fear of consequences and lack of trust in authorities. An increasing level of reporting indicates that measures have been successful to raise awareness that violent behaviours are unacceptable and/or reporting channels for victims of violent crime have improved and/or trust towards authorities has increased; moreover, higher reporting means that criminal justice institutions are in a better position to enforce the law and ensure justice. |
| Data for global and regional monitoring | UNODC collects data on crime reporting rates through the long-standing annual data collection mandated by the UN General Assembly UN-CTS. The UN-CTS has established a network of focal points (presently covering 125 countries and territories). Data on crime reporting rates are currently available for approximately 35 countries.. |
| Supplementary information | Reporting rates of crimes are known to vary widely by type of crime: they are usually higher in relation to property crimes as victims seek to re-obtain stolen goods or for insurance purposes. |
| References | In 2010 UNODC-UNECE published a Manual on Victimization Surveys, that provides technical guidance on the implementation of such surveys, on the basis of good practices developed at country level. UNODC, International Classification of Crime for Statistical Purposes, 2015 |

| | |
|---|--|
| Indicator 16.4 | Number/percentage of seized and collected firearms that are recorded and traced, in accordance with international standards and legal instruments |
| Goal and target addressed | Goal 16 Target 16.4 By 2030, significantly reduce illicit financial and arms flows, strengthen the recovery and return of stolen assets and combat all forms of organized crime |
| Definition and method of computation | <p>Illicit trafficking in firearms is defined by the UN Firearms Protocol as <i>“the import, export, acquisition, sale, delivery, movement or transfer of firearms, their parts components and ammunitions, from or across the territory of one state (party) to that of another state, if any of the states (party) concerned does not authorise it in accordance with the terms of the Firearms protocol, or if the firearms are not marked in accordance with art. 8 of the Protocol”</i> (Source: Art. 3 (e) FP).</p> <p>Tracing is defined in the Firearms Protocol as <i>“the systematic tracking of firearms (parts, components and ammunition) from manufacturer to purchaser for the purpose of assisting the competent authorities of States Parties in detecting, investigating and analysing illicit manufacturing and illicit trafficking”</i> (Source: Art. 3 (f) FP).</p> <p>The number of seized, confiscated and collected firearms are counted as total numbers and can also be expressed as rate by 100,000 population (the rate is defined as the total count of seized, confiscated, found, or collected firearms divided by the total resident population, expressed per 100,000 population).</p> <p>The number of traced firearms is expressed as total numbers and as percentage of all seized, confiscated, found or collected firearms.</p> |
| Rationale and interpretation | <p>Because the manufacturing and transfer of firearms, their parts and component and ammunition is subject to legal authorization, their seizure information can provide useful insight on possible deviation or trafficking of these goods. Firearms seizures data appear to be the best currently available measure of transnational firearms trafficking, when combined with other relevant information. Seizure may be necessary in order to prevent firearms from being trafficked elsewhere.</p> <p>Firearms tracing is the means through which national authorities can discover the origin of firearms, used in illicit activities or suspected to have been illicitly trafficked from abroad or stolen. Tracing valued as a source of evidence for prosecution of trafficking and other offenses, and a source of information for analysis and combating the routes used by firearms traffickers. Tracing allows authorities to track down the firearms back through all stages and transfers, from manufacturing until the moment the firearm was diverted into the illicit circuit.</p> <p>Tracing of firearms requires countries to properly identify and record the firearms and to maintain comprehensive and up to date records through registries of all arms held in State or in civilian hands. Tracing is conducted at national level, by checking the firearms identifying data against national registries, as well as internationally, through international cooperation, directly or facilitated by organizations such as Interpol, Europol etc.. The increased number of tracing requests and responses is an indicator of the increased level of information exchange, confidence and cooperation among States.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| Sources and data collection | <p>Sources for seized and collected firearms at the national level are the police and customs/border authorities. UNODC was mandated by the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime (COP-UNTOC) <i>to conduct a study on the transnational nature of and routes used in trafficking in firearms, based on the analysis of information provided by States on confiscated weapons and ammunition.</i>²⁷</p> <p>UNODC has collected data on firearms seizures and additional information on firearms trafficking through two sets of questionnaires – total annual seizures and significant individual seizure data – from 2010 – 2013.</p> <p>In 2014 UNODC also received a mandate to continue in the data collection on seizures made by Member States.</p> |
| Disaggregation | <p>Recommended disaggregation for this indicator are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total annual firearms seizures • Types of seized firearms • Quantities of traced firearms • Countries involved in the tracing of firearms • Offences associated with traced firearms • Types of firearms prohibited or restricted to civilian use (legal regime of the traced firearms) |
| Comments and limitations | N/A |
| Gender equality issues | When data are properly disaggregated, information related to seized firearms and their context can be used to quantify gender-based information on the persons involved in the illicit activities leading to the seizure and confiscation of firearms, in particular their illicit traffic. |
| Data for global and regional monitoring | <p>Data are currently being collected through 2 different questionnaires: the Annual Seizure Questionnaire and the Significant Seizure Questionnaire.</p> <p>Through the help of the Permanent Missions, UNODC establish a network of national focal points responsible for collecting and collating quantitative and qualitative information on seizures from relevant authorities at the national level. The first data collection was conducted in 2010.</p> |
| Supplementary information | Firearms are also widely acknowledged as playing a crucial role in the commission of serious crimes, including homicides. Their illicit trafficking is thought to be closely linked to organized crime and terrorist groups that benefit from their availability and from the profit that their illicit trade generate. |
| References | UNODC Firearms Study2015 |

| | |
|---|--|
| Indicator 16.6.1 | Percentage of recommendations to strengthen national anti-corruption frameworks (institutional and legislative) implemented, as identified through the UNCAC Implementation Review Mechanism. |
| Goal and target addressed | Goal 16 Target 16.5 ALT 16.6 |
| Definition and method of computation | By measuring the level of implementation of the recommendations stemming from the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC) Implementation Review , this indicator provides an objective metrics of government actions fighting against corruption by strengthening their institutional and legislative resilience to corruption, and aligning them to the internationally agreed upon criteria as outlined |

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| | <p>in UNCAC. This implementation rate thereby becomes an individual, country-owned yardstick to monitor progress towards enhancing their resilience to corruption and their fight against it.</p> |
| Rationale and interpretation | <p>Corruption is an antonym of equal accessibility to public services and of correct functioning of the economy; as such, it has a negative impact on fair distribution of resources and development opportunities. Besides, corruption erodes public trust in authorities and the rule of law; when administrative bribery becomes a recurrent experience of large sectors of the population and businesses, its negative effects have an enduring negative effect on democratic processes and justice.</p> <p>The United Nations Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC) is the only globally accepted framework for action by States in relation to the issue of corruption remain. At 175 States parties, and an even larger number of signatories, countries unable to proceed with the ratification remain blocked due to the necessary national legislative amendments required prior to doing so. There is therefore strong reasons to believe 180 State Parties will be reached within the next couple of years, as even those few countries that have not yet ratified the Convention are mostly in the process of doing so and have on multiple occasions expressed their support to the objectives of the Convention.</p> <p>The UNCAC's Mechanism for Implementation Review is the only globally applicable and accepted anti-corruption tool. The Mechanism reviews each State Party's normative and qualitative implementation by comparing the viability of the legislative framework with the reporting, investigation, prosecution and conviction statistics provided by the country's national authorities. The information submitted is reviewed by experts from two other States Parties and the UNCAC Secretariat (UNODC) for gaps and weaknesses based on their expertise as well as international standards. Ways to enhance and strengthen the current framework and additional measures to address weaknesses and gaps are identified and agreed upon and made public in a United Nations document, called an Executive summary:</p> <p>http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/treaties/CAC/country-profile/index.html</p> <p>To date, with well over 90 reviews finalised and another 30 in advanced stages, every single State party reviewed has received recommendations on how to strengthen their anti-corruption framework.</p> |
| Sources and data collection | States Parties' self-reported measures to implement the recommendations. |
| Disaggregation | <p>Recommended disaggregation for this indicator are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • institutional recommendations • legislative recommendations • recommendations related to enhanced collection/generation of statistics on the implementation of UNCAC |
| Comments and limitations | The major advantage of this proposed indicator is that the system for data collection is largely in place (States parties shall submit information on progress achieved through each new review cycle), and more importantly it would be a system which has been vetted and agreed to by all the 175+ States parties. The challenge here would consist in determining what would be a reasonable target. Moreover, recommendations may differ as concerns the complexity of implementation. |

| | |
|--|---|
| Gender equality issues | N/A |
| Data for global and regional monitoring | Data readily available through the already funded and existing Implementation Review Mechanism. Data can easily be aggregated at the regional and global level and is already being done through the Secretariat's analysis presented twice a year to the Implementation Review Group. http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/treaties/CAC/IRG-sessions.html |
| Supplementary information | A noteworthy reference to the importance of this indicator can be found in the Rio+20 declaration, para 266 “We are determined to take urgent and decisive steps to continue to combat corruption in all its manifestations, which requires strong institutions at all levels, and urge all States that have not yet done so to consider ratifying or acceding to the United Nations Convention against Corruption and begin its implementation. ” |
| References | N/A |

20. UNODC and WHO – 12 June 2015

Comments submitted by UNODC and WHO on the priority indicator list prepared for the first meeting of the IAEG-SDG (1-2 June 2015)

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

Suggestion: replacing of the current priority indicator with an indicator on intentional homicide.

Rational

Comments on the indicator (proposed in the June list as priority indicator):. *Disaggregate by age, sex, region and population group, displacement and migratory status (including statelessness)*

The indicator identified as priority in the June list (*Homicide and conflict-related deaths per 100,000 population*) merges intentional homicide and conflict deaths into a measure which is not normally used to monitor violence by national governments and international organizations as it mixes two dimensions into one indicator for which trends would be difficult to interpret. Deaths related to conflicts and violent deaths in contexts of peace are two different phenomena, which fall into distinct policy areas so the merging of these two measures produces an indicator whose measurement's objective is unclear. There is no scientific base to justify the merged indicator, while there is wide academic literature on violence prevention making reference to intentional homicide as the primary reference to measure violence.

The indicator is also problematic from a methodological point of view, for the following reasons:

- Intentional homicide belongs to tier I while conflict deaths belongs to tier III category: data for the latter indicator are not produced by countries in conflict, because of disruption of recording systems in such periods, while estimates are produced only at international level by research institutes or NGOs, on the basis of information that becomes available at international level.
- Mixing indicators of very different nature and solidity (intentional homicide and conflict deaths) will result in a weak indicator (tier III), subject to high level of uncertainty and not suitable for monitoring, neither nationally nor internationally.
- Conflict death is not a universal indicator, as it is relevant only for countries at war.

Indicator proposed: Number of victims of intentional homicide by age, sex, mechanism and where possible type of perpetrator, per 100,000 population (see Annex for metadata)

This indicator is widely used at national and international level to measure the most extreme form of violent crime and it also provides a direct indication of lack of security.

This indicator belongs to Tier 1: homicide data are routinely produced at national level by two independent data production channels - criminal justice and public health systems - on the basis of well- established definitions and data collection processes and with good level of matching between two data sources. Data on intentional homicide are widely available at international level as they are routinely collected by UNODC (criminal justice sources) and WHO (public health/vital registration sources). National data on homicide are available for 174 countries, with at least one data point between 2009-2013.

The **indicator on conflict-related deaths** could be included as a separate indicator, relevant for countries in conflict, and following a different methodology and data collection system from intentional homicide.

Annex

| | |
|---|--|
| Indicator 16.1.1 | Number of victims of intentional homicide by age, sex, mechanism and type of perpetrator, per 100,000 population |
| Goal and target addressed | Goal 16 Target 16.1 |
| Definition and method of computation | Intentional homicide is defined as the unlawful death inflicted upon a person with the intent to cause death or serious injury (Source: International Classification of Crime for Statistical Purposes, ICCS 2015); the rate is defined as the total count of victims of intentional homicide divided by the total resident population, expressed per 100,000 population. |
| Rationale and interpretation | <p>This indicator is widely used at national and international level to measure the most extreme form of violent crime and it also provides a direct indication of lack of security. Security from violence is a pre-requisite for individuals to enjoy a safe and active life and for societies and economies to develop freely. Intentional homicides occur in all countries of the world and this indicator has a global applicability.</p> <p>Monitoring intentional homicides is necessary to better assess their causes, drivers and consequences and, in the longer term, to develop effective preventive measures. If data are properly disaggregated (as suggested in the ICCS), the indicator can identify the different type of violence associated with homicide: inter-personal (including partner and family-related violence), crime (including organized crime and other forms of criminal activities) and political (including terrorism, hate crime).</p> <p>The interpretation of this indicator is straightforward also for non-specialised users.</p> |
| Sources and data collection | Two separate sources exist at country level: a) criminal justice system; b) public health/civil registration. UNODC collects and publishes data from criminal justice systems through its long-lasting annual data collection mandated by the UN General Assembly (UN Crime Trends Survey, UN- |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>CTS); WHO collects and publishes data produced by public health/civil registration.</p> <p>UNODC and WHO are working together to harmonize data and procedures to produce joint UNODC-WHO homicide estimates at country, regional and global level.</p> <p>Considering data collected by both UNODC and WHO, national data on homicide are available for 174 countries (at least one data point between 2009-2013) . Time series data on homicide suitable for monitoring are available for 141 countries (at least 3 data points, the most recent between 2011-2013).</p> <p>When national data on homicide are not available, estimates are produced by WHO.</p> |
| Disaggregation | <p>Recommended disaggregations for this indicator are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sex and age of the victim and the perpetrator • relationship between victim and perpetrator(intimate partner, other family member, acquaintance, etc.) • means of perpetration (firearm, blunt object, etc.) • situational context/motivation (organized crime, intimate partner violence, etc.) |
| Comments and limitations | <p>The ICCS provides important clarifications on the definition of intentional homicide. In particular, it states that the following killings are included in the count of homicide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Murder • Honour killing • Serious assault leading to death • Death as a result of terrorist activities • Dowry-related killings • Femicide • Infanticide • Voluntary manslaughter • Extrajudicial killings • Killings caused by excessive force by law enforcement/state officials <p>Furthermore, the ICCS provides indications on how to distinguish between intentional homicides, killings directly related to war/conflict and other killings that amount to war crimes.</p> <p>The fact that homicide data are typically produced by two separate and independent sources at national level (criminal justice and public health) represents a specific asset of this indicator, as the comparison of the two sources is a tool to assess accuracy of national data. Usually, for countries where data from both sources exist, a good level of matching between the sources is recorded (<i>see UNODC Global Study on Homicide, 2013</i>).</p> <p>Data on homicides produced by public health authorities are guided by the International classification of diseases (ICD-10), which is very similar to the definition of intentional homicide provided by the ICCS.</p> |
| Gender equality issues | <p>When data are properly disaggregated, intentional homicide can be used to quantify gender-based killings, a relevant indicator to monitor violence against women. Currently, 68 countries have reported homicide data disaggregated by type of perpetrator to UNODC (at least one data point after 2009).</p> |
| Data for global and regional monitoring | <p>At international level, data on intentional homicides are routinely collected and disseminated by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) and the World Health Organization. UNODC partners with regional organizations in the collection and dissemination of homicide data, respectively with Eurostat in Europe and with the Organisation of American States in the Americas.</p> |
| Supplementary information | <p>At global level, intentional homicide is the most prevalent type of violent death. In 2012, the ratio between victims of conflict/war and victims of</p> |

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| | <p>intentional homicide varied between one to five to one to ten (uncertainty due to variability of estimates of deaths related to war/conflict produced respectively by WHO and Uppsala Conflict Data Program).</p> <p>Non-intentional homicide is another crime that can provide information on violence prevalence. Though, it mostly refers to cases of killings due to negligent behaviours rather than to intentional violence. For nine countries where data are available to UNODC, 95% of all non-intentional homicide are due to vehicular homicide, so the concept of non-intentional homicide is not relevant for monitoring the target.</p> |
| References | <p>UNODC homicide database, Global Study on Homicide 2011; UNODC, Global Study on Homicide 2013; WHO-UNDP-UNODC, Global Status Report on Violence Prevention 2014); UNODC, International Classification of Crime for Statistical Purposes, 2015</p> |

21. FAO statement on the substantive and organizational matters related to the first meeting of the IAEG-SDG, June 1-2, 2015

Organizational Aspects

FAO would like to express its concerns regarding the organization of the first meeting of the IAEG-SDG, which offered limited opportunities for a technical discussion on the list of global indicators to be used for monitoring the SDG targets. We call on UNSD to intensify its efforts to bridge the divide between member countries and international organizations, and to facilitate in all possible ways a meaningful technical discussion between national and international statistical organizations for the selection of global SDG indicators.

FAO is equally concerned that the role of international organizations has not been clearly defined in the document on the working methods of the IAEG-SDG. We welcome countries leading this process, in the context of an overall member-state-driven Post-2015 Development Agenda. At the same time, we are also eager to participate in the IAEG-SDG in a meaningful and more clearly defined way than has hitherto been the case. We recognize that the IAEG-SDG's TORs grant international organizations observer status, however, as global indicators are monitored by international organizations, we urge the Secretariat to propose a mutually agreeable *modus operandi* that will offer them the possibility of contributing in a more meaningful way. The hope is that in the upcoming of virtual consultations and contributions organized by discussion streams international organizations will be involved as active participants rather than observers.

Substantive Aspects

Attached to this statement is FAO's complete proposal for SDG indicators, which also incorporates a reaction to UNSD's preliminary and priority lists. The following is a summary of the main comments on that proposal:

- While FAO appreciates the need to limit global SDG indicators to a manageable number, this cannot be done with a mechanical rule of one indicator per target, as there are numerous SDG targets that are multi-dimensional by nature. Selecting only one indicator for such targets would therefore not only imply an arbitrary choice on which element to focus on, but would also risk undermining the ambition of the SDGs.
- FAO is concerned that in some cases, UNSD has at the last minute introduced indicators proposed by itself in the 'priority list', even though it did not participate in the preliminary discussions. We encourage UNSD to commit to a neutral facilitating role by engaging in a fully transparent and participatory selection process.
- For **target 1.4**, the "Percentage of female/male agricultural landowners out of total agricultural landowners" should be a core indicator for this target. While this has been placed under 5.a. in UNSD's priority list, it is more suitable for target 1.4, whilst 5.a.

is more appropriately measured by the rights-based indicator “The legal framework includes special measures to guarantee women’s equal rights to landownership and control”. In fact, target 1.4 should be measured by an outcome indicator, whereas target 5.a. should be measured by a means of implementation indicator. This proposal is supported by FAO, IFAD and UN-Women.

- On **target 2.1**, FAO is highly concerned that UNSD’s priority list determined only one indicator for this target. Retaining the PoU while excluding the FIES undermines the effort to provide a more meaningful, granular, and timely metric for food access in the SDG era, essentially sticking to the already established MDG indicator. This choice also undermines the universality ambition of the SDGs, by selecting an indicator that is primarily designed for developing countries (the PoU) whilst excluding an indicator that is applicable to both developed and developing countries (the FIES).
- On **target 2.2**, FAO urges the Secretariat to consider the resounding need for more than one indicator. Only in this way it is possible to monitor malnutrition for both developing countries (prevalence of stunting) and developed countries (prevalence of overweight children). Only in this way, moreover, it is possible to monitor not just the nutritional outcomes (which may depend from health problems or water and sanitation access), but also the quality of the diets (Women Dietary Diversity Score). This proposal is fully in line with the proposal made by the Standing Committee on Nutrition and is supported by all three UN Rome-based Agencies.
- On **target 2.5**, as this addresses both plants and animals, its measurement cannot be limited to only the indicator on plants. Both indicators need to be retained.
- On **target 2.c.**, UNSD’s classification of the “indicator of food price anomalies” as Tier III is erroneous. FAO’s methodological factsheet reveals that it should rather be categorized as Tier I.
- **Target 6.4** addresses both water-use efficiency and water stress (sustainable withdrawals); both elements cannot be subsumed under one sole indicator. Both indicators proposed by UN-Water should therefore be retained.
- For **target 14.6**, FAO proposes the indicator "Progress by countries in the implementation of international instruments on IUU fishing" which is more suitable than the current proposal for two reasons: firstly, during the recent Meeting of the UN Open-ended informal consultative process on Oceans and the Law of the Sea, member states frequently mentioned the omission of an indicator on IUU fishing for SDG 14. Secondly, an indicator on subsidies would not only be highly controversial for member states, but “negative fishery subsidies” also has no agreed definition.
- **Target 14.b** addresses both access rights and market access, and both elements cannot be subsumed under one sole indicator. FAO urges the Secretariat to retain both proposals.

- On **target 14.c**, FAO is highly concerned that its proposal has been omitted from UNSD’s priority list and even from the full list of proposals presented at the IAEG-SDG meeting of May. FAO’s proposed indicator is highly relevant to fisheries and fisheries governance efforts at all levels, with the CCRF being the most prominent fisheries instrument and the CCRF implementation reporting mechanism being an established process, globally recognized and “owned” by FAO Committee on Fisheries members.
- **Target 15.2** touches on a range of sub-issues that cannot be captured by one indicator. To capture all the different elements, FAO suggests two indicators: “Carbon stocks in woody biomass” and “Area of forest under Sustainable Forest Management”.
- On **target 15.3**, FAO has proposed the indicator “area of land/soils under sustainable management”. FAO would also like to point out that the alternative proposal “trends in land degradation”, relies heavily on FAO data, and is in some sense its mirror image: to reduce land degradation, sustainable land management should be adopted. In this regard, FAO is exploring closer collaboration with UNCCD in order to develop a common approach to this question in the IAEG-SDG process. The indicator proposed by FAO for target 15.3 can be derived as a combination of the indicators proposed for target 2.4 and 15.2.
- On **target 15.4**, FAO is highly concerned that UNSD’s priority list has only included an indicator based on protected areas, which are not an adequate proxy for the overall situation of conservation in mountain areas. Instead, by adopting the “Green Cover Index”, all mountain green cover will be assessed and used to analyze the trend.
- On **target 15.6**, the indicator currently included in the priority list is partial as it focuses only on the ratification of the Nagoya protocol. FAO and CBD have discussed and agreed that this target should be monitored by a broader indicator, i.e. the “Number of permits or their equivalents made available to the ABS Clearinghouse under the Nagoya Protocol and number of SMTAs, as communicated to the Governing Body of the International Treaty”.

Additional inputs from National Statistical Offices – IAEG-SDGs observers:

22. Director-General for Policy Planning (Statistical Standards) of Japan – 1 June 2015

This input was provided in response to the request to assess a preliminary list of proposed provisional indicators contained in the document of March 2015 entitled “Technical report by the Bureau of the United Nations Statistical Commission (UNSC) on the process of the development of an indicator framework for the goals and targets of the post-2015 development agenda”

1. Proposed indicators which are not suitable

(1) We do not support / need to consider other indicators

(2) Fable feasibility

① : lack of data, relevant ministry or agency

② : Definition of proposed indicator is not clear and need the clarification

Goal 1: End poverty in all its forms everywhere

> All proposed indicators are : ① and/or ②

| | |
|---|--|
| Target 1.1: By 2030, eradicate extreme poverty for all people everywhere, currently measured as people living on less than \$1.25 a day. | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Proportion of population below \$1.25 (PPP) per day disaggregated by sex and age group. | [comment] ① The data is not collected, due to the lack of any relevant problems. |
| Target 1.2: By 2030, reduce at least by half the proportion of men, women and children of all ages living in poverty in all its dimensions according to national definitions. | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) disaggregated by sex and age group | [comment] ② |
| Proposed Indicator 2: Proportion of population living below national poverty line, disaggregated by sex and age group. | [comment] ① The data is not collected, due to the lack of any relevant problems. |
| Target 1.3: Implement nationally appropriate social protection systems and measures for all, including floors, and by 2030, achieve substantial coverage of the poor and the vulnerable. | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Percentage of population covered by social protection floors/systems, disaggregated by sex, with break down by children, unemployed, old age, people with disabilities, pregnant women/new-borns, work injury victims, poor and vulnerable, including one or more of the following: a) Percentage of older | [comment] ① In Japan, since the implementation agencies determine the decision of payment as unemployment benefits after receiving requests from people to receive them, we do not know the number of subject people. |

| | |
|--|--|
| persons receiving a pension; b) Percentage of households with children receiving child support; c) Percentage of unemployed persons receiving unemployment benefits; d)Percentage of persons with disabilities receiving disability benefits; e) Percentage of pregnant women receiving maternity benefits; f)Percentage of workers covered against occupational accidents; and g) Percentage of poor and vulnerable people receiving benefits | |
| Proposed Indicator 2: Average social protection transfers as a % of income / or poverty line | [comment] ② |
| Target 1.4: By 2030, ensure that all men and women, in particular the poor and the vulnerable, have equal rights to economic resources, as well as access to basic services, ownership and control over land and other forms of property, inheritance, natural resources, appropriate new technology and financial services, including microfinance | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Proportion of population/households with access to basic services (to be defined) by sex and age group | [comment] ② |
| Proposed Indicator 2: Proportion of adult population with tenure that is legally recognised and documented or perceived as secure, by sex and age group | [comment] ② <i>(Not applicable to all countries)</i> |
| Target 1.5: By 2030, build the resilience of the poor and those in vulnerable situations and reduce their exposure and vulnerability to climate-related extreme events and other economic, social and environmental shocks and disasters | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Number of people affected by hazardous events by sex. | [comment] <i>Protecting assets and jobs/livelihoods as well as human lives through investment in disaster prevention is indispensable for the eradication of poverty.</i> |
| Proposed Indicator 2: Proportion of health and educational facilities affected by hazardous events | [comment] <i>There is no need to limit the target to health and educational facilities.</i> |
| Target 1.a: Ensure significant mobilization of resources from a variety of sources, including through enhanced development cooperation, in order to provide adequate and predictable means for developing countries, in particular least developed countries, to implement programmes and policies to end poverty in all its dimensions | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Resources mobilized and spent for poverty reduction, including government, private sector and development partners. | [comment] <i>Taking due account of a variety of sources to end poverty in all its dimensions, resources mobilized and spent for poverty reduction should be recognized in broad terms, including poverty reduction through sustainable economic growth.</i> |

Goal 2: End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture

> **All proposed indicators are : ① and/or ②**

Goal 3: Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Target 3.3: By 2030, end the epidemics of AIDS, tuberculosis, malaria and neglected tropical diseases and combat hepatitis, water-borne diseases and other communicable diseases. | |
| Proposed Indicator 7: Prevalence of hepatitis B surface antigen in children under 5 | [comment] ① |
| Target 3.4: By 2030, reduce by one third premature mortality from non-communicable diseases through prevention and treatment and promote mental health and well-being | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Probability of dying of cardiovascular disease, cancer, diabetes, or chronic respiratory disease between ages 30 and 70 | [comment] ①, ② |
| Target 3.5: Strengthen the prevention and treatment of substance abuse, including narcotic drug abuse and harmful use of alcohol | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Coverage of opioid substitution therapy among opioid-dependent drug users | [comment] ② |
| Proposed Indicator 2: Coverage of interventions for the prevention of substance abuse interventions among people under 25. | [comment] ② |
| Target 3.7: By 2030, ensure universal access to sexual and reproductive health-care services, including for family planning, information and education, and the integration of reproductive health into national strategies and programmes. | |
| Proposed Indicator 2: Demand satisfied with modern contraceptives | [comment] ② |
| Target 3.9: By 2030, substantially reduce the number of deaths and illnesses from hazardous chemicals and air, water and soil pollution and contamination. | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Population in urban areas exposed to outdoor air pollution levels above WHO guideline values | [comment] ① |

Goal 4: Ensure inclusive and equitable education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all

| | |
|--|--|
| Target 4.1: By 2030, ensure that all girls and boys complete free, equitable and quality primary and secondary education leading to relevant and effective learning outcomes. | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Percentage of children who achieve minimum proficiency standards in reading and mathematics at end | [comment] ② The definition of this proposed indicator is not clear. |

| | |
|--|--|
| of: (i) primary (ii) lower secondary | |
| Target 4.4: By 2030, increase by [x] per cent the number of youth and adults who have relevant skills, including technical and vocational skills, for employment, decent jobs and entrepreneurship | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Participation rate in formal and non-formal education and training in the last 12 months among 25-64 year-olds | [comment] ① |
| Proposed Indicator 2: Percentage of youth/adults who are computer and information literate | [comment] ① |
| Target 4.5: By 2030, eliminate gender disparities in education and ensure equal access to all levels of education and vocational training for the vulnerable, including persons with disabilities, indigenous peoples and children in vulnerable situations. | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Parity indices (female/male, urban/rural, bottom/top wealth quintile) for all indicators on this list that can be disaggregated | [comment] ② |
| Target 4.6: By 2030, ensure that all youth and at least [x] per cent of adults, both men and women, achieve literacy and numeracy | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Percentage of youth/adults proficient in literacy and numeracy skills | [comment] ① |
| Proposed Indicator 2: Youth/adult literacy rate | [comment] ① |
| Target 4.7: By 2030, ensure that all learners acquire the knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development, including, among others, through education for sustainable development and sustainable lifestyles, human rights, gender equality, promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence, global citizenship and appreciation of cultural diversity and of culture's contribution to sustainable development. | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Percentage of 15- year old students showing proficiency in knowledge of environmental science and geoscience | [comment] <i>Regarding Goal 4 of SDGs, the discussion including indicators in UNESCO, such as the indicators corresponding to the priority action areas of the Global Action Programme on ESD, should be taken into account.</i> |
| Target 4.a: Build and upgrade education facilities that are child, disability and gender sensitive and provide safe, non-violent, inclusive and effective learning environments for all | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Percentage of schools with access to (i) electricity; (ii) drinking water; and (iii) single-sex sanitation facilities (as per the WASH indicator definitions) | [comment] ① The data is not collected, due to the lack of any relevant problems. |
| Target 4.b: By 2020, expand by [x] per cent globally the number of scholarships available to developing countries, in particular least developed countries, small island developing States and African countries, for enrolment in higher education, including vocational training and information and communications technology, technical, engineering and scientific programmes, in developed countries and other developing countries | |
| Proposed Indicator 1 | [comment] |

| | |
|--|--|
| Volume of ODA flows for scholarships by sector and type of study | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>In Japan, it is not necessary to select persons who receive the government-sponsored scholarship depending on their national origin; therefore, it would not be appropriate to set the number and/or volumes of scholarship as one of the indicators for achieving the goal.</i> • <i>In addition to the ODA, other form of cooperation, including from private sector, should be monitored. From this perspective, the proposed indicator is 'somewhat relative.'</i> |
|--|--|

Goal 5: Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls

Target 5.a: Undertake reforms to give women equal rights to economic resources, as well as access to ownership and control over land and other forms of property, financial services, inheritance and natural resources, in accordance with national laws

| | |
|---|---|
| Proposed Indicator 1 Proportion of adult population owning land, by sex, age and location | [comment] <i>Not relevant to this Target.</i> |
|---|---|

① : **The data is not collected, due to the lack of any relevant problems.**

- **Target 5.3:** Eliminate all harmful practices, such as child, early and forced marriage and female genital mutilation

- >**Proposed Indicator 2:** Percentage of girls and women aged 15-49 years who have undergone FGM/C, by age group (for relevant countries only)

- **Target 5.4:** Recognize and value unpaid care and domestic work through the provision of public services, infrastructure and social protection policies and the promotion of shared responsibility within the household and the family as nationally appropriate.

- >**Proposed Indicator 2:** Proportion of households within 15 minutes of nearest water source

- **Target 5.5:** Ensure women's full and effective participation and equal opportunities for leadership at all levels of decision-making in political, economic and public life.

- > **Proposed Indicator 2:** Proportion of women who have a say in household decisions (for large purchases, their own health and visiting relatives)

- **Target 5.6:** Ensure universal access to sexual and reproductive health and reproductive rights as agreed in accordance with the Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development and the Beijing Platform of Action and the outcome documents of their review conferences

- >**Proposed Indicator 1:** Percentage of women and girls who make decisions about their own sexual and reproductive health and reproductive rights by

age, location, income, disability and other characteristics relevant to each country

>**Proposed Indicator 2:** Existence of laws and regulations that guarantee all women and adolescents informed choices regarding their sexual and reproductive health and reproductive rights regardless of marital status.

Goal 6: Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all

| | |
|--|--|
| Target 6.3: By 2030, improve water quality by reducing pollution, eliminating dumping and minimizing release of hazardous chemicals and materials, halving the proportion of untreated wastewater and increasing recycling and safe reuse by [x] per cent globally | |
| PI2 Percentage of receiving water bodies with ambient water quality not presenting risk to the environment or human health | [comment] <i>We need to clarify what concrete action can be taken to estimate presenting risk."</i> |
| Target 6.4: By 2030, substantially increase water-use efficiency across all sectors and ensure sustainable withdrawals and supply of freshwater to address water scarcity and substantially reduce the number of people suffering from water scarcity. | |
| Proposed Indicator 2: Water Productivity | [comment] ② Depending on definitions of this indicator. Indicator 6.5-2: Japan does not have a transboundary river basin. |
| Target 6.5: By 2030, implement integrated water resources management at all levels, including through transboundary cooperation as appropriate | |
| Proposed Indicator 2: Availability of operational arrangements for transboundary basin management | [comment] ① We do not have the data because Japan is an island country. |
| Target 6.6: By 2020, protect and restore water-related ecosystems, including mountains, forests, wetlands, rivers, aquifers and lakes | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Change in wetlands extent over time (% change over time) | [comment] ② The definition of this proposed indicator is not clear. |
| Target 6.a: By 2030, expand international cooperation and capacity-building support to developing countries in water- and sanitation-related activities and programmes, including water harvesting, desalination, water efficiency, wastewater treatment, recycling and reuse technologies. | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: ODA flows for support of water and sanitation sector by using OCED/DAC statistics (code-140) | [comment] <i>By using OECD/DAC statistics (code-140), some parts of the target could be measured Other form of cooperation, including from private sector should be monitored.</i> |

Goal 7: Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all

| | |
|---|---|
| Target 7.1: By 2030, ensure universal access to affordable, reliable and modern energy services | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Percentage of population with electricity access (%) | [comment] ① The data is not collected, due to the lack of any relevant problems. We would like you to clarify the meaning of "modern" |
| Proposed Indicator 2: Percentage of population with primary reliance on non-solid fuels (%) | [comment] ① The data is not collected, due to the lack of any relevant problems. We would like you to clarify the meaning of "non-solid fuels." |
| Target 7.2: By 2030, increase substantially the share of renewable energy in the global energy mix | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Renewable energy share in the total energy final consumption (%) | [comment] <i>We can provide the renewable energy composition of electricity generation or primary energy, but not that of final energy consumption.</i> |
| Proposed Indicator 2: Enabling legislation and framework for renewable energy production established by 2020 | [comment] <i>The feed-in tariff (FIT) began in 2012</i> |
| Target 7.3: By 2030, double the global rate of improvement in energy efficiency | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Rate of improvement in energy intensity (%) measured in terms of primary energy and GDP | [comment] ① It isn't enough to regard "primary energy/GDP" as an indicator of energy efficiency |
| Proposed Indicator 2: Composite Energy Efficiency Improvement Index built up of sub-indicators measuring transport energy efficiency, industrial energy efficiency, power generation energy efficiency, buildings energy efficiency and agricultural energy efficiency | [comment] ① The definition of "energy efficiency" is obscure and the agricultural energy efficiency and some other efficiencies are under other ministries' jurisdictions, so we can't follow up when some accidents occur. |
| Target 7.a: By 2030, enhance international cooperation to facilitate access to clean energy research and technology, including renewable energy, energy efficiency and advanced and cleaner fossil-fuel technology, and promote investment in energy infrastructure and clean energy technology. | |
| Proposed Indicator 2: Amount of Foreign Direct Investment and Financial transfer for these purposes | [comment] ② The data is not collected, due to the lack of any relevant problems |
| Target 7.b: By 2030, expand infrastructure and upgrade technology for supplying modern and sustainable energy services for all in developing countries, in particular least developed countries and small island developing States | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Rate of improvement in energy productivity (the amount of economic output achieved for a given amount of energy consumption) | [comment] <i>Prior to considering this indicator, we would like you to clarify the following points: - the definition of "clean energy"(ex. is nuclear energy is included?).</i> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p><i>-the meaning of percentage of international cooperation projects'(the share of clean energy projects in ODA?).</i></p> <p><i>-the meaning of the amount of economic output"</i></p> |
| <p>Proposed Indicator 2: Percentage of international cooperation projects being implemented to facilitate access to clean energy</p> | <p>[comment]</p> <p><i>Prior to considering this indicator, we would like you to clarify the following points:</i></p> <p><i>-definition of 'clean energy'</i></p> <p><i>- the meaning of and measurement method for percentage of international cooperation projects"</i></p> |

Goal 8: Promote sustained, inclusive economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Target 8.4: Improve progressively, through 2030, global resource efficiency in consumption and production and endeavour to decouple economic growth from environmental degradation, in accordance with the 10-year framework of programmes for sustainable consumption and production, with developed countries taking the lead</p> | |
| <p>Proposed Indicator 1: Indicator for national material efficiency (production and consumption approaches)</p> | <p>[comment]</p> <p>② The definition of "Material efficiency" needs to be determined.</p> |
| <p>Proposed Indicator 2: Sectoral material efficiency</p> | <p>[comment]</p> <p>② The definition of "Material efficiency" needs to be determined.</p> |
| <p>Target 8.5: By 2030, achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all women and men, including for young people and persons with disabilities, and equal pay for work of equal value.</p> | |
| <p>Proposed Indicator 1: Employment to working-age population (15 years and above) ratio by gender and age group, and people with disabilities</p> | <p>[comment]</p> <p>① We do not have the data by disabilities.</p> |
| <p>Target 8.7: Take immediate and effective measures to secure the prohibition and elimination of the worst forms of child labour, eradicate forced labour and, by 2025, end child labour in all its forms, including the recruitment and use of child soldiers</p> | |
| <p>Proposed Indicator 2: Number of people in forced labour</p> | <p>[comment]</p> <p>① The data is not collected, due to the lack of any relevant problems.</p> |
| <p>Target 8.10: Strengthen the capacity of domestic financial institutions to encourage and expand access to banking, insurance and financial services for all</p> | |
| <p>Proposed Indicator 1: Getting Credit: Distance to Frontier</p> | <p>[comment]</p> <p>② The definition of this proposed indicator is not clear.</p> |
| <p>Target 8.a: Increase Aid for Trade support for developing countries, in particular least developed countries, including through the Enhanced Integrated Framework for Trade-Related Technical Assistance to Least Developed Countries</p> | |
| <p>Proposed Indicator 1: Evolution in Aid for Trade Commitments and</p> | <p>[comment]</p> <p>② It is not clear how "Evolution" can indicate</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| Disbursements | progress. Prior to considering this proposed indicator, we need to clarify the meaning of "evolution." |
| Target 8.b: By 2020, develop and operationalize a global strategy for youth employment and implement the Global Jobs Pact of the International Labour Organization | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Total government spending in social protection and employment programmes as percentage of the national budgets and GDP | [comment] <i>We can not judge that this indicator is suitable to promote sustained inclusive economic growth."</i> |

Goal 9: Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and foster innovation

| | |
|--|--|
| Target 9.1: Develop quality, reliable, sustainable and resilient infrastructure, including regional and trans border infrastructure, to support economic development and human well-being, with a focus on affordable and equitable access for all | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Percentage share of people employed in business infrastructure (consultancy, accounting, IT and other business services) in total employment | [comment] <i>The scope of Target 9.1 includes physical infrastructure, but does not include Business infrastructure (consultancy, accounting, IT and other business services), which is mentioned in Proposed indicator 1. Therefore, it is not appropriate as an indicator.</i> |
| Target 9.4: By 2030, upgrade infrastructure and retrofit industries to make them sustainable, with increased resource-use efficiency and greater adoption of clean and environmentally sound technologies and industrial processes, with all countries taking action in accordance with their respective capabilities. | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Intensity of material use per unit of value added (international dollars) | [comment] <i>It is necessary to take the character of each sector into consideration.</i> |
| Proposed Indicator 2: Energy intensity per unit of value added (international dollars) | [comment] ② The definition of this proposed indicator is not clear. |
| Target 9.5: Enhance scientific research, upgrade technological capabilities of industrial sectors in all countries, in particular developing countries, including, by 2030, encouraging innovation and increasing the number of research and development workers per 1 million people by[x] per cent and public and private research and development spending | |
| Proposed Indicator 2: Percentage share of medium and high-tech industry value added in total value added | [comment] ② The definition of this proposed indicator is not clear. |
| Target 9.a: Facilitate sustainable and resilient infrastructure development in developing countries through enhanced financial, technological and technical support to African countries, least developed countries, landlocked developing countries and small island developing States | |

| | |
|---|--|
| Proposed Indicator 1: Annual credit flow to infrastructure projects (in International Dollar) | [comment] <i>The proposed indicators focus only on the financial aspects, while the quality of infrastructure is indispensable for the sustainable development of developing countries. Thus, the proposed indicators (both 1 and 2) are Not suitable'und “Not relevant”.</i> |
| Proposed Indicator 2: Percentage share of infrastructure loans in total loans | <i>Proposed indicator 1 and 2, which focuses only on financial flow cannot measure how sustainable and resilient infrastructure is, which Target 9.1 is aiming to realize. Also, since technological and technical support, which is mentioned in the target, cannot be measured by loans solely, proposed indicator 2 is not appropriate.</i> |
| Target 9.b: Support domestic technology development, research and innovation in developing countries, including by ensuring a conducive policy environment for, inter alia, industrial diversification and value addition to commodities | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Aggregate value of all support mechanisms for technology and innovation (in International Dollar, % of GDP) | [comment] ② The details of the indicator are not clear, so we can not consider it for feasibility. |
| Proposed Indicator 2: Aggregate value of expenditure on diversification and value addition policy related instruments and mechanisms (in International Dollar; % of GDP) | [comment] ② The details of the indicator are not clear, so we can not consider it for feasibility. |

Goal 10: Reduce inequality within and among countries

| | |
|---|--|
| Target 10.1: By 2030, progressively achieve and sustain income growth of the bottom 40 per cent of the population at a rate higher than the national average. | |
| Proposed Indicator 2: Change in real disposable income and consumption by quintiles over time, at global, regional and national level. | [comment] ② The meaning of “with a view to measuring the ‘policy space’ available to them” is not clear. Please explain more. |
| Target 10.2: By 2030, empower and promote the social, economic and political inclusion of all, irrespective of age, sex, disability, race, ethnicity, origin, religion or economic or other status. | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Measure the progressive reduction of inequality gaps over time, disaggregated by groups as defined above, for selected social, economic, political and environmental SDG targets (at least one target per goal where relevant should be monitored using this approach) | [comment] <i>It is too comprehensive to consider.</i> |
| Proposed Indicator 2: Proportion of people living below 50% of median income | [comment] <i>We answered A'bn the condition that the target means that data could be available from the “Comprehensive Survey of Living Conditions” of the</i> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <i>Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. However, to be accurate, it is the relative poverty rate calculated based on the “median of equivalent disposable income” rather than the “median income”, and the “percentage of household members” instead of the “percentage of households.”</i> |
| Target 10.3: Ensure equal opportunity and reduce inequalities of outcome, including by eliminating discriminatory laws, policies and practices and promoting appropriate legislation, policies and action in this regard | |
| Proposed Indicator 2: Existence of an independent body responsible for promoting and protecting the right to non-discrimination | [comment] ② The definition of this proposed indicator is not clear. |
| Target 10.4: Adopt policies, especially fiscal, wage and social protection policies, and progressively achieve greater equality. | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: % of people covered by minimum social protection floor, that include basic education and health packages, by age, sex, economic status, origin, place of residence, disability, and civil status (widows, partners in union outside of marriage, divorced spouses, orphan children) and other characteristics of relevance for each country | [comment] ② The definition of this proposed indicator is not clear. <i>Purpose of the public assistance system is promotion of self-reliance as well as guarantee of the minimum standard of living, and rate of public assistance that is affected highly the percentages occupied in the low-income person’s population in the current state isn’t appropriate as an indicator of the achievement greater equality.</i> <i>In addition, it isn’t appropriate to adopt only rate of public assistance as an indicator, because reduce inequality is performed to combine with fiscal, wage and social protection policies and starting working support., etc.</i> |
| Target 10.5: Improve the regulation and monitoring of global financial markets and institutions and strengthen the implementation of such regulations. | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Adoption of a financial transaction tax (Tobin tax) at a world level | [comment] <i>The introduction of a financial transaction tax at a world level would have pros and cons, and discussions have been continued domestically and internationally. In addition, there are only a few countries which have introduced it. In this situation, we can not consider it for feasibility.</i> |
| Target 10.a: Implement the principle of special and differential treatment for developing countries, in particular least developed countries, in accordance with World Trade Organization agreements | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Degree of utilization and of implementation of SDT measures in favour of LDCs | [comment] <i>Negotiations on SDT are underway in the WTO/ Doha Development Round, and we cannot say firmly that we are able to have data on the potential agreements.</i> |
| Target 10.b: Encourage official development assistance and financial flows, including foreign | |

| | |
|---|---|
| direct investment, to States where the need is greatest, in particular least developed countries, African countries, small island developing States and landlocked developing countries, in accordance with their national plans and programmes | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: FDI inflows as a share of GDP to developing countries, broken down by group (LDCs, African countries, SIDS, LLDCS) and by source country | [comment] <i>Regarding Question 1, related definitions of the Indicator such as Foreign Direct Investment (FDI), African countries should be clarified. If the definition of FDI is as same as that of Balance of Payments statistics and the subject amount can be more than 30 million yen, it is technically feasible for us.</i> <i>Regarding Question 2 and 3, we do not support the feasibility of those indicators and we cannot see any relevance of them to the target. As for financial flows on the target, we think limiting the subject fund to FDI is not necessary and that Loans and Securities Investments, etc. can be included.</i> |

Goal 11: Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable

| | |
|---|---|
| Target 11.1: By 2030, ensure access for all to adequate, safe and affordable housing and basic services and upgrade slums. | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Percentage of urban population living in slums or informal settlements | [comment] <i>We are counting the population by areas smaller than municipal area because 'slum' and 'informal settlement' are not defined in Japan. .</i> |
| Target 11.4: Strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world's cultural and natural heritage. | |
| Proposed Indicator 2: Percentage of urban area and percentage of historical/cultural sites accorded protected status | [comment] ② The definition of this proposed indicator is not clear. |
| Target 11.6: By 2030, reduce the adverse per capita environmental impact of cities, including by paying special attention to air quality and municipal and other waste management | |
| Proposed Indicator 2: Level of ambient particulate matter (PM 10 and PM 2.5) | [comment] <i>We answered "A" on the condition that the indicator means the environmental standard of PM2.5 or measurement results of PM 2.5. 11.6.2: We answered "Yes" on the condition that the indicator means emissions of soot, not PM10.</i> |
| Target 11.7: By 2030, provide universal access to safe, inclusive and accessible, green and public spaces, in particular for women and children, older persons and persons with disabilities | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Area of public space as a proportion of total city space | [comment] ② The definition of this proposed indicator is not clear. |
| Target 11.b: By 2020, increase by [x] per cent the number of cities and human settlements adopting and implementing integrated policies and plans towards inclusion, resource efficiency, mitigation and adaptation to climate change, resilience to disasters, develop and implement, in line with the forthcoming Hyogo Framework, holistic disaster risk management at all levels | |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Proposed Indicator 2: Population density measured over continuous urban footprint</p> | <p>[comment] <i>Ideally, economic loss on a monitoring basis is appropriate. As the target focuses on making human settlements resilient, the number of housing units damaged and destroyed is appropriate to describe the achievement of the target and is clearly measurable. Since water-related disasters are specifically referred to in the target, the above mentioned figure for water-related disasters must be separately calculated as well as the disasters in total.</i></p> |
|---|--|

Goal 12: Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Target 12.3: By 2030, halve per capita global food waste at the retail and consumer levels and reduce food losses along production and supply chains, including post-harvest losses</p> | |
| <p>Proposed Indicator 1: Global Food Loss Index (GFLI) Proposed Indicator 2: Per capita food waste (kg/year), measured using Food Loss and Waste Protocol</p> | <p>[comment] <i>Methodology of both indicators is not clear, for which countries cannot estimate current and historical amount of food waste and losses. Therefore it is not appropriate to judge the suitability or relevance of these indicators without clarification of the methodology.</i></p> |
| <p>Target 12.4: By 2020, achieve the environmentally sound management of chemicals and all wastes throughout their life cycle, in accordance with agreed international frameworks, and significantly reduce their release to air, water and soil in order to minimize their adverse impacts on human health and the environment.</p> | |
| <p>Proposed Indicator 1: Number of Parties to, and number of national reports on the implementation of, international multilateral environmental agreements on hazardous chemicals and waste</p> | <p>[comment] <i>Proposed indicator 1 of Goal 12, Target 4 is feasible, since the number of parties and the number of national reports of MEAs on hazardous chemicals and wastes is easy to monitor under the existing conventions. However, for the suitability of the proposed indicator, many of the chemicals and wastes related MEAs have more than 150 parties, so it is not very convincing that the number of the parties is the optimal indicator. Target 12.4 is closely related to the SAICM objectives as we find its target year in 2020, same as the one for SAICM. SAICM has its own implementation indicators to evaluate the results, therefore, synchronizing the target indicator(s) with those in SAICM is much beneficial and efficient. (Current proposed indicators do not match with the ones in SAICM)</i></p> |
| <p>Proposed Indicator 2: Annual average levels of selected contaminants in air, water and soil from industrial sources, energy generation, agriculture, transport</p> | <p>[comment] <i>Target 12.4 is closely related to the SAICM objectives as we find its target year in 2020, same as the one for SAICM. SAICM has its own implementation</i></p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>and wastewater and waste treatment plants</p> | <p><i>indicators to evaluate the results, therefore, synchronizing the target indicator(s) with those in SAICM is much beneficial and efficient. (Current proposed indicators do not match with the ones in SAICM)</i></p> <p><i>- Since the soil is locally contaminated, countermeasures would have to be taken for the land which is likely to be contaminated after grasping the situation of the soil contamination. Therefore, monitoring does not fit the grasp of the situation of the soil contamination and its countermeasures in this case.</i></p> |
| <p>Target 12.c: Rationalize inefficient fossil-fuel subsidies that encourage wasteful consumption by removing market distortions, in accordance with national circumstances, including by restructuring taxation and phasing out those harmful subsidies, where they exist, to reflect their environmental impacts, taking fully into account their specific needs and conditions of developing countries and minimizing the possible adverse impacts on their development in a manner that protects the poor and the affected communities</p> | |
| <p>Proposed Indicator 1: Amount of fossil fuel subsidies, per unit of GDP (production and consumption), and as proportion of total national expenditure on fossil fuels</p> | <p>[comment] <i>The support for fossil fuels is applied to various sectors, and there are also various policies for fossil fuels for each sector. Therefore, treatment in the overall sector comprehensively is not appropriate to consider as an indicator.</i> <i>The data is not collected, due to the lack of any relevant problem.</i></p> |

Goal 13: Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts*

***Acknowledging that the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change is the primary international, intergovernmental forum for negotiating the global response to climate change**

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Target 13.a: Implement the commitment undertaken by developed-country parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change to a goal of mobilizing jointly \$100 billion annually by 2020 from all sources to address the needs of developing countries in the context of meaningful mitigation actions and transparency on implementation and fully operationalize the Green Climate fund through its capitalization as soon as possible</p> | |
| <p>Proposed Indicator 1: Mobilized amount of USD per year starting in 2020 accountable towards the USD 100 billion commitment</p> | <p>[comment] <i>No decision has been made with regard to the post-2020 goal of financial mobilization for developing countries. Therefore “the USD 100 billion commitment” and “starting in 2020” in the proposed indicator 1 has no ground. The proposed indicator contains factual errors.</i></p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| Proposed Indicator 2: % of GCF funded projects finalized and sustained afterwards through national funding to produce climate neutral solutions | [comment] <i>The scope of the target should not be limited to “national funding” (public funds) as expansion of private sector funding to GCF is also important.</i> |
|--|--|

Goal 14: Conserve and sustainable use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development

| | |
|--|--|
| Target 14.2: By 2020, sustainably manage and protect marine and coastal ecosystems to avoid significant adverse impacts, including by strengthening their resilience, and take action for their restoration in order to achieve healthy and productive oceans | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Percentage of coastline with formulated and adopted ICM/MSP plans | [comment] <i>ICM/MSP, which is implemented with specifying areas, is one of the methods used to manage and protect marine and coastal ecosystems. However, promoting ICM/MSP itself is not the purpose. Other methods which are implemented without specifying areas contribute to the target. To achieve the target, we must be able to choose each method, not only ICM/MSP. Therefore, Proposed Indicator 1 evaluating only ICM/MP is inappropriate.</i> |
| Proposed Indicator 2: Ocean Health Index | [comment] ② The definition of "Ocean Health Index" is obscure. Therefore Japan cannot support Proposed Indicator 2. |
| Target 14.4: By 2020, effectively regulate harvesting and end overfishing, illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing and destructive fishing practices and implement science-based management plans, in order to restore fish stocks in the shortest time feasible, at least to levels that can produce maximum sustainable yield as determined by their biological characteristics | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Fish species, threatened | [comment] <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Japan does not support any indicator for Target 14.4, since there is no appropriate indicator to fit this purpose. Japan considers it would be better and appropriate for this target to be pursued through enhancing and improving efforts under UNGA Resolutions and RFMOs.</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>There are 4 pillars referred to in Target 14.4, namely, end overfishing, end IUU fishing, end destructive fishing, and implement science-based management plans at least to levels that can produce</i> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p><i>maximum sustainable yields.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Only proposed Indicator 1 and 2 can indicate the target to end overfishing, but these two have a strong correlation and should be regarded as one indicator.</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>There is no indicator recognized for the end of IUU fishing. Proposed Indicator 1 and 2 are not appropriate or sufficient, since overfishing is not represented by IUU fishing. IUU fishing is identified and registered under a national and international legal framework through a complicated process, thus, identified IUU fishing activities does not reflect the actual frequency of IUU fishing activities.</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>The definition of destructive fishing practices differs among countries and so it is necessity to have such legal provisions. There seems to be no method to indicate this practice properly.</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Regarding the implementation of science-based management plans, Japan does not believe the WG has the capacity to identify new indicators. Identifying a new indicator for this target requires more robust study and discussion, which the WG does not aim to do.</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Overall, Japan does not support any indicator for Target 14.4, since there are no appropriate ones under the current situation and creating new indicators would require more in-depth and technical discussions.</i> |
| <p>Target 14.5: By 2020, conserve at least 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, consistent with national and international law and based on the best available scientific information.</p> | |
| <p>Proposed Indicator 1: Percentage area of each country's EEZ in MPA Percentage area of ABNJ in MPA Percentage area of global ocean under MPA</p> | <p>[comment] <i>The Protected Area including MPA is one of the methods to manage and protect marine and coastal ecosystems. Other methods which are implemented without specifying protected areas can also contribute to the target. To achieve the target, we must be able to choose a proper method to the various choices including, but not limited to Protected Area. Therefore, Proposed Indicator 1 and 2, evaluating only Protected Area or MPA is inappropriate.</i></p> |
| <p>Proposed Indicator 2: Legal framework or tax/trade mechanisms prohibiting certain forms of fisheries subsidies</p> | <p>[comment] <i>It makes no sense to mention a specific legal framework or tax/trade mechanisms in the indicator because a discussion to define fisheries subsidies has not been finalized in WTO negotiations.</i></p> |
| <p>Target 14.c: Ensure the full implementation of international law, as reflected in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea for States parties thereto, including, where applicable, existing regional and international regimes for the conservation and sustainable use of oceans and</p> | |

| | |
|---|---|
| their resources by their parties | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Adoption of a legal framework and number of associated court cases | [comment] <i>The purpose of the proposed indicator is unclear. It isn't appropriate as a statistical indicator of target 14c.</i> |
| Proposed Indicator 2: Number of countries implementing either legally or programmatically the provisions set out in regional seas protocols | [comment] <i>The purpose of the proposed indicator is unclear and it isn't appropriate as a statistical indicator of the target.</i> |
| [Additional Comments] Target 14.6, Proposed Indicator 2: It makes no sense to mention a specific legal framework or tax/trade mechanisms in the indicator because a discussion to define fisheries subsidies has been not finalized in WTO negotiations. Target 14.c, Proposed Indicator 1: The purpose of the proposed indicator is unclear. It isn't appropriate as a statistical indicator of target 14.c. | |

Goal 15: Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss

| | |
|---|---|
| Target 15.3: By 2020, combat desertification, restore degraded land and soil, including land affected by desertification, drought and floods, and strive to achieve a land-degradation-neutral world | |
| Proposed Indicator 2: Area of land/soils under sustainable management | [comment] ② The definition of this proposed indicator is not clear. |

Target 15.4: By 2030, ensure the conservation of mountain ecosystems, including their biodiversity, in order to enhance their capacity to provide benefits that are essential for sustainable development

Proposed Indicator 2: Mountain Green Cover Index

[comment]

The definition of this proposed indicator is not clear. We interpret 15.4 proposed indicator 2 “Mountain Green Cover Index” as “percentage of forest coverage”. Definitions for “Mountain” and “Green” should be discussed as well in the future.

| | |
|---|---|
| Target 15.9: By 2020, integrate ecosystem and biodiversity values into national and local planning, development processes, poverty reduction strategies and accounts | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: National programme on the measurement of values of biodiversity or on the implementation of the SEEA-EEA | [comment] <i>To incorporate SEEA-EEA into the indicator is not appropriate because SEEA-EEA is not ensured as an international standard.</i> |
| Target 15.a: Mobilize and significantly increase financial resources from all sources to conserve and sustainable use biodiversity and ecosystems | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Official Development Assistance | [comment] <i>Proposed indicator 1 of Target 15.a is not appropriate since it only measures ODA, while Target 15.a aims</i> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <i>to mobilize financial resources from all sources.</i> |
| Target 15.b: Mobilize significant resources from all sources and at all levels to finance sustainable forest management and provide adequate incentives to developing countries to advance such management, including for conservation and reforestation | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Public funding for sustainable forest management | [comment] <i>If proposed indicator 1 of Target 15.b intends to measure domestic public funding, it should be clearly stated as domestic public funding.</i> |
| [Additional Comments] Target15.3, Proposed Indicator 2: The definition of this proposed indicator is not clear. Target15.9, Proposed Indicator 1: To incorporate SEEA-EEA into the indicator is not appropriate because SEEA-EEA is not ensured as an international standard. Target15.b, Proposed Indicator 1: Under consideration | |

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

| | |
|---|--|
| Target 16.2: End abuse, exploitations, trafficking and all forms of violence against and torture of children | |
| Proposed Indicator 2: Number of victims of human trafficking per 100,000 people | [comment] <i>Definitions of terms and cases of “human trafficking” varies from one country to another and a simple comparison would not work.</i> |
| Target 16.3: Promote the rule of law at the national and international levels and ensure equal access to justice for all | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Percentage of people who have experienced a dispute, reporting access to an adequate dispute resolution mechanism | [comment] <i>The indicator only focuses on domestic cases, but it should take into account such aspects as the cases of international cooperation in this respect.</i> |
| Target 16.4: By 2030, significantly reduce illicit financial and arms flows, strengthen the recovery and return of stolen assets and combat all forms of organized crime | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Total volume of inward and outward illicit financial flows | [comment] <i>This indicator is not appropriate because it requires using ‘dark figures’ as parameters, which are difficult to survey. It is not feasible for almost any country.</i> |
| Target 16.5: Substantially reduce corruption and bribery in all their forms. | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Percentage of population who paid a bribe to a public official, or were asked for a bribe by these public officials, during the last 12 months | [comment] <i>This indicator is not appropriate because it requires using ‘dark figures’ as parameters, which are difficult to survey. It is not feasible for almost any country.</i> |
| Proposed Indicator 2: Percentage of businesses that paid a bribe to a public official, or were asked for a bribe by these public officials, during the last 12 months | [comment] <i>This indicator is not appropriate because it requires using ‘dark figures’ as parameters, which are difficult to survey. It is not feasible for almost any country.</i> |

| | |
|--|--|
| Target 16.7: Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Diversity in representation in key decision-making bodies (legislature, executive, and judiciary) | [comment] ② The definition of this proposed indicator is not clear. |
| Target 16.8: Broaden and strengthen the participation of developing countries in the institutions of global governance | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Percentage of children under 5 whose births have been registered with civil authority | [comment] <i>The data of this indicator is not collected because our law requires the submission of birth reports for all children and is followed almost completely.</i> |
| Target 16.9: By 2030, provide legal identity for all, including birth registration | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Percentage of children under 5 whose births have been registered with civil authority | [comment] <i>The data of this indicator is not collected because our law requires the submission of birth reports for all children and is followed almost completely.</i> |
| Target 16.10: Ensure public access to information and protect fundamental freedoms, in accordance with national legislation and international agreements | |
| Proposed Indicator 2: Number of journalists, associated media personnel and human rights advocates killed, kidnapped, disappeared, detained or tortured in the last 12 months | [comment] ② The definition of "human rights advocates" is not clear. |
| Target 16.a: Strengthen relevant national institutions, including through international cooperation, for building capacity at all levels, in particular in developing countries, to prevent violence and combat terrorism and crime | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Proportion of the population reporting and perceiving to be discriminated against directly and/or indirectly, and hate crimes | [comment] <i>This indicator is not appropriate because it requires using 'dark figures' as parameters, which are difficult to survey. It is not feasible for almost any country.</i> |
| Proposed Indicator 2: Proportion of population satisfied with the quality of public services, disaggregated by service | [comment] ① Measurement methods and subject agencies are unknown. |

Goal 17: Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development

[comment]
- *No indicators other than 17.19 are applicable.*
- *Target 17.19, Proposed Indicator 2: This indicator is not appropriate because what makes people happy differs from country to country.*

2. Proposed indicators which we could support

Goal 3: Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages

| | |
|---|---|
| Target 3.1: By 2030, reduce the global maternal mortality ratio to less than 70 per 100,000 live births. | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Maternal deaths per 100,000 live births | [comment] <i>These indicators reflect the targets and they are also in line with WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators</i> |
| Proposed Indicator 2: Skilled birth attendance | [comment] <i>These indicators reflect the targets and they are also in line with WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators</i> |
| Target 3.2: By 2030, end preventable deaths of newborns and children under 5 years of age. | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Under-five mortality per 1,000 live births | [comment] <i>These indicators reflect the targets and they are also in line with WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators</i> |
| Proposed Indicator 2: Prevalence of overweight children under 5 years of age. | [comment] * note: ①, ② <i>These indicators reflect the targets and they are also in line with WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators</i> |
| Target 3.6: By 2020, halve the number of global deaths and injuries from road traffic accidents | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Number of deaths due to road traffic accidents | [comment] <i>These indicators reflect the targets and they are also in line with WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators</i> |
| Target 3.8: Achieve universal health coverage, including financial risk protection, access to quality essential health-care services and access to safe, effective, quality and affordable essential medicines and vaccines for all. | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Fraction of the population protected against impoverishment by out-of-pocket health expenditures | [comment] * note: ①, ② <i>These indicators reflect the targets and they are also in line with WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators</i> |
| Proposed Indicator 2: Fraction of households protected from incurring catastrophic out-of-pocket health expenditure | [comment] * note: ① <i>These indicators reflect the targets and they are also in line with WHO Global Reference List of 100 Core Health Indicators</i> |

Goal 5: Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls

| | |
|--|--|
| Target 5.5: Ensure women's full and effective participation and equal opportunities for leadership at all levels of decision-making in political, economic and public life. | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Proportion of seats held by women in local governments | [comment] <i>The government of Japan accepts indicator 5.5.1</i> |

Goal 6: Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all

| | |
|---|--|
| Target 6.3: By 2030, improve water quality by reducing pollution, eliminating dumping and minimizing release of hazardous chemicals and materials, halving the proportion of untreated wastewater and increasing recycling and safe reuse by [x] per cent globally | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Percentage of waste water safely treated | [comment] <i>Indicator 1 is considered to be suitable for quantitative assessment in implementing measures.</i> |
| Target 6.5: By 2030, implement integrated water resources management at all levels, including through transboundary cooperation as appropriate | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Status of IWRM Implementation | [comment] <i>By implementing integrated water resources management at all levels, we can ensure sustainable water use.</i> |

Goal 11: Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable

| | |
|---|---|
| Target 11.5: By 2030, significantly reduce the number of deaths and the number of people affected and decrease by [x] per cent the economic losses relative to gross domestic product caused by disasters, including water-related disasters, with a focus on protecting the poor and people in vulnerable situations. | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Number of people killed, injured, displaced, evacuated, relocated or otherwise affected by disasters | [comment] <i>11.5 should be aligned with SFDRR. In this sense, numerical indicators which clearly show the damages and losses caused by disasters are to be set to monitor the progress of DRR efforts.</i> |
| Proposed Indicator 2: Number of housing units damaged and destroyed | |
| Target 11.6: By 2030, reduce the adverse per capita environmental impact of cities, including by paying special attention to air quality and municipal and other waste management | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Percentage of urban solid waste regularly collected and recycled (disaggregated by E-waste and non-E-waste) | [comment] <i>If E-waste is properly collected and recycled, it will reduce metal resource consumption, which will have a major positive effect on the environment. On the other hand, if not properly treated, it will cause severe environmental damage due to heavy metals. In addition, since E-waste is often exported to overseas improperly, international society should set an index and promote the proper treatment of E-waste.</i> |
| Target 11.b: By 2020, increase by [x] per cent the number of cities and human settlements adopting and implementing integrated policies and plans towards inclusion, resource efficiency, mitigation and adaptation to climate change, resilience to disasters, develop and implement, in line with the forthcoming Hyogo Framework, holistic disaster risk management at all levels | |
| Proposed Indicator 1: Percent of cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants that are implementing risk reduction and resilience strategies aligned with accepted international frameworks (such as the successor to the Hyogo Framework for Action on Disaster Risk Reduction) that include vulnerable and | [comment] <i>The indicator should be updated as follows: Proposed Indicator 1: The percentage of cities that have more than 100,000 inhabitants that are implementing risk reduction and resilience strategies based on reliable data, that are aligned with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (2015–2030), and that include vulnerable and</i> |

| | |
|--|---|
| marginalized groups in their design, implementation and monitoring | <i>marginalized groups in their design, implementation and monitoring</i> |
|--|---|