

Civil Society Statement

2nd Meeting of the Interagency and Expert Group on SDG Indicators

Bangkok, 26 October, 2015

Global Indicators under Goals 17

Thank you Chair,

I'm going to speak about Goal 17 on behalf of civil society present. As this may be our final statement (although we hope you will make space for stakeholders tomorrow) I want to say that civil society has significant material to input to this goal and others which we think can assist to make this agenda as effective and rigorous as possible.

You, as statistical experts, are of course a core element of Means of Implementation and we acknowledge that your work will need substantial support to take on this large task. But I want to also take this opportunity to ask you some closing questions.

As you prepare for your closed meeting in the morning and prepare for the next steps I want to ask you whether there is consensus amongst you that you will ensure that neither existing international standards, nor the ambition of Agenda2030 will be diluted through indicators. Yesterday we reminded you that indicators have the potential to both undermine the agenda and to obscure problems. We reminded you that changes to World Bank indicators for poverty made hundreds of millions of the poor disappear from official figures. Another proposal to alter the figures needs rigorous dissection. Similarly changes to hunger indicators in 2012 occurred when FAO altered its hunger measurements following the global food crisis and overnight millions of people were no longer hungry.

Recalling that the means of implementation must incorporate measures to enable redistribution of resources as well as power, measures to restore policy space for country ownership, ensure financing, technology, capacity building and data we have a number of proposals to better capture the ambition of the goals through indicators.

I'm going to start with target 17.14 on policy coherence. We support this critical indicator on ratification of UN instruments and hope we can expand the list provided by ILO (for example we propose including ILO 189 on Domestic Workers which would aid target 8.8).

However we also note that we should be addressing here the instruments and institutions that undermine policy coherence and make compliance with international human rights obligations impossible and indeed would prevent states from fulfilling their obligations under the Agenda. Specifically we refer to preferential trade and investment treaties that have been demonstrated to exacerbate inequalities, promote unsustainable practices and prevent governments from regulating in the interests of environmental protections, labour rights and access to education, basic health and

services as required by this agenda. Let me give you an example - we have a target 3.b that specifically refers to the TRIPS provisions that allow developing countries to produce generic medicines. Yet governments concluded negotiations for the Trans Pacific Partnership the week after Agenda2030 that makes that provision impossible. Trade agreements have include binding remedies with real impact on national budgets, this agenda does not. So therefore more meaningful indicators that would monitor how trade contributes to sustainable development could include:

1. Number of disputes brought against countries through dispute settlement processes (by companies, other countries, other) in areas such as trade, investment, technology etc.
2. Number of constraints embodied in ODA or loan agreements

Touching briefly on addition yellow indicators:

17.1 - We support the inclusion of environmental taxes and encourage you to include taxes on other harmful industries and disaggregate other sources of tax including company tax and indirect taxes. UN collated data repeatedly points to the need to increase redistributive taxes and reduce indirect taxes .

17.3.1 -Mobilise additional financial resources for development – the current indicator doesn't effectively measure increases in resources mobilised specifically for Developing Countries. The indicator should be measuring both increased resources to Developing Cpuntries - specifically LDCs - disaggregated by source and be compared to outflows of resources going from Developing Countries to OECD countries.

17.4.1 - While the indicator is green we can see varying views and support the need to measure contributions to debt relief from OECD countries

17.7.1 - The indicator is focused on transferring renewable technology. Consequently the target should not be tariff focused. This indicator shifts responsibilities to developing countries and perversely deprives them of tariff income. Instead the proposal to measure funds for technology provided by countries with historical responsibility would be appropriate and, should states consider further indicators, an indicator that measures the costs of renewable energy imposed through intellectual property barriers may be more appropriate.

17.12.1 - Support India's reformation

Additional contributions on indicators not included in the verbal statement:

On 17.3 we propose that indicators incorporate transparent measurement of ODA. We support breaking down of ODA by countries and sectors. We also suggest including data on percentage of ODA that comes in the form of concessional loans or other instruments.

We propose an indicator on the percentage of tax paid by multi-national corporations within host countries. We propose that the volume of debt under 17.3.1 Amount of additional, predictable and untied finance available in national budgets for sustainable development financing countries

Indicator 17.16. 1 to be added or replaced by an indicator “Mutual accountability among development partners is strengthened through inclusive reviews”.

On 17.17s

Target 17.17 should be broad. As noted in OECD, “Indicators proposed so far only deal with public-private partnerships, and focus on specific projects and investments. The wording of target 17.17 suggests a broader coverage of partnerships may be intended”.

We support the proposal to measure i) the quality of public-private dialogue; iii) existence and implementation of binding human rights and environmental protection frameworks for the regulation of public-private partnerships, including periodic impact assessments and iii) the extent to which governments and providers of development cooperation contribute to an enabling environment for civil society academia and micro enterprises. We should also measure contributions to PPPs by source.

While noting our repeated concerns about the inclusion of Public Private Partnerships in the framework in the delivery of any essential resources, services, institutions, we suggest that the value of public-private partnerships should be measured in terms of their contribution to sustainable development. For this reason, we suggest the following two indicators:

- i) % of public-(for profit) private partnerships that deliver greater value for achieving the SDGs than public or private finance alone, as measured via ex ante and ex post evaluations of impact against cost effectiveness, poverty and equity.
- ii) % of public-(for profit) private partnerships that include full transparency of contracts, terms, and ex ante and ex post assessment results, and subject to the highest international environmental and social safeguards.
- iii) Ratio of stock of public to public to private investment
- iv) Measure contributions to PPPs by source

The current indicator 17.7. 1 is inclined only to PPPs. We suggest to add an indicator “Civil Society operates in enabling environment that maximizes its engagement and contribution to sustainable development”, which is supported by United Kingdom.

17.7 - Total commitments in USD to partnerships that are public -public / public-private and public - civil society by source and according to profit making status.

On target 17.18

As stated in the Outcome Document, the follow-up and review mechanisms will be based on “data which is high-quality, accessible, timely, reliable and disaggregated by sex, age, race, ethnicity, migration

status, disability and geographic location and other characteristics relevant in national contexts”. These categories for disaggregation are largely consistent with the “prohibited grounds of discrimination” under international law, and reflect the cross-cutting human rights principles of non-discrimination and equality.

Adequate implementation of target 17.18 is key to enabling a systematic monitoring of the equality and non-discrimination dimensions of the entire Agenda. However, the requirement for disaggregation is mentioned in an uneven manner – or not at all - across the proposed indicators. It is of utmost importance for the human rights relevance of the indicators that:

A systematic approach to disaggregation of data based on prohibited grounds of discrimination is mainstreamed across the indicators framework.

Full disaggregation is recommended for a number of strategically selected indicators (selected, for example, on the basis of criteria such as their human rights reference and importance for reducing inequalities)

Further, in order to counter arguments about the lack of data availability, it will be crucial that the IAEG-SDGs stress the importance of capacity-building support for progressive realisation of comprehensive collection of disaggregated data as provided for in Target 17.18. In this regards, IAEG-SDGs should provide guidance on participatory innovative approaches to data collection in collaboration with concerned rights-holder groups, where data is not readily available.

Finally, whether captured under Goal 17, Goal 10 or elsewhere we reiterate the need for a composite indicator to determine whether the ‘means’ and the ‘ends’ are balanced nationally and globally.

Aggregate indices and indicators may be less for precise measurement than tools of communication on the global universal goals that gestures toward the differentiated approaches to achieve the goals, which countries may pursue.

One option that could be explored is combining the Human Development Index with the Global Footprint Network’s Ecological Footprint. The 2013 Human Development Report 2013 proposes a similar combination of the HDI with the Ecological Footprint in order to show where countries are positioned in a grid indicating the ecological sustainability of their development.

Such an aggregate could signify the continued relevance of the CBDR principle—and pointing out that while countries pursue the universal SDGs, their pathways, priority areas and targets to arrive at those goals will be quite different.

Thank you.